

ITEMS FOR DEBATE COUNCIL MEETING 25 JANUARY 2022

ADOPTION BY EXCEPTION RESOLUTION

RECOMMENDATION

That the Committee Recommendations for items 12.1 and the Officer Recommendations for items 16.1, 16.2. 17.1 and 17.2 be adopted en bloc:

	-
12.1	Airport Advisory Committee – 14/12/2022 – BUSSELTON MARGARET RIVER AIRPORT – OPERATIONS UPDATE
16.1	FINANCIAL ACTIVITY STATEMENTS – YEAR TO DATE AS AT 30 NOVEMBER 2022
16.2	LIST OF PAYMENTS MADE – NOVEMBER 2022
17.1	LOCALITY BOUNDARY AMENDMENT – VASSE/KEALY
17.2	COUNCILLORS' INFORMATION BULLETIN

ITEMS TO BE DEALT WITH BY SEPARATE RESOLUTION (WITHOUT DEBATE)

Item No.	Item Title	Reason
15.1	BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT, EVENTS AND MARKETING PROGRAM (BDEMP) – BUSSELTON FRINGE FESTIVAL FUNDING 2022/23 - 2023/24	Disclosure of Impartiality Interest – Cr Paine
16.4	ESTABLISHMENT OF CEO PERFORMANCE REVIEW COMMITTEE Supplementary Agenda	Absolute Majority Required

ITEMS FOR DEBATE

Item N 12.2	-	Policy and Legislation Committee - 9/11/2022 - LOCAL PLANNING POLICY REVIEW : ADOPTION FOLLOWING CONSULTATION - LPP 1.5 COASTAL	Pulled by Cr Ryan	Page 1
		SETBACKS		
ALTERN	ATIVE	RECOMMENDATION		
That the	Coun	cil:		
		nt to Clause 4, Part 2 of Schedule 2 – Deemed Provision as of the Planning and Development (Local Planning Sc		0
a	dopt a	s final LPP 1.5 Coastal Setbacks, as set out at Attachm	ent A; and	
a S	iccorda icheme	a notice of adoption in a newspaper circulating withir once with Clause 4, Part 2 of Schedule 2 – Deemed Pro- es of the Planning and Development (Local Planning Sc icy set out in 1 above.	visions for Local P	lanning
1. F	Retain	the current existing policy;		
2. I	Reques	st a report comes back to Council within the next six m	onths which addr	esses:
	a.	Why LPP1.5 Draft Policy should/ should not be re-ad only to advertise but the potential of any SAT appeal from possible affected landholders;		-
	b.	The rationale why the current policy should be revok affected by relaxed setbacks;	ed and ramification	ons to lot
	c.	Why the Draft Policy, resolved to be advertised in No long to come to Council for final consideration;	ovember 2020, ha	s taken so
	d.	Why an approval was given by the City of Busselton l removal thereof).	based on a Draft F	Policy (or
t	thereo	e that Planning Staff are not to be using Draft Policy LI f) under any circumstances until such time as Council it does.		
REASON	IS FOR	ALTERNATIVE		
Reason í Regulati	1: Cour ons 20	ncil has three options under the Planning and Developm 15. It can retain the existing policy, modify the policy r hanges to be re-advertised; or revoke the policy in its e	ecommended to b	-
		s than 2% response from 600/700 ratepayers was om 11 parties were received in relation to the propo		

Reason 3: It appears that 946B Geographe Bay Road Geographe has been approved pre-empting approval of this Draft Policy. Under the Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015 "the local Government must first resolve to proceed with the policy and the local government must publish notice of the policy in accordance with clause 87. A policy has effect on publication of a notice...". Considering this policy has not yet reached this point, delegated authority should not have been applied.

properties affected are not insignificant.

OFFICER COMMENT

As well as providing some brief comment on the substantive issues, it is first considered necessary to comment on the drafting of the proposed alternative recommendation, as in its current form it would not appear to achieve its stated objectives.

With respect to the opening part of the proposed alternative motion, it needs to read 'that the Council', not 'that the City'. That is because it is intended as a resolution of the Council and, in addition, the powers of the local government in relation to local planning policies are powers of the Council.

With respect to points one and three of the proposed alternative motion, should the Council wish to retain the current policy and not have the draft policy considered in relation to the assessment of development applications, point one would need to be redrafted and, should that occur, point three would become redundant. Point one should be redrafted as follows –

"1. Pursuant to Clause 4, Part 2 of Schedule 2 – Deemed Provisions for Local Planning Schemes of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015* resolve not to proceed with draft LPP 1.5 Coastal Setbacks, as set out at Attachment A;"

That is because the Regulations set out that, when a draft local planning policy has been subject of consultation, and is being considered by a Council of a local government after consultation, the Council must (under Clause 4 (3) (b) of Schedule 2) -

"b) resolve to —

(i) proceed with the policy without modification; or(ii) proceed with the policy with modification; or(iii) not to proceed with the policy."

The effect of Cr Ryan's proposed wording would be such that the draft local planning policy would, in a formal sense, remain a draft local planning policy, and would therefore need to be considered by the City in relation to the assessment of development applications, notwithstanding any Council resolution consistent with point 3. That is because the provisions of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015* require consideration of draft local planning policies, as long as they remain draft local planning policies. Specifically, clause 67 (2) of the Regulations sets out that, amongst other things –

"In considering an application for development approval...the local government is to have due regard to the following matters...including any...proposed planning instrument that the local government is seriously considering adopting or approving."

A draft local planning policy that the Council has formally adopted as a draft, but not formally decided not to proceed with, would remain a draft local planning policy, and therefore would also remain a proposed planning instrument that the local government is seriously considering adopting or approving. Should the Council be so minded, that issue could be overcome by resolving not to proceed with the draft local planning policy, as set out above, and would then mean that it could not be considered in relation to the assessment of development applications, as it would no longer be a draft local planning policy. As already noted, that would also render point 3 redundant.

Such a decision would result in the existing LPP 1.5 remaining in effect. There are, however, elements of the existing LPP 1.5 that are no longer consistent with State level planning legislation and policy, and are therefore no longer able to be considered, as the State level documents prevail to the extent of the inconsistency. Most importantly, clause 4.3 of the existing LPP 1.5 sets out 'performance criteria' to be considered in applying the policy. Under the current version of Volume 1 of *State Planning Policy 7.3 – Residential Design Codes* (R-Codes), however, local planning policies can only amend or replace the 'deemed-to-comply' provisions of the R-Codes, they cannot amend or replace the 'design principles' (which are the equivalent of what were called 'performance criteria' in an earlier version of the R-Codes).

With respect to point 2 of the proposed alternative motion, most of these matters have already been outlined and addressed in the report, and/or in response to questions from Councillors when the matter was considered by the Policy and Legislation Committee, and subsequently in response to questions from Councillors in association with the Council's 21 December 2022 and 25 January 2023 ordinary meetings. With respect to sub-points (c) and (d) specifically, however, it is advised that –

- The reason the draft local planning policy was not presented to the Council after advertising prior to December 2022 is simply down to resources, workload and prioritisation there is no further information that can be provided with respect to that matter; and
- As noted above, pursuant to clause 67 (2) of the Regulations, draft local planning policies must be considered by the City in relation to the assessment of development applications, and the existing policy does not and in fact cannot set out inflexible or un-variable standards.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ADMINISTRATION) REGULATIONS REQUIREMENT

Pursuant to regulation 11(da) of the *Local Government (Administration) Regulations* 1996, if the amended recommendation is adopted by Council, the above Reasons will be recorded in the Minutes.

Item No.	Policy and Legislation Committee - 9/11/2022 - LOCAL	Pulled by	Page 13
12.2	PLANNING POLICY REVIEW : ADOPTION FOLLOWING	Cr Riccelli	
	CONSULTATION - LPP 1.5 COASTAL SETBACKS		

ALTERNATIVE RECOMMENDATION

That the Council:

- Pursuant to Clause 4, Part 2 of Schedule 2 Deemed Provisions for Local Planning Schemes of the Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015 resolve not to proceed with draft adopt as final-LPP 1.5 Coastal Setbacks, as set out at Attachment A; and
- Publish a notice of adoption in a newspaper circulating within the Scheme area in accordance with Pursuant to Clause 4, Part 2 of Schedule 2 – Deemed Provisions for Local Planning Schemes of the Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015 adopt draft LPP 1.5 Coastal Setbacks as a draft for advertising, as set out at Attachment A.of the Policy set out in 1 above.

REASONS FOR ALTERNATIVE

Council resolved to initiate amendments to LPP 1.5 on Nov 11, 2020, whereby a public consultation period ensued, and letters were sent out in February 2021. Given that there is a delay of nearly two years and there appears to be confusion by affected parties, as to the intent and scope of these modifications, a second public consultation seems appropriate in this instance. As the legislation does not allow for readvertising of a draft local planning policy, in order to achieve that, the Council must close out the earlier process by resolving not to adopt the draft policy, and restart the process, by adopting the policy as a draft for consultation a second time – after which it can be further considered by the Council.

OFFICER COMMENT

The wording of the proposed alternative recommendation would enable the proposed change to planning controls to be readvertised and then further considered by the Council after advertising.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ADMINISTRATION) REGULATIONS REQUIREMENT

Pursuant to regulation 11(da) of the *Local Government (Administration) Regulations* 1996, if the amended recommendation is adopted by Council, the above Reasons will be recorded in the Minutes.

Item No.	COUNCIL MEMBERSHIP – GEO CATCH	Pulled by	Page
16.3		Officers	101
		Disclosure of	
		Financial	
		Interest-	
		Cr Paine	

AMENDED RECOMMENDATION

That the Council nominates Cr Ross Paine as an ex officio member of the GeoCatch board, noting appointment is subject to approval of the minister.

REASONS FOR AMENDMENT

The GeoCatch membership is reserved for the Mayor or their representative, and does not require Ministerial approval for appointment.

The amended recommendation reflects the membership process.

OFFICER COMMENT

As above.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ADMINISTRATION) REGULATIONS REQUIREMENT

Pursuant to regulation 11(da) of the *Local Government (Administration) Regulations* 1996, if the amended recommendation is adopted by Council, the above Reasons will be recorded in the Minutes.