

MINUTES.

Electors' Special Meeting

25 August 2025

Notice of Meeting

Mayor and Councillors

Here within are the Minutes of the Electors' Special Meeting held Monday 25 August 2025 in the South Perth Community Hall, Civic Centre, corner Sandgate Street and South Terrace, South Perth.



MATTHEW SCOTT
ACTING CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

10 September 2025

Acknowledgement of Country

Kaartdjinin Nidja Nyungar Whadjuk Boodjar Koora Nidja Djining Noonakoort kaartdijin wangkiny, maam, gnarnk and boordier Nidja Whadjuk kura kura.

We acknowledge and pay our respects to the traditional custodians of this land, the Whadjuk people of the Noongar nation and their Elders past and present.

Our Guiding Values



Disclaimer

The City of South Perth disclaims any liability for any loss arising from any person or body relying on any statement, discussion, recommendation or decision made during this meeting.

Where an application for an approval, a licence or the like is discussed or determined during this meeting, the City warns that neither the applicant, nor any other person or body, should rely upon that discussion or determination until written notice of either an approval and the conditions which relate to it, or the refusal of the application has been issued by the City.

Contents

1.	DECLARATION OF OPENING / ANNOUNCEMENT OF VISITORS	5
2.	DISCLAIMER	5
3.	ATTENDANCE	5
4.	ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE PRESIDING MEMBER	6
5.	PRESENTATION BY THE LEAD PETITIONER AND SECONDER OF THE MOTION	8
6.	GENERAL BUSINESS RELATED TO THE PURPOSE OF MEETING INCLUDING PUBLIC QUESTION TIME AND PUBLIC STATEMENTS	14
7.	CLOSURE	32

Electors' Special Meeting

The Electors' Special Meeting was held in response to an electors' petition received for the purpose of:

"That the Electors of the City of South Perth ('the City'):

1. *Express a lack of confidence in the Council for their decision on Cr Coveney's Notice of Motion Item 12.1 (Resolution 0725/140) 'Removal of the Six Trees Planted on the South Side of Lake Douglas During Winter 2024' of the July 2025 Ordinary Council Meeting agenda, for the following reasons:*
 - (a) *The decision to remove six trees from public land in order to protect the outlook of the adjoining private landowners ('the decision') is not in the best interests of the general community of the City, and is inconsistent with the conservation and enhancement of a functional, healthy river and foreshore environment which is the aim of the City's **South Perth Foreshore Strategy and Management Plan**.*
 - (b) *The decision is inconsistent with and disrespectful of the consensus of the community as expressed in research undertaken for and feedback to the **Urban Greening Strategy**, as endorsed by Council.*
 - (c) *The decision undermines the goals of the **Urban Greening Strategy** to: protect the City's ecologically sensitive riverside environment as a community asset; protect the City's vegetation, tree canopy and green spaces and existing trees; and expand existing urban greening for the benefit of the City's environment and community wellbeing.*
 - (d) *The proposal to hold a Councillor workshop to develop a policy on planting trees on public land is inconsistent with the requirements of the **Urban Greening Strategy**, the **South Perth Foreshore Strategy and Management Plan** and the Environment (Built and Natural) elements of the **Strategic Community Plan**. This could affect potential Federal and State Government funding by suggesting to higher levels of government that funding might not align with a thoroughly researched, community supported plan.*
 - (e) *The decision establishes a concerning precedent by permitting the interests of a limited group of individuals to take precedence over those of the broader community. As such, it does not fulfil the **Strategic Community Plan's** requirements (at 4.3.1) to foster effective governance with quality decision making to deliver community priorities.*
2. *In accordance with the above, we call upon Council to rescind or change Resolution 0725/140 resulting from Item 12.1, in its entirety or as possible under the Standing Orders, at its earliest opportunity."*

In accordance with Section 5.28 of the *Local Government Act 1995* and the Local Government (Administration) Regulations 1996, the Order of Business was as follows:

1. DECLARATION OF OPENING / ANNOUNCEMENT OF VISITORS

The Presiding Member declared the meeting open at 6.01pm and welcomed everyone in attendance.

2. DISCLAIMER

The Presiding Member read aloud the City's Disclaimer.

3. ATTENDANCE

Mayor Greg Milner (Presiding Member)

Councillors

Como Ward
Como Ward
Manning Ward
Manning Ward
Moresby Ward
Moresby Ward

Councillor Glenn Cridland (Arrived at 6.03pm)
Councillor Bronwyn Waugh
Councillor Blake D'Souza
Councillor André Brender-A-Brandis
Councillor Jennifer Nevard
Councillor Hayley Prendiville

Officers

A/ Chief Executive Officer (A/CEO)
A/ Director Corporate Services (A/DCS)
Director Development and Community Services (DDCS)
Director Infrastructure Services (DIS)
Manager Customer, Communications & Engagement
Manager Governance
Communications and Marketing Coordinator
Governance Coordinator
Governance Officer
Governance Administration Officer

Mr Matthew Scott
Mr Abrie Lacock
Ms Donna Shaw
Ms Anita Amprimo
Ms Danielle Cattalini
Ms Toni Fry
Ms Sonya Kimbar
Ms Christine Lovett
Ms Jane Robinson
Ms Kira Digwood

Gallery

There were approximately 110 members of the public present, 93 of those present registered with addresses that would enable them to validly be declared an Elector.

Councillor Glenn Cridland arrived at the meeting at 6.03pm during consideration of Item 4.

4. ANNOUNCEMENTS FROM THE PRESIDING MEMBER

The Presiding Member read aloud the following:

“This Electors’ Special Meeting has been called as a result of a petition of electors received on 4 August 2025, with 658 verified signatures. The purpose of the petition requesting the Electors’ Special Meeting is:

That the Electors of the City of South Perth (‘the City’):

1. *Express a lack of confidence in the Council for their decision on Cr Coveney’s Notice of Motion Item 12.1 (Resolution 0725/140) ‘Removal of the Six Trees Planted on the South Side of Lake Douglas During Winter 2024’ of the July 2025 Ordinary Council Meeting agenda, for the following reasons:*
 - (a) *The decision to remove six trees from public land in order to protect the outlook of the adjoining private landowners (‘the decision’) is not in the best interests of the general community of the City, and is inconsistent with the conservation and enhancement of a functional, healthy river and foreshore environment which is the aim of the City’s **South Perth Foreshore Strategy and Management Plan**.*
 - (b) *The decision is inconsistent with and disrespectful of the consensus of the community as expressed in research undertaken for and feedback to the **Urban Greening Strategy**, as endorsed by Council.*
 - (c) *The decision undermines the goals of the **Urban Greening Strategy** to: protect the City’s ecologically sensitive riverside environment as a community asset; protect the City’s vegetation, tree canopy and green spaces and existing trees; and expand existing urban greening for the benefit of the City’s environment and community wellbeing.*
 - (d) *The proposal to hold a Councillor workshop to develop a policy on planting trees on public land is inconsistent with the requirements of the **Urban Greening Strategy**, the **South Perth Foreshore Strategy and Management Plan** and the Environment (Built and Natural) elements of the **Strategic Community Plan**. This could affect potential Federal and State Government funding by suggesting to higher levels of government that funding might not align with a thoroughly researched, community supported plan.*
 - (e) *The decision establishes a concerning precedent by permitting the interests of a limited group of individuals to take precedence over those of the broader community. As such, it does not fulfil the **Strategic Community Plan’s** requirements (at 4.3.1) to foster effective governance with quality decision making to deliver community priorities.*
2. *In accordance with the above, we call upon Council to rescind or change Resolution 0725/140 resulting from Item 12.1, in its entirety or as possible under the Standing Orders, at its earliest opportunity.”*

This meeting has been advertised in accordance with the Local Government Act 1995 and Local Government (Administration) Regulations 1996. The procedure to be followed at Electors’ Meetings is determined by the Presiding Member, that is me.

So, the procedure for this evening's meeting is as follows –

- *A presentation of 15 minutes by the Lead Petitioner;*
- *A Seconder of the Motion will be called and given three minutes to speak;*
- *General Business related to the purpose of the meeting including Public Question Time and Public Statements; and*
- *Then the motion as presented by the Lead Petitioner will be put to the vote.*

Speaking

Electors who have submitted statements or questions prior to the meeting will be called to the microphone first. Each elector will be allocated a maximum of three minutes to make a statement, and each elector will be provided a maximum of two questions. Following this all those that did not register prior to the meeting will be called forward (up to the point where we run out of time for public questions or public statements).

All questions and statements must relate to the purpose of the meeting and are to be directed to myself as the Presiding Member and I may then refer it to a Councillor, the Acting Chief Executive Officer, or a Director to answer. When you are called to the microphone, please clearly state your name and address before commencing.

When you are making a statement or asking a question – please do make sure that you extend due courtesy and respect to the Elected Members, City officers and other members of the public present and that your statement or question does not contain any material that is offensive, objectionable or defamatory. We are recording the meeting, so let us play nice, folks.

Voting

1. *Each elector who is present is entitled to one vote on each matter to be decided at the meeting but does not have to vote.*
2. *All decisions are to be made by a simple majority of votes.*
3. *Voting is to be conducted so that no voter's vote is secret.*

As defined in the Local Government Act 1995, an elector, in relation to a district or ward, means a person who is eligible to be enrolled to vote at elections for the district or ward. If you are not an elector (as defined by the Local Government Act), do not vote.

The meeting will now commence with a presentation from the Lead Petitioner, Ms Bronwyn David.”

5. PRESENTATION BY THE LEAD PETITIONER AND SECONDER OF THE MOTION

The following was read out by Ms Bronwyn David of South Perth at the Electors' Special Meeting held 25 August 2025.

Ms Bronwyn David: Thank you very much, Mayor, and welcome everyone. Thank you all for coming out on a very wintery night, we appreciate it. We have a motion before us, in regard to a motion on the Removal of the Six Trees Planted on the South Side of Lake Douglas. That has already been read so I will not go through that again, Let us get straight into it.

How did we get here? Let us go back in time a little bit. That is where the City's aerial maps run out, but we do not actually have to go back that far. We are only going back to last month, which seems like an awfully long time away now. But at the July Agenda Briefing, a motion appeared on the Agenda consisting of 21 words: 'that Council requests the CEO to remove the six trees planted on the south side of Lake Douglas during Winter 2024.' During the meeting, it was indicated that the motion would be amended, although the text of the motion was not available in writing at that meeting. Which tends to defeat the purpose of an Agenda Briefing meeting when you are not given notice of what is actually on the Agenda; but that turned out to be the least of our worries. The reasons given in that Agenda in support of this motion, centred on the possible interference that these trees caused to the outlook of a small number of residents on Jubilee Street. The word 'views' (as in outlook) was used 14 times in those reasons. By the time the motion came back before the Council at the Ordinary Council Meeting at the end of July, it had significantly expanded to include the removal of the trees, the substitution of the trees with low-level planting over 135m², a request for an adjustment in the budget of an additional \$30,000, and a request for a Councillor Workshop on planting trees on public land. Never mind that the City budget had been finalised the previous month. Never mind that there was no talk of where that \$30,000 was to come from. Which Council services would be cut to afford that? Or would rates rise to cover that?

The expansion of the motion to include other planting was nothing more than a desperate attempt to make an unpalatable idea more attractive. The motion was passed and then the outcry kicked off. Fair to say that the City of South Perth has been thoroughly pilloried in the media and attracted the attention of the Minister for Local Government, who is fresh off the sacking of the Nedlands' City Council and the installation of administrators there. But it is not as if the Council was not warned. Every motion that comes before the Council is examined by City staff and advice is given, including any risks in carrying the motion. Here the City anticipated the outcry and the reputational damage that may occur through sustained adverse comments in the media. Although, it turns out that the risk rating probably was a little bit higher than medium.

At this point, I will briefly mention the duality we find in local government. We have the Elected officials or Council, who have their role and the administration (personified in the Chief Executive Officer) have their role. We can find the respective roles of the administration and Council set out in a document known as the City of South Perth's Governance framework. This paragraph from that Framework speaks of the clear separation of roles and responsibilities and their importance to good governance.

Anyone contemplating running for Council is required to undertake an online induction provided by the Department of Local Government and to read information provided online about the role of a Councillor. In short, to quote from the online information: under the leadership of the CEO, local government employees undertake the administrative and operational activities required to implement the Council's Strategic Direction, decisions, policies, and plans. Members of Council (i.e. Councillors) have no direct involvement in administrative, operational activities or in managing local government employees (other than the CEO).

It is not quite as simple as the Council makes the decisions and the City employees carry out the decisions. There are different types of decisions; administrative or operational activities (the carrying out of which involves day-to-day decisions) is out of the hands of the Council. Those administrative or operational activities are guided by plans and strategies, which the Council has put in place. The planting of trees by Council staff on public land administered by the Council is an operational activity. As an aside, the City of South Perth Governance Framework provides more details about the role of a Councillor. It emphasises that despite being elected by and belonging to a ward, they must represent the interests of the broader community on the Council. It is not appropriate for individual Councillor's constituents' concerns to interfere with their decision-making processes in providing good governance. So far, we have heard that good governance involves the separation of powers between the Council and administration and Councillors making decisions that represent the interests of the broader community. But the City's Governance Framework sets out other aspects of good governance. Again, we see the consideration of the needs of the entire community, but also making the best use of resources, which includes the resources of the administration, such as the employees. Here we return to the \$30,000 expenditure contemplated by this motion. The original six saplings were planted based on professional advice from City employees, and the cost of planting them has already been incurred. That cost in terms of time and money spent will have been wasted if the trees are removed.

Accordingly, this decision does not make effective use of employee resources or time and hence would not achieve the best possible outcomes for the community. References by Councillors to bolster their views on the alternative planting to ecological, horticultural, or landscaping experts also defies the investment that the City has made in employing experts in these fields. The City of South Perth is one of the few metropolitan Councils with its own plant nursery. Council staff are experts at growing plants and trees and planting them on behalf of the City. If this decision is allowed to stand, the precedent it sets also threatens to waste employee expertise, resources, and time as there is nothing to stop other Councillors bringing further motions along similar lines on behalf of individuals who consider that their outlook is threatened. If this sort of motion needs to be handled again and again, that is an inefficient use of the City's resources.

The best way for Councils to achieve good governance is through the creation of strategies, plans, policies, and procedures. Strategic plans developed through community consultation anchor proper decision-making.

Without policy frameworks, local government decision-making risks decisions that are inconsistent and with arbitrary outcomes. They expose Councils to act in support only of the most vocal community factions. Fortunately, the City has a number of these plans and strategies which are relevant in this case and were not adhered to in this decision. Before we get to them, speaking of legislative requirements, let us look at the *Local Government Act*, which sets out the general function of local government. Here we see specific references to environmental sustainability, mitigating risks associated with climate change, and making decisions that consider long-term consequences and the impacts of those decisions on future generations. It is uncontroversial that we desperately need more trees in Perth. Our climate is changing, summers are getting longer and hotter; trees are the cheapest and best way to regulate the climate. Under no circumstances should we be contemplating the removal of trees in these circumstances.

So back to the strategies, policies, and procedures that the City has established, which are relevant here. The first of these that I will refer to is the City of South Perth's Strategic Community Plan. It's subtitle is a City of active places and beautiful spaces, a connected community with easily accessible, vibrant neighbourhoods and a unique sustainable natural environment. Sustainable natural environments need trees. One of the strategic directions of the Strategic Community Plan is respect and value for the natural environment. Another strategic direction is leadership that meets the needs of our community. In relation to these six trees, I would suggest that 658 individuals signing a petition supporting their retention is persuasive in suggesting the needs of our community have not been met in this regard. Drilling even further down into the Strategic Community Plan, we find that a mechanism to deliver the environmental strategic direction is the enhancement of the City's urban forest on public land. That is planting trees, not removing them. In an incredibly ironic turn of events, the same night that the motion to remove the six saplings was passed, the Council also adopted a new Urban Greening Strategy. In this document, we find even more measures that define good governance in terms of greening, including protecting newly planted trees, enhancing the environment by planting more, utilising expertise to manage greening, and undertaking collaborations to protect and enhance urban greening. In developing the Urban Greening Strategy, the City consulted with a community panel. Seven priorities emerged from that panel. Number five is increasing canopy to provide shade and frame views. I am sure that no one on that panel contemplated that an outcome of the Greening Strategy would be the removal of trees already planted to protect views. Finally, the City's Foreshore Management Plan is probably the most relevant document of all of these strategies in establishing what good governments should look like in respect of this decision. The relevant node in the plan is number seven, the lakes. The Foreshore Management Plan sets out that in the area of the lakes, the strategy is to enhance and encourage the flora and fauna of the lakes. Ecologically to rehabilitate the lakes and improve storm water management. In planting the six saplings adjacent to Lake Douglas, City employees adhered to these strategies.

I understand that the species were chosen because they are appropriate to the environment of the lakes and will perform ecological functions. The strategy of the lakes can be contrasted with strategies for the other nodes such as these two. One of them specifically refers to the maintenance of vista or views and following the legal maxim that everything that is not forbidden is allowed, it stands to reason that given there is no reference in Node 7 to the maintenance of views or vistas. City staff acting in accordance with this plan have planted trees appropriately. The Foreshore Management Plan is an incredibly comprehensive document and details its own creation. Further, the document explicitly refers to another important part of good governance; the ability to attract State and Federal funding, no one likes rate increases. The two main sources of income for Councils are rates and State and Federal grants. As outlined here, ad-hoc decisions that are not well researched or arrived at without stakeholder input. Such as calling on the Council to spend an unbudgeted \$30,000 in a manner that is inconsistent with established strategies and plans, risks not only the reputation of the Council, but also our ability to attract external funding. That is the risk we face if the decision to remove the trees is not overturned. You may be surprised that I have not made any comments about tree selections, the environmental merits of understory planting versus grass. That is because that is not within my ambit. I do not have qualifications in ecology, horticulture, or landscaping. But I tell you who does - the operational staff of the City in whose hands are the decision of what tree goes where; is illuminated by the City's Foreshore Management Plan, Urban Greening Strategy and Strategic Community Plan rests. Our local government exists to serve the needs of the people. Most of us simply want to maintain lifestyle. To me, that includes keeping our community green and shaded. Is it more important that a few property owners are able to make a greater profit, than a resident maintains lifestyle? The majority of residents are not interested in fighting Council decisions just for the sake of fighting. Most just want to preserve what is good about their community area. Thankfully, there are people who are willing to turn up (thank you everyone) to seek solutions that enrich our lives and increase our collective prosperity.

The Presiding Member called for a seconder to move the following motion:

Moved: Ms Bronwyn David of South Perth

Seconded: Ms Sue Gillieatt of Salter Point

That the Electors of the City of South Perth ('the City'):

1. Express a lack of confidence in the Council for their decision on Cr Coveney's Notice of Motion Item 12.1 (Resolution 0725/140) 'Removal of the Six Trees Planted on the South Side of Lake Douglas During Winter 2024' of the July 2025 Ordinary Council Meeting agenda, for the following reasons:
 - (a) The decision to remove six trees from public land in order to protect the outlook of the adjoining private landowners ('the decision') is not in the best interests of the general community of the City, and is inconsistent with the conservation and enhancement of a functional, healthy river and foreshore environment which is the aim of the City's **South Perth Foreshore Strategy and Management Plan**.
 - (b) The decision is inconsistent with and disrespectful of the consensus of the community as expressed in research undertaken for and feedback to the **Urban Greening Strategy**, as endorsed by Council.
 - (c) The decision undermines the goals of the **Urban Greening Strategy** to: protect the City's ecologically sensitive riverside environment as a community asset; protect the City's vegetation, tree canopy and green spaces and existing trees; and expand existing urban greening for the benefit of the City's environment and community wellbeing.
 - (d) The proposal to hold a Councillor workshop to develop a policy on planting trees on public land is inconsistent with the requirements of the **Urban Greening Strategy**, the **South Perth Foreshore Strategy and Management Plan** and the Environment (Built and Natural) elements of the **Strategic Community Plan**. This could affect potential Federal and State Government funding by suggesting to higher levels of government that funding might not align with a thoroughly researched, community supported plan.
 - (e) The decision establishes a concerning precedent by permitting the interests of a limited group of individuals to take precedence over those of the broader community. As such, it does not fulfil the **Strategic Community Plan's** requirements (at 4.3.1) to foster effective governance with quality decision making to deliver community priorities.
2. In accordance with the above, we call upon Council to rescind or change Resolution 0725/140 resulting from Item 12.1, in its entirety or as possible under the Standing Orders, at its earliest opportunity.

The following statement was read out by Ms Sue Gillieatt of Salter Point at the Electors' Special Meeting held 25 August 2025.

Ms Sue Gillieatt: Good evening Mayor, Councillors and City officers. The Salter Point Community Group supports tonight's expression of a lack of confidence in the South Perth Council due to its decision to remove six trees planted on Lake Douglas. Our support is given for tonight's motion since for us, the Council has shown poor governance in its decision-making process. These saplings have become a lightning rod for widespread critique of Council governance. An ad hoc, poorly thought through decision to remove six trees has created a maelstrom of negative publicity and demonstrated to us all that this is not a matter of just about some small trees. It is about a much bigger and pressing need for good governance, which we have not been seeing. Motions such as the tree removal one (the original one) and there have been others over the last year that have been disruptive, dismissive of ratepayers, and wasteful of City resources. One of the biggest risks is that battles fought in public like this one, speak to disturbing disunity. The decision to remove trees from public land shows poor governance in the areas of participation, transparency, accountability, and efficiency. First, it is inconsistent with the City's South Perth Foreshore Management Plan. It is also inconsistent and disrespectful of the community's time-consuming and significant contribution to guiding the Urban Greening Strategy. Further, it undermines the goals of the now endorsed strategy and establishes a concerning precedent in catering to a few, rather than the community. It also comes at an additional cost to ratepayers. The decision to remove the trees is also in conflict, as we have seen tonight, with the City's Strategic Community Plan. It does not speak to the City's priority for the natural environment to retain and enhance our open and green spaces for the current and future generations. Nor does it satisfy prescribed outcomes of the plan, such as enhancing the City's Urban Forest; nor does it improve the amenity value and sustainable uses of our public open spaces. Neither does it speak to maintaining of our open space and effective management of the foreshore. Our aspirations for leadership of our Council is for it to be receptive and proactive in meeting the needs of our community. We expect our leaders to foster effective governance with honesty and integrity. It builds trust and respect between community members and those elected to represent them. It is the norms and actions of our Council which determine good governance and we have not been seeing this.

Mayor Greg Milner: That is time, Ms Gillieatt.
The motion has now been moved and seconded. We will move to Item 5 now.

6. GENERAL BUSINESS RELATED TO THE PURPOSE OF MEETING INCLUDING PUBLIC QUESTION TIME AND PUBLIC STATEMENTS

The Presiding Member called on public questions that were received prior to the meeting.

The following questions were asked by Ms Gemma Spencer of Kensington at the Electors' Special Meeting held 25 August 2025.

Ms Gemma Spencer: My first question is what is the proposed cost for the Councillors workshop to develop a policy for planting trees on public land?

Ms Anita Amprimo (DIS): The cost would be associated with the use of internal staff and would not be additional to the existing budget, however it would divert staff from undertaking other tasks.

Ms Gemma Spencer: My second question is more in line with Governance, and not in terms of the tree situation. Given the divisive way that the South Perth Council seems to have been operating in for some time, how will the Councillors move forward from these issues, and act in a more cohesive manner that best serves the ratepayers of the City?

Mayor Greg Milner: I better field that one. I can only say that a Councillor's duties which includes representing the interests of electors, ratepayers, and residents of the district to provide leadership and guidance to the community in the district, and to facilitate communication between the community and the Council. I probably cannot elaborate past that.

Thank you for both of your questions.

I would now like to invite Dr Mark Brogan of Kensington, if you would like to come to the microphone, welcome to you and we look forward to your questions.

The following questions were asked by Dr Mark Brogan of Kensington at the Electors' Special Meeting held 25 August 2025.

Dr Mark Brogan: Can Councillors who voted to remove the trees on the South side of Lake Douglas, explain to us because we are genuinely puzzled, how it is in the public interest to assert private property rights over public spaces for the subjective matter of protecting views and thereby critically weakening application of the South Perth Foreshore Strategy Management Plan and also the Urban Greening Strategy?

Mayor Greg Milner: Okay, I do recall that of the four Councillors who voted in favour of Item 12.1 at last month's Council Meeting, three of them spoke and those comments are available on our website. If any of the Councillors who did vote in favour of Item 12.1 at last month's Council Meeting would like to elaborate on or would like to speak – you do not have to, but I will make that opportunity available.

That is a no. Your second question, Dr Brogan?

Dr Mark Brogan: Can the City provide an ecological assessment of the comparative environmental and community value of the six mature trees proposed for removal versus 135m² of low level planting around Lake Douglas inclusive of the environmental factors of carbon sequestered and ecosystem impact?

Ms Anita Amprimo (DIS): The City has not undertaken such an ecological assessment and does not consider that assessment to be a good use of public funds.

Mayor Greg Milner: Thank you Dr Brogan for the questions. I would now like to invite Ms Cristy Lowe of Como, if you would like to come the microphone, welcome to you and we look forward to your questions.

The following questions were asked by Ms Cristy Lowe of Como at the Electors' Special Meeting held 25 August 2025.

Ms Cristy Lowe: The City's Governance Framework makes clear that Councillors are expected to act in the interests of the community as a whole rather than a small group of constituents; that good governance requires decisions to be efficient, effective and sustainable in their use of staff time and public resources; and that all decisions should be aligned with the City's endorsed strategic plans and priorities. Considering these principles together, can the City advise whether it believes the decision to remove the six saplings was consistent with the intent of its Governance Framework, and explain why it holds this view?

Mr Abrie Lacock (A/DCS): The City's administrative role is to carry out the Council's resolutions, not to provide comments on them publicly or otherwise.

Ms Cristy Lowe: The Minister for Local Government recently commented on 6PR radio that Council's decision to remove the six trees to prioritise "million-dollar" was "strange," and acknowledged that she is concerned and "keeping a close eye" on the City of South Perth. She further expressed that external political influence appears to be – and I quote – "sucking the oxygen out of the City of South Perth and their ability to provide good governance which is what their community expects." Considering these remarks and the risk of further reputational damage, can the City advise whether it believes rescinding the decision would be in the best interests of good governance and the reputation of this local government, and if not, explain why?

Mr Abrie Lacock (A/DCS): Similar to the answer to the previous question the City's administrative role is to carry out the Council's resolutions, and not provide comment on them that includes an opinion regarding the impact of such decisions.

Mayor Greg Milner: I will add to that and most of you are already aware of this – there is a revocation motion for Council's consideration at the Council Meeting tomorrow night. I will not say anything further than that because I am one of the decision makers.

Thank you very much for your questions and I would now like to invite Ms Veronica McPhail of Kensington if you would like to come to the microphone. Welcome to you and we look forward to your questions.

The following questions were asked by Ms Veronica McPhail of Kensington at the Electors' Special Meeting held 25 August 2025.

Ms Veronica McPhail: My first question: can Council explain why \$30,000 is being allocated to replace six trees, and reassure us that this decision truly delivers value and does not come at the expense of the wider community amenities?

Mayor Greg Milner: I am the spokesperson for the Council but I am conscious that we do have a decision to make on this tomorrow night. I do not want to pre-empt what that decision might be. Thank you for the question – we will find out tomorrow night.

Ms Veronica McPhail: Given that this motion has created division, a lack of transparency and eroded community trust while consuming valuable Council time, how will Council demonstrate stronger leadership and ensure that future decisions reflect the majority of residents?

Mayor Greg Milner: I can only give the answer that I gave Ms Spencer earlier. That is the *Local Government Act* says that the role of Councillors includes representing the interests of electors, ratepayers, and residents of the district. It includes providing leadership and guidance to the community in the district; it involves facilitating communication between the community and the Council; and participating at the local government's decision-making processes such as the Council and Committee Meetings. Thank you for the questions.

Those were the questions from the questions that were submitted prior to tonight's meeting, there is now an opportunity (although we will have a time limit) to call on public questions from the floor.

Is there anyone that would like to ask a question from the floor?

Yes - if you would like to come to the microphone, please state your name and address and there is a maximum of two questions.

The following questions were asked by Ms Denise Lazenby of Como at the Electors' Special Meeting held 25 August 2025.

Ms Denise Lazenby: I would like to ask how the City has managed conflicting community preferences in the past, such as when one resident wants to plant a tree and others object to it. Whose view takes precedence and how has the City been ensuring consistency and fairness in these cases?

Mr Matthew Scott (A/CEO): Generally, Council will consider all views when making a decision and generally decisions are made by Council on the merits of each application.

Mayor Greg Milner: Ms Amprimo, would you like to add anything to that?

Ms Anita Amprimo (DIS): The administration will seek to negotiate with all parties involved to find a resolution, that would be the first place that we would go. Ultimately, if we cannot find a satisfactory resolution, we will also look for guidance from whatever policies or adopted documents that there is. If we ultimately cannot reach a compromise that suits all parties, in general we will go with the status quo; unless there's an overwhelming reason to do something different. For example, if we are looking to plant a street tree and we cannot get agreement from the neighbouring properties - we will generally not plant it and seek to find an alternative location to plant, where we can.

Mayor Greg Milner: Thank you, Mr Scott, and Ms Amprimo. Did you have a second question, Ms Lazenby?

Ms Denise Lazenby: Yes, thank you for the courtesy of a response. I would also like to ask does the approval of the motion to remove the trees weaken the City's ability to implement long-term urban greening and biodiversity planning, particularly if future motions seek to override operational plans or redirect limited planning planting resources, based on case-by-case community demands?

Mr Matthew Scott (A/CEO): Ultimately, as previously advised in previous questions, the administration's role is to implement the Council's decisions. One of the roles of Council is to allocate the Council's resources, therefore it is not the administration's role to determine what happens into the future; it will be the Council's role through its various strategies and plans but also through in (sometimes) individual decisions.

Mayor Greg Milner: Thank you, Mr Scott, and thank you Ms Lazenby.

The following questions were asked by Mr Aidan Carlsson of Karawara at the Electors' Special Meeting held 25 August 2025.

Mr Aidan Carlsson: The City's budget was agreed upon in July by the Council. The proposed tree removal and planting will cost an estimated \$30,000. What is it that the City will not be doing in order to spend that \$30,000?

Mr Matthew Scott (A/CEO): The decision, in regards to the \$30,000, is to go to Council as part of the mid-year budget review. I cannot speculate on what will be involved in that review, or what will be recommended to Council. As it is a resolution that it will be considered as part of the mid-year budget review.

Mr Aidan Carlsson: I have a second question. I was talking to residents in Karawara on Jackson Road. They were concerned that they have lost their views of the golf course and they would like some trees removed and underplanting's there. Is that something that the Council will advocate for in such a situation - particularly those within the Ward that they can retain their views (which are valuable for them for over 20 years that they have lived there and held those views). Will the Council now advocate for them to have these plantings amended?

Mayor Greg Milner: Council has not considered a motion to that effect or made a decision that would allow me to form an informed opinion.

Mr Aidan Carlsson: I will leave that as a comment then.

Mayor Greg Milner: Thank you.

I know Mr Rosenberg but once again in fairness to everyone, could you please state your name and address, we look forward to your questions.

The following questions were asked by Mr Murray Rosenberg of Como at the Electors' Special Meeting held 25 August 2025.

Mr Murray Rosenberg: The reason for the Council making this decision seems to be related to their concern about the neighbours or the people living by the views losing their views, these are very wealthy houses and they are concerned about the views of the City being lost. My question relates to the issue about the views, do residents own the views from their property?

Ms Donna Shaw (DDCS): Historically, no resident was entitled to a view. However, recently Council considered a Local Planning Policy related to significant views. We would consider views in the assessment of any views - that is being considered this month. Should Council adopt that Policy we would consider the significance and impact on potential loss of views in considering any potential development application. However, local planning policies do not extend to public land. They only apply to private properties. At this point in time, there is no consideration of a view when it comes to any sort of development application.

Mr Murray Rosenberg: I understand that residents could be impacted by views, but my question is do they own the view – in every respect you did not answer that question?

Mr Matthew Scott (A/CEO): What you own is on your title, anything outside your title you do not have an ownership right over.

Mayor Greg Milner: Thank you, Mr Scott, and Mr Rosenberg.

Ms Schmidt - if you would like to come to the microphone, welcome to you and we look forward to your questions.

The following questions were asked by Ms Heidi Schmidt of South Perth at the Electors' Special Meeting held 25 August 2025.

- Ms Heidi Schmidt:** The passing of this motion to remove six trees for vires highlights financial accountability and potential trade-offs and underscores the need for transparency in unplanned expenditure and its effect on broader greening efforts. The removal of six healthy trees and replanting of wetlands plants are estimated to cost \$30,000. Previous motions by ex-Councillor Coveney regarding olive trees removal.
- Mayor Greg Milner:** Ms Schmidt, sorry to interrupt here, you will get a chance to make a public statement, but the questions have to be without preamble.
- Ms Heidi Schmidt:** This \$30,000 (that we are all aware of) was not included in the approved budget, where specifically will such a large amount of money for a handful of residence preferences come from? Where does that \$30,000 come from?
- Mr Matthew Scott (A/CEO):** As per my previous response, the \$30,000 will be considered as part of the mid-year budget review. That review looks at the entire City's budget and recommendations will be made to Council on how best to review the budget. At this stage, I am not at liberty to speculate how that \$30,000 will be funded.
- Ms Heidi Schmidt:** I understand it creates an issue for governance there too. My second question: within governance roles and decision-making, is the decision to plant trees and determine their location a function of Council or administration in line with the separation of powers as outlined by the Department of Local Government?
- Mr Matthew Scott (A/CEO):** The planting is an administration function, based on plans and strategies that have been adopted by Council.
- Ms Heidi Schmidt:** So, Councillors can choose where trees go?
- Mayor Greg Milner:** Hypothetically.
- Ms Heidi Schmidt:** Sure.
- Mr Matthew Scott (A/CEO):** Generally, it is an administration function, based on adopted strategies and plans of Council.
- Ultimately though, Council is a decision-making body, and they allocate the resources of the City. Council could potentially instruct the City on where to plant trees.
- Mayor Greg Milner:** Thank you, Mr Scott and thank you, Ms Schmidt for the questions.

The following question was asked by Ms Gemma Pepper of Como at the Electors' Special Meeting held 25 August 2025.

Ms Gemma Pepper: My question is can the City or the Council clarify whether the approval of this motion sets a precedent where individual residents can request the removal of trees, regardless of arborist advice or strategic planning and dictate where rehabilitation or planting occurs in public open space?

Mr Matthew Scott (A/CEO): I cannot conclusively say that it sets a precedent. Council has to consider each item on its merits. Council may be made aware of past decisions, but that does not necessarily determine a way that Council has to decide. As I said, the items are considered on their merits individually, subject to the information available to Council at the time.

Mayor Greg Milner: I will add to that. Based on my best recollection as to what was said at last month's Council Meeting. If I recall correctly, some Elected Members, including me, said that it sets a precedent, but other Elected Members said that it did not. So, I am afraid that I cannot give you a more concrete answer than that.

Ms Gemma Pepper: Thank you.

Mayor Greg Milner: Pleasure.

Is there anyone else who would like to ask a public question from the floor? No. In that case, we will move onto the time allocated to public statements.

We have received six public statement requests prior to tonight's meeting, so we will give priority to those.

I would like to begin by inviting Ms Kathy Lees of South Perth, if you would like to come to the microphone. Welcome to you, you have three minutes. We look forward to your statement.

The following statement was read out by Ms Kathy Lees of South Perth at the Electors' Special Meeting held 25 August 2025.

Ms Kathy Lees:

Good evening everyone. So, I will get right along.

I would like to speak specifically to the Urban Greening Strategy and the conflict of the decision with that. There is a lot more things that I would like to speak to, but I have only got three minutes. The Council's recent decision to remove six trees on the South Perth foreshore is in direct conflict with its newly adopted Urban Greening Strategy. This decision, taken on the very night the strategy was approved, erodes public faith and undermines the Council's own stated objectives. Two of the strategy's four primary pillars; protect and enhance are directly contradicted by this decision. The strategy explicitly mandates the protection of the City's ecologically sensitive riverside environment as a community asset and states that removing trees on City land is to be considered as a last resort. It talks to expanding tree canopy not reducing it. The removal of these trees to preserve a handful of private views goes against these core principles. Moreover, the decision disregards the extensive community consultation that informed the strategy which revealed overwhelming support for prioritizing tree canopy over views.

Unfortunately, a decision was made during the development of the strategy that saw it remain silent on this contentious long-running issue. But by making this ad-hoc decision now, the Council has ignored this community feedback and undermined the public's trust. Understandably, it erodes the community's confidence in the Council's commitment to faithfully implement the Greening Strategy or any other adopted Council strategies. I call on the Council to immediately revoke this decision. I ask that any future policies on tree planting and objections be developed through the Urban Greening Implementation Plan, as the most appropriate vessel for that decision with genuine community input. It is time to move beyond reactive decisions and engage in a productive balanced dialogue with all stakeholders to find sustainable solutions that protect and increase our tree canopy with a balanced approach to all community priorities on the foreshore. This is the path to truly implementing the strategy and restoring the community's trust in the Council's leadership. Thank you.

The Presiding Member called Ms Sue Gillieatt of Salter Point to the microphone, it was at this point it was acknowledged that Ms Sue Gillieatt had formally seconded the motion and accordingly had already spoken.

Mayor Greg Milner: I would like to invite Ms Joanne Ord of Como to the microphone, welcome to you and we look forward to your statement. Once again, if you could please state your name and address before you begin.

The following statement was read out by Ms Joanne Ord of Como at the Electors' Special Meeting held 25 August 2025.

Ms Joanne Ord: Hello everybody. I am speaking in support of the petition tonight, specifically in respect of the lack of confidence in the decision-making and governance shown by Council. Council's decision at the 22 July OCM undermines the City's ability to manage public land in accordance with its own management plans, strategies, and contradicts the City's online removal request form conditions. The City advised mid last year that not being able to proceed with works on publicly administered land without explicit endorsement of adjoining residents is not a practice the City is aware of in any instance. Yet, here we are. Decisions on issues similar to this involving publicly administered land must centre on a whole community outcome, which many local governments have detailed via their strategies and our City is amongst them. The benefit to the community and whether community expectations would be met by this decision appear not to have been considered and this is the very responsibility of our Council. The decision to support the amended motion has led to a revocation motion and tonight's Electors' meeting. The cost to ratepayers is not just their time in preparing for and attending these meetings, but a loss in productivity to the City in dealing with this protracted issue. Council's role is to support the City's efforts to meet its strategic objectives. Of all the City's strategies, this decision does not support the newly endorsed UGS is at the forefront. The community engaged in good faith to guide this strategy via pop-up events, submissions, and notably via the deliberative panel. I am informed by members of that panel that the expectation was for Council to then take up the baton on the community's behalf, which Council did by endorsing the UGS, but only to (roughly an hour) later pass the amended motion, which was the impetus for this petition. The City's community has rallied quickly to secure this special Electors' meeting, motivated by what they see as a failure of governance. I often hear the words Council and City interchanged and perhaps the assumption being that they are the same entity, but a separation in function and role does exist. This separation is essential for good governance. But to be clear, the issue of governance tonight is Council's alone. The Electors' meeting is a result of a series of decisions. Decisions which have a direct influence on the reputation of this City we call home. Thank you.

Mayor Greg Milner: Thank you for your statement.

Mayor Greg Milner:

I would now like to invite Mr Stephen Russell of Como, If you would like to come to the microphone. Welcome to you and we look forward to your statement. Once again, if you could state your name and address before you begin your statement.

The following statement was read out by Mr Stephen Russell of Como at the Electors' Special Meeting held 25 August 2025.

Mr Stephen Russell:

I speak in favour of tonight's Electors' motion. I am sure Council will hear from the community here tonight about the benefits of trees, about private property rights versus public property rights, etc., etc., to which many here know where I stand. But I wish to speak more specifically about clause (e), which talks of fostering effective governance with quality decision making to deliver community priorities. Clause (e) is simply requiring Council to perform its' fiduciary duty to the community. The most basic element of good government.

Obviously, the community feels that the Council has not carried out this duty, because we are here tonight. It is incredulous, indeed beyond frustrating, that the community has needed to mobilize itself to call for a special Electors' meeting to revoke a Council decision on a matter that should not have presented itself. How on earth did we all arrive at this point here tonight? What were the circumstances, the decision-making environment, where a Council felt so empowered to support a Notice of Motion where its ultimate objective is to remove public trees to protect million-dollar views of adjacent private residents, an objective so lacking in material public benefit that it does not align with good government. Alas, this is not a singular example as we have seen other examples of motions and Council decision-making that are more about Elected Member public profiles rather than good government. For me, it comes down to a Council culture of its own making. A culture that has become so evidently factionalised and self-absorbed with itself, since the State seat pre-selection battle in early 2024. In effect, the fallout has spilled onto the Council floor. The Council Chambers has become a proxy battleground for political ambition and upmanship. It is exhausting to observe as a community member and it must be exhausting for the City administration to be caught in the crossfire. A Council focused on itself, cannot be focused on the community. That is why we are here tonight, that is why this Electors' motion needs to be supported not only for the six trees but also for good government.

Thank you.

Mayor Greg Milner:

Thank you, Mr Russell.

I would now like to invite Mr Ian Barlow of Koondoola, if you would like to come to the microphone.

Welcome to you, if you could please state your name and address. We look forward to your statement.

The following statement was read out by Mr Ian Barlow of Koondoola at the Electors' Special Meeting held 25 August 2025.

Mr Ian Barlow:

Thank you. my name is Ian Barlow and I have acquired permission by governance to speak.

I have been asked to raise awareness of the importance of encouraging our local turtles and their population to help aid in the maintenance of healthy water quality, not just biodiversity. These turtles are not only the saviours of our wetlands, but they also provide an annual spectacle with females emerging on mass for their nesting season. With the planting of the six trees, it is a great step forward in increasing tree coverage but also creates additional nesting habitat for our turtles. With this creation of nesting habitat in prime turtle nesting area, it will help reduce the human wildlife interactions and that includes deterring turtles from nesting in residential gardens. Alongside with keeping the lakeside residents happy about their gardens not being disturbed, the newly planted trees will drastically reduce the exposure time for not only nesting females, but will improve the survival rate of hatchlings entering the water. With a higher number of turtles, it means cleaner water and a chance for wildlife to generate revenue in the community as they are the only large reptile that can be safely observed so close to the city. If you have seen a turtle and seen the way that a turtle looks back and smiles at you, you cannot help but be happy and smile back.

That is my statement.

Mayor Greg Milner:

Thank you very much, Mr Barlow.

I would now like to invite Mr Oliver Crosthwaite of South Perth, welcome to you. The microphone is yours, if you could please state your name and your full address. We look forward to your statement.

The following statement was read out by Mr Oliver Crosthwaite of South Perth at the Electors' Special Meeting held 25 August 2025.

Mr Oliver Crosthwaite: Mayor, Councillors, officers, and residents - whilst I made a Deputation at last week's Council Briefing, opposing the removal of the six trees. I would like to reiterate the salient points for the benefit of this public forum. Council's decision to remove these trees is difficult to understand for a number of reasons. Firstly, there are so few of these trees - so why have they become such an issue? Secondly, five of the six trees will grow to less than 5m. This is contrary to former Councillor Coveney's assertion that the six trees will grow up to 30m. Thirdly, the majority of these six trees would grow to be about the same height as similar trees that already exist in varying places around the lake and be no more an obstruction than what already exists. Fourthly, the six trees have been planted by City staff in accordance with a long-standing practice that is in line with side boundaries of adjoining properties to minimise visual obstruction.

Fifthly, most of the six adjoining properties have house heights of between 10m-15m and therefore provide vantage points to Perth City, over the expected 5m height of these five trees should they inadvertently be in direct line of sight. Sixthly, it is well known and accepted that adjoining owners do not own the rights of the views to the city. A point grudgingly made by the mover of the motion to have the trees removed. Seventhly, that Councillor made it clear that he was acting on behalf of around a dozen residents, presumably from just six adjoining properties.

Mayor Greg Milner: Sorry, Mr Crosthwaite, I do need to jump in there. I do not think former Councillor Coveney said he was acting on behalf of those residents. I think he said he had been contacted by those residents. I have paused your time, I am about to restart it.

Mr Oliver Crosthwaite: Accepted. Thank you.

Presumably from just six adjoining properties in front of which the trees appear in the park. This is a bit rich given that there are thousands of other residents with an interest in the adjoining public land. In fact, supporters of the six trees managed within hours to obtain close to 700 on a petition calling for the special Electors' meeting. Tenthly, catering to the self-interest of so few is shortsighted and sets a dangerous precedent for future decision-makers.

Mayor Greg Milner: That is time, Mr Crosthwaite, thank you for your statement.

Mr Oliver Crosthwaite: Thank you.

Mayor Greg Milner: Okay, so they were the statements from all the people that had registered prior to this meeting, but we still have time if there are people who would like to make a statement from the floor. Would anyone like to do so?

Yes, the fellow at the back there - if you would like to come up?

Welcome to you, if you could please state your name and full address and we look forward to your statement.

The following statement was read out by Mr Anthony Sacca of South Perth at the Electors' Special Meeting held 25 August 2025.

Mr Anthony Sacca: I was not planning on making a statement tonight, so I do not have a nice written piece of paper to speak by, but while I was sitting here, I am listening. I wanted to hear from people who actually supported this decision in the first place. So, the residents who wanted them removed, and the Councillors that voted. Now, interestingly, they were given the opportunity to speak tonight and not one person has said a word. So, I am curious either: one, they're too ashamed to say anything in front of all of us.

Mayor Greg Milner: I will jump in there, Mr Sacca. I am going to encourage everyone to play the issue, not the person.

Mr Anthony Sacca: I am not speaking about any individual, I am talking about.

Mayor Greg Milner: No, I get it.

Mr Anthony Sacca: Either they have changed their minds, or they do not want to speak. The Council does not want to speak to the people when they are here and I find that shocking. Thank you.

Mayor Greg Milner: Thank you for the statement. Just a gentle reminder to everyone to please be respectful, please extend due courtesy, as you would want due courtesy to be extended to you.

So, with that, is there anyone else who would like to make a statement from the floor?

Yes. If you would like to come to the microphone - if you could please state your name and full address and we look forward to your statement.

The following statement was read out by Ms Amanda Marley of Como at the Electors' Special Meeting held 25 August 2025.

Ms Amanda Marley: I had not really planned on coming here tonight either. I have been a nurse and a midwife for my career (retired now) but an advocate for vulnerable people. I would like to advocate and have my voice heard here tonight, because I would like to promote activism for vulnerable plants, which are living things. I believe we have European borer problem here in Perth, which I think we need to keep as many trees planted on the lovely foreshore. I was just wondering also have you consulted any of the local indigenous Whadjuk people from the Noongar nation in our lovely Boodja?

Mayor Greg Milner: On this specific issue?

Ms Amanda Marley: Yeah, about you know, removing the trees?

Mayor Greg Milner: Mr Scott?

Mr Matthew Scott (A/CEO): I do not believe so, but this is not public question time, it is for statements.

Mayor Greg Milner: Good point, yes, timely reminder, I should have picked up on that.

Ms Amanda Marley: I just remind you of your Reconciliation Action Plan, as well.

Mayor Greg Milner: Thank you.

Ms Amanda Marley: That is very important.

Mayor Greg Milner: Thank you for the statement.

Folks, is there anyone else who would like to make a statement from the floor? Yes, the lady in the third row there. Welcome to you. If you could please state your name and full address and we look forward to your statement.

The following statement was read out by Ms Noreen Fynn of South Perth at the Electors' Special Meeting held 25 August 2025.

Ms Noreen Fynn: Good evening, Mayor and Councillors and staff. I think my main concern, along with many, is that I consider this to be an extremely dangerous precedent that has been set. In taking the interests of a very small number of electors, in terms of their views and their own financial considerations in voting for the removal of the trees when that was the reason given for bringing this motion. I think that very dangerous precedent that could be used by others, in other parts of the City, needs to be very carefully taken into consideration. Thank you.

Mayor Greg Milner: Thank you, Ms Fynn.

Is there anyone else? Yes, Mr Richter, Yes.

Welcome to you, I will get you to say your name and full address, but we look forward to your statement.

The following statement was read out by Mr Zane Richter of Manning at the Electors' Special Meeting held 25 August 2025.

Mr Zane Richter: Good evening, Mayor and Councillors. I just want to make a statement about: I am a glass half full type of guy and I think we should not throw the baby out with the bath water. We have \$30,000 of potential additional planting to support that wetland. I would like to see that as well as the retention of the trees, move forward as we go from here.

Mayor Greg Milner: Thank you for the statement.

Folks, is there anyone else who would like to make a statement from the floor? No. Okay, in that case, there being no further statements, I am going to put the motion as presented by Ms Bronwyn David and seconded by Ms Sue Gillieatt to the vote.

DECISION

Moved: Ms Bronwyn David of South Perth

Seconded: Ms Sue Gillieatt of Salter Point

That the Electors of the City of South Perth ('the City'):

1. Express a lack of confidence in the Council for their decision on Cr Coveney's Notice of Motion Item 12.1 (Resolution 0725/140) 'Removal of the Six Trees Planted on the South Side of Lake Douglas During Winter 2024' of the July 2025 Ordinary Council Meeting agenda, for the following reasons:
 - (a) The decision to remove six trees from public land in order to protect the outlook of the adjoining private landowners ('the decision') is not in the best interests of the general community of the City, and is inconsistent with the conservation and enhancement of a functional, healthy river and foreshore environment which is the aim of the City's **South Perth Foreshore Strategy and Management Plan**.
 - (b) The decision is inconsistent with and disrespectful of the consensus of the community as expressed in research undertaken for and feedback to the **Urban Greening Strategy**, as endorsed by Council.
 - (c) The decision undermines the goals of the **Urban Greening Strategy** to: protect the City's ecologically sensitive riverside environment as a community asset; protect the City's vegetation, tree canopy and green spaces and existing trees; and expand existing urban greening for the benefit of the City's environment and community wellbeing.
 - (d) The proposal to hold a Councillor workshop to develop a policy on planting trees on public land is inconsistent with the requirements of the **Urban Greening Strategy**, the **South Perth Foreshore Strategy and Management Plan** and the Environment (Built and Natural) elements of the **Strategic Community Plan**. This could affect potential Federal and State Government funding by suggesting to higher levels of government that funding might not align with a thoroughly researched, community supported plan.
 - (e) The decision establishes a concerning precedent by permitting the interests of a limited group of individuals to take precedence over those of the broader community. As such, it does not fulfil the **Strategic Community Plan's** requirements (at 4.3.1) to foster effective governance with quality decision making to deliver community priorities.
2. In accordance with the above, we call upon Council to rescind or change Resolution 0725/140 resulting from Item 12.1, in its entirety or as possible under the Standing Orders, at its earliest opportunity.

CARRIED

Mayor Greg Milner:

I think that was unanimous, so the motion has been carried.

Mayor Greg Milner:

Before I do close the meeting, I would like to advise everyone that any decisions made at electors' meetings are to be considered by Council in accordance with section 5.33 of the *Local Government Act 1995*. At this point in time, given that we have got our August Council Meeting tomorrow night, it is anticipated that the minutes from this meeting will be considered by Council at the Council meeting to be held Tuesday 23 September 2025.

7. CLOSURE

The Presiding Member thanked everyone for their attendance and closed the meeting at 7.12pm.