

Program	Reference	Reference Group
Major Review of the City's Strategic Community Plan – Joondalup 2022	Strategic Community Plan – Joondalup 2022	To assist the Council in undertaking a major review of the City's Strategic Community Plan.
Options for volunteer recognition	Community Development Plan Priority - Identifying and mitigating barriers to community participation. Strategic Response - Support, encourage and recognise opportunities for volunteering within the community	To assist Council in developing a comprehensive volunteer recognition program. To assist Council in the development of a program to recognise and support volunteer activities in the City.
Options for Community Leadership Programs	Community Development Plan Priority - Empowering and supporting existing and new community leaders. Strategic Responses: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop recognition programs to acknowledge and celebrate community leaders. • Investigate the development of a community leaders program that provides knowledge and skill enhancement. • Facilitate mentoring opportunities between community organisations that support skill and leadership growth. • 	To assist the Council in the development of a framework and approach for a comprehensive community leaders program.



**STRATEGIC COMMUNITY REFERENCE GROUP
NOTES OF MEETING HELD ON
THURSDAY, 5 JUNE 2014**

Please note these are not minutes, but merely notes from discussions at the Meeting of the Strategic Community Reference Group held on Thursday, 5 June 2014.

The Strategic Community Reference Group Meeting opened at 6:05pm.

ATTENDANCES

Committee Members:

Mayor Troy Pickard	Mayor
Cr Russ Fishwick	South Ward
Cr Kerry Hollywood	North Ward
Cr Mike Norman (Deputy)	South-West Ward

Community Representatives:

Dr Zarrin Siddiqui	South-East Ward
Dr Susan King	South Ward
Mr Brian Yearwood	South-West Ward
Mrs Penny Gilpin	North Ward

Officers:

Mr Jamie Parry	Director, Governance and Strategy
Ms Dale Page	Director, Planning and Community Development
Ms Debbie Terelinck	Manager Community Development and Library Services
Ms Glenda Blake	Manager Strategic and Organisational Development
Ms Julie Forrester	Community Development Coordinator
Ms Sheree Edmondson	Strategic Policy Development Coordinator
Mr Dean Burton	Policy Officer
Mr Rohan Klemm	Recreation Services Coordinator

Guests:

Mr Simon Bowen	Facilitator
Ms Melissa Rudez	Team Leader Community Inclusion, Department of Sport and Recreation
Mr Tim Muirhead	Director, Community, Spirit, Development Network

APOLOGIES

Cr Christine Hamilton-Prime	South-West Ward
Mr Bryan Saunders	Central Ward
Mr Ross Grey	North-Central Ward
Mr Craig Comrie	CEO, Youth Affairs Council of WA

Mr Kenny Annand
Mr Philip Kieran

Principal Consultant, KGA Consulting
Chair, Joondalup Lotteries Management Committee

ITEM 1 COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Mr Bowen welcomed members and outlined that the purpose of the meeting was to obtain feedback on the revised structure of the draft *Community Development Plan 2014-2019*, circulated to members for review. Particular focus was to be given to identifying “clever ways” to deliver the draft strategies, whilst also noting any specific gaps within the structure.

The Presiding Member addressed the group and thanked members for their contributions so far and noted any apologies received. It was acknowledged that the previous meeting highlighted commentary around structure and language in the development of a revised *Community Development Plan 2014-2019*, which had been generally taken into consideration by the Administration in the documents circulated for tonight’s meeting.

Ms Terelinck delivered a presentation on the outcomes of the last meeting including the factors considered as a result of initial feedback from the SCRG and an overview of the revised structure.

Mr Bowen facilitated a group discussion on the information distributed to members in advance of the meeting. Mr Bowen requested feedback on the information within the revised structure of the draft *Community Development Plan 2014-2019*, relating specifically to the draft definitions, challenges, overall strategies and any key projects, programs and/or ideas for implementation on a theme-by-theme basis.

The following main points and comments were raised by members:

General Comments

- Following feedback from the last SCRG meeting the Plan is now a cleaner document with community development clearly defined.
- Community development definitions considered to be well drafted, however, the “Our Community” section needs to reference ‘informal’ and ‘formal’ networks as well as recognising that people are brought together by a range of connections that may include interests, locality, etc. Considered a little too prescriptive at present, with the suggestion to perhaps emphasise that the definitions are providing examples rather than being exhaustive.
- The definition of ‘networks’ should be clearer to highlight that some networks and groups may extend past City of Joondalup borders. It was acknowledged that limited funding is available to assist networks external to the City and the issue relates more to determining how assistance can be provided niche groups that do not currently have sufficient critical mass to attract support.

Themes

Community Participation

- Major challenges that could be better highlighted in the Plan include:
 - Encouraging people to participate on committees/groups, given existing family and work pressures.
 - Engaging participation in the online world/social media, given how it will change face-to-face interaction in the future.
- Consideration should be made to accessing facilities for general community purposes; they don’t necessarily need to be world class, as referenced within *Joondalup 2022* but rather “people just need a place to go to participate”.

- Consideration should be made to including more commentary on ageing-in-place, as it is not sufficiently captured under this theme although it was acknowledged that it is referenced under the Assets and Infrastructure theme.
- With regard to 'clever ways to implement the strategies', the following ideas were canvassed:
 - Promoting volunteers through regular segments in local media streams and identifying 'community heroes' to recognise highly active volunteers.
 - Encouraging people to volunteer within their own neighbourhood and networks to simplify and overcome barriers to volunteering.
 - Make it known to the community that activities and opportunities are currently available to them.
 - Develop a community organisation asset base. The City should consider investing in developing and maintaining an effective database that can facilitate volunteering and participation opportunities between networks.
 - Consideration should be made to gathering volunteering and community participation data within geographic or demographic profiles.
 - Consideration should be given to up-skilling community groups to access funding sources such as grants.
 - Time and resources should be invested to mapping the key people who are involved in networks across the City. These people tend to be the people of influence who connect people together from which the City can leverage.
 - Life-long learning programs need to be considered that include cross-over of generations. Older generations could pass on skills to youth or vice-versa.
 - Consider offering the Volunteer Resource Centre as a satellite source in various areas of the community. These perhaps could be co-located with other City libraries other than just Joondalup Library.
 - Consider working with schools and connecting schools with groups who require human resources on volunteer projects. There could be the ability to leverage and aggregate existing supply and demand for volunteer opportunities.

Leadership

- With regard to 'clever ways to implement the strategies', the following ideas were canvassed:
 - Survey community leaders to identify the barriers that get in their way and what assistance can be provided to overcome these challenges.
 - Support existing community leaders with the skills and knowledge they need to be effective. Similar programs and workshops could be delivered to community groups as they currently are to sporting groups.
 - Up-skilling with regard to succession planning and delegation; a focus should be given toward youth as they are the leaders of tomorrow.
 - Consideration could be made to an emerging leaders program and/or developing networks where leading volunteers can meet and discuss challenges, issues and/or new topics. This could be in an online forum or a meeting forum.
 - Removing the barriers to up-skilling through small grants or sponsorship to undertake courses that will assist in training and development.
 - Establishment of a Youth Council or advisory committee to promote active citizenship.
 - Hall of fame to recognise leaders in the community for honourable service or outstanding contributions.
 - Run future leaders youth program to attract young people into community leadership positions.
 - Investigate best practice both nationally and internationally for ways in which to enhance community participation and community capacity building.

Assets and Infrastructure

- With regard to 'clever ways to implement the strategies', the following ideas were canvassed:
 - Improve understanding of community facility utilisation and make it publicly available to fill any gaps, rather than resorting to constructing more buildings.
 - Seek abandoned warehouses/buildings or large spaces that require minimal investment to retrofit to assist availability issues. They don't require long term leases/licences and can be short term or pop-up spaces; these will especially assist the arts community.
 - Ensure the user groups are engaged thoroughly throughout the planning process. This can assist the demand issues and can facilitate co-sharing and better meet functionality requirements
 - Adoption of the concept of 'place-making'.
 - Look at facilitating relationships with schools to use existing infrastructure for community and sporting activities as they are only used six hours of the day at present.

Community Capacity Building

- With regard to 'clever ways to implement the strategies', the following ideas were canvassed:
 - Public liability insurance; broaden the range of groups who are afforded subsidies/grants to cover the cost of insurance.
 - Grant programs; simplify the process and aim to remove the bureaucracy involved when applying. Perhaps consider giving smaller grants \$500-\$1000 (micro-giving) to assist community activities.
 - Investigate and research the existing programs out there and make these publicly available to the community and the leaders who are in various networks.
 - Resource sharing; groups could pool together positions that are difficult to fill on committees (e.g. Treasurer) and share them across multiple groups.
 - City officers could offer one-on-one assistance with grant writing and other technical documents.
 - Workshops – offer a range of workshops to community groups on key topics such as grant writing, governance, finance etc.
 - Consideration should be given to taking a “case management” approach to capacity building programs similar to those run by the Department of Corrective Services (re-entry services), WA Police and UK Government (Troubled Family Program).
 - Consider a process of conducting community consultation, with emphasis on uniting not dividing. Look at skilfully bringing people together who have opposing ideas with the emphasis on building community capacity to manage differences and build respect amongst the community.
 - Developing a 'Joondalup Currency' where groups can exchange skills or services required.
 - Using older generations of the community (e.g. retirees) to assist service groups and fill key committee positions.
 - Innovation centre – a place where like-minded individuals can congregate and learn particular topics relevant to delivering the programs and services for their organisation.

Mr Bowen then asked the members to exclude references to the City providing a service from the discussion and pose the question, “the community can....”. The responses included:

- Network with each other
- Take on some of the tasks identified for City uptake

- Become aware of participation opportunities
- Talk to their neighbours about local issues and have the courage to have opinions
- Connect with other leaders
- Give support to people who are leading – not knock people down (tall poppy syndrome)
- Identify research avenues
- Become more self-sufficient.

The members suggested that given this is a Community Development Plan, extra effort should be made with regard to consultation and engagement with the community during the next phase of development.

The Presiding Member thanked the members and experts of the Strategic Community Reference Group for their honest and valuable input. It was suggested that an additional meeting would not be required, however, the City would provide the opportunity for the SCRG to comment on the draft *Community Development Plan 2014-2019* when developed.

The Strategic Community Reference Group meeting closed at 7:55pm.



**STRATEGIC COMMUNITY REFERENCE GROUP
NOTES OF MEETING HELD ON
MONDAY, 27 OCTOBER 2014**

Please note these are not minutes, but merely notes from discussions at the Meeting of the Strategic Community Reference Group held on Monday, 27 October 2014.

The Strategic Community Reference Group Meeting opened at 6:05pm.

ATTENDANCES

Committee Members:

Mayor Troy Pickard	Mayor (Presiding Member)
Cr Russ Fishwick	South Ward
Cr Kerry Hollywood	North Ward
Cr Mike Norman	South-West Ward (Deputy)

Community Representatives:

Dr Susan King	South Ward
Mr Brian Yearwood	South-West Ward
Mr Bryan Saunders	Central Ward
Mrs Penny Gilpin	North Ward

Officers:

Mr Nico Claassen	Director Infrastructure Services
Mr Andrew Murphy	Manager Infrastructure Management Services
Ms Glenda Blake	Manager Strategic and Organisational Development
Mr Peter Hoar	Waste and Recycling Policy Coordinator
Mr Chris Hoskisson	Coordinator Waste Operations
Ms Sheree Edmondson	Strategic Policy Development Coordinator
Mr Dean Burton	Policy Officer

Guests:

Mr Simon Bowen	Facilitator
Ms Janelle Booth	Principal Environment Consultant, Hyder Consulting
Rebecca Brown	Manager Waste and Recycling, WALGA; and President Waste Management Association of Australia (WA Branch)
Gunther Hoppe	Acting CEO, Mindarie Regional Council
Victoria Bond	Member, WA Waste Authority Board; and WA Manager, Umwelt Consultancy

APOLOGIES

Cr Christine Hamilton-Prime	South-West Ward
Mr Jamie Parry	Director Governance and Strategy
Dr Zarrin Siddiqui	South-East Ward
Ian Watkins	Consultant, IW Projects Pty Ltd

ITEM 1 WASTE MANAGEMENT

The Presiding Member welcomed the group and thanked members and guests for their attendance, noting any apologies received for the meeting. The topic of discussion was introduced with the Presiding Member acknowledging that the development of a Waste Management Plan was an opportunity for the City to demonstrate leadership in this area. An overview of example successes and challenges in the delivery of waste management services across Western Australian local governments was also provided as context to the discussion.

The Presiding Member also noted that one of the major issues associated with waste was striking the balance between environmental sustainability and cost and whilst it might be cheaper to put waste into landfill, it is not the right thing to do. The Presiding Member also stated that the Waste Management Plan should deliver sustainable environmental outcomes and have a major focus on community education.

Mr Bowen provided an overview of the meeting's proceedings, informing members that its purpose was to discuss the City's future approach to waste management, rather than determining specific solutions to identified issues. All discussions were to also have consideration of the City's broader strategic objectives within *Joondalup 2022*.

Mr Murphy and Ms Booth delivered a presentation on the:

- history and achievements of the previous Waste Minimisation Plan 2010 – 2014
- contextual background on anticipated policy changes, current waste service arrangements and waste generation figures (highlighting bulk waste generation within the City as a key area for reduction)
- major issues associated with the delivery of waste services, namely: costs, diversion and tonnages
- potential actions to mitigate the identified issues.

Mr Bowen facilitated a group discussion to clarify any information presented and/or provided in advance of the meeting.

The following main points were raised by members:

- Members sought clarification on where potential cost recovery opportunities in waste management would come from in the future. City Officers explained that future waste diversion initiatives come at a cost and efforts would be made to offset these costs through identified areas of saving in the short term. There was also the capacity to achieve savings by sharing resources between MRC members.
- Clarification was also sought on the expense associated with delivering on-demand services for bulk waste removal, due to a loss in scale of economy. City Officers indicated that costs could be counter-balanced by an overall reduction in processing bulk waste, providing user-pays systems or aggregating requests within particular locations before delivering the service.

- Members raised the issue of excess product packaging and the opportunity for local governments to influence companies in this regard. It was indicated that whilst the City can provide some influence, this is generally an area of policy at the Federal Government level.
- Members noted that there was currently no reference within the documentation provided about what the community's perceptions were regarding waste management wants and needs. Whilst research on best practice was valid and required, the City will need to better understand community awareness in this area.

Mr Bowen guided members through each of the draft themes and objectives, asking members to indicate any potential gaps or issues that needed attention. Members were also asked to consider how the proposed actions aligned with the four themes, with the following outcomes:

Proposed Action	Theme
Model the effect of a third (organics) bin on cost and diversion (<i>Better Bins Kerbside Model</i>).	Waste Services
Progress strategy for increasing diversion (including additional alternative waste treatment options) with MRC member Councils.	Stakeholder Relationships and Partnerships
Trial the use of larger (360 litre) yellow lidded bins.	Waste Services/ Research and Development
Put in place interim arrangements for recycling processing then develop a long term solution with partner Councils.	Stakeholder Relationships and Partnerships
Develop service (tender) options for bulk waste that will maximise recovery and reduce tonnages collected.	Waste Services
Develop service (tender) options for green waste composting to increase reuse of the compost.	Waste Services
Introduce a comprehensive education and promotion campaign to increase diversion and reduce costs.	Community Participation and Engagement
Investigate options for a hazardous waste service.	Waste Services/ Research and Development

The following points were raised under each theme:

WASTE SERVICES

- The City's previous Waste Minimisation Plan 2010 – 2014 highlighted the various waste streams, which should be included in the new plan as useful information for the community.

COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION AND ENGAGEMENT

- Members raised the need for the City to proactively engage the community when undertaking trials for a third organics bin and larger yellow lidded recycling bin, to ensure that the validity of the trials were not undermined by a lack of community understanding or awareness. With regard to bulk waste service changes, it was suggested that the City obtain the views of the community prior to progressing any service alterations.
- It was acknowledged in the discussion that recent household surveys conducted by WALGA illustrated that community attitudes and behaviours towards recycling did not correlate. As such, to encourage behaviour changes the community will likely require a combination of information, incentives and consequences.
- Members suggested that any engagement with the community on service changes would require a mix of information that presents facts and figures to ensure that opinions were informed. It was discussed that the inclusion of costs associated with delivering services

would enable an increased awareness in the community. In addition to this comment, members also noted a gap in the proposed structure of the plan, namely, an interim community engagement measure by which the City communicates potential future approaches to waste management services during the roll-out of new service trials. This would provide a foundational layer of educations prior to decisions being implemented.

- The development of a comprehensive community education strategy was also highlighted by members as an important action under this theme.
- The utilisation of financial incentives to change community behaviours was noted as a possible area for investigation, similarly to the application of fines for regulating water use.
- A gap of promoting waste avoidance through the plan was noted by members. However, it was also acknowledged that avoidance tends to be a federal or regional-based issue due to the resources and political leverage required to achieve effective results.
- Members noted the inconsistent approach to waste disposal applied across the City, for example, utilising recycling bins within households, but not within parks or public buildings. A level of consistency was noted as a potential improvement as well as ensuring education was applied to the whole community and not just school children. It was noted that migrants moving to the City were unaware of recycling requirements within the locality.
- The term “encourage” was questioned with regard to the first objective, noting that it was too passive a term and perhaps “lead” was a better indication of what the City should be doing to drive behaviour change within the community.

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

- Members noted that there was a gap in articulating alternate waste options utilising future technologies to the community such as energy production, which could be subject to further research and development in the future.
- Members also noted that the two objectives under this theme appeared somewhat interchangeable. References to “inform” within the objectives also appeared as too passive in their description.
- The definition of “waste management” was highlighted by members, seeking clarification as to whether this only extends to the delivery of waste services. It was acknowledged that this definition could be broader.
- Resolutions for dealing with demolition waste were raised for future consideration in this theme by members. It was acknowledged, however, that the State Government does provide strong financial incentives to divert demolition waste and prevent illegal dumping.
- Members raised the question as to how much waste the City’s administration creates and if corporate waste management needs to be incorporated into the plan as well. It was acknowledged that the City does have strategies in place now to deal with internal waste creation through the City’s Think Green Program.

STAKEHOLDER RELATIONSHIPS AND PARTNERSHIPS

- Clarification on the definition of stakeholders was requested by members and whether this extended to tenders and private service providers. It was considered appropriate that external service providers were included in the mix of relationship building exercises.

- Members also highlighted a leadership gap in this theme relating to “influencing” and “lobbying” within the objectives. Particularly with regard to our relationship with the State Government and leveraging the City’s size and position to influence outcomes.

GENERAL COMMENTS

Mr Bowen provided members with an opportunity to raise any further/general comments on the issue of waste management, with the following comments provided:

- Members indicated that the City had an opportunity with its 1/6 voting share on the Mindarie Regional Council to leverage this strength to influence outcomes. Furthermore, by negotiating with other local government, the positive effect of aggregation would enable services to be provided more affordably.
- The implementation of the City’s *Local Housing Strategy* was raised as an issue for consideration in the delivery of waste services and the possibility of providing different levels of services for high density areas.
- Members also highlighted the need to further explore the application of disincentives within the community to producing waste. E.g. the Town of Cambridge model which provides more expensive service options for the production of more waste by households, rather than averaging the cost out across all ratepayers.

Mayor Pickard thanked the members and experts of the Strategic Community Reference Group for their honest and valuable input and suggested that an additional meeting be held on this matter in the New Year to consider a draft Waste Management Plan when developed by the City.

The Strategic Community Reference Group meeting concluded at 7:56pm.



**STRATEGIC COMMUNITY REFERENCE GROUP
NOTES OF MEETING HELD ON
THURSDAY, 30 JULY 2015**

Please note these are not minutes, but merely notes from discussions at the Meeting of the Strategic Community Reference Group held on Thursday, 30 July 2015.

The Strategic Community Reference Group Meeting opened at 6:03pm.

ATTENDANCES

Committee Members:

Mayor Troy Pickard	Mayor (Presiding Member)
Cr Russ Fishwick	South Ward
Cr Christine Hamilton-Prime	South-West Ward
Cr John Chester	South-East Ward (Deputy)
Cr Philippa Taylor	North-Central Ward (Observer)

Community Representatives:

Mr Brian Yearwood	South-West Ward
Mr Bryan Saunders	Central Ward
Mrs Penny Gilpin	North Ward
Dr Zarrin Siddiqui	South-East Ward
Mr Wes Buzza	North-Central Ward

Officers:

Mr Jamie Parry	Director Governance and Strategy
Mr Nico Claassen	Director Infrastructure Services
Mr Andrew Murphy	Manager Infrastructure Management Services
Ms Glenda Blake	Manager Strategic and Organisational Development
Mr Wes Miller	Transport Projects Officer
Mr Stevan Zecevic	Assistance Engineering Technical Officer
Ms Sheree Edmondson	Strategic Policy Development Coordinator
Mr Dean Burton	Policy Officer

Guests:

Mr Simon Bowen	Facilitator
Ms Cilla de Lacey	Cycling and Urban Strategies Team Leader, Department of Transport
Edward Rose	Cycling and Pedestrian Coordinator, Main Roads WA
Jeremy Murray	Chief Executive Officer, Bicycling WA

APOLOGIES

Cr Kerry Hollywood
Dr Susan King
Heinrich Benz

North Ward
South Ward
Executive Officer, Bicycle Transport Alliance

ITEM 1 BIKE PLAN

The Presiding Member welcomed the group, acknowledged the appointment of Wes Buzza in representation of the North-Central Ward and thanked members and guests for their attendance. Apologies received for the meeting were also noted and an overview of the purpose and function of the group was provided for first-time attendees.

Mr Bowen provided an overview of the meeting's proceedings, informing members that discussions were intended to be held at the strategic and tactical levels of thought and not at an operational level. An opportunity for members to seek clarification on any of the materials circulated in advance of the meeting was also provided.

Mr Murphy delivered a presentation on the:

- City's approach to reviewing the Bike Plan
- attempted alignment of objectives within the Department of Transport's *Western Australian Bicycle Network Plan 2014-2031* ("WABN Plan") to maximise opportunities for funding
- achievement of infrastructure projects in the previous Bike Plan
- responsibilities of local governments under the WABN Plan
- progress achieved to date in the review process
- current pathway utilisation data and projected funding requirements
- proposed structure for the new Bike Plan

Mr Bowen facilitated a group discussion to clarify any information presented.

The following main points were raised by members:

- Members sought clarification on the impacts that changes to the Department of Transport's Perth Bike Network funding criteria in 2011-12, had on the achievement of City cycling projects. It was indicated that the changes focused on larger strategic linkages, which did affect funding for smaller City projects.

Mr Bowen guided members through the draft purpose, vision and objectives of the new Bike Plan, seeking any initial feedback and responses from members.

The following points were raised under each:

PURPOSE

- Members highlighted concerns with the terms "cycling" and "cyclist" and the connotations they have within a Perth context, namely riding for sport. It was discussed that efforts should be made to decouple cycling from sport through language such as "bike riders" and "riding".
- Members sought clarification as to where cycling sat within the City's broader integrated transport planning framework. It was indicated that the Bike Plan would become a sub-set of a future Integrated Transport Plan that was in development.

- The meaning of the term “development of cycling” within the purpose statement was questioned by members, whilst the “development of cycling infrastructure” made more sense.
- Members also highlighted the need for various categories of cyclists to be acknowledged within the Bike Plan, which are segmented on the basis of their needs and uses. This was in recognition that people share cycling infrastructure for different purposes.

VISION

- The Bike Plan was seen by members as an opportunity for the City to create linkages between suburbs and destinations locally and to view cycling within the broader context of public transport. For example, enabling people to effectively commute to the City for work and leisure activities and not necessarily towards the Perth CBD.
- School children were acknowledged as being the next generation of bike riders and consideration should be given to their safe travel to school and improvement of cycling education.
- It was suggested that the vision for the Bike Plan should be to normalise cycling as an activity, much like driving is at present. Terms such as viewing cycling as an “acceptable form of transport” may be missing from the vision.
- Members all agreed the vision should be bolder with suggestions to include the following sentiments: “shifts in behaviour”, the City being the “gold standard of cycling in the Perth Metropolitan Area” and being a “cycling destination for visitors”.

OBJECTIVES

- Members questioned the order of the objectives, suggesting that increased cycling participation should be number 1. Stronger terminology was also suggested within this objective, perhaps changing “encourage” to “influence”.
- Clarification on how the City would measure safety within objective 2 was sought, namely, whether it was measuring perceptions of safety or crash data. It was indicated that both are likely to be measured, including the potential introduction of a perceptions survey. A discussion on major areas for complaints and incidences ensued, acknowledging shared paths as a hot-spot for conflict. “Conflict of paths” was seen as potentially missing from objective 2.
- The term “interconnected” within objective 1 was questioned by members, with a preference for “connecting the City”.
- An objective to “normalise” cycling or create a “bike friendly City” was raised by members and strongly supported in discussions.

Mr Bowen then guided members through the draft focus areas of the new Bike Plan, requesting consideration of any issues, needs or opportunities that could be identified under each.

The following points were raised:

CONNECTIVITY

- Members questioned what was meant by connectivity, given that 50% of cycling journeys were less than 5km. It was discussed that if the City can better understand intended destinations, that cycling infrastructure can be improved to encourage more direct routes.

This was clarified to mean the connection of “key attractors” such as schools, shopping centres, etc.

- The issue of trying to facilitate bike riding to and from schools was discussed by members as being more of a societal issue than an infrastructure issue, as many children are dropped at school by parents on their way to work. Various programs were cited as examples of how behaviour changes could be encouraged.
- Members questioned the incorporation of “safety” within the connectivity focus area, suggesting that it was better aligned with education or safety, access and inclusion. It was believed that this focus area should just focus on connectivity.

SUPPORTING INFRASTRUCTURE

- End of trip facilities was cited by members as an important infrastructure consideration. Options such as requiring all new commercial developments or change of use applications to mandate the inclusion of end of trip cycling facilities was canvassed by members. The planning requirement used by the Metropolitan Redevelopment Authority was cited as a good example of this.

SAFETY, ACCESS AND INCLUSION

- The need to create safe environments for different types of riders was acknowledged by members. This could apply to roads, shared paths, etc. depending on the rider.
- It was suggested that the focus area should refer to “improving safety outcomes” for all road users, not just the safety of cyclists.
- The issue of accessibility for people to afford bikes was raised. Discussion ensued on the merits and limitations of shared bike and rental schemes, which can be expensive for Council’s to fund.
- Members raised the option of implementing speed limits for cyclists on shared paths to improve safety for other path users, but recognised the difficulties in policing this management approach. It was acknowledged that education was the catalyst for improved safety and knowledge.

EDUCATION AND PARTICIPATION

- Members suggested the focus area be extended to promote “safe cycling”. The premise being to educate children as the cyclists of tomorrow.
- Comparisons to the Netherlands were also drawn, acknowledging that more women than men cycle there. In order to normalise the activity, it was suggested that participation strategies encourage and facilitate more women to cycle.
- For increased participation, members suggested leveraging connections to existing activities, festivals and events held within the City. Or to create new events that were family-friendly. The word “celebration” was considered to be missing from this focus area, as the City has extensive pathways around Lake Joondalup that are under-utilised by cyclists.
- Identified barriers to participation raised by members included summer heat, natural “hilly” geography and compulsory helmet requirements. Although on the issue of helmets, it was acknowledged that, according to RAC surveys, it is only the 5th highest reason for people

choosing not to ride. The number one reason was safety, which is most effectively improved through infrastructure upgrades.

- Behaviour change was considered by members as the most important factor for influencing increased cycling participation. Whilst safety, convenience and opportunities for discouraging driving were also mentioned. The term “encourage” participation was considered too benign, with a suggested replacement term of “increase”.
- In terms of education, members acknowledged the need to educate not only cyclists, but motorists to achieve improved safety outcomes. It was also noted that the City can educate the community to cycle safely and effectively, but education needs to be coupled with incentives to achieve behaviour changes.

STAKEHOLDERS AND PARTNERSHIPS

- Members discussed whether “interconnectedness” was more important than strengthening connections across jurisdictions, as funding should seek to maximise the City’s internal networks before others. It was also acknowledged that cyclists are frustrated by differences in infrastructure across local government borders, therefore the focus area should have a dual-focus of both improving both internal and regional connections.
- An opportunity to work with industry was also noted within this focus area. For example, engaging bike shops to provide more diverse products for a broader range of riders, or working with shops, cafes and restaurants to be more “bike-friendly” with end of trip facilities.

RESEARCH AND INNOVATION

- Members questioned the relevance of innovation in this focus area, believing the focus should be on getting the infrastructure right over the next 5 years before looking at innovations. If the Bike Plan was a long term strategy, then innovation would have more relevance. However, it was acknowledged by members that an innovative infrastructure project could be developed and created within 5 years to act as a catalyst for behaviour change and increased cycling participation.
- It was suggested that innovation in this focus area could be more about the collection of data to improve modelling over the next 5 years. Greater investment should be made in innovative data collection and research opportunities, so that the City knows as much about the movement of bikes as it does about the movement of cars. This includes greater knowledge in the short journeys that people are making or would like to make, to improve design decisions.

LOBBYING AND ADVOCACY

- Members suggested that “congestion funding” could be more relevant in this focus area than “cycling funding”, as the core issue is congestion, which can be alleviated or resolved through increased cycling. Building on this thought, members also highlighted opportunities for funding under the banner of “liveability”.
- Gaps identified in this focus area included the achievement of healthy lifestyle outcomes for the community and the need to champion and advocate for cycling interests beyond just infrastructure.

GENERAL COMMENTS

Following consideration of each of the proposed focus areas, members were asked by Mr Bowen to highlight if there was anything missing or not covered in the structure of the Bike Plan presented.

- Members asked if the level of influence within the City's policy framework would be broadened to include, for example, building or planning approvals. It was explained that if the City was to be bold in its cycling vision, that consideration would need to be given to areas of decision-making across the organisation to account for improved cycling outcomes.
- It was also suggested that the development of the City's internal cycling network could be a separate focus area within the Bike Plan, which could include the creation of cycling trails within the City, not just hard infrastructure.
- Bold events such as the "Eco-mobility Festival" in Cape Town were mentioned as ways in which to create a more "bike-friendly" City.

Mayor Pickard thanked the members and experts of the Strategic Community Reference Group for their valuable input and suggested that an additional meeting be held on this matter once a full draft Bike Plan had been developed. The Presiding Member also noted that the community was ready for a transformational shift in the space of cycling and that the conversation with SCRG members and the development of the Bike Plan was a good opportunity to achieve this. Further ideas from members would also be sought when the notes from the meeting are circulated.

The Strategic Community Reference Group meeting concluded at 8:05pm.



**STRATEGIC COMMUNITY REFERENCE GROUP
NOTES OF MEETING HELD ON
WEDNESDAY, 23 SEPTEMBER 2015**

Please note these are not minutes, but merely notes from discussions at the Meeting of the Strategic Community Reference Group held on Wednesday, 23 September 2015.

The Strategic Community Reference Group Meeting opened at 6:02pm.

ATTENDANCES

Committee Members:

Cr Russ Fishwick, JP	South Ward (Acting Presiding Member)
Cr Christine Hamilton-Prime	South-West Ward
Cr Kerry Hollywood	North Ward
Cr Teresa Ritchie	South Ward (Deputy)

Observers:

Cr Mike Norman	South-West Ward
Cr John Chester	South-East Ward

Community Representatives:

Mr Bryan Saunders	Central Ward
Mr Brian Yearwood	South-West Ward
Ms Penny Gilpin	North Ward
Dr Susan King	South Ward
Mr Wes Buzza	North-Central Ward

Officers:

Mr Nico Claassen	Director Infrastructure Services
Mr Andrew Murphy	Manager Infrastructure Management Services
Ms Glenda Blake	Manager Strategic and Organisational Development
Ms Sheree Edmondson	Strategic Policy Development Coordinator

Guests:

Rebecca Brown	Manager Waste and Recycling, WALGA
Gunther Hoppe	Director Corporate Services, Mindarie Regional Council

APOLOGIES

Mayor Troy Pickard	Mayor
Dr Zarrin Siddiqui	South-East Ward

ITEM 1 DRAFT WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN 2015 – 2020

Mr Claassen opened the meeting and welcomed attendees. He indicated the session would allow members to consider the incorporation of previous feedback into the draft *Waste Management Plan 2015-2020* and to provide an opportunity for further comments to be received on the draft, prior to its presentation to Council.

The Acting Presiding Member welcomed and introduced attendees, thanking each for their contributions to date and noted all apologies received in advance of the meeting. Community representatives of the group were also asked to indicate their availability for the upcoming Strategic Community Reference Group meeting on 5 October 2015 to City staff.

Mr Bowen provided an overview of the meeting, indicating that discussions would focus on answering the following questions:

- Is the format/structure of the draft Plan appropriate?
- Is there any key information missing from the draft Plan?
- Are the initial contributions of the Strategic Community Reference Group effectively incorporated into the draft Plan?
- Are there any specific improvements to the draft Plan you would like to identify?

Mr Murphy delivered a presentation on the draft *Waste Management Plan 2015-2020*, focussing on the alignment of key focus areas with projects and objectives to achieve the State Government targets of 65% diversion of waste from landfill by 2020.

During the presentation, members sought clarification on what a 65% diversion rate meant and whether it was more important to reduce waste overall. Mr Murphy explained the differences between diversion and reduction and the need for waste to avoid landfill, regardless of the tonnages produced. Whilst reduction was important, the State Government targets focussed on the need to deal with the diversion of existing levels of waste from landfill. It was also clarified for members that the calculation of current diversion rates included bulk waste streams.

Mr Bowen facilitated a group discussion on the current structure and purpose of the draft Plan.

Members raised the following points:

General Structure:

- The draft Plan was considered very informative and read well with regard to the background and contextual information provided. However, it was questioned how the information would be presented to and received by the community. The alignment of objectives and projects was considered to be missing from the plan and was perhaps confusing for readers in terms of how they were linked.
- Members noted the importance of the community to be able understand and embrace the document and as such, it was suggested that key information within the plan should be condensed in some way for ease of reading, perhaps through a “short guide” or navigation tool within the plan to assist in this regard.
- It was also noted by members that wording within the plan was stated slightly different throughout the document, requiring form of continuity check.

Purpose:

- Members raised if the purpose should be to “reduce waste from landfill” rather than “increase diversion” as some may consider it to read as a double negative statement. A further discussion on the differences between reduction and diversion ensued.

- It was suggested that perhaps the achievement of a target should be included within the purpose. Discussions indicated that targets have only been set at 2020 and the City needs to be looking beyond this timeframe. The targets may also become counterproductive if the plan guides the City to just achieve the target, rather than extend beyond a 65% diversion rate.

Mr Bowen guided members through each of the draft objectives of the plan, asking members to indicate any potential gaps or issues that needed attention.

Members raised the following points:

Objective 1:

- Members raised whether the wording of the objective sounded “too bureaucratic” with references to the waste hierarchy requiring some level of industry knowledge. It was acknowledged that alternatives such as reduce, reuse, recycle could be used, however, it would not align with the current legislative or policy terminology used within the industry. Following discussion it was considered appropriate to refer to industry language within a plan at this level.
- Members questioned if the term “diversion” should be included in this objective. It was discussed that the “minimisation of waste” was a different objective to diversion and should remain in this context.

Objective 2:

- It was suggested by members that the term “participate” could be included in this objective, as it sought to bring about behaviour change within the community. The term “educate” was questioned in this context, as it was inconsistent with the plan’s intention of meeting community needs and expectations. Educating implied changing behaviour rather than meeting needs.
- Members highlighted Project 4 as a chance to extend community education for children by looking at the inclusion of recycling bins and educational signage within parks.
- Members asked if the objectives required measurable outcomes, or whether they are just desirable results. It was noted that several KPIs are listed on page 48, which aim to achieve the overall objectives of the plan and are measurable. Discussions indicated the importance of measuring outcomes rather than individual objectives to ensure the collection of data adds value to the implementation of the plan.

Objective 3:

- Members noted that the “Recycle 360” project did not include the roll-out of a smaller 120L general waste bin to provide options and incentives for the production of less waste to landfill. It was noted that the “Recycle 360” project was approved and budgeted for by Council and the consideration of alternative bin options would be captured in Project 15 in the future.
- Members discussed current research into costs mechanisms to provide incentives for people to reduce waste in households.
- The most important factor noted by members in achieving this objective was the change in future bulk waste services. Members encouraged the Council to be courageous in this space to achieve long-lasting outcomes.

Objective 4:

- It was noted that Projects 2 and 14, (which align to this objective), could provide an opportunity for household hazardous waste to be collected in alternative ways. Members discussed how

WALGA were looking at options for making hazardous waste collection more convenient by analysing recent survey data in this area. A suggestion was made to liaise with real estate agents to remove hazardous waste from properties when they are vacated by renters.

Objective 5:

- The order of the objectives was noted by members and a suggestion was made to reverse objective 5 and 6 in acknowledgement of the long-term nature of objective 5.
- Waste to energy was highlighted by members as a “game-changer” for this objective and as such, more information on this subject within the plan could be of value. Members discussed the current activities of the Mindarie Regional Council in this area and the regional, economies of scale required to deliver these large-scale projects. It was noted as a treatment of last resort, but equally, an important factor in the long-term achievement of waste diversion targets.
- Members sought clarification on what mechanisms the plan contained to ensure the community was engaged in the implementation of projects. It was discussed that significant projects would be undertaken with regional partners, of whom currently meet on a monthly basis to discuss future plans. The City’s Community Consultation and Engagement Policy also guided the City’s approach to general engagement processes.

Objective 6:

- No comments were provided by members on objective 6.

Mr Bowen provided members with an opportunity to raise any further/general comments on the draft *Waste Management Plan 2015-2020*, with the following comments provided:

- Members were generally comfortable with the draft plan presented.
- It was noted that reducing waste volumes would be ideal, but acknowledged the difficulty of local governments being able to have large-scale impact on behaviour changes. Education was seen as key to changing community attitudes and behaviours.
- Members noted that the City should be proud of its achievements in waste management to date, with exceptional corporate waste diversions and a responsive community to bin tagging trials. This acknowledged that the community was in a position to change. With regard to this particular program, it was suggested that page 35 of the plan include an explanation as to why fewer participants placed their bins on the verge over the four-week trial period. It was explained that changing sunrise patterns over this period were likely to explain this outcome.
- Discussion ensued on the placement of recycling bins within community facilities and why there were inconsistencies. It was explained that different waste arrangements under various lease agreements and facility usages were the main reasons.

Mr Murphy provided a brief overview of the step-change process required to achieve a 65% diversion rate target, noting three key elements:

1. Providing the right waste service that is able to balance community expectation with cost and waste reduction outcomes.
2. Changing community behaviour to use waste services correctly, e.g. reducing recycling contamination, placing the right items in the bulk waste service, etc.
3. Investigating and investing in alternative waste treatment technologies, requiring a regional approach. It was noted that the first 3 years of the plan looked at making decisions in this area and the last 2 years focussed on implementing these decisions.

The Acting Presiding Member closed the meeting by thanking community representatives and experts of the Strategic Community Reference Group for their valuable input and acknowledged the quality advice and contributions received in the development of the draft *Waste Management Plan 2015-2020*. It was noted that from here, the draft Plan would progress to Council to seek approval for public consultation, after which it would return to Council for adoption.

The Strategic Community Reference Group meeting concluded at 7:25pm.



**STRATEGIC COMMUNITY REFERENCE GROUP
NOTES OF MEETING HELD ON
MONDAY, 5 OCTOBER 2015**

Please note these are not minutes, but merely notes from discussions at the Meeting of the Strategic Community Reference Group held on Monday, 5 October 2015.

The Strategic Community Reference Group Meeting opened at 6:00pm.

ATTENDANCES

Committee Members:

Mayor Troy Pickard	Mayor (Presiding Member)
Cr Russ Fishwick	South Ward
Cr Christine Hamilton-Prime	South-West Ward
Cr Michael Norman	South-West Ward (Deputy)

Community Representatives:

Mr Brian Yearwood	South-West Ward
Dr Susan King	South Ward
Mr Wes Buzza	North-Central Ward

Officers:

Mr Nico Claassen	Director Infrastructure Services
Mr Andrew Murphy	Manager Infrastructure Management Services
Ms Glenda Blake	Manager Strategic and Organisational Development
Mr Wes Miller	Transport Projects Officer
Ms Zoe O'Donnell	Policy Officer

Guests:

Mr Simon Bowen	Facilitator
Ms Cilla de Lacey	Cycling and Urban Strategies Team Leader, Department of Transport
Edward Rose	Cycling and Pedestrian Coordinator, Main Roads WA
Jeremy Murray	Chief Executive Officer, Bicycling WA

APOLOGIES

Cr Kerry Hollywood	North Ward
Ms Penny Gilpin	North Ward
Mr Bryan Saunders	Central Ward
Dr Zarrin Siddiqui	South-East Ward
Heinrich Benz	Executive Officer, Bicycle Transport Alliance
Mr Jamie Parry	Director Governance and Strategy

ITEM 1 BIKE PLAN 2015 - 2020

The Mayor welcomed the group, thanked members and guests for their attendance and noted all apologies received for the meeting.

Mr Murphy delivered a presentation on the:

- Draft structure of the revised Bike Plan
- Overview of feedback received from SCRG at the first meeting
- Purpose, vision, aim and objectives of the Plan
- The Key Focus Areas
- Challenges and opportunities
- Key focus areas and their outcomes
- Descriptions, objectives and outcomes of the 13 projects outlined in the Plan

Mr Bowen provided an overview of the meeting's proceedings, informing members that discussions were intended to capture any glaring omissions in the Plan, not to focus on new wording or minor changes.

Mr Bowen guided members through the draft vision, aim, focus areas and outcomes listed in the new Bike Plan, seeking any feedback and comments from members. He then facilitated discussions around the 13 projects identified in the Plan.

The following points were raised under each:

VISION AND AIM

- Members felt that whilst the vision conveys the theme of the Plan it is not bold enough. The vision should be setting a benchmark for other local governments to strive towards and, therefore, should convey leadership and best practice.
- Members stated that it is not enough for the aim to say "to increase bike riding within the City of Joondalup", it needs to quantify the increase in some way.
- The aim needs to reflect that the Plan is promoting a better transport choice by normalising bike riding and enabling it to be a legitimate transport option.
- The aim needs to include the concept of raising awareness of non-bike riders and car drivers as well as bike-riders.
- There was discussion around whether the aim was just stating the target of the plan rather than capturing the broader picture. It was suggested that more appropriate wording for the aim could be: "To make bike riding a part of everyday life within the City of Joondalup".

THE FOUR P's

- It was suggested that the second P "Paths" be reworded to "Pathways". All members agreed to this.

FOCUS AREA 1: PEOPLE - OUTCOMES

- There were no specific comments on any omissions in relation to the outcomes for this focus area.

FOCUS AREA 2: PATHS - OUTCOMES

- It was suggested that the first outcome under Paths be reworded to incorporate the maintenance aspect of paths as this seems to be missing. Suggested rewording is: "Bike paths and bike lanes within the City are expanded, improved and maintained".
- The comment was made that we need to be clear about whether we are referring to bike related facilities or other surrounding infrastructure in relation to the outcome of "innovative design for bike infrastructure". This outcome may need to be reworded to encompass a broader picture of design.

FOCUS AREA 3: PLACES - OUTCOMES

- Members asked if the Joondalup CBD could be identified as a special case in the local destinations examples. There was also discussion around whether "recreation" is a place. It was suggested that the first outcome for Places be reworded to: "Local destinations (Joondalup City centre, shops, schools, work and recreation sites) can be accessed easily and safely by bike". (Note: reoccurrences of this sentence throughout the Plan should also be changed to maintain consistency). Riding to train stations was seen to be missing and was thought to be significant enough to be included as a dot point.
- It was recognised that Project 4 addresses this; however it should be elevated to the outcomes section as suggested above.
- Members felt that there were many visible "last mile gaps" on the pathways map in the Plan. There was discussion around needing to focus on the infrastructure in the middle of suburbs to ensure that any gaps in the path network are filled in order to connect all residents to the periphery of suburbs and the main cycling networks throughout the City. If we want to be successful in encouraging riding then the network must start at the resident's house.
- There was discussion on whether hubs within suburbs (i.e. shopping centres) need to be highlighted on the map to link them in visually as part of the network.

FOCUS AREA 4: PROMOTIONS - OUTCOMES

- Members did not like the word "perceived" in the first objective for this focus area as it weakens the impact of the outcome. It was also questioned as to "who" this statement is referring to (i.e. "who" perceives the city as being bike-friendly?) It was suggested that this outcome be reworded to: "City of Joondalup is known as a bike-friendly city".
- There is no outcome for promoting community awareness of the path network. This should be listed as an outcome under this focus area.
- It was suggested that consideration be given to including reference to the fact that bike riding is good for business and perhaps there needs to be an outcome that about the benefits to the City of being a bike-friendly city (e.g. more bike traffic can lead to better business for cafes, etc).

PROJECT 1: COUNTING BIKE RIDERS

- Members discussed whether methods for counting the number of bike riders would allow a clear distinction to be made on the different types of bike riders using the path network (e.g. male, female, children, etc).
- City officers confirmed that the intention of this project is to determine the different types of bike riding that take place in the city via various surveying methods. This will help to verify the types and numbers of bike riders within the City.

PROJECT 2: UNDERSTANDING BIKE RIDERS

- It was suggested that this project have an additional focus on engagement directly with schools (or school related groups/associations) to help identify and understand any barriers that are a deterrent to bike riding within the City. This may provide the City with access to a more detailed knowledge base on the obstacles people experience when it comes to bike riding for transport or recreational purposes and how we can facilitate changes to overcome this.

PROJECT 3: CHANGING BEHAVIOUR

- There were no specific comments on any omissions in relation to this project.

PROJECT 4: BIKE INFRASTRUCTURE

- Members requested that the first project objective be modified to also mention improved connectivity by linkages to the Joondalup CBD.
- Members commented that the heart of each suburb needs to be considered with respect to overall connectivity to the path network and this should be highlighted under the project objectives/outcomes. It is very important that we are seen to be filling the existing gaps in the network as part of the improvement of bike infrastructure, not just expanding the larger network.

PROJECT 5: INNOVATIVE DESIGN

- Complaints from bike-riders about traffic treatments, etc creating squeeze points for bike riders on the roads are very common. Such complaints need to be kept in mind when considering innovative new designs. It is important that new designs keep the needs of both pedestrians and cyclists in mind.
- It was suggested that the second outcome for this project be reworded to: "Applying innovative design".

PROJECT 6: LOCAL BIKE FRIENDLY ROUTES

- There were no specific comments on any omissions in relation to this project.

PROJECT 7: BIKE FRIENDLY PLANNING DEVELOPMENTS

- Comments were made that this project should not just be about bike parking and end of trip facilities. There should also be an objective around the creation of travel plans (possibly as a part of district planning schemes), incorporating different modes of travel. Travel plans are not currently referenced anywhere within the Bike Plan.

PROJECT 8: A BIKE FRIENDLY JOONDALUP CBD

- It was requested that access to the Joondalup CBD should be specifically referred to as an example of local destinations in the first outcome of this project.

PROJECT 9: STRATEGIC PARTNERSHIPS

- There were no specific comments on any omissions in relation to this project.

PROJECT 10: PROMOTING A BIKE FRIENDLY CITY

- There were no specific comments on any omissions in relation to this project.

PROJECT 11: BIKE FRIENDLY CITY EVENTS

- Members felt that this project was a little on the weak side and think we can do more than just promote our City events as bike-friendly. We need bike riding to be at the front edge of promotion by arranging bike specific events (e.g. eco-mobility, specific bike events that include roads being shut down to motorists, etc).
- It was suggested and agreed by all that combining projects 11 and 12 would strengthen the intentions for specific promotion of a bike friendly city.

PROJECT 12: CELEBRATING A BIKE FRIENDLY CITY

- Combine project 11 and 12 as discussed in the section above.

PROJECT 13: ADVOCATING FOR BIKE RIDERS

- Project 13 will now become project 12 (due to merging of projects 11 and 12 as discussed above).
- This project should be used to set the standards and cover the broader issues around bike riding in the City. The project needs to be more focussed on bike standards, guidelines and general bike friendliness, rather than being cyclist/person specific. Members are happy with this provided the wording for the outcome is changed to read as follows: "Advocating for bike riding" in order to address broader issues including infrastructure and other issues.

GENERAL COMMENTS

Following consideration of each of the specific aspects of the plan above, members were asked by Mr Bowen to highlight if there was anything else missing or not covered in the Bike Plan as a whole. The following points were raised:

- Emphasis should be given to the social cohesion and wellbeing aspects associated with bike riding in terms of promotional activities.
- Funding sources identified in Table 8 need to be broader in order to maximise all funding opportunities not just PBN funding which will require adherence to the Perth Bicycle Network Plan – e.g. Healthways etc.
- Reference to free parking at train stations in Table 10 requires updating to reflect the current situation.

- Mention of general path maintenance needs to be weaved into the entire Plan; it is not relevant to only one section of the Plan.
- One of the barriers to bike riding is people not feeling safe when riding in close proximity to motorists. The mindset of Main Roads has changed in recent years, which could mean more support for reducing speed limits in some residential areas to help calm the roads and make it safer for bike riders. It was noted, however, that the main roads are the biggest challenge when it comes to safety for bike riders. Introducing the reduction of speed limits in some areas to improve the perception of a safer riding environment would be problematic as it is likely to result in increased driving time for motorists.
- Comments were made that the Plan needs to have a greater emphasis on mutual responsibility and safety to address issues of conflict between walkers, bike-riders, dog walkers etc.
- It was suggested that that Figure 3 could be reviewed to provide greater clarity on the connections and integrations across plans – the integration of the Bike Plan and Walkability Plan were specifically referenced.
- There was some general discussion about the KPI's in Table 14. One of the KPI metrics used in the Easter States is the amount of spending on infrastructure per resident. Is this a reasonable metric to use? There would need to be a benchmark for \$/resident to compare this to for it to be useful/relevant.

Mr Bowen wrapped up the meeting by asking members if there were any deal breakers that would prevent the Plan from being finalised. All members agreed that there were no deal breakers and that the Plan could be finalised based on the comments and feedback from this meeting.

Mayor Pickard thanked the members and experts of the Strategic Community Reference Group for their valuable input. The Presiding Member also noted that City officers would incorporate the proposed changes and comments into the Plan prior to its finalisation and the Plan would then be presented to Council for approval to release the Draft for a community consultation period.

The Strategic Community Reference Group meeting concluded at 8:00pm.