CITY OF ARMADALE

AGENDA

OF COMMUNITY SERVICES COMMITTEE TO BE HELD IN THE COMMITTEE ROOM, ADMINISTRATION CENTRE, 7 ORCHARD AVENUE, ARMADALE ON TUESDAY, 8 SEPTEMBER 2015 AT 7.00PM.

A meal will be served at 6:15 p.m.

PRESENT:

APOLOGIES: Cr M S Northcott (Leave of Absence)

OBSERVERS:

IN ATTENDANCE:

PUBLIC:

“For details of Councillor Membership on this Committee, please refer to the City’s website – www.armadale.wa.gov.au/your council/councillors.”
DISCLAIMER

The Disclaimer for protecting Councillors and staff from liability of information and advice given at Committee meetings to be read.

DECLARATION OF MEMBERS’ INTERESTS

QUESTION TIME

DEPUTATION

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

RECOMMEND

Minutes of the Community Services Committee Meeting held on 4 August 2015 be confirmed.

ITEMS REFERRED FROM INFORMATION BULLETIN

Report on Outstanding Matters – Community Services Committee

Monthly / Quarterly Departmental Reports
Community Planning Report - August 2015
Community Development Report – August 2015
Recreation Services Report July 2015

If any of the items listed above require clarification or a report for a decision of Council, this item to be raised for discussion at this juncture.
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1.1 - AUTHORISED OFFICERS

WARD : ALL
FILE No. : M/703/15
DATE : 23 July 2015
REF : BW
RESPONSIBLE MANAGER : Executive Director Community Services

In Brief:
- The appointment of Authorised Person for the purposes of administering the various Acts, Regulations and Local Laws relating to Ranger Services.
- The appointment of “Authorised Person” in accordance with the provisions of Section 29 (1) of the Dog Act 1976, for the purpose of effecting dog registrations only.

Tabled Items
Nil

Officer Interest Declaration
Nil

Strategic Implications
1. Community Wellbeing.
   1.6 Support the community in emergency and fire management planning.
      1.6.1 Support the community in emergency and fire management planning, response and recovery.
      1.6.2 Ensure effective management of animals within the community.
      1.6.3 Promote and support planning and activities that encourage a safe and responsible community.

Legislation Implications
Assessment of legislation indicates that the following apply:
- Local Government Act 1995 - Section 9.10(1) – Appointment of authorised persons.
- Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1960 - Section 450 - Pounds, poundkeepers and rangers, notice and proof of etc.
- Dog Act 1976 and Regulations
- Dog Act 1976 - Section 29 (1) - Power to seize dogs
- Cat Act 2011 and Regulations
- Control of Vehicles (Off-Road Areas) Act 1978 - Section 38(3) - Authorised officers, who are, functions of etc.
- Bush Fire Act 1954 and Regulations
- Bush Fires Act 1954 - Section 38(1) - Local government may appoint bush fire control officer.
- Litter Act 1979 – 1981 - Section 26(1) - Authorised officers, appointment and jurisdiction of etc.
- Criminal Procedures Act 2004 - Section 20 (1) - Who can commence a prosecution.

Council Policy/Local Law Implications
Assessment of Policy/Local Law indicates that the following is applicable:
- Local Laws Relating to Dogs
Local Laws Relating to Parking and Parking Facilities.
Local Government Property Local Law
Activities and Trading in Thoroughfares and Public Places Local Law
Local Laws Relating to Trading In Public Places.
Environment, Animals and Nuisance Local Laws

Budget/Financial Implications
Nil

Consultation
Coordinator Governance and Administration

DETAILS OF PROPOSAL

City of Armadale
To enable the following staff members to undertake the appropriate responsibilities it is a requirement that Council shall, in writing, appoint them to exercise on behalf of the Local Government the powers conferred on an “Authorised Person” for the purpose of enforcing various Acts/Local laws generally, and the duties of a Registration Officer pursuant to the provision of the Dog Act 1976 in particular.

External Agencies
To enable the following nominated persons at external dog registration facilities, to undertake the appropriate responsibilities it is a requirement that Council shall, in writing, appoint them to exercise on behalf of the Local Government the powers conferred on an “Authorised Person” for the purpose of carrying out the duties of a “Registration Officer only” pursuant to the Dog Act 1976. It is also proposed that all appointments as an Authorised Person pursuant to Section 29(1) of the Dog Act 1976, be automatically cancelled on termination of employment with the herein named veterinary establishments.

COMMENT
The recommended appointment of the following persons as Authorised Officers is consistent with their position role description and will serve to facilitate and assist in the orderly business and performance of the Ranger & Emergency Services and the City of Armadale.

RECOMMEND

1 That the following persons:-


be appointed as “Authorised Persons” for the City of Armadale to exercise powers under:

- Part XX of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1960
- Section 449 Local Government (Miscellaneous Provision) Act 1960
• Section 9.13 & 9.15 of the Local Government Act 1995,
• Section 20(1) Criminal Procedures Act 2004
• Dog Act 1976 and Regulations - All powers
• Control of Vehicles (Off Road Areas) Act 1978 and Regulations – All powers
• Bush Fires Act 1954 and Regulations – All powers
• Section 38 (1) Bush Fire Act 1954
• Litter Act 1979 and Regulations – All powers
• Cat Act 2011 and Regulations- All powers
• Local Laws Relating to Dogs- All powers
• Local Laws Relating to Parking and Parking Facilities- All powers
• Local Government Property Local Law – All powers
• Activities and Trading in Thoroughfares and Public Places Local Law – All powers
• Local Laws Relating to Trading In Public Places – All powers
• Environment, Animals and Nuisance Local Laws – All powers

2 That the following persons be appointed as “Authorised Person” in accordance with the provisions of Section 29 (1) of the Dog Act 1976, for the purpose of effecting dog registrations only.

Ranger Services
• Elizabeth Anne Jones
• Rhoda Lesley Primrose
• Kaitlin Brooke Murphy

Customer Service
• Rhett Sullivan
• Leonie Gehring
• Ashley Buckee
• Noeline Johnston
• Gina Carillo
• Nancy Wright

The abovementioned authorisations to remain in effect whilst the appointed person is employed by the City of Armadale.

All previous appointments are hereby cancelled.

3 External Agencies

That the following persons be appointed as “Authorised Person” in accordance with the provisions of Section 29 (1) of the Dog Act 1976, for the purpose of effecting dog registrations only.

Foothills Animal Hospital
Siobhian Harbron
Brook Kinsey
Shanay Lyall
Rebecca Underhill
Karina Lilly
Jessica Petingill
Nathan Mannix
Nicole Lawrence
Juanita Morrison
Johnathan Wood

Railway Avenue Veterinary Hospital
Jackie Atkinson
Cassie Gough
Phoebe Spencer
Gemma Sillitto
Catherine Fry
Rachelle Millard
Emily Michie

Ark Veterinary Clinic
Stacey Saunders
Eva Spiegl
Joanne Baxter
Katie Smith

Roleystone Animal Hospital
Dr. Yoko Clinch
Dr. Tiffany Jacobs
Bec Banting
Rebecca Waller
Adrian Clinch
Perri Hernan

Armadale/Byford Veterinary Hospital
Glenda Miller
Keeley Schofield
Jenny Meyrick
Michelle White
Monique Holden
Nicki Harrison
Emma Harvey
Felicity Kelleher
Lucinda Wildie
Alanda Spoonheim
Bessie Walker
Petra Bailey

Champion Lakes Veterinary Centre
Colin Sherry
Lesley Sherry
Matthew Sherry
The appointment of the herein named “Authorised Persons” will automatically be cancelled upon termination of employment with the corresponding Veterinary Facilities.

That all previous appointments as “Registration Officers” at the aforementioned Veterinarian Facilities be cancelled.

ATTACHMENTS
There are no attachments for this report.
**1.2 - REVIEW OF DELEGATIONS OF AUTHORITY RELEVANT TO THE COMMUNITY SERVICES DIRECTORATE**

WARD : ALL  
FILE No. : M/744/15  
DATE : 11 August 2015  
REF : SG  
RESPONSIBLE MANAGER : Executive Director Community Services

In Brief:

- Annual review of Council Delegations of Authority to the Chief Executive Officer as relevant to the Community Services Directorate.
- That Council pursuant to Section 5.46(2) and .42(1) of the Local Government Act 1995 approves the following current delegations to the Chief Executive Officer as having ongoing application, relevance and accuracy.
- That Council pursuant to section 10AA of the Dog Act 1976 delegate to the Chief Executive Officer the exercise of all its powers and the discharge of all its duties under the Act including the appointment of an authorised person under section 29(1), the appointment for a registration officer and the power to further delegate the power or duty.
- That Council delegate to the Chief Executive Officer the exercise of all its powers and the discharge of all of its duties under the Local Laws Relating to Dogs and the power to further delegate the power or duty, except:
  - Section 2.1 – Determining of charges and Costs
  - Section 3.3(2) – Fees determined for the lodgement of an exemption
  - Section 4.10(4) – Fees determined for the lodgement of an application for a licence for a kennel establishment.

Tabled Items
Nil

Officer Interest Declaration
Nil

Strategic Implications
4. Good Governance and Management.
   4.1 Good governance and leadership.
      4.1.2 Ensure governance policies, procedures and activities align with legislative requirements and best practice.
4.5 Effective and efficient administrative services.
4.5.1 Ensure compliance of relevant Council policies and procedures with legislative and organisational requirement.
4.5.2 Provide professional administrative services to support Council operations and services.

Legislation Implications
Assessment of legislation indicates that the following apply:

Sections of the Local Government Act 1995 as follows;

5.42. Delegation of some powers and duties to CEO.
5.43. Limits on delegations to CEO’s.
5.44. CEO may delegate powers and duties to other employees.
5.46. Register of, and records relevant to, delegations to CEO’s and employees.

Section 10AA of the Dog Act 1976 - Delegation of local government powers and duties:

“(1) A local government may, by absolute majority as defined in the Local Government Act 1995 section 1.4, delegate to its chief executive officer any power or duty of the local government under another provision of this Act.

(2) The delegation must be in writing.

(3) The delegation may expressly authorise the delegate to further delegate the power or duty.”

Council Policy/Local Law Implications
Assessment of Policy/Local Law indicates that the following is applicable:

- Local laws Relating to Dogs.

Budget/Financial Implications
Nil

Consultation
1. Executive Director and Managers of Community Services.
2. Officers from Governance and Administration.

BACKGROUND
It is a requirement of the Local Government Act 1995 – (Section 5.46(2)) that delegations of authority be reviewed annually.

During this review consideration was given to the effects of the amendments to the Dog Act 1976 as it applies to delegations.

A report was presented to Council on 26/8/13 in which approval was sought to delegate powers under the Cat Act 2011 to the CEO which was subsequently resolved (CS77/8/13).
Commentary in this report referred to the fact that there were impending changes to the Dog Act and more particularly the introduction of the power to delegate which did not exist.

These amendments were subsequently enacted in late 2013.

DETAILS OF PROPOSAL

Council is asked to confirm Council’s Delegations of Authority as relating to the functions of Community Services Directorate.

It is also proposed that Council approves the delegation of authority under Section 10AA of the Dog Act 1976 to the Chief Executive Officer to exercise all of it power and discharge all of it duties under the Act including the appointment of an authorised officer under section 11 and a power to further delegate the power or duty.

It is further proposed that Council approves the delegation to the Chief Executive Officer to exercise all of it power and discharge all of it duties under the Local Laws Relating to Dogs and the power to further delegate the power or duty.

ANALYSIS

In line with statutory requirements, all current Council Delegations of Authority as relating to the functions of the Community Services Directorate have been reviewed to ensure that each Delegation is compliant with current legislation and has on-going operational relevance.

In line with this review it is now considered appropriate to seek delegated authority under the Dog Act.

The powers under the Dog Act 1976 fall into two (2) categories – Delegations, which primarily deal with the administrative aspects of the Act (registrations) and Authorised Person’s which align more to the enforcement of the Act (seizure and impounding and issuing infringement notices).

In order to ensure the most effective administration of the Dog Act it is recommended Council delegate the necessary powers, including the power to appoint Authorised Officers, to the CEO. It is then intended to seek approval from the CEO to grant secondary delegations and authorisations to the relevant officers for the various powers under this Act.

General examples of relevant officers include:

- Registration Officers e.g. Customer Service Officers, Ranger Administration Officers
- Enforcement Officers e.g. Rangers,
- Approval officers (Multiple Dog Applications) (withdrawal of infringement notices) e.g. Manager Ranger and Emergency Services, Executive Director Community Services

Traditionally when new officers were employed and they were required to perform functions as an authorised officer under the various pieces of legislation such as the Dog Act 1976 a report had to be provided to Council requesting that they be appointed as ‘authorised persons’

In this regard it is seen as more efficient and effective for the overall administration of the Dog Act that all the local government powers be passed onto the CEO.
OPTIONS
There are two options available in relation to the Dog Act delegations.

Option 1 - Allow the delegation to the CEO, with or without conditions.

As mentioned previously registration officers derive their power from a delegation and as Council can only delegate to the CEO it is essential that Council approve this part of the recommendation.

However to enable the Act to be administered more efficiently and effectively it is requested the CEO also be given the power to appoint authorised officers as necessary and to administer the Act in general.

This is the recommended option.

Option 2 - Council delegate the power to the CEO to appoint registration officers only and Council continue to appoint authorised officers.

For reasons stated above this is not the preferred option.

CONCLUSION
It is recommended that the Council Delegations of Authority as relating to the functions of the Community Services Directorate and as presented in the following report recommendation be adopted.
RECOMMEND

That Council:

1. Pursuant to Section 5.46(2) and 5.42(1) of the Local Government Act 1995 **approves the following current delegations to the Chief Executive Officer as having ongoing application, relevance and accuracy:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Local Government Act 1995</th>
<th>Assignee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>Authority to sell or dispose of impounded goods (Section 3)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.20</td>
<td>To withdraw infringement notice</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.47A</td>
<td>Disposal of sick or injured animals (Section 3.47A)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>900</td>
<td>(44)1</td>
<td>The Chief Executive Officer is delegated authority to exercise all of its powers and the discharge of all of its duties under the Cat Act 2011 including the appointment of authorized persons or classes of persons under section 48.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Policy</th>
<th>Policies of Council</th>
<th>Assignee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>502</td>
<td>COMD 1</td>
<td>Consider requests for assistance according to the following categories Donations Community Grant</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>603</td>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Other Delegations Community Development – Authority to approve any requests for “one-off” free use of facilities shall be considered on its merits but will normally only be eligible for approval if it is a not-for-profit community service activity that provides a significant benefit to the community. In the event that a request is refused the matter is to be referred to the Community Service Committee for consideration prior to a decision. Fire Service – The Mayor and Chief Bush Fire Control officer be given delegated authority to vary the prohibited and restricted burning periods.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


2. Pursuant to section 10AA of the Dog Act 1976 delegate** to the Chief Executive Officer the exercise of all its powers and the discharge of all its duties under the Act including the appointment of an authorised person under section 29(1), the appointment for a registration officer under section 11 and the power to further delegate the power or duty; and

3. Delegate** to the Chief Executive Officer the exercise of all its powers and the discharge of all of its duties under the Local Laws Relating to Dogs and the power to further delegate the power or duty, except:

- Section 2.1 – Determining of charges and Costs
- Section 3.3(2) – Fees determined for the lodgement of an exemption
- Section 4.10(4) – Fees determined for the lodgement of an application for a licence for a kennel establishment.

ABSOLUTE MAJORITY RESOLUTION REQUIRED

ATTACHMENTS
There are no attachments for this report.
In Brief:

- Save the Children Australia has held a Management Agreement over two rooms at the Champion Centre since September 2013. It now wishes to renew this agreement for a further two year term.
- This report seeks Council approval to enter into a further two (2) year Management Agreement with Save the Children Australia for shared use of the Champion Centre.
- The Agreement terms and conditions have been negotiated and are now presented for Council’s approval.

Tabled Items

1. Plan of proposed Management Agreement exclusive use area

Officer Interest Declaration

Nil

Strategic Implications

1. Community Wellbeing.
   1.2 Optimum quality of life for all citizens.
      1.2.1 Work with key partners to address the needs of our Indigenous community.
      1.2.2 Advocate and promote programs and services that enhance the wellbeing of seniors.
   1.6 Support the community in emergency and fire management planning.
      1.6.3 Promote and support planning and activities that encourage a safe and responsible community.

2. Enhanced Natural and Built Environments.
   2.6 Council buildings and facilities that meet community needs.
      2.6.1 Maintain Council buildings, facilities and public amenities to the determined levels of service.

Legislation Implications

Assessment of legislation indicates that the following apply:

- Local Government Act 1995 - Section 3.58(2) - Disposing of property, outlines the requirements for the disposal of land and it states:

  “Except as stated in this section, a local government can only dispose of property to –
  (a) the highest bidder at public auction; or
Committee - Community Development

(b) the person who at public tender called by the local government makes what is, in the opinion of the local government, the most acceptable tender, whether or not it is the highest tender.

Subclause (5)(d) also states that:

“This section does not apply to – any other disposition that is excluded by regulations from the application of this section.”

- Regulation 30(2)(b) of the Local Government (Functions and General) Regulations 1996 states:
  “A disposition of land is an exempt disposition if –
  the land is disposed of to a body, whether incorporated or not –
  (i) the objects of which are of a charitable, benevolent, religious, cultural, educational, recreational, sporting or other like nature; and
  (ii) the members of which are not entitled or permitted to receive any pecuniary profit from the body’s transactions.”

Accordingly Save the Children Australia is exempt from the provisions of the requirements of section 3.58 of the Act.

Council Policy/Local Law Implications
Assessment of Policy/Local Law indicates that the following is/are applicable:

- Council Policy ADM2 – Property Lease Rentals

Budget/Financial Implications
The anticipated annual income from this arrangement, $8,280 per annum, has already been included in the City’s adopted budget.

Consultation
1. Community Services
2. Corporate Services
3. Save the Children Australia

BACKGROUND
The Champion Centre operates as a culturally appropriate setting for the provision of services and programs for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. Activities operating from the Centre are provided by agencies, not-for-profit organisations and other community groups working in partnership with the City of Armadale. The City primarily acts as a facilitator and coordinator of the Centre and where appropriate, enters into Management Agreements with agencies and organisations to articulate and manage those partnerships.

On 23 September Council resolved (CSI/9/13) to support a Management Agreement with Save the Children Australia for use of the spaces at the Champion Centre as shown on the plan included in this report as exclusive use areas.
DETAILS OF PROPOSAL

Save the Children Australia advised the City of Armadale on 16 June that it required a renewal of the existing arrangements for a further two years. This request is not within the provisions of the current Management Agreement which requires written notice not less than three months prior to the expiration date. As the current agreement expires on 1 September 2015, it is not possible to extend this to a further term.

During this period, Save the Children has undertaken improvements to the leased area including paying for office equipment and internet cabling services. It is prudent to include these in a new agreement to accurately acknowledge and reflect the state of the premises covered by the agreement.

The Management Agreement is for shared use of the Champion Centre under the following basic terms and conditions:

Term: Two (2) years
Annual Contribution: $8,280 per annum plus GST and not including electricity costs.
Rates for Hire Areas: To pay the City’s Community Rate for areas in the Champion Centre as amended from time to time.
Operating Costs: The occupant to be responsible for operating expenditure, including maintenance and operation of telephones located within the exclusive use areas. A sub-meter will be installed in the exclusive use areas and the occupant will be billed for electricity consumption according to the sub-meter reading.
Insurance: The occupant to maintain Public Liability insurance to a minimum of $20,000,000. The City shall be responsible for building insurance.

A plan showing the proposed exclusive use areas is included in this report.

ANALYSIS

The City has established a sound relationship with Save the Children Australia. The operation of Save the Children’s programs (Reconnect—Aboriginal Homelessness Prevention Program, the Armadale Intensive Supported Playscheme and One-Step Closer-Youth at Risk Program) from the Champion Centre have already improved access to support services for Aboriginal children, young people and their families.

The provision of an expanded use of a space at the Centre will enable Save the Children Australia to locate additional staff at the Centre. This maximises opportunities to engage with young people, children and their families through the multifaceted networks and partnerships operating from the Centre. The proposed Management Agreement provides the mechanism for managing the access, operational requirements and financial contributions for the Champion Centre.

OPTIONS

Council has the following options:
1. Enter into the proposed Management Agreement with Save the Children Australia for shared use of the Champion Centre in accordance with the basic terms and conditions, as outlined in this report.

2. Enter into the proposed Management Agreement with Save the Children Australia for shared use of the Champion Centre but vary the basic terms and conditions, as outlined in this report.

3. Not enter into the proposed Management Agreement with Save the Children Australia for shared use of the Champion Centre.

Option 1 is recommended.

CONCLUSION
The Champion Centre is continuing to attract interest and strong support from the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community and a diverse range of agencies, service providers and community organisations. A Management Agreement is considered to be an appropriate arrangement for managing the access, operational and financial obligations of the individual parties including the City.

RECOMMEND
That Council:
Agrees to enter into a Management Agreement with Save the Children Australia for shared use of the Champion Centre under the following basic terms and conditions:

Premises: Champion Centre, 76 Champion Drive, Seville Grove, with relevant access areas as defined in the plan included in this report.

Term: Two (2) years.

Annual Contribution: $8,280 per annum plus GST and not including electricity costs.

Rates for Hire Areas: To be at the City’s Community Rate for areas in the Champion Centre as amended from time to time.

Operating Costs: The occupant to be responsible for operating expenditure, including maintenance and operation of telephones located within the Exclusive use areas. A sub-meter will be installed in the leased areas and the occupant will be billed for electricity consumption according to the sub-meter reading.

Insurance: Occupant to maintain Public Liability insurance to a minimum of $20,000,000. The City shall be responsible for building insurance.

ATTACHMENTS
1. Champion Centre Floor Plan
3.1 - ARMADALE DISTRICT HALL UPGRADE

WARD : ALL
FILE No. : M/794/15
DATE : 2 September 2015
REF : GT
RESPONSIBLE MANAGER : Executive Director Community Services

In Brief:
- This report follows the consultation process undertaken with stakeholders, the community and Councillors, since the Council meeting on 14 July 2014 at which a preliminary concept for the upgrade of the Armadale District Hall was presented. The report outlines how the recommended concept has been developed in response to community and Elected Member feedback.

Recommend:
- That Council endorse the Armadale District Hall Concept Plan shown as Attachment 1 to this report.
- That the Concept Plan as shown as Attachment 1 is provided to the Heritage Council of WA for comment.
- That external funding opportunities are investigated to complement the municipal funds already allocated to the project for the upgrade.
- That a report is provided to Council that includes the response from the Heritage Council and also confirms funding arrangements for the upgrade.

Tabled Items
Nil.

Officer Interest Declaration
Nil.

Strategic Implications
1. Community Wellbeing:
   1.2 Optimum quality of life for all citizens.
   1.2.5 Ensure Council’s services and facilities are accessible.

   1.3 Access to a wide range of cultural, arts and learning opportunities.
   1.3.4 Promote and support initiatives that enable the community to enjoy a variety of cultural experiences.
1.5 Sport, recreation and leisure opportunities that contribute to community health and wellbeing.
   1.5.1 Provide and promote Council sport, recreation and leisure facilities.

2. Enhanced Natural and Built Environments:
   2.3 Diverse and attractive development that is integrated with the distinctive character of the City.
   2.3.2 Ensure preservation and maintenance of heritage buildings, heritage items and places.

2.6 Council buildings and facilities that meet community needs.
   2.6.1 Maintain Council buildings, facilities and public amenities to the determined levels of service.
   2.6.2 Implement improvements to buildings, amenities and facilities as required to enhance the service to the community.

**Legislation Implications**

Any construction or design is required to comply with the Building Code of Australia, Universal Access and Australian Standards. The Armadale District Hall is included in the Heritage Council WA (HCWA) State Heritage Register. Any significant works are required to be approved by the HCWA under the Heritage of Western Australia Act 1990.

**Council Policy/Local Law Implications**

Assessment of Policy/Local Law indicates that the following are applicable:

- ENG 13 - Asset Management Vision.
- RECN 4 - Hire of Halls and Buildings.
- Municipal Heritage Inventory.
- Armadale District Hall Conservation Plan.

**Budget/Financial Implications**

The Armadale District Hall Upgrade Project is a major project that is identified in the City’s Corporate Business Plan. The current year’s budget includes a total of $3,368,400 for the upgrade comprising:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Armadale (Upgrade)</td>
<td>$2,660,000 (Loan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Armadale (Renewal)</td>
<td>$ 708,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,368,400</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The estimated cost of the recommended design is $4,107,080. Should Council endorse this design, it is intended that the balance of $738,680 is sought from external sources.
While detailed design and other preliminary works can begin in this current Financial Year, it is anticipated that the upgrade construction period would not commence until 2016/2017, which would require a carry forward of the funds unspent at 30 June 2016. A significant factor in the timing of the upgrade is to enable continued access to the District Hall until June/July 2016 when the upgrade to the Greendale Centre is due for completion. It is seen as highly desirable not to have both centres closed at the same time to enable each to cover for the other in helping with the temporary relocation of user groups.

**Consultation**

1. MANEX.
2. Officer workshops.
3. Heritage Council WA.
5. Provision of the draft Concept Plan at Council libraries and on-line for public viewing.
6. Feedback forms.
7. A stakeholder workshop at the Armadale District Hall on the 28 October 2014.
12. Councillor Briefing 10 August 2015.

**BACKGROUND**

This report follows the consultation process undertaken with stakeholders, the general community, and Councillors, following the July 2014 Community Services Committee Meeting at which a preliminary concept plan for an upgraded Hall was presented (Attachment 2). Committee’s discussion and recommendation to Council, which was endorsed at the subsequent Council Meeting, is as follows:

“Committee Discussion

Committee discussed the report in relation to:

- Landscape design aspects including – tree/plant retention, visibility of Hall.
- Accessibility and interaction of garden space with Main Hall space, entry aspects and lawn levels, cooling aspects in urban environment.
- Historical plaque on wall facing garden space.
- Retention of gallery.
- Maintaining historical /heritage significance.
- Ongoing and relevant usage in regard to performing and multi-use aspects.
- Previous considerations/studies of cultural/civic space and provision for performing/exhibition space.
- Comparisons with other performing facilities (Don Russell and Kalamunda Hall).
- Other external performance facilities in the City of Armadale eg Schools/Churches.
It was requested by the Executive Director that if Councillors had any specific issues that they wanted to be noted that they be forwarded in writing.

MOVED Cr R Butterfield, SECONDED Cr G Nixon
OPPOSED Cr C Frost

That the first word ‘Endorse’ be replaced with ‘Support’ in part 4 of the Recommendation.

MOTION DECLARED CARRIED (4/3)

C�9/7/14 RECOMMEND

That Council:

1. Note the Armadale District Hall Concept Plan as presented in Attachment1 of this report.

2. Note further consultation is to be undertaken with Heritage Council and the City’s Community Heritage Advisory Committee.

Following advice from the Community Heritage Advisory Committee and Heritage Council WA, further consultation will be undertaken with the wider community, existing user groups, local performance based organisations and schools and the professional arts sector.

3. Note that following feedback from Councillor presentation/workshop and site visits, further investigation into options into the retention of the existing gallery and its implications and opportunities is being undertaken.

4. Support a single construction period to minimise disruption and mitigate risk of increase in construction cost.

5. Note that a further report to Council will be presented in October/November 2014.”

Context

A number of studies and plans regarding the redevelopment of the Armadale District Hall have been undertaken since 1989. These include:

- Armadale Enquiry by Design process - which identified the Armadale District Hall as an important City Centre facility which could be turned into a focus of activity (1999).
- Civic Precinct Redevelopment Plan (2008).
- Convention/Arts Facility Demand Study (2010).
In summary, these various plans identified a deficiency of modern exhibition space and visual arts/performance space, and a focus of such activity desirable within the City of Armadale. The design plans indicated improvement to exhibition and performance space within the Armadale District Hall. The options identified in these plans and studies include:

- Upgrade to primarily a small performance facility, with exhibition facility located elsewhere in the City Centre.
- Upgrade to a primary exhibition facility.
- Incorporating convention facilities within a multipurpose community facility, with a focus on visual and performing arts and assist in making the facility sustainable (multi-use facility).

In June 2008, as part of the Plan for the Future and 15 Year Financial Plan, Council approved the initiation of the upgrade project (CS70/6/08).

**Consultation Outcomes**

At the Ordinary Council Meeting of 14 July 2014 (C29/7/14), Council were presented with a Preliminary Concept Plan for the District Hall upgrade (see Attachment 2). It was noted that further consultation would be undertaken on that concept and reported back to Council.

Details and outcomes of the subsequent consultation included:

**Heritage Council of WA**

The Concept Plan, as presented to Council in July 2014, was presented to the Heritage Council of WA. Relevant extracts of their response are as follows:

“The proposed development has been considered in the context of the identified cultural significance of the place and the following comments are given:

**Findings:**

- The Demolition of WCs (1961) will significantly alter the front façade of the existing Hall building; however, the proposed changes are based on historical evidence.
- The proposed works will involve the loss of some significant fabric. This loss is offset by the reinstatement of the original configuration of the Hall, and the viable ongoing use of the place for its intended purpose.
- The contemporary design of the proposed new structure is readily identifiable as new, and finishes are based on historical physical evidence.
- The new structure is adequately set back from the original building, and will not obscure significant views to the front of the place, or dominate the significant form of the original Hall.
Advice:
The proposed development in accordance with the plans submitted, is supported, subject to the following condition:

1. A photographic archival record shall be provided to the satisfaction of the Executive Director of the State Heritage Office of the structures proposed to be demolished.

The Development Committee encourages the activation of the original main entry in order that it does not become redundant.

The Committee also notes that the retention of the rear section of the upper gallery would be a positive outcome if it is retained. If this approach is pursued, further information regarding the impact to the fabric arising out of the partial removal is to be provided for further consideration and advice.”

Community Heritage Advisory Group

City Officers attended a Community Heritage Advisory Group meeting on 25 September 2014 which included a ‘walk through’ of the Hall. Members were encouraged to participate in the feedback process by providing a submission on behalf of the Group, to attend the Stakeholder Workshop which was held on 28 October 2014, and also to submit feedback forms as part of the Out for Comment period. The Group did not provide a consolidated submission, although some members attended the Stakeholder Workshop and provided feedback forms as individual community members. Extracts from the minutes of the meeting held on 25 September 2014 by the Community Heritage Advisory Group, which is convened by the City, are included as follows:

(Extract CHAG Meeting Minutes 25 September 2014)

“4. ARMADALE DISTRICT HALL – DRAFT CONCEPT PLAN

Following the site visit, members discussed the current draft concept plan for the Armadale District Hall. Points of note are as detailed below:

- Compliment Council on what they are doing but some concerns regarding the plans.
- Concerns regarding the location of the toilets as they appear to detract from the upgrade and having them come directly off a meeting / gathering area is not appealing.
- Memories of the gallery need to be considered, it was so special and sight lines can be fixed by design.
- The current and future use of the hall is a major point – the hall has not been used as a Town Hall for some time.
- It is Armadale’s jewel; it was noted that the removal of the disabled ramp at the front of the building will not increase mingling in front of the building as it is believed that people will not mingle on a slope.
The current toilets should stay where they are and be upgraded.
The Gallery should be kept and redesigned within the existing fabric.
Another comment was that if the Gallery is not going to be used for performances then why keep.
Acoustics should be looked at for both if the Gallery stays or is removed.
Stage extension may improve usability in the Gallery.
Kitchen needs further design work as blocks off stage, and if multi-use areas being used by multiple groups at the same time, how functional is its location of the kitchen.
A suggestion was that perhaps the money could be spent elsewhere in the City, say for an indoor pool or performing arts centre.
Members would like a copy of the State Heritage Conservation Plan.

The group did not form a general consensus, and were encouraged to participate in the future focus groups that will be held by the Community Services Directorate.

Amendment made at October Meeting and subsequently added as endorsed comments:

- The heritage aspects of the Hall are highly treasured by the local community and should be retained at all costs. The view to the Hall from the Visitors Centre / Heritage /Tourist precinct to the east is majestic and highly regarded. It should not be covered up by a new Lesser hall and toilet block, which is proposed to be built in a modern style that is completely unsympathetic to the style of the original Hall.
- Removal of the ramp at the front of the Hall is a backward step as it removes accessibility for the disabled from Jull Street! Why should those with special needs have to compete with cars entering the carpark from Jull Street? It is not safe for them. Also the proposal to have a disabled toilet in the structure to be built in Centennial Grove seems discriminatory. If there is to be a new one, it should be located next to the main toilets.
- It was agreed by all that the 1960's additions to the front side wings should be retained. Even if the toilets here were not retained, it would allow for a larger usable meeting room than the current tiny proposed rooms.
- It was noted that the additions to the Hall were designed by the same original architects who designed the Hall.
- It was also noted that the State Heritage Assessment particularly commented that the additions are "sympathetic and do not detract from the original design".
- A request was made for copies of the Palassis Architects Armadale District Hall Conservation Plan not the State Heritage Conservation Plan."

Public Comment Period and Stakeholder Workshop

Community consultation for the Armadale District Hall upgrade was undertaken over the later part of 2014 via: a public comment period, meetings with the City’s Heritage Reference Group and Community Heritage Advisory Group, a stakeholder workshop held on 28 October 2014, and user feedback forms.
The consultation period received a high profile with a number of stories printed in the local press.

A total of 43 submissions were received through the community consultation process. The submissions can broadly be divided into those that express overall support, those that offer suggestions for improvement, and those that make objections. They are summarised below:

1. **OVERALL SUPPORT**  
3 References

The expressions of overall support varied and have been listed below:

- ‘Architectural plans presented are innovative ... This is alluring for the Classic Sounds Orchestra Association.’
- ‘A modern/contemporary building which attracts high calibre performances is essential; attracting acts that would normally perform at the Astor or Regal would give residents options … Don’t carry money forward, just get on and do it.’
- ‘We like the idea of removing the gallery and replacing it with retractable seating … Happy to see the old toilet block removed.’

2. **SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENTS**  
19 References

Suggestions for improvements generally referred to the layout and features that submitters would like to see retained and/or installed to enhance the functionality and comfort levels for hirers.

The installation of air conditioning and kitchen facilities that match the Hall’s capacity was referenced 6 times. Suggestions for improved kitchen facilities included a larger kitchen, a commercial kitchen, a microwave oven, a larger oven and a larger pie warmer.

Other suggestions with fewer references included: the retention of the garden and trees as opposed to a paved garden, the retention of the bio box, internet connection, different trusses to improve gallery sightlines, picture rails for exhibitions, disabled toilets, additional meeting rooms, a small bar area for canapés, access stage lights and improved acoustics.

3. **OBJECTIONS**

The objections can be subdivided into two groups that express contentions relating to the project’s viability and/or the three key structural modifications (demolitions and additions) believed to compromise the heritage conservation of the building and the surrounding heritage precinct.

(a) **Project Viability**  
17 References

The predominant perspective extracted is that the Concept Plan compromises the standard of heritage conservation for only a marginal improvement in functionality.
The Hall’s unsuitability as a performing arts centre was referenced 9 times. 17 references proposed that a new purpose built facility be located elsewhere and/or that an alternative facility with less historical significance be upgraded instead. The justifications reiterated were that a retrofit cannot meet modern specifications or expectations of a performing-arts centre and/or Armadale’s ‘City’ status.

(b) Structural Modifications

The dominant perspectives relating to the three key structural modifications are summarised below:

(i) Removal of the Gallery, Balcony and Staircase (specific feedback was sought on the gallery in response to Council’s request on this element).

Comments Included:
- The gallery is an asset to the Hall and should have never been neglected.
- A structural alteration by the City in 1998 increased the height of the balustrade and interfered with the sightlines towards the stage.
- Rectify sightlines and aesthetics of balcony.
- The retractable seating provides less seating than the gallery.
- The State Heritage Assessment reports that the gallery is sympathetic and does not detract from the original design.
- A gallery is rare in a district hall and can be used as a tourist attraction.
- The bio box at the rear of the balcony should be restored.

Two submissions referenced the gallery but advocated the full and/or partial removal. One justification was that the gallery was not being part of the original building and that it ‘does not hold special significance for a large portion of the community’. Another submission advocated the full and/or partial removal of the gallery if it prevents the ability to have retractable seating that would diversify use.
(ii) **Removal of Non Original Building Fabric (1961 Wings)**  
7 References

Comments Included:
- They are a documented part of the legitimate ongoing history of the place.
- These extra wings are sympathetic and do not detract from the original design.
- They are designed by the same architect and could be considered as original.
- They balance the proportions of the building; strengthen the landmark qualities of the building and Jull Street.

(iii) **Modern Additions (Lesser Hall)**  
11 References

Comments Included:
- Restoration and refurbishment is needed to be carried out immediately in keeping with the heritage aspect of the building – not major additions and redevelopment.
- Not justified due to space restrictions, loss of parking bays and the demolition of the public toilets.
- Aesthetics and scale are not complementary and the contrasting modern building form is not supported.
- Restricted parking means the driveway and additions are not viable.
- Compromising scale, façade and access obstructs the views of the original building and heritage precinct. Current parking shortage is already causing bad feelings between users and the surrounding businesses. Parking will be an impediment during school/office hours when alternative off-site carparks are full.

Heritage conservation underpinned the concerns relating to the three key structural modifications with **21 references**.

While **43 submissions** cannot be regarded as a significant number, particularly given the high profile the proposed upgrade received in the press, a predominate focus of the feedback was opposed to the upgrade as presented in the proposed Concept Plan. In the most general terms that opposition could be characterised as follows:

- Compromising the Heritage of the Hall (including removal of the Gallery).
- Trying to do too much on the site with the proposed expansion.
- Unsuitability of the Hall as a Performing Arts Centre.
- Shortage of parking and access to the public toilets.
It should be remembered that the preceding comments all relate to the Preliminary Concept Plan that was presented to Council in July 2014 (Attachment 2), and not the Concept Plan that is recommended in this report.

**Theatre Consultant**

Advice was sought from Graham Walne of Graham Walne Theatre Consultants on aspects of the upgrade design related to use of the building for performances. This consultant has significant and wide ranging experience in advising on performing arts venues. Relevant projects in which he has been involved include upgrades to the Fremantle Arts Centre, Perth Town Hall, Subiaco Arts Centre, Narrogin Town Hall, construction of the Hale School Music and Drama Centre, and lead theatre consultant for the Department of Culture and the Arts on the State Theatre Complex.

Specialist input was provided on the following aspects of the District Hall:

- Interior design and specifications of the Main Hall.
- Specifications for acoustic treatments.
- Specifications for sound system and lighting provision.
- Design and specifications for retractable seating.
- Backstage and loading area design.
- Internal design for performers’ access.
- Foyer and entrances.

**Councillor Briefings**

Three Councillor Briefings and one Councillor Workshop have been held since December 2014. It is noted that workshops and briefings are not decision making forums and it is not intended that consensus be reached, however they provide opportunities for interactive feedback and provide valuable guidance to the process.

**2 December 2014 - Councillor Workshop**

Under discussion were key points arising from the consultation in relation to the preliminary concept, and included:

- The heritage look and feel of the Hall, both external and internal, should be preserved and respected in any concept designs.
- The Hall should retain its original functionality for larger scale community functions and events such as art displays, performances and social activities.
- Clarity around usage of proposed additional activity spaces.
- Car parking.
- A range of design options was identified for discussion at a further workshop.
24 March 2015 – Councillor Workshop

Four concepts were presented and discussed. Two were based on retaining the footprint of the original building, and two that included an additional activity space and new internal toilets.

The revised concepts included the following components:

- Changes to the Main Hall, including retractable seating and partial removal of Gallery.
- Removal of external exit and stairway.
- Replacing external toilets with a set of toilets accessible from inside the facility.
- Relocating the kitchen to its original position to better service the building.
- Inclusion of backstage facilities to support improvements to Main Hall.
- Additional activity spaces would increase the facility’s ability to accommodate future demand.

Some further points arose at the Workshop including:

- A desire to locate internal toilets away from the front of the building.
- Removal of the front ‘wings’ that were added in 1961.
- By adding additional activity areas, was the site trying to do too much.
- The original larger scale activities for which the Hall was used originally should be the key focus of any upgrade.
- The strong desire to retain the heritage values of the building.

13 July 2015 – Councillor Workshop

The architects responded to the points raised with a further concept plan which was discussed alongside the previous concepts, and the original Hall footprint at a workshop on 13 July 2015.

Further discussion at this Workshop regarding:

- The usage of an additional activity area.
- Relocation of the kitchen from the front of the building to a central location.
- The need to be sure of the financial implications of the various options.
- The perceived dominance of the contemporary component of the building over the heritage.
- The possibility of greater separation between the heritage building and any new activity areas.
- Potential impact on car parking in the immediate area.

31 August 2015 – Councillor Briefing

The architects presented the concept that is proposed in this report (Attachment 1). The architects provided comments on how feedback since the July 2014 Preliminary Concept had been considered and incorporated into the design process.
DETAILS OF PROPOSAL

The Armadale District Hall would have been constructed in the contemporary style of the times with the vision of it being a vibrant active social hub for the growing City. The recommended concept applies the same philosophy creating an inviting open and spacious facility with the benefit of a complimentary mixture of heritage and contemporary built form. Internally the facility provides a wide range of activity spaces for both large and small programs and events surrounding a central courtyard.

The upgraded Main Hall and Lesser Hall, as presented as Attachment 1 of this report, caters for both traditional uses and modern activities with the capacity for around 300 seated patrons. The new activity areas are clearly separated from the Main Hall, keeping sound intrusion to a minimum and allowing for simultaneous activities to be carried out without interfering with each other.

The recommended concept includes the following:

- Upgrade to the current Main Hall with sound proofing and air conditioning to improve comfort levels.
- Renovated floor to retain sprung feel and provide strengthening where the additional load from the retractable seating will be required.
- Mechanically operated retractable seating for 220 and retained gallery seating for 50.
- Under stage storage for chairs and tables.
- Retractable stage extensions.
- New sound system.
- Additional backstage area for performers.
- Front entrance toilets converted in to small meeting rooms.
- Front toilets added in 1961 removed to reinstate the original frontage.
- Kitchen relocated to its original position, and enhanced to provide a central service and servicing of kitchen from the rear of the facility.
- Supper Room renovated and original entrance to old building re-opened.
- Old kitchen at front replaced with a public foyer space.
- New paved entry plaza giving a clear separation between heritage and contemporary components.
- Glass frontage to allow clear view of heritage components from the north east perspective.
- Internal toilet block that serves all areas.
- New Lesser Hall that provides a visual balance between heritage and contemporary components and provides for current and future demand by user groups.
- New low front sloped lawn providing good visibility of the facility and guiding access.
- Car parking is impacted on with the loss of approximately 6 bays anticipated from the existing carpark.

The cost of the recommended concept plan is estimated at $4,107,080.
The Preliminary Concept Plan as presented to Council in July 2014 was presented to, and endorsed by the Heritage Council of WA. The current recommended Concept Plan as well as any subsequent detailed design based on that Plan would also require support from the Heritage Council. It is proposed that that if endorsed, the recommended Concept Plan be submitted to the Heritage Council to comment with the response from the Heritage Council reported back to Council.

The current Budget includes an amount of $3,368,400 for the upgrade. The cost of the recommended upgrade is $4,107,080 leaving a funding gap based on the current estimate of $738,680. It is anticipated that the funding gap can be addressed through what could be considered a modest capital grant from an external source such as Lotterywest. The proposal of this report is to investigate external funding for this gap and report the outcome of that investigation back to Council.

Given the time taken over the consultation and design phase for the District Hall upgrade, and also the desirability of not having two major facilities (the District Hall and the Greendale Centre) out of commission at the same time due to upgrades at both facilities, it is proposed that the main construction period for the District Hall upgrade does not commence until the Greendale Centre upgrade is finished, which is anticipated to be July 2016. This is to allow some flexibility in providing alternative spaces for user groups at both facilities.

Some elements of the project will be addressed at a later detailed design phase. These include landscaping and a final design for modifications to the existing car park to allow for a new Lesser Hall. With regard to the car park, there is every intention to retain existing mature trees and so, for example, the size of the new Lesser Hall may be reduced to accommodate access to the rear of the building if required.

ANALYSIS

It is recognised that rapidly growing outer metropolitan growth areas such as the City of Armadale, face a number of challenges over and above those faced in more fully established areas. Amongst these challenges is the appropriate provision of community infrastructure such as community centres, halls, libraries, sporting facilities and recreational spaces. The scale of this challenge is evident if one considers the growth from what was historically a fairly modest growth rate up until 2006 when the population was 50,535, to the very high rate of growth that has occurred since that time to the current population of 82,267. This is an increase of 31,732 residents or a 62% increase in the City’s population from 2006 – 2015. It is forecast that by 2036 the City’s population will increase to approximately 145,000, or nearly three times of that historical base population of around 50,000.

With these figures in mind, it is clear that a strategic and cost effective approach is required if the City wishes to continue to provide community infrastructure at a level that enables a well-functioning and connected community.
In a sense, in order to optimise the functionality of the City of Armadale community, the same care, attention and forethought need to apply to the overall provision of community infrastructure as occurs with hard infrastructure such as the road and drainage networks. While the consequences of not providing good levels of community infrastructure are not as clear cut as for example a bridge collapse or gridlocked traffic, the consequences can be as serious, and can result in a community that is disconnected with itself and the services it requires, and potentially a dissatisfied community that looks outside the City’s boundaries for sporting, recreational, community and lifelong learning needs.

The City’s response to this challenge includes a number of different elements:

- Designing more multi use facilities where new facilities are being built, or existing facilities redeveloped, e.g. the Armadale Aquatic Centre and the Arena Recreation Centre, Frye Park Pavilion, Piara Waters Pavilion.
- Working with the Department of Education to develop shared school/community sites in the City’s growth areas.
- Incorporating developer contributions to assist in funding the construction of facilities in north Forrestdale and Wungong.
- Master Planning twelve community ‘hubs’ in the City’s established areas, to identify how facilities and their usage patterns can be improved.

The preceding comments provide context for the discussion about the upgrade of the Armadale District Hall, and in particular the opportunity that the upgrade provides to include additional activity areas to meet what will be an ongoing and increasing need for more community spaces. The approach to upgrading the Hall has been to emphasise its standing as a facility that draws people into the centre of Armadale by providing a unique space for significant community events and performances, whilst also providing a base for weekly programs that keep the facility activated on a daily basis. The inclusion of a new Lesser Hall as an additional activity space creates flexibility, enabling a range of regular smaller scale activities as well as the larger community and Civic activities that link more directly to the original function of the District Hall.

As with any building that has multiple activity areas, the use of the spaces at the District Hall would be proactively managed. While it is unlikely that activities would be run at the same time as major events or functions in the Main Hall, for most of the time, the Lesser Hall would be available either for smaller scale activities or to support activities in the Main Hall. The recent Community concerts by the Classic Sounds Orchestra is an example where a new Lesser Hall would have provided a gathering space for a larger ensemble while allowing the Supper Room to be used as a reception area for patrons. To continue with this example; the setup and pack down requirements for this type of concert result in taking the Main Hall out of commission for three or four days while the building is only full of people for the concerts themselves. The inclusion of a new Lesser Hall means that the building would be used and ‘active’ with smaller activities over that entire time.

Another example where multiple spaces could be used concurrently is with the Minnawarra and Outside the Frame Art Awards where the Main Hall and Supper Room are used for the Awards and complimentary activities, such as music performances and art workshops, can be held in a new Lesser Hall.
It is envisaged that a typical annual program of activities at the District Hall would fall in to the following categories:

1. Events and activities that utilise the Main Hall and original Supper Room that takes advantage of a commercial standard kitchen:
   - Minnawarra and Outside the Frame Art Awards.
   - Civic dinners and award nights.
   - Community Concerts, such as by the Classic Sounds Orchestra and Armadale Concert Band.
   - Seniors Concerts run by the City or run externally.
   - Short, smaller scale lunchtime performances, or a sundowner series in the Supper Room for CBD workers.
   - Less formal jazz/blues/folk/theatre club style shows.
   - Use as a satellite venue for events organised by the Perth International Arts Festival, Fringe Festival, Perth Writers Festival, Comedy Festival.
   - Hired to external promoters for performances.
   - Children’s Concerts linked to activities in the Mall.
   - A venue for corporate functions, strategic planning days, and smaller scale conferences.
   - Social functions.
   - Community meetings, presentations, and workshops.

2. Stand-alone activities in the new Lesser Hall:

   These would be similar to the many activities that currently operate from the City’s venues and halls, including the District Hall:
   - Dance Classes.
   - Exercise Groups.
   - Yoga, Martial Arts.
   - Bingo.
   - Playgroups.
   - Regular community group meetings, such as Neighbourhood Watch.

**Design Option that Does Not Include a New Lesser Hall**

Much of the discussion around the upgrade has focused on whether or not to include additional activity space in an upgraded Hall, and to ensure that any new spaces relate properly to the heritage values of the original building. Consequently, as part of the concept planning process the heritage architects were asked to prepare a design that enhanced the original building but did not include additional activity spaces. This option, which is included as Attachment 3 to this report, is estimated to cost $2,485,000.

With the exception of the new Lesser Hall and foyer spaces, this option includes the same elements as the design that is recommended in this report. It also includes an allocation of $300,000 to upgrade/replace the current outside toilet block, recognising that some work on the public toilets adjacent to the Hall would be highly desirable.
Retaining but enhancing the original building through elements such as improved air conditioning; improved acoustics, additional backstage facilities, relocation of the kitchen to better service the building, would significantly increase the District Hall’s functionality. The Hall would undoubtedly be a very attractive and appealing venue for the same larger scale community, Civic and commercial events and activities previously noted.

While there would be gaps in the Hall’s schedule between larger scale activities, allowing time for what could be described as secondary smaller scale activities, these would be difficult to schedule on a regular basis as there would be an ongoing requirement to relocate regular groups when the Main Hall is out of commission from set up to pack down periods.

**OPTIONS**

The following options present at this time:

1. **Endorse the Concept Plan, as shown as Attachment 1 of this report, which shows an enhanced District Hall including a new Lesser Hall and other internal facilities.**

   A decision to endorse this concept plan means that further investigation can proceed with the Heritage Council and to seek additional funds for the project. As noted in the recommendation, a further report is to be provided to Council with the outcomes of the submission to the Heritage Council and funding before the project would proceed. A decision to endorse this concept is not a green light to immediately commence the upgrade however it would confirm Council’s intention to work towards the recommended concept.

   This is the recommended option.

2. **Endorse the option as shown in Attachment 3 of this report which shows improvements to the original building, including an enhanced backstage area, but no other additional activity spaces.**

   This option will increase the functionality of the existing Hall and reinstate some of the original design elements, however it has limitations in how much the building can be activated.

   This option is not recommended.

3. **Defer a decision until a later date.**

   This option prolongs the uncertainty on the future of the Hall, and is not recommended.
CONCLUSION

Consultation on the upgrade to the Armadale District Hall has been comprehensive. The concept as recommended in this report has sought to respond to feedback received since July 2014, and aims to create an identifiable and well used iconic heritage facility that will meet the needs for the City of Armadale community for generations to come.

RECOMMEND

That Council:

1. Endorse the Armadale District Hall Concept Plan, shown as Attachment 1 of this report.

2. Note that the Concept Plan, as shown as Attachment 1, is to be provided to the Heritage Council of WA for comment.

3. Investigate external funding opportunities to complement the municipal funds already allocated to the project for the upgrade.

4. Receive a further report that includes the response from the Heritage Council and also confirms funding arrangements for the upgrade.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Attachment 1 - Final Concept - 31 August 2015.
3. Attachment 3- Armadale Hall Original Footprint with Green Room.
3.2 - ARMADALE GOLF COURSE

WARD : ALL
FILE No. : M/796/15
DATE : 24 August 2015
REF : NK
RESPONSIBLE MANAGER : Executive Director Community Services

**In Brief:**
- Expressions of Interest were invited for the Future Operations of the Armadale Public Golf Course including possible alternative recreational use.

- **Recommend:**

  That Turfcare WA, Global Edge Marketing and Golf Oracle be invited to tender for the maintenance and operations of the Armadale Public Golf Course and that Council receive a further report in November 2015 on the response to the call for tenders.

**Tabled Items**
Nil

**Officer Interest Declaration**
Nil

**Strategic Implications**
1. Community Wellbeing
   1.1 Services that support community growth and development.
   1.1.2 Support and strengthen community groups, organisations, and volunteer services.
   1.2 Optimum quality of life for all citizens.
   1.2.5 Ensure Council’s services and facilities are accessible.
   1.5 Sport, recreation, and leisure opportunities that contribute to community health and wellbeing.
   1.5.1 Provide and promote Council sport, recreation and leisure facilities.

2. Enhanced Natural and Built Environments
   2.6 Council buildings and facilities that meet community needs.
   2.6.2 Implement improvements to buildings amenities and facilities, as required, to enhance the services to the community.

**Legislation Implications**
Assessment of legislation indicates that the following apply:

- Local Government Act 1995 - Sections 5.36, 5.38 and 5.39 – Local Government Employees
- Local Government (Functions and General) Regulations 1996 – Division 2 – Tenders for providing goods or services

**Council Policy/Local Law Implications**
Assessment of Policy/Local Law indicates that the following is/are applicable:
ENG 13 Asset Management Vision
ADM 19 Procurement of Goods or Services

Budget/Financial Implications
Information regarding the potential financial implications associated with proceeding with a call for tenders is included in the confidential attachment to this report.

Consultation
1. Various City of Armadale Departments.
2. Elected Member briefing on 10 August 2015.

BACKGROUND
Council has considered a number of reports in the lead up to, and subsequent to the expiry in December 2014 of the operating lease for the Armadale Public Golf Course. Key aspects of the relevant reports are:

Golf Course Upgrade
The City currently has plans for an upgrade to the Golf Course with $911,000 in the current budget allocated for this purpose. Funding for the upgrade is a grant from the Department of Sport and Recreation of $316,000 with loan funds accounting for the balance. The Department of Sport and Recreation Grant and the analysis that led to the scope of the upgrade was reported to Council in April 2013 (C14/4/13). This upgrade is currently on hold pending the outcome of deliberations on the future of the Course.

April 2014 - Council considered what approach should be taken to secure a new operator for the course and resolved:

“C13/4/14 That Council;
1. Receive the Report presented at Attachment 2.2.1 noting the options presented therein;
2. Endorse an Expression of Interest approach for the development of a new lease agreement for the Armadale Golf Course when the current lease expires on 7th December 2014;
3. Receive a further report once Expressions of Interest for the ongoing lease of the Armadale Golf Course have been received and analysed, that makes recommendation on:
   a) The preferred approach for the City in any ongoing management and operational arrangements of the Armadale Golf Course, and
   b) The financial and budget implications associated with (a) above.”

September 2014 – Responses to the call for Expressions of Interest were reported to the Community Services Committee including a confidential report on the ramifications of proceeding with a call to tender. Two EOI’s were submitted with one considered non-compliant. Based on the information contained in the EOI in the conforming submission from Prime/McMahons, Council resolved the following recommendation:

“C40/9/14 That Council;
Invite Prime Golf/McMahons to tender for the Operations and Management of the Armadale Golf Course.”
December 2014 – A report was presented through the City Strategy Committee (CS110/12/14) on the tender submission by Prime/McMahons. Unfortunately the tender was assessed as non-compliant with the following explanation provided in the report:

“The tender submission included a number of course maintenance assumptions that were in conflict with the tender request, specifically the assumptions noted on page 26 of the submission whereby the Contractor declared:

- Required supply and cost of irrigation water, power to bores and pumps and service/repairs to bores and pumps will be the responsibility of the City of Armadale.
- Cost of utilities to the maintenance shed will be responsibility of City of Armadale.
- Council is responsible for repair and or replacement of all Council assets.

The tender Specification and conjunctional attachments specifically “Attachment L” City of Armadale Golf Course Minimum Performance Standards clearly specified the Lessee will be responsible for,

- The sound maintenance of the golf course surfaces, buildings, fences and other associated infrastructure as per the attached performance standards and plans.
- The service and maintenance of the existing and planned golf course irrigation system (2015), including but not limited to the maintenance of all bores, electrical cabinets, pipes, valves and control systems in accordance with each sub components manufacturers recommendations and standards.
- The entire turf watering system, comprising but not limited to all bores, electrical maintained by the Lessee in “like new” condition, in accordance with each irrigation system sub components manufacturer’s service requirements and recommendations.

There is therefore a clear misalignment of the tenderers demands/expectations/requirements and the City’s requirements.

The tenderer has also included what are considered onerous financial arrangements, and these have been covered separately in the confidential report attached to this report.”

A confidential attachment was included with the report which outlined some key issues to be considered in determining the long term future of the course. In summary these comprised:

- The preference for an independent operator.
- Constraints on the scale of the course.
- Status of the planned golf course upgrade.
- Financial Sustainability of the Course.
- The market response to the EOI and tender process.

Four options were identified for the future of the course:

1. Proceed with a commercial arrangement for the operations and management of the course.
2. Bring the operations of the course under the full control of the City of Armadale.
3. Endeavor to develop an arrangement of shared responsibility for elements of the operations and maintenance of the Golf Course between the City and an independent operator.
4. Close the Course.
Committee discussion on the report as recorded in the minutes of the meeting was as follows;

“Committee Discussion

The Executive Director Technical Services briefed Committee on the tender process leading to an officer recommendation to not accept the tender submitted and for officers to negotiate with other service providers. It was confirmed that interim arrangements have been made for day to day operation of the golf course with greens, fairways and irrigation being maintained and until a new Manager is in place, no green fees will be charged.

and.....

In considering the report on alternate options for the future of the Armadale Golf Course, Committee recommended that officers investigate either Option-1 (alternative commercial arrangement) or Option-4 (Closure of the Golf Course with recommended transition arrangements for the 3 Golf Clubs) and report to Council by February 2015. An allocation of $26,000 per month for the interim management of the Golf Course was approved for the next 3 months. Part 5 of the officer recommendation was amended accordingly.”

Council’s resolution was:

“CS110/12/14 That Council:

1. Not accept the tender submitted for Tender No. 30/14 - Lease and Operation of the Armadale Public Golf Course by Prime Golf McMahons WA Pty Ltd.
2. In terms of Regulation 11.2.c Local Government (Functions and General) Regulations 1996, grant approval for negotiations to be entered into with alternate suitable service providers for the operation and management of the Armadale Golf Course.
3. That a further report on the outcomes of any negotiations or alternate outcomes for the future of the Armadale Golf Course be submitted to Council, taking into consideration the contents of the confidential report.
4. That the Armadale Golf Course be operated and managed departmentally until the report on the alternate outcomes has been considered by Council.
5. Consider funding to an amount of $26,000 per month for the interim departmental operation and management of the Armadale Golf Course in the mid-year budget review, for a maximum period of three months (concluding end February 15), until such time that the future management of the Armadale Golf Course has been determined.

December 2014 – February 2015

During this period the City maintained the golf course and assisted the resident clubs with their regular usage of the course. The main elements of this arrangement were;

- The City maintained the course and the toilets.
- The kiosk was closed.
- No fees were charged.
- No bookings were taken.

February 2015 – At the February 2015 City Strategy Committee meeting a report was presented on the status of negotiation with alternative service providers. The report also included additional information on ramifications of closing the course based on;
The option of transferring responsibility for the land to the State Government.
Opportunities for alternative recreational uses for the site.
Transitioning the resident clubs to other courses.

Five potential operators were contacted for proposals that would form the basis of negotiations for the future management of the course. Of these, a proposal from Programmed Turnpoint was identified as having the potential to develop the most advantageous arrangement for the City and the community. Consequently negotiations proceeded directly with them.

Council’s resolution in February 2015 was:

“CS8/2/15 That Council:
1. Endorse continued negotiations for the future management and operations of the Armadale Golf Course with Programmed Turnpoint as the “preferred operator” to finalise a draft agreement for the management of the course for Council’s consideration in May 2015.
2. Receive in May further information on the implications of decommissioning the Armadale Golf Course.
3. Consider providing a funding allocation of $92,042 through the mid-year review to engage the preferred operator to manage the Armadale Golf Course until June 2015.

It is noted that the February 2015 report referenced above (CS8/2/15) consolidates much of information on the course prior to February 2015 and is a good source of more detailed background information if it is sought.

February 2015 – May 2015
Programmed/Turnpoint operated the course under a short term contract for this period during which time the kiosk was reopened and green fees were reinstated. Feedback from the resident clubs indicated that the course was maintained and managed very well. Patronage increased and in this short time the general appearance and functionality of the course was enhanced.

The cost of the contract over this time was approximately $23,000 per month or approximately $92,000 over the life of the contract which aligns with the amount allocated by Council for this purpose. It is noted that as a short term arrangement and given that the kiosk had been closed and no green fees were charged in the previous three months, the reinstatement of these was seen as desirable rather than essential and was not a specific requirement of the contract.

May 2015 – A report to the City Strategy Committee meeting outlined the final proposal received from the preferred operator. In essence the proponent sought an operating subsidy from the City of $3.3 Million over 10 years to assist in bringing the course to the point of financial sustainability. As indicated in the report, this proposal was not seen as providing good value for the City of Armadale community and so the officer recommendation was to not accept the proposal. Given that the process of trying to identify a suitable operator had been significant, the officer recommendation was also to close the course and look to other options for the use and management of the site.
While the recommendation to not accept the proposal from the preferred operator was endorsed, Council determined that further investigation should take place before making a decision to close the course. Extracts from the City Strategy Committee meeting minutes outline how the Committee recommended Council proceed:

“Officer’s Report Recommendation

That Council:

1. Not accept the proposal by Programmed Turnpoint to operate the Armadale Golf Course.
2. Close the Armadale Golf Course with effect on Wednesday 1 July, 2015.
3. Support the relocation of resident clubs to other courses.
4. Decommission the Course from July 1, 2015 and maintain it as a basic ‘dry reserve’ pending further investigation on alternative uses.
5. Receive a report in February 2016 that includes the outcomes of further feasibility analysis on alternative uses for the Golf Course site.
6. Confirm with the Department of Sport and Recreation that the grant of $316,000 provided for the Course upgrade is no longer required.
7. Consider including an annual allocation of $12,000 in the Long Term Financial Plan from 2017 – 2025 for the purpose of maintaining the site as a dry reserve.
8. Consider an amount of $50,000 in the 2016 draft budget for a feasibility analysis of alternative future uses for the site.

Council resolved at its Ordinary Meeting on 25th May 2015 that the Officer’s Report Recommendation be amended as per the following –

1. That part 1 be amended to read:
   a. Not accept the proposal by Programmed Turnpoint to operate the Armadale Golf Course.
2. Part 8 be deleted.
3. Part 9 be renumbered to read 8.

Committee Discussion

In considering the current state of uncertainty surrounding the future of the Armadale Golf Course, the Committee discussed a number of matters including:-

- The risk of carrying significant operational deficits should revenue targets not be met;
- Costs associated with the operation and management of the Course;
- Costs associated with the undertaking of a feasibility analysis on alternative uses;
- Possibility of closure and transferring the land back to the State;
- Closure and using the land for alternative recreational activities;

Committee agreed to extend the time of the temporary arrangement currently in place to investigate further options relating to the future use of the golf course. Accordingly, the Recommendation was amended.

CS34/5/15

RECOMMEND

That Council:

1. Not accept the proposal received from Programmed Turnpoint to operate the Armadale Golf Course.
2. Continue to operate the Course until the end of January 2016 either under the current arrangement (estimated at $26,000 per month) or by the City.
3. Consider an amount of $50,000 in the 2016 draft budget for a feasibility analysis of alternative future uses for the site.

June 2015 – Temporary arrangements until January 2016
Consistent with the City’s procurement process quotes were called for a further interim contract to manage the course. Several companies were invited to quote with TurfcareWA being successful in securing the contract. It is acknowledged that the effort invested into the course and the relationships with the resident clubs by the previous operator was excellent; however the proposal from Turfcare WA on this occasion was more competitive.

The current contract has built on the work the previous operator did in stabilising the operations of the course, reopening the kiosk and reinstating green fees. Accordingly the requirements of this contract include:

- Continuing the maintenance regime as required by the City.
- Maintaining operating hours for the course.
- At a minimum, operating the kiosk for the same hours as with the previous contract.
- The City providing a service fee for maintenance and operations of the course.
- TurfcareWA collecting green fees and returning them to the City.
- TurfcareWA providing the City with weekly data on course usage and green fees.

At the time this report was prepared information has been received on the first eight weeks of the new temporary arrangement with TurfcareWA. Key statistics for this period are:

- The service fee to the operator is $19,765 per month.
- The course is averaging around 225 rounds per week.
- An estimated 60% - 80% of rounds played are by resident club members.
- Membership of the four resident clubs is approximately 180 people.
- Green fees being returned to the City are averaging $3,500 (or approx. $14,000 per month).
- The net cost to the City at this time is approximately $5,700 per month.

It is noted that the current contract cannot extend beyond December as this would take the value of the service beyond the $100,000 tender threshold in which case a tender, rather than quotes would have been required. Due to the time required to process a tender, this would have resulted in a gap between operators which was not seen as desirable. It is anticipated however, that regardless of the outcome of the proposed call for tenders, the City can maintain the operations of the course as Council has directed, either under a new commercial arrangement or by itself until the end of January 2016.

Call for Expressions of Interest – July 2015
EOI’s were sought in July 2015 for interested parties to submit preliminary proposals for the future of the course. As is generally the case, the feedback through the EOI process is intended to inform the development of a more focused scope for the service sought. This particular EOI provided for a very broad range of proposals outlined in four options:

1. Grounds maintenance of the Course.
2. Golf Management of the Course (Running the kiosk, marketing/promotion/ booking and scheduling rounds).
4. Alternative Commercial or Community Based Recreational Uses of the Golf Course Site other than Golf.

EOIs were invited on any option or combination of options. Importantly, any commercial proposals for the site as a golf course or for alternative recreational use were required to demonstrate a partnership approach in the sharing of investment, risk and benefit.

The scope of the request for EOIs was broader that the process undertaken in 2014 which focused on the commercial management of the course only. It is noted that the scope of the EOI allowed for proposals to be either commercially or community based.

The invitation for EOIs was advertised in the West Australian Newspaper, in a local newspaper, on the City’s website, promoted through the City’s Community Information Directory and through the City’s network of sporting organisations. Direct contact was also made with identified commercial operators of golf courses and to other organisations including Supa Golf, Foot Golf, Disc Golf and the Make a Difference Foundation (a golf focussed charity).

The EOIs were required to contain:

- Details of Relevant Organisational Experience.
- Key Personnel – skills and experience.
- Respondents Resources.
- Any alternative models that represent an advantageous solution to the City.

Five responses were received. One was considered non compliant as it contained minimal information about its proposal and did not address a number of the criteria in the EOI document. This response was from the Kelmscott Baseball Club who proposed constructing three baseball fields on the golf course site. This club is currently located at John Dunn Reserve and through the EOI expressed some concerns about facilities and equipment its current location and also at Bob Blackburn Reserve which is used for overflow training. City officers are now in discussion with the Kelmscott Baseball Club about those concerns which seem relatively easy to resolve.

The remaining four submissions were from the following commercial operators who all demonstrated experience in golf course maintenance and operations;

- TurfcareWA.
- Global Edge Marketing.
- Golf Oracle.
- Leisure Management Service.

The response to the EOI process should be considered quite strong with four experienced operators showing an interest in proceeding with a tender if that is the decision Council should take. None of these four participated in the process that was run in 2014 in which only one other operator was identified though the call for EOIs.
DETAILS OF PROPOSAL

The proposal is to proceed to a restricted call for tenders for the maintenance and operations of the Armadale Public Golf Course and to invite three of the four organizations that submitted compliant EOIs; TurfcareWA, Global Edge Marketing and Golf Oracle to participate in the tender process.

All four organisations demonstrated experience and knowledge in Golf Course maintenance and management. The three organisations that are proposed to be invited to tender proposed long term arrangements (minimum 10 years) during which a strategic approach would be taken to increase patronage and revenue of the course. All three also proposed partnership models in which risk, investment and benefit would be shared. These are all aspects of a solution to the long term future of the Golf Course that are seen as desirable.

The proposal from Leisure Management Services took a more cautious approach, proposing a two year contract during which time arrangements for a longer term lease could be developed. This is seen as prolonging the uncertainty around the future of the course and far less desirable at this time, particularly in comparison with the other three EOIs.

Further details of the submitted EOIs along with consideration of the alternatives to a commercially operated Golf Course for the site are included in the next section of this report and in the confidential attachment to this report.

ANALYSIS

Pursuing once again, a commercial operator for the Golf Course could be seen as something of a futile exercise given that the market was tested thoroughly in 2014 with a call for EOIs, an invitation to tender and, as allowed for under Regulation 11.2.c Local Government (Functions and General) Regulations, a subsequent period of direct negotiation with an alternative suitable service provider.

Because of the weak response to the previous EOI and Tender process, the scope for the EOIs this time was broadened considerably to allow for a wider range of proposals, whether commercially or community based and whether golf focussed or for other recreational activity (the land is vested for the purpose of recreation but not specifically for golf).

Possible explanations for the greater level of interest in the recent call for EOIs could include;

- A raised general awareness of the course including the professional sector resulting from the significant community interest in the future of the course.
- Two of the EOIs are from companies that have been involved in the short term management arrangements that have been in place since February 2015.
- Broadened scope for EOIs

Had the EOI responses been weaker or had any alternatives to golf as a viable use for the course been proposed, there would be a more immediate imperative to progress the other options of:

- Undertaking feasibility work on alternative recreational uses for the site.
- Closing the Course and maintaining as a dry reserve.
- Closing the course and pursuing the transfer of responsibility for the site to the State.

It is noted that an amount of $50,000 is included in the 2016 budget to undertake feasibility work for alternative recreational uses of the site. With the responses to the call for EOIs
indicating a reasonable hope that a suitable commercial arrangement can be struck it would seem premature to incur additional costs by undertaking a feasibility study until the matter of a long term lease is decided.

Transfer of responsibility for the site to the State Government

As reported to Council in May 2015 (CS34/5/15) the City has initiated discussions with the Department of Planning and the Department of Parks and Wildlife on the possibility of transferring responsibility for the site to the State Government. While this option remains a possibility, the City’s experience is that it would take a significant amount of time to negotiate the most favourable outcome for the City and is likely to be at considerable cost, notably from the anticipated requirement to rehabilitate the area to some degree. On this option, the City’s Planning Department has provided the following additional comments, some of which were included in the May 2015 report.

“In access to sufficient land for Public Open Space, especially sites that can provide for active recreation, is an important issue for the City as the Armadale population grows. Suburban backyards continue to shrink in response to upwards housing cost pressures and Health authorities are increasingly concerned for lifestyle and technology trends which are impacting on activity and obesity levels in the community, particularly for children.

In new land developments the land that can be claimed from developers as local POS has long been capped at 10% by State policy. In addition to local recreation uses, under State Government policies local POS also has to provide for a variety of landscape and vegetation protection purposes such as Multiple Use - Living Stream - environmental corridors. The City has a number of reserves it has controlled and maintained for many decades, some of which have opportunities for recreation zoning into “active” and more “passive” recreation zones and which can also serve environmental objectives.

In the 1960’s the Armadale community was granted 138 ha of land in Forrestdale for recreation uses (the Armadale Golf Course Reserve). For half a century the Armadale Golf Course Reserve is a 138 ha Parks and Recreation Reserve has been vested with the City (with power to lease for 21 years). The State Government handed over this land to the Armadale community to develop for Recreation, specifically the Armadale Golf Course. While the land area given by the State was sufficient to develop a large Golf Course of 27 or 36 holes, only a 9 hole course was ever developed by the City as a first stage. Since the 1960’s the State Government has significantly withdrawn from providing major landholdings for development of district level active recreation facilities, notwithstanding it has recently identified some areas for development of active recreation in the Draft South Metropolitan and Peel Sub-Regional Planning Framework, and has therefore attempted to redress that imbalance.

Since the 1960’s new environmental policy controls have been placed over native vegetation, fauna and wetland areas, including undeveloped portions of the Armadale Golf Course Reserve. These has effectively restricted any potential for expansion of the existing 9 hole course. Over a period of 20 or 30 years there has been an ongoing discussion with the State Government’s land management agency (now the Department of Parks and Wildlife or DPaW) on management of the environmental attributes of the Armadale Golf Course Reserve and management that is compatible with the Department’s management of the adjacent Forrestdale Lake Nature Reserve.

The City is a responsible land manager of its reserves and land assets and it has conducted several environmental management studies specifically on managing the Armadale Golf Course. The City has also increased its levels of qualified environmental and bushland management staff who have the skills to manage bushland such as found in the Reserve, while also protecting access and compatible recreation uses by future generations of the Armadale community.
In its Management Plans for the adjacent Forrestdale Lake Nature Reserve the Department of Parks and Wildlife has suggested the City could de-vest itself of the Armadale Golf Course Reserve land which would allow for future control and management by that Department. In its mid-2000 Nature Reserve Management Plan the DPaW included the recommendation that it continue to discuss this option with the City.

While Forrestdale Lake and the Nature Reserve around it is extremely important to the Australian and global community as a wetland of international importance, it is also important to the Armadale community as a recreation site for uses such as walking, cycling and horse riding. There is no reason to suggest the City’s environmental management of the Armadale Golf Course Reserve land is incompatible with Forrestdale Lake Nature Reserve and therefore no valid reason for the City’s vesting to change. Indeed the use and control of the Armadale Golf Course Reserve is an asset the local Armadale community could reasonably have expected to retain in perpetuity. The Armadale community’s voice and its ability to influence future management decisions over the wider Forrestdale area would likely be greatly reduced if it were to relinquish its legal rights for future management and use of the portion of the land developed for a 9 hole golf course or passive recreation uses over the balance of the Reserve.

The City’s Technical Services Directorate has previously constructed limestone pathways for the purpose of semi-active/passive uses of these limestone trails. In the future new environmentally compatible passive or semi active recreation activities are likely to arise and/or grow in popularity among what will be a much larger Armadale population. If the City were to forfeit its stakeholder status by relinquishing its legal control and management rights, it may have difficulty in being heard above other lobbies involved in the area. In addition to the loss of direct control over the future use and management of the land, relinquishment of the Armadale community’s control of the Golf Course Reserve land would certainly reduce the City’s influence on policy planning and management surrounding Forrestdale Lake by State and Federal government agencies.

The fundamental recommendation of the State government’s Forrestdale Lake management plans which date from the 1980’s and was revised in the mid 2000’s, is that the future vesting of the Golf Course Reserve land should be “negotiated” with the City of Armadale. There has never been any timeframe put on this negotiation nor any decision by the City to formally relinquish the City’s legal rights and controls over the land. While various discussions have occurred over the years without any conclusion, only informal arrangements for a shared and compatible management of environmental issues affecting the Armadale Golf Course Reserve land have been agreed (Technical Services Committee 22 July 2002).

As the vested management body the City retains all legal liability for matters such as public safety, nuisances and health, fire protections etc and the informal joint management arrangement Technical Services entered into, with what is now the Department of Parks and Wildlife, has no real legal status. The City remains responsible for all public liability claims that may arise and therefore cannot ignore its responsibilities to manage or pass these to another authority by any informal means. The City therefore maintains the formal legal management role that flows from its vesting (what is now called a Management Order).

Any future City resolution to formally forfeit its vested-authority status and control of the Golf Course Reserve should only be part of a negotiation with State government whereby the Armadale community and City gets some compensatory benefit for this asset loss and the loss of the City’s status as a stakeholder/landowner. Any restoration/rehabilitation costs DPaW imposed on the City with as part of formal surrender of management would add a potentially significant financial cost for rehabilitation of the Golf Course which, by providing the land, the State Government had originally endorsed.
During the many years of approaches by DPaW for the transfer of use and management of the Reserve from the City to DPaW, numerous State government development plans have been put forward for the Forrestdale area which also need to be taken into consideration, the most recent being the Perth and Peel @ 3.5 Strategy documents. These propose a vastly increased corridor population size and new developments in and around the Forrestdale locality. These strategies have also made land which can be used for local active or passive recreation increasingly valuable. Therefore any relinquishment and forfeiture of the City’s existing rights and assets, such as the Armadale Golf Course and the wider 138 ha Armadale Golf Course Reserve it is located within, is a matter which needs careful consideration.

The State Government’s ongoing land use and development strategies for the corridor, bring the 1980s original Forrestdale Lake Plan recommendation suggesting the City could relinquish its control and re-vest the Golf Course land to DPaW, increasingly into question. On that point the 138 ha of Parks and Recreation land is probably a greater area of potential recreation land held by the City than the total of all the land that will be provided by developers in Wungong, Brookdale, Haynes, Hilbert, Forrestdale, Harrisdale and Piara Waters combined, over a 20 year period. Council should carefully weigh-up the issues and consider the size, composition and recreation needs of the future Armadale community before making any decision to forfeit its vesting and control over the Armadale Golf Course Reserve land. In that regard an objective report that considers all the issue will help Council properly consider the best course of action.

OPTIONS

1. Invite tenders for the maintenance and operations of the Armadale Public Golf Course from TurfcareWA, Global Edge Marketing and Golf Oracle and report back to Council on tenders received in November 2015.
2. Decide that the course be closed at the end of January 2016 and maintain the Course as a dry reserve.
3. Decide that the course be closed at the end of January 2016 and initiate a feasibility study on alternative recreational uses for the course.
4. Decide that the course be closed at the end of January 2016 and elevate discussion with the State government regarding the potential to transfer responsibility for the site to the state.

Option 1 is recommended.

CONCLUSION

The City is committed to identifying all possible options to retain the Armadale Public Golf Course as a viable community asset. The level of interest from experienced organisations in wishing to pursue the opportunity for a long term partnership with the City for the operations of the Course gives rise to optimism that sound and competitive proposals may be presented through a call for tenders for Council’s consideration.
RECOMMEND

That Council:

1. Invite TurfcareWA, Global Edge Marketing and Golf Oracle to tender for the Maintenance and Management of the Armadale Public Golf Course.

2. Receive a further report in November 2015 on the response to the call for tenders.

ATTACHMENTS
1. Armadale Golf Course - Confidential Attachment Sept 2015. - This matter is considered to be confidential under Section 5.23(2) (e iii) of the Local Government Act, as the matter, if disclosed, would reveal information about the business, professional, commercial or financial affairs of a person.
4.1 - ARMADALE AQUATIC CENTRE SWIM COACHING SERVICES

WARD : ALL
FILE No. : M/798/15
DATE : 25 August 2015
REF : FG
RESPONSIBLE MANAGER : Executive Director Community Services

In Brief:

- Recommend:
  
  That Council waive lane hire fees for 2015/16 and 2016/17 and enter into a two year Memorandum of Understanding with Perth Integrated Health ‘Swim Strong’ program.

Tabled Items
Nil

Officer Interest Declaration
Nil

Strategic Implications
1. Community Wellbeing.
   1.1 Services that support community growth and development.
   1.2 Optimum quality of life for all citizens.
   1.5 Sport, recreation, and leisure opportunities that contribute to community health and wellbeing.

Legislation Implications
General assessment of relevant legislation (eg Local Government Act) has not revealed any restrictions.

Council Policy/Local Law Implications
Assessment of Policy/Local Law indicates that the following is/are applicable:

- COMD1 – Financial Assistance Policy

Budget/Financial Implications
The waiver of lane hire at the Armadale Aquatic Centre has been estimated to be worth $19,822 for the two year period. The City currently provides a coaching program but does not generate the revenue from the lane hire as it is an internal program.

If supported, the Perth Integrated Health ‘Swim Strong’ program has the potential to increase revenue by approximately $9,650 over a two year period in 2015/16 and 2016/17 through increased entry patronage.

Consultation
1. Recreation Services
2. City of Melville
BACKGROUND

With the Armadale Aquatic Centre being a seasonal facility, Armadale Kelmscott Swim Club has had an ongoing challenge to attract and retain members and coaches. In 2014 the Swim Club ceased the coaching program due to difficulties sourcing coaches and the City incorporated coaching into the Learn to Swim program in an effort to maintain a coach presence at the centre. Coaching in any sport is not local government core business and officers do not have the capacity to develop a strong coaching program, or actively recruit new members to squads for fitness or competitive swimming.

Currently the City’s swim coaching program attracts approximately 15 regular participants, who swim up to three times per week. The program does make a $3,000 profit per annum, however when administrative costs are taken into consideration it is likely that this would be a break even program. Successful swim coaching programs at year round facilities generally have 50 to 100 participants per day, providing an additional revenue source for the centre.

A good swim coaching program is run by a dedicated, professional coaching team, with a focus on both fitness and social aspects of the sport and competitive swimmers. As a sport, swimming is often managed through two different entities at aquatic centres, the traditional community based swim club who coordinate club meet nights and affiliation with Swimming WA and a professional coaching service which provides opportunity for fitness and competitive participation in the sport. These services also provide opportunity for training toward multi-discipline sports like Triathlons, where swimming is a key element and provides new opportunities for adult participation.

As identified in Policy COMD1 – Financial Assistance Policy, any request for donations, which including waiver of fees over $1,000 is referred to Community Services Committee for approval. This proposal incorporates a waiver of fees for over $1,000.

DETAILS OF PROPOSAL

In July 2015 Perth Integrated Health approached the City of Armadale with a proposal to undertake swim programs and related aquatic activities. Perth Integrated Health is the parent body of Perth Integrated Health Cycling Group who run the City of Armadale Grand Fondo.

The company also manages aquatic swim programs in the City of Melville, City of Stirling and HBF Stadium. Having identified an opportunity for growth in the south east metropolitan area, Perth Integrated Health approached officers to discuss use of Armadale Aquatic Centre for the ‘Swim Strong’ program. ‘Swim Strong’ has a range of programs including swim coaching, ‘blue squadron’ adult rehabilitation and fitness program, Triathlon training and swim coaching camps during school holidays.

Perth Integrated Health focus is on supporting development in swimmers and is not in sport club management. There is an opportunity for a strong alliance with Armadale Kelmscott Swimming Club as part of the project.

With a relatively existing low membership base it is anticipated that establishing a foundation for a sustainable, financially viable program will take two to three years; taking into consideration the seasonal nature of Armadale Aquatic Centre and significant membership drop over winter. Perth Integrated Health will be responsible for all promotion and program administration, including sourcing alternative training options over winter.
To support the development of the ‘Swim Strong’ coaching program, including building membership numbers the proposal is to waive lane hire fees for the first three seasons; this will allow Perth Integrated Health to establish a program without significant associated risks. Swimmers will still be required to pay normal pool entry and monthly coaching fees. The number of lanes required and times will be subject to program growth and lane availability. Perth Integrated Health will also provide opportunities for existing swim coaches at the centre.

Perth Integrated Health is aware of the future plans for Armadale Aquatic Centre and have acknowledged that during any construction phase the pool would not be available for a lengthy duration.

ANALYSIS

This proposal will positively impact on future aquatic programs at Armadale Aquatic Centre. Perth Integrated Health is a commercial allied health organization, delivering programs and services for the overall health and well-being of communities. These include the various sport specific branches and health services including Podiatry, Dietetics and Occupational Therapy. Perth Integrated Health has demonstrated themselves as a professional company, with excellent knowledge of multi-disciplined sports.

The ‘Swim Strong’ program has proven to be successful at various facilities in the Perth metropolitan area. Feedback from other local governments has been positive, with an increase in participation for fitness and competitive swimming in children and adults. An additional benefit will be the growth experienced by Armadale Kelmscott Swimming Club, who will potentially see an increase in club members.

Perth Integrated Health considers Armadale a suitable location for the ‘Swim Strong’ program. This program would provide an excellent service to the community, immediate increase in pool entry revenue and longer term, additional revenue through lane hire.

To ensure this program is established it is important the City provides support while the program is established through waiving of lane hire for two seasons. Financially it is a significant amount that would be waived although this would be countered through standard pool entry for swimmers, resulting in an immediate increase in revenue.

Currently the City revenue for the swim coaching program is approximately $3,000 per annum. This does not take into account the administration time for the program or any promotions, which would result in a break even program. As the coaching is an internal program the City currently does not receive revenue from lane hire and previously the swimming club had never been charged lane hire fees.

Lane Hire

Approximate cost of lane hire for a two year period is $19,822. It is suggested that lane hire is waived for the first two years, enabling Perth Integrated Health to establish a financially sustainable program at the centre. As the City of Armadale currently runs the aquatic swim coaching program, this is not an existing revenue stream and therefore won’t be a financial loss to the centre. Longer term the City would gain financially by supporting the establishment of a solid program in its first two years of operation. The lanes Perth Integrated Health program would access are currently used for the existing coaching programs.
LANE HIRE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Sessions/ Week</th>
<th>Weeks/ Season</th>
<th>Time (hrs)</th>
<th>Lane use</th>
<th>Fee (ex GST)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015/16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>$20.91</td>
<td>$5520.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$20.91</td>
<td>$12,420.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special event camps 15/16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$20.91</td>
<td>$940.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special event camps 16/17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$20.91</td>
<td>$940.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$19,822.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Entry Revenue

Estimates on basic minimum new participants in the swim coaching program forecast the City would receive approximately $9,650 increase in pool entry revenue over the two year period. This figure has been calculated on newly attracted participants and the season passes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Season passes</th>
<th>Fee (ex GST)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015/16 - child</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>$150.91</td>
<td>$2263.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/16 - adult</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>$240.91</td>
<td>$1204.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/17 - child</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>$150.91</td>
<td>$3772.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016/17 - adult</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>$240.91</td>
<td>$2409.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
<td>$9650.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By waiving fees for two seasons this will provide Perth Integrated Health the opportunity to develop a good membership base prior to commencing payment of lane hire. A two year period is considered appropriate as it will include the transition between seasons and retention rate of participants over summer.

Longer term this will provide the City with an additional revenue stream through lane hire and provide the community with a focused aquatic program. To formalize the agreement officers will prepare a Memorandum of Understanding, including a review of the program on an annual basis to measure its success.

OPTIONS

1. Support waiving lane hire fees to Perth Integrated Health for two seasons, 2015/16 and 2016/17 and enter into a MOU for the period.
2. Support waiving a different amount for lane hire to Perth Integrated Health and enter into a MOU for the period.
3. Not support waiving lane hire fees to Perth Integrated Health, nor enter into a MOU.

It is recommended that Council support option 1.

CONCLUSION

By supporting the establishment of Perth Integrated Health, ‘Swim Strong’ program at the Armadale Aquatic Centre, the City will be supporting a potential longer term sustainable program that meets community needs and provides additional revenue for the Centre.
Establishing this program now will mean the City should have a good arrangement as we progress into the future, including the Aquatic Centre redevelopment.

RECOMMEND

That Council:

1. Waive lane hire fees at the Armadale Aquatic Centre for 2015/16 and 2016/17 financial years for the Perth Integrated Health, Swim Strong program.

2. Authorise the Chief Executive Officer to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding with Perth Integrated Health, Swim Strong program for a two year period 2015/17 which will include an annual review of outcomes.

ATTACHMENTS

There are no attachments for this report.
5.1 - MASTER PLAN FOR THE AREA BOUND BY JULL STREET, PROSPECT ROAD AND CHURCH AVENUE.

At the Ordinary Council Meeting of 10 August 2015, Cr Butterfield referred the following matter to the Community Services Committee:

“That the matter of a Master Plan for the area bound by Jull Street, Prospect Road and Church Avenue, be referred to the Community Services Committee.”

Comment from Cr Butterfield

Over recent years the City of Armadale has undertaken the Master Planning of community and sporting hubs in order to ensure that any redevelopment of these precincts occurs in a considered and cost effective way.

Master planning of the area bound by Jull Street, Prospect Road and Church Avenue, has not yet occurred. The relationship and future uses of this and the City’s ‘Civic Precinct’ have not been clearly articulated or strategically planned. Strategic planning and long term vision is extremely important particularly in a city centre. I would recommend a review of the City’s land use plan and vision for the Civic Precinct (including the area containing the District Hall and the Visitor’s Centre) before any large building projects are undertaken.

Officer Comment

Nil.

RECOMMEND

To be determined.

ATTACHMENTS

There are no attachments for this report.
COUNCILLORS' ITEMS

Nil

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR COMMUNITY SERVICES REPORT

Nil
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