



# AGENDA

ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING

TIME: 5.30PM

THURSDAY 6 APRIL 2017

CITY OF WANNEROO

---

*Managing waste and recovering resources responsibly*  
*Constituent Members: Cities of Perth, Joondalup, Stirling, Vincent and Wanneroo*  
*Towns of Cambridge and Victoria Park*



CITY OF VINCENT



---

**MINDARIE REGIONAL COUNCIL  
NOTICE OF MEETING**

24 March 2017

Councillors of the Mindarie Regional Local Government are advised that an Ordinary Meeting of the Council will be held in the Council Chambers of the City of Wanneroo, 23 Dundobar Road, Wanneroo, at 5.30pm on Thursday 6 April 2017.

The agenda pertaining to the meeting follows.

Your attendance is respectfully requested.

**BRIAN CALLANDER  
CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER**

**MINDARIE REGIONAL COUNCIL - MEMBERSHIP**

Cr R Fishwick JP (Russ) - <b>Chair</b>	City of Joondalup
Cr D Boothman JP (David) – <b>Deputy Chair</b>	City of Stirling
Cr M Norman (Mike)	City of Joondalup
Cr J Adamos (Jim)	City of Perth
Cr A Guilfoyle (Andrew)	City of Stirling
Cr S Jenkinson (Samantha)	City of Stirling
Cr S Proud JP (Stephanie)	City of Stirling
Cr E Cole (Emma)	City of Vincent
Cr R Driver (Russell)	City of Wanneroo
Cr D Newton JP (Dot)	City of Wanneroo
Cr C MacRae (Corinne)	Town of Cambridge
Cr V Maxwell (Vince)	Town of Victoria Park

NB: The City of Vincent has resolved at its council meeting held on 7 March 2017 to appoint its Mayor, Cr E. Cole as its representative on the Mindarie Regional Council (MRC). Mayor Cole will be sworn in as a councillor of the MRC prior to the commencement of the ordinary council meeting to be held at the City of Wanneroo on 6 April 2017.

---

---

## CONTENTS

1	DECLARATION OF OPENING / ANNOUNCEMENT OF VISITORS.....	4
2	ATTENDANCE / APOLOGIES / LEAVE OF ABSENCE .....	4
3	DECLARATION OF INTERESTS.....	4
4	PUBLIC QUESTION TIME.....	4
5	ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PRESIDING PERSON.....	4
6	APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE .....	4
7	PETITIONS / DEPUTATIONS / PRESENTATIONS .....	4
8	CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING .....	4
	8.1 Ordinary Council Meeting – 9 February 2017 .....	4
9	CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER REPORTS .....	5
	9.1 Financial Statements for the months ended 31 January 2017 and 28 February 2017 .....	5
	9.2 List of Payments made for the months ended 31 January 2017 and 28 February 2017 .....	7
	9.3 Land Use and Feasibility Study for the Post Closure of the Tamala Park Waste Management Facility – TPG Stage 1 Findings and Recommendations.....	8
	9.4 Review of the MRC’S Strategic Community Plan 2018 – 2037 .....	20
10	MEMBERS INFORMATION BULLETIN – ISSUE NO. 34 .....	27
11	MOTIONS OF WHICH PREVIOUS NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN .....	27
12	URGENT BUSINESS .....	27
13	QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS OF WHICH DUE NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN .....	27
14	MATTERS FOR WHICH THE MEETING MAY BE CLOSED TO THE PUBLIC .....	27
15	NEXT MEETING.....	27
16	CLOSURE .....	27

---

---

<b>1</b>	<b>DECLARATION OF OPENING / ANNOUNCEMENT OF VISITORS</b>
----------	--

<b>2</b>	<b>ATTENDANCE / APOLOGIES / LEAVE OF ABSENCE</b>
----------	--

<b>3</b>	<b>DECLARATION OF INTERESTS</b>
----------	---------------------------------

Declaration of Financial/Conflict of Interest to be recorded prior to dealing with each item.

Disclosure of Financial and Proximity Interests

- (a) *Members must disclose the nature of their interest in matters to be discussed at the meeting. (Section 5.65 of the Local Government Act 1995).*
- (b) *Employees must disclose the nature of their interest in reports or advice when giving the report or advice to the meeting. (Sections 5.70 and 5.71 of the Local Government Act 1995).*

Disclosure of Interest Affecting Impartiality

- (a) *Members and staff must disclose their interest in matters to be discussed at the meeting in respect of which the member or employee has given or will give advice.*

<b>4</b>	<b>PUBLIC QUESTION TIME</b>
----------	-----------------------------

<b>5</b>	<b>ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PRESIDING PERSON</b>
----------	--

<b>6</b>	<b>APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE</b>
----------	--

<b>7</b>	<b>PETITIONS / DEPUTATIONS / PRESENTATIONS</b>
----------	--

<b>8</b>	<b>CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING</b>
----------	--

**8.1 ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING – 9 FEBRUARY 2017**

The Minutes of the Ordinary Council Meeting held on 9 February 2017 have been printed and circulated to members of the Council.

**RESPONSIBLE OFFICER RECOMMENDATION**

**That the Minutes of the Ordinary Council Meeting of Council held on 9 February 2017 be confirmed as a true record of the proceedings.**

---

---

<b>9</b>	<b>CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER REPORTS</b>
----------	--

<b>9.1</b>	<b>FINANCIAL STATEMENTS FOR THE MONTHS ENDED 31 JANUARY 2017 AND 28 FEBRUARY 2017</b>
<b>File No:</b>	<b>FIN/5-07</b>
<b>Appendix(s):</b>	<b>Appendix No. 1 Appendix No. 2 Appendix No. 3</b>
<b>Date:</b>	<b>15 March 2017</b>
<b>Responsible Officer:</b>	<b>Director Corporate Services</b>

#### **SUMMARY**

The purpose of this report is to provide financial reporting in line with statutory requirements which provides useful information to stakeholders of the Council.

#### **BACKGROUND**

Reporting requirements are defined by Financial Management Regulations 34 of the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996.

The financial statements presented for each month consist of:

- Operating Statement by Nature – Combined
- Operating Statement by Nature – RRF Only
- Operating Statement by Function
- Statement of Financial Activity
- Statement of Reserves
- Statement of Financial Position
- Statement of Investing Activities
- Information on Borrowings
- Tonnage Report

#### **DETAIL**

The Financial Statements attached are for the months ended 31 January 2017 and 28 February 2017 and are attached at **Appendix No. 1 and 2** to this Item. The Tonnage Report for the 8 months to 28 February 2017 is attached at **Appendix No. 3**.

The complete suite of Financial Statements which includes the Operating Statements, Statement of Financial Position, Statement of Financial Activity and other related information are reported on a monthly basis.

The estimates for Provisions for Amortisation of Cell Development, Capping and Post Closure expenditure are based on the estimated rates per tonne calculated with reference to estimated excavation cost of various stages of the landfill and the life of the landfill. An adjustment is made (if necessary) at the end of the year based on actual tonnages on a survey carried out to assess the “air space” remaining and other relevant information.

---

Summary of results for the eight month period ended 28 February 2017

	<b>Actual</b>	<b>Budget</b>	<b>Variance</b>
	<b>t</b>	<b>t</b>	<b>t</b>
Tonnes – Members	197,319	218,040	(20,721)
Tonnes – Others	10,524	11,603	(1,079)
<b>TOTAL TONNES</b>	<b>207,843</b>	<b>229,643</b>	<b>(21,800)</b>
	<b>\$</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>\$</b>
Revenue – Members	34,264,447	37,899,064	(3,634,617)
Revenue – Other	1,664,694	1,707,177	(42,483)
<b>TOTAL REVENUE</b>	<b>35,929,141</b>	<b>39,606,241</b>	<b>(3,677,100)</b>
Expenses	34,206,383	36,528,062	2,321,679
Profit on sale of assets	62,277	34,207	28,070
Loss on sale of assets	1,167	-	(1,167)
<b>NET SURPLUS</b>	<b>1,783,868</b>	<b>3,112,386</b>	<b>(1,328,518)</b>

Commentary

Member tonnes for the year to February 2017 are tracking 9% behind budget, which is directly attributable to the change in systems for bulk/verge collection implemented by various councils. Trade and casuals are 1,073 tonnes behind budget.

The reduction in member tonnes from what was budgeted translates into a reduced surplus for the 8 months, despite the partial offset achieved in operational expenditure savings.

This reduction in waste to landfill is consistent with the MRC's vision of 'Winning Back Waste' but will over time see the cost per tonne to landfill for the remaining waste increasing proportionally.

Overall, the MRC has still generated a strong surplus of \$1.7 million for the year to date.

**VOTING REQUIREMENT**

Simple Majority

**RESPONSIBLE OFFICER RECOMMENDATION**

**That the Financial Statements set out in Appendix No. 1 and 2 for the months ended 31 January 2017 and 28 February 2017, respectively, be received.**

---

<b>9.2</b>	<b>LIST OF PAYMENTS MADE FOR THE MONTHS ENDED 31 JANUARY 2017 AND 28 FEBRUARY 2017</b>
<b>File No:</b>	<b>FIN/5-06</b>
<b>Appendix(s):</b>	<b>Appendix No. 4 Appendix No. 5</b>
<b>Date:</b>	<b>15 March 2017</b>
<b>Responsible Officer:</b>	<b>Director Corporate Services</b>

### SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to provide details of payments made during the periods identified. This is in line with the requirement under the delegated authority to the Chief Executive Officer (CEO), that a list of payments made from the Municipal Fund since the last Ordinary Council meeting be presented to Council.

### COMMENT

The lists of payments for the months ended 31 January 2017 and 28 February 2017 are at **Appendix 4 and 5** to this Item and are presented to Council for noting. Payments have been made in accordance with the delegated authority to the CEO which allows payments to be made between meetings. At the Ordinary Council Meeting held on 1 September 2016, the Council delegated to the CEO the exercise of its power to make payments from the Municipal Fund. In order to satisfy the requirements of Clause 13(2) of the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations, a list of payments made must be submitted to the next Council meeting following such payments.

It should be noted that generally all payments are GST inclusive and the Mindarie Regional Council is able to claim this tax as an input credit when GST remittances are made each month to the Australian Tax Office.

<b>Months Ended</b>	<b>Account</b>	<b>Vouchers</b>	<b>Amount</b>
31 January 2017	General Municipal	Cheques	\$7,605.73
		EFT	\$6,541,257.18
		DP	\$258,460.32
		Inter account transfers	\$14,061.30
		<b>Total</b>	<b>\$6,821,384.53</b>
28 February 2017	General Municipal	Cheques	\$6,909.85
		EFT	\$3,031,549.46
		DP	\$276,818.00
		Inter account transfers	\$1,700,000.00
		<b>Total</b>	<b>\$5,015,277.31</b>

### VOTING REQUIREMENT

Simple Majority

### RESPONSIBLE OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

**That the list of payments made under delegated authority to the Chief Executive Officer, for the months ended 31 January 2017 and 28 February 2017, be noted.**

---

---

<b>9.3</b>	<b>LAND USE AND FEASIBILITY STUDY FOR THE POST CLOSURE OF THE TAMALA PARK WASTE MANAGEMENT FACILITY – TPG STAGE 1 FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS</b>
<b>File No:</b>	<b>WST/102-04</b>
<b>Appendix(s):</b>	<b>Nil</b>
<b>Date:</b>	<b>22 March 2017</b>
<b>Responsible Officer:</b>	<b>CEO</b>

### **SUMMARY**

The report seeks endorsement of the consultant, TPG's findings and recommendations of Stage 1 of the Land Use and Feasibility Study (LUFS) for the post closure of the Tamala Park Waste Management Facility.

### **BACKGROUND**

The Tender for the LUFS required the consultant to do the work in two stages allowing the Mindarie Regional Council (MRC) and its member councils' discretion to move to stage 2 based on the findings of stage 1. The following is an extract from the Tender that describes the expected key outputs from the two stages.

#### **“KEY OUTPUTS**

##### **Stage One**

*All documents should be provided in Word and PDF formats and in A4 and/or A3 formats and include:*

- *Notes from discussion with stakeholders.*
- *A summary report for the two workshops detailing the following:*
  - *Opportunities and Constraints*
  - *Selection Criteria*
  - *Evaluation Process*
  - *Land Use Options*
  - *Record of Workshop proceedings*
- *A draft and final report for Stage One including the outcomes of the workshops and subsequent recommendations.*

##### **Stage Two**

- *Concept Plan/s and accompanying report.*
- *Preliminary Feasibility Study.*
- *Indicative Implementation Strategy.*
- *A draft and final report for Stage Two summarising the Concept Plan/s, Preliminary Feasibility Study, Indicative Implementation Strategy, recommendations in respect to the Preferred Option and Landowner Considerations as set out in the Scope of Work.*

*Consideration could be given to undertaking the work identified in this stage if it is considered necessary.*

### **DETAIL**

TPG have completed stage 1 and in December 2016 provided an Outcomes Report (the Report) detailing its findings. The Report provides a number of Opportunities and Challenges the site offers and recommends the next steps in the process as follows.

---



---

### **“3. Opportunities and Challenges**

#### **3.1 Challenges**

##### **3.1.1 Bush Forever Site 323**

*Bush Forever Site 323 is located within the broader Tamala Park Landfill Facility boundary. The Bush Forever site was determined during the development of Bushplan prior to 2000 and the boundary modified in the final Bush Forever mapping. The boundary includes all the native vegetation on the site and some cleared patches. The Bush Forever boundary is very irregular as a result. The primary reason for the inclusion of the site in Bush Forever was to provide a linkage between Burns Beach Bushland (Tamala Park Bushland) (Bush Forever Site 322) and Neerabup National Park. There is a basic presumption against development and clearing in Bush Forever sites.*

##### **3.1.2 Native Vegetation**

*The subject site contains areas of native vegetation as well as rehabilitated areas over parts of capped landfill and borrow pits. The native vegetation includes areas of Tuarts and Banksia Woodland, Parrot Bush Heathlands and coastal heath on Quindalup dunes. A flora and vegetation survey of the native vegetation is currently being completed by Mindarie Regional Council (MRC).*

*The vegetation may include a number of Floristic Community Types (FCT) listed under the EPBC Act as Threatened Ecological Communities (TECs). Among those is Banksia Woodland of the Swan Coastal Plain have recently been added as a Matter of National Environmental Significance (MNES). The detailed information in the flora and vegetation survey will determine which, if any of the TECs may be present on the site.*

##### **3.1.3 Fauna Habitat**

*A fauna survey of the site is currently being completed by the MRC. Carnaby's Black Cockatoos which is listed under the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (EPBC Act) may occur in the area including the Tuart and Banksia Woodland and Parrot Bush Heath. Under the guidelines if a proposal impacts on more than 1ha of 'quality' foraging habitat then referral under the EPBC Act may be required, a process which is described in subsequent sections.*

##### **3.1.4 Ecological Linkage**

*The site was included in Bush Forever primarily as it provided a vegetated ecological corridor between the Burns Beach Bushland and Neerabup National Park. Maintaining the linkage the bushland provides will be a requirement of any proposed development on the site.*

##### **3.1.5 Waste Settlement Within Tip Cell**

*Any future development proposal on the 31 ha land fill cell will need to be cognizant of the engineering challenges including foundation design and landfill gas migration control. The large total and differential settlement often associated with landfills is an integral part of these challenges. It is understood the tip cell level settles at a rate of 5 metres per annum.*

*Due to the large settlement potential, landfill redevelopment using shallow foundations is generally restricted to low-rise structures of one or two stories with raft foundations. Construction of taller structures using pile foundations is generally restricted to landfills without an engineered bottom liner system. Both deep and shallow foundation systems must be provided with protective measures against landfill gas migration.*

---

---

### 3.1.6 Gas Migration

*Landfill gas migration represents a challenge for the redevelopment due to the risk of fire and explosion associated with methane and the health risks associated with some of the non-methanogenic organic constituents. Methods of controlling gas in modern landfills include the creation of physical and pneumatic barriers, passive venting systems, and active gas collection and treatment systems, both within the waste and under structures. The presence of these gas collection systems and engineered covers in a modern closed landfill can mitigate post closure development hazards due to landfill gas to some extent. However, additional protective measures may be required for post closure development, even for a modern landfill with a geomembrane cap and an active gas control system.*

*The MRC commissioned GHD Pty Ltd (GHD) to prepare a conceptual site model (CSM) and an assessment of landfill gas and groundwater information to show the migration rates, extent of impacts and the risks posed to sensitive receptors. The GHD report Tamala Park Landfill Summary Conceptual Site Model (May 1015) states that the modeling undertaken suggests that the subject site generated a significant quantity of landfill gas during 2015 (>500 m<sup>3</sup>/hr) and will continue to do so for many decades. The GHD report (March 2015) indicates a tentative gas migration distance of 20m to 90m (2015 and 2024) extending south of the tip site into the adjoining earmarked development cell to the south. The report notes that there are several key areas of uncertainty in the modeling undertaken that require further refinement in future iterations of the model. This will be important to better understand and quantify to ensure this does not conflict with the short and medium term land uses for the site.*

### 3.1.7 Existing Facilities and Associated Operational Buffers

*Short term land use solutions within the subject site will need to accommodate the ongoing operations of the transfer station and land fill methane gas operations. This means that land uses should not occur within the required buffer areas of these operations, or if they do, they are not deemed a sensitive receptor to the operations. For guidance purposes, a 'Waste Depot' land use (for the transfer station) requires a buffer distance of 200m (EPA Guidance Statement No.3: Separation Distances between Industrial and Sensitive Land Uses, June 2005).*

### 3.1.8 Bushfire Regulations

*The majority of the subject site (excluding the land fill area) is identified as a 'Bush Fire Prone Area'. The WAPC's Statement of Planning Policy 3.7 intends to assist in reducing the risk of bushfire to people, property and infrastructure by taking a risk-minimisation approach to development proposed in bushfire prone areas. A designated Bushfire prone area is an area that has been identified and designated by the Fire and Emergency Services Act 1998 (as amended). Such areas are identified on the Map of Bush Fire Prone Areas.*

*A generic 100m separation distance is nominally applied between fire risk areas and sensitive land uses. A Bushfire Management Plan and BAL Contour Map will need to be undertaken to justify a reduction in the buffer separation distance to any future development proposed. This exercise should be undertaken only once some certainty is achieved regarding the potential Bush Forever boundary reconfigurations (refer to Opportunities section of this report). Consideration will also need to be given to*

---

*suitable vehicle access points which shall ensure alternative emergency evacuation can occur in the event of a fire.*

### **3.1.9 Heritage Sites**

*A desktop search of the Department of Aboriginal Affairs (DAA) Heritage Inquiry System shows that there are three recorded sites and two stored data sites located within the subject site. The sites are identified in the table below:*

<i>Site Status</i>	<i>Site ID</i>	<i>Details</i>
<i>Registered Sites</i>	<i>3407</i>	<i>Tamala Park Trees Modified Tree</i>
<i>Registered Sites</i>	<i>18801</i>	<i>Scarred Tree Modified Tree</i>
<i>Registered Sites</i>	<i>3567</i>	<i>Mindarie Waugal Artefacts/Scatter Mythological</i>
<i>Other Heritage Places</i>	<i>18803</i>	<i>Tamala Park Waterhole Mythological, Camp Stored Data/Not a Site</i>
<i>Other Heritage Places</i>	<i>18802</i>	<i>Tamala Park Campsite Mythological, Camp Stored Data/Not a Site</i>
<i>Other Heritage Places</i>	<i>17497</i>	<i>Mindarie Burial Mound Skeletal Material/Burial Stored Data/Not a Site</i>

*These sites are located within the Parks and Recreation reserve and therefore are largely separated from the operations of the landfill site and southern development cell. The Mindarie Waugal is located along the northern edge of the subject site and stretches east-west across the parabolic dune ridge. Development is not permitted within this area. The DAA has indicated they would want this area to be fenced off to protect the site and prevent public access. As a result, the subject site is effectively disconnected from the Catalina residential development to the north.*

## **3.2 Opportunities**

### **3.2.1 Rationalisation of the Bush Forever Boundary**

*The boundary of the Bush Forever site has a high which is not ideal for the viability of a local natural area. The irregular shape has been recognised by the Department of Planning (DoP), the vested management body of Bush Forever as minuted in a meeting held with the project team and DoP to discuss the future of Tamala Park (refer to Appendix 2 - Schedule of Meeting Minutes – Stakeholder Feedback).*

*The potential to rationalise the Bush Forever site boundaries to make the boundaries more regular might have merit from a maintenance and management point of view. It may not be viable to support ongoing maintenance and management of narrower slivers and sections of Bush Forever sites. Any modification would need to be supported by an offset of an equivalent area of bushland.*

*Therefore, any future development of the site could facilitate some boundary reconfigurations to improve the viability of the Bush Forever Site. The DoP also indicated this may be possible but that no net loss of Bush Forever land will be*

---

*supported by the Department. If the bushland is degraded, this is not reason in itself to remove it from the identified Bush Forever site.*

*Rationalising the boundary could result in a number of positive outcomes for the environmental values of the new Bush Forever site such as:*

- Reduced edge effects as the perimeter will be smaller, compared to the area - providing better protection from weed infestation to more of the bushland;*
- Potentially increasing the width of the corridor in the southern part of the Bush Forever site between Tamala Park Bushland and Neerabup National Park, improving ecological linkage values; and*
- Improving the efficiency of management of the site including reduced fencing and firebreak distances which require maintenance and decreased rubbish vectors from surrounding residences.*

### **3.2.2 Land Swap**

*We have identified a potential opportunity to rationalise the existing Bush Forever boundaries adjacent to Marmion Avenue. This would require a negotiated land swap with the rehabilitated area adjacent to the borrow pit. Approximately 7.6ha of the rehabilitated area could potentially be swapped to unlock development adjacent to Marmion Avenue where areas have already been cleared for buildings and roads. While the rehabilitated area adjacent to the borrow pit is not remnant native vegetation as such, it is far more advanced than the rehabilitation on the older parts of the landfill site. As this area has not been used as landfill, it has more potential to rehabilitate to native vegetation. If a land swap can be successfully negotiated with the DoP, this would result in approximately 24ha of developable area located outside of the landfill site (subject to detailed design and assessment against required buffers).*

### **3.2.3 Review Mapped Heritage Sites**

*During our discussions with the officers at the DAA they encouraged the MRC to request a review of the mapping for Sites 3407 (Registered) and 1749 (Other Heritage Place). It was suggested by the officers that the existing mapped areas could be contracted based on further information being provided by MRC's environmental officer regarding the location of the sites, if known.*

### **3.3.1 Environmental**

*The potential for karst has been raised during consultation and it is recommended that a geotechnical assessment of the site be undertaken to ascertain potential constraints on land use. According to discussions with MRC's environmental officer, during the drilling process, many drillers have referred to a term "lost circulation" this may mean a karst (cave) or a karst filled with sand. During the drilling on the northern site boundary and the northern landfill edge boundary, a number of lost circulations were encountered. However, no karst (cave) has been identified on site to their knowledge.*

*The results of the Flora, Vegetation and Fauna monitoring for 2016 are, as yet, not finalised. The results will provide additional information about the vegetation and habitat on the site and allow further informed decisions, particularly regarding fauna habitat and the potential for the site to contain the Banksia Woodland on the Swan Coastal Plain TEC.*

### **3.3.2 Services**

*Public domain information regarding services is limited to the utility providers who have infrastructure located within the existing road reserves. Any potential*

---

---

*development of the land will require an investigation to locate the privately-owned services within the boundaries of the site, unless this level of information is available within MRC's own records."*

#### **"7. Recommendations and Next Steps**

*The analysis undertaken as part of Stage 1 assisted in prioritising the land use options to derive which land uses were both compatible with the landfill site and preferred by the member Council group. The intent of the multi-criteria analysis was to arrive at a group of land uses as a basis for obtaining consensus from the member Council group, thereby enabling further investigations be undertaken as part of Stage 2 of the project.*

*The project brief for Stage 2 identified the following tasks be undertaken:*

- To prepare concept plan/s and accompanying report;*
- Undertake preliminary feasibility study against concept plans;*
- Prepare indicative implementation strategy; and*
- Prepare a draft and final report for Stage Two summarising the concept plans, preliminary feasibility study, indicative implementation strategy, recommendations in respect to the preferred option and landowner considerations.*

*From our investigations during Stage 1, it is evident there are a number of matters which require further investigation prior to undertaking works associated with Stage 2. These matters are discussed below.*

##### **7.1 Bush Forever Rationalization Investigations and Offsets**

*The findings of MRC's flora, vegetation and fauna monitoring for 2016 are, as yet, not finalised. The results will provide additional information about the vegetation and habitat on the site and allow further informed decisions, particularly regarding fauna habitat and the potential for the site to contain the Banksia Woodland on the Swan Coastal Plain TEC. This information would enable future discussions to occur with the DoP regarding the potential rationalization of the Bush Forever boundary, and whether there is scope to undertake a land swap which would result in a more useable development footprint for Area 2. It is recommended that clarity regarding the potential Bush Forever boundary rationalization be reached prior to any concept plans being undertaken as part of Stage 2 works. This shall inform the workable dimensions for Area 2.*

*The Flora, Vegetation and Fauna information would also confirm the potential value of the vegetation, and whether it would be worthwhile for the MRC to pursue the commodification of the Bush Forever land. As previously noted, the whole of the Bush Forever site may not be usable as an offset, as the majority of the northern portion of the site on the Mindarie Waugal dune is not Carnaby's habitat or Banksia Woodland TEC.*

*The statutory process to modify a Bush Forever site would be through a Metropolitan Region Scheme (MRS) Amendment referred to the Environmental Protection Authority (EPA). The EPA may assess the amendment or, if they were to find the outcome was beneficial to the environment may not assess the amendment. The amendment would need endorsement from the DoP and possibly the Department of Parks and Wildlife (DPaW) regarding the modified boundary.*

---

*Any proposals to rationalize the Bush Forever boundary that leads to the loss of native vegetation would need to be offset by the addition of other areas of native vegetation into the Bush Forever site. Offsets could include adding good quality rehabilitation areas into the Bush Forever site, revegetating degraded areas of the Bush Forever Site and potentially purchasing land of 'like for like' biota and quality for inclusion into another Bush Forever Site. The DoP, DPaW and EPA will need to be consulted to reach a general agreement to any offset proposal.*

#### *7.2 Heritage Mapping Rationalisation*

*It is recommended that a process be initiated to amend the DAA mapping for the heritage sites located in the south-east corner of the subject site (Site 3407, Registered and Site 1749, Other Heritage Place). It was suggested by the DAA officers that the existing mapped areas could potentially be contracted based on further information being provided by MRC's environmental officer regarding the location of the sites, if known.*

#### *7.3 Gas Migration Confirmation*

*Figure 1 of the GHD report (March 2015) indicates a tentative gas migration distance of 20m to 90m (2015 and 2024) extending into the southern development cell (Area 2). The report notes that there are several key areas of uncertainty in the modeling undertaken that require further refinement in future iterations of the model. Whilst future concept plans could exclude these areas identified as being potentially affected by gas migration, it would be beneficial to better understand the likelihood of this occurring within Area 2.*

#### *7.4 Alternative Recycling Operations and Sustainable Energy*

*It is recommended that the MRC further investigate potential operations to complement the existing Transfer Station. As previously mentioned, this could potentially include downstream waste processing land uses such as green waste recyclers, wood chip repurposing etc. These opportunities could be further investigated by the MRC with potentially interested operators.*

*Sustainable energy infrastructure, such as a solar farm, has also been discussed by stakeholders as a potential operation for a portion of the subject site. It is understood that preliminary discussions have occurred between the MRC's executives and a potential provider to establish a solar farm. This opportunity should be further investigated.*

#### *7.5 Environmental Implications For Stage 2 Works*

*Based on the investigations undertaken by the project team, we recommend that the matters identified under 7.1, 7.2 and 7.3 be investigated and resolved prior to undertaking Stage 2 works. The resolution of these items shall define the workable development boundaries. Without this certainty, any concept design work undertaken prior to the resolution of these matters would be at risk of becoming abortive works.*

#### *7.6 Short Term Actions*

*An amendment to the Metropolitan Region Scheme is a lengthy process and it may be some years before a formal amendment request is initiated by the WAPC. Therefore it is necessary to define a process whereby short-term land use opportunities may be pursued for the site notwithstanding the sites current reservation for Public Purposes and Parks and Recreation.*

---

*During our discussions with the Department of Planning it was evident that the Department did not have a long-term vision or specific land use in mind for the site.*

*In order to broaden the short-term land use opportunities for the site it is recommended that the MRC provide a copy of the Stage 1 outcomes report to the Department of Planning, and seek its feedback in relation to the potential short term land use opportunities located within the 'Public Purposes' reserve, without the necessity to commit to an amendment to the Metropolitan Region Scheme.*

*It is understood through previous discussion and correspondence with officers of the Department of Planning, that the department is generally comfortable with the establishment of short-term land use options presented within this report on cleared portions of the site located outside of the Bush Forever site boundaries, provided that key constraints are adequately addressed prior to land use and development. Such land use constraints have previously been identified within this report and include risk of bushfire, Aboriginal heritage sites and other constraints associated with the past landfill activities.*

#### 7.7 Recommended Resolutions

*That the Council adopt the recommendations of the Stage 1 Outcomes Report:*

1. *Defer Stage 2 works until the following matters are resolved:*
  - *Bush Forever Boundary Rationalisation: Review the outcomes of the MRC's flora, vegetation and fauna monitoring program. Based on the outcomes of this monitoring program, reengage with the DoP regarding the potential rationalisation of the Bush Forever boundary. Reach an in-principle agreement to the proposed Bush Forever boundary adjustments based on the MRC's latest flora, vegetation and fauna data.*
  - *Heritage Mapping: Initiate a review of the DAA's mapping for Sites 17497 and 3407 with the objective of contracting these areas.*
  - *Gas Migration: Seek further clarification from GHD regarding the tentative gas migration distance which extends into the southern development cell (Area 2)."*

A copy of the report was provided to the member councils on 22 December 2016 requesting a response on the recommendations contained within the report. The following responses were provided:

Member Council	Response to TPG Recommendations
City of Wanneroo	<p>The City's Administration (the City) thanks you for the updated progress of the project and concurs with the recommendations of the completed Stage 1 study and that the Stage 2 works are deferred until the following matters are resolved:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>a) Bush Forever Boundary Rationalisation;</li><li>b) Heritage Mapping; and</li><li>c) Gas Migration.</li></ol> <p>The City further recommends that a geotechnical report is completed for Karst and Caves, as recommended in Section 3.3.1 of the completed report.</p>
City of Joondalup	Nil
City of Stirling	Nil
Town of Cambridge	Nil

City of Vincent	Nil
City of Perth	<p><b>Post Closure Use Study for Tamala Park Waste Management Facility</b></p> <p>On 14 September 2016, I along with other members of the City of Perth (CoP) team met with yourself and representatives from The Planning Group Pty Ltd (TPG).</p> <p>At the meeting/workshop the CoP team provided ideas and recommendations for the post closure use of the Tamala Park Waste Management Facility. Minutes were subsequently forwarded and we acknowledged them as a true reflection of our comments.</p> <p>Your letter dated 22 December 2016 provided recommendations from TPG on how to proceed to Stage 2 works and an update on how the Mindarie Regional Council (MRC) was addressing them.</p> <p>CoP supports the MRC in moving forward with TPG's recommendations and requests that consideration be given to our comments from the 14 September 2016 meeting when planning the Stage 2 developments.</p> <p>Thank you for continuing to provide updates on the post closure project and CoP looks forward to watching the space develop into the future.</p>
Town of Victoria Park	<p>I refer to your letter dated 22 December 2016 and acknowledge receipt of a copy of the stage 1 Outcomes Report for the Tamala Park Waste Management Facility Site Landuse and feasibility Study dated December 2016 as prepared by TPG.</p> <p>I acknowledge the progress MRC has made to address the three matters as stated in your letter and advise that the Town is supportive of MRC progressing to Stage 2 of the project as soon as these three matters as tabled under Attachment 1 of your letter have been adequately resolved. It is noted that the tasks involved in Stage 2 of the project include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To prepare concept plan/s and accompanying report;</li> <li>• Undertake preliminary feasibility study against concept plans;</li> <li>• Prepare indicative implementation strategy; and</li> <li>• Prepare a draft and final report for Stage Two summarising the concept plans, preliminary feasibility study, indicative implementation strategy, recommendations in respect to the preferred option and landowner considerations.</li> </ul> <p>When undertaking Stage 2 of the project, it would be appreciated that the comments provided by the Town during our meeting on 15 August 2016 are considered and if there is any concerns or clarifications required on any of these comments, please do not hesitate to contact John Wong on 9311 8111.</p>

The MRC supports TPG's recommendation not to progress to stage 2 until the three issues identified in the report relating to Bush Forever, Heritage Mapping and Gas Migration are addressed. The MRC is currently progressing all three matters. The following table provides details on the progress the MRC has made on these matters.



Attachment 1 – MRC Progress on TPG Recommendations

TPG RECOMMENDATIONS	MRC PROGRESS ON TPG RECOMMENDATIONS
<p>a. <i>Bush Forever Boundary Rationalisation: Review the outcomes of the MRC's flora, vegetation and fauna monitoring program. Based on the outcomes of this monitoring program, reengage with the DoP regarding the potential rationalisation of the Bush Forever boundary. Reach an in-principle agreement to the proposed Bush Forever boundary adjustments based on the MRC's latest flora, vegetation and fauna data.</i></p>	<p>The MRC has now received the flora, vegetation and fauna monitoring program (Bushland Survey) referred by TPG. The Bushland Survey highlights a number of issues that will require further investigation prior to approaching the DoP, which are:</p> <p><u>Banksia Woodlands</u> The Bushland Survey indicates that this woodland may be present on the site and that it is considered to be an endangered ecological community on the Swan Coastal Plain. The MRC will request the Department of Parks and Wildlife to investigate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The presence of the endangered Banksia Woodland complex at Tamala Park; and</li> <li>• The complex size and condition of the bushland.</li> </ul> <p><u>Southern Brown Bandicoot</u> This species is identified as being present on the site and is listed as a Priority 4 – 'Rare, Near Threatened and other species in need of monitoring' under the <i>Wildlife Conservation Act 1950</i> (WA). The MRC will assess the location; numbers etc. of the species and develop a monitoring plan.</p> <p><u>Carnabys Black Cockatoos</u> This species is considered to be facing a very high risk of extinction in the wild and are present on the site. The MRC will commence an assessment of the presence, including numbers and settling areas of the Cockatoos that visit the site.</p>
<p>b. <i>Heritage Mapping: Initiate a review of the DAA's mapping for Sites 17497 and 3407 with the objective of contracting these areas.</i></p>	<p>The MRC has engaged with the Department of Aboriginal Affairs to define the areas of Aboriginal significance on the site registered as "Site 17497 – Mindarie Burial Mound and DAA Site 3407 – Tamala Park Trees" and have determined that the following actions are required:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Investigate if the site's files are open or closed to public</li> <li>• Determine the need for, and number of, discussions with local indigenous people to assist in the re-assessment of the areas</li> </ul>
TPG RECOMMENDATIONS	MRC PROGRESS ON TPG RECOMMENDATIONS
<p>c. <i>Gas Migration: Seek further clarification from GHD regarding the tentative gas migration distance which extends into the southern development cell (Area 2)</i></p>	<p>The MRC at its ordinary council meeting held on 1 December 2016 resolved, in part, the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>"2. Undertake a Site Specific Risk Assessment Investigation to assess the risk of migrating gas and groundwater on development within the approved buffer zone.</li> <li>3. The cost of the Assessment detailed in 2. above be funded by the MRC in the half yearly budget review".</li> </ol> <p>The MRC is currently finalising a Tender for this risk assessment and will have it completed for release once the funds are allocated by the council.</p>

In relation to the recommendation relating to Gas Migration above the MRC has, at its meeting held on 9 February 2017, resolved to appoint DLA Environmental Services to undertake the Site Specific Risk Assessment.

## CONSULTATION

The Member Councils CEO's were instrumental in developing the tender for the study and have been kept informed on its progress.

The Report has been presented to the member councils requesting feedback on its recommendations.

The MRC further consulted with TPG to determine if they had issues with the time lag of commencing the second stage of the tender. The following response was received from TPG's Director, Principal Planner, Mr Matt Raymond

*"Further to our telephone conversation in relation to the Tamala Park project, it is understood that tasks associated with Stage 2 of the project may be significantly*

---

*delayed past the projected timeframes identified within the contract. It is noted the existing contract provides some flexibility to allow both parties to account for extensions in time and variations (Clauses 18 and 27). This can provide both parties with the mechanisms to manage potential adjustments in the project scope and deliverables, as required.*

*TPG+Place Match is committed to assisting the Mindarie Regional Council in progressing the next stage of the feasibility study, and looks forward to continuing our relationship with the Council.”*

## **STATUTORY ENVIRONMENT**

Nil

## **POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

Nil

## **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

Nil

## **COMMENT**

In accordance with the tender the consultants, TPG have met with the required stakeholders including the member councils and have reviewed the development opportunities of the site. It is clear that there is general agreement by the stakeholders including the member councils that the site will continue to provide waste services in the medium to long term as a transfer/recycling station post landfill providing the MRC a level of certainty when setting its strategic direction. The recommendations presented by TPG in its report provide the MRC with a clear action plan ensuring that the member councils can develop a structure plan that will enable development of the site in a timely manner. The development of a structure plan is anticipated in stage 2 of the study.

## **VOTING REQUIREMENT**

Simple Majority

## **RESPONSIBLE OFFICER RECOMMENDATION**

That the Council:

### **1. Advise TPG:**

- (a) that it supports the recommendation not to proceed to Stage 2 of the Land Use and Feasibility Study for the Post Closure of the Tamala Park Waste Management Facility Site (the Study) at Lot 9005 on Deposit Plan 76936 – 1700 Marmion Avenue Tamala Park until after the following issues are resolved or finalised:
    - (i) Bush Forever Boundary Rationalisation;
    - (ii) Review the Heritage Mapping of the Department Aboriginal Affairs (mapping Sites 17497 and 3407) with the objective of contracting these areas; and
    - (iii) Undertake a Site Specific Risk Assessment Investigation to provide a clearer picture of the gas and ground water movement in and around the Landfill Site; and
  - (b) that it will make contact with them once the issues referred in (1) above are resolved with the intention of completing Stage 2 of the Study as per the Tender.
-

- 2. Advise the MRC's member councils:**
    - (a) the decision made in 1. above;**
    - (b) that the MRC will address any further comments received on the stage 1 report from the member councils; and**
    - (c) that the MRC will progress the issues referred in 1. above in a timely manner and provide updated reports on the progress made on the issues.**
  - 3. Present a copy of the stage 1 report to the Department of Planning seeking feedback on the possibility of implementing the short term uses identified in the report, that can be accommodated on the site that are consistent with the Metropolitan Region Scheme zoning and reservation of "Parks and Recreation" and "Public Purpose – Special Use".**
-

---

<b>9.4</b>	<b>REVIEW OF THE MRC'S STRATEGIC COMMUNITY PLAN 2018 – 2037</b>
<b>File No:</b>	<b>COR/2-06</b>
<b>Appendix(s):</b>	<b>Appendix 6 – Strategy Community Plan 2018 – 2037 Appendix 7 – Corporate Business Plan 2018 – 2021 Appendix 8 – Financial Plan 2018 – 2037 Appendix 9 – Asset Management Plan 2018 – 2037 Appendix 10 – Workforce Plan 2018 – 2021</b>
<b>Date:</b>	<b>22 March 2017</b>
<b>Responsible Officer:</b>	<b>CEO</b>

### **SUMMARY**

This report presents the Mindarie Regional Council's (MRC) reviewed Strategic Community Plan, Corporate Business Plan and associated suite of strategic documents to Council for consideration as part of the four yearly review process required under the Local Government Act 1995 and the Local Government (Administration) Regulations 1996.

The report seeks endorsement of the Plans and to provide notice to the public of the Council's decision.

### **BACKGROUND**

The MRC's current Strategic Community Plan 2014 – 2033 was adopted by Council at its meeting on 20 June 2013. The Plan has been instrumental in guiding the activities of the MRC both at the strategic and operational levels.

The Executive Summary of the current Plan reads in part as follows:-

*“The Mindarie Regional Council is one of Western Australia's largest waste management authorities assisting its member councils, mainly situated in Perth's northern corridor, deal with their waste. The MRC recognises that waste does have a value as a resource and is committed to managing waste in line with the waste hierarchy and in a way sensitive to the environment and future generations.*

*The MRC's Strategic Community Plan 2013/14 – 2033/34 'Winning Back Waste', constitutes not only the consolidation of the MRC as a leader in the industry, but also hails a new direction. The Plan articulates a shared vision for waste management in the Region and shows how the MRC can deliver environmentally sustainable waste management for its communities.*

*Waste management is changing. Although landfilling is still seen as an important part of the industry, the focus is moving toward resource recovery and other higher order activities that minimise waste. The goal is to treat waste and offer solutions as high up on the waste hierarchy as practicable.*

*This Plan creates a new vision for the MRC, 'Winning Back Waste' and with this a focus in achieving improved waste outcomes for the region, which focus on:*

- *Reducing the amount of waste being generated*
  - *Increasing resource recovery*
  - *Diversion from landfill”*
-

---

Since the development of the current plan, the MRC has been on a journey which has included developing a better understanding of the waste processing infrastructure needed to achieve the Waste Authority's waste diversion targets, as well as a more progressive understanding of where the MRC needs to position itself to deliver the best value for its member councils.

While the overall Vision of the MRC remains 'Winning Back Waste', the review has resulted in a number of changes to the plans being proposed which are outlined more fully in this report.

#### **DETAIL**

The Plan is required to be reviewed every four years under the requirements of the *Local Government Act 1995*.

The MRC has undergone a structured review process in relation to the plan which commenced in September 2016 and involved consultation with the following stakeholders:

- MRC Senior Management Team
- MRC elected members
- MRC staff
- The MRC's Strategic Working Group (SWG) which includes directors from each of the MRC's member councils
- The Waste Education Strategy Steering Group (WESSG) which includes offices from each of the MRC's member councils

The structured review began with an evaluation of the documents by the senior management team, which included consideration of key factors such as the waste diversion targets included in Western Australian Waste Strategy "Creating the Right Environment" developed by the Waste Authority, the expected closure date of the Tamala Park landfill site, the outcomes of the Hyder Infrastructure and Hyder Services reports commissioned by the MRC in 2015 and the recent developments in the WA waste market.

The outcome of this initial review was that the MRC's current vision of "Winning Back Waste" was still appropriate given the nature of the MRC's role carried out on behalf of its member councils.

It was proposed that the MRC's mission be slightly amended from "To manage waste" to "To manage waste astutely for the benefit of the community" to provide greater clarity and focus on what the MRC sees its role to be.

A number of minor consequential changes and refinements were made as a result to the strategic objectives supporting the MRC's vision and mission, however there were no material changes proposed.

At a strategic level though, the following changes to the MRC's direction are worth noting as they present a significant change in course for the organisation:

1. The original Plan was focussed on developing waste processing infrastructure with a view to helping the MRC and its member councils achieve the Waste Authority's waste diversion targets. The included the MRC developing and owning the following key pieces of infrastructure:
    - a. A new landfill to replace the Tamala Park landfill
    - b. A bulk waste sorting shed to handle the bulk verge collection stream
-

---

c. A new alternative waste treatment plant

2. The reviewed Plan still contemplates the requirement for new waste processing infrastructure, but with a key shift from the MRC owning the infrastructure as previously considered, to the MRC rather acting a procurer of these services on behalf of the member councils.

To this end, the MRC is not intending to establish a replacement landfill for when the Tamala Park facility closes, but rather will seek to outsource the provision of this service to third party contractors or another local government entity.

In addition, the MRC's role with respect to a new alternative waste treatment plant will revolve more around the MRC conducting a tender process on behalf of its member councils as an aggregator of their waste.

These proposed changes are significant and have a consequential impact on the MRC's Corporate Business Plan, Financial Plan, Asset Management Plan and Workforce Plan.

Some of this direction has already crystallised with the council of the MRC resolving not to procure land to replace its current landfill operations and instead resolving to create a waste precinct at Neerabup Industrial Estate adjacent to the existing Resource Recovery Facility. The Waste Precinct includes the development of Energy from Waste Facility, a Municipal Recycling Facility and a bulk waste sorting shed. In line with the precinct concept the MRC has joined the Eastern Metropolitan Regional Council's (EMRC) Alternative Waste Treatment infrastructure (Energy from Waste) tender in late 2016.

The proposed changes to the Strategic Community Plan were discussed with the MRC's Councillors at a strategy workshop held in September 2016. There was some robust discussion about the continued relevance of the MRC's Vision of "Winning Back Waste", with the outcome being an endorsement by Councillors of the proposed change to the MRC's role and strategic direction.

The proposed changes were also put to the MRC's staff in September 2016, who strongly endorsed ongoing relevance of the MRC's Vision and the changes being proposed. A similar response and endorsement was received at the presentations made to WESSG and the SWG in the same month.

Over the subsequent three months, the MRC has worked on the proposed changes, taking into account the feedback from the various stakeholder meetings and an updated presentation was made to Councillors in February 2017, with Councillors endorsing the proposed changes.

The suite of plans accompanying the Strategic Community Plan have also been updated to reflect the changes the changes being proposed.

The draft suite of documents being presented to Council for consideration and endorsement clearly outline the path forward for the MRC and the mechanism by which it will continue to deliver on its Vision of "Winning Back Waste".

The Strategic Community Plan and the Corporate Business Plan included in the appendices of this agenda are marked up copies to allow the changes made to be clearly

---

identified. Once approved the finished documents will be distributed to the councillors and other relevant stakeholders.

### **CONSULTATION**

The Regulations require that the Strategic Community Plan be developed with input from the local governments' electors and ratepayers.

A regional council does not have electors or ratepayers to consult. When developing the initial plan the MRC sought clarification from the Department of Local Government on the stakeholders to be consulted who advised that the member council local governments were the primary stakeholders. The MRC's Strategic Community Plan has been developed in close consultation with each of the member councils' representatives on the MRC, being the member councils CEO's, the executive members who from part of MRC's SWG and the twelve councillor/s nominated by each of the seven member councils.

In addition to this, the member councils' representatives have also been closely involved in the review of the Plans through the SWG and WESSG forums. The MRC executive and staff have also been consulted on the proposed changes.

The feedback from all stakeholder groups has been taken into account in the final draft.

### **LEGAL COMPLIANCE**

The development or an amendment to the Strategic Community Plan is a requirement of the Local Government Act 1995 and the Local Government (Administration) Regulations 1996. The following are extracts from the aforementioned legislation as it relates to this report.

Extract from the *Local Government Act 1995*

*"5.56. Planning for the future*

- (1) A local government is to plan for the future of the district.*
- (2) A local government is to ensure that plans made under subsection (1) are in accordance with any regulations made about planning for the future of the district."*

Extract from the *Local Government (Administration) Regulations 1996*

*"19C. Strategic community plans, requirements for (Act s. 5.56)*

- (1) A local government is to ensure that a strategic community plan is made for its district in accordance with this regulation in respect of each financial year after the financial year ending 30 June 2013.*
- (2) A strategic community plan for a district is to cover the period specified in the plan, which is to be at least 10 financial years.*
- (3) A strategic community plan for a district is to set out the vision, aspirations and objectives of the community in the district.*
- (4) A local government is to review the current strategic community plan for its district at least once every 4 years.*
- (5) In making or reviewing a strategic community plan, a local government is to have regard to —*
  - (a) the capacity of its current resources and the anticipated capacity of its future resources; and*
  - (b) strategic performance indicators and the ways of measuring its strategic performance by the application of those indicators; and*
  - (c) demographic trends.*

- 
- (6) *Subject to subregulation (9), a local government may modify its strategic community plan, including extending the period the plan is made in respect of.*
  - (7) *A council is to consider a strategic community plan, or modifications of such a plan, submitted to it and is to determine\* whether or not to adopt the plan or the modifications.*  
*\*Absolute majority required.*
  - (8) *If a strategic community plan is, or modifications of a strategic community plan are, adopted by the council, the plan or modified plan applies to the district for the period specified in the plan.*
  - (9) *A local government is to ensure that the electors and ratepayers of its district are consulted during the development of a strategic community plan and when preparing modifications of a strategic community plan.*
  - (10) *A strategic community plan for a district is to contain a description of the involvement of the electors and ratepayers of the district in the development of the plan or the preparation of modifications of the plan.*

19D. *Adoption of plan, public notice of to be given*

- (1) *After the adoption of a strategic community plan, or modifications of a strategic community plan, under regulation 19C, the local government is to give local public notice in accordance with subregulation (2).*
- (2) *The local public notice is to contain —*
  - (a) *notification that —*
    - (i) *a strategic community plan for the district has been adopted by the council and is to apply to the district for the period specified in the plan; and*
    - (ii) *details of where and when the plan may be inspected;*
  - or*
  - (b) *where a strategic community plan for the district has been modified —*
    - (i) *notification that the modifications to the plan have been adopted by the council and the plan as modified is to apply to the district for the period specified in the plan; and*
    - (ii) *details of where and when the modified plan may be inspected.”*

**POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

Nil

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

The Financial Plan has changed quite significantly as a result of the changes proposed to the Strategic Community Plan. Infrastructure spending over the life of the Plan has reduced dramatically as the MRC will not be investing directly in a replacement landfill or providing the capital investment in Alternative Waste Treatment (AWT) plants. Not operating a replacement landfill has also reduced the capital requirement for replacement machinery associated with the operation of a landfill.

The outsourcing of the landfill service post 2028 and the addition of 100,000 tonnes of AWT processing capacity at each of 2021, 2031 and 2041 will result in commensurate increases in the members' gate fee on the basis that it is more expensive to process waste than it is to simply landfill it. The disparity of the costs between processing and

---



---

landfilling though are expected to be eroded over time as the State Government continues to use the landfill levy as a tool to promote waste diversion.

The Workforce Plan has also been significantly altered to reflect the reducing landfill staff requirements as AWT capacity comes on line in 2021 and the landfill is closed in 2028. The previous Workforce Plan anticipated a continuation of the staff required to operate the landfill, as well as the employment of additional staff to run the various pieces of new waste processing infrastructure that were being anticipated. In the new plan, staff numbers will initially remain constant, but reduce over time to 2028, where only a smaller staff complement, sufficient to keep the administrative, the recycling and transfer station functions of the MRC in operation, will remain.

### **STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS**

The Integrated Planning Framework ensures that the future of local government/regional council is set using long term strategies backed by shorter termed implementation plans.

An important element of the Framework is the need for the Plans to be reviewed regularly accepting that the services required to meet the needs of the member councils change over time and ensuring that the Plans keep up with these changes and remain relevant over their life span.

The Plans will be referenced in reports to council and in discussion with the Strategic Working Group to ensure that the MRC remains focussed on its future as directed by the plans.

### **COMMENT**

The revised plans provide a clear direction for the MRC toward achieving its Vision of “Winning Back Waste”.

The plans are strongly aligned to the Waste Authority’s thinking around achieving waste diversion from landfill and provide an achievable path toward achieving the Waste Authority’s desired 65% target for diversion of Municipal Solid Waste from landfill by 2020 in a cost effective, efficient manner.

The MRC will continue to play a key role in assisting its member councils in achieving the best possible waste outcomes by acting as a procurer of waste services for the members and aggregating the tonnes available to achieve the best market outcomes.

### **VOTING REQUIREMENT**

Simple Majority / Absolute Majority

### **RESPONSIBLE OFFICER RECOMMENDATION**

**That the Council:**

- 1. Adopt the Strategic Community Plan 2018 - 2037 and the Corporate Business Plan 2018 – 2021, as contained in Appendices 6 and 7.**

**(Absolute Majority Required)**

---

- 
- 2. Give Local Public Notice, in accordance with s.19D of the Local Government (Administration) Regulations 1996, advising that the Strategic Community Plan and Corporate Business plan detailed in 1. above have been adopted by the Council and that the Plans are available on the website and at the Administration Office of the Mindarie Regional Council.**
  - 3. Adopt the following supporting plans to the Strategic Community and Corporate Business Plans referred to in 1. above:  
Financial Plan 2018 – 2037;  
Asset Management Plan 2018 – 2037; and  
Workforce Plan 2018 – 2021  
as contained in Appendices 8, 9 and 10.**
-

---

<b>10 MEMBERS INFORMATION BULLETIN – ISSUE NO. 34</b>
---

**RESPONSIBLE OFFICER RECOMMENDATION**

**That the Members Information Bulletin Issue No. 34 be received.**

<b>11 MOTIONS OF WHICH PREVIOUS NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN</b>
---

<b>12 URGENT BUSINESS</b>
---------------------------

<b>13 QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS OF WHICH DUE NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN</b>
---

<b>14 MATTERS FOR WHICH THE MEETING MAY BE CLOSED TO THE PUBLIC</b>
---

<b>15 NEXT MEETING</b>
------------------------

*Next meeting to be held on Thursday 6 July 2017 in the Council Chambers at City of Stirling commencing at 5.30pm.*

<b>16 CLOSURE</b>
-------------------

---