



MINUTES

of the Special Meeting of Council held on

**Monday 10 September 2012
commencing at 9.00am**

in the Council Chambers, Ravensthorpe.

1. DECLARATION OF OPENING / ANNOUNCEMENT OF VISITORS

9.02 am – 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 Don Lansdown
Cr Jan Field
Cr Julianne Townsend
Cr Ken Norman
Cr Andrew Duncan (Participated by instantaneous communication.)

STAFF: Pascoe Durtanovich (Chief Executive Officer)
Jenny Rutter (Executive Assistant)

APOLOGIES:

ON LEAVE OF ABSENCE:

ABSENT:

3. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

3.1 RAY EDWARDS – Re: - Heavy Haulage

Expressed opposition to Option 1 and 2 because both options split his farm and causes many operational problems such as:

- Regular 7 day a week access for livestock and machinery across the construction site.
- The road will prevent livestock access to a farm dam.
- Compensation payable by Main Roads is ludicrous.

He also expressed grievance that

- A request for a meeting with Andrew Duffield to discuss the issues had no response.
- Shire Councillors have not attempted to discuss the matter with him.

3.2 JOHN FLETCHER – Hopetoun Progress Association Re: - Heavy Haulage

Expressed Progress Association's preference for Option 2.

9.15am – There being no further speakers Public Question time concluded.

4. APPLICATIONS FOR, AND PREVIOUSLY APPROVED, LEAVE OF ABSENCE AND DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST

Nil

5. Special Business

5.1 RAVENSTHORPE HEAVY HAULAGE ROUTE

File Ref:	Roads
Applicant:	Not applicable
Location:	Not applicable
Disclosure of Officer Interest:	None
Date:	2 September 2012
Author:	Pascoe Durtanovich – Chief Executive Officer
Authorising Officer:	Not applicable
Attachments:	Yes – Main Roads – Planning Report Summary

Summary:

Public consultation on the Ravensthorpe Heavy Haulage Route project concluded with the third public meeting on 21 June 2012.

Main Roads WA has progressed the heavy haulage route planning study to the extent that they have determined their preferred alignment for the heavy haulage route.

Council is now required to determine a preferred alignment.

Background:

The issue of a heavy haulage route for Ravensthorpe has been discussed with relevant authorities on a number of occasions over many years.

In 2011 the State Government committed to a planning study. The study was required to identify alignment options together with indicative costings, environmental, heritage and mining constraints and impacts on property ownership.

The Planning study has now been completed and Main Roads WA has established a preferred option.

The study identified five heavy vehicle route alignment options. A detailed comparative assessment of the route options was conducted based on the key environmental, social, economic and engineering constraints and impacts along the proposed routes. Heavy Vehicle Route Option 1 (full bypass) achieved the best overall score based on these categories.

Comment:

In determining a preferred option on this matter Council should be mindful of the following:

- The initial public meeting on the question of a heavy haulage route clearly indicated support for a planning study only. The meeting also identified a number of issues the planning study should address, one of which was that a “heavy haulage vehicle route” should be considered and not a deviation of South Coast Highway. The latter being a full bypass road.
- At subsequent public meetings support for any of the southern options was minimal. This together with existing and future land uses in this area has resulted in the northern options as preferred.

- No detailed study of the impact on existing businesses, and equally as important future business investment, has been undertaken.

There are many examples of heavy vehicle routes and town bypass roads throughout Australia with varying impacts, every situation has its own set of circumstances that influence the impact on business.

- Option 1 provides priority to heavy vehicles with minimum stop start. Option 2 gives priority to general traffic.
- Under either option 1 or option 2 the key to reducing the impact on business and heavy vehicles is the design of the entry/exit areas. The current plans appear to give minimal consideration to this aspect, it is acknowledged however that when a preferred option is determined and detailed project development is undertaken, access will be addressed.
- Whether option 1 or option 2 is decided on Council should insist on substantial funds, in the vicinity of \$2 million, being allocated as part of the project to Town Centre Revitalization.
Innovative signage should also be introduced.
- Council should insist that a Project Reference Group be established for the project development phase, with the Shire of Ravensthorpe being represented by two Councillors and one Officer.
- The need for a heavy haulage route is not only because of the problems associated with the "hill".

Pedestrian and vehicular safety issues through the townsite and the restrictions placed by heavy vehicles on the ability to enhance the appearance of the town centre are relevant.

- Whilst considerable public consultation was undertaken for this project, both by Main Roads WA and Council the response from ratepayers and residents was minimal, in terms of public meeting attendance and questionnaire returns. (Details are included in the attachments)

Following a decision on the preferred option for the heavy haulage route the next stage of the project will be the detailed identification of the route, engineering design, landowner consultation and negotiation, tender specification development and cost estimates. Main Roads WA has verbally advised that this phase will take at least twelve months and will require funding of approximately \$1 million. Council should make immediate representation to the Premier, the Minister for Transport and local parliamentary members to have an out of budget allocation made for this purpose.

In terms of funding availability for the construction phase of the project indications are that the State Government, following the next State Election, will commit to a \$150 million Goldfields Esperance Revitalization fund to be implemented over a four year period. For projects to qualify for this funding they must be "shovel ready" and supported by a detailed business case therefore it is essential that the project development phase is commenced immediately.

Consultation:

A public meeting was held on 15 February 2011. At that meeting it was agreed, almost unanimously that a planning study be undertaken. The meeting also identified a number of criteria that the study had to address.

In addition to the public meeting all ratepayers were surveyed to ascertain their views on the need for a heavy haulage route. The matter was also raised in the State Parliament by the Hon Graeme Jacobs MLA.

A further two public meetings were held, on 28 March, 2012 and 21 June, 2012.

In addition to the consultation undertaken by Council, Main Roads WA consulted with key stakeholders, including Co-operative Bulk Handling, Department of Mines and Petroleum, Department of Environment and Conservation, Galaxy Lithium and the Ravensthorpe Progress Association.

Statutory Obligations:

There is no statutory obligation on the Shire of Ravensthorpe to solve the traffic problems on South Coast Highway, through Ravensthorpe. The Shire of Ravensthorpe has delegated authority from Main Roads WA for the section of road referred to however this is only for matters such as signage, pedestrian access, street lighting etc and does not extend to full responsibility for the road pavement and traffic thereon.

Policy Implications:

Nil

Budget / Financial Implications:

There are no budget/financial implications on the Shire of Ravensthorpe, the project is a State Government responsibility.

Strategic Implications:

Shire of Ravensthorpe Strategic Plan / Plan for the Future (superseded) identified action on this issue.

Removal of heavy vehicles from the centre of town will not only improve safety but will provide the opportunity to develop the town centre and enhance business/economic opportunity.

Sustainability Implications:

- **Environmental:**

There will be environmental issues with both option 1 and option 2, predominantly clearing of vegetation and drainage. This aspect will be addressed by Main Roads WA through the project development phase.

- **Economic:**

There are no known significant economic considerations. There are various commentaries on the impacts of bypass roads on country towns however it is difficult to quantify as each situation has its own circumstances that influence the outcome.

- **Social:**

Removal of heavy vehicles from South Coast Highway, through the Town Centre will provide the opportunity for major town revitalization works which will develop a sense of community. It will also provide safe access for pedestrians and light vehicles.

Voting Requirements:

Simple Majority

COUNCIL DECISION AND OFFICER RECOMMENDATION (1)	ITEM 5.1
Moved: Cr Dunlop	Seconded: Cr Townsend
That Route Option North 2 be adopted as the alignment for the Ravensthorpe Heavy Haulage route.	
Carried: 6/1	Res: 172/12

COUNCIL DECISION AND OFFICER RECOMMENDATION (2)	ITEM 5.1
Moved: Cr Field	Seconded: Cr Lansdown
That Main Roads WA be requested to establish a Ravensthorpe Heavy Haulage Route Reference Group and the Shire President Cr Goldfinch, the two Ravensthorpe Councillors, Cr Townsend and Cr Lansdown, and the Manager Engineering Services be Council's representatives on the Group.	
Carried: 5/2	Res: 173/12

COUNCIL DECISION AND OFFICER RECOMMENDATION (3)	ITEM 5.1
Moved: Cr Townsend	Seconded: Cr Dunlop
That the Shire President and the Chief Executive Officer make representation to the Premier and the Minister for Transport for an out of budget allocation to be made by the State Government to enable the project development phase of the Ravensthorpe Heavy Haulage route to be undertaken by Main Roads WA and the assistance of the Hon Graeme Jacobs MLA, Member for Eyre be enlisted for this purpose.	
Carried: 7/0	Res: 174/12

5.2 DISPOSAL OF 95 MARTIN STREET, RAVENSTHORPE

File Ref:

Applicant: Not applicable

Location: 95 Martin Street, Ravensthorpe

Disclosure of Officer Interest: None

Date: 2 September 2012

Author: Pascoe Durtanovich – Chief Executive Officer

Authorising Officer: Not applicable

Attachments: None

Summary:

Council has received an expression of interest from Mr Steve Ball to purchase Lot 101, 95 Martin Street Ravensthorpe. This report recommends that the property be disposed, by private treaty to Mr Ball.

Background:

Lot 101, 95 Martin Street is a staff house previously occupied by Mr Ball. Mr Ball resigned from the position of Shire Ranger and vacated the property on 21 July 2012.

The dwelling is a 4 bedroom, 1 bathroom fibro and iron building.

Comment:

The property is surplus to requirements, particularly with the refurbishment of 41 Kingsmill Street and the possible purchase of 27(A) Carlisle Street, Ravensthorpe.

Consultation:

Prior to making a decision to dispose of property by private treaty the proposal must be advertised for public comment.

Statutory Obligations:

Council can dispose of property either by public tender, auction or by private treaty. If property is disposed of by private treaty the following process applies:

The Local Government Act, 1995, Section 3.58 disposal of property requirements have to be complied with. The relevant clause is as follows:-

A local government can dispose of property other than under subsection (2) if, before agreeing to dispose of the property-

(a) it gives local public notice of the proposed disposition-

- I. describing the property concerned; and*
- II. giving details of the proposed disposition; and inviting submissions to be made to the local government before a date to be specified in the notice, being a date not less than 2 weeks after the notice is first given;*

and

(b) it considers any submissions made to it before the date specified in the notice and, if its decision is made by the council or a committee, the decision and the reasons for it are recorded in the minutes of the meeting at which the decision was made.

(4) The details of a proposed disposition that are required by subsection (3)(a)(ii) include-

- (a) the names of all other parties concerned; and*
- (b) the consideration to be received by the local government for the disposition: and*
- (c) the market value of the disposition-*
 - I. as ascertained by a valuation carried out not more than 6 months before the proposed disposition: or*
 - II. as declared by a resolution of the local government on the basis of a valuation carried out more than 6 months before the proposed disposition that the local government believes to be a true indication of the value at the time of the proposed disposition.*

Policy Implications:

Nil

Budget / Financial Implications:

Cost of advertising, approximately \$100. Value of the premises is determined by valuation.

Funds from the sale of this property will be put towards the purchase of 27(A) Carlisle Street.

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 5.2
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) That the proposal to dispose of Lot 101, 95 Martin Street, Ravensthorpe by private treaty to Mr Steve Ball be advertised in accordance with Section 3.58 of the Local Government Act 1995. 2) That the valuation of \$115,000, provided by Albany Valuation Services, be adopted as a true market value. 	

COUNCIL DECISION	ITEM 5.2
Moved: Cr Lansdown	Seconded: Cr Field
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) That the proposal to dispose of Lot 101, 95 Martin Street, Ravensthorpe by private treaty to Mr Steve Ball be advertised in accordance with Section 3.58 of the Local Government Act 1995. 2) That the valuation of \$115,000, provided by Albany Valuation Services, be adopted as an estimated market value. 3) That a sale price between \$150,000 and \$160,000 be adopted by Council. 	
Carried: 7/0	Res: 175/12

5.3 PURCHASE OF STAFF HOUSING

File Ref:**Applicant:**

Not applicable

Location:

27(A) Carlisle Street, Ravensthorpe

Disclosure of Officer Interest:

None

Date:

3 September, 2012

Author:

Pascoe Durtanovich – Chief Executive Officer

Authorising Officer:

Not applicable

Attachments:

None

Summary:

To consider the purchase of 27(A) Carlisle Street, Ravensthorpe to supplement staff housing requirements.

Background:

Currently 30 Kingsmill Street, Ravensthorpe is used to accommodate contractors employed by the Shire of Ravensthorpe. With the appointment of the Manager of Recreation and Community Services this house will no longer be available for this purpose and will be occupied by the Manager Recreation and Community Services.

Comment:

An opportunity has arisen to purchase 21(A) Carlisle Street, virtually opposite the Shire Office, which will satisfy contractor requirements.

The Kingsmill Street property is four bedroom, two bathroom and is more suited for permanent occupancy whereas 27(A) Carlisle St is a three bedroom, one bathroom house which is more appropriate for use by contractors on a one or two night basis.

27(A) Carlisle Street is a strata unit of fibro and iron construction with a purchase price of \$235,000. No strata fees apply.

Consultation:

Not applicable

Statutory Obligations:

Nil

Policy Implications:

Council does not have a policy on the provision of Staff housing. The practice has been to provide housing as negotiated with employees as part of the employment conditions.

Budget / Financial Implications:

The 2012/2013 budget does not include an allocation for the purchase of housing however funds are available from the Building Reserve.

The purchase price of 27(A) Carlisle Street is \$235,000. If the sale of 95 Martin Street proceeds the resulting funds will be allocated to the purchase of 27(A) Carlisle Street with the balance from the Reserve.

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:

Absolute majority as the proposed expenditure is unbudgeted.

COUNCIL DECISION AND OFFICER RECOMMENDATION	ITEM 5.3
Moved: Cr Norman	Seconded: Cr Dunlop
That the property at 27(A) Carlisle Street, Ravensthorpe be purchased at a cost of \$235,000 and unbudgeted expenditure of up to \$235,000 be authorized from the Building Reserve Fund for this purpose.	
Carried by Absolute Majority: 7/0	Res: 176/12

5. CLOSURE OF MEETING 9.52am

These minutes were confirmed at the meeting of the _____

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

Date: _____