

Please note: These minutes are yet to be confirmed as a true record of proceedings

CITY OF BUSSELTON

MINUTES FOR THE COUNCIL MEETING HELD ON 22 JUNE 2016

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ITEM NO.	SUBJECT	PAGE NO.
1.	DECLARATION OF OPENING AND ANNOUNCEMENT OF VISITORS.....	3
2.	ATTENDANCE	3
3.	PRAYER	3
4.	PUBLIC QUESTION TIME.....	4
5.	ANNOUNCEMENTS WITHOUT DISCUSSION.....	4
6.	APPLICATION FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE.....	4
7.	PETITIONS AND PRESENTATIONS	4
8.	DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS	5
9.	CONFIRMATION AND RECEIPT OF MINUTES	5
	Previous Council Meetings.....	5
9.1	Minutes of the Council Meeting held 8 June 2016.....	5
	Committee Meetings.....	5
9.2	Minutes of the Finance Committee Meeting held 2 June 2016	5
9.3	Minutes of the Airport Advisory Committee Meeting held 8 June 2016	5
9.4	Minutes of the Capes Region Organisation of Councils (CapeROC) Meeting held 26 May 2016	6
10.	REPORTS OF COMMITTEE	8
10.1	Finance Committee - 2/06/2016 - LIST OF PAYMENTS MADE - APRIL 2016	8
10.2	Finance Committee - 2/06/2016 - FINANCIAL ACTIVITY STATEMENTS - PERIOD ENDED 30 APRIL 2016.....	10
10.3	Airport Advisory Committee - 8/06/2016 - BUSSELTON-MARGARET RIVER AIRPORT NOISE MODELLING	19
11.	PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES REPORT	28
11.1	DA14/0561 - PROPOSED EXTRACTIVE INDUSTRY - LOT 61 (NO.1958) CAVES ROAD, NATURALISTE.....	42
11.2	DOG CONTROL DESIGNATIONS REVIEW.....	28
12.	ENGINEERING AND WORKS SERVICES REPORT.....	37
13.	COMMUNITY AND COMMERCIAL SERVICES REPORT	37
14.	FINANCE AND CORPORATE SERVICES REPORT	52
14.1	CORPORATE BUSINESS PLAN 2016/2017 - 2019/2020.....	52
15.	CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT	37
15.1	COUNCILLORS' INFORMATION BULLETIN	37

16.	MOTIONS OF WHICH PREVIOUS NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN	61
17.	CONFIDENTIAL REPORTS.....	61
18.	QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS	61
19.	PUBLIC QUESTION TIME.....	61
20.	NEXT MEETING DATE	61
21.	CLOSURE	61

MINUTES

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE BUSSELTON CITY COUNCIL HELD IN MEETING ROOM ONE, COMMUNITY RESOURCE CENTRE, 21 CAMMILLERI STREET, BUSSELTON, ON 22 JUNE 2016 AT 5.30PM.

1. DECLARATION OF OPENING AND ANNOUNCEMENT OF VISITORS

The Presiding Member opened the meeting at 5.30pm.

2. ATTENDANCE

Presiding Member:

Cr Grant Henley Mayor

Members:

Cr Coralie Tarbotton
Cr Ross Paine
Cr Terry Best
Cr John McCallum
Cr Rob Bennett
Cr Paul Carter
Cr Robert Reekie
Cr Gordon Bleechmore

Officers:

Mr Mike Archer, Chief Executive Officer
Mr Oliver Darby, Director, Engineering and Works Services
Mr Paul Needham, Director, Planning and Development Services
Mrs Naomi Searle, Director, Community and Commercial Services
Mr Matthew Smith, Director, Finance and Corporate Services
Mr Martyn Glover, Executive Director
Miss Hayley Barge, Administration Officer, Governance

Apologies

Nil

Approved Leave of Absence

Nil

Media:

"Busselton-Dunsborough Times"
"Busselton-Dunsborough Mail"

Public:

15

3. PRAYER

The prayer was delivered by Pastor Emily Seinemeier from Cornerstone Church.

4. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**Response to Previous Questions Taken on Notice**

Nil

Public Question Time

Nil

5. ANNOUNCEMENTS WITHOUT DISCUSSION**Announcements by the Presiding Member**

The Mayor acknowledged the work and efforts of those involved in creating the Busselton Youth Precinct resulting in the WA Branch award - Major Play Space received from Parks and Leisure Australia.

The award will be displayed in the new Administration Building.

Announcements by other Members at the invitation of the Presiding Member

Nil

6. APPLICATION FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Nil

7. PETITIONS AND PRESENTATIONS**Petition –**

A petition relating to the construction of a footpath for the length of Amberley Loop in Dunsborough Lakes was presented which stated:

“Amberley Loop is one of the few roads in the Dunsborough Lakes Development that is not serviced with a footpath and we strongly request, as a matter of urgency that these hazards and their potential danger to members of this segment of the community be eliminated.”

Council Decision

C1606/143

Moved Councillor J McCallum, seconded Councillor T Best

That the petition be received and referred to the CEO to prepare a report to the Council or a Committee.

CARRIED 9/0

Presentations –

Mrs Sabine Hofferberth addressed the Council in accordance with Section 6.1 of the Standing Orders as a party with an interest in Item 11.2. Mrs Hofferberth was generally not in agreement with the Officer Recommendation.

Mr Peter Bogue of Borrello Graham representing Mt Duckworth residents addressed the Council in accordance with Section 6.1 of the Standing Orders as a party with an interest in Item 11.1. Mr Bogue was generally not in agreement with the Officer Recommendation.

8. DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS

The Mayor noted that a declaration of impartiality interest had been received from:

- Chief Executive Officer, Mike Archer in relation to Agenda Item 11.1- DA14/0561 - Proposed Extractive Industry - Lot 61 (No.1958) Caves Road, Naturaliste

The Mayor advised that in accordance with the Local Government (Rules of Conduct) Regulations 2007 this declaration would be read out immediately before Item 11.1 was discussed.

9. CONFIRMATION AND RECEIPT OF MINUTES**Previous Council Meetings**9.1 Minutes of the Council Meeting held 8 June 2016**Council Decision**

C1606/144 Moved Councillor G Bleechmore, seconded Councillor P Carter

That the Minutes of the Council Meeting held 8 June 2016 be confirmed as a true and correct record.

CARRIED 9/0

Committee Meetings9.2 Minutes of the Finance Committee Meeting held 2 June 2016**Council Decision**

C1606/145 Moved Councillor C Tarbotton, seconded Councillor J McCallum

- 1) That the minutes of the Finance Committee Meeting held 2 June 2016 be received.
- 2) That the Council notes the outcome from the Finance Committee Meeting held 2 June 2016 being:
 - a) The Finance Committee Information Bulletin - Period Ending 30 April 2016 item is noted.
 - b) The List of Payments Made - April 2016 item is presented for Council consideration at item 10.1 of this agenda.
 - c) The Financial Activity Statements - Period Ended 30 April 2016 item is presented for Council consideration at item 10.2 of this agenda.

CARRIED 9/0

9.3 Minutes of the Airport Advisory Committee Meeting held 8 June 2016**Council Decision**

C1606/146 Moved Councillor G Bleechmore, seconded Councillor J McCallum

- 1) That the minutes of the Airport Advisory Committee Meeting held 8 June 2016 be

received.

- 2) That the Council notes the outcomes from the Airport Advisory Committee Meeting held 8 June 2016 being:
 - a) The Busselton-Margaret River Airport Noise Modelling item is presented for Council consideration at item 10.3 of this agenda.

CARRIED 9/0

9.4 Minutes of the Capes Region Organisation of Councils (CapeROC) Meeting held 26 May 2016

Council Decision

C1606/147

Moved Councillor C Tarbotton, seconded Councillor J McCallum

- 1) That the minutes of the Capes Region Organisation of Councils (CapeROC) Meeting held on 26 May 2016 be received.
- 2) That the Council notes the outcomes from the Capes Region Organisation of Councils (CapeROC) Meeting held 26 May 2016 being:
 - a) CapeROC endorsed the allocation of \$20,000 from the 2016/17 budget for a historical initiative celebrating the 50th anniversary of the Margaret River Wine Association.
 - b) CapeROC will invite the Margaret River Busselton Tourism Association to take over responsibility of producing the Calendar of Events for the coming financial year with CapeROC providing funding up to the value identified for a 1 year term. In the event that the Margaret River Busselton Tourism Association does not support this proposal, CapeROC will proceed with the calendar publication for the coming year only.
 - c) CapeROC received the information provided in the 2015/16 budget report; the Shire of Augusta Margaret River and the City of Busselton agreed to each allocate \$50,000 of their individual budgets towards a total CapeROC budget of up to \$100,0000 to progress regional economic development initiatives; and CapeROC identified the following projects and provisional allocations to be included in the 2016/17 CapeROC budget:
 - i. Margaret River Wine - 50th Anniversary Budget Allocation Request for 2016/17 Amount: \$20,000;
 - ii. Tourism Directional Signage Amount: \$20,000
 - iii. Margaret River Region Calendar of Events Amount: up to \$25,000; and
 - iv. To be identified in the next financial year Amount; \$35,000
- 3) Major project updates relating to the Busselton Margaret River Regional Airport, Busselton Foreshore and Civic and Administration Building redevelopments, Waste Management and State Budget Announcements were presented by Officers to CapeROC.

CARRIED 9/0

ITEMS BROUGHT FORWARD AND ADOPTION BY EXCEPTION RESOLUTION

At this juncture the Mayor advised the meeting that with the exception of the items identified to be withdrawn for discussion, that the remaining reports, including the Committee and Officer Recommendations, will be adopted en bloc.

Council Decision / Committee Recommendation and Officer Recommendation

C1606/148 Moved Councillor G Bleechmore, seconded Councillor T Best

That the Committee and Officer Recommendations in relation to the following agenda items be carried en bloc:

- 10.1 Finance Committee - 2/06/2016 - LIST OF PAYMENTS MADE - APRIL 2016
- 10.2 Finance Committee - 2/06/2016 - FINANCIAL ACTIVITY STATEMENTS - PERIOD ENDED 30 APRIL 2016
- 10.3 Airport Advisory Committee - 8/06/2016 - BUSSELTON-MARGARET RIVER AIRPORT NOISE MODELLING
- 11.2 DOG CONTROL DESIGNATIONS REVIEW
- 15.1 COUNCILLORS' INFORMATION BULLETIN

CARRIED 9/0

EN BLOC

10. REPORTS OF COMMITTEE

10.1 Finance Committee - 2/06/2016 - LIST OF PAYMENTS MADE - APRIL 2016

SUBJECT INDEX:	Financial Operations
STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE:	An organisation that is managed effectively and achieves positive outcomes for the community.
BUSINESS UNIT:	Finance and Information Technology
ACTIVITY UNIT:	Finance
REPORTING OFFICER:	Financial Accountant - Ehab Gowegati
AUTHORISING OFFICER:	Director, Finance and Corporate Services - Matthew Smith
VOTING REQUIREMENT:	Simple Majority
ATTACHMENTS:	Attachment A List of Payments Made - April 2016

This item was considered by the Finance Committee at its meeting on 2 June 2016, the recommendations from which have been included in this report.

PRÉCIS

This report provides details of payments made from the City's bank accounts for the month of April 2016, for noting by the Council and recording in the Council Minutes.

BACKGROUND

The Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations require that when the Council has delegated authority to the Chief Executive Officer to make payments from the City's bank accounts, that a list of payments made is prepared each month for presentation to, and noting by, Council.

STATUTORY ENVIRONMENT

Section 6.10 of the Local Government Act and more specifically, Regulation 13 of the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations; refer to the requirement for a listing of payments made each month to be presented to the Council.

RELEVANT PLANS AND POLICIES

NA.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

NA.

Long-term Financial Plan Implications

NA.

STRATEGIC COMMUNITY OBJECTIVES

This matter principally aligns with Key Goal Area 6 – 'Open and Collaborative Leadership' and more specifically Community Objective 6.3 – 'An organisation that is managed effectively and achieves positive outcomes for the community'.

RISK ASSESSMENT

NA.

CONSULTATION

NA.

OFFICER COMMENT

NA.

CONCLUSION

NA.

OPTIONS

NA.

TIMELINE FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

NA.

Council Decision / Committee Recommendation and Officer Recommendation

C1606/149 Moved Councillor G Bleechmore, seconded Councillor T Best

That the Council notes payment of voucher numbers M112831 – M112923, EF045654 – EF046151, T007233 – T007235, and DD002727 – DD002758; together totaling \$6,887,743.33.

CARRIED 9/0

EN BLOC

10.2 Finance Committee - 2/06/2016 - FINANCIAL ACTIVITY STATEMENTS - PERIOD ENDED 30 APRIL 2016

SUBJECT INDEX:	Budget Planning and Reporting
STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE:	An organisation that is managed effectively and achieves positive outcomes for the community.
BUSINESS UNIT:	Financial Services
ACTIVITY UNIT:	Financial Services
REPORTING OFFICER:	Manager, Financial Services - Victoria Wilmot Financial Accountant - Ehab Gowegati
AUTHORISING OFFICER:	Director, Finance and Corporate Services - Matthew Smith
VOTING REQUIREMENT:	Simple Majority
ATTACHMENTS:	Attachment A Financial Activity Statements - April 2016

This item was considered by the Finance Committee at its meeting on 2 June 2016, the recommendations from which have been included in this report.

PRÉCIS

Pursuant to Section 6.4 of the Local Government Act ('the Act') and Regulation 34(4) of the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations ('the Regulations'), a local government is to prepare, on a monthly basis, a statement of financial activity that reports on the City's financial performance in relation to its adopted/amended budget.

This report has been compiled to fulfil the statutory reporting requirements of the Act and associated Regulations, whilst also providing the Council with an overview of the City's financial performance on a year to date basis for the period ending 30 April 2016.

BACKGROUND

The Regulations detail the form and manner in which financial activity statements are to be presented to the Council on a monthly basis; and are to include the following:

- Annual budget estimates;
- Budget estimates to the end of the month in which the statement relates;
- Actual amounts of revenue and expenditure to the end of the month in which the statement relates;
- Material variances between budget estimates and actual revenue/expenditure (including an explanation of any material variances);
- The net current assets at the end of the month to which the statement relates (including an explanation of the composition of the net current position).

Additionally, and pursuant to Regulation 34(5) of the Regulations, a local government is required to adopt a material variance reporting threshold in each financial year. At its meeting of 23 July 2015, the Council adopted (C1507/208) the following material variance reporting threshold for the 2015/16 financial year:

That pursuant to Regulation 34(5) of the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations, the Council adopts a material variance reporting threshold with respect to financial activity statement reporting for the 2015/16 financial year to comprise variances equal to or greater than 10% of the year to date budget amount as detailed in the Income Statement by Nature and Type/Statement of Financial Activity report, however variances due to timing differences and/or seasonal adjustments are to be reported on a quarterly basis.

STATUTORY ENVIRONMENT

Section 6.4 of the Local Government Act and Regulation 34 of the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations detail the form and manner in which a local government is to prepare financial activity statements.

RELEVANT PLANS AND POLICIES

NA

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Any financial implications are detailed within the context of this report.

STRATEGIC COMMUNITY OBJECTIVES

This matter principally aligns with Key Goal Area 6 – ‘Open and Collaborative Leadership’ and more specifically Community Objective 6.3 - ‘An organisation that is managed effectively and achieves positive outcomes for the community’. The achievement of the above is underpinned by the Council strategy to ‘ensure the long term financial sustainability of Council through effective financial management’.

RISK ASSESSMENT

Risk assessments have been previously completed in relation to a number of ‘higher level’ financial matters, including timely and accurate financial reporting to enable the Council to make fully informed financial decisions. The completion of the monthly Financial Activity Statement report is a treatment/control that assists in addressing this risk.

CONSULTATION

NA

OFFICER COMMENT

In order to fulfil statutory reporting requirements, and to provide the Council with a synopsis of the City’s overall financial performance on a year to date basis, the following financial reports are attached hereto:

- Statement of Financial Activity

This report provides details of the City’s operating revenues and expenditures on a year to date basis, by nature and type (i.e. description). The report has been further extrapolated to include details of non-cash adjustments and capital revenues and expenditures, to identify the City’s net current position; which reconciles with that reflected in the associated Net Current Position report.

- Net Current Position

This report provides details of the composition of the net current asset position on a year to date basis, and reconciles with the net current position as per the Statement of Financial Activity.

- Capital Acquisition Report

This report provides year to date budget performance (by line item) in respect of the following capital expenditure activities:

- Land and Buildings
- Plant and Equipment
- Furniture and Equipment

- Infrastructure

- Reserve Movements Report

This report provides summary details of transfers to and from reserve funds, and also associated interest earnings on reserve funds, on a year to date basis.

Additional reports and/or charts are also provided as required to further supplement the information comprised within the statutory financial reports.

COMMENTS ON FINANCIAL ACTIVITY TO 30 APRIL 2016

Comments on the financial activity and a brief explanation of the variances is provided below.

Operating Activity

- Operating Revenue

As at 30 April 2016, there is a variance of +0.2% in total operating revenue, with the following categories exceeding the 10% material variance threshold:

Description	Variance %	Variance \$000's
Operating Grants, Subsidies and Contributions	+22%	+\$615
Interest Earnings	+45%	+\$771
Non-Operating Grants, Subsidies and Contributions	-19%	-\$1,397
Profit on Asset Disposal	+17%	+\$2

Operating Grants, Subsidies and Contributions (+\$615K)

The current variance on operating grants, subsidies and contributions is primarily attributable to:

- Office of the CEO revenue is favourable to budget by +\$40k. This is mainly attributable to +\$38k revenue received for the CapeRoc project allocations and management studies and +\$2k silver funding sponsorship for the Busselton Skate park opening (Sunday 13th December 2015).
- Operations Services Works revenue is favourable to budget by +\$41k. This is mainly attributable to the reimbursement of workers compensation funds which offsets expenditure that has already been incurred.
- Financial Services revenue is favourable to budget by +\$59k. This is mainly attributable to the receipt of an unbudgeted distribution from the Local Government Insurance Scheme (LGIS) for the 2015 scheme member dividend. A total of \$6m was redistributed to members, with the City's share amounting to +\$37k. The City also received from LGIS an additional +\$11k in insurance recoup claims attributable to the Busselton Hockey Club and the Busselton Horse and Pony Club. These funds were then on-forwarded to these community groups to offset expenditure already incurred. The remaining +\$11k is for the receipt of funds associated with parental leave payments. This additional revenue also offsets expenditure already incurred by the City.
- Fire Prevention Services revenue is favourable to budget by +\$79k. This is mainly attributable to the receipt of unbudgeted revenue on the finalisation of the 2014/15 DFES reconciliation of +\$66k.
- Civic and Administration Centre revenue is favourable to budget by +\$228k. This is attributable to a contribution by BCG towards costs associated with the building design, as per contract negotiations. The final amount is still to be confirmed and therefore an immaterial variance may occur on the final amount received.
- Busselton Jetty revenue is favourable to budget by +\$351k. This is attributable to a timing difference where the invoice was raised in April (and paid in May) for the second payment attributable to the Jetty license agreement.
- Miscellaneous Bridge maintenance is below budget expectations by -\$360k. This is attributable to timing differences at this time with +\$180k being confirmed as received in May.

Interest Earnings (+\$771K)

The current variance on interest earnings is primarily attributable to:

- Late payment interest of +\$40k.
- Instalment plan interest of +\$6k.
- Interest on Municipal funds of -\$48k.
- Interest on reserve funds of +\$195k. The reserves balance currently includes \$16.9m loan funds for the Administration building redevelopment which is yet to be utilised. Due to the higher than anticipated balance at this time, interest earned has exceeded budget projections. It is noted of the \$195k in additional interest, \$124k is attributable to the Civic and Administration Centre Construction Reserve.
- Interest on restricted funds of +\$578k. This relates to interest on airport funds which is not budgeted for. The Airport grant agreement requires these funds be applied towards the Airport project.

Non-Operating Grants, Subsidies and Contributions (-\$1,397K)

The current variance on non-operating grants, subsidies and contributions is primarily attributable to:

- Developer contributions revenue to date is +\$93k over budget. At this time, it appears this maybe a timing difference. This line item has no impact on the budget as all developer contributions are transferred to restricted assets accounts to be used in subsequent periods for the purpose for which they were raised.
- Bridges construction program projected revenue is under budget by -\$645k. This is attributable to;
 - Federal funding of -\$288k towards the Queen Street Bridge design and preliminary works, which has been delayed pending the Busselton Traffic Study. Although some work has commenced the grant will not be claimed this financial year;
 - Works valued at \$304k for the Metricup Road Bridge were postponed to next year due to an unacceptable impact on tourist traffic. Both these projects will be carried forward and completed in the 16/17 financial year.
- Busselton shark net revenue is +\$100k over the year to date budget. This is reflective of a timing difference with the budget revenue being allocated to June.
- Busselton Foreshore projects are on the whole -\$599k below the year to budget. The main variances are attributable to;
 - Foreshore East Youth Precinct (skate park and adventure playground) revenue is +\$614k over the year to date budget, due to a budget allocation timing difference;
 - Provision of Services and Auxiliary works revenue is below budget by -\$1.2m. This is due to the \$4.5m Royalties for Regions grant being pending, with likely notification in June or July.
- Footpath construction works on the whole is below the year to date budget by -\$181k. This is attributable to;
 - Busselton Bypass, Strelly Street to Clydebank Avenue revenue is -\$61k below budget projections. This is a timing variance only as the City can only claim the 50% grant contribution in arrears, upon completion of the project. The acquittal process is currently underway;
 - Busselton Bypass, Fairway to Kangaroo Gully, revenue is -\$120k below budget projections. This is due to a timing variance only as the City can only claim the last 20% of this project upon completion of the works when the final cost is known. It is anticipated the final claim will be made in June.
- Main Roads capital road construction projected revenue is -\$179k below year to date budget. This variance is mainly attributable to two jobs, being Strelly Street -\$80k and Queen Elizabeth Avenue -\$84k;
 - The Strelly Street project consists of design, planning and minor preliminary works and has been delayed due to deliberations surrounding the outcomes of the Busselton Traffic Study. The City can only claim the second 40% progress payment in advance when the

first 40% has been fully expended. It is anticipated that this project will represent a carry over into the 16/17 financial year;

- The Queen Elizabeth Avenue asphalt overlay project is now nearing completion with the final 20% of the grant totalling \$42k to be claimed in June. A claim totalling the year to date variance of \$84k was raised in May effectively reducing this variance to nil.
- Roads to Recovery road project grant revenue is -\$52k below year to date budget. The City submits a quarterly claim in advance based on anticipated expenditure which was raised in April. It is noted that the amount subsequently received in May is lower than the claim amount. The variance is anticipated to be received next year and due to timing of expenditure there is no expected material impact on the City's net position as at year end.
- Road Initiative bus bays and shelters revenue is under budget by -\$180k. This is attributable to a timing variance only. The second 40% progress claim totalling \$120k was processed in May with the final claim valued at \$60k to be made in June.

Profit on Asset Disposals (+\$2K)

The current minor variance remains attributable to book profits on the sale of assets. It should be noted that this is an accounting book entry, and has no direct impact on the surplus/deficit position.

- Operating Expenditure

As at 30 April 2016, there is a variance of -7% in total operating expenditure, with the following categories exceeding the 10% material variance threshold:

Description	Variance %	Variance \$000's
Materials and Contracts	-21%	-\$2,639
Insurance Expenses	-10%	-\$74
Other Expenses	-20%	-\$514
Loss on Asset Disposal	+73%	+\$49

Materials and Contracts (-\$2,639K)

The materials and contracts operating expenditure category comprises a wide range of expenditure types. The current variance is attributable to both favourable and adverse variances (of varying magnitudes) across a range of diverse activities. The material variances are as follows:

- **Information Technology**
Information technology has a favourable variance of -\$165k compared to the year to date budget, which is mainly attributable to consultancy -\$54k, computer software licenses -\$29k, GIS costs -\$33k, and lease of equipment -\$32k. It is anticipated that the full budget allocation will be spent prior to the end of the financial year.
- **Community Recreation Centres**
Community recreation centres have an overall favourable variance of -\$91k. This is attributable to the Naturaliste Community Centre -\$57k, and the Geographe Leisure Centre -\$34k below the year to date budget. To maintain the net operating positions forecast, expenditure at both the GLC and NCC is being strictly prioritised and delayed wherever possible.
- **Environmental Planning**
Environmental planning is overall favourable by -\$124k, with implementation of management plans being down as compared to budget by -\$90k. This is attributable to timing differences associated with the utilisation of contractors and the seasonality of the work that is required. It is still expected that full budget allocation will be utilised by year end.
- **Busselton Jetty**
Busselton Jetty contractor costs are under the year to date budget by approximately -\$541k. The works planned for this financial year (as per the 50 year maintenance plan) consist of steel pier and superstructure corrosion protection assessment and repairs, handrail repainting, pile wrapping, light globe replacement and a \$110k contingency repair amount that has, to this point,

not been required. This will be a significant under expenditure to budget associated with Jetty works at year end. A portion of these works have been re-budgeted into the 2016/17 financial year. As Jetty works are funded from the Jetty Reserve, this variance will not impact on the City's year end net financial position.

▪ **Meelup Regional Park**

The Meelup Regional Park budget is underspent by -\$107k. This is mainly attributable to seasonal scheduling of expenditure on Meelup trail maintenance works and vegetation rehabilitation works. These works are now in progress.

▪ **Building Maintenance**

The scheduled building maintenance budget is underspent by -\$206k year to date. This is due in part to Facility staff spending a considerable amount of their time on relocating staff for the new administration building project. It is still anticipated however, that the level of expenditure will increase prior to the end of the year.

▪ **Provence and Vasse Newtown – Parks and Gardens**

Contractor costs associated with Provence Estate maintenance are under budget by -\$194k as public open space areas within the estate is yet to be handed over and therefore the maintenance of this area is not yet the responsibility of the City. There is also a favourable variance for contractor costs totaling -\$124k attributable to Vasse Newtown with some of this offset by City employee costs. A portion of the allocated budget is funded from the specified area rates and this draw down can only occur if expenditure is within the specified areas.

Insurance Expenses (-\$74K)

The current variance associated with insurance expenses is attributable to:

- Property insurance of -\$9k.
- Plant insurance premiums of -\$47k.
- Public liability insurance of -\$14k.
- Other general insurance costs of -\$4k.

As indicated in the budget review, whilst additional insurance expenses are expected to be incurred prior to 30 June 2016 due to insurance schedule additions and amendments, along with excess payments, these are not expected to be material in value. Consequently, a favourable variance is expected by financial year end.

Other Expenditure (-\$514K)

The current variances associated with other expenditure is attributable to:

- Members of Council expenses of -\$105k. This variance is made up of a number of different accounts with the main variances being;
 - Mayor and deputy mayor allowances -\$8k;
 - Elected members refreshment and functions -\$9k;
 - Elected members conference and training expenses -\$15k;
 - Elected members election and poll expenses -\$5k;
 - Elected members sitting fees -\$23k;
 - International relationships account -\$10k;
 - Presentations on termination policy -\$5.
- Community services administration expenses of -\$216k. This variance is attributable to;
 - Events, marketing and promotions is -\$147k below year to date budget. MERG Marketing funds which have not been expended as the MRBTA recharge campaign was halted due to amalgamation of GBTA/AMRTA and regional branding. Council has resolved to transfer \$150k from the commercial and industrial differential marketing funds into the Airport Marketing Reserve specifically for the marketing and support of the Airport development project, and this \$147k, along with further savings in the remainder of the financial year, will be used for this purpose. All remaining funds in the differential rate

marketing fund will be transferred to the Airport Marketing Reserve (\$150k as previously endorsed by Council and the remaining \$46k as per the MERG report to Council dated the 8th June 2016);

- Donations, contributions and subsidies of -\$49k. This relates to the timing of payments for projects funded as part of the community bids programme;
- Events sponsorships (differential rates) of -\$20k. This relates to events that have been funded through the events sponsorship programme that either have not yet been held, or have been cancelled.
- Half Iron man events sponsorship of -\$46k. This variance is a timing difference as the event was held in early May and therefore funds will be expended before the end of the financial year.
- Public relations expenses of -\$32k. This is attributable to catering -\$13k, advertising Council pages -\$7k, community consultations and surveys -\$7k, public relations account -\$9k and long service contributions to other Local Government Authorities +\$7k.
- Planning administration expenses of -\$30k. This is mainly attributable to the façade refurbishment subsidy account -\$25k and advertising (public/statutory) account being -\$4.5k below the year to date budget. With regard to the façade refurbishment, there were no suitable applications received in the first round fitting the requirements for funding. Letters have been sent out calling for a second round of applications. Although there has been a number of enquires, it now appears unlikely that the City will resolve any for payment this financial year.
- Rates administration valuation expenses are under budget by -\$18k. It is projected that the full rates valuation expense account will be expended by year end. A commitment of \$61k is posted against this account which mainly relates to the end of year unimproved values general valuations which have been received in May.

Loss on Asset Disposal (+\$49K)

The loss on asset disposal represents adverse book losses on the sale of sundry plant items and vehicles. It should be noted that this is a book entry only, and has no direct impact on the surplus/deficit position.

Capital Activity

Capital Revenue

As at 30 April 2016, there is a variance of -76% in total capital revenue, with the following categories exceeding the 10% material variance threshold:

Description	Variance %	Variance \$000's
Proceeds from Sale of Assets	-36%	-\$200
Transfer from Restricted Assets	-95%	-\$11,073
Transfer from Reserves	-61%	-\$4,900

Proceeds from Sales (-\$200K)

The proceeds from sale of assets category recognises the estimated sale or trade-in value of heavy and light plant items budgeted to be replaced during the financial year. The current adverse variance is largely reflective of the timing difference in the lower plant and equipment capital expenditure on a year to date basis.

Transfer from Restricted Assets (-\$11,073K)

The variance in transfers from restricted assets results largely from the budgeted -\$11.5m transfer associated with the Busselton Regional Airport development. As at 30 April 2016, no transfer has been processed with year to date actual project expenditure at \$755k (\$535k exclusive of City employees costs). It is anticipated that a transfer from the Airport Development project to municipal funds will be made during May.

The remaining -\$96k transfer from restricted assets relates to the Port Geographe bank guarantee drawdown and this transfers will occur in May.

This variance is partly offset by refunds in bonds and deposits of +\$523k as at the end of April where all obligations have been fulfilled to authorise the return of funds. The City does not budget for these transactions, and as such, any material variance will be reported accordingly.

Transfer from Reserves (-\$4,900K)

The variance in transfers from reserves is attributed to the less than anticipated budget transfer of \$4.9m associated with the new Civic and Administration Centre building. A significant timing variance is reflected as at 30 April 2016, as transfers are not processed until after funds have been expended or invoiced. It is anticipated that the end of year position will be in line with the budget.

▪ Capital Expenditure

As at 30 April 2016, there is a variance of -42% in total capital expenditure, with the following categories exceeding the 10% material variance threshold:

Description	Variance %	Variance \$000's
Land and Buildings	-69%	-\$11,171
Plant & Equipment	-39%	-\$885
Furniture and Equipment	-38%	-\$192
Infrastructure	-41%	-\$9,988
Transfers to Restricted Assets	+61%	+\$927
Transfers to Reserves	-20%	-\$1,851

The attachments to this report include detailed listings of the following capital expenditure (project) items, to assist in reviewing specific variances:

- Land and Buildings
- Plant and Equipment
- Furniture and Equipment
- Infrastructure

In respect of the other classifications, an overview of the year to date financial performance is provided as follows:

Transfers to Restricted Assets (+\$927K)

The transfers to restricted assets budget comprises an estimation of funds that could potentially be received during the financial year, primarily from developer contributions. Due to the nature of the category, the annual budget allocation is spread evenly throughout the financial year. The performance in this activity does not have any direct impact on the surplus/deficit position, as whilst recognised as operating revenue upon receipt, these funds are subsequently quarantined to restricted assets. The transfers to restricted assets category also include the payment of bonds and deposits, where no specific budget allocation is made for these funds.

The favourable financial year to date variance of approximately +\$927k is primarily attributable to:

- The receipt of developer contribution payments in excess of budget totalling +\$93k.
- The receipt of unbudgeted interest associated with the Airport funds of +\$578k.
- The City salaries attributable to the Airport development project of -\$220k. It has been confirmed that in-kind salaries are not recoverable from project funds.
- The receipt of bond and deposit payments totalling approximately +\$480k.

The performance in this category generally does not impact on the closing surplus/deficit position with the exception the non-recovery of City's salaries from the Airport Development project. Part of the interest earned on certain restricted asset funds do contribute to the City's municipal interest earnings.

Transfers to Reserves (-\$1,851K)

The transfers to reserves are attributable to:

- An increase in interest earned of +\$195k (as explained previously under the heading of "Interest Earnings").
- The transfer of funds from the municipal account to the reserve account associated with the Port Geographe drawdown yet to occur of -\$2.046m. This transaction will be processed as part of the May transfers.

CONCLUSION

The Net Current Position as at 30 April 2016 of \$4.4m is \$1.6m higher than as at 30 April 2015. The Net Current Position is impacted by many factors and consistent with prior years, is expected to fluctuate significantly as we move towards the end of financial year.

In terms of the annual budget review, completed as at 29 February 2016, a surplus closing position of approximately \$360k was projected as at 30 June 2016 (excluding any re-list items). Whilst there have been favourable and unfavourable variances that have arisen during the month, these do not warrant an amendment to the current projected surplus. The level of fluctuation expected over the next two months highlights the increased necessity to closely monitor financial performance over the remainder of the current financial year.

OPTIONS

Nil.

TIMELINE FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

Not applicable.

Council Decision / Committee Recommendation and Officer Recommendation

C1606/150 Moved Councillor G Bleachmore, seconded Councillor T Best

That the Council receives the statutory financial activity statement reports for the period ending 30 April 2016, pursuant to Regulation 34(4) of the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations.

CARRIED 9/0

EN BLOC

10.3 Airport Advisory Committee - 8/06/2016 - BUSSELTON-MARGARET RIVER AIRPORT NOISE MODELLING

SUBJECT INDEX:	Busselton-Margaret River Airport
STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE:	Infrastructure assets are well maintained and responsibly managed to provide for future generations.
BUSINESS UNIT:	Commercial Services
ACTIVITY UNIT:	Commercial Services
REPORTING OFFICER:	Manager, Commercial Services - Jennifer May
AUTHORISING OFFICER:	Manager, Community Services - Maxine Palmer
VOTING REQUIREMENT:	Simple Majority
ATTACHMENTS:	Attachment A BMRRA Noise Modeling Report Attachment B Noise Modeling Peer Review Close Out Letter

This item was considered by the Airport Advisory Committee at its meeting on 8 June 2016, the recommendations from which have been included in this report.

PRÉCIS

Following the submission of a comprehensive business case to the State Government, the City of Busselton was awarded \$55.9m for the redevelopment of the Busselton-Margaret River Regional Airport. As part of the project, environmental approvals are being sought through the Office of the Environmental Protection Authority and the Minister for the Environment using an Assessment on Proponent Information - Category A (API-A) referral, which includes submitting the noise modelling report and resulting noise contours.

This report presents the Noise Modelling Report (May 2016) prepared By To70 Aviation (Australia) Pty Ltd and noise contours to be submitted to the OEPA as part of the API-A referral.

BACKGROUND

In 2014, as part of the preparation of the State Government business case the City of Busselton engaged To70 Aviation (Australia) Pty Ltd (To70) to prepare noise models and noise contours using the then Busselton Regional Airport Master Plan (2011-2031) and specifically, proposed runway infrastructure. The purpose of the noise modelling was to identify any potentially noise affected residential properties in the vicinity of the airport resulting from the proposed upgrade to the then Busselton Regional Airport which could then be used to inform the business case for noise mitigation strategies and funding.

The initial noise modelling prepared by To70 in 2014 included the preparation of Australian Noise Exposure Concept (ANEC) contours, 'Number Above' noise contours (Nxx contours) and LAmx contours.

Noise Modelling and Contours

Australian Noise Exposure Concepts (ANEC) are part of the Australian Noise Exposure Forecast (ANEF) System, developed in 1980 from the Noise Exposure Forecast (NEF) system used at the time and modified to suit Australian conditions became termed the ANEF system. One of the main differences of the ANEF system was that it incorporated a weighting for aircraft events for the period 7pm to 7am as opposed to the 10pm-7am period used in the NEF system.

The ANEF was primarily developed as a land use planning tool aimed at controlling encroachment on airports by urban land development, in particular noise sensitive buildings. The ANEF system is the basis for the Australian Standard AS2021: Acoustics - Aircraft Noise Intrusion – Building Siting and

Construction (2015) which provides advice to land planners on the acceptability of building uses (residential, schools, hospitals, industrial etc) based on ANEF zones. The ANEF is accepted as the current Australian standard for forecasting aircraft noise. It is a forecast of the cumulative noise effect over a twelve month period of airport operations, including all projections of aircraft movements and weather patterns, divided by 365 to show an average annual day exposure. ANEF contours are given values of 5, 10, 15, 20, 25, 30, 35 and 40, with the higher the contour value, the greater the noise effect. The ANEF system is made up of the following three noise exposure indicators that all use the same calculation models but are based on different inputs and have different purposes.

- ANEF (Australian Noise Exposure Forecast) noise contours show the anticipated/forecast noise exposure patterns around an airport and are mainly used by land use planning authorities to manage land development in the vicinity of airports.
- ANEI (Australian Noise Exposure Index) contours show the historic noise exposure patterns (based on actual aircraft movements and weather patterns) and are generally used in environmental reporting and benchmarking.
- ANEC (Australian Noise Exposure Concept) are scenario contours and are used to predict ('what if') noise contours resulting from proposed changes to airport operations.

'Number above' contours show the average number of events per day, that exceed a certain sound level and is closer to how people typically perceive noise. For example, an N65 10 noise contour represents the number of events (10) over 65 decibels (65dB(A)) for a particular area. N contours are generally used to supplement the ANEF and in particular used in community consultation as they indicate a measureable sound that the user can relate to. It is important to note that N contours represent an average day and not a typical day. Hence, on any specific day a resident may actually experience more events (or fewer) than the N contour suggests.

LAmx Single event noise contours are a basic metric and represent the maximum noise exposure (in A-weighted Decibels) likely to be experienced during an overflight of a specific aircraft type.

The scope of the noise modelling completed in 2014 included the preparation of the following;

- Standard ANEC for the current Busselton Margaret River Regional Airport infrastructure / operations and upgraded* BMRRRA infrastructure/operations projected out to twenty (20) years;
- N65, N70, N75 and N80 contours for the following scenarios:
 - upgraded aerodrome infrastructure / operations 2018/19
 - upgraded aerodrome infrastructure / operations 2022/23
 - upgraded aerodrome infrastructure / operations 2028/29
 - upgraded aerodrome infrastructure / operations 2038/39
- Single event LAmx contours
 - Fokker 100 (approach & departure for 03 and 21).
 - A320 (approach & departure for 03 and 21).
 - B737-800 (approach & departure for 03 and 21).
- The ANEC contours must meet the AirServices Australia ANEF Endorsement Criteria checklist for airports document.

* Note- the upgraded aerodrome infrastructure was based on the Busselton Regional Airport Master Plan 2011-2031.

Following the announcement of the State Government funding to redevelop the Busselton-Margaret River Regional Airport (BMRRRA) in July 2015, the City reviewed and subsequently revised the BMRRRA Master Plan (2016-2036), as endorsed by the Council at its meeting on 13 April 2016 (C1604/075).

The review of the Busselton Regional Airport Master Plan (2011-2031) identified that limitations within the overall planning existed, in that the Master Plan only considered infrastructure

requirements within a 20 year period. Given the opportunity to revise these requirements, the City engaged an aviation specialist to design the concept and staging plans over a longer timeframe to ensure that the Airport was 'future proofed' for planning and development works over a longer planning horizon.

In relation to the noise modelling that had been completed in 2014, the revised master plan (2016) included changes in the design characteristics of the airside infrastructure (runway thresholds, aprons and taxiways) and hence the input assumptions for the Integrated Noise Model (INM) used to generate the ANECs and N-contours in 2014 had changed, requiring the noise modelling to be rerun. Additionally, City Officers took the opportunity to review the aircraft traffic forecast and design aircraft inputs previously developed to ensure that they were still considered appropriate for the BMRRR redevelopment and made changes where considered necessary.

In late 2015, the City of Busselton engaged To70 to update the INM with the revised infrastructure input assumptions, traffic forecasts and design aircraft and generate the ANECs and N contours underlying the BMRRR Master Plan (2016) with the specific purpose of using the contours for the environmental approval process and community consultation relating to the future BMRRR operations. The scope of works for the noise modelling was as follows;

- Review of data inputs and remodeling of ANECs, N65, N70, N75 and N80 contours previously developed (2014) including traffic forecasting;
- The remodeling of standard ANECs (20 year) for the Busselton Regional Airport Master Plan 2016 aerodrome infrastructure / operations projected for twenty (20) years.
- The preparation of N65, N70, N75, N80s for the following scenarios;
 - Master Plan (2016) aerodrome infrastructure / operations 2017/2018 (first year of operations);
 - Master Plan (2016) aerodrome infrastructure / operations 2022/2023;
 - Master Plan (2016) aerodrome infrastructure / operations 2027/2028.
 - Master Plan (2016) aerodrome infrastructure / operations 2037/2038;
- Single event LAmx contours using the Master Plan (2016) infrastructure for the following design aircraft;
 - Fokker100 (approach & departure for 03 and 21).
 - A320 (approach & departure for 03 and 21).
 - B737-800 (approach & departure for 03 and 21).
- The ANEC contours must meet the AirServices Australia ANEF Endorsement Criteria checklist for airports document.

During consultation with the OEPA on the preparation of the noise modelling and contours for the BMRRR and future airport operations to be described in the API-A referral, the OEPA recommended that the City of Busselton have a peer review of the noise modelling report and the underlying INM, assumptions and inputs performed.

As such the City called for quotations in early 2016 to peer review the noise modelling undertaken and engaged GHD to complete this work. The scope of the works of the peer review involved a desktop review of the following;

- Review and assess the data sources and attribution for aircraft movement forecasts, aircraft type selection and flight paths/tracks, track maps with labels and track assignment assumptions, details of circuit operations, stage lengths for departures and forecast horizons
- Airport setup, runway description, temperature, headwind and humidity assumptions, calculations of airport capacity runway usage assumptions, day/night split assumptions and sources

- INM model setup including version, aircraft type selection, details of terrain files (if used), base map coordinate systems etc.
- Documentation of inputs and outputs.

GHD's review provided a report containing recommended amendments and a number of questions requiring clarification. The peer review report was forwarded to To70 for consideration. Following discussions between City Officers, To70 and GHD, a number of the recommended amendments to the INM inputs and settings were implemented and the models rerun, including regeneration of the noise contours. Additionally, the written report has been updated where clarification or further detail was requested to be included. For completeness a close out report and accompanying letter has been provided by GHD (Attachment B) and will be included in the API-A referral to be submitted to the OEPA.

STATUTORY ENVIRONMENT

The BMRA operates in accordance with the following; Aviation Transport Security Act 2004, Aviation Transport Security Regulations 2005, CASA MOS 139, the City of Busselton's Transport Security Plan, policies and procedures. Additionally, the BMRA operations are managed in accordance with Ministerial Statement 1009 (under the Environmental protection Act 1996) and the City's Noise Management Plan (2015).

RELEVANT PLANS AND POLICIES

The Busselton Regional Airport Master Plan (2016- 2036) and BMRA Noise Management Plan (2015) are relevant to this report.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The preparation of the noise modelling reports were included in the adopted Airport Operations budget for 2015/16. There are no further cost implications for the 2015/16 or 2016/17 Airport Operations municipal budgets as a result of this report.

The State Government project funding of \$55.9m has been incorporated into the City's draft 2016/17 budget, and will form part of future budgets. The funding covers operational and capital costs associated with the project, including noise mitigation and amelioration.

Long-term Financial Plan Implications

An operational financial model was developed as part of the State Government business case proposal which incorporated a 10-year financial plan. The model considered revenues and costs associated with the upgraded facility, including up-front and recurrent capital and ongoing operational expenditure, including costs relating to ongoing noise modelling, monitoring and noise amelioration if required. The model demonstrates that the upgraded facility will be self-sustainable, generating a modest profit into the future, to be transferred into the City's Airport Infrastructure Renewal and Replacement Reserve at the end of each financial year.

The Long Term Financial Plan (LTFP) is currently based on the 'here and now' scenario (stage 1b), and will now require updating to reflect the project, including ongoing operational and capital revenue and expenditure based on the Stage 2 redevelopment. This work has commenced and will be incorporated into the next LTFP review.

STRATEGIC COMMUNITY OBJECTIVES

The BMRA is consistent with following the City of Busselton's strategic Objectives:

Well Planned, Vibrant and Active Places:

- Infrastructure Assets that are well maintained and responsibly managed to provide for future generations.
- Connected City of Busselton Transport options that provide greater links within our district and increase capacity for community participation.

RISK ASSESSMENT

Whilst a formal risk assessment is being developed as part of the overall development project, at a high level, and based on the Busselton Regional Airport Master Plan (2011-2031), a comprehensive risk assessment was undertaken as part of the development of the State Government business case proposal that identified and evaluated the effect of uncertainty on the project's objectives and deliverables, including risk mitigation strategies. Below outlines the risks assessed as 'high' and 'medium' relating to this report;

<i>Risk</i>	<i>Controls</i>	<i>Consequence</i>	<i>Likelihood</i>	<i>Risk Level</i>
The OEPA do not have confidence in the noise modelling results (based on inputs & assumptions) included in the API-A referral.	Noise modelling has been peer reviewed and the inputs/assumptions kept consistent with the State Government Business Case (i.e Funding Agreement).	Unlikely	Major	High
Future aircraft operations exceed projections resulting in increased aircraft noise exposure.	Review the aircraft traffic projections following negotiations with airlines and commencement of operations.	Possible	Moderate	Medium

CONSULTATION

Officers will continue to consult with the OEPA, CASA, AirServices Australia, City of Busselton residents and wider community, airport users and stakeholders throughout the environmental approval process and Airport Development Project.

As part of the API-A referral process the City has performed the following community and stakeholder consultation.

Who	Meeting Forum	Description	Information Provided
Residents in vicinity of the Airport and/or near flight paths	Private meeting either at residents home or at the City offices.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brief outline of the development project, objectives and infrastructure; • Predicted flight movements; • Predicted noise impacts including ANECs, N-Contours and flight paths 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City's Noise brochure; • City project Fact sheet; • Information on External websites and agencies for further information.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noise Management Plan review 	
Community information sessions	Information session for up to 12 people held at the City offices.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Brief outline of the development project, objectives and infrastructure; Predicted flight movements; Predicted noise impacts including ANECs, N-Contours and flight paths Noise Management Plan review 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> City's Noise brochure; City project Fact sheet; Information on External websites and agencies for further information.
Decision Making Agencies (DMAs) engagement	Individual meetings with DMAs – Libby Mettam MLA Dept Of Water Dept Parks and Wildlife Dept of Transport	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Brief outline of the development project, objectives and infrastructure; Predicted flight movements; Predicted noise impacts including ANECs, N-Contours and flight paths Noise Management Plan review 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> City's Noise brochure; City project Fact sheet; Information on External websites and agencies for further information.
NMP Public Comment	Revised NMP advertised on the City's Airport website for public comment.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revised NMP showing track changes advertised for 21 days for public comment. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revised NMP Summary of changes and justification for changes Information on API-a process

As part of the public consultation relating to the Development Project and understanding aircraft noise management associated with the BMRA, eighty seven letters were sent out to residential property owners in the vicinity of the airport inviting them to a private meeting. A total of 8 meetings were booked with one resident cancelling prior to the meeting. The majority of feedback received from residents related to questions on flight paths and the possibility of flights late at night as well as asking to be kept informed of updates throughout the project.

Additionally, 1180 letters were sent out to property owners in residential areas approximately within 5km of the airport informing community members of the community information sessions and how to register. The community information sessions were also advertised in the local media. A total of five community sessions were held with between 10 and 14 people attending each session. As with the private meetings the main feedback received from the sessions related to questions on the flight paths and the possibility of flights late at night as well as requesting to be kept informed of updates throughout the project.

Following Council's consideration of the noise modelling report and noise contours, Officers will place the noise modelling report and noise contours on the BMRRA website and offer community members to meet with City Officers to discuss any concerns and/or questions relating to the report and contours.

Additionally, City Officers have consulted with Australian Aircraft Noise Ombudsman and sought advice on the noise modelling requirements and resulting contours; and the public consultation process completed to date and planned for the duration of the project to ensure that a comprehensive and appropriate process is being undertaken.

OFFICER COMMENT

The Busselton-Margaret River Regional Airport (BMRRA) has operated under the authority of the Minister for the Environment, regulated by the Office of the Environmental Protection Authority (OEPA) since the commencement of operations of the then Busselton Regional Airport (BRA) in 1996. As part of the initial BRA project, environmental approvals were sought from the Minister for the Environment for the operations of the Airport. The Ministerial approval for the then BRA resulted in the implementation of Ministerial Statement 399, which incorporated a number of environmental management commitments, including noise management and wetland protection in order to protect the environment. While the City has had amendments approved and implemented to the original Statement 399, and currently operates under Statement 1009, the Airport Development Project represents a significant change to the original proposal submitted to the EPA in 1995 and hence one of the priority approval processes identified for the project is the environmental approval required from the Minister of the Environment; Heritage.

The environmental approvals specifically involve the City of Busselton applying to the Office of Environmental Protection Authority (OEPA) to amend the proposal description that underlies the current Ministerial Statement 1009 and submit a revised NMP that will allow for the proposed interstate air services resulting from the Airport Development Project. Following consultation with the OEPA, an Assessment of Proponent Information-Category A (API-A) is considered the most appropriate assessment application to amend the existing Ministerial Statement and implement a revised NMP.

The API-A referral assessment requires the proponent to consider the EPA's Environmental Assessment Guideline No. 8: Environmental Principles, Factors and Objectives (2013b) to identify the key preliminary environmental factors that may be impacted as part of the Proposal. Consideration of these guidelines has identified the two key environmental factors to be included in the referral;

1. Amenity (aircraft noise);
2. Terrestrial fauna (Vasse-Wonnerup Wetlands).

To demonstrate that the future noise disturbance resulting from the Airport Development Project and future airport operations will not significantly impact on the community, the City has engaged aviation specialist consultants to prepare noise modelling and noise contours that will be included in the API-A referral submitted to the OEPA.

During the preparation of the Airport Business case, the City engaged consultants to prepare noise models and noise contours in order to assess any potential noise impacts from the future airport operations and to inform the business case. However, since the funding announcement the update of the BMRRA Master plan and revised runway infrastructure dimensions, has meant that the noise modelling inputs needed to be updated and the models rerun.

City Officers engaged To70 aviation consultants to prepare the noise modelling and contours. The scope of works included the preparation of ANECs, N contours and LAMax contours. The preparation

of multiple noise contour information was seen as necessary to provide a comprehensive representation of the possible future airport operations noise impacts. The ANECs and N contours will be used to inform future land planning in the vicinity of the airport and the City's Strategic Planning Department are expected to progress a town planning scheme amendment for a revised Airport Special Control Zone to be implemented into the TPS in 2017. The N contours and LAMax's will also be used in the public consultation to inform the community of the potential noise impacts for future BMRRRA operations.

Finally, the ANECs, N contours and LAMax contours will be included in the API-A referral to be submitted to the OEPA as part of the Development Project environmental approvals process. The inclusion of the noise modelling is key in the assessment of the project environmental approvals as they indicate that the impacts from the future airport operations that may result from the Development Project on the surrounding environment (amenity and terrestrial fauna) are not considered significant. The BMRRRA Noise Modelling Report (May 2016) can be viewed in Attachment A.

CONCLUSION

The redevelopment of the Busselton-Margaret River Regional Airport requires environmental approvals are sought from the Office of the Environmental Protection Authority and the Minister for the Environment. Consultation with the OEPA has indicated that an Assessment on Proponent Information - Category A (API-A) referral is the most appropriate process to achieve the approvals which will also need to include the noise modelling report and resulting noise contours.

Following the revision of the BRA Master Plan (2011-2031) and design changes to the runway infrastructure, it was determined that the noise modelling completed in 2014 needed to be updated and rerun. As such, Officers engaged To70 to prepare ANECs, N contours and LAMax contours using the BMRRRA Master Plan (2016-2036) as informing documents to be included in the API-A referral to be submitted to the OEPA and for community consultation with regards to the Development Project.

To ensure the integrity of the noise contours, a peer review of the noise modelling was completed by an independent consultant (GHD) and recommended changes and clarifications have been implemented.

As such, this report presents the Noise Modelling Report (May 2016) prepared by To70 Pty Ltd and noise contours as informing documents to be submitted to the OEPA as part of the API-A referral and community consultation for the BMRRRA Development Project.

OPTIONS

Council may choose not to accept the Officer's recommendation.

TIMELINE FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

The BMRA Noise Modelling Report (May 2016) will be included in the API-A referral expected to be submitted to the OEPA in June 2016 and used as part of the community consultation immediately following Council's endorsement of the report.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That the Council endorses the Busselton-Margaret River Regional Airport Noise Modelling Report (May 2016) prepared by To70 Aviation (Australia) Pty Ltd for inclusion in the API-A referral to be submitted to the Office of the Environmental Protection Authority and community consultation.

Note: Officers noted that the recommendation should read 'community reference' not 'community consultation'. With acceptance from the Committee Officers put forward a revised recommendation.

Council Decision / Committee Recommendation and Revised Officer Recommendation

C1606/151 Moved Councillor G Bleechmore, seconded Councillor T Best

That the Council endorses the Busselton-Margaret River Regional Airport Noise Modelling Report (May 2016) prepared by To70 Aviation (Australia) Pty Ltd for inclusion in the API-A referral to be submitted to the Office of the Environmental Protection Authority and community reference.

CARRIED 9/0

EN BLOC

11. PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES REPORT

11.2 DOG CONTROL DESIGNATIONS REVIEW

SUBJECT INDEX:	Animal Management
STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE:	A community where people feel safe, empowered, included and enjoy a sense of good health and wellbeing.
BUSINESS UNIT:	Development Services; Environmental Services
ACTIVITY UNIT:	Ranger & Emergency Services
REPORTING OFFICER:	Director, Planning and Development Services - Paul Needham Manager, Environmental Services - Greg Simpson
AUTHORISING OFFICER:	Director, Planning and Development Services - Paul Needham
VOTING REQUIREMENT:	Simple Majority
ATTACHMENTS:	Attachment A Notice of Determination - Management of Dogs in Public Places Including Beaches Attachment B Dog Management Areas Beaches Map - Final Attachment C Old Dunsborough Map Attachment D Eagle Bay Map Attachment E Petition - Change to Prohibited Area Vincent St Attachment F Petition - Supports Dog Exercise Area Vincent St

PRÉCIS

This report sets out the recommendations of a review of dog control designations relating to public places in the City, following the introduction of new controls in 2015. The introduction of the new controls followed several rounds of extensive community consultation. This report also provides for the Council's formal consideration of two petitions relating to the designation applicable to the beach in the Vincent Street area, in Old Dunsborough.

It is considered that, whilst there are concerns in some sections of the community, the current controls are broadly sound and strike an appropriate balance. It is therefore recommended that the Council not make any change to the controls at this time.

The report does, however, discuss a number of potential changes that have been suggested by members of the community over recent months – which are not supported by officers, but which the Council may nevertheless wish to consider. It is also recommended that the Council that detailed changes may be considered on a case-by-case basis in future, should the need arise.

BACKGROUND

In 2015, the Council made several resolutions that resulted in the introduction of a comprehensive set of controls in relation to where and when dogs can be taken in public places throughout the District. The area of greatest interest to the community, however, was the controls that applied to dogs on beaches.

The decisions made by the Council were informed by three rounds of public consultation, the most significant of which occurred in early 2015, and resulted in a total of 1,257 responses. The Council has, however, also indicated that it would undertake a review of the controls following the first summer season with the new controls in place – which was the 2015/16 summer season – hence the presentation of this report to the Council.

A consolidated copy of the controls adopted by the Council is provided as **Attachment A**, but the controls of most interest and most relevance for the purposes of this report can also be summarized conceptually as follows –

1. Dogs allowed, but on a lead at all times in all public places, unless otherwise determined;
2. Dogs prohibited in public buildings and children's playgrounds (noting this does not extend to guide dogs or similar);
3. Dogs not allowed off-lead in key foreshore/town centre parks – Mitchell Park, Lions Park, Seymour Park, Dugalup Brook reserves, and Busselton, Dunsborough and Yallingup Foreshores (other than Signal Park);
4. Dogs allowed off-lead on the grassed areas of all other parks and reserves, other than when events or sporting activity underway;
5. Beach areas split into three designations – *Prohibited* (dogs not allowed at any time), *Exercise* (dogs allowed off-lead at any time) and *Seasonal* (dogs allowed off-lead, other than during the daytime in summer [i.e. 9am-5pm, 1 December to 28 February], when dogs are not allowed);
6. The beach areas where dogs are prohibited are the main beach areas adjacent to the Busselton Foreshore, Dunsborough Foreshore and Old Dunsborough (i.e. the bay that includes the boat ramp and seasonal beach enclosure), as well as adjacent to the Yallingup Lagoon, Locke Estate (noting that dogs are permitted in the Locke Estate sites), Meelup Regional Park (where dogs have been prohibited for several decades) and around the Elmore Lagoon in Quindalup (which is a popular location for waterbirds); and
7. Along the rest of the coast, Exercise and Seasonal areas alternate.

A plan illustrating the pattern of controls along the City's beaches is provided as **Attachment B**.

STATUTORY ENVIRONMENT

The most important statutory environment is set out in the *Dog Act 1976* ('the Act') and the subsidiary Regulations, with s31 of the Act being most relevant to the issues addressed in this report.

S31(2B) of the Act then sets out that -

A local government may, by absolute majority...specify a public place, or a class of public place, that is under the care, control or management of the local government to be a place where dogs are prohibited –

- (a) *at all times; or*
- (b) *at specified times.*

S31(3A) of the Act also sets out that –

A local government may, by absolute majority...specify a public place, or a class of public place, that is under the care, control or management of the local government to be a dog exercise area.

S31(3C) of the Act then establishes notice requirements for specifying prohibited and/or exercise areas -

At least 28 days before specifying a place to be –

- (a) *a place where dogs are prohibited at all times or at a time specified ... or*
- (b) *a dog exercise area...*

...a local government must give local public notice of its intention to so specify.

Note that, should the Council resolve to make any changes to the current pattern of dog management controls, that would require an absolute majority resolution and could not be implemented until such time as the change had been subject of a 28 day notice period.

RELEVANT PLANS AND POLICIES

The *Meelup Regional Park Management Plan* and several foreshore and reserve management plans are relevant to consideration of this issue. Those plans were considered in developing the current pattern of dog management controls.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

There are no financial implications of the recommendations of this report. Should the Council decided to consider and/or make changes to the current pattern of controls, there would be costs associated with the consultation process and/or with amending signage. The scale of those costs would depend upon the nature and extent of the changes contemplated. Those costs, unless very substantial changes were made, could be met without requiring additional funds, but would require the re-prioritisation of some other work.

Long-term Financial Plan Implications

There are no Long-term Financial Plan Implications of the recommendations of this report.

STRATEGIC COMMUNITY OBJECTIVES

The recommendations of this report reflect Strategic Objective 1.1. of the City of Busselton Strategic Community Plan 2013-2017, which is '*A community where people feel safe, empowered, included and enjoy a sense of good health and wellbeing*'.

RISK ASSESSMENT

An assessment of the recommendations of this report has been undertaken against the City's risk assessment framework. Risks are only identified where the residual risk, once controls are identified, is 'medium' or greater. No such risks have been identified.

CONSULTATION

The current pattern of dog management controls was adopted by the Council following, and was informed by, three rounds of community consultation, broadly as follows –

1. Preliminary consultation in 2012, with nearly 800 responses received;
2. Consultation regarding the then proposed pattern of controls in early 2015, with over 1,250 responses being received; and
3. Further consultation in mid-2015 regarding some proposed changes to the pattern of controls advertised in early 2015, with 77 responses being received at that time.

It is therefore clear that the process of developing the current pattern of controls followed several rounds of substantial consultation, and that this is an issue of strong community interest and strong, but often inconsistent, opinions amongst many in our community.

Over the recent summer period, the City has also received feedback from the community on the current pattern of controls and their implementation. That feedback has been mixed, with some in the community expressing views that the current pattern of controls and its implementation is not strict enough, and others expressing the contrary view. There has also been some very positive feedback received, supportive of the approach adopted by the City. Some of the feedback has also been more about how the controls have been implemented, rather than being about the controls as such (that feedback is not discussed any further in this report, but is being carefully considered in planning for implementation over the coming summer).

The area that has been subject of by far the greatest amount of community feedback is the Vincent Street area in Old Dunsborough, where the beach is currently identified as an Exercise area.

On 1 March 2016, the City received a petition asking that the Council consider identifying this area as a Prohibited area instead. The petition suggested that beach areas to either the north or south could be identified an alternative Exercise area. A plan illustrating the proposed changes suggested is provided as **Attachment C**. A copy of that petition is provided as **Attachment E**. At its ordinary meeting of 9 March 2016, the Council resolved that the petition be received and considered as part of the review that is the subject of this report – and this report provides for Council consideration of both petitions. The petition was signed by approximately 114 people, of which around half appear to be electors of the City.

On 7 April 2016, the City received a petition asking that the Council retain the existing designation. A copy of that petition is included as **Attachment F**. At its ordinary meeting of 9 March 2016, the Council resolved that this second petition also be received and considered as part of the review that this is the subject of this report. This petition was signed by approximately 440 people, with a large majority appearing to be electors of the City.

Other areas where the City has received feedback requesting that changes to the pattern of controls be considered are –

- Shifting the boundary between the Exercise and Prohibited areas at Eagle Bay to expand the Exercise area eastward from Jingarmup Brook to align with a pedestrian access way - this is illustrated on **Attachment D**;
- A request to prohibit dogs entirely in the grassed area at the Yallingup Foreshore – dogs are currently allowed in this area, but only on a lead; and
- Requests to reduce the hours in summer when dogs are not permitted in the Seasonal areas.

The various potential changes noted above are outlined and discussed in the ‘officer Comment’ section of the report below. As set out in ‘Officer Comment’ there are no detailed changes to dog control designations that are recommended at this stage. Should the Council want to consider any detailed changes, either as a result of the consideration of this report or at some future time, though, officers would generally recommend that consultation be undertaken prior to the Council making a final decision regarding any such changes. The following general approach to consultation would be recommended –

- A separate online survey be set up in relation to each proposed change (or if conceptually and/or physically related changes are proposed, they could be integrated into a single survey);
- The online survey be promoted via the media, online and through letters to landowners and residents within an identified area of interest – perhaps within around 200 metres of where changes are proposed; and
- The survey to be open for a minimum of 3-4 weeks.

Whilst the Council can obviously make a formal resolution to undertake such consultation as a result of consideration of this report, a formal resolution is not actually required to undertake such consultation in any legal or statutory sense. As such, in future, should issues be raised by the community, or should there be some other reason that results in the City considering changes to dog control designations, a decision could be made by officers (although most likely informed by informal discussions with the Council) to undertake consultation regarding potential changes to dog control designations. Depending on the outcome of that consultation, consideration could then be given as to whether the proposed change required formal Council consideration or not – which if changes

were actually supported would be necessary, as any change to those designations would require an absolute majority resolution of the Council.

There is also a discussion in 'Officer Comment' below regarding whether or not broad-based consultation should occur as part of completing a review of the current dog control designations – and, as discussed, that is not recommended by officers. There is also, however, a discussion below regarding how such consultation might best be undertaken if the Council would like to undertake broad-based consultation.

OFFICER COMMENT

There are felt to be four key questions that the Council needs to consider in reviewing the current pattern of dog management controls –

1. Is the current pattern of dog management controls generally sound and broadly accepted by the community?
2. Should further broad-based consultation be undertaken in making that decision and, if so, how should such consultation be undertaken?
3. What, if any, detailed changes should be considered at this time?
4. What and how should the controls be reviewed and/or changed in future?

Each of these questions is outlined and discussed below, under relevant sub-headings.

Is the current pattern of dog management controls generally sound and broadly accepted by the community?

The experience since the current pattern of controls was adopted by the Council in August 2015, especially over the last summer period, indicates that the current pattern of controls is generally sound and broadly accepted. Whilst there are clearly some in the community with very strong views one way or the other (reflected in some social media commentary and through letters to the editor in local newspapers), given the scale and nature of the interest during the consultation phases, the level of feedback received subsequently has not actually been very significant. A reasonable amount of the feedback received has also been very positive; and it is well understood and accepted that those unhappy with an outcome are much more likely to provide negative feedback than those happy with an outcome are to provide positive feedback.

In addition, given the reasonably well resourced approach to enforcement over the summer period, the relatively low number of warnings and infringements issued by the City also indicates broad understanding and acceptance of the current pattern of controls (note that only 26 dog-related infringements and 75 warnings were issued by the City in total between December 2015 and February 2016 –but note that only three of the 26 infringements related to dogs on beaches, although most of the warnings did relate to dogs on beaches).

The experience with introduction of any new or changed regulations is also generally that the level of understanding and acceptance grows over time. That has certainly been the case with the City's introduction of controls relating to holiday homes, as well as those relating to building in bush fire prone areas. Given that, it is considered reasonable to assume that the level of understanding and acceptance of the current pattern of dog management controls, which was a substantial departure in some ways from what had been in place previously, will also grow over time.

Should further broad-based consultation be undertaken in making that decision and, if so, how should such consultation be undertaken?

‘Broad-based consultation’ in this context refers to consultation relating to the overall approach to dog management controls across the City as a whole, rather than being more narrowly focused consultation relating to the controls that apply in one particular place or area. Because there was previously a need to review and re-establish a coherent pattern of controls across the whole of the City, broad-based consultation was previously necessary. The broad-based consultation exercises undertaken in the past, however, required a very significant allocation of staff time, as would any further broad-based consultation exercise. Given the high level of response to previous rounds of consultation and the good understanding of community views that allowed, the apparent level of understanding and acceptance by the community as a whole of the current controls, and the many competing priorities for the allocation of finite staff time, further broad-based consultation is not recommended at this time (noting that consultation could be out-sourced if the Council was of the view that would be appropriate, but likely at higher cost than using staff resources).

In addition, it is considered that, unless the consultation was very carefully designed, the outcomes of any broad-based consultation process at this time would probably reveal more about the level of motivation and organization of those with strong views on the issue, rather than revealing much about the views of the community as a whole. As such, should the Council, notwithstanding the recommendation to not undertake further broad-based consultation, want to undertake further broad-based consultation at this time, rather than open public consultation approaches as have been used previously, it would be recommended that a much more targeted approach be utilized, such as through surveys of beach users, phone surveys or focus group type approaches. These alternative approaches would, however, almost certainly require some degree of out-sourcing, and would not create the same sense of engagement that is sometimes possible with open consultation.

It needs to be acknowledged that it was previously envisaged that this review would involve consultation – and that may still be the case, depending on the decisions made by the Council, which may result in consultation occurring, possibly more focused, area-specific consultation, though, rather than broad-based consultation. Since the review process was first being thought about, however, there has been a relatively low level of feedback overall, a reasonable amount of which has been broadly positive, and for that and the other reasons set out above, further broad-based consultation is not recommended, as already noted.

What, if any, detailed changes should be considered at this time?

As set out in the ‘Consultation’ section of this report above, feedback since the current controls have been introduced has identified a number of particular changes that the Council may wish to consider, specifically –

1. Potentially changing the designation of the **beach area near Vincent Street area in Old Dunsborough** from Exercise to Prohibited, with beach areas further to the north and south currently designated Seasonal instead being identified as Exercise;
2. Shifting the boundary between the Exercise and Prohibited areas at **Eagle Bay** to expand the Exercise area eastward from Jingarmup Brook to align with a pedestrian access way ;
3. Prohibiting dogs entirely in the grassed area at the **Yallingup Foreshore** - dogs are currently allowed in this area, but only on a lead; ; and
4. Requests to reduce the hours in summer when dogs are not permitted in the **Seasonal areas** – where dogs are allowed off-lead, other than 9am-5pm, 1 December to 28 February.

Each of these potential changes is outlined and discussed below.

With respect to the **beach area near Vincent Street in Old Dunsborough**, the City has received two petitions, the first asking that this area be changed from Exercise to Prohibited (with other areas nearby potentially being changed from Seasonal to Exercise), the second asking that the current arrangements remain in place. A plan illustrating the proposed change is provided as **Attachment C**.

The primary reason that this area was identified as an Exercise area was because it was considered to be the only area in Old Dunsborough that could provide a reasonably accessible and useable area, on an all year basis, for those that wish to take their dogs to the beach in Old Dunsborough. That was seen as being important, because otherwise the nearest Exercise area would be south of Burt Court, not far to the north of Dunsborough Town Centre. Unless a suitable alternative Exercise area could be identified in Old Dunsborough, a change to the designation in the Vincent Street area would not be supported. The first petition implicitly recognises that, by suggesting two alternative locations.

The area immediately to the north, around the Old Dunsborough Boat Ramp, has been identified as a Prohibited area already, largely because it is a very high use area, with good facilities in the way of ablutions, car parking, a children's playground and the Old Dunsborough Boat Ramp. It is also now the location for the seasonal beach enclosure. This area was identified as a proposed Prohibited area in the consultation undertaken in early 2015, and there was a high level of support for that direction. Given the above, a change in the designation in this location would certainly not be supported. Note that the first petition did not suggest this area as an alternative in any case. Given the above, there is not seen to be any need to further consider this option.

The first petition did, however, suggest that an alternative Exercise area could potentially be identified either to the north of the area around the Old Dunsborough Boat Ramp, or to the south of the Vincent Street area, heading south towards Burt Court, and adjoining the main 'Dunsborough Resort Strip'. In terms of accessibility, beach amenity and/or car parking supply (noting that there isn't formalised car parking in the Vincent Street area – but there is some informal parking available, and the capacity to add to that in future, if deemed appropriate and necessary), however, neither of these alternative areas would, from the perspective of many of those who to take their dog to the beach, adequately replace the Vincent Street area. In addition, the area to the south adjoins the Dunsborough Resort Strip, and permitting dogs on the beach in that area during the day in summertime, especially when a more accessible and suitable location for Dunsborough residents is available to the north, is not seen as appropriate.

Even if either of those alternatives was supported, dog owners in Old Dunsborough would be left without a good all year option if they actually wanted an easily accessible location to go the beach with their dog to swim and recreate more generally, rather than having to walk a considerable distance to do so, or simply walk along the coast and/or beach with their dog, which is obviously also a popular activity. In addition, it should be noted that those who live in the Vincent Street area, some of whom would prefer that particular beach be identified as a Prohibited area actually have an excellent all year, dog-free alternative very close by – certainly much closer than is the case in most of the rest of the coast.

The current approach, with the highest use, amenity and accessibility beach in Old Dunsborough (i.e. the area around the Old Dunsborough Boat Ramp) being a Prohibited area and the second-highest use, amenity and accessibility beach (i.e. the area around Vincent Street) being an Exercise area is seen as being a generally sound and fair approach, and so it is not recommended that the designation applicable to the Vincent Street area be changed.

With respect to **Eagle Bay**, feedback from some landowners in the portion of the townsite to the south-east of Jingarmup Brook has requested that a section of the coast currently identified as Prohibited be identified as Exercise instead – this would effectively move the boundary between areas with the respective designations some 200 metres to the south-east, and extend the total

length of the Exercise area at Eagle from around 450 metres to around 650 metres. A plan illustrating the proposed change is provided as **Attachment D**.

The arrangements adopted by the Council at Eagle Bay were substantially the result of discussions with and between the City's Meelup Regional Park Management Committee (noting that the beach areas adjacent to the townsite are located within the Regional Park – where dogs had been entirely prohibited throughout, until the Council adopted the current controls) and the Residents of Eagle Bay Association. In general terms, though, it is seen as reasonable to assume that the Committee's position will not change, and there would be desire to reduce the extent of the Exercise area, rather than increase it, and with rather less certainty, it is reasonable to assume that the Association would hold the contrary view. The Committee's primary interest is in reducing risks to wildlife and the environment generally from dogs, with the Association no doubt also being conscious of those issues, but also being more conscious of the desires of some Eagle Bay residents and property owners to be able to take their dogs to the beach.

Whilst it is still certainly considered that no change should occur in this area without prior consultation, it is not clear that further consultation has much potential to further enlighten the City's understanding of community views. City officers do not have strong views on this particular matter, but on balance recommend that no change is made.

With respect to the grassed area at the **Yallingup Foreshore**, the current situation is that dogs are allowed on the grassed area, but only on a lead – although they are prohibited in the playground, in common with all other playgrounds across the City. This approach is consistent with the approach taken in other key foreshore/town centre parks – Mitchell Park, Lions Park, Seymour Park, Dugalup Brook reserves, and Busselton, Dunsborough and Yallingup Foreshores (other than Signal Park). It should be noted that beach areas adjacent to both the Yallingup and the other foreshore parks are similarly identified as Prohibited areas, so the Yallingup Foreshore is not different to either the Busselton or Dunsborough Foreshores in that respect. Whilst the Yallingup Foreshore is more physically constrained than either of the other town foreshores, there is not seen to be a compelling reason to prohibit dogs there. As such, this potential change is not recommended.

In relation to the **Seasonal areas**, and the suggestion that the hours when dogs are prohibited be reduced, it is considered that the current controls strike the best overall balance. It is also worth noting that there is no location along the coast (other than in conservation areas – National Park or regional Park), where one is located more than around 800 metres from an Exercise area in any case.

Given the above, no detailed changes are recommended at this time.

What and how should the controls be reviewed and/or changed in future?

For a range of practical and historical reasons, establishing the current set of controls required broad-based was previously necessary. The reality is, however, that most people are only actually interested in the controls applicable to one or more relatively small areas, often beach areas that they frequent on a reasonably regular basis. Whilst at some future time a future Council may wish to undertake an overall review again, it is not seen as necessary or appropriate for the current Council to commit to undertaking a further overall review. Rather, it is considered that potential changes in future can best be considered on a case-by-case basis, informed, especially if changes are being seriously contemplated, by consultation with those most likely to be interested in the proposed change. Because that consultation is not of a statutory nature, decisions to undertake such consultation can be made informally, by City officers following informal discussions with the Council and potentially with other stakeholders. As has been noted elsewhere in this report, though, the making of any such changes would require an absolute majority resolution of the Council.

CONCLUSION

It is considered that the current controls, introduced by the Council in 2015, are sound and appropriate, and no changes are recommended at this time. Because a coherent set of controls across the district has now been established, however, it is considered that future changes could be considered on a case-by-case basis.

OPTIONS

There are a range of options that the Council may wish to consider, including –

1. Undertaking some broad-based consultation as part of this review – if the Council was of a mind to do that, a targeted approach to consultation would be recommended, rather than an open consultation approach, for the reasons set out in the body of the report;
2. Contemplating one or more of the specific changes discussed in the report, or conceivably others – if the Council was of the mind to do that, it would be recommended that consultation with those most likely to be interested in the proposed change(s) occur before a final decision is made.

For the reasons set out in the body of the report, neither of these options is recommended.

TIMELINE FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

The recommendation would effectively be implemented immediately upon the Council making a resolution consistent with the officer recommendation.

Council Decision and Officer Recommendation

C1606/152 Moved Councillor G Bleechmore, seconded Councillor T Best

That the Council receives the report and resolves to –

1. Make no changes to the current pattern of dog management controls at this time; and
2. Acknowledge that there may be a need to consider detailed changes in future, and indicate that such changes can generally be considered on a case-by-case basis, and that where changes are seriously contemplated, consultation should generally occur before Council consideration of any such changes.

CARRIED 9/0

EN BLOC

12. ENGINEERING AND WORKS SERVICES REPORT

Nil

13. COMMUNITY AND COMMERCIAL SERVICES REPORT

Nil

15. CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER'S REPORT**15.1 COUNCILLORS' INFORMATION BULLETIN**

SUBJECT INDEX:	Councillors' Information
STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE:	Governance systems that deliver responsible, ethical and accountable decision-making.
BUSINESS UNIT:	Executive Services
ACTIVITY UNIT:	Executive Services
REPORTING OFFICER:	Reporting Officers - Various
AUTHORISING OFFICER:	Chief Executive Officer - Mike Archer
VOTING REQUIREMENT:	Simple Majority
ATTACHMENTS:	Attachment A Planning Applications Received 16 May - 31 May 2016
	Attachment B Planning Applications Determined 16 May - 31 May 2016
	Attachment C Minister for Transport - Recreational Boating Facilities Scheme
	Attachment D ALGA - Joint Infrastructure Statement
	Attachment E Libby Mettam MLA - Regional Cabinet in Busselton
	Attachment F Department of Sport & Recreation - Strategic Directions for the Western Australian Sport & Recreation Industry 2016-2020
	Attachment G Peron Naturaliste Partnership Board Meeting Minutes 27 May 2016
	Attachment H Busselton Hospice Care Inc - Certificate of Appreciation
	Attachment I St John of God Foundation - 21st Year Celebrations
	Attachment J Busselton Surf Life Saving Club - 2015-16 Annual Report

PRÉCIS

This report provides an overview of a range of information that is considered appropriate to be formally presented to the Council for its receipt and noting. The information is provided in order to ensure that each Councillor, and the Council, is being kept fully informed, while also acknowledging that these are matters that will also be of interest to the community.

Any matter that is raised in this report as a result of incoming correspondence is to be dealt with as normal business correspondence, but is presented in this bulletin for the information of the Council and the community.

INFORMATION BULLETIN**15.1.1 Planning and Development Statistics**

Attachment A is a report detailing all Planning Applications received by the City between 16 May, 2016 and 31 May, 2016. 46 formal applications were received during this period.

Attachment B is a report detailing all Planning Applications determined by the City between 16 May, 2016 and 31 May, 2016. A total of 49 applications (including subdivision referrals) were determined by the City during this period with 48 approved / supported and 1 refused / not supported.

15.1.2 Local Planning Scheme Notices

LOCAL PLANNING SCHEME NO. 21

Scheme Amendment No. 6

The above scheme was published in the Western Australian Government Gazette on 27th May 2016

The purpose of this amendment is to introduce Special Provision no. 57 into Schedule 3 of the Local Planning Scheme to include Lot 3 into the Broadwater "Development Area".

15.1.3 Current Active Tenders

2016 TENDERS

EOI 01/16 EXPRESSION OF INTEREST – DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION OF AIRSIDE INFRASTRUCTURE AT BUSSELTON-MARGARET RIVER REGIONAL AIRPORT

Council resolved at its 23 March 2014 meeting to invite Expressions of Interest (EOI) for the design and construction of Airside Infrastructure at Busselton-Margaret River Regional Airport and to delegate to the CEO the power to decide which, if any, of those expressions of interest that are received, are from persons who he thinks to be capable of satisfactorily supplying the goods and services required for this purpose. The EOI was advertised in the West Australian on 26 March 2016 and 3 April 2016 and on the City's Website. EOIs closed on 26 April 2016. In total 14 submissions were received. On 10 May 2016 the CEO endorsed the Evaluation Panel's recommendation that the following companies be listed as acceptable tenderers and advance to the tender phase:

- BGC Contracting
- BMD Construction
- CPB Contractors
- Densford Civil
- Downer
- Ertech
- Fulton Hogan
- Georgiou
- NRW
- WBHO

It is anticipated that tenders will be invited from these prospective tenderers in June 2016 with a timeframe of approximately six weeks to submit their tenders.

RFT03/16 BUSSELTON JETTY PAINTING

The City of Busselton invited tenders for the provision of painting services for the Busselton Jetty, including all handrails, the Interpretive Centre building and Under Water Observatory building. The successful supplier will be contracted to supply these painting services for a period of three years. The tender was advertised on 16 April 2016 with a closing date of 10 May 2016. Three (3) tender submissions were received. It is anticipated the evaluation will be completed and a recommendation report presented to the CEO by mid-June 2016. The value of the contract is not expected to exceed \$500,000 and therefore falls within the CEO's delegated authority. This is a variable price contract and will be based on the submitted tendered rates.

RFT04/16 KOOKABURRA CARAVAN PARK MANAGEMENT AGREEMENT

The City of Busselton invited tenders for the provision of Management Services for the Kookaburra Caravan Park. The successful supplier will be contracted to supply these services for a minimum period of three years. The tender was advertised on 14 May 2016 with a closing date of 14 June 2016. The value of the contract is expected to exceed \$500,000. It is anticipated the evaluation will be completed and a recommendation report presented to the Council in August 2016.

EOI 02/16 EXPRESSION OF INTEREST – SUPPLY AND INSTALLATION OF OFFICE WORKSTATIONS TO THE CITY OF BUSSELTON ADMINISTRATION AND CIVIC BUILDING

Council resolved at its 10 May 2016 meeting to invite Expressions of Interest (EOI) for the Supply and Installation of Office Workstations to the City of Busselton Administration and Civic Building and to delegate to the CEO the power to decide which, if any, of those expressions of interest that are received, are from persons who he thinks to be capable of satisfactorily supplying the goods and services required for this purpose, and to award the Contract resulting from the subsequent tender process to the preferred tenderer, subject to the value of the Contract not exceeding the allocated budget. The EOI was advertised in the West Australian on 14 May 2016 and on the City's Website, with a closing date of 31 May 2016. Ten EOI submissions were received and are currently under evaluation. It is anticipated the evaluation will be completed by mid-June and tenders will be invited from the prospective tenderers by late June 2016.

RFT05/16 BUSSELTON FORESHORE REDEVELOPMENT: DESIGN, SUPPLY & INSTALLATION OF UTILITY SERVICES

The City of Busselton invited tenders for the construction of the Busselton Foreshore Utilities. This includes the design, supply and installation of sewer, potable water, reticulated water, gas & telecommunications infrastructure for the next stage of the Busselton Foreshore development. The tender was advertised on 28 May 2016 with a closing date of 30 June 2016. The value of the contract is expected to exceed \$500,000. It is anticipated the evaluation will be completed and a recommendation report presented to the Council in August 2016.

RFT06/16 BUSSELTON FORESHORE PARADE WEST: PROVISION OF CONSTRUCTION SERVICES

The City of Busselton invited tenders for the construction of Foreshore Parade West on the Busselton Foreshore. The tender was advertised on 28 May 2016 with a closing date of 30 June 2016. The value of the contract is not expected to exceed \$500,000 and therefore falls within the CEO's delegated authority. It is anticipated the evaluation will be completed and a recommendation report presented to the CEO in July 2016.

RFT07/16 PEST AND WEED CONTROL SERVICES

The City of Busselton invited tenders for the provision of Pest and Weed Control Services, including urban and rural pest and weed control on road verges, drainage sumps, cycle-ways, footpaths, kerb-lines, bridges, parks, ovals and other various infrastructure managed by the City. The successful Contractor will be required to provide the required services to the City for a period of two years, with the option of two one year extensions, to be exercised at the discretion of the City. The tender was advertised on 11 June 2016 with a closing date of 28 June 2016. The value of the contract is expected to exceed \$500,000. It is anticipated the evaluation will be completed and a recommendation report presented to the Council in August 2016.

RFT08/16 AUDIO VISUAL FIT OUT – CITY OF BUSSELTON NEW CIVIC & ADMINISTRATION BUILDING

The City of Busselton invited tenders for the Audio Visual Fit-out for the new City of Busselton Administration and Civic Building. The functional requirements of this tender include the design, supply and installation of audio visual technologies for the Council Chambers, Council Civic reception/gallery, function hall and up to six meeting rooms. The tender was advertised on 11 June 2016 with a closing date of 29 June 2016. The value of the contract is not expected to exceed \$500,000 and therefore falls within the CEO's delegated authority. It is anticipated the evaluation will be completed and a recommendation report presented to the CEO in August 2016.

RFT09/16 STREET AND DRAIN CLEANING TENDER

The City of Busselton invited tenders for the provision of Street and Drain Cleaning Services. The successful Contractor will be required to provide the required services to the City for a period of three years, with the option of two one year extensions, to be exercised at the discretion of the City. The tender was advertised on 11 June 2016 with a closing date of 28 June 2016. The value of the contract is expected to exceed \$500,000. It is anticipated the evaluation will be completed and a recommendation report presented to the Council in August 2016.

15.1.4 Minister for Transport – Regional Boating Facilities Scheme

Correspondence has been received from the Minister for Transport, Dean Nalder MLA and is available to view in Attachment C.

15.1.5 Australian Local Government Association – Joint Infrastructure Statement

Correspondence has been received from the Australian Local Government Association and is available to view in Attachment D.

15.1.6 Libby Mettam MLA – Regional Cabinet in Busselton

Correspondence has been received from Libby Mettam MLA, Member for Vasse and is available to view in Attachment E.

15.1.7 Department of Sport & Recreation – Strategic Directions for the Western Australian Sport & Recreation Industry 2016-2020

Correspondence has been received from the Department of Sport and Recreation, the covering letter is available to view in Attachment F and the full edition of the Strategic Direction is located in the Council in tray.

15.1.8 Peron Naturaliste Partnership – Board Meeting Minutes

The minutes from the Peron Naturaliste Partnership 27 May 2016 board meeting have been received and are available to view in Attachment G.

15.1.9 Busselton Hospice Care Inc – Certificate of Appreciation

Correspondence has been received from Busselton Hospice Care Inc and is available to view in Attachment H.

15.1.10 St John of God Foundation – 21st Year Celebration

St John of God Foundation has provided a copy of their 21st Year Celebrations, the covering letter is available to view in Attachment I and the full edition is located in the Council in tray.

15.1.11 Busselton Surf Life Saving Club – 2015/16 Annual Report

The 2015/16 Annual Report for Busselton Surf Life Saving Club has been received and is available to view in Attachment J.

Council Decision and Officer Recommendation

C1606/153 Moved Councillor G Bleechmore, seconded Councillor T Best

That the items from the Councillors' Information Bulletin be noted:

- 15.1.1 Planning and Development Statistics
- 15.1.2 Local Planning Scheme Notices
- 15.1.3 Current Active Tenders
- 15.1.4 Minister for Transport – Regional Boating Facilities Scheme
- 15.1.5 Australian Local Government Association – Joint Infrastructure Statement
- 15.1.6 Libby Mettam MLA – Regional Cabinet in Busselton
- 15.1.7 Department of Sport & Recreation – Strategic Directions for the Western Australian Sport & Recreation Industry 2016-2020
- 15.1.8 Peron Naturaliste Partnership – Board Meeting Minutes
- 15.1.9 Busselton Hospice Care Inc – Certificate of Appreciation
- 15.1.10 St John of God Foundation – 21st Year Celebration
- 15.1.11 Busselton Surf Life Saving Club – 2015/16 Annual Report

CARRIED 9/0

EN BLOC

ITEMS CONSIDERED BY SEPARATE RESOLUTION

At this juncture, in accordance with Clause 5.6 (3)(a) & (b) of the Standing Orders, those items requiring an Absolute Majority or in which Councillors had declared Financial, Proximity or Impartiality Interests were considered.

11.1 DA14/0561 - PROPOSED EXTRACTIVE INDUSTRY - LOT 61 (NO.1958) CAVES ROAD, NATURALISTE

SUBJECT INDEX:	Planning/Development Applications
STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE:	Growth is managed sustainably and our environment is protected and enhanced as we develop.
BUSINESS UNIT:	Development Services and Policy
ACTIVITY UNIT:	Statutory Planning
REPORTING OFFICER:	Senior Development Planner - Andrew Watts
AUTHORISING OFFICER:	Director, Planning and Development Services - Paul Needham
VOTING REQUIREMENT:	Simple Majority
ATTACHMENTS:	Attachment A Location Plan Attachment B Revised Proposal Attachment C Original vs Revised Extraction Area Proposals Attachment D Schedule of Submissions

DISCLOSURE OF INTEREST	
Name/Position	Mike Archer, Chief Executive Officer
Item No./Subject	11.1 - DA14/0561 - Proposed Extractive Industry - Lot 61 (No.1958) Caves Road, Naturaliste
Type of Interest	Impartiality Interest
Nature of Interest	The proponent of the application being a distant relative.

PRÉCIS

The Council is asked to consider an application seeking approval for an extractive industry (sand mining) on Lot 61, Caves Road, Naturaliste ("the site").

The proposal has been placed before Council due to the history of extractive industry proposals for this property and also given the number and nature of submissions received as a result of the consultation process.

It is considered that the extractive industry proposed in this location is consistent with the relevant planning framework and is recommended for approval subject to conditions.

BACKGROUND

The City received an application (DA14/0561) for an extractive industry (sand) at Lot 61, Caves Road, Naturaliste.

The site is located on the corner of Caves and Vidler Roads. It is zoned 'Agriculture', is located within a Landscape Value area and has a total size of 54.3 Ha (see Attachment A). The site currently accommodates the 'Empire Retreat' tourist development – and the owner of that development is also the applicant for this application. Access for the purposes of the extraction operation is to be via Vidler Road. As has occurred with some other extractive industry applications in recent times, the Council may wish to visit the application site as part of the process of determining the application.

The application was advertised for public comment and was also referred to relevant agencies. Both public and agency referral submissions raised various issues and concerns with the proposal and these concerns were subsequently presented to the applicant for consideration and response prior to a recommendation being presented to Council.

The original proposal was for a total of 1,000,000m³ of sand to be removed from the site, which the application stated would be removed at an average rate of 50,000 tonnes per year over a 20 year period, however it was also advised that if a major contract is won then 100,000 tonnes may be removed within a 3 month period.

The applicant subsequently revised the proposal by reducing the total volume of material to be extracted to 350,000m³, increasing the distance between the extraction site and sensitive premises. Further to this the applicant has advised that they are removing from the proposal providing for any significant increase in extraction volumes over short periods for major contracts.

The application for planning consent as revised is Attachment B.

A plan showing a comparison of the original and proposed extraction areas is Attachment C.

The subject site has had a history of past applications for extractive industry being considered by Council with an application being refused by Council on 13 July 2005 due to the following reasons:

- (a) The proposed sand pit conflicts with Council Policy in that it is within 500 metres of residences and the residents who are opposing the sand pit are likely to be adversely affected by dust/noise.
- (b) The proposed sandpit is practically surrounded by established or about to be established high-grade tourist resorts.
- (c) The cartage requirements of the pit would drastically increase the danger to motorists in their use of Vidler Road.
- (d) Council at its Meeting of 14 February 2001, determined that no sand pits would be permitted in this area in the future.

It should be noted that the current Council is not bound by this earlier resolution, and that a Council cannot bind a future Council in this matter. Furthermore, the relevant policy framework was modified a number of years ago to allow extractive industry in this area, and more broadly in the western part of the District.

STATUTORY ENVIRONMENT

The key statutory environment is set out in the City of Busselton *Local Planning Scheme No. 20* ('the Scheme'), which classifies 'Extractive Industry' as development requiring planning consent and an 'A' use within the Agricultural zone. The 'A' permissibility means that the proposed land use can be approved at the discretion of the City, following a compulsory consultation process as outlined in clause 12 of the Scheme.

RELEVANT PLANS AND POLICIES

The assessment of the proposed extractive industry is guided by a number of policies which relate to the zoning and proposed use of the land. The key policy implications are outlined below.

Local Rural Planning Strategy

The site is contained within the 'Naturaliste' Precinct in the Local Rural Planning Strategy. The Strategy recognizes that from an economic perspective that there are commercial sand extraction resources in the area.

The precinct vision is to *'Retain and conserve the natural environment, landscape values and character of the area in balance with limited tourist development.'*

The objectives of the precinct are *'To ensure that the planning in this precinct is consistent with the LNRSP and Scheme provisions.'*

Agricultural Zone - Objectives and Policies

The objectives and policies of the Agriculture zone seek to preserve the agricultural potential of rural land and to only permit development for other purposes where other suitable land is not available and where the rural amenity will not be adversely impacted.

Leeuwin-Naturaliste Ridge Statement of Planning Policy

The LNRSP places a very high priority on the protection of Prime Agricultural Land with the overriding criterion being to ensure the predominant use of land will be agriculture. Other uses, including uses of interspersed lands with lesser agricultural potential, will be compatible with and not jeopardise, agricultural use of adjoining Prime Agricultural Land. The LNRSP requires that development of mineral and basic raw material resources will be subject to programmed rehabilitation which will be recommended as a condition of any Planning Consent granted. The proposal is consistent with this policy.

Local Planning Policy 5A: Extractive Industries

The Extractive Industry Policy recognises that extractive industries have the potential for incompatibility with other land uses. It also recognises that this is particularly the case west of Bussell Highway where sensitive land uses such as tourist accommodation and tourist-oriented land uses are most often located. The Policy only supports extractive industries where land use conflicts can be avoided or minimised.

The Local Planning Policy requires the advertising of all Extractive industry Proposals to involve advising all landowners within 1.0km of the site.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

There are no identifiable significant financial implications to the City arising from the staff recommendation in this report.

Long-term Financial Plan Implications

Nil

STRATEGIC COMMUNITY OBJECTIVES

The recommendation of this report reflects Community Objective 5.2 of the Strategic Community Plan 2013, which is; *"Growth is managed sustainably and our environment is protected and enhanced as we develop."*

RISK ASSESSMENT

An assessment of the potential implications of implementing the Officer Recommendation has been undertaken using the City's risk assessment framework. The assessment identifies 'downside' risks only, rather than 'upside' risks as well. Risks are only identified where the individual risk, once controls are identified, is medium or greater. No such risks have been identified.

CONSULTATION

The proposal was referred to landowners within one kilometre of the proposed extractive industry and to relevant Government agencies. It was also advertised in the local newspaper.

36 submissions were received — seven from Government agencies or service providers, 29 from surrounding landowners. All public submissions received broadly objected to the proposal. Subsequent to being provided with details of the issues raised in submissions the applicant revised the proposal. As revisions to the proposal were made in response to addressing issues raised in submissions the revised proposal has not been re-advertised. The exception to this being that the revised proposal was referred to Main Roads WA due to a reduction in proposed peak traffic volumes and significant works having been undertaken to Caves Road and its intersection with Vidler Road subsequent to comment being made on the original proposal.

A schedule of submissions is in Attachment D.

Agency comment

The Department of Mines and Petroleum (DMP) had no specific comments regarding this proposal. It did, however, advise that sand is a scarce and important resource in the South West region and that supplies of it are needed for affordable development and infrastructure projects. It has also been requested that the City notify the Geological Survey of Western Australia of all extractive industry applications to assist/contribute towards their database.

The Department of Water (DoW) recommends that any approval for the proposed extractive industry should include the following conditions:

- the extractive industry will not intercept the water table;
- there will be no dewatering of the extraction area permitted; and
- no standing water will occur at the end of mining / post rehabilitation.

To protect water resources against potential contamination, the following specific conditions are also recommended to be applied:

- there will be no additional storage of hydrocarbons on-site,
- on-site refuelling of equipment will be from a mobile service vehicle carrying appropriate spill prevention and clean-up equipment; a
- no major repairs or maintenance will take place on site.

The Department of Parks and Wildlife (DPaW) advised the Lot 61 subject of the proposal borders two lots which are subject to the DPaW “Land for Wildlife” program, which aims to encourage landholders to conserve nature and wildlife on properties. DPaW note that the proposed extractive industry site is generally cleared of native vegetation but is within close proximity to potential Western Ringtail Possum and Black Cockatoo habitat trees. The proponent should ensure that these trees are not impacted by the proposed extraction works.

DPaW has also mentioned the requirements of the Leeuwin Naturaliste Ridge Statement of Planning Policy and the need to comply with landscape protection requirements. DPaW recommends that all final contour and batter slopes should be no steeper than 1 vertical to 6 horizontal.

Main Roads referral response to the original proposal requested that a condition of approval should be applied for upgrades to be made to the intersection of Vidler and Caves Roads, including right

turn widening. As a result of a revised proposal that reduces peak truck movement numbers and with recent improvements made to the Vidler Road intersection with Caves Road, Main Roads has revised their comments to advise that they have no objection to the proposal and that the intersection upgrades recently undertaken by Main Roads are sufficient to cater for the proposal without any further works being necessary.

The Department of Environment and Regulation (DER) had no specific comments other than to advise that if clearing of native vegetation or screening and washing of sand is proposed, approval from DER may be required for these activities.

Public Comment

29 public submissions objected to the proposal. The main issues raised in public submissions related to proximity to houses and tourist accommodation, noise, dust, traffic and landscape amenity issues. These issues have been discussed in more detail within the officer comment section of this report.

OFFICER COMMENT

There are seen to be a number of key issues affecting the consideration of this proposal. These issues are outlined below:

1. Environmental Impact;
2. Traffic Impact and Management;
3. Noise and Dust Emissions;
4. Landscape Impact; and
5. Basic Raw Material Supply

Environmental Impact

The extraction site is predominantly clear of vegetation however if native vegetation clearing is required, that clearing may require approval of the Department of Environment Regulation.

In accordance with the Extractive Industry Policy, however, it is necessary for a rehabilitation and environmental management plan to be provided and approved.

The extractive industry policy requires that only 2ha can be worked at any one time. Further to this, it is required that worked areas commence rehabilitation prior to commencing extraction on the next cell.

Given the role of the DER in the clearing permit process, the environmental responsibility of the City involves approving a suitable Environmental Management Plan and associated Rehabilitation Plan.

Traffic Impact and Management

Access and the additional trucks movements the proposal would place on Vidler & Caves Roads and safety concerns was raised as an issue by most submitters during the consultation process. Both roads are currently sealed with Caves road being under the management of Main Roads WA. Main Roads referral response to the original proposal requested that a condition of approval if granted was for upgrades to be made to the intersection of Vidler and Caves Roads including right turn widening. As a result of a revised proposal that reduces peak truck movement numbers and with recent improvements made to the Vidler Road intersection with Caves Road, Main Roads has revised

their comments to advise that they have no objection to the proposal and that the intersection upgrades recently undertaken by Main Roads are sufficient to cater for the proposal without any further works being necessary.

Noise and Dust

There are a number of controls within the Extractive Industry Policy which aim to control the impact of extractive industries on amenity. Noise and dust generated from extractive industry are the primary concerns which require addressing in this regard. As mentioned in the Background section of this report, there are a number of sensitive land uses located within the general proximity of the site. The primary controls in this case are setback requirements and noise/dust management plans. Clause 6.2.1 of the Extractive Industry Policy states that *"No extractive industry operations to be located within 500m of any tourist accommodation/attraction, where the owners of such object to the proposal"*. The owners of the nearby Yallingup Lodge tourist development which is within 500m of the site of the original proposal objected. There was also objection submitted on behalf of the owners of Lot 4 Hemsley Road which adjoins the subject site and upon which Tourist Accommodation was approved as part of developments for DA13/0739 at the Council meeting of 23 April 2014. The nearest part of the approved development (Chalets) would be approximately 100m to the original proposed extraction area. No physical construction of development for DA13/0739 has commenced and with the Development Approval due to expire in May 2017, to date no building permit application has been submitted so it is unclear if development for DA13/0739 will proceed.

With the revised proposal modifying the proposed extraction area layout a 500m buffer from all existing tourist developments will be achieved and the distance to the nearest existing sensitive premises will be approximately 370m to a house on adjoining Lot 6. The distance to the development site for DA13/0739 is approximately 200m.

The policy provides for setbacks between extractive industry and dwellings in 6.2.1, stating *"No extractive industry is to be located within 500m of a residence where the owner or resident of such objects to the proposal"*. In this instance the owners of Lot 24 Drummond Glen have objected to the original proposal, however the revised proposal achieves a setback of greater than 500m to the house on Lot 24.

Notwithstanding Clauses 6.2.1 and 6.2.2 of the policy discussed above, the policy guides that the extraction of sand could be located less than 500m but no closer than 300m from a sensitive landuse dependent on the nature and scale of the development and suitable dust and noise management. The revised proposal is located approximately 370m from the nearest sensitive premises, being a house on Lot 6 Caves Rd.

Furthermore, in terms of setbacks, clause 6.2.5 of the Extractive Industry Policy is also applicable, requiring the following to be addressed; *"Policy Areas 2 and 3: Where an extractive industry is approved within 1km of a residence or tourist accommodation or attraction, additional conditions to reduce amenity impact from noise and dust may be imposed, including operating times."*

There are a significant number of residences and tourist based operations within 1km of the proposal, which includes almost all of the objections received. The noise and dust management plan which has been submitted to the City, as per requirements of the Extractive Industry Policy, proposes a number of management measures. This includes installation of noise and particulate monitoring equipment. The noise targets identified for compliance within the management plans are as set out in the State noise regulations (i.e. the *Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations 1997*). Also, operating and haulage hours are in accordance with the provisions outlined by the Policy, which does not allow work on the weekends or public holidays.

Having assessed the noise and dust management plan, officers are of the view that the plan is technically sound and that it is reasonably practical for the proposal to otherwise be modified to

comply with the dwelling separation and boundary setback requirements. It is also important that distance alone is not a protection of amenity. Other measures will be applied in combination to maintain the amenity for neighbouring residents. Note that does not mean there will be *no* impact on the amenity of the locality, but rather that the impacts will not be unreasonable, provided they are managed in accordance with the noise and dust management plan that has been provided by the applicant.

In summary on the issue of amenity, it is considered that the noise and dust management plan which the applicant has submitted are of an appropriate standard and meet the requirements of the Extractive Industry Policy. The management plan, in conjunction with a rehabilitation plan, will manage the amenity concerns raised.

Landscape Impact

The issue of amenity at a localised level has been addressed above. In regards to the potential impact on the greater area, it is necessary to consult the landscape provisions of the *Leeuwin-Naturaliste Ridge Statement of Planning Policy*. Lot 61 is largely classified as 'General Character' with the rear section of the site mapped as 'Natural Landscape Significance' and the front part of the site being 'Travel Route Corridor'. The Extraction area appears to be confined to 'General Character.' General character is classified as the lowest level of significance within the policy and is the designation given to areas which do not fall into higher levels of importance. The western section of the site is classified as 'Natural Landscape Significance'; this is the highest level of landscape value in the policy. It is to be noted that this section of the site is not proposed to be subject to extractive industry. It is important to note that the proposal does not fall within an area that may be viewed from an identified 'travel route corridor'. The policy requires that extractive industries are to be subject to programmed rehabilitation, which will be recommended as a condition of any consent granted. On this basis, given that the area mapped 'Natural Landscape Significance' is not affected and with the implementation of a suitable rehabilitation plan, the proposal will not result in a significant impact on landscape values.

Basic Raw Material Supply

The supply of basic raw materials, including sand, is a significant issue across the region and is a relevant planning consideration – although primarily at the policy and strategy development level, rather than as a significant factor in the determination of individual applications. In assessing individual applications the City should be primarily concerned with ensuring that the impacts of proposals, in terms of environmental, traffic, amenity and/or landscape values, will be effectively managed.

CONCLUSION

It is accepted that sand is an important resource and finding such accessible resources is becoming increasingly difficult.

A number of submissions regarding the proposal have been received, concerning a range of issues, and the applicant has responded to these issues satisfactorily.

Officers are satisfied that the road network is satisfactory to accommodate this proposal, and haulage time will be restricted to avoid a potential to conflict with school bus travel times.

OPTIONS

The Council could:

1. Refuse the proposal, setting out reasons for doing so.

2. Apply additional or different conditions.

TIMELINE FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

The proponent and those who made submissions will be advised of the Council decision within two weeks of the Council making a determination.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

That the Council resolve:

- 1) That application DA14/0561 submitted for an Extractive Industry at Lot 61 Caves Road, Naturaliste is considered by Council to be consistent with the City of Busselton Local Planning Scheme No. 21 and the orderly and proper planning of that locality.
- 2) That Development Approval is issued for the proposal referred to in 1. above subject to the following conditions:

General Conditions:

1. The development hereby approved is permitted to operate for five years from the date of this Decision Notice or until 350,000 cubic metres volume of material has been extracted, whichever is sooner. The site shall be rehabilitated in accordance with an approved Rehabilitation Plan by the expiry date of this planning consent and shall be operated in a manner consistent with all associated detailed plans, including but not limited to the Noise Management Plan and Dust Management Plan.
2. The development hereby approved shall be limited to: the extraction of sand from the site; screening of material; associated drainage works; and rehabilitation works. At no time shall any processing, crushing or blasting works be carried out.
3. Working hours within the pit area and transportation of materials shall be restricted to the hours between: 7.00am and 6.00pm Mondays to Fridays; 7.00am and 12.00pm Saturdays for rehabilitation works only; and at no time on Sundays or public holidays.
4. No more than 2 hectares shall be worked at any one time; this area shall then be rehabilitated in accordance with the approved details pursuant to Condition 7.3 concurrently with the extraction of the following 2 hectare area.
5. The lowest level of excavation shall always be a minimum of at least 1 metre above the maximum water table level.
6. The minimum setback from all boundaries shall be 20 metres.

Prior to Commencement of Any Works Conditions:

7. The development hereby approved, or any works required to implement the development, shall not commence until the following plans or details have been submitted to the City and have been approved in writing:
 - 7.1 A Noise Management Plan. The plan is to be prepared using the prescribed standards for noise emissions as set down in the Environmental Protection (noise) Regulations 1997.
 - 7.2 A Dust Management Plan. This plan is to be prepared using the DEC guidelines "A Guideline for Managing The Impacts of Dust and Associated Contaminants

From Land Development Sites, Contaminated Sites Remediation and Other Related Activities (DEC 2011).

- 7.3 A Rehabilitation Plan, incorporating, at a minimum, the following:
- Embankments not to be steeper than 1 in 6;
 - Contour ripping the bottom and sides of the pit area;
 - Spreading of stockpiled topsoil;
 - Spreading of stockpiled branches and undergrowth;
 - Seeding with an appropriate agriculture seed mix, and / or planting native species of trees,
 - Shrubs and ground covers;
 - Topsoil is to be stockpiled and re-established;
 - Reuse of timber;
 - Staging of rehabilitation process.
- 7.4 A Drainage Management Plan, incorporating the installation of detention and silt / nutrient stripping ponds. The measures incorporated into the Plan shall be implemented prior to the commencement of excavation and maintained at all times.
- 7.5 A Dieback Hygiene Management Plan addressing the issue of dieback spread from, or to, the property by transfer of the disease by plant and vehicles, and the material being transported. All operations related to the extractive industry shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Plan.
- 7.6 A Traffic Management plan, incorporating, at a minimum, the following:
- Road signage to be erected along the transport route. The installation of the signs shall be completed by the City of Busselton for which fees are payable;
 - Truck operating hours that avoid conflict with school bus services;
 - A maximum of 30 laden truck movements departing the property on any given day;

Prior to Occupation/Use of the Development Conditions:

- 8 The development hereby approved, or any works required to implement the development, are subject to the following bonds (accompanied by an executed legal agreement with the City at the full cost of the owner) which shall be paid to the City within 2 months of the date of this planning consent:
- 8.1 A road maintenance bond of \$20,000.00 in the form of an unconditional bank guarantee to ensure that the surrounding road network is maintained to the satisfaction of the City for the term of the extractive industry. Those portions of public roads affected by the activities related to the approval shall be maintained to a standard acceptable to the City at the applicant's cost; such bond may be utilised for road maintenance purposes where necessary as a result of the operation;
- 8.2 A performance bond to the value of \$5,000.00 in the form of an unconditional bank guarantee to ensure that the impacts on surrounding properties as affected by the activities related to the subject Extractive industry are managed to a standard acceptable to the City;
9. The crossover to be constructed to a sealed and drained standard to the specifications and satisfaction of the City. Existing access off Vidler Rd to be sealed and drained for a minimum of 20m from the edge of seal on Vidler Road into Lot 61.

On-Going Conditions:

10. The works undertaken to satisfy Condition(s) 7.1-7.6 shall be subsequently maintained for the life of the development including:

- 10.1 The approved Rehabilitation Plan shall be carried out in accordance with the approved details.
- 10.2 All operations related to the extractive industry shall be carried out in accordance with the approved Dieback Management Plan.
- 10.3 The approved Dust Management Plan shall be implemented and carried out in accordance with the approval details.
- 10.4 The approved Noise Management Plan shall be implemented and carried out in accordance with the approval details.
- 10.5 The approved Traffic Management Plan shall be implemented and carried out in accordance with the approval details.
- 10.6 The approved Drainage Management Plan shall be implemented and maintained at all times.

Note: Councillor Bennett proposed an Alternative Motion for Council consideration that would defer the item until the next Council meeting on 27 July 2016.

Council Decision and Alternative Motion

C1606/154 Moved Councillor R Bennett, seconded Councillor P Carter

That this item be deferred for further consideration until the next Council meeting on 27 July 2016.

CARRIED 7/2

Voting:

For the motion: Councillor R Bennett, Mayor G Henley, Councillor J McCallum, Councillor C Tarbotton, Councillor P Carter, Councillor R Reekie and Councillor R Paine.

Against the motion: Councillor T Best and Councillor G Bleechmore.

Note: Officers had also proposed a Revised Officer Recommendation for Council to consider the modification of the specified general conditions, dividing general condition one into two separate conditions however as Councillor Bennett's Motion was endorsed this did not proceed.

14. FINANCE AND CORPORATE SERVICES REPORT

14.1 CORPORATE BUSINESS PLAN 2016/2017 - 2019/2020

SUBJECT INDEX:	Corporate Business Plan
STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE:	An organisation that is managed effectively and achieves positive outcomes for the community.
BUSINESS UNIT:	Corporate Services
ACTIVITY UNIT:	Organisational Development
REPORTING OFFICER:	Manager, Corporate Services - Sarah Pierson
AUTHORISING OFFICER:	Director, Finance and Corporate Services - Matthew Smith
VOTING REQUIREMENT:	Absolute Majority
ATTACHMENTS:	Attachment A Corporate Business Plan 2016/2017 - 2019/2020

PRÉCIS

This report presents the attached City of Busselton Corporate Business Plan 2016/2017 – 2019/2020 (Attachment A) and seeks Council’s approval and formal adoption of the plan.

BACKGROUND

On 26 August 2012 the Minister for Local Government introduced regulations establishing new requirements for the Plan for the Future under the *Local Government Act 1995*. Under these regulations, all Local Government Authorities are required to have a Strategic Community Plan spanning a minimum ten year period and a Corporate Business Plan, spanning a four year period. Local governments are also required to develop a number of informing documents, namely Asset Management Plans for key asset classes, a four (4) year Workforce Plan and a ten (10) year Long Term Financial Plan. This set of plans and their integration with each other is commonly referred to as the integrated planning and reporting framework.

After a program of community engagement, the City of Busselton adopted its Strategic Community Plan 2013 on 27 February 2013, thereby setting the strategic direction for its activities and initiatives for the next 10 years. The adoption of the City’s first Corporate Business Plan for years 2013/2014 - 2016/2017 followed, with plan being developed in consultation with each area of the organisation and with Council to ensure it reflected the City’s services and priority actions for the ensuing four (4) years. The City also developed (and has regularly reviewed) key resourcing documents – Asset Management Plans, a Long Term Financial Plan and a Workforce Plan.

A minor review of the Strategic Community Plan is conducted every two (2) years and a full review every four (4) years). The first minor review was conducted at the beginning of 2015 with the Strategic Community Plan 2013 (Review 2015) adopted on 22 April 2015. The first major review is due to commence in July 2016, with a revised Strategic Community Plan – ‘Vision 2030’ – targeted for adoption in April 2017.

The Corporate Business Plan is reviewed annually with each annual review considering the ongoing relevance of services delivered, assessing the progress of priority actions and establishing the medium term (four year) direction of the organisation, cognisant of the overall strategic direction set by the Strategic Community Plan.

There are three standards for measuring a local government’s integrated planning and reporting performance - basic, intermediate and advanced. At the very least, the basic standard must be met. The intermediate and advanced standards reflect the higher levels of planning and integration practices local governments should aspire to as they mature.

STATUTORY ENVIRONMENT

Section 5.56 of the *Local Government Act 1995* (the Act) requires a local government to plan for the future of the district and to ensure that any such plans are in accordance with regulatory requirements.

Regulation 19(D)(A) of the *Local Government (Administration) Regulations 1996* (the Regulations) require the development of a Corporate Business Plan which relates to the whole of the district over a term of at least four financial years. The Corporate Business Plan must:

- Set out the local government's priorities for dealing with the objectives and aspirations of the community as reflected in the Strategic Community Plan;
- Govern the local government's internal business planning by ensuring that any priorities referred to in the Corporate Business Plan are within the capacity of the local government's resources; and
- Develop and integrate matters relating to any Asset Management Plans, Workforce Planning and the local government's Long Term Financial Plan.

Regulation 19(D)(A) also requires that the Corporate Business Plan is adopted by an Absolute Majority decision of the Council and that the Corporate Business Plan is reviewed each year.

RELEVANT PLANS AND POLICIES

The Integrated Planning and Reporting Advisory Standards published by the Department of Local Government and Communities sets out basic, intermediate and advanced standards for each of the components of the integrated planning process. All local governments are encouraged to continually improve their integrated planning and reporting processes as they mature. Currently the City satisfies the basic standard and partially meets the intermediate standard.

The basic standard for a Corporate Business Plan is met when:

- A Council has, by 30 June 2013 or earlier, adopted a Corporate Business Plan that meets all of the listed regulatory requirements;
- The current year of the Corporate Business Plan establishes the current Annual Budget; and
- The local government also has in place:
 - a workforce plan that meets the basic standard;
 - asset management key performance indicators that meet the basic standard; and
 - a long term financial plan.

The intermediate standard for a Corporate Business Plan is met when:

- The Corporate Business Plan meets the basic standards;
- Resourcing components (e.g. workforce plan, asset management plan, long term financial plan) have been integrated to drive activities/service delivery;
- The workforce plan has been developed to an intermediate standard;

- Key performance indicators for assets meet advanced standards ;
- Financial management key performance indicators meet basic standards.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The review of the Corporate Business Plan for 2016/2017 was completed in-house by Officers and as such the review per se did not have financial implications.

Long-term Financial Plan Implications

The financial implications of the Corporate Business Plan 2016/2017 – 2019/2020 are reflected in the first four (4) years of the adopted Long Term Financial Plan 2016/2017 - 2025/2026. Some of the more significant infrastructure projects identified in the Corporate Business Plan will be substantially delivered through borrowings. Other projects and activities will rely to varying degrees on grant or other external funding sources. Where this is the case it has been indicated in the plan.

STRATEGIC COMMUNITY OBJECTIVES

The Corporate Business Plan 2016/2017 – 2019/2020 is the City's response to the community objectives listed in the Strategic Community Plan 2013 (Review 2015). Adoption of the Corporate Business Plan links to key goal area six (6) "Open and Collaborative Leadership" and specifically Community Objective 6.3 – "An organisation that is managed effectively achieves positive outcomes for the community".

RISK ASSESSMENT

There is always the potential for non-delivery of services or actions referred to in a Corporate Business Plan. However, the risk is assessed as low, given that the plan reflects existing services and actions that are incorporated into the Long Term Financial Plan 2015/2016 – 2024/2025. Actions dependent on external funding are denoted as such in the Corporate Business Plan to ensure transparency and accountability.

CONSULTATION

The Corporate Business Plan 2016/2017 - 2019/2020 strongly reflects and links to the aspirations of the community as expressed in the City of Busselton Strategic Community Plan 2013 (Review 2015). The Corporate Business Plan directs the internal operations of the City and hence is not directly the subject of consultation. Having said that community feedback gained through the minor review of the Strategic Community Plan 2013 in March 2015 provided valuable information which validated the relevance of the strategies and actions articulated in the Corporate Business Plan.

OFFICER COMMENT

It is important that the Corporate Business Plan upholds the directions of Strategic Community Plan 2013 (Review 2015), and integrates all relevant information contained in the Long Term Financial Plan, the Workforce Plan and asset management plans. Officers believe that the proposed Corporate Business Plan 2016/2017 – 2019/2020 satisfies these requirements.

The proposed Corporate Business Plan outlines, by key goal area, all of the services that Council delivers to the community and which aid in achievement of the community objectives. It also lists the priority actions that the organisation intends to complete over the four (4) year life of the plan. A "best fit" approach to the linking of services and actions to the Strategic Community Plan goal areas

has been maintained, with actions also linked to one or more of the Council strategies listed in the Strategic Community Plan 2013 (Review 2015).

As discussed in the Financial Implications section of this report, all of the services and actions referred to in the Corporate Business Plan are funded in the Long Term Financial Plan 2016/2017 – 2025/2026. Where actions rely on external funding it is indicated in the “External/Grant Funding” column of the draft plan.

The section titled *Resourcing our Corporate Business Plan* provides an overview of the process for ensuring commitments within the plan are funded, a summary of some of the key expenditure items within the plan and a high level summary of the City’s projected financial position for the period 2016/17 – 2019/2020.

The detail of the Corporate Business Plan is found in each of the sections titled *Key Goal Area*. The Corporate Business Plan 2016/2017 – 2019/2020 continues the initiatives listed in the current Corporate Business Plan. The plan reflects the City’s ongoing commitment to progressing significant projects such as the expansion of the Busselton Regional Airport, the redevelopment of the Busselton Foreshore, the development of a business case for the establishment of a Performing Arts Centre and the redevelopment of the City’s Civic and Administration Centre. Overall the plan continues to progress the strategic direction established with the creation of the Strategic Community Plan in 2013 and is hence fairly consistent with the current plan in terms of priorities. The first major review of the Strategic Community Plan is pending and this will help to inform the future strategic direction, which would then be translated to the development of the 2017/2018 – 2020/2021 Corporate Business Plan.

As part of the review process some new actions have been included and others have been amended to reflect and respond to progress made over the last 12 months. Actions which have been completed during 2015/2016 have been deleted.

New actions in the draft Corporate Business Plan 2016/17 – 2019/20 include, but are not limited to, construction of the Busselton Youth and Community Activities Building and the Railway House building on the Busselton Foreshore, the development of a Reconciliation Action Plan in partnership with the district’s Noongar people, the revision of the Need a Hand Directory to assist with locating local and regional support services, and the implementation of a dedicated online community engagement site. With each new action care has been taken to ensure that it aligns and aids in achieving the community’s objectives and can be appropriately resourced.

The table that follows illustrates the new and significantly amended actions in each goal area, noting that minor amendments have been made to other actions to ensure they reflect the current detail of the action. Where the intent has not been impacted however they are not listed below.

Key Goal Area 1: Caring and Inclusive Community

Action	Responsibility	Informing Policy or Plan	External/Grant Funding	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20
NEW Need a Hand Directory Revise the Need a Hand Directory to assist with locating local and regional support and health services.	Community Development	Disability Access and Inclusion Plan 2014-2018	Yes	X	X		
AMENDED Community Safety and Security Strategy Review update and implement Social Plan initiatives to address community	Community Development	Social Plan	Yes	X	X	X	X

safety in the Busselton City Centre, Dunsborough Town Centre and surrounding districts. <i>(Previous action referred to a stand alone safety and security strategy which has now been incorporated as part of the City's Social Plan)</i>							
NEW Cultural Reconciliation In partnership with the district's Noongar people develop a Reconciliation Action Plan to enhance cultural awareness and relationships with Aboriginal people.	Community Development			X	X		
NEW Busselton Youth and Community Activities Building Construct a new facility to house the Surf Living Saving Club and facilitate a central youth activity precinct.	Major Projects	Busselton Foreshore Master Plan	Yes	X	X		
NEW Children and Family Services Support the provision of intervention programs that promote the importance and value of a child's early development.	Community Development	Social Plan		X	X	X	X

Key Goal Area 2: Well Planned, Vibrant and Active Places

Action	Responsibility	Informing Policy or Plan	External/Grant Funding	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20
AMENDED Active Sports Precinct Design and construct the new sports pavilion and change rooms located between the two ovals on the original alignment of Milne Street. <i>(Previously action referenced development of a "Multi-purpose Community Sporting Clubhouse" at Barnard Park however with the revision of the Busselton Foreshore Master Plan a new location for a clubhouse / sports pavilion has been identified).</i>	Major Projects	Busselton Foreshore Master Plan	Yes	X	X		
NEW Railway House Complete the construction of Railway House including the new premises for BJECA and MRBTA and an interpretive facility (museum) to house the Ballaraat engine.	Major Projects	Busselton Foreshore Master Plan	Yes	X			
NEW Active Sports Precinct Design and construct the new sports pavilion and change rooms located between the two ovals on the original	Major Projects	Busselton Foreshore Master Plan	Yes	X	X		

alignment of Milne Street.							
<p>DELETED</p> <p>Busselton Jetty</p> <p>Maintain the Busselton Jetty in accordance with the Busselton Jetty Asset Management Plan</p> <p><i>(Action covered under the broader Facilities Management Program with the Busselton Jetty Asset Management Plan added as an informing document to that broader action)</i></p>	Facilities Services	Busselton Jetty Asset Management Plan	Yes				

Key Goal Area 3: Robust Local Economy

Action	Responsibility	Informing Policy or Plan	External/Grant Funding	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20
<p>NEW</p> <p>Regional Centre Development Plan</p> <p>Develop a plan that inspires and supports economic growth within the district</p>	Strategic Planning and Development / Economic and Business Development		Yes	X	X		
<p>DELETED</p> <p>Regional Development</p> <p>Progress regional development strategies to facilitate economic opportunities and benefits for the district.</p> <p><i>(Deleted as it forms part of core service delivery and is in effect driven by the new action to create a “Regional Centre Development Plan” and the current action to finalise an Economic Development Strategy)</i></p>	Economic and Business Development						
<p>AMENDED</p> <p>Cruise Ship Industry</p> <p>Continue to work with the cruise ship industry to develop and grow cruise ship tourism in the district.</p> <p><i>(Previously action “Marine Berthing Facility”, was about improving berthing facilities on the Busselton Jetty. Such actions have now been completed and so the new action reflects the focus now on growing cruise ship tourism)</i></p>	Economic and Business Development	Events Strategy		X	X	X	X

Key Goal Area 4: Connected City

Action	Responsibility	Informing Policy or Plan	External/Grant Funding	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20
<p>DELETED</p> <p>Extended Train Service to Busselton</p> <p>Continue to advocate planning for a future train service linking Busselton to Bunbury and Busselton to Perth</p>	Governance Services						

<i>(Proposal for an extended train service to Busselton now forms part of the South West Regional Blue Print and so it is considered that this action can be removed as a priority)</i>							
---	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Key Goal Area 5: Care for and enhanced environment

Action	Responsibility	Informing Policy or Plan	External/Grant Funding	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20
DELETED Western Ringtail Possum Habitat Strategy Review the draft Western Ringtail Possum Habitat Strategy with respect to the Town Planning Scheme amendment <i>(Action completed)</i>	Environmental Planning						
NEW Contaminated Sites Remediation Develop and implement a contaminated site and remediation plan for Meelup Regional Park.	Environmental Planning	Meelup Beach Master Plan		X	X		
DELETED Energy Action Plan Continue to implement and review the Busselton Energy Action Plan. <i>(Action now part of business as usual service delivery for the area)</i>	Environmental Planning	Energy Action Plan	Yes				

Key Goal Area 6: Open and collaborative leadership

Action	Responsibility	Informing Policy or Plan	External/Grant Funding	16/17	17/18	18/19	19/20
DELETED Customer Service Charter Implement the City's Customer Service Charter and internal Customer Service Standards to continuously improve service to all customers. <i>(Action completed)</i>	Customer Services						
NEW Online Community Engagement Implement a dedicated online community engagement site to facilitate interactive community engagement and broaden public access to community engagement processes.	Governance Services			X			
AMENDED Fair Value Continue Fair Value reporting for all asset classes in accordance with	Finance Services			X	X	X	X

legislative requirements. <i>(Previous action was to Implement Fair Value reporting for all asset classes. This has now been done but does need to be regularly reviewed hence the amended action)</i>							
DELETED Record Keeping Plan Amend the City's Record Keeping Plan to ensure it is reflective of the City's record keeping practices and compliant with the State Records Act <i>(Action completed)</i>	Record and Information Services						
DELETED Business Systems Improvement Progress the implementation of business systems improvement initiatives to ensure effective utilisation of corporate systems <i>(Very similar to action titled "<u>Digital Services Enhancement</u>" and hence rationalised)</i>	Information Technology						
NEW Implement works and assets IT business software Develop a business case for the implementation of works and assets across in the organisation, and subject to approval, implement	Information Technology			X	X	X	

The final section of the Corporate Business Plan relates to measuring our progress. To facilitate this Council's 21 key performance indicators (KPIs) are listed at the end of the plan. The KPIs assist in measuring progress of the Corporate Business Plan actions and the progress and success of the organisation's ongoing service delivery. The KPIs are reported on six (6) monthly to Council with annual progress reported in the Council's annual report each year.

CONCLUSION

The City of Busselton Corporate Business Plan 2016/2017 – 2019/2020 is a key component of the City's integrated planning framework as required by the Department of Local Government and Communities. It is believed the proposed plan meets all of the regulatory requirements and successfully integrates all relevant information from the City's current Long Term Financial Plan, the City's existing asset management plans and Workforce Plan. The plan continues to progress the strategic direction established with the creation of the Strategic Community plan in 2013, and furthers many of the key initiatives that the City has been working hard to achieve. Importantly the plan provides a strong program to support delivery of the community aspirations and objectives.

OPTIONS

1. The Council may choose not to adopt the Corporate Business Plan 2016/2017 – 2019/2020. Officers do not recommend this as it is a requirement to adopt a Corporate Business Plan outlining services and priority actions for the ensuing four years on an annual basis.
2. The Council may choose to alter any of the components or wording of the proposed City of Busselton Corporate Business Plan 2016/2017-2019/2020 as it sees fit.

TIMELINE FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

The City of Busselton Corporate Business Plan 2016/2017 – 2019/2020 will be effective from 1 July 2016 with the services and actions contained within the Plan implemented over the four year life of the Plan as identified. The plan will be professionally published within one month of its adoption.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION**ABSOLUTE MAJORITY DECISION OF COUNCIL REQUIRED**

That the Council adopts the Corporate Business Plan 2016/2017 – 2019/2020 in the form attached to this report.

Note: Officers put forward a revised Officer Recommendation for Council consideration to amend page 57 of Attachment A.

Council Decision and Revised Officer Recommendation

C1606/155 Moved Councillor P Carter, seconded Councillor C Tarbotton

ABSOLUTE MAJORITY DECISION OF COUNCIL REQUIRED

That the Council adopts the Corporate Business Plan 2016/2017 – 2019/2020 in the form attached to this report with specified changes made on page 57.

CARRIED 9/0

BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY

16. MOTIONS OF WHICH PREVIOUS NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

Nil

17. CONFIDENTIAL REPORTS

Nil

18. QUESTIONS FROM MEMBERS

Nil

19. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

Nil

20. NEXT MEETING DATE

Wednesday, 27 July 2016

21. CLOSURE

The meeting closed at 6.06pm.

THESE MINUTES CONSISTING OF PAGES 1 TO 61 WERE CONFIRMED AS A TRUE AND CORRECT RECORD ON WEDNESDAY, 27 JULY 2016.

DATE: _____ PRESIDING MEMBER: _____