

Attachment 7.1(b)

CR JAMIESON'S COMMENTS IN SUPPORT OF MOTION

MOTION

That the expression "internal workshop" referred to in the Council resolution 11.1(d) of 25 July 2006 be interpreted to include the following:

- (1) all people who were involved in preparing or assisting with the 2005 Canning Mews Council Meeting Reports or preparing or assisting the City of South Perth case at the SAT hearings shall be eligible to attend provided they are not paid to attend nor request travelling or other allowances to attend and who may assist the city in learning from the application to provide better processes for the city, the applicants and the community;
- (2) the KCA be invited to send a maximum of two representatives to the Workshop; and
- (3) Canning Mews be invited to send a maximum of two representatives to the workshop.

COMMENT

My interpretation is that "internal workshop" would be any person that assisted or was involved with the Canning Mews case and does not request to be paid to attend the workshop. This interpretation is consistent with my argument as presented during the council meeting, and in particular during my argument I specifically mentioned including KCA. Personally I would have no trouble with McLeod also attending to provide and listen to lessons learned, as long as he does not want payment for attending (I did not present this argument as part of the debate but it is my position), particularly as he received a substantial share of the payment for legal advice which we subsequently found was not consistent with the SAT outcome. There are likely other people I am not aware of that also assisted in the case.

In your comment in regard to my motion on 25 July 2006 you suggested it would require the expertise of a very experienced town planner or lawyer (something which the city does not have on staff). I did not see the need for such formal expertise. I am involved in lookbacks and lessons learned as an everyday part of my work so it is likely my interpretation based on my experiences was far less daunting than others may have interpreted. The term internal workshop was introduced as an amendment only to keep the lid on involvement by expensive resources.

Personally I would not have any problem with Canning Mews being represented at the lessons learned workshop. To hear comments, feedback and lessons learned from "the other side" could be a very valuable business insight.

A senior member of the City that was not involved in the Canning Mews evaluation could also be invited to attend. (My suggestion would be Mr Michael Kent because of his involvement in the Business Excellence programme.) My motion does not specifically include such a person but also does not exclude them from an invite.

The KCA was a major player in this case. They were consistent with their advice to council that the application did not comply with the TPS, they provided arguments to council to vote against the staff recommendation, the SAT granted them approval to make a submission at the final hearing, the KCA highlighted that the applicant lodged its appeal for deemed refusal too late, engaged the community to find out their wishes, conducted meetings with the applicant to resolve issues, and the SAT appeared to be using the KCA submission as a reference document. The SAT decision was consistent with almost all of the KCA submission. Consequently KCA will have a lot they can contribute to establishing business value lessons learned - i.e. how can we all work better for the benefit of residents and ratepayers.

I want to maximise the business outcome for the residents and ratepayers of COSP, and to have an open and visible workshop to determine the lessons learned that will have ongoing business value.

Modern business practices, and a component of the Business Excellence programme, is for continuous improvement, much of which comes from critical self evaluation. The comments associated with my motion on 25 July 2006 that was accepted by Council included the following points that illustrate some of the key LL we can obtain:

1. LL should include what went right and hence we will continue to repeat them
2. LL should include what went wrong and identify proposed changes to our current approach and how
3. Are there LL about the format of the CEOs memo prior to the Council July 2005 meeting
4. Are there LL about receiving and using legal advice
5. Are there LL about the report provided to Council
6. Are there LL about discussions and comments from the public and how they were factored into the report
7. Are there LL about the value of community involvement and community assessment in review of Canning Mews
8. Are there LL about the value of community assistance in participation in the SAT appeal
9. There should be some form of management plan to ensure LL are registered and administered, and not just in the heads of a few.
10. What risks are associated with previous Council decisions given the outcomes and LL from Canning Mews?

I suggest that lookbacks and lessons learned may be something that the City could adopt into its Business Excellence programme following completion of major, high-risk or high-visibility projects or activities.

(Note: I am NOT proposing that all lookbacks and lessons learned should be externally facilitated NOR am I suggesting that they should be on the same large scale as this one.)