

# CITY OF JOONDALUP

## MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE DRY PARKS, MEDIAN AND VERGE COMMITTEE HELD IN CONFERENCE ROOM 3, JOONDALUP CIVIC CENTRE, BOAS AVENUE, JOONDALUP ON TUESDAY 29 AUGUST 2000.

### ATTENDANCE AND APOLOGIES

#### Committee Members:

Cr A Patterson - *Chairman*  
Cr J Hollywood - *Deputy Chairman - from 1816 hrs*  
Cr T Barnett  
Cr J Hurst  
Cr S Magyar  
Mr D Djulbic, Director Infrastructure Management  
Mr D Cluning, Manager Operations Services

#### In Attendance:

Mayor J Bombak - *from 1837 hrs*  
Cr L Ewen-Chappell - *from 1838 hrs*  
Cr C Mackintosh - *from 1838 hrs*

#### Officers:

Committee Clerk: K LAURENDET

### APOLOGIES

Nil

The Chairman declared the meeting open at 1812 hrs.

Cr Patterson welcomed Mr Michael Baird to the meeting and offered him the floor to make his presentation on the issues raised previously by him. The Chairman was prepared to allow sufficient time for Mr Baird to present his case.

Mr Baird referred to his written document, a copy of which was provided to all members present to follow. The document advises what Mr Baird sees as a problem area, being that no consideration has been given to the points raised by him relating to parks and verge areas since 11 April 2000, prior to the Budget being adopted.

*Cr Hollywood entered the Room at 1816 hrs.*

Mr Baird read from written questions, which included:-

Can the Council establish a working party to investigate and review the whole criteria and selection of parks and verge medians.

Why does the unofficial dry park development criteria place community utilisation and availability of alternative Public Open Space as a second-rate or priority 2 consideration?

Why does verge and median reticulation continue to consume an equal or greater portion of the landscape budget, when no review has taken place of such developments since 1997?

*Cr Magyar entered the Room at 1817 hrs.*

Why have the vast majority of dry parks reticulated since 1997, have been done as adjuncts to verge/median development?

Why does the current list of Priority 1 dry parks include parks with no community usage, parks with limited community access or usage? Similarly with Priority 2 dry parks.

Mr Baird asked if Councillors were aware that the 2000/2001 Budget had earmarked \$603,000 in capital works and did the Council also realise that more has been spent on 1.5 kilometres of Marmion Avenue than on the entire Dry Park Development Program for this year, and does it approve?

Mr Baird asked what sort of accessibility the public should have to the Budget before it is voted on and advised he would be contacting the Minister for Local Government to find out.

The Director Infrastructure Management advised that Council had provided him a copy of the Dry Park Development Program at least two months before the Budget was adopted.

Mr Baird referred to his second point of his introduction, that the program for the reticulation of dry parks and entry statements was not envisaged in 1997 and in his reading of the Minutes Council is looking at 90 kilometres of arterial roads. This is reflected in the figures, eg. there was a 50/50 split of the \$500,000 in 1997, which gave equal amounts to verges and dry parks. Where it is now, is \$275,00 for dry parks and out of that figure is coming the bores for arterial roads and verges; and \$803,000 for verges and medians. Arterial roads have certainly got the major "bite of the cherry".

The Manager Operations Services clarified a point, through the Chair, that out of the total number of dry parks irrigated since 1997, Council has done 16.96ha of dry parks and out of the total hectares per medians irrigated Council has done 6.97ha. The budgeted amount for 1997/98 was \$500,000; 1998/99 was \$500,000; 1999/2000 was \$196,000 (because of the split the money had to be shared). If you base that on a per hectare basis, we have done equally 2/3 dry parks to 1/3 medians. One of the problems is that where we list, say, the irrigation of the Marmion Avenue median, don't confuse that we have done the whole lot. In the Marmion Avenue section between Beach Road and Warwick Road we have only done .4ha. That is all that the long, thin linear strip measures out at, it is a very small amount of area in real terms. The areas that have gone to Wanneroo have been deleted, so there are four dry parks now with Wanneroo, that were included as part of the original 1997/98, 1998/99 program.

Cr Hollywood asked, when a dry park is allocated a bore, does that bore have to do other areas other than that park.

The Manager Operations Services advised of instances where this has occurred. Some discussion followed. Multi use of a bore provides efficiency.

This year's program includes Barwon, Brisbane and Delaware Parks that are all dry parks connected to an existing park bore, but don't connect to a median at this stage, however the potential is there.

Discussion ensued regarding bore capacity and water availability, as this factor may determine the extent of irrigation.

Mr Baird was of the understanding that Main Roads contributed to the development of medians. The Manager Operations Services advised that this was not the case, Main Roads only paid the maintenance costs associated with Marmion Avenue, between Beach Road and Ocean Reef Road. It is an agreed figure.

The Director Infrastructure Management clarified the point that, if bores were required as part of the Median and Verge Program, they would be funded by that program. That program was not in place previously, and to say that the dry parks are funding the bore component of the Median and Verge Program in future is not quite correct. If a road median needed a bore for road and median enhancement works, that bore would be funded out of that program. However, if there is a bore adjacent to a park which has the capacity to be used to reticulate the median and verge, then obviously we would use that bore.

Mr Baird agreed that there is no doubt that there some individual cases where dry parks and median/verges have combined well.

*Mayor J Bombak entered the Room at 1837 hrs.*

*Cr Ewen-Chappell and Cr Mackintosh entered the room at 1838 hrs.*

Mr Baird then made comparisons between Macaulay Park and Cinque Ports Park in relation to size, provision of play equipment and the parks' proximity to an arterial road.

Mr Baird suggested Councillors should read the Draft Open Space Policy because it is an ideal situation that the Councillors sought information on before they did their own. It has been picked up by the Wanneroo Shire, but not picked up by the commissioners for Joondalup on the basis that there was no new development in Joondalup City. However, the ideal that it espouses can apply to areas where it is still possible and that includes the older suburbs that have large amounts of dry parks.

The Director Infrastructure Management advised that the Draft Open Space document is a WA Planning Commission document which is used as a planning tool and should not be confused as an operational document that can be used in existing areas.

The Manager Operations Services advised that the planning policy document resulted from the development of Warwick, Greenwood and other suburbs and the Shire of Wanneroo-of-the-day was out of step, they believe, with the Planning Commission, in that we now don't

want small dry parks and we don't want dry parks literally. So that document was prepared by officers from this City, in conjunction with the Ministry of Planning. It is a very good document for a new subdivision, but it is purely for planning purposes. To take that document and go back into any of the older suburbs is not practical.

Cr Magyar believed that what Mr Baird was trying to say was that if you look at the idea behind the document, that is to say that you distribute the parks that are usable fairly evenly and the whole way that we link the verges into parks, means that we are leaving out parks which could meet the general principle of providing the more accessible park to that part of the suburb.

The Director Infrastructure Management reiterated the point made previously about bore capacity.

The Chairman directed members back to matters concerning the committee.

Mr Baird passed around photographs of parks he doesn't feel meet the community usage priority.

Cr Hollywood asked what priority is Macaulay Park. The Manager Operations Services advised it is Priority 2 and would take 4 to 5 years to get to the park, but that doesn't exclude a Priority 2 park being done if there is a criteria form for it.

Mr Baird stated that, of the current selection of parks chosen for reticulation in the later budgets, 4 out of 15 parks don't have community usage. He went on to list several other parks he feels don't meet the criteria for Priority 1 and advised that he doesn't agree with the costing factor.

Mr Baird then went on to question the rationale behind the usage of big bores, rather than small bores. He stated he had spoken to someone at the City of Stirling regarding the inefficiency of large bores and was told that he didn't see any rationale for this inefficiency.

Mayor asked for a comment from the Manager Operations Services regarding the difference between Stirling and Joondalup and the size of bores. Is it relevant and is there a \$10,000 saving per bore?

The Manager Operations Services advised that Stirling has a lot of very small parks, house block size, spread throughout the older areas. Originally they were reticulated by mains pressure and 8-10 years ago they cut them off mains pressure. So they put a lot of small bores down. But if we want to water a Public Open Space and extend it to connect to possibly other dry parks, a bigger system is required.

Some discussion followed regarding this issue.

The Chairman requested Mr Baird to start wrapping his presentation up.

Mr Baird referred to the final maintenance cost at the bottom of the page (introduction). The biggest cost for reticulation is the ongoing maintenance cost. He compared the one-off installation cost for half a hectare of \$5,000 and the annual maintenance cost of only \$2,500, with the larger areas with large bores where the maintenance cost is \$9,000 and the

installation cost is \$20,000. He asked why can't just the area to be played on be reticulated, instead of the whole park.

Mr Baird presented his argument for Macaulay Park. The park has high community usage and access via the cycleway, pedestrian, verge and street parking. He pointed out that it is on the major cycleway down the freeway and is in close proximity to a primary and secondary school. It has high community interest in the development, is an isolated park in an areas that doesn't have alternative reticulated parks and it can be linked to other dry parks, such as Strathaven and Cabrini. He also put a word in for Telopia and Bracken Parks, both of which have been the subject of a petition.

The Chairman thanked Mr Baird and called for any last questions.

Mayor Bombak noted that Mr Baird had recorded Macaulay Park has having a high usage factor and Council recorded it as a low usage factor. He asked why the usage factors differed.

Mr Baird's criteria is the number of children in Macaulay Avenue using the park, the number of people jogging and walking through the park and its proximity to the schools.

The Chairman thanked Mr Baird for attending the meeting and making his presentation. He then called for other questions. There being no further questions forthcoming, Mr Baird left the meeting at 1919hrs.

The Chairman then called the meeting to order at 1920hrs.

#### **DECLARATIONS OF FINANCIAL/NON FINANCIAL INTEREST**

Cr J Hollywood - Non financial disclosure - Third Avenue.  
Cr A Patterson - Non financial disclosure - Wanbrow Park.

#### **CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES**

Minutes of the meeting held on 15 August 2000 were accepted as a true and correct record.

**Moved: Cr J Hurst                      Seconded: Cr J Hollywood**

#### **BUSINESS OUTSTANDING FROM PREVIOUS MINUTES**

Mr Baird's application and questions at the Council meeting held on 22 August 2000, and additional information and comments provided this evening by Mr Baird, will be taken into consideration by the committee as part of its deliberations in reviewing the Dry Parks, Median and Verge Program.

## **ITEMS OF BUSINESS**

### **1 Multi Criteria Analysis**

The Chairman thanked Cr Barnett and the Manager Operations Services for the information provided in the analysis.

The Manager Operations Services asked whether there was any additional information Councillors required to be shown on the matrix. Additional information will be incorporated into the matrix.

- 2 The Chairman stated that there are still a number of issues for the committee to consider. He advised that a reassessment of the criteria be considered and that any recommendation for changes to the criteria will be presented to Council.

- 3 The Manager Operations Services clarified the point made by Mr Baird relating to Macaulay Park, being that the dual use path runs alongside the park, along the freeway.

- 4 Cr Hurst suggested a bus tour of dry parks to become familiar with the parks. The Chairman requested the Director Infrastructure Management to organise transport for the tour to take place. The Manager Operations Services will compile an itinerary.

Cr Barnett suggested that Cr Mackintosh be invited to attend the bus tour, as it could tie in with the Urban Animal Committee.

- 5 The Chairman stated he would like to put on the next Items of Business the opportunity to discuss and look at the current criteria.

## **DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting of the Dry Parks, Median and Verge Committee will be held in Conference Room 3, Joondalup Civic Centre on Thursday 21 September 2000, commencing at 6.00pm.

## **CLOSURE**

There being no further business, the Chairman declared the meeting closed at 1945hrs.