



MINUTES

of the Council Meeting held on

Monday 17 September 2012
commencing at 5 p.m.

in the Rural Transaction Centre, Hopetoun.

ORDINARY MEETING OF COUNCIL
HELD IN THE RURAL TRANSACTION CENTRE, HOPETOUN
ON 17 SEPTEMBER 2012, COMMENCING AT 5PM

CONTENTS	PAGE NO
1 DECLARATION OF OPENING /ANNOUNCEMENTS OF VISITORS	3
2 RECORD OF ATTENDANCE	3
3 RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS PUBLIC QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE	3
4 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME	3
5 APPLICATIONS, FOR AND PREVIOUSLY APPROVED LEAVE OF ABSENCE AND DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST	4
6 PETITIONS/DEPUTATIONS/ PRESENTATIONS	4
7 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES	4
7.1 COUNCIL MEETING 23 AUGUST 2012	4
7.2 SPECIAL MEETING OF COUNCIL 10 SEPTEMBER 2012	5
8 SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS	5
9 ANNOUNCEMENTS BY PRESIDING MEMBER WITHOUT DISCUSSIONS	5
10 REPORTS OF OFFICERS	5
10.1 DEPUTY CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER	5
10.1.1 MONTHLY FINANCIAL REPORT – 31 AUGUST 2012	5
10.1.2 SCHEDULE OF ACCOUNT PAYMENTS – AUGUST 2012	7
10.1.3 CONFIRMATION OF FEES AND CHARGES - CEMETERIES	9
10.2 MANAGER OF PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT	13
10.2.1 PROPOSED SECOND HAND TRANSPORTABLE DWELLING AND OVER-HEIGHT OUTBUILDING	13
10.2.2 PROPOSED RESERVE STREET NAMES REGISTER	19
10.3 MANAGER OF ENGINEERING SERVICES	23
10.3.1 GUIDELINES FOR SUBDIVISIONAL DEVELOPMENT	23
10.3.2 GRAVEL PIT MANAGEMENT AND REHABILITATION	25
10.4 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER	27
10.4.1 FORWARD CAPITAL WORKS PLAN AMENDMENTS	27
10.4.2 RAVENSTHORPE TOWNSITE ENTRY STATEMENTS	30
10.4.3 DEPARTMENT OF SPORT AND RECREATION CSRFF SMALL GRANTS ROUND	32
10.4.4 ANNUAL REPORT 2011/2012 & ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING OF ELECTORS	34
10.4.5 GOLDFIELDS ESPERANCE REVITALIZATION FUND	35
10.4.6 BUSH FIRE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING 11 SEPTEMBER, 2012	38
11 ELECTED MEMBERS MOTIONS OF WHICH PREVIOUS NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN	39
12 NEW BUSINESS OF AN URGENT NATURE INTRODUCED BY DECISION OF MEETING	39
13 MATTERS BEHIND CLOSED DOORS	39
14 CLOSURE OF MEETING	39

1. DECLARATION OF OPENING / ANNOUNCEMENT OF VISITORS

5.00 pm – The Presiding Person, Cr Ian Goldfinch, opened the meeting.

2. ATTENDANCE / APOLOGIES/ APPROVED LEAVE OF ABSENCE

MEMBERS: Cr Goldfinch (Shire President)
Cr Keith Dunlop (Deputy Shire President)
Cr Julianne Townsend
Cr Ken Norman

STAFF: Pascoe Durtanovich (Chief Executive Officer)
Craig Pursey (Manager Planning and Development)
Jenny Rutter (Executive Assistant)

APOLOGIES: Cr Jan Field
Cr Don Lansdown
Darryn Watkins (Manager Engineering Services)

ON LEAVE OF ABSENCE:
Cr Andrew Duncan

ABSENT:

3. RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE

Nil

4. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

4.1 Mr Ian Campbell –Re - various issues

4.1.1 Jerdacuttup Hall

Expressed the view that the \$267,000 included in the budget for this project is excessive and the project is unnecessary.

The Chief Executive Officer responded and advised that the total project cost is \$408,000 (Inc GST) of which some \$338,000 is funded by grants and contributions from the Jerdacuttup community.

4.1.2 Councillor Representation

Suggested that there should be five Councillors – three in Hopetoun and two in Ravensthorpe. Also commented that 'no ward' system should be considered.

Chief Executive Officer advised that a review of Councillor/Elector ratios will be undertaken, as required under the Local Government Act 1995 and the suggestions raised could be considered through that process.

4.1.3 Hopetoun Community Centre Project

Asked if Council has made a decision on the submissions received during the advertising period.

Chief Executive Officer advised that Council considered the submissions at the August, 2012 meeting and referred Mr Campbell to the minutes of that meeting.

4.1.4 Fire Hazard

Explained that the community Fire and Emergency Services Officer had committed to issuing an order on the government agency that is the custodian of the land immediately behind his property to reduce the fire risk but at this stage nothing has been done.

Chief Executive Officer advised that he will follow the matter up with the CESM.

5.16pm – There being no further speakers Public Question time concluded.

5 APPLICATIONS FOR, AND PREVIOUSLY APPROVED, LEAVE OF ABSENCE AND DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

Nil

6 PETITIONS/ DEPUTATIONS/ PRESENTATIONS

6.1 Mr Hugh Lavery – Regional Manager Goldfields Esperance Water Corporation

Mr Lavery who is new to the position said he intended visiting Ravensthorpe every 3 months to keep in touch with local problems/requirements. He listened to concerns of Council in relation to problems with quality/quantity/pressure of water supplies, effects of carting water etc. and committed to returning to the February meeting with some replies.

6.2 Mrs Simone O'Donnell - Manager Westpac Bank Esperance

Mrs O'Donnell is also new to her position. She agreed that there had been a lack of support from Westpac in recent times and is already working to improve back up / support and training for staff. She indicated that an ATM is not feasible at present partly because of lack of population but also because of the lack of compliance (alarms, security etc.) for the large increase of cash that would be required to be kept in the building and the technological/maintenance support that is required to run a machine.

Other issues were discussed - a Westpac employee rather than Shire staff running the bank, a visiting banking specialist on regular basis, possible in-store at Hopetoun.

6.27pm – Presentations concluded.

7 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

7.1 Council Meeting – 23 August, 2012

COUNCIL DECISION AND OFFICER RECOMMENDATION	ITEM 7.1
Moved: Cr Townsend	Seconded: Cr Norman
That the minutes of the meeting of Council held on 23 August, 2012 be confirmed as a true and correct record of proceedings.	
Carried: 4/0	Res: 177/12

7.2 Special Meeting of Council – 10 September, 2012

COUNCIL DECISION AND OFFICER RECOMMENDATION	ITEM 7.2
Moved: Cr Dunlop	Seconded: Cr Townsend
That the minutes of the special meeting of Council held on 10 September, 2012 be confirmed as a true and correct record of proceedings.	
Carried: 4/0	Res: 178/12

8 SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS

COUNCIL DECISION AND OFFICER RECOMMENDATION	ITEM 8
Moved: Cr Townsend	Seconded: Cr Norman
That all Standing Orders be suspended for the remainder of the agenda items to enable detailed discussion, Councillors' questions and briefing by staff on the agenda items in accordance with Council's policy that the meeting on the third Monday of each month is a briefing/discussion meeting only and no decisions will be made on agenda items at this meeting. Decisions on the agenda items listed will be made at the meeting on the following Thursday.	
Carried: 4/0	Res: 179/12

9 ANNOUNCEMENT BY PRESIDING MEMBER WITHOUT DISCUSSIONS

Nil

10 REPORTS OF OFFICERS**10.1 Deputy Chief Executive Officer****10.1.1 MONTHLY FINANCIAL REPORT – 31ST AUGUST 2012****File Ref:**

Applicant: Not applicable

Location: Not applicable

Disclosure of Officer Interest: None

Date: 6th September 2012

Author: Brent Bailey – Deputy Chief Executive Officer

Authorising Officer: Not applicable

Attachments: Monthly Financial Statements – 31st August 2012

Summary:

This report presents the monthly financial report to Council which is provided as an attachment to the agenda. The recommendation is to receive the monthly financial report.

Background:

As per the Financial Management Regulation 34 each Local Government is to prepare each month a statement of financial activity reporting on the sources and applications of funds, as set out in the annual budget under regulation 22(1) (d), for that month with the following detail

- The annual budget estimates,
- The operating revenue, operating income, and all other income and expenses,
- Any significant variations between year to date income and expenditure and the relevant budget provisions to the end of the relevant reporting period,
- Identify any significant areas where activities are not in accordance with budget estimates for the relevant reporting period,
- Provide likely financial projections to 30 June for those highlighted significant variations and their effect on the end of year result,
- Include an operating statement, and
- Any other required supporting notes.

Comment:

This report contains annual budget estimates, actual amounts of expenditure, revenue and income to the end of the month. It shows the material differences between the budget and actual amounts where they are not associated to timing differences for the purpose of keeping Council abreast of the current financial position.

Consultation:

Council Financial Records

Statutory Obligations:

Section 6.4 of the Local Government Act 1995 and Regulation 34 of the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996 require that financial activity statement reports are provided each month reporting on the sources and applications of funds, as set out in the annual budget under regulation 22(1)(d) for that month.

The report is to be presented at either the next ordinary meeting after the end of the month, or if not prepared in time to the next ordinary meeting after that meeting.

Policy Implications:

Nil

Budget / Financial Implications:

As detailed within the attachments

Strategic Implications:

Nil

Sustainability Implications:

- **Environmental:**
There are no known significant environmental considerations.
- **Economic:**
There are no known significant economic considerations.
- **Social:**
There are no known significant social considerations.

Voting Requirements:

Simple Majority

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

ITEM 10.1.1

That Council receive the Monthly Financial Report for the period ending 31st August 2012 in accordance with Section 6.4 of the Local Government Act 1995.

10.1.2 SCHEDULE OF ACCOUNT PAYMENTS – AUGUST 2012**File Ref:****Applicant:**

Not applicable

Location:

Not applicable

Disclosure of Officer Interest:

None

Date:

31 August 2012

Author:

Tahnee Gairen- Accounts Payable

Authorising Officer:

Brent Bailey – Deputy Chief Executive Officer

Attachments:

Schedule of Payments to 31st August 2012

Summary:

This item presents the schedule of payments for Council approval in accordance with Regulation 13 of the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996.

Background:

FUND	PAYMENT	VOUCHERS	AMOUNTS
Municipal Account	EFT and	EFT664-EFT717	\$380,914.49
	Cheque	37437-37513	\$113,028.09
Municipal Account Total			\$493,942.58
	Trust EFT	EFT 713-716	\$140.00
	Trust Cheque	1144-1190	\$28,878.55
Trust Account Payments			\$29,018.55
			<u>\$522,961.13</u>

Comment:

This schedule of accounts as presented, submitted to each member of the Council, has been checked and is fully supported by vouchers and invoices which are submitted herewith and which have been duly certified as to the receipt of goods and the rendition of services and as to prices computation, and costing's and the amounts shown have been paid.

Consultation:

Not applicable.

Statutory Obligations:**Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996****13. Lists of accounts**

(1) If the local government has delegated to the CEO the exercise of its power to make payments from the municipal fund or the trust fund, a list of accounts paid by the CEO is to be prepared each month showing for each account paid since the last such list was prepared —

- (a) the payee's name;
- (b) the amount of the payment;
- (c) the date of the payment; and
- (d) sufficient information to identify the transaction.

(2) A list of accounts for approval to be paid is to be prepared each month showing —

- (a) for each account which requires council authorisation in that month —
 - (i) the payee's name;
 - (ii) the amount of the payment; and
 - (iii) sufficient information to identify the transaction; and
- (b) the date of the meeting of the council to which the list is to be presented.

(3) A list prepared under subregulation (1) or (2) is to be —

- (a) presented to the council at the next ordinary meeting of the council after the list is prepared; and
- (b) recorded in the minutes of that meeting.

Policy Implications:

Nil

Budget / Financial Implications:

This item address Council's expenditure from Trust and Municipal funds which have been paid under delegated authority.

Strategic Implications:

Nil

Sustainability Implications:

- **Environmental:**
There are no known significant environmental considerations.
- **Economic:**
There are no known significant economic considerations.
- **Social:**
There are no known significant social considerations.

Voting Requirements:

Simple Majority

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

ITEM 10.1.2

That pursuant to Regulation 13 of the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996, the payment of accounts for the month of August 2012, be noted.

10.1.3 CONFIRMATION OF FEES AND CHARGES - CEMETERIES**File Ref:****Applicant:** Not applicable**Location:** Not applicable**Disclosure of Officer Interest:** None**Date:** 6th September 2012**Author:** Brent Bailey – Deputy Chief Executive Officer**Authorising Officer:** Not applicable**Attachments:** Nil**Summary:**

This item seeks to provide detailed information on the structure of fees and charges incurred during a burial at Council cemeteries. It also recommends the removal of one of the fees and charges associated with cemetery plot allocations.

Background:

This item is brought to Council's attention to discuss the fees, charges and expenses associated with burial services within the Shire of Ravensthorpe. It is noted that there has been a substantial increase in fees and charges associated with the cemetery and a clarification of the fees and charges is provided below to improve overall understanding of what Council charges customers for burial services.

Comment:

The following fees and charges are generally applicable to most burials within a Shire of Ravensthorpe cemetery.

- 1) A Grant of Right of Burial confers upon the holder, (including successors or assigns) the right to arrange up to four (4) interments with a maximum of three(3) burials (and place cremated remains) in a grave and the right to place appropriate plaques or headstones on the plot. This is established in the Cemeteries Act 1986. Effectively the fees for this grant provide the families with a lease over a plot within the cemeteries and Council's management of that plot thereafter.
 1. Tenure on private graves is specified in a Grant of Right of Burial.
 2. Prior to October, 1980 Grants were issued for fifty (50) years. After that date they were issued for twenty five (25) years with a right of renewal for a further twenty five (25) years.

3. When a Grant expires, control of the grave plot reverts to the Shire and the following conditions apply.
- If the grave was purchased pre-need and has not been used for burial, a new Grant of Right of Burial would be required before an interment is arranged.
 - If a grave is to be used for further interments a new Grant would be required.
 - Currently due to the relatively low utilisation of plots within the cemeteries the provisions relating to renewal of Grants of Rights of Burial are not enforced.

Total Fee \$913.00

- 2) The sinking fees are charged as a contribution towards the expenses associated with the preparation of adult graves and subsequent replacement of soil post burial. Additional fees are charged at cost if the grave is required to be deeper than 1.8m (*Minimum fee \$990 applies to graves deeper than 1.8m*) and the fee is reduced for children under 7.

Total Fee \$924.00

- 3) The administration fee is in place to cover some of the costs associated with the document preparation and administration work related to the processing of applications and requests for burial services. It usually it takes approximately 2-3 hours for administration staff to prepare the necessary paperwork associated with a burial.

Total Fee \$55.00

Under the current charges the total Council related fees for an adult burial is \$1,892.00.

The following table represents a comparison with several other Councils who publish their fees online:

	Mandurah	Donnybrook	Esperance	Jerramungup	Denmark	Manjimup
Right of Burial	\$1,445.00	\$944.00	\$450.00	\$913.00	\$300.00	\$640.00
Sinking Fees	\$1,117.20	\$1,130.00	\$660.00	\$924.00	\$500.00	\$465.00
Admin Fee	\$0.00	\$55.00	\$0.00	\$55.00	\$55.00	\$0.00
Total	\$2562.20	\$2129.00	\$1,110.00	\$1,892.00	\$855.00	\$1,105.00

	Margaret River	Dumbleyung
Right of Burial	\$918.00	\$320.00
Sinking Fees	\$819.00	\$250.00
Admin Fee	\$0.00	\$0.00
Total	\$1,737.00	\$570.00

A fee listed as “Land 2.5m x 1.25m where directed by the trustees - \$572.00” is acknowledged as duplicating the role of the grant of Right of Burial and recommended for removing from the fees and charges schedule. This fee was adapted originally from another Council whose local law provided other circumstances for applying for a burial plot. This is not applicable within the Shire of Ravensthorpe.

Analysis of works staff time spent in preparing cemetery plots for burials in Hopetoun indicate it costs around \$1,200 in preparing the cemetery and site and an additional \$1,000 for the contract expense of digging gravesites – total \$2,200. Ravensthorpe burials would cost slightly less via travel and mobilisation expenses saved.

The fees and charges associated with burials have increased significantly since last financial year upon review, comparison with other Shires and analysis of real costs associated with the service. Last year the grant of Right of Burial was \$25.00 and sinking fees were \$440.00 and there was no administration fee. A standard burial cost totalled \$465.00 thus the fees have increased by \$1,427.00 per standard burial.

Given that the current expenditure associated with preparing sites for burials is not fully recovered under the fees and charges adopted it is recommended that Council reaffirm the fee structure in place. Alternatively if Council feels the increase has been too severe from one financial year to the next, a revised fee structure can be adopted and readvertised.

Consultation:

Council Financial Records

Other Council fees and charges schedules

Statutory Obligations:

The Cemeteries Act 1986 is the overarching legislation associated with the management and setting of fees and charges for cemetery services.

Policy Implications:

Nil

Budget / Financial Implications:

Approximately \$2,500 is budgeted for income this financial year from cemetery fees and charges.

Strategic Implications:

Nil

Sustainability Implications:

- **Environmental:**
There are no known significant environmental considerations.
- **Economic:**
There are no known significant economic considerations.
- **Social:**
There are no known significant social considerations.

Voting Requirements:

Simple Majority

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

ITEM 10.1.3

- 1) That Council reaffirm the following fees and charges for cemetery services

Cemetery Plot Fees

Administration Fee	\$55.00
Grant of Right of Burial (Plus Administration Fee)	\$913.00

Sinking Fees - On application for a form of order for burial

Ordinary grave 1.8m depth	\$924.00
Grave for child under 7	\$693.00
Grave for any stillborn child	\$374.00
Interment of cremated ashes by Council staff	\$165.00
Deeper than 1.8m – at cost with a minimum set at \$990.00	

Reopening Fees

Ordinary adult grave	\$924.00
Grave for child under 7	\$693.00
Grave for any stillborn child	\$374.00

Extra Charges for

Interment without due notice	\$275.00
Interment outside usual workplace hours	\$302.50

Miscellaneous Charges

Permission to erect a headstone or kerbing	\$77.00
Permission to erect memorial plaque or plinth	\$77.00
Permission to erect monument	\$77.00
Permission to erect nameplate	\$27.50
Registration of "Transfer of Form of Grant of Right of burial" or issue copy	\$33.00
Renewal of grant of right of burial	\$66.00
Undertakers single license for one interment	\$82.50

Niche Wall

Single Niche - plus cost of plaque, inscription and administration	\$291.50
Double Niche - plus cost of plaque, inscription and administration	\$346.50
Placement of ashes	\$60.50
Reservation of niche - plus administration	\$55.00
Administration Fee	\$55.00
Deposit for plaques - if not paid full upfront	\$120.00

- 2) That Council revoke the fee listed as "Land 2.5m x 1.25m where directed by the trustees - \$572.00"

*Discussion***10.2 Manager of Planning and Development****10.2.1 PROPOSED SECOND HAND TRANSPORTABLE DWELLING AND OVER-HEIGHT OUTBUILDING**

File Ref:	13.0.0.DAV035
Applicant:	Mr George Passmore
Location:	Lot 510 (#35) Daviesia Drive, Hopetoun
Disclosure of Officer Interest:	None
Date:	21 August 2012
Author:	Craig Pursey, Planning Officer
Authorising Officer:	Pascoe Durtanovich - CEO
Attachments:	Site, floor and elevation plans Supporting letter from applicant

Summary:

Council is requested to consider an application for a second hand transportable dwelling and an over-height outbuilding for Lot 510 Daviesia Drive, Hopetoun.

The proposed dwelling complies with the requirements of the Scheme and Local Planning Policy 10 – ‘Relocation and use of Second-Hand Dwellings’; it is a good quality, purpose-built transportable dwelling. Conditions of approval to ensure the amenity of the area is not affected are recommended.

The outbuilding complies with all aspects of Council’s requirements for outbuildings in this zone with the exception of the roof height. A higher roof height has been requested in order to store a large boat.

The proposed relaxation of local planning policy requirements is supported subject to the planting and maintenance of adequate screening vegetation and a lowering of the wall height by 0.3m.

Background:*Subject Site*

Lot 510 (#35) Daviesia Drive, Hopetoun (the subject site) is 4.02ha in area, cleared and has no remnant vegetation. The subject site is undeveloped.

The site is zoned Rural Small Holdings Area 3 under the Shire of Ravensthorpe Town Planning Scheme No.5 (the Scheme). The objective of this zone is “...for rural lots used for residential purposes in conjunction with a rural pursuit such as hobby farming or keeping animals.”

Comment:

Proposal

A planning application has been received that proposes a second-hand transportable building and an over-height outbuilding.

The dwelling is a purpose built transportable that is currently constructed in Kalgoorlie. Current photos of the dwelling have been submitted that show it to be neat and tidy and of a reasonable quality.

The outbuilding proposed has a floor area of 72m², a wall height of 5.4m and a roof height of 6.2m. The applicant has provided some justification for the height of the outbuilding that includes:

- *The outbuilding needs to house a 7.5m long, 5m high shark cat that has navigation lights and rod holders on top. The height is required so that the boat may be reversed comfortably without any restrictions and housed, covered and secured;*
- *The outbuilding will be positioned behind the house and therefore not clearly visible from the road; and*
- *It is proposed to landscape around the outbuilding with trees and shrubs.*

The dwelling and outbuilding are proposed centrally on the lot, a minimum of 50m from any boundary.

A full copy of the plans and supporting documentation are attached to this report.

Scheme Requirements

The setback provisions for Rural Small Holding Zone 3 require:

"No building or structure shall be erected closer than:

- *15m from a street frontage;*
- *15m from any other boundary;*

The application complies with all setback requirements.

Local Planning Policy No.10 – Relocation and use of Second-hand Dwellings

The primary objectives of this policy are to:

- 1) *Provide clear standards as to what constitutes an acceptable type of second-hand building to be used as a dwelling or for other habitable purposes;*
- 2) *Ensure compliance with the relevant provisions of Council's Scheme in a manner that is realistic and that ensures that the relocation of second-hand dwellings is undertaken to an approved standard that pays regard to local amenity and aesthetics; and*
- 3) *Ensure the style, construction and design of Second-hand Dwellings is in keeping with the character of the surrounding dwellings in particular and the locality in general.*

The table below shows the applicable requirements.

Policy Requirement	Compliance
Certification from a practicing structural	Building is a purpose built transportable

engineer that the design and condition of the building is suitable for transportation.	building, not required.
Minimum dwelling standards: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Min' gross floor area of 50m²; • At least 1 separate bedroom; • A meals, lounge and kitchen area; • A separate bathroom and laundry 	Complies
A Second-hand Dwelling is considered a new building under the Building Code of Australia. Consequently, it is required to meet the current Energy Efficiency requirements	This is building permit issue, add as an advice note to any planning approval.
Asbestos to be removed	Advice note
The Second-hand Dwelling in its relocated position being rendered visually acceptable by the use of verandahs, screening and/or landscaping	Complies Landscaping plan to be required as part of any planning approval. Photos submitted show that the dwelling is of an acceptable standard.
The design, scale and bulk of the Second-hand Dwelling being compatible with the type of dwellings that exist in the locality in which it is to be located.	Complies
Council may require upgrading of the house to an acceptable standard and landscaping of the area between the house and road.	Preparation and implementation of a landscaping plan to be required as part of any planning approval. A schedule of upgrades and a time limit of 6 months to implement them may be applied to any planning approval.

The dwelling is a purpose built transportable dwelling that is of a reasonable standard and age and would fit with the standard of dwelling in the immediate locality. Support is recommended subject to the preparation and implementation of a landscaping plan showing the area between the house and road being landscaped with local endemic species.

Local Planning Policy No.5 Outbuildings in the Rural Small Holding and Rural Conservation Zones (LPP5)

“The primary objectives of this Policy are to:

- 1. Recognise the unique characteristics of rural residential development within the shire as it relates to outbuilding size and construction.*
- 2. Provide Acceptable Development standards for outbuildings in rural residential areas.”*

The table below shows the applicable requirements.

	Maximum Wall Height (metres)	Maximum Ridge Height (metres)	Maximum floor area (aggregate)
Requirements for	3.8	4.5	200m ²

Rural Residential 2-5ha lot size			
Proposed	5.4	6.2	72m ²

The proposed outbuilding seeks a variation on the maximum wall and roof height.

The Policy outlines matters to be taken into consideration by Council in considering Policy variations such as:

1. *“Consistency with the primary objectives of this Policy;*
2. *The likely impact on the amenity of the locality and adjoining properties including:*
 - *The visibility of the proposed outbuilding(s) as viewed from a street, public space or neighbouring property;*
 - *The need for removal of any native vegetation or major trees;*
 - *Preservation of useable on site open space areas;*
 - *The ability for the outbuilding(s) to be screened by existing or proposed landscaping; and/or*
 - *The impact of the development on streetscape and the character of the area.*
3. *Whether support for the application will set an undesirable precedent for similar sized outbuildings on surrounding lots;*
4. *Comments from adjacent neighbours/landowners;*
5. *Where a variation to the maximum area and/or height is requested that the applicant demonstrates that the outbuilding is essential for storage of goods or vehicles that the applicant has demonstrated they own;*
6. *The objectives of the zone;*
7. *All relevant general matters as set out in Clause 10.2 of the Scheme; and*
8. *Any other matter considered relevant by the Council.”*

Whilst there is a question of precedent whenever Council makes a decision to vary a Policy, it is important that Council recognises that the Policy is a guideline only and each application still needs to be based on its individual merit. The main considerations in examining the proposed outbuilding are increased height, visual impact, amenity and streetscape.

The height of the proposed outbuilding starts to move from a residential scale to an industrial scale. However, the floor area is only 72m² which is far less than the maximum permitted 200m².

The height of the outbuilding does appear to exceed what is needed to accommodate the boat and trailer and it is recommended that the height be reduced by 0.3m if the proposal is to be approved.

Discussions with the applicant have led to agreement that the overall height of the outbuilding can be lowered by 0.3m, resulting in a wall height of 5.1m and a roof height of 5.9m.

It is recommended that Council approve the over-height outbuilding application for the following reasons:

1. The applicant has demonstrated that they have a requirement for additional height needing to store a standard boat;

2. The floor area of the outbuilding is of a residential scale, the extra height is clearly only proposed so as to house the landowners boat. Because of the modest floor area there would not be a threat of the outbuilding being used for commercial or industrial purposes;
3. The outbuilding is located behind the proposed house and 75m from the front and closest side boundary.
4. The outbuilding proposes to use green colourbond that may assist in it blending with the landscape.
5. The neighbouring landowners to the east have written definitively stating they have no objection to the proposal; and
6. The impact of the outbuilding on the streetscape may be softened by landscaping if the correct species of trees and plants are used.

Conclusion

The proposed outbuilding requests a concession on maximum height.

The proposed location and additional height will not affect neighbouring landowner's views and the effect on the streetscape may be mollified through the use of suitable landscaping.

Conditional approval is recommended.

Consultation:

The proposal was referred to neighbouring landowners for comment. One submission was received from the owner of Lot 509 Daviesia Drive raising no objection to the proposal.

Statutory Obligations:

The Shire of Ravensthorpe Town Planning Scheme No.5 is an operative local planning scheme under the Planning and Development Act 2005.

The present policy 'Outbuildings in the Rural Conservation & Rural Small Holding Zones' is an adopted policy under Part 2 of the Scheme. The powers of an adopted policy are set out in clause 2.3 below:

2.3 Relationship of Local Planning Policies to Scheme

2.3.1 If a provision of a Local Planning Policy is inconsistent with the Scheme, the Scheme prevails.

2.3.2 A Local Planning Policy is not part of the Scheme and does not bind the local government in respect of any application for planning approval but the local government is to have due regard to the provisions of the Policy and the objectives which the Policy is designed to achieve before making its determination.

The applicant has a right of review to the State Administrative Tribunal if aggrieved by any decision made by the Council.

Policy Implications:

As described in the body of this report.

Budget / Financial Implications:

The applicant has included the appropriate planning application fee as determined under the 2012/2013 Schedule of Fees and Charges.

Should Council refuse the application and the applicant decide to appeal the matter to the State Administrative Tribunal, there would be costs to defend any appeal. The amount of those costs cannot be determined at this time.

Strategic Implications:

Nil

Sustainability Implications:

- **Environmental:**
There are no known significant environmental considerations.
- **Economic:**
There are no known significant economic considerations.
- **Social:**
There are no known significant social considerations.

Voting Requirements:

Simple Majority

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION	ITEM 10.2.1
<p>That Council;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Approve the application for an outbuilding on Lot 510 (#35) Daviesia Drive, Hopetoun subject to the following conditions:<ol style="list-style-type: none">a) The height of the proposed outbuilding being reduced by 0.3m.b) The outbuilding being used for domestic storage only and not for human habitation.c) All stormwater from roofed and paved areas shall be collected and disposed of to the satisfaction of the Shire of Ravensthorpe.d) The walls and roof of the outbuilding are to be constructed in non-reflective materials that blend with the approved dwelling.e) The preparation and implementation of a landscaping plan to the satisfaction of the Shire of Ravensthorpe.	

- f) Plans certifying the structural adequacy of the house to be transported are to be provided prior to the issue of a building permit.

- g) The owner must upgrade the transported building to a standard the satisfaction of the Shire of Ravensthorpe. To ensure this, once the dwelling has been relocated the Shire may apply a schedule of upgrades to ensure that the dwelling is of a suitable standard in keeping with the amenity of the immediate locality. The schedule of upgrading may include;
 - i) Cladding around the base of the house;
 - ii) New colourbond roof and guttering; and
 - iii) Repainting after relocation.
- h) All upgrading specified in Condition (g) is to be completed within 6 months from the date of this approval unless otherwise agreed to in writing by the Shire.

2. Advise the applicant that;

- i) Planning approval should not be construed as an approval to commence works as a separate building permit is also required.
- ii) The building permit application will need to show that the dwelling complies with the energy efficiency requirements as if it was a new dwelling;
- iii) Any asbestos is to be removed prior to transportation;
- iv) Approval from the Shire of Ravensthorpe Works and Technical Services team may be required to transport the building on Shire roads.
- v) The landscaping plan required at condition (e) above is intended to screen the outbuilding from the adjoining properties and Daviesia Drive.

Discussion

10.2.2 PROPOSED RESERVE STREET NAMES REGISTER

File Ref:	
Applicant:	Not Applicable
Location:	Not Applicable
Disclosure of Officer Interest:	None
Date:	4 September 2012
Author:	Craig Pursey, Planning Officer
Authorising Officer:	Pascoe Durtanovich - CEO

Attachments: 2006 Register of Current & Proposed Names
Hopetoun Flora Register (2005)

Summary:

A recent rural residential subdivision highlighted the shortfall in the number of names on the Council's street names register for new rural residential roads in Hopetoun. The Shire has a list of road names established for different areas in the Shire, all have enough names except Hopetoun Rural Residential development. In the past, Council has resolved to draw road names from an Indigenous Flora Species List.

This report proposes a number of additional road names drawn from local flora to be added to the reserved street names register.

Background:

Reserve Street Names Register 2006

The Council has adopted a reserve street names register in the past and this was compiled into a single document in 2006. Council has resolved to source road names for different areas in the Shire from different sources. These are as follows:

Locality	Road name source	No. of unused names
Ravensthorpe	Mines in the Ravensthorpe district	18
Hopetoun	Ships that served Hopetoun or were wrecked off the Hopetoun coast	11
Hopetoun Rural Residential area	Indigenous Flora Species List	3 – all of which are questionable
Munglinup & other smaller townsites	Nil	-
Rural Roads	Nil	-

NB There is no development pressure in the smaller townsites or rural areas to subdivide and create additional roads. Therefore a reserve street name register for these areas is considered unnecessary.

A full copy of the existing Reserve Street Names Register is attached to this report.

Hopetoun Rural Residential road names

Council considered and adopted a list of road names for rural residential development in Hopetoun based on a list of indigenous flora in 2005. This took the botanical name and common name and drew a list of names that were suitable for use as road names. This list is attached to this report.

Subdivision of Lot 61 Hopetoun-Ravensthorpe Road, Hopetoun

In April and May 2012 Council considered a road name for a new rural residential subdivision at Lot 61 Hopetoun-Ravensthorpe Road, Hopetoun that proposes one additional road. The subdivider proposed the use of a name not on the Register. Its assessment highlighted the shortfall in the current register.

Comment:

An updated Flora Register has been prepared with advice from Nathan McQuoid from the 'Friends of the Fitzgerald' and a review of 'Checklist of Plants – Fitzgerald National Park' by Ken Newbury (updated and revised by Nathan McQuoid) 1997. The names are drawn from endemic species from the Fitzgerald National Park and Ravensthorpe Ranges and only names that may be easily pronounced, etc have been included for assessment.

Names suggested must also comply with the Geographic Names Committee (GNC) guiding principles of nomenclature' which are provided in full in the statutory section of this report.

Common Name	Botanic Name	Suggested Register Name
<i>Fitzgerald National Park</i>		
Barren's Kindred Wattle	Acacia simulans	Simulans
	Acacia venosus	Venosus
	Grevillea fuscolutea	Grevillea
	Agonis undulata	Undulata
Crowned Mallee	Eucalyptus coronata	Coronata
	Eucalyptus arborella	Arbolella
	Eucalyptus mcquoidii	McQuoid
	Eucalyptus nutans	Nutans
Burdett Gum	Eucalyptus burdettiana	Burdett
	Cooperhooikia georgei	Georgei
Stemless Daisy	Brachycome lineariloba	Daisy
Lindley's everlasting	Helichrysum lindleyi	Everlasting
Graceful Sunray	Helipterum gracile	Sunray
Coast Saltbush	Atriplex exilifolia	Saltbush
Samphire	Halosarcia indicia	Samphire
Prickly Hibbertia	Hibbertia mucronata	Hibbertia
Common Scarlet Sundew	Drosera glanduligera	Sundew
Brush Starflower	Calytrix asperula	Starflower
Mohan	Melaleuca viminea	Mohan
Orchid	Caladenia	Orchid Caladenia
Qualup Bell	Pimelea physodes	Pimelea
Barrens Leschenaultia	Lechenaultia superba	Superba
	Regelia velutina	Regelia
<i>Ravensthorpe Ranges</i>		
	Calothamnus roseus	Roseus
	Dryandra quercifolia	Dryandra
	Eucalyptus proxima	Proxima
	Eucalyptus cernua	Cernua
	Hibbertia abyssa	Abyssa
	Guichenotia anota	Anota

There are many names available, only those which are relatively easy to pronounce have been suggested. A brief check against existing road names has been conducted.

The Geographic Names Committee have indicated that the Shire should keep a Reserves Street Names Register but have requested that these are not forwarded to the GNC for formal adoption at this time as they have a large backlog. The list can be adopted locally and chosen by subdividers at some time in the future.

Road types (i.e. avenue, place, crescent, way, etc) can be chosen by the subdivider at that time and must comply with the GNC guidelines.

Consultation:

No consultation has been undertaken or is required in the adoption of the proposed street names.

Statutory Obligations:

Council is required to adopt road names before recommending them to the Geographic Naming Committee for approval.

Road names are required to be supported by Council and forwarded to the Geographic Names Committee (GNC) for final approval. Road names chosen are to comply with the 'Road Naming Guidelines' and are to follow the 'guiding principles of nomenclature' as shown below:

"GUIDING PRINCIPLES OF NOMENCLATURE

- *New names and changes of names shall have strong local community support.*
- *Names in public use shall have primary consideration.*
- *Name duplication and dual naming should be avoided, especially those in close proximity.*
- *Names of living individuals should be used only in exceptional circumstances.*
- *Names characterised as follows are to be avoided, where possible:-
incongruous; given and surname combinations; qualified names; double names; corrupted, unduly cumbersome, obscene, derogatory or discriminating names; and commercialised names.*
- *Preferred sources of names are:-
descriptive names appropriate to the features, pioneers, war casualties and historical events connected with the area, and names from Aboriginal languages currently or formerly identified with the general area.*
- *Generic terms must be appropriate to features described.*
- *New names proposed must be accompanied by exact information as to location, feature identification, origin, or if alteration is proposed, by a rationale.*
- *The use of the genitive apostrophe is to be avoided (e.g. Butcher's).*
- *Hyphenated words in place names shall only be used where they have been adopted in local usage. (e.g. City of Kalgoorlie-Boulder)"*

The procedure for naming roads is as follows:

"Survey documents require endorsed road names before the survey can be approved. To facilitate the early release of titles, the developer or their agent should be prompt in lodging a concept plan and a proposal for road names with the Secretary, Geographic Names Committee. Proposals should conform with the 'Road Naming Guidelines' and it is advisable to supply the relevant local government with a copy of the proposal.

Following agreement between the Committee and the local government, the names will be approved and all interested parties advised." (GNC Principles, Guidelines and Procedures 2009).

Policy Implications:

Nil

Budget / Financial Implications:

Nil

Strategic Implications:

Nil

Sustainability Implications:

- **Environmental:**
There are no known significant environmental considerations.
- **Economic:**
There are no known significant economic considerations.
- **Social:**
There are no known significant social considerations.

Voting Requirements:

Simple Majority

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

ITEM 10.2.2

That Council add the following names to the Reserve Street Names Register:

Abyssa, Anota, Arbolella, Burdett, Caladenia, Cernua, Coronata, Daisy, Dryandra, Everlasting, Georgei, Grevillea, Hibbertia, McQuoid, Mohan, Nutans, Orchid, Pimelea, Proxima, Regelia, Roseus, Simulans, Saltbush, Samphire, Starflower, Sundew, Sunray, Superba, Undulata and Venosus.

10.3 Manager of Engineering Services**10.3.1 GUIDELINES FOR SUBDIVISIONAL DEVELOPMENT****File Ref:****Applicant:**

Not applicable

Location:

Not applicable

Disclosure of Officer Interest:

None

Date:

September 2012

Author:

Leslie Hewer – Engineering Consultant

Authorising Officer:

Pascoe Durtanovich – Chief Executive Officer

Attachments:

Yes – Proposed Guidelines – TP Policy 2 & 11

Summary:

Council to adopt the new amended policy WS16 Technical Specifications for Subdivisional Works for Local Government – Guidelines to Subdivisional Development and rescind previous policies TP2 Subdivision Bonds and TP11 Administrative Procedures and Specifications.

Background:

The Council in the past has had several policies relating to the technical administration and specifications for subdivisions.

Comment:

The Local Government – Guidelines to Subdivisional Development was developed by the Institute of Public Works Engineering Australia in collaboration of councils in both the city and country areas. The guidelines were update in 2011.

Most of the consulting engineers align themselves to the guidelines as it maintains a standard across all Councils.

Ravensthorpe will benefit from these guidelines as it closes some of the gaps from the old policy and allows staff to administer subdivisional development with greater confidence and ensuring developers are more compliant.

Consultation:

Not applicable.

Statutory Obligations:

Clause 2.5 (a) of the Shire's Town Planning Scheme allows for the revocation of a policy by adopting a new policy that supersedes it. The adoption of a replacement policy is the only action required to revoke the existing policies.

Policy Implications:

Revising existing Policy WS16 and rescinding Policies TP2 and TP11

Budget / Financial Implications:

Nil

Strategic Implications:

Nil

Sustainability Implications:

- **Environmental:**
There are no known significant environmental considerations.
- **Economic:**
There are no known significant economic considerations.
- **Social:**
There are no known significant social considerations.

Voting Requirements:

Simple Majority

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION (1)

ITEM 10.3.1

That Council:

1. Amend policy WS16 Technical Specifications for Subdivisional Works to include the document "Local Government – Guidelines to Subdivisional Development".

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION (2)

ITEM 10.3.1

Council rescind policy TP2 Subdivision Bonds and TP11 Administrative Procedures and Specifications.

10.3.2 GRAVEL PIT MANAGEMENT AND REHABILITATION

File Ref:

Applicant: Not applicable

Location: Not applicable

Disclosure of Officer Interest: None

Date: 10 September 2012

Author: Leslie Hewer – Engineering Consultant

Authorising Officer: Pascoe Durtanovich – Chief Executive Officer

Attachments: Yes – Draft Policy

Summary:

Council to adopt a policy to rehabilitate old disused gravel pits on Council controlled reserves.

Background:

Over the past Shire work's crews have extracted gravel from road reserves and other Council controlled reserves for road construction. In general most of these pits were never rehabilitated. It is estimated that there are over 50 locations that are affected and in need of reinstatement.

Comment:

A gravel pit procedure has been developed to ensure that in future all material extraction will be in accordance with the required legislation and environmental regulations. Management will be implemented for each individual pit which includes rehabilitation guidelines.

Policy outline:

Objective

For Council to have written procedures for the sustainable management of current gravel pits within the Shire of Ravensthorpe and the progressive rehabilitation of disused gravel pits controlled and managed by the Shire

Policy Statement

The Shire of Ravensthorpe recognizes and accepts that gravel pit rehabilitation is necessary to create environmentally sound and sustainable best practice operations for gravel resourcing in the future.

Procedure for Operating Gravel Pits

1. *Prior to opening a gravel pit, a plan for the management of the site will be written which will include all details of the pit including location, quantities, quality and a plan for rehabilitation and monitoring.*
2. *Wherever possible, new gravel pits will be established on cleared land, not existing bushland. The visual impacts of an operating gravel pit will be minimised through the establishment of buffers between the pit and visual vantage point/s.*
3. *Drainage is to be established within the pit, to ameliorate any ponding and surface erosion.*
4. *Throughout the life of the pit, topsoil, overburden and vegetation will be stockpiled separately ready for respreading in the rehabilitation process.*
5. *If weeds have developed on the topsoil mounds these should be removed or destroyed prior to respreading the topsoil.*
6. *Rehabilitation will be done progressively throughout the life of the gravel pit.*
7. *Where necessary, the dust and noise impacts of an operating gravel pit will be minimised through the establishment of buffers between the pit and neighbours.*
8. *All necessary steps are to be taken to avoid any bushfires.*
9. *Prior to opening a gravel pit, approval to clear will be obtained from the relevant authority if necessary.*
10. *Private operators are required to submit and abide to a gravel pit management plan, which includes a plan for rehabilitation and monitoring, before being issued with an Extractive Industry Licence.*

Pit Rehabilitation

11. *A budget allocation be made each financial year for rehabilitating abandoned gravel pits until **all** pits are rehabilitated to a satisfactory level.*
12. *The general process of rehabilitation will be carried out as per the gravel pit procedure manual.*
13. *Rehabilitation will be done progressively throughout the life of the gravel pit.*
14. *The site is to be monitored every year and for three years after closure of the pit. If rehabilitation is inadequate, appropriate measures will be taken to ensure success is achieved.*
15. *For pits on private property prior to establishment of the site, the landowner will be asked how they want the site rehabilitated.*

Old and Disused Gravel Pits

16. *The method for rehabilitation will not change from that mentioned above.*
17. *If fill is no longer available, spoil from road works etc. may be used. Topsoil, if no longer on site, will be imported to ensure satisfactory regeneration.*

Consultation:

Not applicable.

Statutory Obligations:

This policy aligns with the following Acts;

- Environmental Protection Act 2003
- Soil and Conservation Act 1945
- Environmental Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999
- Wildlife Conservation Act 1950-1979
- Bush Fires Act 1954

Policy Implications:

Nil

Budget / Financial Implications:

Allocation of \$40,000 in future budgets

Strategic Implications:

Nil

Sustainability Implications:

- **Environmental:**
This policy aligns with environmental guidelines.
- **Economic:**
There are no known significant economic considerations.
- **Social:**
There are no known significant social considerations.

Voting Requirements:

Simple Majority

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

ITEM 10.3.2

That draft Policy WS18 - Gravel Pit Management and Rehabilitation be adopted.

*Discussion***10.4 Chief Executive Officer****10.4.1 FORWARD CAPITAL WORKS PLAN AMENDMENTS****File Ref:****Applicant:**

Not applicable

Location:

Not applicable

Disclosure of Officer Interest:

None

Date:

10 September 2012

Author:

Pascoe Durtanovich – Chief Executive Officer

Authorising Officer:

Not applicable

Attachments:

Yes – Forward Capital Works Plan

Summary:

In accordance with the requirements of the Department of Regional Development and Lands, a draft Forward Capital Works Plan for the period 2010 to 2015 was prepared in 2010 and adopted by Council in December 2010.

This report recommends the Plan be amended by reviewing project implementation years and estimated costs.

Background:

The need for country local governments to prepare Forward Capital Works Plans was identified through the Royalties for Regions funding program.

The provision of adequate Forward Capital Works Plans is a new prerequisite for the accessing of Council's allocation from the Royalties for Regions Country Local Government Fund.

The primary document used in preparing the 5 year Forward Capital Works Plan was the Shire of Ravensthorpe Strategic Plan/Plan for the Future. In accordance with the Department's guidelines the Forward Capital Works Plan has to comply with the following:

- Infrastructure items only, not plant and equipment;
- infrastructure that is owned by Council; (if not, reasons should be provided for Council wishing to spend funds on assets which it does not own);
- expenditure for 5 years, commencing in 2010/11;
- Council approval of the FCWP; and
- information on capital works expenditure by Council in 2009/10.

The FCWP contains an opening statement on what the plan covers and confirms Council approval for it with a signature by the Shire President and Chief Executive Officer. It should include a commitment to review the plan each year.

The Forward Capital Works Plan contains a summary of the classifications and the risk assessment matrix used in the report. It also includes summary tables such as an overview of the Forward Capital Works Plan, the sub-project priorities and an identification of any projects with funding gaps.

In March 2011 Council adopted an addendum to the Plan to accommodate the 2010/2011 Royalties for Regions Allocations and other requirements.

Comment:

The amendments to be considered in this review involve the Buildings section of the Plan, specifically in regard to implementation timing and in some instances deletion of projects.

Amendments to the Works and Services area of the Plan, roads, footpaths and drainage, will be considered during 2012/2013 as the Road Network Strategy is developed.

The following amendments to the Plan are recommended:

- | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| • Ravensthorpe Childcare Facility | Completed |
| • Hopetoun Childcare Facility- include in 2011/2012 | Completed |
| • Ravensthorpe Town Hall Refurbishment
- include in 2011/2012 and 2012/2013 | Completed |
| • Jerdacuttup Hall Refurbishment
- include in 2011/2012 and 2012/2013 | Completed |
| • Staff Housing Refurbishment
– include in 2012/2013 | |

- Access ramp and balcony at Ravensthorpe Entertainment Centre
- include in 2014/2015
Note: - Given the limited use of the recreation centre it is doubtful whether this project can be justified.
- Ravensthorpe Heavy Vehicle Road
- include in 2013/2014 and indicate a cost of \$15 million (State Government)
- Ravensthorpe Administration Building
- include in 2012/2013 and increase amount to \$1.8 million.
- Starvation Bay Caretakers Facility – delete.
Note: - For the past two years a Ranger has been employed for the period Christmas to Easter. The Officer covers the area from Hopetoun to Starvation Bay. The system works well and expenditure on a permanent dwelling seems unnecessary.
- Hopetoun Community Centre Replacement
- include in 2012/2013 and 2013/2014 and increase amount to \$3.5 million.

Apart from co-ordinating projects with CLGF funding the amendments to the Plan are required to enable funding applications to be submitted as other opportunities arise.

Consultation:

The Ravensthorpe Heavy Vehicle road has been subject to intensive community consultation. Other amendments proposed are deemed to be minor and further public consultation is unnecessary.

Statutory Obligations:

Prerequisite for accessing funding from the CLGF and other funding sources.

Policy Implications:

Nil

Budget / Financial Implications:

As outlined in the Plan.

Strategic Implications:

The Forward Capital Works Plan is based on the Shire of Ravensthorpe Strategic Plan. The identified projects will be included in the Shire's Corporate Business Plan.

Sustainability Implications:

- **Environmental:**
There are no known significant environmental considerations.
- **Economic:**
There are no known significant economic considerations.
- **Social:**
Implementation of the Plan will deliver facilities and services necessary to retain and grow the population of the Shire.

Voting Requirements:

Simple majority.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

ITEM 10.4.1

That the amendments to the Shire of Ravensthorpe Forward Capital Works Plan, as identified in this report be adopted.

*Discussion***10.4.2 RAVENSTHORPE TOWNSITE ENTRY STATEMENTS****File Ref:****Applicant:** Ravensthorpe Progress Association**Location:** Not applicable**Disclosure of Officer Interest:** None**Date:** 10 September, 2012**Author:** Pascoe Durtanovich – Chief Executive Officer**Authorising Officer:** Not applicable**Attachments:** None**Summary:**

Council Officers have completed a review of the Ravensthorpe Entry Statements project in conjunction with the Ravensthorpe Progress Association.

Council is now requested to approve the Shires financial contribution.

Background:

In April 2010 Council invited the Ravensthorpe Progress Association to facilitate the process to determine entry statement design for the Ravensthorpe town site, with a design recommendation to be submitted to Council prior to July, 2010.

For various reasons, including public consultation, redesign and cost concerns, it was not until March, 2012 that the Association submitted a final design concept to Council.

At the meeting on 22 March, 2012 Council resolved as follows:

That Council acknowledge the work done by the Ravensthorpe Progress Association and support the Ravensthorpe town site entry statement design as submitted by the Association, subject to the following:

- *suitable arrangements for ongoing maintenance of the infrastructure being determined*
- *location be determined*
- *public consultation to be undertaken by the Progress Association.*

Council requested further public consultation be undertaken because of the fact that there was a substantial design concept change since the first proposal was put to the community by the Association.

At the Council meeting held 30 July, 2012 Council resolved as follows:

1. *That the Chief Executive Officer and Manager Engineering Services be authorized to liaise with the Ravensthorpe Progress Association to investigate cost saving options for the provision of entry statements for the Ravensthorpe town site, based on the current design concept and two entry statements.*
2. *That the outcome of the investigations be reported to Council in September, 2012.*
3. *That \$15,000 towards the cost of entry statements be included in the 2012/ 2013 budget.*

Comment:

Originally the cost estimate per entry statement was \$65,000. Following discussions with the contractor the Ravensthorpe Progress Association was able to reduce this to \$ 66,500 (+GST) for two statements, this included \$14,000 for the erection of the manufactured items.

Following further discussion with Council Officers it was ascertained that the statements could be erected by volunteers thereby reducing the cost by \$14,000.

Funding to date has been achieved from:

- Future Fund	\$30,000
- Shire of Ravensthorpe	\$15,000 (subject to confirmation)
Leaving a shortfall of	\$7,500

To satisfy the remaining \$7,500 the Ravensthorpe Progress Association has offered to provide voluntary assistance with the Ravensthorpe Streetscape project. This aspect has been assessed by Council staff and determined as possible, particularly with the removal of existing paving and kerbing.

Consultation:

Discussed with Ravensthorpe Progress Association and the contractor.

Statutory Obligations:

Nil

Policy Implications:

Nil

Budget / Financial Implications:

The Shire of Ravensthorpe 2012/2013 budget includes a cash contribution of \$15,000 to this project. \$180,000 is included for the streetscape project.

Strategic Implications:

Nil

Sustainability Implications:

- **Environmental:**
There are no known significant environmental considerations.
- **Economic:**
There are no known significant economic considerations.
- **Social:**

There are no known significant social considerations.

Voting Requirements:

Simple Majority

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

ITEM 10.4.2

That the final cost estimate of \$ 52,000 plus GST for the manufacture and erection of two Ravensthorpe entry statements be accepted and the Shire contribution of \$15,000 for the project be authorised, together with a voluntary contribution of \$7,500 by the Ravensthorpe Progress Association, to the Ravensthorpe Streetscape Project.

Discussion

10.4.3 DEPARTMENT OF SPORT AND RECREATION CSRFF SMALL GRANTS ROUND

File Ref:

Applicant: Not applicable

Location: Not applicable

Disclosure of Officer Interest: None

Date: 10 September, 2012

Author: Pascoe Durtanovich – Chief Executive Officer

Authorising Officer: Not applicable

Attachments: Yes – Copy of application

Summary:

Council is requested to prioritize applications received for submission to the Department of Sport and Recreation (DSR) for their 2012/13 CSRFF Grants Round.

Background:

Each year the DSR make funds available through their Community Sporting and Recreation Facilities Fund (CSRFF).

As part of the assessment process, applicants must liaise with their Local Government Authorities (LGA) regarding planning and building approvals pertinent to their project. LGA's are then required to assess relevant applications and rank applications in priority order for the municipality.

This year one application has been received;

- Shire of Ravensthorpe – Hopetoun Skate Park

The DSR fund up to one third of the total project cost.

Comment:

This is a Local Government project and has been assessed on the following criteria:

- Project justification
- Planning
- Community consultation
- Access and opportunity by members as well as the municipality
- Design
- Financial viability including commitment from the applicant
- The potential to increase physical activity
- And sustainability of the project

Council considered this project at the March, 2012 meeting and resolved as follows:

That:

1. *The use of portion of reserve 35584 Hopetoun as identified on attachment 10.4.3, be approved for a skate park.*
2. *Council support this project and express support for funding through the Ravensthorpe Hopetoun Future Fund and other suitable funding bodies.*

Funding of \$55,000 (GST Inc) has been received from the Ravensthorpe Hopetoun Future Fund.

Consultation:

A number of meetings have been held with the "Hopetoun Skate Park Project" volunteer group, plus consultation and comparisons with other Local Government Authorities.

Statutory Obligations:

Nil

Policy Implications:

Nil

Budget / Financial Implications:

Proposed funding from the Department of Sport and Recreation (up to 1/3) and Lotterywest. The Shire's contribution will be plant and labour for the required site works. Community Voluntary contributions are also available.

Strategic Implications:

This project is identified in the Shire of Ravensthorpe Youth Activity Plan as a priority project.

Sustainability Implications:

- **Environmental:**
There are no known significant environmental considerations.
- **Economic:**
There are no known significant economic considerations.
- **Social:**
The project identified will improve existing facilities and provide for ongoing activities in relatively isolated communities.

Voting Requirements:

Simple majority.

COUNCIL DECISION AND OFFICER RECOMMENDATION ITEM 10.4.3

That Council support the following project for submission to the Community Sporting and Recreation Facilities fund 2012/2013

- Hopetoun Skate Park

10.4.4 ANNUAL REPORT 2011/2012 & ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING OF ELECTORS

File Ref:

Applicant: Not applicable

Location: Not applicable

Disclosure of Officer Interest: None

Date: 10 September 2012

Author: Pascoe Durtanovich – Chief Executive Officer

Authorising Officer: Not applicable

Attachments: Yes – Annual Report to be tabled

Summary:

Council is required to adopt the Annual Report for 2011/2012 and set a date for the Annual General Meeting of Electors.

Background:

Nil

Comment:

The adoption of the Annual Report and determining a date for the Annual General Meeting of Electors is covered by sections 5.27, 5.53, 5.54 and 5.56 of the Local Government Act. The draft report is in accordance with the Local Government Act in that it contains:

- A report from the Shire President
- A report from the Chief Executive Officer
- Overview of the Plan for the Future
- The financial report for the 2011/2012 financial year
- The Auditors report for the 2011/2012 financial year
- Information in relation to employees salary
- Other reporting requirements
 - Disability Services
 - National Competition Policy
 - Record Keeping Requirements

In addition to the above the statutory requirements it is intended that electors discuss the electors / Councillors ratio review, specifically wards or no wards.

In accordance with the Local Government Act, the general meeting of electors is to be held on a day selected by the local government but not more than 56 days after the local government accepts the annual report for the previous financial year.

Council should endeavour to hold the meeting in late November.

Consultation:

Not applicable.

Statutory Obligations:

Nil

Policy Implications:

Nil

Budget / Financial Implications:

Nil

Strategic Implications:

Nil

Sustainability Implications:

- **Environmental:**
There are no known significant environmental considerations.
- **Economic:**
There are no known significant economic considerations.
- **Social:**
There are no known significant social considerations.

Voting Requirements:

Simple Majority

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION (1)	ITEM 10.4.4
----------------------------	-------------

That the 2011 / 2012 Annual Report for the year ending 30 June 2012 identified as attachment 10.4.4 be accepted.	
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION (2)	ITEM 10.4.4
----------------------------	-------------

That the 2011 / 2012 Annual General Meeting of Electors be held on _____ in the Ravensthorpe Recreation Centre, commencing 7.30pm.	
---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

Discussion

10.4.5 GOLDFIELDS ESPERANCE REVITALIZATION FUND

File Ref:

Applicant: GVROC

Location:	Goldfields Esperance Region
Disclosure of Officer Interest:	None
Date:	10 September, 2012
Author:	Pascoe Durtanovich – Chief Executive Officer
Authorising Officer:	Not applicable
Attachments:	None

Summary:

The City of Kalgoorlie Boulder, in conjunction with the GVROC Technical Officers Group is pushing the State Government to establish a Goldfields Esperance Revitalization Fund.

This report recommends Ravensthorpe Shire projects that should be included, should funding be forthcoming.

Background:

A number of regions throughout the State, particularly in the northern areas have received funding as part of a regional revitalization program.

With the development of the Goldfields-Esperance 2012 – 2021 Strategic Development Plan GVROC is pushing for a similar funding program.

Comment:

To take the matter further GVROC member Local Governments are required to submit projects for funding.

Relevant points to be considered include:

- GVROC will need a united position on the fund;
- Projects must come out of the Regional Strategic Plan;
- If there is a project that is considered important but not in the plan, then at some stage, possibly in Year 3, projects in the plan can be reviewed.
- Funding will probably be spread over 4 years;
- Each project will need to have a business case supporting it;
- It is expected that the projects will not be 100% funded from this fund and there will be leveraging of other monies;
- How much funds will Esperance receive, given it is a Super Town and has already received funds under the Super Towns program?

The Shire of Ravensthorpe priority projects identified in the Shire's Forward Capital Works Plan and Goldfields Esperance Strategic Development Plan are;

Flagship – Ravensthorpe Heavy Haulage Vehicle Route.

Sub regional

1. Hopetoun Community Centre
2. Main street upgrade – Hopetoun
3. Ravensthorpe streetscape
4. Ravensthorpe Local Government Administration building.

It is recommended that the following projects be submitted to GVROC for consideration under the Revitalization fund.

Project	Cost Estimate	Year spent	Revitalization Fund	Other sources
Ravensthorpe Heavy Vehicle Road	\$15 million	2013/2014 2014/2015	\$10 million	\$5 million
Hopetoun Community Centre	\$3.5 million	2013/2014	\$2.0million	\$1.5 million
Hopetoun Main Street Upgrade	\$1.5 million	2013/2014	\$1.2 million	\$300,000
Local Government Administration Building	\$1.8 million	2014/2015	\$1.5 million	\$300,000

Consultation:

Not applicable

Statutory Obligations:

Nil

Policy Implications:

Nil

Budget / Financial Implications:

As outlined in this report.

Strategic Implications:

Nil

Sustainability Implications:

- **Environmental:**
There are no known significant environmental considerations.
- **Economic:**
There are no known significant economic considerations.
- **Social:**
There are no known significant social considerations.

Voting Requirements:

Simple Majority

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION	ITEM 10.4.5
------------------------	-------------

That the following projects be submitted to the Goldfields Esperance Voluntary Regional Organization of Councils for funding under the proposed Goldfields Esperance Revitalization Fund.

Project	Cost Estimate	Year spent	Revitalization Fund	Other sources
Ravensthorpe Heavy Vehicle Road	\$15 million	2013/2014 2014/2015	\$10 million	\$5 million
Hopetoun Community Centre	\$3.5 million	2013/2014	\$2.0 million	\$1.5 million
Hopetoun Main Street Upgrade	\$1.5 million	2013/2014	\$1.2 million	\$300,000
Local Government Administration Building	\$1.8 million	2014/2015	\$1.5 million	\$300,000

Discussion

10.4.6 BUSH FIRE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING 11 SEPTEMBER, 2012

File Ref:

Applicant:

Not applicable

Location:

Not applicable

Disclosure of Officer Interest:

None

Date:

12 September, 2012

Author:

Pascoe Durtanovich – Chief Executive Officer

Authorising Officer:

Not applicable

Attachments:

Yes – Copy of Minutes

Summary:

Considerations of recommendations from the Shire of Ravensthorpe Bush Fire Advisory Committee meeting held on the 11 September, 2012.

Background:

Nil

Comment:

The Bush Fire Advisory Committee recommendations are in the main procedural matters and should be supported.

Consultation:

Not applicable

Statutory Obligations:

Bushfires Act 1954.

Shire of Ravensthorpe Bushfire Brigades Local Law 2010.

Policy Implications:

Shire of Ravensthorpe Bush Fire Advisory Committee operational guidelines.

Budget / Financial Implications

Equipping of the Munglinup water tanks will be funded from the maintenance budget.

Strategic Implications:

Nil

Sustainability Implications:

- **Environmental:**
There are no known significant environmental considerations.
- **Economic:**
There are no known significant economic considerations.
- **Social:**
There are no known significant social considerations.

Voting Requirements:

Simple Majority

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

ITEM 10.4.6

That the Minutes of the Shire of Ravensthorpe Bush Fire Advisory Committee meeting held on 11 September, 2012 be received and the recommendation therein be adopted.

11 ELECTED MEMBERS MOTIONS OF WHICH PREVIOUS NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

Nil

12 BUSINESS OF AN URGENT NATURE INTRODUCED BY DECISION OF MEETING**12.1 Elected Members**

Nil

12.2 Officers

Nil

13 MATTERS BEHIND CLOSED DOORS

Nil

14. CLOSURE OF MEETING – 7.02PM

These minutes were confirmed at the meeting of the _____

Signed: _____
(Presiding Person at the meeting of which the minutes were confirmed.)

Date: _____