



# Shire of Pingelly

## Minutes

Special Council Meeting  
29 February 2016

**SHIRE OF PINGELLY**

**Minutes of the Ordinary Council Meeting of the Shire of Pingelly held in the Council Chambers, 17 Queen Street, Pingelly on 29 February 2016.**

**Contents**

1.	DECLARATION OF OPENING / ANNOUNCEMENT OF VISITORS .....	3
1.1	Acknowledgement of Country .....	3
1.2	Reminder.....	3
2.	RECORD OF APOLOGIES / APPROVED LEAVE OF ABSENCE .....	3
3.	RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS PUBLIC QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE.....	3
4.	PUBLIC QUESTION TIME .....	4
5.	APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE .....	4
6.	DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST .....	4
7.	ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PRESIDING PERSON WITHOUT DISCUSSION .....	4
8.	PETITIONS / DEPUTATIONS / PRESENTATIONS / SUBMISSIONS .....	4
9.	REPORTS OF OFFICERS .....	5
9.1	OFFICE OF THE CEO.....	5
	9.1.1 Tender RFT 02 – 2015/16 Architectural Services Pingelly Recreation and Cultural Centre (PRACC) .....	5
	9.1.2 Emergency Assistance – Shire of Harvey Bush Fires .....	15
10.	ELECTED MEMBERS MOTIONS OF WHICH PREVIOUS NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN .....	16
11.	NEW BUSINESS OF AN URGENT NATURE INTRODUCED BY DECISION OF MEETING..	16
12.	CLOSURE OF MEETING .....	16

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Cr SJ Lange	President
Cr WV Mulroney	Deputy President
Cr RJ Marshall	
Cr DI Freebairn	
Cr LN Steel	
Cr M Walton-Hassell	
Cr E Hodges	

**STAFF IN ATTENDANCE**

Mr G Pollock	Chief Executive Officer
Mr B Gibbs	Director Technical Services
Ms G French	Director Corporate & Community Services
Mrs L Boddy	Executive Assistant
Mr C McLennan	Project Manager (from 8.06am to 9.21am)

**APOLOGIES**

Cr AJ Morton

**OBSERVERS & VISITORS**

Nil

**1. DECLARATION OF OPENING / ANNOUNCEMENT OF VISITORS**

The Chairman, Cr Shirley Lange, declared the meeting open at 8.05am.

**1.1 Acknowledgement of Country**

I respectfully acknowledge the past and present traditional owners of this land on which we are meeting, the Noongar people. It is a privilege to be standing on Noongar country. I also acknowledge the contributions of Aboriginal Australians and non-Aboriginal Australians to the security and wellbeing of all the people of this country where we live and that we share together – Australia.

**1.2 Reminder**

“It takes a team to make the dream work” Dr John Maxwell.

Craig McLennan entered the meeting at 8.06am.

**2. RECORD OF APOLOGIES / APPROVED LEAVE OF ABSENCE**

Cr Aaron Morton was granted leave from the 27<sup>th</sup> February to the 19<sup>th</sup> March 2016.

**3. RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS PUBLIC QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE**

Nil

**4. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

No members of the public in attendance.

**5. APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE**

Nil

**6. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST**

Item 9.1.1 – Cr Walton-Hassell

Item 9.1.1 – Cr Steel

Item 9.1.1 – Cr Hodges

**7. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PRESIDING PERSON WITHOUT DISCUSSION**

Nil

**8. PETITIONS / DEPUTATIONS / PRESENTATIONS / SUBMISSIONS**

Nil

Prior to consideration of item 9.1.1 Cr Hodges disclosed an impartiality due to an indirect financial interest.

Prior to consideration of item 9.1.1 Cr Walton-Hassell disclosed an impartiality due to being a member of the PRACC Focus Group and knowing one of the tenderers, Judith McDougall.

Prior to consideration of item 9.1.1, Cr Steel disclosed a financial interest in this matter due to being the Manager of the Pingelly Community Resource Centre who received payment to print digital documents and deliver them to the Shire. Cr Steel asked the meeting to allow her to continue to participate in discussions as she believed her interest was miniscule and unlikely to influence her conduct in relation to this matter.

Cr Steel left the room at 8.09am.

**11956 Moved: Cr Walton-Hassell                      Seconded:    Cr Mulroney  
That Cr Steel be allowed to return to the meeting.**

**Carried 6:0**

Cr Steel returned to the meeting at 8.10am.

## **9. REPORTS OF OFFICERS**

### **9.1 OFFICE OF THE CEO**

#### **9.1.1 Tender RFT 02 – 2015/16 Architectural Services Pingelly Recreation and Cultural Centre (PRACC)**

**File Reference:** 0661  
**Location:** Shire of Pingelly  
**Applicant:** Shire of Pingelly  
**Author:** Gavin Pollock, Chief Executive Officer  
**Date:** 25 February 2016  
**Disclosure of Interest:** Nil  
**Attachments:** Tender Submission from Iredale Pedersen Hook Architects (Attachment 1 behind blue sheet under separate cover)

#### **Summary:**

Council to consider the attached Officers report regarding the issue, review, and recommendation of an architectural firm to be engaged and deliver architectural services for the Pingelly Recreation and Cultural Centre (PRACC).

#### **Background:**

In May 2015 at the ordinary Meeting of Council the concept plans for the draft Sport and Recreation Plan were endorsed by Council as follows;

11781 - Moved: Cr Mulroney                      Seconded: Cr Jetta

#### **Recommendation and Council Decision:**

*That Council Endorse;*

- *the Concept Drawings for the New Recreation and Cultural Centre provided by the University of Western Australia (UWA) on behalf of the Sport and Recreation Focus Group.*
- *the Shire President and Chief Executive Officer to actively seek and enter into grant funding arrangements including the development of partnership opportunities for funding contributions for the New Recreation and Cultural Centre.*
- *All public comment received before the 26 June 2015 to be considered when developing the building concept drawing to final construction plans with costing for council's endorsement.*
- *the Chief Executive Officer to advise the Pingelly Tennis and Bowling Clubs that the existing Tennis and Bowling Club rooms will not be decommissioned before the New Recreation and Cultural Centre is constructed and commissioned for each club's use.*
- *the Chief Executive Officer is to gain Council endorsement before commencing any demolition of the existing Pavilion, Community Centre, Tennis or Bowling Club Rooms.*
- *the Chief Executive Officer is to gain Council endorsement before commencing the construction of the New Recreation and Cultural Centre.*

*Carried: 7:0*

Following Council's support of the PRACC Concept it was release to the community for comment via the Sport and Recreation Focus Group prior to Council's consideration endorsement of the Concept Drawings.

At the Ordinary Meeting of Council on 18 November 2015, the floor plan was presented to Council by the Sport and Recreation Focus Group and endorsed by Council as follows;

11902 - Moved: Cr Mulroney                      Seconded: Cr Walton-Hassell

*Recommendation and Council Decision:*

*That Council Endorse;*

- *the Pingelly Recreation and Cultural Centre Building Floor Plan DWG – S03 Dated 12-11-2015 provided by the University of Western Australia (UWA) on behalf of the Sport and Recreation Focus Group.*
- *the Chief Executive Officer further develop the Pingelly Recreation and Cultural Centre Building Floor Plan DWG – S03 Dated 12-11-2015 with the required specifications and documentation ready for calling the construction tenders.*

Carried 8:0

### **TENDER ASSESSMENT REPORT**

#### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The Shire advertised a “Request for Tender” (RFT) number 2 -2015 / 16 for “Architectural Services. Architectural design, documentation, and project delivery services for Pingelly’s Recreation and Cultural Centre” in the West Australian newspaper and the Pingelly Times.

18 Submissions were received. One was disregarded because it was received after the specified Deadline.

The Assessment Team undertook a Compliance Check, and a Qualitative Criteria assessment which included an investigation of the tenderers capacity to undertake the Project, as well as their understanding of the project.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

That the Council enters into a contract with Iredale Pedersen Hook Architects for the consideration of \$249,173.33 (Ex GST).

#### **PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT**

This Report documents the procedure undertaken by the Shire officers and makes a recommendation to Council to enter into a contract with the preferred Tenderer.

#### **ADVERTISING**

The Shire advertised a “Request for Tender” (RFT) 2 -2015 / 16 for “Architectural Services. Architectural design, documentation, and project delivery services for Pingelly’s Recreation and Cultural Centre” in the West Australian newspaper on Saturday 6 and 13 February 2016. The RFT was also advertised in the local Pingelly Times on Tuesday 9 February 2016.

#### **TENDER DOCUMENTS**

In summary, the Tenderers were asked to:

- Make an offer
- Complete Compliance Criteria
- Provide insurance details
- Answer Qualitative Criteria
- Provide referees
- Complete a building costs spreadsheet

### LODGEMENT AND OPENING OF TENDERS

Submissions were to be lodged by hand or by mail and were placed in the locked Shire Tender Box. Any submissions received after the Deadline of 10.30am 22 February (one off) were rejected.

17 Submissions were received prior to the Deadline.

The Opening of the Tender box was undertaken by Barry Gibbs (DTS) Shire of Pingelly, the recording of the Tenderers was undertaken by Craig McLennan (PM) Shire of Pingelly, and the procedures were also witnessed by John Bayly (ICE) Independent Civil Engineer. Also a representative from DWA architects - Herarn Perera - witnessed the procedures.

The Tender Box was unlocked and each Tender was recorded on the Tender sheet. These entries were subsequently transferred into the Tender Register.

### CONFLICT OF INTERESTS

Each Assessor signed a document declaring they had no conflict of interest that would affect their review of the Submissions or affect their decision.

### REVIEW OF TENDERS

Each submission was independently assessed against the Quantative Criteria by the RFT Review Team consisting of Gavin Pollock (CEO), Barry Gibbs (DTS), Craig McLennan (PM) and John Bayly (ICE). Mr Bayly was engaged for his specialist abilities and experience in assessing Tenders within Local Government over the past 30 years.

The combined weighted scores obtained were entered into the standard Western Australian Local Government Association (WALGA) Tender Review Document and a ranking from one to 17 was determined:

**RANKING TABLE**

	Tenderer	TOTAL weighted score	TOTAL weighted score	TOTAL weighted score	TOTAL weighted score	GRAN D TOTAL	RANKING
1	DWA Architects Pty Ltd	54.5	62.0	64.0	49.0	57.4	15
2	Donovan Payne	41.0	64.0	89.0	74.5	67.1	11
3	Hodge Collard Preston	59.0	79.5	81.0	78.5	74.5	5
4	Slavin Architects	84.0	77.5	86.5	65.0	78.3	4
5	Site Architecture Studio	63.5	83.0	79.0	65.0	72.6	9
6	MCG Architects	73.5	88.5	75.0	91.5	82.1	1
7	Judith McDougall	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.5	0.1	17
8	<b>Iredale Pedersen Hook</b>	<b>82.0</b>	<b>85.5</b>	<b>80.0</b>	<b>75.5</b>	<b>80.8</b>	<b>2</b>
9	Vittino Ashe	62.5	67.0	75.5	88.0	73.3	7
10	Holton Connor	63.5	74.5	80.5	69.0	71.9	10
11	Paul Meschiati & Ass Pty Ltd	50.5	44.0	63.5	30.0	47.0	16
12	Lycopodium	49.0	68.5	66.5	50.0	58.5	14
13	HMA Architects	64.5	67.5	73.5	54.5	65.0	12
14	ADC Projects	63.0	80.0	67.5	81.5	73.0	8
15	H+H Architects	67.5	76.5	81.0	70.0	73.8	6
16	Cameron Chisholm Nicol	73.0	81.0	92.0	69.5	78.9	3
17	Rob Anson Architects	54.0	59.5	65.0	58.5	59.3	13

**FURTHER REVIEWS**

The top ten ranked submissions were revisited and scrutinised in greater depth. This review resulted in a reorganising of the Submissions based on the concept of “Best Value” for the Principal.

The top five were then reviewed again and, finally, the number one submission was critiqued in even greater depth. This included a review of the costings against the three QS assessments obtained by the Shire.

One submission withstood this critique and subsequently is the recommended Contractor.

**Comment:**

The Shire advertised the Request For Tender (RFT) and received 55 requests for documents. Five of these were second requests and one was from a timber engineering company. At the specified Deadline, the Shire had received 17 submissions. A later submission was eliminated as it did not satisfy the requirement of the Deadline as specified in the RFT.

The submissions were each independently assessed by the RFT Review Team consisting of Gavin Pollock (CEO), Barry Gibbs (DTS), Craig McLennan (PM) and John Bayly (ICE). Mr Bayly was engaged for his specialist abilities and experience in assessing Tenders within Local Government over the past 30 years.

**NOTES OF ASSESSMENT**

This section is prepared as providing feedback to the Tenderers.

Note: No other Tenderer is specifically referred to.

1. DWA Architects Pty Ltd
  - DWA highlighted two examples (and five unrelated building types) in their Submission, viz: Harvey Agricultural College and the Swan Valley Community School.
  - DWA's portfolio was eclipsed by other Tenderers. This is reflected in the Ranking.
2. Donovan Payne
  - Award winning architect for their aquatic centres. Olympic stadium, new wave pool, and Beatty Park refurbishment.
  - Very little experience demonstrated for buildings of the scope and complexity of the PRACC.
  - Not the Preferred Tenderer.
3. Hodge Collard Preston Architects (HCPA)
  - HCPA presented a good submission despite the images being small and mostly untitled.
  - The document referred to "...the City's specific requirements..." and Project timeline was cut and pasted from the "Quinns / Mindarie" project.
  - Overall, the submission, in comparison to the other Tenderers, did not fully convince the Assessors and the ranking of 5<sup>th</sup> demonstrated this consideration.
4. Slavin Architects
  - Good submission liked by Assessors.
  - Prior to preparing the submission, the two directors of the company visited the site with Pingelly's Project Manager. This effort was reflected in the quality of the submission.
  - There was some discussion by the Assessors as to whether the submission was "complete" as the costing document was submitted only on a thumb drive. It was decided to revisit this issue should it represent an unfair advantage with respect to the other Submissions and /or the weighted criteria showed a ranking of "1".
  - However, closer scrutiny revealed costings appeared incomplete and the Assessors considered that other submissions demonstrated better experience with the building type and its requirements.
5. Site Architecture Studio
  - This submission elicited the widest differential in marks by the Assessors.
  - The issues were the addition of unrequested information and the lack of timber construction.
  - The company has a good array of buildings but, ultimately, not to the extent of the preferred tenderer.

## 6. MCG Architects

- Good submission demonstrating built works for a variety of Shires valued between \$400,000 to \$5.5M.
- In addition, two projects were noted to be “Completed based on another design”, and three have not been undertaken due to budget issues.
- In reviewing the cost spreadsheet, it was noted that there were “Design Contingencies” of \$966,002 and allowances for Professional and Contract Management fees of \$1,110,902
- The Panel, in reviewing the cost issues above against the other Submissions, were not confident that the price submitted and the design could be achieved within the stated budget for the Works.
- Accordingly, the submission was rejected because:
  - \$1.1M of professional fees on a \$6M project
  - Did not represent the greatest advantage for the Principal

## 7. Judith McDougall

- McDougall is a Building Designer located in Narrogin
- The two page submission only addressed the issues of the cost for services.
- The Panel agreed that the submission could not demonstrate an adequate understanding of the requirements and the scope of the works.
- The RFT notes that the Principal is not bound to accept the lowest Quotation.

## 8. Iredale Pedersen Hook (IPH)

- **IPH are a multi award winning architecture practice. Seven of their awards relate to timber design and use.**
- **Images of their work demonstrate originality and excitement in their design.**
- **They have considerable experience and**
- **Are noted to have a very good portfolio in timber and lightweight building.**
- **Many of those buildings have been delivered in isolated and arid conditions.**
- **IPH cite, on page 27, four projects that range between 12 and 29% under budget and on time.**
- **In checking this submission as the preferred Tenderer, the costings were scrutinised against the three QS figures the Shire has obtained. In all cases the figures were sound.**
- **Also noted was IPH's timeline and factors affecting the delivery of the Works. The latter was rarely addressed in the other submissions.**
- **It is noted that considerable negotiation is involved in their designs – particularly with indigenous groups.**

## 9. Vittino Ashe

- Vittino Ashe is the formal entity with whom the Principal would contract.
- A three way group made up of Patrick Beale of Advanced Timber Concepts, Marco Vitino of Vittino Ashe, and the architectural firm of Gresley Abas.
- Concerns were raised about the structure of the entity and with whom the actual control of the enterprise would rest. The question was asked if Gresley Abas had lodged a submission as they appeared to be the main contributor.
- Given ATC and Vittino Ashe have been heavily involved in the project thus far, it was disappointing that the submission did not make more of this knowledge and the potentials of the project.
- Accordingly, this was represented in the Ranking.
- (Note: While not part of the Quantative Criteria, a review of the fee submitted indicated that it would be the second most expensive.)

#### 10. Holton Connor

- This practise has a demonstrated ability to deliver sporting and community facilities.
- Unfortunately, they did not take the opportunity to submit any projects that had significant timber components or delivered outside of major city regions.
- The Assessors considered the practise demonstrated their competence and capacity in their submission, but did not convince the Assessors of their capability to deliver the Scope required for the Project.

#### 11. Paul Meschiati & Ass Pty Ltd

- Meschiati took a great deal of interest in the quality of the pre submission questions asked and the submission was looked forward to in anticipation.
- However, compared to the other submission, it ranked low.
- Ultimately, the combination of a low score in comparison to the other tenderers and a not having an architectural registration saw other Tenderers preferred.

#### 12. Lycopodium

- It was noted that in the “Background” part of the submission was slightly modified text taken from the RFT.
- Under “Demonstrated Experience”, the projects were: One Life saving club, three Main Roads projects, and an Active Open Space plan. While other projects are noted, there appears to be none reflecting the complexities and uniqueness of the PRACC.
- Lycopodium were not considered the preferred Tenderer.

#### 13. HMA Architects

- HMA is a Bunbury based Practice of four people.
- Their portfolio is of interesting and diverse projects but none that represent the complexities and uniqueness of the PRACC.
- Consequently, HMA were not considered the preferred Tenderer.

#### 14. ADC Projects

- The highlight of this submission is the project ADC have undertaken in Beverley for the new Recreation Ground Pavilion. But apart from the Orelia Oval Pavilion, the other examples were for buildings of different uses.
- In addition, Brian Adcroft visited the site but failed to take advantage of this in his submission.
- ADC Projects offered two fee options: One for their estimate of the Construction cost and the other of the Shires estimate. This only confused the Submission.
- Overall, the Submission lacked demonstrated experience in relationship to the other Submissions.

#### 15. H+H Architects

- H+H is an Albany based practise and, as such, delivers a variety of works across the south of WA.
- The submission was hampered by a very small text, uncited images, and a poor selection of projects without indicated prices. For example, the Gnowangerup Community Civic Centre, Morgan Richards Community and Resource Centre, and the Gnowangerup Aboriginal Heritage Centre are all refurbishments of existing building.
- Accordingly, the Assessors considered the submission did not represent the best value to the Principal.

16. Cameron Chisholm Nicol (CCN)

- CCN is a powerhouse architect firm with many years of experience and have traded for over 100 years. Their biggest project lately has been the Perth Arena in conjunction with Ashton Raggat McDougall of Melbourne.
- Given the size of their projects, it is noted that CCN presented a very good submission.
- In comparing the Organisational Capacity with the Program, it was noted that they both finished at Week 22 which is the end of the Tender negotiations and Contract award.
- Under “Relevant Experience”, four projects were cited: Perth Arena, Mundaring Indoor Sports Facility, Carine Multi Sports and Recreation Facility, and the Perth Stadium. These were considered to be a poor selection due to their scope and value.
- Accordingly, when considered against the other submissions, the Assessors felt it the submission failed to demonstrate a complete grasp of the issues relating to this specific Project.

17. Rob Anson Architects

- Under the Demonstrated Experience criteria, Anson provided details of only one like building. The other projects, while significant in their own way, did not demonstrate a capacity to deliver a building within the Scope and unique aspect of the PRACC.
- The image of their office was noted by all Assessors who agreed it should not be included in their Submission.
- The Assessors considered the Practise as competent but not the preferred Tenderer.

18. Patterson Group

- While the submission was assessed by all assessors, it was ultimately disregarded because it was not lodged before the Deadline.

PRICE AVERAGE

The average price for all submissions, is \$279,986. This includes one of \$46,496, and the late tender of \$311,424.

Excluding these two, the modified average price is \$292,614.

The Tenderer Recommended provided a price of \$249,173.33 or \$43,441 below the modified average price.

SUMMARY

The preferred Tenderer is Iredale Pedersen Hook Architects;

1. Submission was balanced and well-presented, and demonstrated a level of consideration and understanding greater than the other Tenderers.
2. Demonstrated experience in timber design. Including seven awards for use of timber.
3. Demonstrated experience in delivery of buildings in and under arid conditions.
4. Demonstrated liaison with a variety of groups – including indigenous groups on cultural issues.
5. Currently working on Yagan Square.
6. Submission demonstrates understanding of project such as:
  - a. Design issues
  - b. Funding issues
7. Their price is acceptable at \$249,173.33

**PRICES SUBMITTED**

	Tenderer	General Notes Provide comment when score >3<	Lump sum price
1	DWA Architects Pty Ltd		\$248,000
2	Donovan Payne		\$356,000
3	Hodge Collard Preston		\$368,750
4	Slavin Architects		\$279,480
5	Site Architecture Studio		\$212,497
6	MCG Architects		\$288,600
7	Judith McDougall	Did not supply any supporting documents.	\$46,496
<b>8</b>	<b>Iredale Pedersen Hook</b>		<b>\$249,173</b>
9	Vittino Ashe	Partnership Tender ATC Studio, Vittino Ashe & Gresley Abas (Included Consultancy Rates)	\$524,418
10	Holton Connor		\$299,000
11	Paul Meschiati & Ass Pty Ltd		\$236,700
12	Lycopodium		\$282,000
13	HMA Architects		\$250,000
14	ADC Projects		\$212,112
15	H+H Architects		\$316,400
16	Cameron Chisholm Nicol		\$288,705
17	Rob Anson Architects		\$270,000
18	Patterson Group	Late Tender	\$311,424

**Consultation:**

Specifically for the RFT assessment:

John Bayly – Independent Civil Engineer (ICE)

Gavin Pollock - Chief Executive Officer (CEO) Shire of Pingelly

Barry Gibbs - Director Technical Services (DTS) Shire of Pingelly

Craig McLennan - Project Manager (PM) Shire of Pingelly

The Tender Iredale Pedersen Hook Architects provided two Referees in the Tender document being;

Toni Tonkin – Senior Project Manager, Department of Education

Mike Hessel – Asset Manager Planning & Procurement, Department of the Attorney General

Referees were contacted and both provided strong, supportive, detailed and positive information to support the quality of work and statements made within the Tender document. Reference statements provided to Councillors under commercial confidentiality.

**Statutory Environment:**

*Local Government Act 1995*

*Local Government (Functions and General) Regulations 1996, Provision of goods and services Part 4. Tenders for providing goods or services (s. 3.57) Division 2*

**Regulation 11. When tenders have to be publicly invited**

*(1) Tenders are to be publicly invited according to the requirements of this Division before a local government enters into a contract for another person to supply goods or services if the consideration under the contract is, or is expected to be, more, or worth more, than \$150 000...*

**Policy Implications:**

Nil as the process is conducted as per Council Policy Manual part 5.11 Purchasing Policy

**Financial Implications:**

As part of the 2015/16 Budget review Council endorsed that \$300,000 be transferred from the Building, Land & Recreation Reserve and allocated under GL1186, Job Number RCC02 Architectural Services for the Pingelly Recreation and Cultural Centre (PRACC). No expenditure has been allocated to this account to date.

Preferred Tenderers price: \$249,173.33 (Ex GST) and will have expenditure allocated over the 2015/16 and 2016/17 financial years.

**Strategic Implications:**

Compliments the Community Strategic Plan with colocation of sporting infrastructure as per the Recreation and Cultural plan for the reserve.

**Voting Requirements:**

Absolute Majority

**11957 Moved: Cr Mulroneu                      Seconded:    Cr Marshall**

**Recommendation and Council Decision:**

**That Council endorse the Officers recommendation to award Tender RFT 02 – 2015/16 Architectural Services for the Pingelly Recreation and Cultural Centre (PRACC) to Iredale Pedersen Hook Architects for the consideration of \$249,173.33 (Ex GST) and authorise the Chief Executive Office to enter and sign the required contract documents for engagement.**

**11958 Moved: Cr Steel                              Seconded:    Cr Hodges**

**To suspend the meeting 8.15am so discussions for further clarification can take place regarding the awarding of the tender.**

Cr Marshall left the room at 8.59am and returned at 9am.

Lisa Boddy left the meeting at 9.16am and returned at 9.18am.

The meeting resumed 9.20am.

**Carried 7:0**

Craig McLennan left the meeting at 9.21am

### **9.1.2 Emergency Assistance – Shire of Harvey Bush Fires**

**File Reference:** 00083  
**Location:** 16 Eliot Street Pingelly  
**Applicant:** Gavin Pollock – Chief Executive Officer  
**Author:** Gavin Pollock – Chief Executive Officer  
**Date:** 24 February 2016  
**Disclosure of Interest:** Nil  
**Attachments:** WALGA – INFOPAGE 13 January 2016 (Attachment 2 behind yellow sheet under separate cover)  
**Previous Reference:** Nil

#### **Summary:**

That the Shire of Pingelly Council consider taking 16 Eliot Street Pingelly off the market and via WALGA offer the property as available for a family who has had a significant loss as a result of the Shire of Harvey bush fires.

#### **Background:**

On the 13<sup>th</sup> January 2016 the Shire of Harvey via WALGA requested assistance following the devastating fires experienced being the worst experienced in the past 50 years.

Assistance was requested in the way of donations to the Lord Mayor's Disaster Relief Fund or by providing staff resources, plant and equipment.

#### **Comment:**

The property would be offered in the first instance to a family and subject to all normal rental reference checks and lease agreements being in place.

The tenants would be responsible for all utilities costs they incur plus conducting normal gardening / property maintenance. The Shire would undertake the normal property repairs and maintenance as required of the landlord.

The providing of the house at 16 Eliot Street would be offered instead of making a financial contribution to the Lord Mayor's Disaster Relief Fund.

#### **Statutory Environment:**

Tenancy Act and the Local Government Act 1995.

#### **Policy Implications:**

Nil

#### **Financial Implications:**

The 205/16 budget would be adjusted to reflect the removal of the sale income and asset disposal. As the property would be offered with 12 months free rent no income would be budgeted for in the 2016/17 financial year.

With 16 Eliot Street not being sold at this point in time would see money budgeted in 2015/16 for allocation to the Building and Infrastructure Reserve deferred until a later date.

As part of the recommendation Council will be asked to allocate \$15,000 to 16 Eliot Street to undertake some minor repairs, upgrades and landscaping to make the property more presentable.

**Strategic Implications:**

Will bring a new family to town that will impact on the community socially and economically.

**Voting Requirements:**

Absolute Majority

**11959 Moved: Cr Freebairn                      Seconded:    Cr Walton-Hassell**

**Recommendation and Council Decision:**

**That Council:**

1. remove 16 Eliot Street Pingelly from the market for sale and via WALGA offer the property as available for a family who has experienced a significant loss as a result of the Shire of Harvey Bush Fires.
2. amend the 2015/16 financial budget to reflect the non-sale of 16 Eliot Street Pingelly and allocate \$15,000 to the building maintenance account for the property to undergo minor repairs, upgrades and landscaping works to make the property more presentable and useable. The \$15,000 to be allocated from surplus funds identified during the 2015/16 Budget Review.
3. endorse the Chief Executive Officer providing a 12 month tenancy agreement for 16 Eliot Street Pingelly at a rental value of \$0.00 and that any extensions of the tenancy agreement after the first 12 months will then be charged at a reasonable rental rate in line with the Pingelly rental market.

**Carried 7:0**

**10. ELECTED MEMBERS MOTIONS OF WHICH PREVIOUS NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN**

**11960 Moved: Cr Steel                      Seconded: Cr Walton-Hassell**

That Council support the Chief Executive Officer’s request to increase staffing resources only in the short term to deliver the large number of additional projects over and above normal business. To achieve this that Council approve an unbudgeted amount of up to \$20,000 be allocated to staff wages and resources (2015/16 financial year).

**Carried 7:0**

**11. NEW BUSINESS OF AN URGENT NATURE INTRODUCED BY DECISION OF MEETING**

New business of an urgent nature introduced by decision of the meeting. Best practice provides that Council should only consider items that have been included on the Agenda (to allow ample time for Councillors to research prior to the meeting) and which have an Officer Report (to provide the background to the issue and a recommended decision).

**12. CLOSURE OF MEETING**

The Chairman declared the meeting closed at 9.40am.

<p>These minutes were confirmed by Council at the Ordinary Meeting held on 16 March 2016.</p>  <p>Signed.....  Presiding Person at the meeting at which the minutes were confirmed.</p>
---