



CITY of SWAN

MINUTES

SPECIAL MEETING OF ELECTORS

19 MAY 2014

MINUTES AVAILABLE ON THE WEBSITE

www.swan.wa.gov.au

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. OPENING	3
2. ATTENDANCE AND APOLOGIES	3
3. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE MAYOR	4
4. MEETING OPEN TO THE FLOOR	5
4.1 QUESTIONS AND STATEMENTS	5
4.2 MOTIONS	14
5. CLOSURE	17

1. OPENING

The Mayor welcomed those present and opened the meeting at 6.00pm.

2. ATTENDANCE AND APOLOGIES

Councillors:	Cr C Zannino	Mayor, Swan Valley/Gidgegannup Ward (Presiding Member)
	Cr M Wainwright	Deputy Mayor, Altone Ward
	Cr D Färdig	Altone Ward
	Cr D Lucas	Altone Ward
	Cr M Congerton	Ballajura Ward
	Cr M Haynes	Ballajura Ward
	Cr J McNamara	Ballajura Ward
	Cr D McDonnell	Ellenbrook Ward
	Cr M Elliott	Midland/Guildford Ward
	Cr S Gregorini	Midland/Guildford Ward
	Cr D Parasiliti	Midland/Guildford Ward
	Cr D Trease	Swan Valley/Gidgegannup Ward

Staff:	Mr M Foley	Chief Executive Officer
	Mr C Cameron	Executive Manager Corporate
	Mr J Coten	Executive Manager Operations
	Mr S Tan	Executive Manager Planning
	Mr M Bishop	Executive Manager Place
	Mr P Russell	Manager Statutory Planning
	Mr L Van der Linde	Place Leader, Midland
	Mr D Bruce	Manager Project Management
	Mr R Sao	Public Relations Co-ordinator
	Ms M Dolling	Media Relations Officer
	Ms M Dwyer	Governance Support Officer (Minute Clerk)

Absence: Nil

Apologies:	Cr N Cheung	Ellenbrook Ward
	Cr P Williams	Ellenbrook Ward
	Cr K Bailey	North Ward

Members of
the Public:

Registered Attendees (Residents)

Ms D Arvin, Guildford
Mr S Ashby, Woodbridge
Mr L Baxter, Guildford
Ms B Bradley, Woodbridge
Ms H Bradley, Guildford
Ms F Brand, Woodbridge
Mr G Brindle, Woodbridge
Ms B Biggs, Midland
Mr B Chester, Guildford
Mr M Copeman, Guildford

Ms S Dauth, Guildford
Ms C deSaxe, Guildford
Ms J Dewing, Guildford
Ms B Dundas, Guildford
Mr P Graham, Hazelmere
Mr B Haynes, Guildford
Ms C Hogan, Guildford
Mr S Hogan, Guildford
Mr P Irwin, Woodbridge
Mr I Johnson, Guildford
M D Kininmonth, Guildford
Mr K Knighton, Guildford
Ms K Langan, Guildford
Mr B Langlands, Guildford
Ms N Langlands, Guildford
Mr P Langlands, Guildford
Ms P Lannin, Guildford
Ms S McGlew, Midland
Ms A McKellar, Woodbridge
Mr R Mitchell, Guildford
Mr K Mounsher, Woodbridge
Ms N Nicolay, Guildford
Mr N Nicolay, Guildford
Ms S Nielsen-Harvey, South Guildford
Mr T Park, Guildford
Ms L Paterson, Guildford
Ms K Reynolds, Guildford
Ms M Roberts, Midland
Ms P Riarden, Guildford
Ms D Saunders, Guildford
Mr T Saunders, Guildford
Ms R Schweniz, Helena Valley
Ms T Slater, Woodbridge
Mr J Squire, Guildford
Mr P Stephenson, Guildford
Mr R Ten Seldam, Guildford
Ms A van Oosten, Ballajura

Registered Attendees (Other)

Ms J Genovese, Wattle Grove
B Frey, Bassendean
Ms C Schwerin, Helena Valley
Ms R Schwerin, Helena Valley

Media: 1

3. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE MAYOR

The Mayor introduced all Councillors present and made the following address:

"I welcome those present to this Special Meeting of Electors called under section 5.28 of the *Local Government Act 1995* to discuss the matters raised by the community.

The request for a special Meeting of Electors received by the City of Swan requested a meeting to discuss:

a) The meetings, motions and processes which led to the decision to remove two mature, public trees in Claymore Close, Guildford, and without community consultation contrary to the City's stated principle of community engagement and as expressly recommended by officer in this particular matter and contrary to the expert opinion sought by the City.

b) The transparency, accessibility and accountability of Council meetings and Councillors.

Under the Local Government Act these are the only items that the meeting can deal with tonight. If those in attendance have a question, statement or motion, it will need to relate to these matters.

As outlined in the Local Government Act, myself as the Mayor of the City of Swan will chair the meeting.

As the organiser of the request for the meeting, I give Mr Peter Langlands the first opportunity to address the meeting before inviting those listed on the register of electors wishing to address the meeting. Thereafter I will open the floor to further speakers.

Once all questions and statements have been canvassed, the meeting will move to any motions that the meeting wants to convey to Council.

In terms of voting, attendees have already been asked to register as electors on entry. I request that if there are any members of the public present that are not electors of the City of Swan that you refrain from voting or influencing the debate.

Where the vote is not significantly split, I will not require an actual count. Any successful motions from tonight's meeting will be considered by Council at its meeting on June 18.

4. MEETING OPEN TO THE FLOOR

4.1 QUESTIONS AND STATEMENTS

4.1.1 Mr Peter Langlands

The handling of the request to remove trees in Claymore Close has highlighted flaws in the current decision making process. The matter is about community consultation, evidence based decision making, transparent Council processes and how natural assets are valued. It is hoped that the meeting will raise motions to preserve natural heritage and strengthen democracy of local government.

Outlined the process in regard to the trees in Claymore Close, Guildford to date:

- On 22 January 2014 a petition was presented to Council*
- The tree was inspected by staff and a report prepared by an arborist who concluded that the trees posed a low risk and on 5 March 2014 a staff recommendation that the trees remain was presented to Council. Council voted unanimously in support of the recommendation.*

- *On 26 March a new motion to remove the trees passed 6-5. Community consultation was not sought.*
- *A rescission motion was considered on 16 April 2014 and lost 8-6. Community consultation was not sought.*

Surrounding residents did not know about the decisions of Council until door knocked. They indicated they were not in favour of the trees removal.

The principles of the City and the Local Government Act require Councils to be accountable to the community and ensure public participation in decision making.

A lot has been made of issues of risk; there is inherent risk in lives. Decisions should be based on evidence and not emotions.

In light of recent events, a forum on the value of urban green spaces was organised and the role of trees (and parks) was discussed. It is hoped the visions presented at the forum could be replicated in the City.

4.1.2 Mr Peter Stephenson

Guildford is a historic precinct and many building and places are historically significant. New developments and changes should be in sympathy with the character and historical context. Guildford is unique. Decisions should be made considering the whole, including heritage, environment and character.

The decision to remove the trees in Claymore Close cannot be considered minor and trees are part of the fabric of Guildford regardless of location.

All stakeholders should work together to maintain this character and policies, procedures and principles to ensure the preservation of Guildford should exist.

The petition was signed only by residents but they only represent a small percentage of the population of Guildford.

A Council commissioned expert provided a report that showed the trees are healthy, do not pose a significant risk, and no reason to remove them existed. Council originally accepted the report but later deemed it to be inaccurate without evidence. No opportunity was given to the arborist to respond.

Distinction needs to be made between perception and reality of risk and a 'knee-jerk' reaction should be avoided. It is necessary to consider consequences to the loss of character, amenity and loss of habitat if tree was removed.

Questions (received in writing):

- 1. Have you personally inspected the site?*
- 2. Do you have any evidence which contradicts the arborist's report?*
- 3. If you had some doubts about the accuracy of the report did you seek to clarify these points with the arborist?*

4. *In the absence of any evidence what basis do you have for not accepting the report?*
5. *If you felt that the trees should be removed why did you not adopt the recommendation in the report for wider community consultation?*
6. *How did you determine the risk associated with the trees?*
7. *Is legal advice given or available to Councillors? In particular advice about liabilities or potential consequences of actions or decisions?*

Mayor Zannino responded that he had visited the site, had no evidence to contradict the arborist report and did not seek to clarify the report. He advised that he represented every individual ratepayer in the City and was available to speak or meet with them. Following making the original decision, he was contacted by the residents of Claymore Close and met with them and they were unanimous in requesting the Rose Gum be removed. They provided photos of fallen limbs and discussed their concerns with him and requested he consider supporting their removal. He gave due consideration to a number of factors including the location and size of the park and determined he would support the removal of the trees. In this instance given the locality of the trees and minimal impact on a wider community he determined he was comfortable with the removal of the trees without wider community consultation. Should the tree be in a different location with a direct effect on a larger part of the community, he would consider public consultation to be required.

Cr Wainwright responded that he had not visited the site, had no evidence to contradict the arborist report and did not seek to clarify the report.

Cr Parasiliti advised that he had visited the site and was not satisfied with the arborist report that was provided to Council and that it did not assess the users of the park, through traffic or differing weather conditions and questioned the size of branches falling. He did not seek for it to be clarified. He believed that this was not a major park, was located in a cul de sac with 11 residences, and did not believe wider community consultation was required in this instance.

Cr Lucas responded he had visited the site, had no evidence to contradict the arborist report and strongly recommended community consultation to occur.

Cr Färdig responded he had visited the site, had no evidence to contradict the arborist report and supports the rescission motion. Cr Färdig stated that Councillors do listen to their community and that this is evident by the meeting currently being held.

Cr Gregorini advised she initially supported the retention of the tree but when branches came down changed her decision as she was concerned about the consequences. The trees are in a small park in a cul de sac and are not indigenous to the area.

Cr Congerton responded that he had visited the site, relied upon the evidence provided by consultants engaged by the City, on a number of matters not just this matter and therefore accepted the report provided.

Cr Elliott responded that he had visited the site and had taken into consideration the concerns brought to the attention of ward Councillors by the local residents. This informed his decision making. No clarification was sought on the arborist's report.

Councillors are given, and can request legal advice.

4.1.3 Mr Ian Johnson

No community consultation occurred and that consent should not be taken from the fact that no community members commented.

Current timing of Council meeting meant it was difficult for community members to attend meetings.

4.1.4 Mr Simon Ashby

(Written statement was provided)

These are the facts, most of which have been confirmed by the Minister for Local Government in his letter to me. It should however be noted that the "secrecy" involved in the City of Swan's decision making process has involved some speculation and assumptions.

The development application was received by City of Swan on 23rd November 2012.

A group of electors (referred to as stakeholders hereon) had to go through the Freedom of Information process to get details of the Application. A denial of "Natural Justice".

18 submissions were made, 17 against the application.

Some of the Councillors accepted an invitation to see the site.

The City of Swan advised the stakeholders when the Application was coming before Council on September 4th 2013.

Several of the stakeholders spoke at the meeting and Council voted 11-2 against the Application.

City of Swan sent letters out to stakeholders advising them of Council's decision refusing the application based on non-compliance with the intent of the Residential Design Code concerning the extent of fill and batter in the flood fringe and inappropriateness with the topography which would "substantially alter the visual impression of the existing natural level of this dramatically low lying site as viewed from Plymouth Street."

The Applicant took the matter to SAT.

One of the stakeholders encountered a member of SAT, the Applicant and some others on site but was not permitted to express his views thereby denying "Natural Justice".

At a "confidential" meeting of Council on 27th November 2013 Council unanimously revoked their decision on what we have been told by Council was the same development application with no design changes. Another denial of "Natural Justice".

Council did not advise stakeholders that the matter was coming before Council again.

Council did not advise the Stakeholders of the revoking of the decision.

The decision is minuted below a few hyperlinks as

C3.3 "That the Council resolve to:

1) Adopt the recommendation set out at Option 1 in the report",

Hardly a clear statement to those who are not privy to "the report".

The stakeholders found out about this reversal of the decision when they encountered a tenderer for the earthworks on site over two months later.

The stakeholders asked Council at the meeting on March 5th if the original decision had been revoked, on what grounds and why weren't they informed. The response was far from satisfactory, verging on arrogant and patronising, and raised concerns about probity of the Council.

An email was sent to all Councillors and the City of Swan expressing disappointment at the lack communication and openness in the process and asking whether further information could be obtained through the Freedom of Information process and what conditions were set on the Application. No replies were received from any of the Councillors or the City of Swan.

Subsequent emails were sent advising Council that we were appealing to the Minister for Planning, advising the CoS to suspend the decision whilst the appeal was being considered and that we would hold the CoS responsible for consequential damage, such as flooding, resulting from the noncompliance with the Residential Design Code.

We received no response to these emails apart from automated acknowledgments and we felt that we were being stonewalled by Councillors and CoS.

A further email asking why there had been no response to our correspondence was sent. The CEO responded in a letter that "given no questions or request for information were entailed" the City's "acknowledgment of your earlier correspondence is limited and perfunctory" however the letter did provide details of the conditions set in approving the Application, as was requested in our initial correspondence; but no reply to the FoI question.

Consideration should be given to recent events in local government that have been in the limelight and it is important to re-assure ratepayers that all is above board here. The reversal, in a confidential meeting, of a public decision and the avoidance in publicising that change of decision makes one wonder whether there may be a bottle or two of "Grange" involved.

Questions put to Councillors (received in writing):

- 1. Why was the second Council hearing held in confidence? The Minister for Local Government has advised that this is permitted if it "allows such matters that contain or may contain legal advice to be treated in that manner". Was this the case here? Surely all sides should know and stick to the "rules" and such legal advice should be open. Or was the advice that you could get away with ignoring the performance criteria of the Residential Design Code. If that is the case why have the Code?*

The Mayor advised that the applicants were not satisfied with the Council's original decision and therefore took the matter to the State Administrative Tribunal (SAT). This matter became the responsibility of the SAT where mediation can occur and if required the matter can be taken to a full hearing, hence the requirement for confidentiality.

Manager Statutory Planning advised that when a matter goes on review, the SAT acts as the Council and has the power to make a decision and can invite the Council to reconsider its decision. There is usually a mediation process that looks at the grounds for refusal which may include the lack of information provided in the original application. It may be when this information is provided, the grounds for refusal are addressed and Council then grants approval.

When matters are under consideration by the SAT, the report is kept confidential (in accordance with the *Local Government Act 1995*) to ensure the Council can defend its position if required.

2. *Our understanding is the decision was revoked because the flood risk was not considered significant. This information was available prior to the first Council meeting from a desk top study by the Department of Water which apparently did not consider the culvert connecting the area to the flood plain the other side of the railway embankment and did not consider existing stormwater runoff from adjacent properties. What made the 11 Councillors change their minds in the confidential meeting?*

The Mayor advised that the SAT mediation process results in additional information being provided. The City relies on advice provided by government agencies and Councillors take that into consideration in their decision making.

Manager Statutory Planning advised that decisions are made with the best information available at the time. The information provided by the relevant agencies advised that flooding was not an issue and this is what Councillors took into consideration.

Councillors make individual decisions and are not 'told' to make any specific decision.

3. *You may have heard Professor Sarah Watmore, a specialist in natural disasters and flooding from Oxford University on the ABC radio recently where she stressed the importance of local knowledge over theoretical studies of flood risk. Following Council's error in approving the Harper Street development located on a spring and considering stormwater runoff and flooding were issues raised by the public did they seek any further advice than that of the Water Department?*

The Mayor advised the information by the Department of Water was taken into consideration in the decision making process.

4. *The initial refusal of the applications was on four grounds. How have;*
 - a. *the "degree of fill not considered to fulfil the Performance Criteria set out at 6.6.1 of the Residential Design Code",*
 - b. *"the absence of details as to the bulk and scale of the residential built form that will occur on the lots"*
 - c. *the "proposed development is considered to be unresponsive to the topographical and flood fringe constraints of the site to a degree that is most unsympathetic to the particular character and amenity of this part of Plymouth Street." been addressed when "no revisions were made to the original design"?*

Where there has been a lack of information and this is subsequently provided and addressed during the SAT mediation process and Council is satisfied with the additional information provided they may change their decision.

5. *In future is the Council going to consider other stakeholders apart from the Applicant in the appeal process and allow Natural Justice?*

The Council take into account all information provided to them, including the submissions made to it by affected residents.

Cr Lucas reiterated that decisions are made on planning principles and Council may change a decision with additional information.

Executive Manager Planning advised that all decisions made in regard to SAT reconsiderations will be published in full in the minutes of the meeting. He further advised that given the issues raised by the residents, the City has changed its process and will advise those who made a submission (if and when a matter is appealed) when that matter has been appealed, when the matter is being reconsidered by Council and the final SAT outcome.

6. *Given each Councillor declares that "they have given due consideration to all matters contained in the agenda before the meeting" how can an 11-2 decision be revoked unanimously in a secret meeting on what we are advised was the same application? Do they understand the Residential Design Code or are they unqualified to make such decision or is there something more suspicious about the revoking?*

The Mayor advised there was no suspicious activity, that the further information provided satisfied Councillors and therefore Council changed its decision.

4.1.5 Mr Peter Graham

Statement was made on the approachability, accountability and processes of Council and expressed concerns about decision making in Council. He believed there were problems to be exposed and that Council as a whole does not functions properly.

In regard to a recent deputation made, no comment or question in regard to deputation was made and the item passed on bloc without debate. He considered this to be arrogant and rude and no way to engage with electors.

In regard to the trees on Claymore Close he outlined the issues with the debate and decisions made. There were dubious and unsubstantiated arguments made and individual Councillors were not called to account and the basis for arguments were not called into question. Recommendations to consult the community were ignored.

The quality of debate and decision making was below expectation standard. Decisions should be reached through intelligent, considered discussion, deliberation and debate.

It was the responsibility of Councillors to be fully informed and engaged across the City as they were required to vote on issues in all wards.

The City needs to have processes to ensure good, efficient and fair democratic governance.

The recording of meetings will improve transparency help people understand and engage in the decision making process.

4.1.6 Mr Martin Copeman

No action has been taken to ensure risks in regard to the trees are addressed during period up until final decision is made. If there was any substantiated risk, action would have been taken.

Trees can be easily managed to address risks.

When moving to the City he became familiar with the plans, strategies and programs of the City. These documents provide a basis for informed strategic decisions and methodologies and a view of decision making. If any decisions are inconsistent with the content of these documents that it would be reasonable to expect the Council to go back to the community for input.

The removal of the trees is not considered consistent with any City information available publicly on sustainability and the community strategic plan.

Each tree should exist in its own right and their preservation is important. They contribute to liveability.

Decisions regarding trees should be carefully considered and delegated authority should be restricted to those with appropriate knowledge and expertise.

The following reasons should not justify removal of trees: leaf litter, perceived danger, re-landscaping and building matters.

The following reasons may warrant the removal of trees: damaged, diseased or in decline and no remedial action can be taken, causing substantial damage to buildings or public utilities where cost outweigh benefits, and pose a significant risk

A record of tree removals should be maintained.

4.1.7 Mr Rod Mitchell

Trees are an integral part of the eco system and economy and have value in dollar terms and ecological terms.

Fear causes disconnect from what sustains and nurtures us. 'Transition Towns' seek to create interconnected communities.

Trees are a symbol of life, resilience and interconnectedness.

A deeply informed process is required to consider choices that affect us.

4.1.8 Dr Christine Hogan

All deputations are considered together and there is a period of time between deputations and consideration of items.

4.1.9 Mr Greg Brindle

Decisions are made on evidence and on trust. Decision making at the City has been flawed and hidden. All should seek continuous improvement, embrace and take on board comments and move forward. The City needs to ensure there is clear and transparent decision making.

Preservation of the significant flora and fauna in the area is important, it is what makes the area unique.

Encourage continued engagement between Council and ratepayers.

4.1.10 Ms Pamela Newton

Disappointed residents from Clayton Street did not attend the meeting and they should be contact to see if their minds can be changed with new information.

4.1.11 Mr Tony Saunders

Microphones provided have not been appropriate for the situation and requests that this be addressed in the future.

4.1.12 Mr Barry Chester

Requested Councillors to recognise that this matter was not a micro issue.

4.1.13 Ms Celeste deSaxs

There are many issues affecting Guildford and more community consultation should occur.

4.1.14 Mr Peter Langlands

A lot of trees are not indigenous however they have a lot of historical value.

Risk is always present.

The matter of the trees in Claymore Close is not a micro issue. Matter raised regarding the location and size of the park are largely irrelevant, it is a public park and the whole community should be given an opportunity to have their input.

4.2 MOTIONS

4.2.1 Motion 1

That the Council recognises that silence does not equal consent.

Moved: Mr I Johnson
Seconded: Mr G Brindle
CARRIED BY MAJORITY VOTE

4.2.2 Motion 2

That future meetings of Council and Electors commence at 6.30pm.

Moved: Mr I Johnson
Seconded: Ms H Bradley
CARRIED BY MAJORITY VOTE

4.2.3 Motion 3

That Council hold all planning decisions in public, including any legal advice obtained, unless there are strong commercial or personal reasons that justify a closed session.

Moved: Mr S Ashby
Seconded: Mr G Brindle
CARRIED BY MAJORITY VOTE

4.2.4 Motion 4

That Council advise all stakeholders when appeals are being considered and their outcomes.

Moved: Mr S Ashby
Seconded: Mr G Brindle
CARRIED BY MAJORITY VOTE

4.2.5 Motion 5

Minutes of Council meeting clearly state decisions made and not refer to undisclosed reports.

Moved: Mr S Ashby
Seconded: Mr G Brindle
CARRIED BY MAJORITY VOTE

4.2.6 Motion 6

Councillors shall be fully informed on the intent and interpretation of the Residential Design Code adopted by the City of Swan as a Policy.

Moved: Mr S Ashby

Seconded:

MOTION LAPSED DUE TO LACK OF SECONDER

4.2.7 Motion 7

Since Natural Justice has not been given the Plymouth Street Application be reconsidered in an open and communicative manner with all parties eligible to participate in the discussion.

Motion was disallowed as this is *ultra vires* as the decision has been made.

4.2.8 Motion 8

Each Councillor involved to state that their decisions were based on a clear understanding of the requirements of the Residential Design Code and whether and why they consider their vote revoking of the decision was in compliance with the intent of the Code.

Motion was disallowed as this is *ultra vires* as the decision has been made.

4.2.9 Motion 9

That Council meetings are streamed live online, with recordings made available to electors by uploading to the City's website as soon as practical, and maintained online as an archive.

Moved: Mr P Graham

Seconded: Mr G Brindle

CARRIED BY MAJORITY VOTE

4.2.10 Motion 10

That the City of Swan in consultation with its community develops and implements a Tree Policy supported by a comprehensive Urban Forest Management Strategy that aims to preserve and enhance the city's urban forest.

The management strategy should:

- recognise the environmental and aesthetic contribution that trees make to the continuing development and presentation of public spaces;
- Ensure the preservation of all healthy and structurally sound mature trees;

- Apply best practice management to maintain trees so they thrive, thus increasing their longevity;
- Include gap-up planting programs to increase tree canopy cover to improve public amenity including shade and the amelioration of air traffic noise.
- Include tree renewal programs to ensure those trees which have reached the end of their safe useful life expectancy (SULE) can be replaced in a timely manner inline with budgetary constraints;
- Include a Significant Tree Register and that register should be incorporated into the City's Town Planning Scheme to afford a high level of protection to those trees identified as being significant using nationally recognised standards for the identification of trees of significance;
- Consider criteria that supports the preservation of significant trees growing on private property;
- Limit the delegated authority to remove trees to set criteria such as, the tree is damaged, post-mature, diseased or in decline and no further remedial techniques are appropriate, the tree is causing damage to property and there is no reasonable alternative to solve the problem and/or it is substantiated that the tree is an immediate and serious safety hazard to the public; and
- Include a public education program that informs the community of the significance of trees and the contribution they make to the overall liveability of the city.

A record of tree removals, identifying the location, species, date of removal and replacement species, should be maintained and available to the public.

Moved: Mr M Copeman
Seconded: Mr P Langlands
CARRIED BY MAJORITY VOTE

4.2.11 Motion 11

That deputations and matters relating to items are presented immediately preceding the Councillors' discussion and decision on that item.

Moved: Dr C Hogan
Seconded: Mr S Ashby
CARRIED BY MAJORITY VOTE

4.2.12 Motion 12

The City use an alternative public address system for events such as electors meetings.

Moved: Mr T Saunders
Seconded: Dr C Hogan
CARRIED BY MAJORITY VOTE

4.2.13 Motion 13

If Councillors discount or reject an expert opinion or report, they must provide credible and substantive evidence to support the basis of their argument.

**Moved: Mr P Stephenson
Seconded: Mr M Copeman
CARRIED BY MAJORITY**

4.2.14 Motion 14

That Council move a rescission motion, consistent with staff advice and the expert Arborist's report, to preserve the Illawarra flame tree and Rose gum in Claymore Close.

Should the Rose gum need to be removed in the future as it matures, we move that this is undertaken with community consultation, and a clear replacement strategy, where suitable native species are planted in advance and given years to mature prior to the removal of the Rose gum.

**Moved: Mr P Langlands
Seconded: Mr M Copeman
CARRIED BY MAJORITY VOTE**

5. CLOSURE

The Mayor, thanked those present for attending and reminded everyone in attendance that all Councillors are approachable and that members of the public are welcome to attend any Ordinary Council Meeting to make statements and ask questions.

The Mayor declared the meeting closed at 8.15 pm.