




Shire of Northam
Heritage, Commerce and Lifestyle

Shire of Northam

Minutes

Special Council Meeting

2 February 2017



DISCLAIMER

This agenda has yet to be dealt with by the Council. The Recommendations shown at the foot of each item have yet to be considered by the Council and are not to be interpreted as being the position of the Council. The minutes of the meeting held to discuss this agenda should be read to ascertain the decision of the Council.

In certain circumstances members of the public are not entitled to inspect material, which in the opinion of the Chief Executive Officer is confidential, and relates to a meeting or a part of a meeting that is likely to be closed to members of the public.

No responsibility whatsoever is implied or accepted by the Shire of Northam for any act, omission, statement or intimation occurring during Council or Committee meetings.

The Shire of Northam disclaims any liability for any loss whatsoever and howsoever caused arising out of reliance by any person or legal entity on any such act, omission or statement of intimation occurring during Council or Committee meetings.

Any person or legal entity who acts or fails to act in reliance upon any statement, act or omission made in a Council or Committee meeting does so at that person's or legal entity's own risk.

In particular and without derogating in any way from the broad disclaimer above, in any discussion regarding any planning application or application for a licence, any statement or intimation of approval made by any member or Officer of the Shire of Northam during the course of any meeting is not intended to be and is not taken as notice of approval from the Shire of Northam.

The Shire of Northam advises that anyone who has any application lodged with the Shire of Northam must obtain and should only rely on WRITTEN CONFIRMATION of the outcome of the application and any conditions attaching to the decision made by the Shire of Northam in respect of the application.

The Shire of Northam advises that any plans or documents contained within this agenda may be subject to copyright law provisions (*Copyright Act 1968*, as amended) and that the express permission of the copyright owner(s) should be sought prior to their reproduction. It should be noted that copyright owners are entitled to take legal action against any persons who infringe their copyright. A reproduction of material that is protected by copyright may represent a copyright infringement.

Contents

1.	DECLARATION OF OPENING	4
2.	ATTENDANCE.....	4
2.1	APOLOGIES	4
2.2	APPROVED LEAVE OF ABSENCE	4
3.	DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS.....	5
4.	ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE PRESIDING MEMBER (WITHOUT DISCUSSION)	5
5.	PUBLIC QUESTION/STATEMENT TIME	5
5.1	PUBLIC QUESTIONS	5
5.2	PUBLIC STATEMENTS	6
6.	RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS PUBLIC QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE	6
7.	RECEIVING OF PETITIONS, PRESENTATIONS AND DEPUTATIONS	6
7.1	PETITIONS	6
7.2	PRESENTATIONS	6
7.3	DEPUTATIONS	6
8.	APPLICATION FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE.....	6
9.	CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES	6
10.	ITEMS BROUGHT FORWARD FOR THE CONVENIENCE OF THOSE IN THE PUBLIC GALLERY	6
11.	REPORTS OF COMMITTEE MEETINGS	6
12.	SPECIAL ITEMS	7
12.1	Tender 5 of 2016 – Construction of Aboriginal and Environmental Interpretive Centre.....	7
13.	MATTERS BEHIND CLOSED DOORS	23
14.	MOTIONS OF WHICH PREVIOUS NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN	23
15.	URGENT BUSINESS APPROVED BY PERSON PRESIDING OR BY DECISION .	23
16.	DECLARATION OF CLOSURE	23

1. DECLARATION OF OPENING

The Shire President, Cr S B Pollard declare the meeting open at 5:30pm.

2. ATTENDANCE

Council:

Shire President
Deputy Shire President
Councillors

S B Pollard
T M Little
D G Beresford
J E Williams
J Proud
R W Tinetti
C L Davidson
U Rumjantsev
C R Antonio
D A Hughes at 5:33pm.

Staff:

Chief Executive Officer
Executive Manager Engineering Services
Executive Manager Development Services
Executive Manager Community Services
Executive Manager Corporate Services
Executive Assistant – CEO

J B Whiteaker
C D Kleynhans
C B Hunt
R Rayson
C Young
A C Maxwell

Guest:

Iredale Pedersen Hook Architects

A Iredale

Gallery:

Avon Valley Advocate:
Public:

Carla Hildebrandt
Attila Mencshely
Jenny Budas
Belle Moore
Jan James
Jeffrey Pollard

2.1 APOLOGIES

Nil.

2.2 APPROVED LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Nil.

3. DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS

Nil.

4. ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE PRESIDING MEMBER (WITHOUT DISCUSSION)

Nil.

5. PUBLIC QUESTION/STATEMENT TIME

5.1 PUBLIC QUESTIONS

Jan James - Northam

Question 1: What is the correct name of the Centre being considered at this meeting?

Response 1: The Shire President advised that it is the Aboriginal & Environmental Interpretive Centre.

Question 2: What is the aboriginal component of the Centre?

Response 2: The Chief Executive Officer advised that the Shire has undertaken extensive consultation with local representatives and elders of the aboriginal community. This has involved identifying what the Centre will contain and represent around aboriginal culture in the past and future. In addition, there will be a focus on environmental aspect from an aboriginal point of view as well as generally.

Attila Mencshelyi - Northam

Question 1: Were any of the tenders for the construction of this building local?

Response 1: Mr Iredale from Iredale Pedersen Hook Architects advised that there were no local tenderers however local sub-contractors were engaged to submit quotes for some elements of works.

Question 2: As there is a potential shortfall, is there any likelihood of Council obtaining a loan from the Treasury Corporation?

Response 2: The Chief Executive Officer advised that this may be a possible option however Staff have identified a range of possible sources both internally or externally.

5.2 PUBLIC STATEMENTS

Nil.

6. RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS PUBLIC QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE

Nil.

7. RECEIVING OF PETITIONS, PRESENTATIONS AND DEPUTATIONS

7.1 PETITIONS

Nil.

7.2 PRESENTATIONS

Nil.

7.3 DEPUTATIONS

Nil.

8. APPLICATION FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Nil.

9. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Nil.

10. ITEMS BROUGHT FORWARD FOR THE CONVENIENCE OF THOSE IN THE PUBLIC GALLERY

Nil.

11. REPORTS OF COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Nil.

12. SPECIAL ITEMS

COUNCIL DECISION

Minute No: C.2939

Moved: Cr Hughes

Seconded: Cr Williams

That Council;

1. Meet behind closed doors in accordance with Section 5.23 (c) of the Local Government Act 1995 due to considering an item where a contract is entered into, or which may be entered into, by the local government and which relates to a matter to be discussed at the meeting; and
2. Suspend Standing Orders 9.1 and 9.3 of the Shire of Northam Standing Orders Local Law 2008.

CARRIED 9/1

The Gallery departed the Council Chambers at 5:38pm.

12.1 Tender 5 of 2016 – Construction of Aboriginal and Environmental Interpretive Centre

Address:	Grey Street/Minson Avenue, Northam
Owner:	Shire of Northam
File Reference:	1.3.13.5
Reporting Officer:	Ross Rayson Executive Manager Community Services
Responsible Officer:	Chadd Hunt Acting Chief Executive Officer
Voting Requirement	Absolute Majority

BRIEF

For the Council to consider tenders received in response to the Request for Tender 5 of 2016 – Construction of Aboriginal and Environmental Interpretive Centre. This report provides details of the tenders received and project budget amendment proposed to allow Council to appoint a successful tenderer to construct the Aboriginal and Environmental Interpretive Centre (AEIC).

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1: Tender Evaluation report

Attachment 2: Schedule of Tender Savings

Attachment 3: Architectural drawings set

Note: The attachments have been provided to Elected Members as a separate confidential attachment to this agenda/minutes.

BACKGROUND / DETAILS

Council resolved at its meeting held on 18th May 2016 the following with respect to the AEIC –

That Council;

- 1. Endorse the architectural design as presented and authorise progress through to detailed design*
- 2. Accept the interpretive design concept, with the direction that the interpretation needs to incorporate a stronger 'environmental' element, to meet the brief of Aboriginal and Environmental Centre, on the understanding that a more detailed design will be presented to Council for final endorsement.*

Following this resolution detailed plans were developed to allow the construction to be tendered. Subsequently Tender 5 of 2016 for the construction of the AEIC was advertised on 5th November 2016. The tender process was conducted by WALGA through the online tender portal. As part of the tender process, an onsite meeting for prospective tenderers was held on 11 November 2016 and tender submissions closed on 6th December 2016.

The evaluation panel consisted of the CEO, Executive Manager Development Services, Executive Manager Community Services, Executive Manager Engineering Services, Joel Fuller - Iredale Pedersen Hook (Architect) and Rosemarie Ash -WALGA. A total of four (4) tender submissions were received and each was evaluated in accordance with the tender documents and the following qualitative criteria was used in arriving at the final report –

Related Experience – 20%

Project Consideration – 40%

Project Methodology – 40%

Following the qualitative evaluation, pricing was ranked from least expensive and a Relative Value for money assessment undertaken. Following this assessment the recommended Tenderer ranked second in the Qualitative

Criteria (only marginally lower than the highest ranked), submitted the lowest price and scored the highest in the Relative Value of Money Assessment.

A full report on the procurement process and tender evaluation is provided in Confidential - Attachment 1.

CONSIDERATIONS

Strategic Community / Corporate Business Plan

Objective C4: Protect and promote the Shire's diverse culture and heritage.

Strategy C4.3: Understand and acknowledge Aboriginal and European heritage through the provision of interpretive venues, materials and activities.

Action: Construct Northam Aboriginal & Environmental Interpretive Centre.

Financial / Resource Implications

At the time of the original \$2,100,000 grant submission to the Department of Infrastructure and Regional Development it was estimated that the total project cost for the AEIC (inclusive of Architectural design, interpretive design and construction) would be \$4,200,000. At this point Council, in effect, underwrote the gap of \$2,100,000.

Fortunately, Council has been able to leverage the initial \$2.1m grant and secure an additional \$2,300,000 in external grant funding. The additional external funding for the project has been received from the following sources:

- LotteryWest - \$2,000,000.00
- Royalties for Regions - \$300,000.00

The following table details current funding available for the entire project-

Aboriginal & Environmental Interpretive Centre	
Funding	Amount
National Stronger Regions Fund	\$2,100,000
Lottery West	\$2,000,000
Wheatbelt Development Commission	\$300,000
RFR Supertowns Planning Funding	\$209,400
Transfer from the Regional Development Reserve	\$400,981
<i>Recommended Sale of Land Budget Review (unconfirmed allocation)</i>	\$175,000
Total Funding	\$5,185,381

The initial grant application was based on broad conceptual designs with no detailed costing available, subsequently work on the building design and Interpretive design has enabled the total cost to be more clearly defined.

As part of the due diligence for the project, a quantity surveyor (QS) was utilised to assess the estimated cost of the project to make best endeavour to keep the tender price within initial estimates. Unfortunately QS can only provide a prediction with the final design cost only known once tenders are called and submitted. In this instance it is evident that the QS was significantly less than the market price.

The following table provides a summary of current identified capital costs for the AEIC:

		Budget May 2016 Council Report	Budget January 2017 (based on Tender – with building deletions)	Budget January 2017 (based on Tender as submitted)
Architectural design		321,000	347,450	347,450
Interpretive design		111,500	115,500	115,500
Interpretive Fit out		750,000	750,000	750,000
Surrounds	150,000		0	0
Contingency	405,000		241,974	269,979
Escalation	32,500		0	0
Building	2,570,000	3,157,500.00	4,092,820	4,649,582
Headwork's		150,000	106,000	106,000
Procurement		0	12,000	12,000
Superintendent*		0	115,000	115,000
Total		4,490,000	5,780,744	6,365,511

*This fee was agreed to in the original awarding of the tender for the design of the building. This represents a fee for the Architect to project manage the construction phase. At this point staff are of the view that this will be awarded.

Note: the Building Cost is based on all the deletions recommended by the Architect – should Council not agree to all the deletions then obviously the total budget cost will need to be increased.

Council has a number of options with respect to the funding shortfall (currently \$595,363 based on current building deletions) should it wish to proceed with the current project budget. The Regional Development Reserve is budgeted to have a closing balance of \$426,000 at the end of the 2016/17 Financial Year and a proportion of those funds are available to be used for the project. As the project is to be expended over two financial

years there is an opportunity to allocate a portion of the costs in the 2017-18 budget or fund the total \$595,363 through debt.


Staff have utilised a new tool developed by the WA Treasury Corporation to assist in the assessment of Council capacity to accommodate the total additional funding shortfall, \$595,363 from additional debt.

The model as presented includes the additional debt budgeted for in the 2016/17 financial year being, Swimming Pool \$1,000,000, Youth Precinct \$500,000 and the Self Supporting Loan for the Northam Bowling Club \$150,000. Future figures are based on the draft LTFP that includes the following additional loans, Northam Swimming Pool development \$2,251,933 and the Northam works Depot \$2,033,000 budgeted for in 2018/19 and 2020/21 respectfully.

Total debt repayment is expected to peak during 2020/21 at approximately \$731,981 per annum.

Debt Service Cover ratio


This ratio is an indicator of the Council's ability to generate sufficient cash to cover its debt payments. A ratio of greater than 2 is identified as a basic standard. For the purposes of this assessment a benchmark of 3 has been utilised.



As the chart indicates Council, if it proceeds with the project will have sufficient capacity to accommodate it from a cash flow perspective.

Net debt ratio

Has been utilised as an assessment of the Council debt level as a percentage of operating revenue as another indicator of the Council's ability to accommodate the required levels of debt.



The net debt ratio is also within the parameters established as being acceptable.

In addition to the debt funding option, Council could look at additional land sales to assist funding the expected shortfall.

Legislative Compliance

Section 3.57 of the Local Government Act 1995 requires A local government is required to invite tenders before it enters into a contract of a prescribed kind under which another person is to supply goods and services".

The Local Government (Functions & General) Regulations 1996 prescribe the manner in which Tenders are to be called and assessed.

Policy Implications

Policy F 4.2 – Purchasing and Tendering Policy.

Stake Holder Engagement / Consultation

Extensive consultation has occurred between staff, WALGA the Architects and the tenderer.

Risk Implications

The following is based on the original risk assessment undertaken for the project.

Risk description	Risk probability (low, medium, high)	Action manager	Containment strategy	Additional comment
Inability to secure additional funding for the project.	High	Project Team	Develop a funding strategy. Council has agreed to underwrite the required funds.	This risk has been mitigated to a large degree, with Councils own source revenue exposure being limited
Inability to receive the required approvals in a timely manner.	Medium	Project Team	Identify approvals required and develop a project Gantt chart	All necessary approvals have been secured to date.
Inability to commence project works when required by financial agreements.	Medium	Project Team	Possible extension of funding delivery timeframes. Keep all funding groups advised of progress against agreed timeframes.	This remains a risk in the event Council does not wish to accept any tender offered. If this were to be the case staff would commence engagement with the funding bodies as a matter of priority. This is a more significant risk to the project in the event Council opts for a redesign.
Inability to get required community buy in and support.	Medium	Project Team	Develop a Communications Plan.	To date buy in from the Noongar Community has been positive, however this remains a risk to the overall project success.
Project unable to be delivered due to environmental factors.	Medium	Project Team	Develop a list of environmental factors and seek input from DoW and any other potential approval agency. Keep local member/Minister briefed on the progress of the project.	

Risk description	Risk probability (low, medium, high)	Action manager	Containment strategy	Additional comment
Insufficient internal skill coverage to manage the project.	Medium	Project Team	Develop a skills matrix of the project team. Engage external support on the project management group.	This remains a risk to the project, however the use of external project management is still being strongly considered.
Project does not proceed due to funding constraints	Medium	Project Team	Identify additional funding opportunities including Council funds	This represents a significant reputational risk for both within the community (given the level of consultation undertaken) and externally with both the state and federal Government who have committed financially to the projects based on Councils commitment to the project.

Risk Probability Table

Low	Unlikely to occur during the project period and with little impact on the project
Medium	Possibility of occurrence and with some impact on the project
High	Very likely to occur during the project period and potentially impacting heavily

OFFICER'S COMMENT

A full report on the procurement process and outcomes is provided as a separate document.

All of the tenders received tendered a price above the anticipated construction cost of \$3.15 million (based on quantity Surveyor estimate). At the completion of the tender evaluation, FIRM Construction were ranked 1. Subsequent to the tender evaluation, discussions between Firm Constructions, the Architects (Iredale, Pedersen Hook) and the Shire have been undertaken to identify savings in building design and construction to reduce the

construction price. The basis of the discussions was to identify savings which could be achieved without:

- Requirement for building design changes (possibly requiring a new tender process), or
- Compromising the integrity of the building and its purpose

A comprehensive list of savings, totalling approximately \$480,000 has been identified by the architects and the builder. These savings are identified in Attachment 2. In addition the architects have identified several other opportunities for cost saving of up to an additional \$81,000 (also included in Attachment 2). If Council chooses to accept all of the savings, the final tender price will be approximately \$4,089,490.

Staff in reviewing the list of savings have identified several items that requires some further consideration:

1. SV 03 and 04 – Chimney and Fire Pit. Whilst the concept is supported generally another option exists to develop a “meeting place” between the existing Visitor Centre and proposed building.
2. SV 07 – Delete Lift. The cost associated with installing the list is significant and alternate compliant access to the building is located via the proposed ramp.
3. SV 08 – Delete Lift Shaft. A suggestion is to retain the lift shaft so that if in the future a lift can be added there will be reduced retrofitting costs.
4. SV 09 – Delete footpath, walkway and stair to lift lobby – obviously if the lift is deleted then this is not required at this stage.
5. SV 12 – Delete Photo Voltaic Array – the installation of the system will be pursued separately with a private power provider.
6. SV 13 – Delete Water Tank – staff suggest that this should remain due to the cost of retrofitting later and given a key element of the project is focused on 'Environmental' outcomes.

Council has a number of options:

- Option 1
Award the tender for the AEIC at the original tender price of \$4,649,582 with a funding shortfall of approximately \$1.18 million to be sourced from the Regional Development Reserve (\$400,000) and the remaining funds being sourced from the 2017-2018 Financial Year or via debt.
- Option 2
Accept the complete list of identified savings as identified, giving a revised tender price of \$4,089,490 with an overall project funding shortfall of approximately \$595,363 being sourced from the Regional

Development Reserve (\$400,000) and a budget allocation of \$195,000 in the 2017-18 Financial Year.

- Option 3
Identify any of the potential savings items that it is felt need to remain in the project, and adjust the final tender price accordingly. (E.g. whilst the lift is not a compliance requirement, Council may wish for it to be included; or Council may see the gathering space as an integral part of the building purpose). Depending on the level of additional costs funding for the shortfall would be through either Option 1 or 2 as per above.
- Option 4
Not accept any tenders and re-tender the project based on the cost designs already identified. Initial discussions with the Architects have suggested that this will delay the project by up to 10 weeks. The issue identified by staff with this option is the fact that there is unlikely to be any more cost savings than currently identified. In addition delaying the project by this period of time may have consequences from both a site access perspective as well as with the funding bodies.
- Option 5
Not accept any tenders and redesign and re-tender the project based on the original approved building budget. The Architects have indicated that this will delay the project for up to 14 to 16 weeks. The issue staff have with this option is that the building design may significantly change from what is currently proposed which will have issues with respect to the statutory approval processes, potential redesign of the interpretive space (given that the current space is being designed currently). As per the above option the delay in construction time is a concern from a site access and funding body perspective. There is also a high risk that this option would attract additional consultant's fees. This has been discussed with the Architect and a review of the terms of agreement would need to be undertaken to ascertain what contractual obligations exist.

In staff's opinion the most appropriate action to progress the project forward is to accept the changes suggested by the Architect and Builder with the required shortfall in funding being sourced from the Regional Development Reserve and Council budget in 2017-18.

Mr Young departed the Council Chambers at 5:59pm.

Mr Young returned to the Council Chambers at 6:08pm.

Mr Hunt departed the Council Chambers at 6:55pm.

Mr Hunt returned to the Council Chambers at 6:56pm.

RECOMMENDATION / MOTION

Moved: Cr Beresford

Seconded: Cr Hughes

That Council;

- 1. Endorses the outcomes of the tender evaluation panel's assessment in relation to Tender No.5 of 2016 for the construction of the Aboriginal & Environmental Interpretive Centre which has resulted in the tender submitted by FIRM Construction being ranked as the most advantageous to Council.**
- 2. Delegate authority to the CEO to award the contract pursuant to Tender 5 of 2016 to FIRM Constructions, subject to negotiations over the final contract sum including, but not limited to, the deletion of the following identified building components-**

SV 01 – Delete New gathering space and associated seating

SV 02 – Revise detail for under croft car park

SV 03 – Delete Chimney

SV 04 - Delete precast fire pit and seating

SV 05 – Delete Skylight

SV 06 – Reduce suspended slab thickness

SV 07 – Delete lift

SV 08 – Delete lift shaft

SV 09 – Delete footpath, walkway and stair to lift lobby

SV 10 – Delete profiled metal soft lining

SV 11 – Delete bin store

SV 12 – Delete photo voltaic array

SV 14 – Revise extents of recycled jarrah timber screen (A)

SV 15 - Revise extents of recycled jarrah timber screen (B)

SV 16 – Delete wall tiles to wet areas

SV 17 – Delete galvanised steel plate entry snoot

SV 18 – Delete window WT4/W05

SV 21 – Substitute wall cladding specification

SV 22 – Substitute roofing specification

- SV 23 – Delete cast-in galvanised steel plate to workshop
- SV 24 – Delete slab set down and infill topping slab to interpretive exhibition space
- SV 25 – Delete rammed earth walls, replace with reduced extent of low height face block work walls
- SV 26 – Delete portion of concrete paving to top of walkway
- SV 27 – Delete 5 off trees and portion of landscaping
- SV 28 – Substitute automatic sliding entry doors with hinged double doors
- SV 29 – Substitute automatic sliding doors into “immersive Space” with hinged double doors
- SV 30 – Substitute automatic sliding door out of interpretive space with hinged double door
- SV 31 – Delete double glazed door within DT3/W05
- SV 32 – Reduce extent of curved sliding doors
- SV 33 – Delete track and track lighting to office
- SV 34 – Delete track and track lighting to workshop/meeting
- SV 35 – Delete external wall mounted luminaries
- SV 36 – Delete external timber screen mounted luminaries
- SV 37 – Reduce extent of lighting to Entry and shop/gallery
- SV 38 – Delete two off 3 phase instantaneous hot water units
- SV 39 – Delete cleaners sink and three phase instantaneous hot water units
- SV 40 – Delete 1 off 1.5 glazed door to lift lobby
- SV 41 – Delete 1 off fan coil unit
- SV 42 – Delete joinery to interp admin/store
- SV A.01- Delete coloured oxides to all concrete as currently documented
- SV A.02- Cost for coloured oxides for portions of work already removed in earlier items
- SV A.03- Replace all 150 thick precast concrete walls with 390x140 core filled block work
- SV A.04-Cost difference for pre-cast concrete v core filled block work for portions already removed in earlier items
- SV A.05- Potential savings for alternate permanent formwork system

3. Authorise the Chief Executive Officer to commence the procurement of an alternative ‘clean energy’ power source, such as a photovoltaic array.
4. Authorise the allocation of additional funds of up to \$400,000 from the Regional Development Reserve to the project and an allocation of up to \$195,363 in the 2017-18 Budget.

AMENDMENT TO MOTION

Moved: Cr Antonio
Seconded: Cr Little

That the following words be removed;

SV 08 – Delete lift shaft

LOST 4/6

RECOMMENDATION / COUNCIL DECISION

Minute No: C.2940

Moved: Cr Beresford
Seconded: Cr Hughes

That Council;

- 1. Endorses the outcomes of the tender evaluation panel's assessment in relation to Tender No.5 of 2016 for the construction of the Aboriginal & Environmental Interpretive Centre which has resulted in the tender submitted by FIRM Construction being ranked as the most advantageous to Council.**
- 2. Delegate authority to the CEO to award the contract pursuant to Tender 5 of 2016 to FIRM Constructions, subject to negotiations over the final contract sum including, but not limited to, the deletion of the following identified building components-**

SV 01 – Delete New gathering space and associated seating

SV 02 – Revise detail for under croft car park

SV 03 – Delete Chimney

SV 04 - Delete precast fire pit and seating

SV 05 – Delete Skylight

SV 06 – Reduce suspended slab thickness

SV 07 – Delete lift

SV 08 – Delete lift shaft

SV 09 – Delete footpath, walkway and stair to lift lobby

SV 10 – Delete profiled metal soft lining

SV 11 – Delete bin store

SV 12 – Delete photo voltaic array

SV 14 – Revise extents of recycled jarrah timber screen (A)

SV 15 - Revise extents of recycled jarrah timber screen (B)

- SV 16 – Delete wall tiles to wet areas
- SV 17 – Delete galvanised steel plate entry snoot
- SV 18 – Delete window WT4/W05
- SV 21 – Substitute wall cladding specification
- SV 22 – Substitute roofing specification
- SV 23 – Delete cast-in galvanised steel plate to workshop
- SV 24 – Delete slab set down and infill topping slab to interpretive exhibition space
- SV 25 – Delete rammed earth walls, replace with reduced extent of low height face block work walls
- SV 26 – Delete portion of concrete paving to top of walkway
- SV 27 – Delete 5 off trees and portion of landscaping
- SV 28 – Substitute automatic sliding entry doors with hinged double doors
- SV 29 – Substitute automatic sliding doors into “immersive Space” with hinged double doors
- SV 30 – Substitute automatic sliding door out of interpretive space with hinged double door
- SV 31 – Delete double glazed door within DT3/W05
- SV 32 – Reduce extent of curved sliding doors
- SV 33 – Delete track and track lighting to office
- SV 34 – Delete track and track lighting to workshop/meeting
- SV 35 – Delete external wall mounted luminaries
- SV 36 – Delete external timber screen mounted luminaries
- SV 37 – Reduce extent of lighting to Entry and shop/gallery
- SV 38 – Delete two off 3 phase instantaneous hot water units
- SV 39 – Delete cleaners sink and three phase instantaneous hot water units
- SV 40 – Delete 1 off 1.5 glazed door to lift lobby
- SV 41 – Delete 1 off fan coil unit
- SV 42 – Delete joinery to interp admin/store
- SV A.01- Delete coloured oxides to all concrete as currently documented
- SV A.02- Cost for coloured oxides for portions of work already removed in earlier items
- SV A.03- Replace all 150 thick precast concrete walls with 390x140 core filled block work
- SV A.04-Cost difference for pre-cast concrete v core filled block work for portions already removed in earlier items
- SV A.05- Potential savings for alternate permanent formwork system

3. Authorise the Chief Executive Officer to commence the procurement of an alternative ‘clean energy’ power source, such as a photovoltaic array.

4. Authorise the allocation of additional funds of up to \$400,000 from the

Regional Development Reserve to the project and an allocation of up to \$195,363 in the 2017-18 Budget.

**CARRIED 7/3
BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY**

Cr Pollard, Cr Little, Cr Beresford, Cr Williams, Cr Tinetti, Cr Antonio and Cr Hughes voted for the motion.

Cr Rumjantsev, Cr Davidson and Cr Proud voted against to motion.

In forming this decision, Council sought clarification in relation to the following items;

- Whether the removal of building components (e.g. fire pit) would impact the integrity of the building. The CEO confirmed that maintaining the integrity of the building was viewed as paramount, hence the changes being suggested were being put forward in that context. Mr Iredale advised that it is proposed that the fire pit will still be present however located between the Visitor Centre and Aboriginal and Environmental Interpretive Centre. In addition, the removal of the items contained in the Officer's recommendation are not believed to impact the experience nor have significant impacts on the design of the building.
- Clarification was sought in relation to the outcome as a result of removing the lift. Mr Iredale advised that there would be a gradual ramp similar to the one located at the Visitor Centre access ramp. However, this would be a compliant grade so that it is fully wheelchair accessible. It was further queried whether there would be additional costs should Council wish to install this in the future. Mr Iredale confirmed that there would be additional costs due to rectifying/modifying the building however was unable to provide a detailed estimate for this.
- It was queried whether the rainwater tank would be a cost saving in the longer term and if so, should this be removed. Mr Iredale advised that this would not be cost neutral due to only storing a small amount of water.
- Clarification was sought in relation to the risks associated with exceeding the budget once construction has commenced. The CEO advised that a contingency has been made, however there is always this risk associated with projects. This project has been designed to an extremely high level with extensive detail which reduces the risk of unforeseen costs. Mr Iredale reiterated the comments made by the CEO.

- Clarification was sought in respect to the debt service ratio and what Council's capacity was to borrow additional funds. The CEO confirmed that Council has the capacity to borrow an additional \$8 million however after taking into consideration the Swimming Pool and Youth Space, currently in the Long Term Financial Plan it is estimated to be approximately \$6 million.
- General clarification was sought around the options listed within the report. In particular option 4 was discussed, Mr Iredale advised that there is a possibility that the tenders could reduce in cost due to the timing of tendering. The CEO advised that whilst this is an option Council needed to be aware of the additional risk associated with this option including tender prices not reducing and potentially being higher than initially tendered. In addition, Council has a number of milestones deadlines/obligations to meet which have been set by the funding bodies.
- It was queried whether Council would need to make cost reductions with the interpretive element. The Executive Manager Community Services advised that this is a possibility. The CEO advised that the interpretation cost would be easier to manage given it is made up of a range of smaller elements which Council could choose to include or exclude. Staff will be meeting with the Interpretive consultant at the end of the month and should be able to provide a better indication once this meeting has been held.
- It was queried why there is a significant difference in the cost. Mr Iredale advised that a pre tender estimate was completed and was current at the time of being prepared. It is believed that significant difference is due to the timing of tendering (prior to Christmas) and also is impacted by a significant number of tenders being let at that time. There was further discussion around this point with Council expressing its disappointment at the difference between pre tender estimates and tender prices.
- Clarification was sought in relation to the superintendent role. Mr Iredale advised that this fee is for the costs associated with all consultants involved (approximately 10 to 12) and all inspections that are to be undertaken throughout the construction of the building.

COUNCIL DECISION

Minute No: C.2941

Moved: Cr Little

Seconded: Cr Antonio

That Council move out from behind closed doors and resume Standing Orders 9.1 and 9.3 of the Shire of Northam Standing Orders Local Law 2008.

CARRIED 9/1

The Gallery returned to the Council Chambers at 7:06pm and the Shire President read aloud the decision of Council.

13. MATTERS BEHIND CLOSED DOORS

Nil.

14. MOTIONS OF WHICH PREVIOUS NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

Nil.

15. URGENT BUSINESS APPROVED BY PERSON PRESIDING OR BY DECISION

Nil.

16. DECLARATION OF CLOSURE

There being no further business, the Shire President, Cr S B Pollard declared the meeting closed at 7:07pm.

"I certify that the Minutes of the Special Meeting of Council held on Thursday, 2 February 2017 have been confirmed as a true and correct record."

_____ President

_____ Date

