



City of
Joondalup

DRAFT AGENDA

FOR

BRIEFING SESSION

TUESDAY, 14 SEPTEMBER 2004

BRIEFING SESSIONS

The following procedures relating to the conduct of Briefing Sessions were adopted at the meeting of Joint Commissioners held on 31 August 2004.

PURPOSE OF BRIEFING SESSIONS

For the most effective decision-making, elected members/Commissioners must have the opportunity to gain maximum knowledge and understanding of any issue presented to the Council on which they must vote. It is reasonable for elected members/Commissioners to expect that they will be provided with all the relevant information they need to understand issues listed on the agenda for the next or following ordinary Council meetings. The complexity of many items means that elected members/commissioners may need to be given information additional to that in a staff report and/or they may need an opportunity to ask questions of relevant staff members. This is achieved by the elected members/commissioners meeting as a body to receive a briefing on issues listed for Council decision. It is considered Briefing Sessions are much more efficient and effective than elected members/Commissioners meeting staff on an individual basis for such a purpose, with the added benefit that all elected members/Commissioners hear the same questions and answers.

Briefing Sessions conducted by the City are open to the public with the exception of confidential items that are to be considered by Council behind closed doors. In addition to having the opportunity to receive detailed presentations from staff and consultants about matters that are to be on the Council Meeting Agenda for decision, Briefing Sessions are the forum used by the City to receive deputations from the public, ratepayer and other community groups, about matters of interest and due for consideration and decision of Council.

To protect the integrity of the decision-making process it is essential that Briefing Sessions be conducted in keeping with agreed procedures that are consistently applied.

PROCEDURES FOR BRIEFING SESSIONS

- 1 Dates and times for sessions should be set well in advance where practical.
- 2 The CEO will ensure timely written notice and the agenda for each session is provided to all members.
- 3 Session papers should be distributed to members at least three days prior to the meeting. This does not preclude submission of late items where considered appropriate by the CEO.
- 4 The Mayor/Chairman of Commissioners or other designated member is to be the presiding member at all sessions.
- 5 Elected members/Commissioners, employees and consultants shall disclose their financial and conflicts of interest in matters to be discussed.

- 6 Interests are to be disclosed in accordance with the provisions of the Act as they apply to ordinary Council meetings. Persons disclosing a financial interest will not participate in that part of a session relating to their interest and shall leave the meeting room.
- 7 There is to be no opportunity for a person with an interest to request that they continue in the session.
- 8 A record should be kept of all sessions. As no decisions will be made, the record need only be a general record of items covered but should record disclosures of interest with appropriate departures/returns.
- 9 Elected members/Commissioners have the opportunity to request matters be included on the agenda for consideration at future Strategy or Briefing Sessions by:
 - (a) Request to the Mayor/Chairman;
 - (b) Request to the Chief Executive Officer; or
 - (c) Submitting a Notice of Motion to a Council meeting in keeping with Standing Orders.
- 10 An exception to point 7 above would be a situation where a consultant who has/declares a financial interest in the matter, is asked to attend a Strategy or Briefing Session to provide information only, on that matter being considered at the Session.
- 11 Briefing Sessions will be open to the public unless the session is being briefed on a matter for which a formal Council meeting may be closed.
- 12 Briefing Sessions will be the forum that ratepayer, community and other groups and members of the public can make a deputation on Council meeting agenda matters before the Council. Persons wanting to arrange deputations must do so in keeping with the procedures then applicable.
- 13 Items to be addressed will be limited to matters listed on the forthcoming agenda.
- 14 Briefings will only be given by staff or staff and consultants, for the purpose of ensuring that elected members and the public are more fully informed.
- 15 All questions and discussions will be directed through the chair. There will be no debate style discussion, as this needs to take place in the ordinary meeting of Council when the issue is set for decision.
- 16 A period for Public Questions be held at the commencement of Briefing Sessions that relate only to items on the agenda

PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

Public question time is provided at meetings of the Council or briefing sessions that are open to the public.

Public question time is not a public forum for debate or making public statements. The time is limited to asking of questions and receiving responses. This procedure is designed to assist the conduct of public question time and provide a fair and equitable opportunity for members of the public who wish to ask a question. Public question time is not to be used by elected members. Members of the Council are encouraged to use other opportunities to obtain information.

Questions raised at the Briefing Session must relate only to items on the agenda.

Prior to the Meeting/Briefing Session

To enable prompt and detailed responses to questions, members of the public are encouraged to lodge questions in writing to the Committee Clerk by close of business on the Friday prior to the Council meeting or Briefing Session at which the answer is required. Answers to those questions received within that time frame, where practicable, will be provided in hard copy form at that meeting.

At the Meeting/Briefing Session

A register will be provided for those persons wanting to ask questions to enter their name, and the order of registration will be the order in which persons will be invited to ask their questions.

Public question time will be limited to the legislative minimum of fifteen (15) minutes and may be extended by resolution of the Council, but the extension of time is not to exceed ten (10) minutes in total. Public question time will be limited to two (2) questions per member of the public. When all people who wish to do so have asked their two (2) questions, the presiding member may, if time permits, provide an opportunity for those who have already asked their two (2) questions to ask further questions.

During public question time at the meeting, each member of the public wanting to ask questions will be required to provide a written form of their question(s) to a Council employee.

Where the number of required questions exceeds the number able to be asked, the member of the public may submit the unasked questions to the Council, where they would be 'taken on notice' and a written response provided.

The procedure to ask a public question during the meeting is as follows:

- persons are requested to come forward in the order they registered;
- give their name and address;
- read out their question;
- before or during the meeting each person is requested to provide a written form of their question to a designated Council employee;
- the person having used up their allowed number of questions or time is asked by the presiding member if they have more questions; if they do then the presiding member notes the request and places them at the end of the queue; the person resumes their seat in the gallery;
- the next person on the registration list is called;
- the original registration list is worked through until exhausted; after that the presiding member calls upon any other persons who did not register if they have a question (people may have arrived after the meeting opened);
- when such people have asked their questions the presiding member may, if time permits, provide an opportunity for those who have already asked a question to ask further questions;
- public question time is declared closed following the expiration of the allocated time period or where there are no further questions.

The Mayor or presiding member shall decide to:

- Accept or reject the question and his/her decision is final;
- Nominate a member of the Council and/or Council employee to respond to the question;
- Due to the complexity of the question, it be taken on notice with a written response provided as soon as possible, and included in the agenda of the next briefing session or Council meeting, whichever applicable.

The following rules apply to public question time:

- *question time is not to be used by a member of the public to make a statement or express a personal opinion;*
- *questions should properly relate to Council business;*
- *question time shall not be used to require an Elected Member or an officer to make a personal explanation;*
- *questions should be asked politely in good faith and are not to be framed in such a way as to reflect adversely or be defamatory on a particular Elected Member or Council employee;*
- *where a response has been provided to a question asked by a member of the public, and where that response, in the opinion of the presiding person, adequately deals with the question, there is no obligation to further justify the response;*
- *where an elected member is of the opinion that the question is not relevant to the business of the City of Joondalup or that a member of the public is making a statement, they may bring it to the attention of the meeting.*

It is not intended that question time should be used as a means to obtain information that would not be made available if it was sought from the City's records under Section 5.94 of the Local Government Act 1995 or the Freedom of Information (FOI) Act 1992. Where the response to a question(s) would require a substantial commitment of the City's resources, the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) will determine that it is an unreasonable impost upon the City and refuse to provide it. The CEO will advise the member of the public that the information may be sought in accordance with the FOI Act 1992.

Disclaimer

Responses to questions not put in writing are provided in good faith and as such, should not be relied upon as being either complete or comprehensive.

DEPUTATION SESSIONS

Commissioners will conduct an informal session on the same day as the Briefing Session in Conference Room 1, Joondalup Civic Centre, Boas Avenue, Joondalup, commencing at 6.30 pm where members of the public may present deputations by appointment only. (Please note that deputation requests are to be received by no later than 4.00 pm on the Monday prior to a Briefing Session.)

A time period of fifteen (15) minutes is set-aside for each deputation, with five (5) minutes for Commissioners' questions. Deputation sessions are open to the public.

* *Any queries on the agenda, please contact Council Support Services on 9400 4369.*

CITY OF JOONDALUP – BRIEFING SESSION

to be held in Conference Room 1, Joondalup Civic Centre, Boas Avenue, Joondalup on
TUESDAY, 14 SEPTEMBER 2004 commencing at **6.30 pm**

ORDER OF BUSINESS

1 OPEN AND WELCOME

2 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

The following questions were submitted by Ms Sue Hart, Greenwood to the Briefing Session held on 24 August 2004:

Re: Business Outstanding from Previous Meetings: Page 59 Draft Agenda 24/08/04 - Lot 1 Oceanside Promenade Mullaloo. Notice of Motion Cr M Caiacob ex C83-05/03

Q1 In the 15 months that have passed since this Motion was before Council, has the research been completed?

Q2 Have we reached due course, as 15 months have passed?

Q3 When will this research that has taken 15 months be available to the public?

Q4 What is the nature of the research?

A1-A4 Due to resources necessary to undertake other tasks and priorities, the required research has not been completed and a definitive time frame for its completion cannot be provided at this point in time. The nature of the research is yet to be determined, as scoping of this task has not been finalised.

The following questions were submitted by Mr Mike O'Brien, Warwick to the Briefing Session held on 24 August 2004:

Questions to the Commissioners of the City of Joondalup

Q1 When the Commissioners are setting their busy schedules, are they still refusing to meet with the suspended Elected Members who requested a "confidential, without prejudice, informal meeting" earlier this year?

A1 The suspended Elected Members are welcome to submit any requests for meetings to the Joint Commissioners for consideration.

Q2 When considering the Taxing of Peoples Homes, within the boundaries of the Municipality, for the purpose of raising revenue for refuse disposal, did the Commissioners examine Section 41 of the Health Act 1911 in consideration, of assisting Pensioners and Seniors Card Holders, having 50% or 25% of such a

“Proportional Tax” paid to the City, by State Treasury, pursuant the Rates and Charges (Rebates and Deferments) Act 1992?

A2 The Rates and Charges (Rebates and Deferments) Act 1992 does not extend to charges raised under the Health Act 1911. At the time of developing the 2004/05 budget, it was considered appropriate to follow the approach of the previous Council in setting the refuse charge.

Q3 *If not, why not?*

A3 Refer Response to Question 2.

Q4 *When considering the Taxing of Peoples Homes, within the boundaries of the Municipality, for the purpose of raising revenue for refuse disposal, did the Commissioners, if purporting to use Section 106 of the Health Act 1911 receive, Written Approval, pursuant Section 106 (7) of the Act, from the Executive Director Public Health, prior to the 19th day of August in the year 2004 in order to “make different charges”?*

A4 Section 106 (7) does not apply as the City did not set different domestic refuse charges for services rendered in different portions of its district.

Q5 *If not, why not?*

A5 Refer Response to Question 4.

Q6 *When considering the Taxing of Peoples Homes, within the boundaries of the Municipality, for the purpose of raising revenue for refuse disposal, did the Commissioners, if purporting to use Section 112 of the Health Act 1911 cause to be published, in the Gazette; and in a newspaper circulating generally throughout the district, 14 days before the 1st July 2004, a Notice specifying the proposed charges pursuant Section 344C of the Health Act 1911?*

A6 Section 344C does not apply because the domestic refuse charge is not a “prescribed charge”. The domestic refuse charge is not prescribed in the City’s Local Laws.

Q7 *If not, why not?*

A7 Refer Response to Question 6.

Q8 *In light of possible “NON COMPLIANCE” with a Statute of the State of Western Australia in regard to the above, “apparent omission”, will the Commissioners, cause to be published the Statutory Notification, and/or convene a Special Mini Budget Meeting after 14 days Notice has been given in the Gazette and a newspaper, in order to comply with the Law, and/or consider using Section 41 of the Health Act 1911 as an alternative method of Taxing Properties for Revenue for Refuse Disposal?*

A8 There is no non compliance with Section 344C.

The following questions were submitted by Mr V Cusack, Kingsley to the Briefing Session held on 24 August 2004:

Q1 Are the Commissioners aware that ratepayers are vehemently opposed to the removal of the elected members from involvement in the town planning delegation process? Why is the City acting on the recommendations of the Governance Review report which has yet to be made public and before the finalisation of the Panel Inquiry?

A1 Response by Cmr Paterson: We are not aware of the ratepayers' opposition. The Governance Review recommendations will be noted and considered at the Council meeting.

Q2 Are the Commissioners aware that the Governance Review did not seek input from the people who this City purports to 'govern', the ratepayers and since the change stems from the Governance Review could you explain how the removal of elected members from the delegated authority process enhances good governance in accordance with Section 3.1 of the Local Government Act 1995?

A2 Response by Cmr Paterson: This will form part of the discussion at the Council meeting.

The following questions were submitted by Ms S Hart, Greenwood to the Briefing Session held on 24 August 2004:

Q1 Who instigated the delegated authority item on the agenda for the next Council meeting?

A1 It is a legislative requirement that all delegated authority items are reviewed annually.

Q2 Are Commissioners aware that in 2003 there was a child care centre application for Greenwood on the corner of Gorman and Wanneroo Roads. Staff supported this application, yet the Mayor at the time and the Director of Planning pulled the item? The applicant approached the Ward Councillors for assistance. There was a Freedom of Information application but my co-Ward Councillor and I could not obtain a copy of the Delegated Authority report.

A2 Response by Cmr Paterson: Commissioners are not aware but will seek information on the issue.

The following questions were submitted by Mr T Thorpe, Sorrento to the Briefing Session held on 24 August 2004:

- Q1 Did the applicants contact the City before purchasing the site or did they assume they would get approval for the rezoning?*
- A1 It is unknown whether the applicants contacted the City before or after the purchase. CSIRO did contact the City and advised that the site was to be sold.
- Q2 Why is an area zoned Parks and Recreation allowed to reach the stage of rezoning before consultation with the ratepayers?*
- A2 That is part of the planning process. When an application is made for rezoning, it is assessed by staff and a report is submitted to Council.

The following questions were submitted by Mr M Caiacob, Mullaloo to the Briefing Session held on 24 August 2004:

- Q1 Re: Item 3 – Town Planning Delegations: What are the evaluation criteria for public interest and a matter of principle?*
- A1 Those have been taken from the City of Swan’s delegated authority. In terms of matters of principle, the City would be looking to submit items to Council where there would be a fundamental change in planning.
- Q2 Under the proposed delegated authority, who deals with multiple dwelling applications in R2 to R30 areas?*
- A2 There are no standards contained within the R-Codes for multiple dwellings in the Codes R2 – R30 and it would be highly unusual for an application of this sort to be lodged. Given these factors, it is likely that a hypothetical application of this sort would be referred to the Council for consideration.
- Q3 Are the:*
- (a) Director of Planning & Community Development*
 - (b) Manager Approvals, Planning & Environmental Services*
 - (c) Coordinator Planning Approvals*
 - (d) Senior Planning Officers (Planning Approvals)*
- eligible to hold a Municipal Town Planners Certificate?*
- A3 Yes, in normal circumstances, each of the above listed positions would be qualified planners and therefore eligible to hold a Municipal Town Planners Certificate. The qualification existed in the previous Local Government Act and required a tertiary education and a number of years of relative planning experience. Each of the above listed positions meets the requirements of certification.

The role of Acting Director Planning & Community Development is substantially being carried out by the Manager Community Development Services, who is not eligible to hold a Municipal Town Planners Certificate,

and therefore does not exercise the delegated authority or advise on planning matters. This role is currently being undertaken by the Manager Approvals Planning & Environmental Services, who is a qualified planner, and who is eligible to hold a Municipal Town Planners Certificate.

This circumstance will arise from time to time as various managers from within the organisation are provided with opportunities to fill roles in an acting capacity. In the situation where Co-ordinators and Senior employees of the City fill higher roles in an acting capacity, they too may not be eligible to hold a Municipal Town Planners Certificate. In this instance, officers within the organisation that are eligible to hold a Municipal Town Planners Certificate will be called upon when required.

Q4 Why are the:

- (a) Director Planning & Community Development*
- (b) Manager Approvals, Planning & Environmental Services*

to be given all powers conferred or imposed by the scheme, regardless of a variance of more than 10%? How is this open and accountable to the public and how does this satisfy the Local Government Act 1995, Clause 2.10 (role of a Councillor)?

A4 The Planning Delegation is a tool used to assist in the administration of the DPS. The role of the Councillor(s) is to assist in the development of the strategic direction of the Scheme and its controls.

Q5 Could it be the case that all Town Planning matters will be dealt with under Delegated Authority and Council is not responsible for any town planning issues?

A5 No, this is not envisaged at all. Council will always play a role in Town Planning matters

Q6 Could there be a conflict of interest between the Delegated Authority for town planning advertising and Delegated Authority for town planning applications and approvals?

A6 The question is not understood. Further clarification is sought by Mr Caiacob in order for the question to be answered.

Q7 Is the report to Council on Delegated Authority required monthly or yearly?

A7 The items determined under Delegated Authority are reported to Council on a monthly basis.

Q8 Why is the delegation for two years, when one year is specified under the DPS2 and would be more appropriate in order to be reviewed by Council at the time other Delegated Authorities are reviewed?

A8 The District Planning Scheme No 2 states that any delegation shall have effect for a twelve month period unless Council stipulates a lesser or greater period.

The proposal for a 2 year period would provide a level of certainty for the implementation of delegated authority. However, the Joint Commissioners can determine a different length for the delegation period.

Q9 How is Council responsible for the “performance of the Local Government functions, as per 2.7 LGA” if Town Planning matters can be dealt with behind closed doors with no input or consultation from the Elected Members or Council?

A9 The power to delegate Town Planning powers comes from the District Planning Scheme, which expressly allows the Council to delegate its Town Planning powers. The Council may delegate those powers as it sees fit.

Many administrative functions of the Council are dealt with by the administration and the concept of Town Planning Delegation is no different.

The following questions were submitted by Mrs M Macdonald, Mullaloo to the Briefing Session held on 24 August 2004:

Q1 I refer to Item 4 on tonight’s agenda, which refers to amendments to the JCCDPM. The resolutions ask Commissioners to adopt the modifications under Clause 9.6 of DPS2. This clause is for the consideration of a Structure Plan. Clause 9.7 is for the Amendment of an agreed Structure Plan. Are Commissioners being asked to adopt modifications or approve a structure plan?

A1 The Commissioners are being requested to adopt modifications to the JCCDPM which is an agreed structure plan under the City’s DPS2. Clause 9.7 requires that amendments to Structure Plans are considered in accordance with Clause 7.6

Q2 The resolution refers to modifications to JCCDPM Structure Plan No 1. The JCCDPM was deemed a structure plan under TPS1 and was not referred to as structure plan No 1. Are Commissioners being asked to amend Structure Plan No 1 or the JCCDPM and why are they not being asked to modify the Campus Structure Plan, which is in the report as requiring modification?

A2 The JCCDPM is also referred to as the City’s Structure Plan No 1 and therefore are the same document. The campus district is part of the JCCDPM and is therefore not a separate structure plan.

The following question was submitted by Ms M John, Marmion to the Briefing Session held on 24 August 2004:

Q1 Would the Commissioners be prepared to accept an updated flora survey list for the CSIRO site? This shows a Priority 2 species and extra Priority 3 species and indicates the value of the site for both local and regional value.

A1 *Response by Cmr Paterson:* Yes.

The following questions were submitted by Mr M Sideris, Mullaloo to the Briefing Session held on 24 August 2004:

Q1 Re: Item 3: The report does not give a copy of the current town planning delegations and nowhere in the report does it attach the proposed new policy.

A1 This information will be provided for the Council meeting.

Q2 Where in the current policy or DPS2 does it allow the Mayor or Councillors to attend the delegated authority meeting? There should be reference in the report to this detail.

A2 With the exception of the Mayor and/or his/her nominee as outlined in the current Town Planning Delegation, there is no written Policy or part of the District Planning Scheme No 2 that refers to the attendance of Councillors/Commissioners at Delegated Authority sessions. However, it has been past practice to invite interested Councillors to attend the Delegated Authority sessions.

The following questions were submitted by Mr S Magyar, Heathridge to the Briefing Session held on 24 August 2004:

Q1 If a question is taken on notice the necessary answer is not available until after the Council has made a decision. Wouldn't it be more accountable to ensure that a response to any question taken on notice at a Briefing Session is made available to both the public and the Commissioners prior to the Council meeting?

A1 Following a Briefing Session, Commissioners are provided with responses to questions on notice and all the necessary information to enable them to make a decision at the Council meeting.

Response by Cmr Paterson: It is a recommendation of the Governance Review that no question time is permitted at Briefing Sessions.

Q2 Item 3: Town Planning Delegations: Why is there no reference to the performance criteria of the Residential Design Codes in the report that deals with this delegation?

A2 This incorporates the acceptable and desirable performance criteria.

The following questions were submitted by Mrs M Zakrevsky, Mullaloo to the Briefing Session held on 24 August 2004:

Q1 Item 11: Minutes of the Seniors Interests Advisory Committee: The attachments mention a questionnaire which has not been included. Can this be included in the Council agenda?

A1 This attachment will be included.

Q2 Item 12: Streetside Benches Proposed Settlement: This heading is unclear, what does this item relate to?

A2 This is a contractual matter. This item is to be withdrawn from the agenda to enable further advice to be sought on the Trade Practices Act.

The following questions were submitted by Ms M Moon, Greenwood to the Meeting of Joint Commissioners held on 31 August 2004:

Q1 Why is it that the officers' justification for the recommendation to approve Lot 61 Leach Street, Marmion for advertisement is based on what would occur under the proposal, not under the Urban Development zone, and that it would not necessary produce identical land use and building form of locality?

A1 The justification behind the resolution is based on several town planning related considerations that are outlined within the Council report.

Q2 Is the proposal statutory or can it be reviewed by the proponents and changed?

A2 The proposed scheme amendment application process is regulated by the Town Planning Regulations. If the proponent changed the intended rezoning at a future time, this would require a new rezoning application.

The following questions were submitted by Ms S Hart, Greenwood to the Meeting of Joint Commissioners held on 31 August 2004:

Re Item 5 – Amendment 24:

Q1 Page 21 Paragraph 5: "some members of the public" How many are "some" members of the public?

A1 A precise number is unknown, hence the use of the word "some".

Q2 When the report stated "level of community support" is the City also taking on board the level of community opposition?

A2 Yes.

Q3 Consultation. 6/12/03 How many doors were knocked on, how many ratepayers answered the door and what information was presented to ratepayers?

Q4 13/02/03 and 17/01/04 Open Days. Were these open days advertised in the Community News?

Q5 If letter dropped how many ratepayers were contacted?

Q6 If neither of the above how were ratepayers made aware of the open days?

Q7 How many one to one meetings were held?

Q8 What information was presented at these meetings?

Q9 What information was given over the phone?

Q10 How many calls were taken?

A3-10 This consultation was undertaken by the landowner and is separate to any consultation that may be required by the Council. As the landowner undertook this process on an independent basis, it is suggested that questions 3 to 10 be referred to the landowner.

Q11 Page 28 "infill" & "minimising urban sprawl" In line with the State Government's objective. Are Commissions aware that Precinct Plan in the South Ward was 'infill and minimising urban sprawl', and when the community eventually found out, there was overwhelming opposition?

A11 The Commissioners have not been briefed specifically on the City's previous precinct planning exercise, however most would be aware of it.

Q12 If Commissioners adopt Amendment 24 for the purpose of advertising, after advertising has closed and the Amendment is before Commissioners, if the applicant is unsuccessful, there are avenues for appeal. Do Commissioners appreciate that if Amendment 24 is rejected for advertising there is no avenue for appeal?

A12 Yes, the Commissioners are aware. No appeal rights exist with respect to Town Planning Scheme Amendment applications. The Minister for Planning and Infrastructure ultimately determines a Scheme Amendment proposal.

Q13 The community around this site, and other ratepayers in the City, as I have been told this is a regional issue, are concerned about amenity and the rights of ratepayers. Let's face it, the South Ward fought hard for their amenity, Mullaloo and Hepburn Heights the same. When someone purchases land, does it give them the right to apply for rezoning?

A13 Yes.

Q14 When someone purchases land, does it give them the automatic right to achieve rezoning?

A14 No.

3 DEPUTATIONS**4 APOLOGIES AND LEAVE OF ABSENCE****5 DECLARATIONS OF FINANCIAL INTEREST/INTEREST THAT MAY AFFECT IMPARTIALITY****6 REPORTS**

ITEM 1	SCHEDULE OF DOCUMENTS EXECUTED BY MEANS OF AFFIXING THE COMMON SEAL – [15876]	1
ITEM 2	DATE OF FUTURE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ELECTIONS - THIRD SATURDAY IN OCTOBER – [03011]	3
ITEM 3	MINUTES OF SUSTAINABILITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE - 2 SEPTEMBER 2004 – [00906]	5
ITEM 4	TENDER NUMBER 001-04/05 CONSTRUCTION OF STORMWATER DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENTS IN BAHAMA CLOSE SORRENTO – [78562]	9
ITEM 5	NORTHERN CORRIDOR RECOVERY GROUP PARTNERING AGREEMENT FOR THE PROVISION OF MUTUAL AID FOR RECOVERY DURING EMERGENCIES – [33514] ...	14
ITEM 6	PROPOSED PARKING PROHIBITIONS - POYNTER AND BEAUMARIS PRIMARY SCHOOLS – [09564] [08671] [00672] [05640] [36666]	17
ITEM 7	STORM WATER DRAINAGE DISCHARGE INTO NATURAL AREA RESERVES [12168]	20
ITEM 8	MINUTES OF THE CONSERVATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF 28 JULY 2004 – [12168]	23
ITEM 9	PROPOSED MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT (3 OFFICES AND 12 RESIDENTIAL UNITS) LOT 344 (22) GRAND BOULEVARD, CNR HAMMERSMITH COURT, JOONDALUP – [74558]	26
ITEM 10	PROPOSED ADDITIONS TO WHITFORD CITY SHOPPING CENTRE -LOT 501 (470) WHITFORDS AVENUE, HILLARYS – [00081]	35
ITEM 11	PROPOSED RETAINING WALLS (INCLUDING SIDE SETBACK VARIATIONS AND IMPORTATION OF FILL IN EXCESS OF 500MM) – LOT 11415 NO 17 SECOND AVENUE, BURNS BEACH – [00077]	39
ITEM 12	HOME BUSINESS CATEGORY TWO RENEWAL (REPAIR OF PLASTIC CRATES) LOT 130 (2) JANTHINA CRESCENT HEATHRIDGE – [85186]	45
ITEM 13	MINUTES OF THE SENIORS INTERESTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 18 AUGUST 2004 – [55511]	53
ITEM 14	MINUTES OF THE JOONDALUP YOUTH ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING – 18 AUGUST 2004 – [38245]	55
ITEM 15	CRAIGIE LEISURE CENTRE MANAGEMENT REQUIREMENTS AND CHANGES TO THE STAFF ESTABLISHMENT – [09050]	57
ITEM 16	STREETSIDE BENCHES PROPOSED SETTLEMENT –[45612] [45924]	58

- 7 REPORT OF THE ACTING CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER**
- 8 MOTIONS OF WHICH PREVIOUS NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN**
- 9 BUSINESS OUTSTANDING FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS**
- 10 OUTSTANDING PETITIONS**
- 11 REPORTS/PRESENTATIONS REQUESTED BY
COMMISSIONERS**

ITEM 1 SCHEDULE OF DOCUMENTS EXECUTED BY MEANS OF AFFIXING THE COMMON SEAL – [15876]

WARD - All

PURPOSE

To provide a listing of those documents executed by means of affixing the Common Seal for noting by Joint Commissioners.

Document: Amendment
Parties: City of Joondalup
Description: Final adoption of Scheme Amendment No 21 – Portion of Lot 9016 Burns Beach Road - Rezoning
Date: 27.07.04

Document: Agreement
Parties: City of Joondalup and Family and Community Services
Description: Funding Agreement for Youth Activities Services/Family Liaison Worker
Date: 27.07.04

Document: Caveat
Parties: City of Joondalup and Silkchime P/L
Description: Withdrawal of Caveat – Lots 946, 956 and 965 Ellersdale Avenue, Warwick
Date: 05.08.04

Document: Application
Parties: City of Joondalup and Department for Community Development
Description: Preferred Service Provider Application for City of Joondalup Financial Counselling Service
Date: 05.08.04

Document: Caveat
Parties: City of Joondalup and Kapinkoff Nominees P/L
Description: Withdrawal of Caveat – Lot 2 Trappers Drive, Woodvale
Date: 05.08.04

Document: Contract
Parties: City of Joondalup and Australian Air-conditioning Services
Description: Execution of Contract No 045-03/04 – Mechanical Services Preventative Maintenance
Date: 05.08.04

Document: Contract
Parties: City of Joondalup and Coastal Sweeping Services
Description: Execution of Contract No 045-03/04 – Sweeping or urban and arterial roads
Date: 05.08.04

Document: Contract
Parties: City of Joondalup and Wearmasters P/L t/as Road and Traffic Services
Description: Execution of Contract No 044-03/04 – Provision of pavement marking services
Date: 10.08.04

Document: Agreement
Parties: City of Joondalup and R T and R C Holdings P/L
Description: Licence Agreement to operate Joondalup Reception Centre – 1.8.04 to 31.7.05
Date: 19.08.04

ATTACHMENTS

Nil

VOTING REQUIREMENTS

Simple Majority

RECOMMENDATION

That the schedule of documents executed by means of affixing the common seal for the period 21 July 2004 to 19 August 2004 be NOTED.

ITEM 2 DATE OF FUTURE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ELECTIONS - THIRD SATURDAY IN OCTOBER – [03011]

WARD - All

PURPOSE

This report is to ascertain if the City supports a change of the Election Day to the third Saturday in October every two years.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Western Australian Local Government Association (WALGA) has surveyed member councils to determine the level of support for a change of date for holding the biennial local government elections, from May to October. WALGA received responses from over 100 member Councils and whilst there was not a specific date indicated it was clear from the consultation that over 60 Councils supported a broad change to the September/October period.

WALGA is now asking member Councils if they support a change of Election Day to the third Saturday in October every two years, and has requested that a response be provided by Friday 15 October 2004.

It is recommended that the Joint Commissioners support the proposed change in biennial election date from May to October.

BACKGROUND

Report CJ097-05/04 Date of Future Biennial Local Government Elections was presented at the ordinary Council meeting of 18 May 2004, where the following motion was carried:

“That the Joint Commissioners SUPPORT in principle a change in the date for holding of biennial local government elections from May to September/October.”

The City of Joondalup was instrumental in seeking the date change and progressed this through the North Metropolitan Zone Committee of WALGA.

DETAILS

Statutory Provision:

Section 4.7 of the Local Government Act 1995, titled “Ordinary elections day usually the first Saturday in May”, outlines the date on which ordinary elections are to be held. Any change in the election date would require an amendment to section 4.7.

Financial Implications:

Under the current arrangements with the State Electoral Commission those Councils that opt to use the State Electoral Commission to manage their biennial elections with postal voting, may split the cost of the election across successive budgets. With the preferred change from

May to October clarification was sought and agreement given that the State Electoral Commission will continue to permit local governments to split the costs over two budget years.

COMMENT

The City of Joondalup was instrumental in seeking the date change of local government elections from May to October. This action followed the State Government's announcement of its intention to change the Terms of Office of State Parliamentarians to four years and hold the State elections on the third Saturday of February.

The proposed change of Election Day for local government to the third Saturday in October every two years, was deemed necessary as the conflicting times of both the State and local government elections would have overlapped. This would have caused a significant challenge to the State Electoral Commission to manage all elections on those years when State elections were also held.

Other considerations were taken into account when making the decision to seek the change in election date to October. Positive outcomes from the change would be that newly elected members of Councils have more time to settle into their role, be able to undertake training and be better prepared in what is required of their office, especially when the budget process is to be undertaken. A change to this legislation has the potential to affect all local governments throughout the State in different ways. Each local government will be assessing the likely impact from its own perspectives.

Possible Implementation

As this matter is still in the consultation stage and an amendment to the Local Government Act 1995 would be necessary if the proposed date change is supported, it is envisaged that the earliest implementation time would be for the 2007 biennial local government elections.

ATTACHMENTS

Nil

VOTING REQUIREMENTS

Simple majority

RECOMMENDATION

That the Joint Commissioners SUPPORT a change in the date for holding of Biennial Local Government Elections from May to October.

ITEM 3 MINUTES OF SUSTAINABILITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE - 2 SEPTEMBER 2004 – [00906]

WARD - All

PURPOSE

The unconfirmed minutes of the Sustainability Advisory Committee meeting held on 2 September 2004 are submitted for noting by Council.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Sustainability Advisory Committee (SAC) met on 2 September 2004. Several items of Business were discussed including an overview of the Community Funding Round II 2003/04 (Sustainability Category), the first meeting of the Joondalup Energy Team (JET), recruitment for a new Sustainability Advisory Committee (SAC) member, the new home energy audit program, and the outcomes of the previous SAC workshop.

Several issues were raised in regards to the advisory role of the SAC. The SAC indicated that it would like greater involvement with sustainability projects and to be made aware of significant issues under consideration by Council to incorporate the Committee's expertise and experience.

The Committee recommended that the requirements for quorum as detailed within the Committee's Terms of Reference (Attachment 2) be changed.

It is the view of officers that slight amendments to quorum requirements are necessary to provide greater clarity to Committee members on quorum requirements and to reflect requirements of the Local Government Act.

This report recommends that the Joint Commissioners:

- 1 *NOTE the unconfirmed minutes of the Sustainability Advisory Committee meeting held on 2 September 2004, forming Attachment 1 to this Report;*
- 2 *ACCEPT the resignation of Mr Paul Gerrans from the Sustainability Advisory Committee and thank him for his contribution to the Committee;*
- 3 *AMEND the Sustainability Advisory Committee's Terms of Reference (Section 5.4) to read "A quorum shall be 50% of the number of offices (whether vacant or not) of members of the Committee";*
- 4 *REQUEST a report be prepared by Council officers on the Community Funding (Sustainable Development Category) guidelines and ideas to increase grant applications.*

DETAIL

The minutes of the Sustainability Advisory Committee meeting, held on 2 September 2004 are provided at Attachment 1.

ITEM 1 COMMUNITY FUNDING RECIPIENTS CEREMONY (SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT CATEGORY)

The Community Funding – Sustainable Development category recipients were presented with cheques as a result of successful funding applications for Round II 2003/04. Representatives attended the ceremony from the City of Joondalup, Padbury Primary School, Mullaloo Heights Primary and Malubillai Wildlife Carers Network.

The Sustainability Advisory Committee requested that Mr Reay provide the Committee with a report outlining the guidelines for the Community Funding (Sustainable Development Category) Round I 2004/05 and proposed ideas to promote and increase grant applications.

ITEM 2 JOONDALUP ENERGY TEAM HOLDS FIRST MEETING

A report on the proposed establishment of the Joondalup Energy Team (JET) was presented at the Business Unit Manager's meeting on 25 May 2004. Upon approval, the JET was established consisting of key staff from relevant business units who would be able to provide direct input in to the feasibility and practicality of implementing actions identified in the Greenhouse Action Plan (Cities for Climate Protection). JET was established to develop and implement predominately internal actions designed to reduce energy use, reduce resource wastage and improve awareness of global warming and related environmental issues.

ITEM 3 RECRUITMENT OF A NEW MEMBER FOR THE SUSTAINABILITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE UPON THE RESIGNATION OF MR PAUL GERRANS

The City received a resignation letter dated 6 July 2004 from SAC member Mr Paul Gerrans advising that he is unable to continue as a member of SAC due to increased teaching commitments from July 2004.

The resignation of Mr Paul Gerrans opens up a vacancy on the SAC. The City plans to advertise and fill this vacancy with an appropriate community member with knowledge or experience in sustainable economic development. The Committee agreed to accept the resignation of Mr Gerrans.

As a result of the resignation of Mr Gerrans, and in an effort to enable a quorum to be reached until this position is filled, the Committee moved the following recommendation for Council consideration:

“The Terms of Reference (Section 5.4) is amended to read” “A quorum will be 50% of the current Committee members being present”.

Officer Comment

Section 5.19 of the Local Government Act 1995 (the Act) states that the quorum of a meeting of a committee is at least 50% of the number of offices (whether vacant or not) of the committee. Whilst Section 5.15 of the Act allows the Council to reduce the number of offices

of committee members required for a quorum, this is not supported as a long-term option. In the event that the Committee experiences ongoing difficulties in achieving a quorum, it is recommended that the membership of the Committee be reviewed.

It is the view of officers that the Committee recommendation to amend quorum requirements within the Terms of Reference (Attachment 2) is not supported.

It is however recommended that a slight amendment is necessary. The requirements of quorum within the current Terms of Reference are 50% (7) Committee members being present. It is recommended that this should be amended to read:

“A quorum shall be 50% of the number of offices (whether vacant or not) of members of the Committee”.

The proposed changes are reflected in Attachment 2 (Section 5.4). It is the officer’s opinion that this will provide greater clarity to Committee members on quorum requirements.

ITEM 4 HOME ENERGY AUDIT PROJECT (ECO HOUSE)

The City is currently investigating a Home Energy Audit project entitled ECO HOUSE designed to equip residents within the City with the skills and knowledge to reduce their ecological impact.

This project is envisaged to include an audit, implementation and review stages with residents developing an action plan in conjunction with a suitably qualified contractor. This contractor will provide the complete audit process including consultation, selection of participants, and the reporting of tasks during the project.

ITEM 5 WORKSHOP OUTCOMES AND FUTURE PROGRESS

The Sustainability Advisory Committee (SAC) developed a set of high priority objectives and actions during a visioning workshop conducted on 10 June 2004. A draft SAC work plan was developed to progress objectives and high priority actions. A further informal workshop was held on 12 August 2004 to review the draft work plan and make amendments.

The Sustainability Advisory Committee (SAC) is now positioned to progress strongly when the new work plan is completed. The work plan will be designed to clearly identify the roles and responsibilities, tasks and strategic direction of the Committee in support of the City’s Strategic Plan 2003 - 2008.

ATTACHMENTS

- | | |
|--------------|--|
| Attachment 1 | Unconfirmed minutes of the sustainability advisory committee meeting held on 2 September 2004. |
| Attachment 2 | Current Terms of Reference for the Sustainability Advisory Committee. |

VOTING REQUIREMENTS

Absolute Majority

RECOMMENDATION**That the Joint Commissioners:**

- 1 NOTE the unconfirmed minutes of the Sustainability Advisory Committee meeting held on 2 September 2004, forming Attachment 1 to this Report;**
- 2 ACCEPT BY AN ABSOLUTE MAJORITY the resignation of Mr Paul Gerrans from the Sustainability Advisory Committee and thank him for his contribution to the Committee;**
- 3 AMEND the Sustainability Advisory Committee’s Terms of Reference (Section 5.4) to read: “A quorum shall be 50% of the number of offices (whether vacant or not) of members of the Committee”;**
- 4 REQUEST a report be prepared by Council officers on the Community Funding (Sustainable Development Category) guidelines and ideas to increase grant applications**

Appendix 1 refers.

To access this attachment on electronic document, click here: [Attach1brf140904.pdf](#)

ITEM 4 TENDER NUMBER 001-04/05 CONSTRUCTION OF STORMWATER DRAINAGE IMPROVEMENTS IN BAHAMA CLOSE SORRENTO – [78562]

WARD - All

PURPOSE

To seek the approval of the Joint Commissioners to choose the tender submitted by Densford Pty Ltd for the Construction of Stormwater Drainage Improvements in Bahama Close Sorrento.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Tenders were advertised on 21 July 2004 through statewide public tender for the Construction of Stormwater Drainage Improvements in Bahama Close, Sorrento, (Number 001-04/05). Tenders closed on 5 August 2004. Three submissions were received from Works Infrastructure, Densford Pty Ltd and Mako Civil Pty Ltd.

It is recommended, in relation to Tender Number 001-04/05 for the Construction of Stormwater Drainage Improvements in Bahama Close Sorrento, that the Joint Commissioners:

- 1 *CHOOSE Densford Pty Ltd as the successful tenderer for the Stormwater Drainage Improvements in Bahama Close Sorrento (Tender No. 001-04/05) for a lump sum price of \$102,344 excluding GST;*
- 2 *AUTHORISE the Acting Chief Executive Officer (CEO), on behalf of the City, to enter into a contract with Densford Pty Ltd in accordance with the tender submitted by Densford Pty Ltd, subject to any minor variations that may be agreed between the CEO and Densford Pty Ltd.*

BACKGROUND

After a significant storm in June 2003 the stone pitched embankment at the end of Bahama Close, Sorrento was damaged by stormwater overflowing from the road and over the embankment into the adjacent Sacred Heart College property. The existing pipe system was unable to cope with the intensity of the storm.

The existing drainage pipe is located within an easement along the southern boundary of 12 Bahama Close and discharges into a drainage sump at the rear of the property. Due to the proximity of the house and a retaining wall situated along the southern boundary of the property, it would be extremely difficult to upgrade the existing pipe without risking damage to the house.

As an alternative the City's Officers successfully negotiated a solution with Sacred Heart College to allow the City to construct a replacement stormwater drainage pipe through their property. The location of the drainage line is shown on Attachment 1.

The required modifications to the drainage system were subsequently designed and tendered, and three submissions were received.

DETAILS

Three tender submissions were received from: Works Infrastructure, Densford Pty Ltd and Mako Civil Pty Ltd.

The first part of the tender assessment was the Conformance Audit Meeting. The purpose of this meeting is to ensure that all essential requirements have been met. Tenders not meeting all the essential criteria are deemed to be non-conforming and are eliminated from consideration. Additionally, other criteria that is not mandatory is assessed and if not met the City may eliminate the tender from consideration. The extent of non-compliance in this section would determine if the tender was further considered.

The second part of the evaluation process involved an independent assessment by each team member of the qualitative criteria. Each member of the Evaluation Team assessed the Tender submissions individually against the selection criteria using the weightings determined during the tender planning phase. The Evaluation Team then convened to submit and discuss their assessments.

All tenders were deemed conforming and under the City's Contract Management Framework, the tenders were assessed by the Evaluation Team using a weighted multi-criterion assessment system and AS 4120-1994 'Code of tendering'.

The Selection Criteria for Tender number 001-04/05 was as follows:

Resources and Experience of Tenderer in providing similar services:

- Relevant Industry Experience, including details of providing similar supply.
- Tenderers shall submit a Detailed Schedule of previous experience on similar and/or relevant projects.
- Past Record of Performance and Achievement with other clients.
- Level of Understanding of tender documents and work required.
- Written References from past and present clients.

Levels of Service as determined by the Capability/Competence of Tenderer to provide the services required:

- Company Structure
- Qualifications, Skills and Experience of Key Personnel
- Equipment and Staff Resources available
- Percentage of Operational Capacity represented by this work
- Compliance with tender requirements – insurances, licenses, site inspections etc
- Quality Systems
- Occupational Health and Safety Management System and Track Record
- Construction Programme
- Post Contract Services offered

Beneficial Effects of Tender/Local Content:

- The Potential Social and Economic Effect of the tender on the City of Joondalup community
- Infrastructure/Office/Staff/Suppliers/Sub-Contractors within the City of Joondalup
- Value Added items offered by tenderer
- Sustainability/Efficiency/Environmental

Methodology

Tenderers were requested to outline the proposed methodology for each aspect of the work. Information was to include but not be limited to the following:

- Description of all construction activities, protection of property from damage and minimisation of nuisance within the school grounds and in Bahama Close during the works.
- Construction of a new deep manhole, protection of nearby services, extent of cul-de-sac to be excavated for construction and traffic management to be employed.
- Construction of embankment and in particular compaction of embankment fill
- Construction of pipe under the limestone wall. The excavation of the pipe under the limestone wall into the basin may expose the school grounds to flooding from out of the drainage sump - describe how this risk would be managed?
- The works may be impacted by storms during construction - how would this be managed?

Tendered Price/s:

- The Lump Sum price Schedule to supply the specified services
- Discounts, settlement terms

Densford Pty Ltd submitted a tender that fully demonstrated its ability to provide the construction works required. The tender submitted by Densford Pty Ltd ranked highest in the evaluation assessment and accordingly is the recommended tenderer.

Statutory Provision:

The statewide public tender was advertised, opened and evaluated in accordance with the *Local Government (F&G) Regulation 1996*. Advertising this tender also ensures compliance with the *Local Government (F&G) Regulation 1996*, where tenders are required to be publicly invited if the consideration under a contract is expected to be or worth more than \$50,000. The consideration for this contract exceeds the Chief Executive Officer's Delegated Authority limit of \$100,000 for the acceptance of tenders.

Policy 2.5.7 Purchasing Goods and Services

The City's Policy on purchasing goods and services encourages local business in the purchasing and tendering process; none of the tenderers are located within the City of Joondalup.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Funds have been allocated in the 2004/05 Capital Works Budget for the required drainage works in Bahama Close.

Account No:	6662
Budget Item:	Bahama Close, Sorrento – Main Drainage Line Relocation
Budget Amount:	\$ 120,000
YTD Amount:	\$ Nil
Actual Cost:	\$ 102,344 (excluding GST)

COMMENT

All of the companies that submitted tenders have the necessary experience, resources and expertise to undertake the stormwater drainage improvements in Bahama, Close Sorrento. The low number of submissions received reflects the state of the current market.

The tender submitted by Densford Pty Ltd ranked highest in the evaluation assessment and accordingly is the recommended tenderer.

The price of \$102,344 submitted by Densford Pty Ltd was also the lowest, and was within the pre tender cost estimate. This is considered acceptable given the current market conditions.

Additionally, Densford Pty Ltd demonstrated their understanding of the requirements for traffic management, flooding contingencies, correct backfilling procedure to the embankment, restoration works, and liaison with Sacred Heart College.

Densford Pty Ltd has confirmed their ability to complete all works within the required six-week contract period, and demonstrated their ability to provide the construction works required.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 Bahama Close Drainage Improvements

VOTING REQUIREMENTS

Simple Majority.

RECOMMENDATION

That, in relation to Tender Number 001-04/05 for the Construction of Stormwater Drainage Improvements in Bahama Close Sorrento, the Joint Commissioners:

- 1 CHOOSE Densford Pty Ltd as the successful tenderer for the Stormwater Drainage Improvements in Bahama Close Sorrento (Tender No. 001-04/05) for a lump sum price of \$102,344 excluding GST;**
- 2 AUTHORISE the Acting Chief Executive Officer on behalf of the City, to enter into a contract with Densford Pty Ltd in accordance with the tender submitted by Densford Pty Ltd, subject to any minor variations that may be agreed between the Acting Chief Executive Officer and Densford Pty Ltd.**

Appendix 2 refers.

To access this attachment on electronic document, click here: [Attach2brf140904.pdf](#)

**ITEM 5 NORTHERN CORRIDOR RECOVERY GROUP
PARTNERING AGREEMENT FOR THE PROVISION OF
MUTUAL AID FOR RECOVERY DURING EMERGENCIES
– [33514]**

WARD - All

PURPOSE

This paper provides an overview of the proposed Draft Partnering Agreement for the Provision of Mutual Aid for Recovery during Emergencies. This agreement has been prepared by the Metropolitan North and East Recovery Group incorporating the City of Wanneroo, City of Joondalup, City of Stirling, City of Bayswater, City of Swan, Town of Bassendean and Shire of Mundaring.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In March 2004 the Executive Management Team endorsed further discussion in regard to development of a Mutual Aid Agreement for Local Governments within the Northern Corridor. Preparation of the Draft Mutual Aid Agreement /Partnering Agreement is now complete and is submitted for consideration by the Joint Commissioners.

It is recommended that the Commissioners:

- 1 *ENDORSE the Draft Partnering Agreement as prepared by the Metropolitan North and East Recovery Group for the Provision of Mutual Aid for Recovery during Emergencies;*
- 2 *LIST as part of the 2004/2005 half year budget review considerations the creation of an emergency management account with an allocation of \$1,000.*

BACKGROUND

Representatives from various agencies representing Hazard Management Units and Emergency Management Committees have met on various occasions to discuss the benefits and disadvantages for developing a ‘Memorandum of Understanding’ or ‘Mutual Aid Agreement’ in regard to recovery from a significant emergency situation incorporating all local government authorities within the Northern Corridor.

Assistance may be required for recovery of an affected community where the local authority is unable to meet the community demands and expectations. Aid requested may involve a large team with specific equipment e.g. construction crew or a small specialised unit e.g. Health Officers. Mutual Aid Agreements have been initiated for Emergency Response Assistance relating to bush fires in outer metropolitan local governments. It has proposed that a similar agreement be investigated for recovery assistance between local authorities and the current document has been developed.

A Mutual Aid Agreement may also include a central database comprising the pooled resources of the combined Local Government Agencies, capable or being accessed in the event of an emergency.

DETAILS

The Northern Corridor Recovery Planning Group has met formally on four occasions to extensively review the proposed “Partnering Agreement” previously referred to as Mutual Aid Agreement. Issues of concerns surrounding insurance of employees were referred to the Municipal Workcare for comment and the following information was received:

Question

Are Employees covered for Workers Compensation when outside the Council boundary?

Answer

The general answer will be yes, as the Act stated the injury must be during the course of the employment or as directed by the employer. In this case workers will probably be directed by one of Council’s emergency group representatives and supervised by a Council employee. There may be other scenarios as far as who will direct the workers etc and this would have to be taken into consideration.

As far as Common Law is concerned, if another Council is deemed negligent following an accident then Council may be responsible. As the Municipal Workcare scheme has all Councils as members, the workers should be covered from all angles, i.e. Workers Compensation and Common Law. There are a lot of grey areas in Workers Compensation and each claim is assessed on its own merits.

Question

Who pays?

Answer

Initially the costs are carried by the individual municipality. Any significant event would escalate to State Emergency and the conditions of State Emergency Management Advisory Committee Policy Statement No: 13. Funding for Multi – Agency Emergencies (see Attachment 2 - Policy Statement No: 13).

COMMENT

Emergency Management Procedures are currently being reviewed for both Incident Management by Hazard Agencies and Recovery Management by Local Government. Preparation of this Partnering Agreement (refer Attachment 1) is considered a unique opportunity for municipalities to develop cohesive approach to Recovery Management.

Employee knowledge and understanding is a major concern as training is an essential component for any Recovery team.

The Partnering objectives and expectations encompass a variety of concerns identified by the Local Government Representatives and Representatives for Western Australia Police Force, F.E.S.A. and Department of Community Development (D.C.D) during the group meetings.

The City of Joondalup has a minor role at present, as the main area of concern is bush fire. Given the growth of the community and people's expectations, the City must be prepared should an incident occur.

FUNDING

It is proposed that an account for Emergency Management be created during the 2004/05 mid year Budget Review with a fund allocation of \$1,000. This account would primarily be for administration and meeting costs associated with the City's administration of Recovery Management.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 Partnering Agreement.

Attachment 2 State Emergency Management Advisory Committee, Policy Statement No: 13, Funding for Multi-Agency Emergencies.

VOTING REQUIREMENTS

Simple majority

RECOMMENDATION

That the Joint Commissioners:

- 1 ENDORSE the Metropolitan North and East Recovery Group Partnering Agreement forming Attachment 1 to this Report for Provision of Mutual Aid for Recovery during Emergencies;**
- 2 LIST as part of the 2004/2005 half year budget review considerations the creation of an Emergency Management Account with an allocation of \$1,000.**

Appendix 3 refers.

To access this attachment on electronic document, click here: [Attach3brf140904.pdf](#)

ITEM 6 PROPOSED PARKING PROHIBITIONS - POYNTER AND BEAUMARIS PRIMARY SCHOOLS – [09564] [08671] [00672] [05640] [36666]

WARD - All

PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to present a parking strategy to address concerns in relation to parent parking at the Poynter and Beaumaris Primary Schools.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Poynter and Beaumaris Primary Schools are seeking to restrict parking on roads adjacent to the respective schools to alleviate parking congestion problems associated with parent parking. As the parking restrictions form part of an overall Road Safety and Parking strategy for their schools, the implementation of the parking restriction on roads adjacent to the schools is presented for consideration.

It is recommended that the Joint Commissioners:

- 1 *AMEND the existing 'No Parking' restriction on the west side of Beaumaris Boulevard to 'No Stopping', as shown in Attachment 1 to this Report;*
- 2 *APPROVE the installation of 'No Stopping' on Beaumaris Boulevard and Santiago Parkway adjacent to the Beaumaris Primary School, as shown in Attachments 2 and 3 of this Report;*
- 3 *APPROVE the installation of 'No Stopping' on Poynter Drive adjacent to the Poynter Primary School, as shown in Attachment 4 to this Report;*
- 4 *ADVISE each school and affected residents accordingly.*

BACKGROUND

Road safety and parking at Poynter and Beaumaris Primary Schools have been a concern to each school and the local community for some time. These schools have recently expressed their concerns at parking congestion problems on roads adjacent to each school.

The City has been concurrently working with each school's Road Safety Committee and RoadWise to implement a comprehensive road safety and parking strategy at the school.

As part of this strategy, each school's Road Safety Committee has requested that parking restriction be implemented to roads adjacent to the schools.

DETAILS

The schools are concerned that parent parking on both sides of the roads adjacent to the schools during school peak times, restricts normal traffic flow and making it hazardous for pedestrians and other road users.

In view of this, each school's Road Safety Committee has requested that consideration be given to restrict parking on roads around the schools. Generally, a 'NO STOPPING' restriction would be the most appropriate to reduce the congestion caused by parked vehicles, maintain the general traffic flow at all times and therefore increase the level of safety during school peak times. It is envisaged that a 'NO STOPPING' restriction be delineated by a continuous yellow edge line. This type of parking restriction delineation has been used very successfully at other schools within the City.

The extent of the proposed parking restrictions is shown on Attachments 1, 2 and 3 for Beaumaris Primary School and Attachment 4 for Poynter Primary School.

CONSULTATION

In each instance, a copy of the proposal was also circulated to adjacent landowners and each school for comment. No negative responses were received, however the Deputy Principal of Beaumaris Primary School requested that the existing 'No Parking' restriction on the non-school side of Beaumaris Boulevard be removed and replaced with 'NO STOPPING' carriageway or verge restriction complemented by a continuous yellow line. This request has been included within the overall proposal.

COMMENT

At each school, the existing on-street parking embayments provide formalised parking for parent motorists to drop-off and pick-up students. The on-going commitment to each school's Road Safety and Parking strategy will be achieved through an educational package to students and through the school's newsletters. The proposal to restrict parking on the roads, as shown on the attachments, will regulate parent parking, maintain the general traffic flow at all times and therefore increase the level of safety and access during school peak times.

As the parking restriction proposals form an integral part of the overall road safety and parking strategy for each of these schools, the implementation of parking restrictions, as shown on the attachments, is supported.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1	Beaumaris Boulevard Existing Parking Restrictions
Attachments 2 & 3	Beaumaris Primary School Proposed Parking Restrictions
Attachment 4	Poynter Primary School Proposed Parking Restrictions

VOTING REQUIREMENTS

Simple Majority

RECOMMENDATION**That the Joint Commissioners:**

- 1 AMEND the existing ‘No Parking’ restriction on the west side of Beaumaris Boulevard to ‘No Stopping’, as shown in Attachment 1 to this Report;**
- 2 APPROVE the installation of ‘No Stopping’ on Beaumaris Boulevard and Santiago Parkway adjacent to the Beaumaris Primary School, as shown in Attachments 2 and 3 of this Report;**
- 3 APPROVE the installation of ‘No Stopping’ on Poynter Drive adjacent to the Poynter Primary School, as shown in Attachment 4 to this Report;**
- 4 ADVISE each school and affected residents accordingly.**

Appendix 4 refers.

To access this attachment on electronic document, click here: [Attach4brf140904.pdf](#)

V:\DD\04reports\September21\Proposed Parking Prohibitions - Poynter & Beaumaris Primary Schools.doc

ITEM 7 STORM WATER DRAINAGE DISCHARGE INTO NATURAL AREA RESERVES – [12168]

WARD - All

PURPOSE

To resubmit a motion passed at the 22 October 2003 meeting of the Conservation Advisory Committee before the Joint Commissioners for further consideration.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

At the 16 December 2003 Council meeting the Joint Commissioners resolved that a report be prepared with further information regarding a motion passed by the Conservation Advisory Committee at its October 2003 meeting.

The Conservation and Advisory Committee passed a motion that opposed the allowance of storm water drainage into natural area reserves and requested that the City refer this to all parties as part of the subdivision application process.

The disposal and management of storm water within the confines of a development site is generally a condition of subdivision approval. In adopting the Conservation Advisory Committee's motion, Council's position on this environmental issue would be reinforced and this would be in accordance with sustainability principles contained within the City's Strategic Plan. However, as part of the subdivision process the City can only make recommendations to the Western Australian Planning Commission and does not have the authority to impose them.

It is recommended that the Joint Commissioners REFER to the Western Australian Planning Commission as part of the subdivision responses, the policy position that no new storm water outfalls are to be discharged into natural bushland areas that are managed or owned by the City of Joondalup

BACKGROUND

At the 27 August 2003 meeting of the Conservation Advisory Committee representatives from Beaumaris Land Sales Ltd conducted a presentation to gain support from the Committee to allow Beaumaris Land Sales Ltd to construct a drainage swale within the coastal foreshore reserve on Burns Beach road. The purpose of this swale was to drain away excess storm water from the Iluka subdivision.

Committee members felt that Council managed reserves containing native vegetation were inappropriate areas to dispose of drainage water. The Committee's reasoning was that storm water would contain contaminants such as weed seeds, nutrients and plant diseases that could harm the vegetation and biological integrity of the reserve. The following motion was passed:

That any future sub divisional development proposals be rejected by Council if they contain drainage plans that allow drainage water to enter natural area reserves managed by Council. It

is considered that allowing drainage water to be emptied into bushland and coastal reserves is not compatible with sustainability principles contained in the City's Strategic Plan.

At the Council Meeting of 21 October 2003 Council noted the above motion. At a subsequent meeting of the Conservation Advisory Committee on 22 October 2003 the Committee voiced concern that Council had not adopted the motion and that it had only been noted. The committee then carried the following motion:

That the motion passed at the August Meeting of the Conservation Advisory Committee opposing the allowance of drainage water from developments into natural area reserves be enclosed as an attachment to the subdivision application on referral to all parties prior to planning approval.

This new motion was contained in the Minutes of the Conservation Advisory Committee that went before the Joint Commissioners at the meeting of 16 December 2003. The Joint Commissioners requested that the new motion be referred to the Chief Executive Officer for consideration, with a further report being submitted to the Joint Commissioners.

DETAIL

The disposal of storm water into natural areas (bushland) is considered to be detrimental to the bio-diversity of the bushland and is not viewed as a sustainable practice. In natural bushland areas where historically this practice has occurred the bushland has major weed and disease problems with raised nutrient levels and gross pollutants that have found their way into the bushland via drainage pipes. Grass weeds that proliferate around these drainage outfalls pose a serious fire hazard when the grass dries out in the summer months.

Council has a number of drainage outfalls into parks with shallow grassed basins with no bushland in the vicinity, this design allows drainage water to recharge the ground water and does not pose an environmental threat to natural biodiversity.

The disposal of drainage water within the property perimeter is a condition of subdivision approval. However, there are circumstances where drainage water has been allowed to be discharged onto grassed reserves, but the practice of putting new outfalls into bushland should be discouraged. The newer technologies such as the use of centrifuge gross pollutant traps and filter sumps do not reduce the likelihood of diseases such as dieback entering pristine native bushland and the subsequent damage such diseases cause.

The Conservation Advisory Committee's motion could be attached as advice on subdivision responses from the City to the Western Australian Planning Commission when appropriate, to reinforce the City's view that natural areas under its management should be afforded protection wherever possible.

The disposal of stormwater from properties is addressed as a condition of subdivision, details of which are generally provided at the development application stage. Such drainage would be required to be contained on site and not discharged into the adjoining properties or reserves, however there are occasions where it is in the interests of the City when drainage into the latter could be supported (but not in the case of bushland reserves). The Committee's Motion could be attached as advice on the subdivision responses from the City to the Western Australian Planning Commission. Since the City is itself only one of the referral authorities in this process, it would not be possible to provide this advice to other authorities that have input in the subdivision process.

Sustainability Implications

The protection of the City's natural areas is an implicit component of the City's sustainability strategies. The reduction of storm water inflow into bushland reserves is seen as an integral component of biodiversity protection.

COMMENT

It is considered that the motion passed by the Conservation Advisory Committee at the 22 October 2003 meeting opposing drainage discharge to natural reserves can be forwarded to the Western Australian Planning Commission as part of the City's responses on subdivision applications.

ATTACHMENTS

Nil

VOTING REQUIREMENTS

Simple majority

RECOMMENDATION

That the Joint Commissioners REFER to the Western Australian Planning Commission as part of the subdivision responses, the policy position that no new storm water outfalls are to be discharged into natural bushland areas that are managed or owned by the City of Joondalup.

ITEM 8 MINUTES OF THE CONSERVATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF 28 JULY 2004 – [12168]

WARD - All

PURPOSE

The unconfirmed Minutes of the Conservation Advisory Committee Meeting held on 28 July 2004 are submitted for noting by Council.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Conservation Advisory Committee Meeting held on the 28 July 2004 discussed a number of conservation matters within the City of Joondalup. The Committee addressed a range of issues including Japanese Pepper Tree mapping and control, the proposed Conservation Advisory Committee's Strategic Planning Workshop and Fusilade herbicide application in bushland areas.

It is recommended that the Joint Commissioners NOTE:

- 1 the unconfirmed Minutes of the Conservation Advisory Committee Meeting held on 28 July 2004 forming Attachment 1 to this Report;*
- 2 the Conservation Advisory Committee's request to be involved in the process of setting the Biodiversity Sustainability Indicators for the City of Joondalup;*
- 3 the request of the Conservation Advisory Committee that future maintenance, including spraying works in bushland areas, be undertaken by suitably experienced bushland regeneration personnel;*
- 4 that the City is currently preparing a bushland regeneration tender to be advertised during September 2004;*
- 5 that the City is currently preparing a business case in relation to the establishment of a bush regeneration team as part of the 2005/2006 Draft Budget deliberations;*
- 6 that future biodiversity works undertaken within natural areas will be under the control of suitably experienced bushland regenerators.*

DETAILS

A meeting of the Conservation Advisory Committee (CAC) was held on 28 July 2004, and the minutes of the meeting are provided as Attachment 1

The main points of discussion are as follows:

CAC Strategic Planning Workshop:

Members discussed the forthcoming CAC Strategic Planning Workshop and expressed their desire to develop initiatives for the future direction of the Committee, and also be involved in the development of Biodiversity Sustainability Indicators for the City.

Officer's Comment:

It is noted that the Strategic Planning Workshop for the CAC is scheduled to be held during September 2004, at which time members will be given the opportunity to develop initiatives for the future direction of that Committee.

It is also noted that the opportunity will exist as part of the development of the Strategic Biodiversity Plan for the CAC to develop indicators for the City's natural areas.

Japanese Pepper Trees Mapping and Control:

The Committee expressed its gratitude for Council's proactive stance in controlling the exotic woody weed (tree) known as the Japanese Pepper tree which if not controlled will have a detrimental impact on the natural vegetation.

Officer's Comment:

It is noted that all the known Japanese Pepper trees growing in the coastal reserve have been treated with herbicide and the majority of trees in other bushland reserves have also been treated.

Fusilade Herbicide Application within Bushland Reserves:

The application of the grass killing herbicide Fusilade in the City's bushland reserves was discussed in detail. Committee members consider that the control of weeds in bushland is best dealt with by bushland regenerators as part of an integrated multi faceted approach rather than being reliant on a single herbicide spray contract.

The Committee requested that future broad acre spraying in bushland areas not continue, and that a separate contract be developed for natural areas, seeking the services of specialised bushland regenerators.

Officer's Comment:

As the Committee members are aware, the use of a general spray contractor for Fusilade application has been decreasing, and there has been a subsequent increase in the work undertaken by bushland regenerators within the City's natural areas over the last three years.

City officers are currently finalising the tender documentation for suitably experienced bushland regenerators to undertake the necessary works within the City's natural areas. It is anticipated that this tender will be advertised during September 2004.

At the same time officers are preparing a business case looking at the feasibility of the City to establish an in-house bush regeneration team as part of the 2005/06 Draft Budget deliberations to assist in maintaining the City's natural areas as part of the multi faceted approach.

It is also noted that in parallel with the bushland regeneration tender, future maintenance works within the City's natural areas shall only be undertaken by suitably experienced bushland regenerators, and this includes broad acre spraying within these areas.

As can be determined from the above actions taken by officers, the City has moved forward with respect to the application of broad acre weed spraying activities in bushland areas. Consequently, it is not considered appropriate from an operational or contractual perspective for the Joint Commissioners to endorse the Conservation Advisory Committee's suggested resolution, however, it is recommended that the actions taken be noted only at this stage.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 Conservation Advisory Committee Minutes 28/07/2004

VOTING REQUIREMENTS

Simple majority.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Joint Commissioners NOTE:

- 1 the unconfirmed Minutes of the Conservation Advisory Committee Meeting held on 28 July 2004 forming Attachment 1 to this Report;**
- 2 the Conservation Advisory Committee's request to be involved in the process of setting the Biodiversity Sustainability Indicators for the City of Joondalup;**
- 3 the request of the Conservation Advisory Committee that future maintenance, including spraying works in bushland areas, be undertaken by suitably experienced bushland regeneration personnel;**
- 4 that the City is currently preparing a bushland regeneration tender to be advertised during September 2004;**
- 5 that the City is currently preparing a business case in relation to the establishment of a bush regeneration team as part of the 2005/2006 Draft Budget deliberations;**
- 6 that future biodiversity works undertaken within natural areas will be under the control of suitably experienced bushland regenerators.**

Appendix 5 refers.

To access this attachment on electronic document, click here: [Attach5brf140904.pdf](#)

ITEM 9 PROPOSED MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT (3 OFFICES AND 12 RESIDENTIAL UNITS) LOT 344 (22) GRAND BOULEVARD, CNR HAMMERSMITH COURT, JOONDALUP – [74558]

WARD - Lakeside

PURPOSE

To request the Joint Commissioners' determination of an application for a mixed use development in the City North Precinct of the City Centre.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

An application has been received for a development in City North for offices and residential uses. Overall the proposal comprises 90m² of office space (3 offices) and 779.6m² for residential purposes (12 units). The proposed height of the building is 3 storeys, measuring 10.8 metres from the ground level to the top of the roof. Given that the development comprises of multiple levels, the total floor space (869.6m²) is able to exceed the lot area (819m²).

The density, height and urban form of the development is compatible with the overall City Centre environment.

Discretion is sought under the City's District Planning Scheme 2 (DPS2) and the Residential Design Codes (R-Codes) in regard to the plot ratio, extent of glazing and the minimum areas for storerooms and balconies.

The discretions requested are considered to satisfy the objectives of the R-Codes and DPS2. Given that the development will contribute to the desired character of the City Centre area and is compatible with other developments in the vicinity, the proposed development is supported.

BACKGROUND

Suburb/Location: Lot 344 (22) Grand Boulevard, cnr Hammersmith Court, Joondalup
Applicant: Steve Griffiths
Owner: SGMS Pty Ltd
Zoning: **DPS:** Centre
MRS: Central City Area

The proposed Lot 344 (currently vacant) is 819m² in area and falls within the 'City North' area of the Joondalup City Centre, where it is designated for "General City Use." The preferred uses are residential, retail, office, accommodation, leisure and entertainment, cultural facilities, community facilities and medical suites.

DETAILS

The proposed development includes the following features:

- A mixed use development consisting of 12 residential units and 3 office units;
- The ground level consists of residential and office units;
- The height of the building is three storeys (10.8 metres);
- The total number of car parking bays provided is 15 including one disabled car parking bay.
- Service, vehicle access and car parking is provided from the rear laneway;
- The upper level residential are accessed via two flights of stairs located at the rear of the building;
- The office units address the street frontages with nil setbacks from Grand Boulevard and Hammersmith Court.
- Balconies and stores have been provided for the residential units; and
- The office tenancy frontages include pedestrian shelter awnings that extend over the road reserve.

Statutory Provision:

Development within this area is controlled by the provisions of the District Planning Scheme No. 2, the Joondalup City Centre Development Manual (JCCDPM) and the R-Codes.

District Planning Scheme No 2

The site is zoned “Centre” under DPS2.

When determining this application Clauses 4.2.4, 4.5, 4.8 and 6.8 of the DPS2 are relevant:

4.2.4 Subject to clause 4.2.5, the Residential Planning Code density applicable to land within the Scheme Area shall be determined by reference to the legend shown on the Residential Density Codes maps which form part of this Scheme.

Unless otherwise specified on the map the R20 density code applies unless the Council determines that a higher code should apply.

4.5 Variations to Site and Development Standards and Requirements.

4.5.1 Except for development in respect of which the Residential Planning Codes apply and the requirements set out in Clauses 3.7.3 and 3.11.5, if a development is the subject of an application for planning approval and does not comply with a standard or requirement prescribed under the Scheme, the Council may, notwithstanding that non-compliance, approve the application unconditionally or subject to such conditions as the Council thinks fit.

4.5.2 In considering an application for planning approval under this clause, where, in the opinion of Council, the variation is likely to affect any owners or occupiers in the general locality or adjoining the site which is subject of consideration for the variation, the Council shall:

- (a) *consult the affected parties by following one or more of the provisions for advertising uses pursuant to clause 6.7.1; and*
- (b) *have regard to any expressed views prior to making its decision to grant the variation.*

4.5.3 *The power conferred by this clause may only be exercised if the Council is satisfied that:*

- (a) *approval of the proposed development would be appropriate having regard to the criteria set out in Clause 6.8; and*
- (b) *the non-compliance will not have any adverse effect upon the occupiers or users of the development or the inhabitants of the locality or upon the likely future development of the locality.*

4.8 *Car Parking Standards*

4.8.1 *The design of off-street parking areas including parking for disabled shall be in accordance with Australian Standards AS 2890.1 or AS 2890.2 as amended from time to time. Car parking areas shall be constructed and maintained to the satisfaction of the Council.*

The number of on-site car parking bays to be provided for specified development shall be in accordance with Table 2. Where development is not specified in Table 2 the Council shall determine the parking standard. The Council may also determine that a general car parking standard shall apply irrespective of the development proposed in cases where it considers this to be appropriate.

6.8 *Matters to be Considered by Council*

6.8.1 *The Council when considering an application for Planning Approval shall have due regard to the following:*

- (a) *interests of orderly and proper planning and the preservation of the amenity of the relevant locality;*
- (b) *any relevant submissions by the applicant;*
- (c) *any Agreed Structure Plan prepared under the provisions of Part 9 of the Scheme;*
- (d) *any planning policy of the Council adopted under the provisions of clause 8.11;*
- (e) *any other matter which under the provisions of the Scheme, the Council is required to have due regard;*
- (f) *any policy of the Commission or its predecessors or successors or any planning policy adopted by the Government of the State of Western Australia;*
- (g) *any relevant proposed new town planning scheme of the Council or amendment or proposed Metropolitan Region Scheme Amendment insofar as they can be regarded as seriously entertained planning proposals;*
- (h) *the comments or wishes of any public or municipal authority received as part of the submission process;*

- (i) *the comments or wishes of any objectors to or supporters of the application;*
- (j) *any previous decision made by the Council in circumstances which are sufficiently similar for the previous decision to be relevant as a precedent, provided that the Council shall not be bound by such precedent; and any other matter which in the opinion of the Council is relevant.*

Residential Design Codes (R-Codes)

The provisions of the R-Codes apply in regard to all residential development.

Clause 2.3.4 of the R-Codes allows for the exercise of discretion, which shall be exercised having regard to the clause 2.3.4 (2) of the R-Codes as follows:

“2.3.4(2) Discretion shall be exercised having regard to the following considerations:

- (i) *the stated purpose and aims of the Scheme;*
- (ii) *the provisions of Parts 2,3 and 4 of the Codes as appropriate;*
- (iii) *the Performance Criterion of Criteria in the context of the R-Coding for the locality that correspond to the relevant provision;*
- (iv) *the explanatory text of the Codes that corresponds to the relevant provision;*
- (v) *any Local Planning Strategy incorporated into the Scheme;*
- (vi) *the provision of a Local Planning Policy pursuant the Codes and complying with sub-clause (5) below; and*
- (iv) *orderly and proper planning.*

Development Standards Table

The following table summarises the development details:

Standard	Required	Provided
Front Setback	0m	0m
Side/Rear Setbacks	As per Building Code of Australia	0m
Plot Ratio	1.0	1.08 (Residential-0.95, Commercial-0.13)
Height	3 storeys max	3 storeys
Storerooms	1 per dwelling, 4m ² area	1 per dwelling, 2m ² area
Balconies	1 per dwelling 10m ² area	1 per dwelling, 8m ² -10m ²

Consultation:

The proposal has not been advertised, as the form of the development is that expected in the City Centre.

Strategic Implications:

It is likely that this mixed use development proposal will contribute to meeting the projected demand for housing and commercial space for the increasing population of the City of Joondalup. The commercial space will encourage residents to interact with their neighbourhood and localise commercial opportunities as opposed to deviating to alternative commercial centres. The relatively high density of the development will contribute and assist in supporting the local economy.

COMMENT

The development will integrate well with the character of the City Centre. Together with the proposed developments recently approved by the Joint Commissioners at the lots across the road (Lots 325, 343 and 342), the proposal will create urban walls along Grand Boulevard and part of Hammersmith Court, which is expected to contribute to the civic design goals for the City. The impact of this development on any of the adjacent residential/commercial areas is likely to be minimal.

The overall design of development provides a three storey ‘urban wall’ along the road frontages with a tower element on the corner. Along Hammersmith Court there are covered parking spaces, which create a sense of urban wall.

The glazed office fronts and pedestrian shelter will ensure that active frontages will face the streets and will help to bring life into the public spaces adjacent to the building.

Land use

As the proposal provides for both residential dwellings and office space, the proposed uses comply with the general city land use for which the lot has been earmarked under the JCCDPM.

The proposal provides three (3) office tenancies of different configurations. In this form the office space is flexible enough, in the future, to accommodate the permitted uses under the JCCDPM including retail, entertainment and restaurant/café.

The twelve (12) residential dwellings are consistent in size and offer two bedrooms per unit, which reflects the type of residences desirable within a central area.

Residential Density

The JCCDPM does not specify residential densities for the ‘general city’ precinct of City North. Clause 4.2.4 of the DPS2 specifies that unless otherwise specified on the map an R-20 density applies unless Council determines that a higher coding is justified. The proposal has an equivalent density of R-147.

It is recommended that the Joint Commissioners determine that the proposed density at R-147 is considered to be appropriate given that the site is in a prominent location within the City, where higher densities are appropriate and are encouraged by the principles of the JCCDPM

Plot Ratio

For “General City Use” the JCCPDM requires that the development have a maximum plot ratio of 1.0. The plot ratio for the residential component is 0.95 and for the commercial component is 0.13. The overall plot ratio is therefore 1.08.

It is considered that the required plot ratio of 1.0 is counter-productive to the development of an appropriate style building that achieves the form expected, and desirable (for example a 3 storey building), within the City Centre. Given that the proposed development complies with the majority of other development standards, in particular car parking, it is not considered that the site would be over-developed at the proposed plot ratio.

The plot ratio of the office development is considered to be appropriate as it integrates with other existing developments in the area. The development maximises the potential of this land, which is seen as highly desirable, given that the adjoining area is due for development in the near future. From the City’s perspective, it will add value to the City Centre by having quality offices and creating employment opportunities. Moreover the office areas provided may in future accommodate other permitted uses under the JCCDPM including retail, entertainment, and restaurant/café.

Car Parking

The JCCDPM does not specify car parking standards for this precinct.

Clause 4.8 of DPS2 provides that where no parking standards are provided, a car parking standard is to be determined. The car parking ratios below are considered to be appropriate and have been consistently applied to developments throughout the City.

It is recommended the Council exercises discretion under clause 4.8 of DPS2 and applies the following car parking ratios.

Use	Parking Provision	No of Bays Required	No of Bays Provided
Commercial	1 bay per 30m ² GFA (90 ÷ 30)	3	3
Residential Units	1 bay per residential unit	12	12
Total		15	15 bays are provided (including one disabled bay)

From the above table it is noted that the development complies with the parking requirements.

Glazing/Awnings

JCCDPM requires that at least 50% of the area on ground level façade shall be glazed and the horizontal dimension of the glazing shall comprise 75% of the total building frontage for uses other than residential. The building complies with this requirement along Grand Boulevard,

however, along Hammersmith Court the area and horizontal dimension are 33.6% and 49% respectively. This is due to the fact that the Hammersmith Court frontage is characterised by residential dwellings and it would be expected that some degree of privacy be maintained between the living areas and the street. It is not considered that this variation will have an adverse impact on the streetscape

The awnings within the road reserve provide shelter for the pedestrian path along the full frontage of the office tenancies including the corner. However, the awning does not extend along the residential component along Hammersmith Court. This is considered acceptable given that the residential component serves a different function from the commercial spaces. In addition, the Hammersmith Court frontage is a secondary street and does not demand pedestrian shelter to the same degree that Grand Boulevard does.

Storerooms

Clause 3.10.3 of the Residential Design Codes requires an enclosed, lockable storage area, constructed in a design and material matching the dwelling, with a minimum dimension of 1.5 metres with an internal area of at least 4m² for each multiple dwelling.

The storerooms provided are 2m² in area and have a minimum internal dimension of 1.2 metres. This is considered a minor variation and it is deemed to comply with the Performance Criteria of Clause 3.10.3 of the Residential Design Codes as the storerooms are proportionate to the size of the dwellings provided. They are considered adequate to the needs of the residents and are without detriment to the amenity of the locality.

Balconies

Clause 3.4.3 of the Residential Design Codes requires each multiple dwelling to be provided with a balcony with a minimum area of 10m² and minimum dimension of 2 metres. The applicant has provided a balcony with a minimum dimension of 2 metres and area of 8m² for all balconies excluding units 4,8, and 13, which measure 10m², 9m² and 9m² respectively.

The variations are considered minor as the balconies are proportionate to the size of the dwellings proposed, provide a useable area of open space, and are accessible from a habitable room.

Conclusion

It is considered that the development will provide accommodation and office facilities to meet the future demands of the growing City Centre. It will be characteristic of the development already approved in the immediate area and will add value to the City Centre.

The density, glazing and areas of the storerooms are also considered appropriate in this instance, and it is therefore recommended that the development be approved, subject to appropriate conditions.

It is therefore recommended that, in accordance with Clause 4.5 of DPS2 and having regard to the criteria of Clause 6.8, the Joint Commissioners determine that the proposed plot ratio for the office space is appropriate as the built form integrates with the surrounding areas and will not have an adverse effect upon the occupiers of the development or on the locality

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1	Location/Site Plan
Attachment 2	Development Plan

VOTING REQUIREMENTS

Simple Majority

RECOMMENDATION

That the Joint Commissioners:

- 1 EXERCISE discretion under clauses 4.2.4, 4.5, 4.8.1 of the District Planning Scheme No. 2 and determine that:**
 - (a) Plot Ratio for the development of 1.08 in lieu of 1.0;**
 - (b) The area and horizontal dimension of the glazing along Hammersmith Court being 33.6% and 49% in lieu of 50% and 75% respectively;**
 - (c) The development having a density of R-147;**
 - (d) The parking standards of 1 bay per 30m² of commercial space and 1 bay per residential unit;**

are appropriate in this instance;
- 2 EXERCISE discretion under Clause 2.3.4 of the R-Codes and determine that the performance criteria of Clause 3.10.3 has been met and that the internal areas of twelve storerooms with an area of 2m² and a minimum internal dimension of 1.2 metres are appropriate in this instance;**
- 3 EXERCISE discretion under Clause 2.3.4 of the R-Codes and determine that the performance criteria of Clause 3.4.3 have been met and that the area eleven balconies with an area varying from 8m² to 9m² is appropriate in this instance;**
- 4 APPROVE the application dated 25 March 2004 submitted by Steve Griffiths for a mixed use development comprising 3 offices and 12 residential units on Lot 344, No 22 Grand Boulevard cnr Hammersmith Court, Joondalup, subject to the following conditions;**
 - (a) Any roof mounted or free standing plant or equipment such as air conditioning units, satellite dishes and radio masts to be designed and located so not to be visible from the primary street;**
 - (b) No obscure or reflective glazing being used for the commercial units fronting onto public spaces and road reserves;**
 - (c) All boundary walls and parapet walls being of a clean finish and made good to the satisfaction of the City;**

- (d) All fencing to be designed and constructed in accordance with the attached extract from the Joondalup City Centre Development Plan and Manual and thereafter be maintained to the satisfaction of the City;
- (e) One car parking space is to be allocated to each commercial unit;
- (f) Sufficient vehicle reversing area to be provided to car bay 8 to the satisfaction of the City;
- (g) The bin area shall be provided with dedicated pedestrian access path, separate from any adjacent car bay.

Footnote:

- 1 A separate application is to be made to the City for Approval to Commence Development and sign licence prior to the installation of any advertising signage;
- 2 It is advised that the City will not support the erection of telecommunications infrastructure on any part of the proposed building;
- 3 The parking bays, driveways and points of ingress and egress to be designed in accordance with the Australian Standard for Off-Street Car parking (AS2890). Such areas are to be constructed, drained and marked and thereafter maintained to the satisfaction to the satisfaction of the City prior to the development first being occupied. These works are to be done as part of the building programme;
- 4 An on-site stormwater drainage system with the capacity to contain a 1:100 year of a 24-hour duration is to be provided prior to the development first being occupied and thereafter maintained to the satisfaction of the City. The proposed storm water drainage system is required to be shown on the Building Licence submission and be approved by the City prior to the commencement of construction.

Appendix 6 refers.

To access this attachment on electronic document, click here: [Attach6brf140904.pdf](#)

ITEM 10 PROPOSED ADDITIONS TO WHITFORD CITY SHOPPING CENTRE -LOT 501 (470) WHITFORDS AVENUE, HILLARYS – [00081]

WARD - Whitfords

PURPOSE

To request the Joint Commissioners to determine the development application for an addition to the Whitford City Shopping Centre.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The applicant has proposed a new ‘mini-major’ store on an upper level of the existing shopping centre. The upper level of the centre currently comprises seven offices surrounding an open courtyard, as well as the centre management office, toilets and retail space occupied by Lincraft.

The application has been called in by a Commissioner for determination by the Joint Commissioners.

The applicant proposes to enclose an existing courtyard and amalgamate the existing office suites to create a tenancy of 1,142m², with an existing ground tenancy to form a main entry and access to the upper level. This brings the total retail floorspace addition to 1,142m² and a total floorspace for the ‘mini major’ to 1,257m².

The net retail floorspace proposed complies with the requirements of City’s Policy 3.2.8 ‘Centres Strategy’, District Planning Scheme No 2 (DPS2) and the Western Australian Planning (WAPC) Commission Policy 4.2 Metropolitan Centres Policy Statement for the Perth Metropolitan Region (Policy 4.2). The changes to the building being mostly on the interior are unlikely to impact on surrounding properties. As the development complies with statutory requirements and will not impact on the amenity of the area, the proposal is recommended for approval.

BACKGROUND

Suburb/Location: Lot 501 (470) Whitfords Avenue Hillarys
Applicant: Ken Bownes Design Management
Owner: DB Real Estate Australia Ltd
Zoning: **DPS:** Commercial
MRS: Centre

On 7 December 1999, Council approved an application for major alterations and additions to Whitford City Shopping Centre comprising two new malls, with one running parallel to the East-West mall and the other running through the site of the previous location of the Woolworths store and connecting into a new village square on the Whitfords Avenue side of the site. The existing Woolworths store was to be relocated and two new mini-major stores were to be included. New entrances were provided from the northeast and from the west side

of the building. The total retail floor space approved was increased from 37,697m² retail net lettable area (NLA) to 49,601m².

On 26 September 2000, Council approved a modified application where the retail floor space would be reduced from 49,601m² previously approved, to 48,537m² and a decked parking area was proposed on the northeast corner of the site.

A further modified proposal was approved for the site in 2001. This approval brought retail NLA floor space to 48,459m². These additions have now been completed. In addition to this, there have been small additions to retail NLA with the development of Red Rooster and Woolworths Petrol, increasing retail NLA by approximately 250m², to 48,780m².

DETAILS

The applicant has proposed a new mini major store ('JB Hifi) on the upper level of the shopping centre. The upper level of the centre currently comprises seven offices surrounding an open courtyard, as well as the centre management office, toilets and retail space occupied by Lincraft.

The proposal is to enclose the existing courtyard and amalgamate the existing office suites to create a tenancy of 1,142m² with an existing ground tenancy of 115m² to form a main entry. This brings the total retail floor space to 1,257m². Building works will be internal to the Centre with the exception of a new roofline and bricking up of the windows on the upper level balcony above the current National Australia Bank.

Statutory Provision:

Whitford City is classified as a Regional Centre under Policy 4.2 and is subject to its development control provisions. Referral to the WAPC is not required, as the development does not exceed the 50,000m² retail NLA maximum defined by Policy 4.2 and DPS2.

The shopping centre abuts Whitfords Avenue and Marmion Avenue, which are respectively 'Other Regional' and 'Primary Regional' Roads under the Metropolitan Region Scheme. Both roads are classified as Category 1 roads, however referral to the WAPC is not required as the development does not encroach onto these road reservations, no new access points into the shopping centre are proposed and the addition is ancillary to the existing use.

Consultation:

Public consultation was not required in accordance with DPS2. A 'Shop' is classified as a 'P' (permitted) use within the Commercial Zone and does not require advertising as part of the assessment process. Moreover, as the proposed addition is internal within the shopping centre, it is not considered that the proposal will impact on the surrounding properties.

Policy Implications:

The City's Policy 3.2.8 Centres Strategy applies to the subject site. The Policy promotes the maintenance of Whitford City Shopping Centre as a significant regional node offering community focus by providing a mix of retail, office, leisure, entertainment, recreational and community facilities. The policy also promotes the maintenance of the metropolitan centres hierarchy as defined in Policy 4.2.

The Policy further reinforces the restriction of the Whitford City Shopping Centre to 50,000m² retail net lettable area in accordance with regional guidelines.

COMMENT

Retail Floor space

To date with the latest development of the Centre, the floorspace was calculated to be 48,780m² retail NLA, which is under the 50 000m² retail NLA maximum. The new proposal will add an additional 1,142 m² retail NLA and according to the applicant will bring the total retail NLA to 49,922m². Should the proposal be approved, it is appropriate to apply a condition to ensure that the retail NLA cap of 50,000 m² is not exceeded.

Parking and Traffic

The application indicates that 3,857 car parking bays have been provided within the shopping centre. With this addition, DPS2 requires the provision of 3,749 bays, and therefore the provision of car parking complies with the required standards. No changes to the car parking layout are proposed by this application.

It is expected that the proposal will not generate any significant increase in traffic beyond that which can be accommodated by the existing road systems and access points.

Impact on Adjoining Properties

Due to the location of the addition and the scope of the works, mostly on the interior, it is highly unlikely that the proposal will impact on the adjoining residential properties. Furthermore, the residential properties adjoining the area of the proposal exhibit a great degree of separation for the shopping centre. A condition can be applied to any approval issued for the small exterior additions to the building to complement the existing building.

Overall, the proposal addition meets all requirements and thus approval is recommended.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1	Locality Plan
Attachment 2	Site Plan
Attachment 3	Proposed floor plan
Attachment 4	Elevations

VOTING REQUIREMENTS

Simple majority

RECOMMENDATION

That the Joint Commissioners APPROVE the proposed addition to Whitford City Shopping Centre on Lot 501 (470) Whitfords Avenue, Hillarys, subject to:

- 1 Net lettable retail floor space shall not exceed 50,000m²;**
- 2 The exterior finishes of the proposed development are to complement the existing building. Details of building finishes are to be submitted to and approved by the City, prior to the issuance of a Building Licence;**
- 3 A minimum of 3,749 car parking bays are to be provided.**

Appendix 7 refers.

To access this attachment on electronic document, click here: [Attach7brf140904.pdf](#)

ITEM 11 PROPOSED RETAINING WALLS (INCLUDING SIDE SETBACK VARIATIONS AND IMPORTATION OF FILL IN EXCESS OF 500MM) – LOT 11415 NO 17 SECOND AVENUE, BURNS BEACH – [00077]

WARD - North Coastal

PURPOSE

To request the Joint Commissioners' determination of an application for the importation of fill in excess of 500mm and four retaining walls to a residential site.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

An application has been received for approval of fill in excess of 500mm and retaining walls proposed on all four boundaries of the lot.

The application has been called in by a Commissioner for determination by the Joint Commissioners

The applicant seeks to establish retaining walls on all boundaries of the vacant site in order to improve the available ocean views.

Whilst there is a change in grade across the lot, the fall is minor, manageable and should not present any additional difficulties when constructing a dwelling in a manner that is sympathetic to the natural contours of the site.

It is considered that the retaining walls are not justified on planning grounds and do not comply with the performance criteria of the R-Codes. The proposal is therefore recommended for refusal.

BACKGROUND

Suburb/Location: 17 Second Avenue, Burns Beach
Applicant: Donna Marie Rosato and Ricky Rosato
Owner: Donna Marie Rosato and Ricky Rosato
Zoning: **DPS:** Residential R20
MRS: Urban

The location of the site is shown in Attachment 1 and is located in Second Avenue. The site is currently developed with a single storey fibro house. The owner wishes the City to consider four retaining walls at each lot boundary in order to build up the land and to then secure ocean views from a future new residence.

DETAILS

The proposal is for retaining walls at each lot boundary, which range in height from 890mm to 1.73 metres above natural ground level. Each wall is proposed to be flush with its respective lot boundary with the exception of the western wall, which requires a setback due to a nearby sewer easement.

Installing the retaining walls will raise the site levels when compared to those of the street. Currently, the lot has a fall in excess of 1.0 metre from the street to the rear of the property. It is proposed to install a 1.8 metre high fence on top of the retaining walls, which will result in a height ranging from 3.53 metres to 1.03 metres at various points along the walls.

A portion of the retaining wall is proposed to abut the eastern lot boundary (front boundary), which will range in height from 890mm to 1.2 metres.

Under the Performance Criteria of the Residential Design Codes (R-Codes), retaining walls should maintain the natural appearance of the site. It is not considered that the proposed retaining walls achieve this, as the effect of the walls is to raise the ground level of the whole site.

As seen from the street, the impact of the front retaining wall is minimal as it occupies a very small portion of the lot frontage. The retaining walls to the rear and sides of the property represent a considerable impact upon the adjoining properties. With a fence height of 1.8 metres on top of the retaining walls, the effective height of the walls from the adjoining side would be as high as 3.53 metres at various points. The retaining wall on the southern side may also disrupt direct access to sunlight for the lot that shares that boundary.

The applicants have stated their desire is to maximise ocean views. However, to approve this development would create an undesirable precedent and lend weight to other home owners within the area who may wish to reproduce this kind of development in order to maximise their views also.

Statutory Provision:

Clause 6.6.2 of DPS2 requires that Council, in exercising its discretion to approve or refuse an application, has regard to the provisions of Clause 6.8 as follows:

6.8 MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED BY COUNCIL

6.8.1 The Council when considering an application for Planning Approval shall have due regard to the following:

- (a) interests of orderly and proper planning and the preservation of the amenity of the relevant locality;*
- (b) any relevant submissions by the applicant;*
- (c) any Agreed Structure Plan prepared under the provisions of Part 9 of the Scheme;*
- (d) any planning policy of the Council adopted under the provisions of clause 8.11;*
- (e) any other matter which under the provisions of the Scheme the Council is required to have due regard;*

- (f) any policy of the Commission or its predecessors or successors or any planning policy adopted by the Government of the State of Western Australia;
- (g) any relevant proposed new town planning scheme of the Council or amendment or proposed Metropolitan Region Scheme Amendment insofar as they can be regarded as seriously entertained planning proposals;
- (h) the comments or wishes of any public or municipal authority received as part of the submission process;
- (i) the comments or wishes of any objectors to or supporters of the application;
- (j) any previous decision made by the Council in circumstances which are sufficiently similar for the previous decision to be relevant as a precedent, provided that the Council shall not be bound by such precedent;
- (k) any other matter which in the opinion of the Council is relevant.

Residential Design Codes 2002 (R Codes)

Developments that are in compliance with the ‘acceptable development’ provisions of the R-Codes do not require Planning Approval or the exercise of discretion. When a development varies from the ‘acceptable development’ provisions of the R-Codes, the variations can be considered pursuant to the ‘performance criteria.’

The Performance Criteria for Clause 3.6.2 of the R-Codes states:

“Retaining walls designed or setback to minimise the impact on adjoining property”

Clause 2.3.4 of the R-Codes permit Council to vary the provisions of the R-Codes if it is determined that the variations comply with the ‘performance criteria’ of the R-Codes.

Development Standards under the R-Codes 2002

Proposal	Acceptable Development Standard – Required Setback from boundary	Provided
Southern Retaining Wall	1.8m	Nil
Northern Retaining Wall	1.5m	Nil
Western Retaining Wall	1.0m	Nil

Since the eastern retaining wall does not adjoin any common boundaries and instead abuts the verge, the retaining wall setback requirements do not apply. Instead, the excavation or fill provisions of clause 3.6.1 apply when assessing this aspect.

The performance criteria for this clause states:

“Development that retains the visual impression of the natural level of a site, as seen from the street or other public place, or from an adjoining property.”

Proposal	Acceptable Development Standard	Provided
Fill within the front setback area	500mm max	1.2 m
Front Fence	1.2m	1.2 m

Applicant's Justification

The applicant has provided the following justification for the proposal:

“The existing property is a single storey asbestos dwelling with a single garage attached along the southern side. The existing dwelling will in time be removed (demolished or re-stumped) and the intention of the Building Licence is to level the block to 22.25 (current residence pad finished floor level is 22.13). In my opinion this has no discernable impact on the streetscape as the existing residence will remain in-situ, unaffected as a consequence of the plans being approved, the retaining walls being installed and filled.

As the property is located on a high point of Second Avenue, it has rear ocean views at the existing residence's current finished floor level. There is a strong desire to retain and not abnegate these views even though from ground level these views may be lost if/when the western adjoining neighbour obstructs these with a multi storey construction. To mitigate any potential loss of views from the ground level, the plan is to maximise the rear ocean views from a potential second storey.

In time, all surrounding lots will be redeveloped with these developments also being designed to address/capitalise on ocean views. Overlooking and privacy issues will therefore be mitigated over time as the locality undergoes redevelopment (i.e. ocean orientation of habitable rooms/decks thus turning their backs on development behind).

The FFL sought creates the need for retaining walls, this is sympathetic to the adjoining street level, current FFL of the existing house and given the constraints caused by the natural topography of the land together with the configuration of the lot and the overall subdivision design of the locality, the design takes all these constraints into consideration in order to minimise the impact on the three adjoining owners.”

Consultation:

The proposal was not advertised, as letters indicating consent from all the adjoining property owners were provided as part of the application.

COMMENT

It appears from the applicant's justification that the main motivation for the proposal is to obtain ocean views.

The southern side of the front setback area is proposed to be filled to a maximum height of 1.2 metres and minimum of 890mm. The R-Codes acceptable development standards stipulate that filling behind a setback line should not be more than 500mm above natural ground level.

The amount of discretion requested is significant in light of the potential impact on the adjoining properties and the precedent it will set. The effect of the proposal is to artificially raise the level of the block. This is contrary to the natural grades of the adjoining properties.

The applicant was contacted by the City's Planning Department was informed that their proposal was not likely to be supported and it was recommended that an alternative and less detrimental proposal be submitted to the City. The applicant then requested that the matter be referred to the next available Delegated Authority Meeting in any case, as the original proposal may still be approved.

It is not considered that the proposed retaining walls comply with the performance criteria of the R-Codes. Fill within the site is required to retain the visual impression of the site. That is, any fill should retain the visual impression of that slope.

The retaining walls to the rear and side of the property represent a considerable impact upon the adjoining properties. With a fence height of 1.8 metres on top of the retaining walls, the effective height of the walls from the adjoining side would vary between 2.8 metres and 3.53 metres. The retaining wall on the southern side will also disrupt direct access to sunlight for the lot that shares the boundary.

Whilst there is a change in grade across the lot, the fall is minor, manageable and should not present any particular difficulties when constructing a dwelling.

It is also noted that when a dwelling is constructed on the site, for the purposes of implementing the Building Height Policy, the ground levels will be calculated from the ground levels before the construction of retaining walls. Any benefit from the proposed retaining walls in terms of views is therefore questionable.

The applicant's desire to maximise ocean views is not considered a justifiable planning consideration. It is reasonable to assume that redevelopment of the locality will occur as many of the nearby dwellings are old fibro houses in relatively poor condition. To approve this development would create an undesirable precedent and lend weight to other homeowners' desires to reproduce this type of development in order to maximise their views also.

It is considered that the proposed retaining walls do not comply with the performance criteria of the R-Codes, and are not required in order to construct a dwelling on the site. The proposal is therefore recommended for refusal.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1	Location Plan
Attachment 2	Development Plans

VOTING REQUIREMENTS

Simple Majority

RECOMMENDATION

That the Joint Commissioners REFUSE the Development Application submitted by Donna Marie Rosato and Ricky Rosato, the owners, for approval of retaining walls on Lot 11415 (17) Second Avenue, Burns Beach, for the following reasons:

- 1 The development would be contrary to the proper and orderly planning of the locality;**
- 2 The development does not comply with the performance criteria of clause 3.6.2 of the Residential Design Codes 2002 in terms of the retaining wall length and height and would adversely impact the amenity of the adjoining properties;**
- 3 The development does not comply with the performance criteria of clause 3.6.1 of the Residential Design Codes 2002 in terms of importation of fill within the front setback area and would not retain the visual impression of the natural level of the site;**
- 4 Approval of the development would set an undesirable precedent for similar development within the locality.**

Appendix 8 refers.

To access this attachment on electronic document, click here: [Attach8brf140904.pdf](#)

V:\devserv\reports\reports2004\090405am

ITEM 12 HOME BUSINESS CATEGORY TWO RENEWAL (REPAIR OF PLASTIC CRATES) LOT 130 (2) JANTHINA CRESCENT HEATHRIDGE – [85186]

WARD - All

PURPOSE

For the Joint Commissioners to consider the renewal of a Home Business Category 2 (repair of plastic crates).

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The City has received an application for a renewal of a Home Business Category 2 (repair of plastic crates). The original application for a Home Business was approved on 6 June 2002 and subsequently renewed on 29 July 2003. With the previous application for renewal (2003) the City's Officers prepared a report recommending that the application be considered for refusal based on amenity grounds. The Council considered this report and resolved to approve the application. The 12 month approval period of the renewal has now expired and an application to renew the activity has been received.

The City has previously received ongoing complaints relating to the fumes and noise associated with the operations of the business. The City's officers have continued to liaise with a complainant during the 2003 and 2004 approval period.

The renewal of this Home Business was advertised for public comment for a period of 14 days to surrounding landowners. As a result of the advertising, five responses were received, one objecting to the proposal.

There have been ongoing concerns from neighbours throughout the history of the business regarding odours and emissions from welding of the plastic crates. The City Officers have attended the site and have detected odours emanating from the activity.

It is recommended that the application to renew the Home Business be refused due to the adverse effect the business has on the amenity of the neighbourhood.

BACKGROUND

Suburb/Location: Lot 130 (2) Janthina Crescent Heathridge
Applicant: DM Kimberley
Owner: DM & DG Kimberley
Zoning: **DPS:** Residential R20
MRS: Urban

BACKGROUND

In December 2001, the City received a letter from a Councillor on behalf of an anonymous resident informing the City of an unauthorised Home Business at the abovementioned

property. The City's Officers acted on the letter (by contacting the applicant), and an application for a Home Business was subsequently received.

The application for the Home Business Category 2 (repair of plastic crates) was considered under Delegated Authority on 7 March 2002 where it was refused. The applicant lodged an appeal to the Minister for Planning against this decision. It was, however, negotiated that the City would consider a new application, with additional supporting information.

The City subsequently received another Development Application with the additional supporting information. This application was considered under Delegated Authority on 6 June 2002 where the application was approved subject to conditions, including a condition that the business be renewed on an annual basis.

Given the on-going complaints in regard to the home business, the application for the renewal of the business was referred to the meeting of Council held on 29 July 2003 for determination. The City's Officers prepared a report recommending that the application be considered for refusal based on amenity grounds. The Council considered this report and resolved to approve the application for a further 12 month period. The 12 month approval period of the renewal has now expired and an application to renew the activity has been received.

DETAILS

The proposed home business renewal is for the repair of plastic crates using an electric heat gun. The repair process involves welding a plastic component to an existing crate for reinforcement or removing the broken section of the crate with a hand saw and then using a heat gun to weld a patch over the damaged area. The business has been operating in an aluminium garage, which is located at the side of the property.

Approximately eighty (80) to one hundred (100) crates are repaired every week. The business operates two days a week on average, however, the days vary Monday to Friday from 9am to 1.30pm.

The applicant works for her husband's company. Crates are delivered to the subject site twice a week via her husband's vehicle between the hours of 3pm and 5pm and are transferred to the shed or vehicle via a trolley. Deliveries are carried out within the husband's normal working hours, to ensure there is no increase in traffic in the area.

Statutory Provision:

District Planning Scheme No 2 (DPS2)

A Home Business Category 2 is a 'D' use in a Residential area. A 'D' use means:

"A use class that is not permitted, but to which the Council may grant its approval after following the procedures laid down by subclause 6.6.2".

Clause 6.6.2 requires that the Council in exercising discretion to approve or refuse an application, shall have regard to the provisions of Clause 6.8.

The relevant Clauses are outlined in Attachment 2

DPS2 defines a Home Business as:

Home Business – Category 2: means an occupation carried on in a dwelling or on land around a dwelling by a resident of the dwelling which:

- (a) does not entail the retail sale, outdoor display or hire of goods of any nature;
- (b) does not cause injury to or prejudicially affect the amenity of the neighbourhood;
- (c) does not detract from the residential appearance of the dwelling house or domestic outbuilding;
- (d) entails the employment of no more than 1 person not a member of the occupier's household;
- (e) does not occupy an area greater than 30m². Council may permit an area greater than 30m² where it is considered that the scale of the business is limited by other factors and the increase in floorspace will not have a detrimental effect on the amenity of the surrounding areas;
- (f) does not have more than one advertisement sign and the sign displayed does not exceed 0.2m² in area;
- (g) will not result in the requirement for a greater number of parking facilities than normally reserved for a single dwelling, and will not result in a substantial increase in the amount of vehicular traffic in the vicinity;
- (h) does not involve the servicing or repair for gain of motor vehicles; and
- (i) does not entail the presence, parking and garaging of a vehicle of more than 3.5 tonnes tare weight.

Policy 3.1.11 - Home Business

The objective of Policy 3.1.11 Home Business is to establish guidelines for the exercise of Council's discretion when assessing Home Business uses. The most relevant sections of the policy that are applicable to the proposal have been outlined below.

The aim of the policy is to:

- (a) *To maintain residential areas as primarily a place to live, not primarily a place to work whilst recognizing that working from home is an expanding area of employment, and a significant contributor to local employment;*
- (b) *To protect the amenity and character of residential areas by ensuring that potential impacts associated with home business such as noise, traffic, pollution, people and advertising signs are minimised and adequately controlled;*
- (c) *To enhance the effectiveness of Council's decision making through consultation with interested parties;*
- (d) *To provide a measure of the extent of the home business to ensure that it does not dominate the use of the land nor be so large or intensive that it changes the residential character of the neighbourhood;*
- (e) *To guide the location of home business proposals to minimise any impact on the amenity and character of residential locations.*

The policy includes guidelines relating to the operation of the business. The following guidelines of the policy are most relevant to this application:

For the purpose of this policy, amenity refers to all factors that combine to form the character of the area to residents and passers-by and shall include the present and likely future amenity. In determining whether a proposed home business is likely to detrimentally affect the amenity of the neighbourhood, the following factors will be considered:

- (i) emission of noise, vibration, smell, fumes, vapour, steam, soot, ash, dust, grit, oil, waste water or waste products;*
- (ii) hours of operation;*
- (iii) number of customers visiting the premises;*
- (iv) traffic likely to be generated;*
- (v) additional parking requirements created by the proposed home business;*
- (vi) storage of harmful or poisonous chemicals,*
- (vii) compliance with the management plan;*
- (viii) compliance with the requirements set out by the Town Planning Scheme provisions;*
- (ix) public submissions and/or complaints by adjoining owners.*

When determining an application, the Council:

- (i) may limit the number of hours and/or days of operation of a home business proposal where it is deemed necessary to protect the amenity of the surrounding area;*
- (ii) elect to grant an initial term of approval of twelve (12) months. In some instances where it is considered appropriate, a longer period may be considered. The applicant is to seek renewals thereafter to effect the continuance of the home occupation.*

Community Consultation

In considering any variations to the required standards, Council will carry out community consultation as part of the decision making process. Concerns of adjoining owners will be considered as a relevant factor in the assessment of applications for planning approval.

Applicant's Justification

The applicant has not provided any justification for the current renewal application, however, the following statement was provided in the 2003 application (summarized):

- No aspects of the home business have changed since the last approval.*
- The Worksafe Officer has advised that odours generated would be quite small and should not be detected at neighbouring properties.*
- The information provided by Worksafe, Material Safety Data Sheet and the plastic supplier confirm that it is unlikely that odours and fumes will affect adjoining properties.*
- It is apparent that odours and toxicity only becomes an issue in the event of burning of plastic. However, it needs to be clearly understood that the operation does not involve burning but melting of plastic.*
- The adjoining neighbour has been resident at that property for the past 7 years that the business has been operating, and no concerns have been raised in the past.*

- *The neighbours have made complaints to the City regarding offensive odours. The City's Officers have conducted a number of site inspections and only on the last of those occasions the officer concerned noticed any odour.*
- *The City's Environmental Health Officer arranged for a representative of the Department of Environmental Protection to view the operation. The representative was satisfied that there was nothing of a harmful or toxic nature in the gas created through the welding of the crates. In respect to the odour, it is understood that he commented that this was akin to a 'cooking smell' which should not provide any reasonable cause for complaint.*
- *Recommendations were made to install a hood and extraction fan and to ensure that the shed door remains shut whilst carrying out repairs. The hood and fan have been installed to the specifications outlined. The fan outlet is on the part of the shed roof which slopes away from the neighbour which should also assist.*
- *The nature of the proposed activity is such that it would not cause injury to or prejudicially affect the amenity of the neighbourhood.*

Consultation:

The proposal was advertised in writing to nine (9) adjoining and nearby landowners. The comment period was 14 days in accordance with DPS2. From this consultation, five submissions were received, with only one objection. The objections are summarised below:

Objection	Officer Comment
The Material Safety Data Sheet (MSDS) on HDPE (Polyethylene Homopolymer) indicates that if inhaled, this material may cause nausea and irritation of the upper respiratory tract	Noted. The MSDS confirms these assertions.
Environmental Health Officers have detected odour from the welding inside my house	Noted. Officers have detected odours from the adjoining property.
Worksafe advised Council fumes should not be of any sufficient quantity to be detected in neighbouring premises.	Noted.
Council should put the health and welfare of their residents first.	Noted. Health and welfare of residents is a primary concern in considering an application.
The resale value of my property may be affected by the welding crate business being conducted in such close proximity to my kitchen and dining room windows.	Noted. It is difficult to assess what effect the Home Business would have on property values.

The objector makes other statements regarding advice previously received from the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) and Worksafe. These statements allude to possible health effects from the welding on surrounding properties. With respect to these comments, advice from the DEP and Worksafe have been considered when assessing the renewal application and previous application.

COMMENT

The original application for a Home Business was approved on 6 June 2002. Council, at its meeting on 29 July 2003 approved the first renewal of the Home Business subject to conditions. As a condition of Planning Approval required the applicant to renew the approval within twelve months, an application has been received for renewal.

Suitability of Home Business in Residential Zone (Clause 3.4)

Pursuant to the Scheme, the Residential Zone is intended primarily for residential development in an environment where high standards of amenity and safety predominate to ensure the health and welfare of the population.

Since the latest approval of the Home Business in July 2003 the City's officers have continued to liaise with a complainant. Prior to the approval in 2003 there were ongoing complaints regarding fumes emanating from the subject property.

Discretionary Uses (Clause 6.8.2)

In accordance with clause 6.8.2 of the City of Joondalup's Scheme, the Council when considering whether or not to approve a 'D' (a use class that is not permitted, but to which Council may grant its approval after following procedures laid down in sub clause 6.6.2) use application shall have due regard to the nature of the proposed use and its relationship to the use of other land within the locality and the preservation of the amenity of the relevant locality. Although the nature of the Home Business is considered to be small scale, it is not considered to be compatible and congruent in a residential area and may be more appropriately located in a Service Industrial Zone.

Compliance with Home Business Category 2 Definition (Clause 1.9)

A Home Business Category 2 may operate, provided that it does not cause injury to or prejudicially affect the amenity of the neighbourhood.

The City's Home Business Policy specifically outlines that, in determining whether a proposed Home Business is likely to detrimentally affect the amenity of the neighbourhood, the emission of noise, smells and fumes must be considered. If it is considered that smells and fumes will cause a nuisance to surrounding properties then refusal should be considered.

The Policy also states that the concerns of adjoining owners will be considered as a relevant factor in the assessment of applications for planning approval. Given the on-going objection the City has received relating to smells and fumes associated with the business, the Joint Commissions could consider refusing the proposal. However, comments received from adjoining landowners are not a referendum to how the proposal should be determined, rather they are community input into the planning process and should be given due regard if relevant planning concerns exist.

Policy 3.1.11 Home Business

The rationale of issuing a Home Business Approval for a limited period of twelve months is to enable the City to reassess the business after a twelve-month period to ensure that the proposal is operating in accordance with its Planning Approval.

Environmental Health Implications

Odours

Worksafe previously advised that the odours created from heat welding of high-density polyethylene homopolymer (HDPE) would be quite small and should not be detected by adjoining neighbours. The rationale behind this was that the repairing of crates involves heating without reaching a temperature that will cause the crate to burn if carried out correctly.

However, Worksafe also advised that burning HDPE may affect the operator and sufficient ventilation should be provided. Natural ventilation would suffice and external openings should be left open during operations.

Health Risks

Worksafe advised that the risks associated with heating HDPE are low. A Material Safety Data Sheet outlined that HDPE is not expected to be harmful if inhaled, however, if this material is heated, the fumes may be unpleasant and produce nausea and irritation of the upper respiratory tract.

Noise

The welding gun and the loading and unloading of crates from the vehicle generate noise. The applicant was required to comply with the Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations 1997. On 24 April 2002, a site inspection was conducted by the City's Environmental Health Officer to measure the level of noise produced by the business.

The Sound Level Measurement Report revealed that the proposed business complies with the Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations 1997 during the hours of 0700 – 1900 Monday to Saturday.

Environmental Health Considerations

Previously (2003) the City had received complaints regarding odour derived from the plastic crate welding business. In response to the complaints, the City's Environmental Health Officer attended the site and detected an odour commonly associated with burning plastic.

The complaint was referred to the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) for further investigation and the inspector's results were:

"I found that there was an unpleasant odour that was not particularly strong but quite possibly unacceptable in a residential area, especially to sensitive individuals.

I recommend that a ventilation system be installed with a hood over the work area in order to dilute the air being emitted. A hood and fan similar to those used over stoves and hot plates for household use should be sufficient. The hood should be mounted as low as practicable without interfering with the work being carried out. If possible the air should be directed away from the complainant's house."

The recommended works were carried out by the applicant, however, further complaints were received that the odours were still evident. Given that the complaint in regard to the emission of odour from the welding activity has been substantiated, concern is raised over the suitability of the activity in a residential area.

The Commissioners, in considering the renewal of the Home Business, should consider the effects of the business on the adjoining properties and surrounding locality. It needs to be considered if the business is appropriate within the Residential Zone and if any odours usually not present in this zone are acceptable.

In this particular case, given the objection received from the adjoining neighbour, the information available from the City's Environmental Health Officers and the representative from the DEP, the business is not considered appropriate in a residential area and is considered to have had an adverse affect on the neighbourhood.

It is therefore recommended that application for the renewal of the Home Business not be supported.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1	Locality Plan
Attachment 2	Site Plan

VOTING REQUIREMENTS

Simple majority.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Joint Commissioners REFUSE the proposed renewal of Home Business Category 2 (Repair of Plastic Crates) at Lot 130 (2) Janthina Crescent, Heathridge for the following the reasons:

- 1 The proposal is contrary to the principle of orderly and proper planning of the area;**
- 2 The proposal does not conform to the definition of a Home Business under District Planning Scheme No 2, as the business is likely to affect the residential amenity of the area;**
- 3 The Home Business is not considered compatible with the intent of the Residential Zone and would undermine the intent of the Zone;**
- 4 The proposed activity is likely to have an adverse affect on the amenity of the area which is contrary to Policy 3.1.1 Home Business.**

Appendix 9 refers.

To access this attachment on electronic document, click here: [Attach9brf140904.pdf](#)

ITEM 13 MINUTES OF THE SENIORS INTERESTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 18 AUGUST 2004 – [55511]

WARD - All

PURPOSE

To note the unconfirmed minutes of the Seniors Interest Advisory Committee meeting held Wednesday, 18 August 2004.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A meeting of the Seniors Interest Advisory Committee was held on Wednesday, 18 August 2004. The unconfirmed minutes of this meeting are submitted for noting by Council.

It is recommended that the Joint Commissioners NOTE the unconfirmed Minutes of the Seniors Interest Advisory Committee held on Wednesday, 18 August 2004 forming Attachment 1 to this Report.

DETAILS

Subsequent to the visioning session at the last Seniors Interests Advisory Committee meeting, all members agreed to research, consult with seniors and then present on a variety of strategic topics at future committee meetings. These topics include:

- Strategies of the two main political parties with regards to aged care and seniors,
- Latest trends, demographics etc with regards to seniors in the Joondalup area and review the Seniors Plan,
- Latest issues, information and trends with regards to Physical Activity and seniors,
- Latest issues and trends with regards to diet, eating and obesity and seniors,
- The future of employment for seniors over the next 20-30 years.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 Minutes of the Seniors Interest Advisory Committee Meeting
 18 August 2004

VOTING REQUIREMENTS

Simple Majority

RECOMMENDATION

That the Joint Commissioners NOTE the unconfirmed minutes of the Seniors Interest Advisory Committee held on Wednesday, 18 August 2004 forming Attachment 1 to this Report.

Appendix 10 refers.

To access this attachment on electronic document, click here: [Attach10brf140904.pdf](#)

V:\devserv\REPORTS\REPORTS 2004\ComDev\September\090403yp.doc

ITEM 14 MINUTES OF THE JOONDALUP YOUTH ADVISORY COUNCIL MEETING – 18 AUGUST 2004 – [38245]

WARD - All

PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to present the unconfirmed minutes of the August Joondalup Youth Advisory Council meeting for noting by Commissioners.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Joondalup Youth Advisory Council met on 18 August 2004. The unconfirmed minutes of this meeting are attached for the attention of Commissioners. The recommendation is:

That the Joint Commissioners NOTE the unconfirmed minutes of the Joondalup Youth Advisory Council meeting held on 18 August 2004 forming Attachment 1 to this Report.

DETAILS

The unconfirmed minutes of this meeting held on 18 August 2004 are attached for the attention of Commissioners.

During this meeting members discussed two particularly relevant agenda items. The first of these items involved an emerging opportunity for community funding. The second item involved “Crime and Safety” particularly in regards to the issue of youth curfews.

Recommendations originating from these discussions are expected in future meetings.

COMMENT

The business of this meeting included the nomination of Michael Blanchard to the CBD Enhancement Committee. Michael will attend future meetings as a representative of the Youth Advisory Council and will provide a valuable youth perspective to the business of this committee.

The issue of community funding is considered operational at this point in time and will be pursued in consultation with appropriate Council staff.

Members recognised that the issue of council policy regarding “youth curfews” required further research and informed debate before the committee could reach a consensus position on this issue. A recommendation on this issue is expected from future meetings and will be presented to Commissioners for their input and possible endorsement.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 Unconfirmed Minutes of the Joondalup Youth Advisory Council

VOTING REQUIREMENTS

Simple majority

RECOMMENDATION

That the Joint Commissioners NOTE the unconfirmed minutes of the Joondalup Youth Advisory Council meeting held on 18 August 2004 forming Attachment 1 to this Report.

Appendix 11 refers.

To access this attachment on electronic document, click here: [Attach11brf140904.pdf](#)

X:\devserv\REPORTS\REPORTS 2004\ComDev\September\090402jm.doc

**ITEM 15 CRAIGIE LEISURE CENTRE MANAGEMENT
REQUIREMENTS AND CHANGES TO THE STAFF
ESTABLISHMENT – [09050]**

WARD - Pinnaroo

This report was not available at the time of the distribution of the Agenda.

**ITEM 16 STREETSIDE BENCHES PROPOSED SETTLEMENT –
[45612] [45924]**

WARD - All

This Item Is Confidential - Not For Publication

A full report will be provided to the Joint Commissioners under separate cover.

- 7 REPORT OF THE ACTING CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER**
- 8 MOTIONS OF WHICH PREVIOUS NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN**
- 9 BUSINESS OUTSTANDING FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS**
- 10 OUTSTANDING PETITIONS**
- 11 REPORTS/PRESENTATIONS REQUESTED BY COMMISSIONERS**

BUSINESS OUTSTANDING FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS

OFFICE OF THE CEO

AMENDMENT TO CITY'S STANDING ORDERS LOCAL LAW (ex CJ307-12/02 – ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING OF ELECTORS)

- 2(a) Motion 1 (*requesting Council to make the various changes to public question time*) be considered as part of the further review of the City's Standing Orders Local Law:

COUNCIL'S MEETING CYCLE – ex CJ195-08/04

- “4 during the next review of the City's Standing Orders Local Law REQUEST a report be provided to the Council on whether Briefing and Strategy Sessions can be formally recognised in the Standing Orders Local Law but with flexibility as to the procedures that would apply.”

Status: A further review of the Standing Orders Local Law is being undertaken.

MEETING OF THE POLICY MANUAL REVIEW COMMITTEE HELD ON 18 SEPTEMBER 2003 – ex CJ213-09/03

- “3 DEFERS consideration of:

- (a) Policy 2.5.1 Commercial Usage of Beachfront and Beach Reserves – as detailed in Attachment 2 to Report CJ213-09/03 pending a further report being presented to the Policy Manual Review Committee incorporating additional recommendations;
- (c) Policy 2.6.4 – Environmental Sustainability – as detailed in Attachment 2 to Report CJ213-09/03 pending referral to the Environmental and Sustainability Committee for consideration;

Status: Reports will be submitted in due course.

DISBANDING OF POLICY MANUAL REVIEW COMMITTEE (ex CJ158-07/04 – POLICY MANUAL REVIEW COMMITTEE)

“that consideration of the role of the Policy Manual Review Committee, and protocols for the review and adoption of new policies, be REFERRED to a workshop to be attended by Commissioners.”

Status: A workshop will be scheduled.

REVIEW OF CORPORATE CODE OF CONDUCT – ex CJ074-04/04

“2 GIVE further consideration to reviewing the Code of Conduct following the outcome of the Governance Review.”

GOVERNANCE REVIEW ex CJ116-06/04

“2 NOTE that Administration will submit reports on recommendations contained therein for consideration by the Joint Commissioners.”

Status: Once the findings of the Governance Review have been reviewed, this issue will be further considered.

MAYOR D CARLOS (SUSPENDED) – REQUEST FOR PAYMENT OF MAYORAL ALLOWANCE – ex CJ118-06/04

“that no determination is made on this matter at this time and the item be DEFERRED until the McIntyre Inquiry completes its deliberations and issues a Report.”

Status: A report will be submitted following the completion of the McIntyre Inquiry.

PROPOSED LAND PURCHASE – CULTURAL FACILITY (ex CJ174-08/04 – MAJOR LAND TRANSACTION – SITE ACQUISITION)

“3 NOTE that a further report will be presented to Council as soon as practical following the completion of the business plan process in order to obtain authority to execute the Contract of Sale for the cultural facility site;

4 REQUEST the CEO to prepare a report for Council detailing the landscaping plans for the site for the further consideration of Council and recommended that such a plan be developed to satisfy the cultural and performing arts needs of the community at this time;

5 REQUEST the CEO to prepare a report for Council covering the costs and options of redesigning the Council Chamber to meet the provisions of the Governance Review and at the same time to allow for greater availability and usage for performing arts and other community events.”

Status: A Business Plan will be advertised for a period of 42 days seeking public comment to this proposal.

CORPORATE SERVICES AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT**USE OF VEHICLES BY ALL OFFICERS – (ex JSC29-08/04 – MINUTES OF 2004/05 BUDGET COMMITTEE MEETINGS)**

“3 REQUEST that a report be submitted to Council on the option of hybrid vehicles for use by all officers;”

Status: A report will be prepared in due course.

**ESTABLISHMENT OF STRATEGIC FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE -
(EX JSC31-08/04 – NOTICE OF MOTION – CMR S SMITH – REQUEST FOR A REPORT ON THE
ESTABLISHMENT OF STRATEGIC FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE0**

That the CEO be requested to provide a report for consideration of the Council on establishing a new committee called the "Strategic Financial Management Committee" to replace the current budget committee with terms of reference that include dealing with the medium to long term allocation of finances and resources for the City's operations and capital projects - primarily through the Principal Activities Plan and to provide for the Principal Activities Plan and the budget to be dealt with as separate processes.

Status: A report will be prepared in due course.

STRATEGIC AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

DEVELOPMENT OF A COUNTRY TOWN RELATIONSHIP - ex CJ278-11/02

“that Council DEFERS any decision to enter into a city-country sister City relationship until further analysis can be undertaken.”

Status: This report will be presented to Council in 2005 following the adoption of the City’s Tourism development Plan. It is envisaged that the development of a Country Town relationship should be tied to a specific purpose and have clear objectives and outcomes. The Development of the City’s Tourism Plan will likely provide a clear link for the development of such a relationship.

**EXTENSION OF OCEAN REEF ROAD – HODGES DRIVE TO SHENTON AVENUE
(ex C229-11/03 – NOTICE OF MOTION – CR C BAKER)**

“2.4 that the Working Party prepare a report and recommendations to Council at the conclusion of the Community consultation process;”

Status: A Report will be presented to Council in December 2004 following the outcome of the Consultation process.

**DELEGATION TO FORMALISE FRIENDLY RELATIONS WITH JINAN IN
SHANDONG PROVINCE, CHINA ex CJ155-07/04**

“3 REQUEST a report on the outcome of the visit to Jinan which is to include key performance indications that will allow the City to monitor the impact of the relationship with Jinan over the next five years.”

Status: A report will be presented to a future Council meeting on completion of the visit in October 2004.

PLANNING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

LOT 1 OCEANSIDE PROMENADE, MULLALOO (ex C83-05/03 NOTICE OF MOTION NO 4 – CR M CAIACOB)

“that Council AGREES and RESOLVES to incorporate Lot 1 Oceanside Promenade, Mullaloo into Tom Simpson Park reserve proper and makes any and all necessary changes to the status and zoning of the land as per the Council Officers recommendation in CJ118-05/02.”

“that consideration of the Notice of Motion - Cr M Caiacob – Lot 1 Oceanside Promenade, Mullaloo be DEFERRED pending submission of a report.”

Status: Research is being undertaken. A report will be prepared in due course.

PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS TO CURRAMBINE STRUCTURE PLAN NO 14 – DELETION OF THE RESIDENTIAL MIXED USE PRECINCT AND REPLACEMENT WITH A SMALL LOT RESIDENTIAL PRECINCT AND MINOR MODIFICATIONS TO THE DEVELOPMENT PROVISIONS – ex CJ088-04/04

“3 a separate report giving further consideration to the provision of retail land uses for the Currambine locality in relation to the City’s POLICY 3.2.8 – Centres Strategy, and retail floorspace allocations across the City, as noted in Schedule 3 of DPS2, be prepared;”

Status: Partially addressed in Report to Council 27 April 2004. Remainder to be reported as part of the Centres Strategy review which is intended to be undertaken in 2004/2005.

PROPOSED CHANGE OF USE – SORRENTO BEACH RESORT, LOT 25 (1) PADBURY CIRCLE, CNR WEST COAST DRIVE, SORRENTO – ex CJ187-08/04

“that consideration of the application for a change of use from “motel type accommodation” and “resort” to multiple dwelling at Lot 25 (1) Padbury Circle, cnr West Coast Drive, Sorrento be DEFERRED until the meeting of Joint Commissioners to be held on 31 August 2004 to allow the applicant sufficient time to reconsider the form of the application.”

Status: Additional information was not received from the applicant to allow the item to be referred back to the meeting of the 31 August 2004. When the information is received from the applicant, the matter will be referred back to a meeting of the Joint Commissioners.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

PROPOSED NEW STRUCTURES FOR CRIME PREVENTION IN WESTERN AUSTRALIA– ex CJ338-12/02

“4 NOTES that Council will be advised as the matter progresses both through Desk of the CEO reports and a further report to Council”

Status: The structures of crime prevention within Western Australia was reviewed by the Office of Crime Prevention. At the Safer WA Annual General Meeting conducted on 25 October 2003 it was announced that a new proposed model was developed to essentially replace the current Safer WA structure. The new structure would begin in April 2004 and sees crime prevention coordinated and facilitated at a local level by Local Government. Local Government would be responsible for identifying community needs, co-coordinating community involvement and developing local crime prevention plans. Local community safety partnerships are to be established to implement the local crime prevention plan, which is to be facilitated by local government.

At this stage, the outline of the model does not contain sufficient information for the City of Joondalup to make a clear determination on the impact of the proposal. A community engagement team is being developed by the Office of Crime Prevention to visit local government and volunteers to discuss the new structures in more depth.

A report will be presented to Council in October 2004.

PATROLS AND SAFETY/SECURITY ISSUES (ex CJ004-02/04 – ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING OF ELECTORS HELD ON MONDAY 17 NOVEMBER 2003

4 in relation to Motion 11 of the Annual General Meeting of Electors held on 17 November 2003:

(b) REQUEST the CEO to review the effectiveness of the current programme of patrols on Thursday, Friday and Saturday nights;

Status: An investigation of the effectiveness of the current programme of patrols on Thursday, Friday and Saturday nights is currently being reviewed. Results of this investigation will be given to the Joint Commissioners in due course.

SORRENTO DUNCRAIG AND OCEAN RIDGE LEISURE CENTRES OPERATIONS AND MANAGEMENT REVIEW RECOMMENDATIONS – ex CJ093-04/04

“3 NOTE that this arrangement be reviewed as part of the proposed Leisure Plan to be developed by the City.”

Status: Leisure Plan will require funding in the 2004/05 budget. Subject to funding being approved in the 2004/05 budget, it is anticipated that work would commence January 2005. The development of the Leisure Plan will take approximately six months.

LOCATION OF 50 METRE POOL AT CRAIGIE LEISURE CENTRE OR AN ALTERNATIVE LOCATION – (ex JSC29-08/04 – MINUTES OF 2004/05 BUDGET COMMITTEE MEETINGS)

“2 REQUEST that a report be submitted to Council as to whether a 50 metre pool should be located at Craigie Leisure Centre or at an alternative location;”

Status: The City has committed in September 2004 to a refurbishment project to the aquatic facilities at the Craigie Leisure Centre. Further development of the City’s aquatic facilities, i.e. a 50 metre pool, would only occur as a result of:

- 1) Detailed analysis of the performance of the Craigie Leisure Centre once the refurbishment has been completed.**
- 2) Detailed market research that considers all market segments.**

The Craigie Leisure Centre redevelopment project is inclusive of a geothermal water heating system which could cater for a further 50 metre water space.

ABORIGINAL ISSUES IN THE CITY OF JOONDALUP – (ex JSC29-08/04 – MINUTES OF 2004/05 BUDGET COMMITTEE MEETINGS)

“4 REQUEST that a report be submitted to Council on raising the profile of Aboriginal issues in the City of Joondalup as a significant part of the Cultural Plan.”

Status: The forthcoming Cultural plan for the City will address raising both the profile Aboriginal issues and the level community exposure to local programs presenting Aboriginal artistic endeavour and culture. A comprehensive strategy addressing issues relating to the presentation of Aboriginal cultural activities, the participation of Aboriginal people in civic life in the city, and the consequential raising of community awareness of Aboriginal issues will be available for consideration as part of the draft cultural plan.

INFRASTRUCTURE & OPERATIONS

FIRE BREAKS AND PEDESTRIAN ACCESS TO BEACHES IN OCEAN REEF (ex CJ004-02/04 – ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING OF ELECTORS HELD ON MONDAY 17 NOVEMBER 2003)

1 in relation to Motion 4 of the Annual General Meeting of Electors held on 17 November 2003:

- (c) REQUEST the CEO to provide Council with a report and suitable recommendations once investigations concerning the second fire break have been completed;
- (d) REQUEST the CEO to arrange to provide Commissioners with a briefing at a future Strategy Session on the situation regarding pedestrian access to the beaches in Ocean Reef.

Status: (c) **As part of future staged development of Iluka, the developers intend submitting to the City design solutions for either a raised boardwalk or pathway linking the coastal dual use path to the northwestern portion of the Iluka subdivision. It is at that time that consideration to the second fire break can be given by the City.**

(d) Information report to be presented at future Strategy Session.

PROPOSED NEW WORKS DEPOT – EX C46-07/04

“5 NOTE that a further report will be presented to Council as soon as practical following the completion of the business plan process in order to obtain authority to execute the contract of sale for the Works Depot site.”

Status: Business Plan being advertised for 42 days as from 26 July 2004.

<p>A 14-signature petition has been received from Kingsley residents in relation to anti-social behaviour in Moolanda Park and speeding traffic on Moolanda Boulevard, Kingsley.</p> <p>Comment: This project has been provided for in the 2004/05 Capital Works budget and prior to construction, consultation will be undertaken with the street residents on the proposed traffic treatments.</p>	<p>8 June 2004</p> <p>Director Infrastructure and Operations</p>
<p>A 10-signature petition has been received from residents of Eddystone Avenue, Beldon seeking the assistance of Council in relation to problems associated with speeding vehicles/anti-social behaviour of drivers in Eddystone Avenue, Beldon.</p> <p>Comment: Investigations will be carried out and a report will be submitted to Council in due course.</p>	<p>8 June 2004</p> <p>Director Infrastructure and Operations</p>
<p>A 37-signature petition has been received from Warwick residents calling on the City to investigate ways of curbing unruly traffic behaviour, including speeding vehicles in Ellersdale Avenue.</p> <p>A further 3-signature petition has been received</p> <p>Comment: Letter sent to all residents on 9 August 2004 advising listing of works as part of 04/05 Capital Works Program and seeking comment to proposed concept design.</p> <p>Further advice will be provided once comments have been received from the residents on the proposed traffic treatments.</p>	<p>20 July 2004</p> <p>Director Infrastructure and Operations</p> <p>31 August 2004</p>
<p>A 86-signature petition has been received from Kingsley residents objecting to the proposed four-storey development at Lot 99 (4) Hocking Road, Kingsley.</p> <p>Comment: All submissions to be taken into consideration in assessing the proposal.</p>	<p>10 August 2004</p> <p>A/Director Planning & Community Development</p>
<p>A 623-signature petition has been received requested that the City of Joondalup acknowledges the opposition to the rezoning of Lot 61 Leach Street, Marmion from Local Reserve, Parks and Recreation and rezoning of Local and Regional Reserves for any purpose other than the purpose for which the land is reserved or for a public purpose.</p> <p>Comment: All submissions to be taken into consideration in assessing the proposal.</p>	<p>31 August 2004</p> <p>A/Director Planning & Community Development</p>

<p>A 186-signature petition was requesting that the City of Joondalup take appropriate action to remove the carpark at Plumdale Park, Woodvale, thereby returning safe use of the park, and restoring a peaceful environment, to the law abiding residents of the area.</p> <p>Comment: Letter dated 7/9/04 sent to representative petitioners advising that chain gate was installed at Plumdale Park, Woodvale on 2/9/04 and will be monitored to determine its effectiveness.</p>	<p>31 August 2004</p> <p>Director Infrastructure & Operations</p>
---	---

REPORTS/PRESENTATIONS REQUESTED BY COMMISSIONERS

	DATE OF REQUEST - REFERRED TO -
<p>Youth Affairs Advisory Committee</p> <p>Cmr Smith requested that the formation of this Committee be referred to a future Strategy Session.</p> <p>Comment: A report was presented to the Strategy Session held on 7 September 2004. This item may therefore be removed from the agenda.</p>	<p>17 February 2004</p> <p>Office of the CEO/Director Planning and Community Development</p>
<p>Cmr Smith requested that the following comment, from the Minutes of the Sustainability Advisory Committee meeting held on 29 April 2004, be taken into consideration within the proposed review of the Policy Manual:</p> <p><i>“General Business</i></p> <p><i>Mr Carstairs indicated that it was important to ensure that sustainability issues are embedded into Council policy during the next 12 months to ensure ongoing sustainable outcomes in the City. Mr Carstairs believes that it is important to identify targets, outcomes and timeframes to implement these to ensure the best sustainability outcomes in the future.”</i></p>	<p>11 May 2004</p> <p>Office of the CEO/Strategic and Sustainable Development</p>
<p>Selection Committee for a Chief Executive Officer</p> <p>Cmr Smith raised concern that the current committee name might give reason for the role and responsibility of the Committee to be misunderstood, and it was requested that a report be submitted to Council to rename the Committee to “Advisory Committee for the Selection of a Chief Executive Officer”.</p> <p>Comment: A report will be submitted in due course.</p>	<p>8 July 2004</p>