



City of
Joondalup

DRAFT AGENDA

FOR

BRIEFING SESSION

TUESDAY, 15 FEBRUARY 2005

GARRY HUNT
Chief Executive Officer
11 February 2005

BRIEFING SESSIONS

The following procedures relating to the conduct of Briefing Sessions were adopted at the Council meeting 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 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

Council 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, 15 FEBRUARY 2005 commencing at 6.30 pm

ORDER OF BUSINESS

1 OPEN AND WELCOME

2 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

The following questions were submitted by Mr V Cusack, Kingsley to the Briefing Session held on 7 December 2004:

I refer Council to the following questions I asked on 19 August 2004:

Q1 Why was the apparently more expensive LandCorp site chosen over the quarry site in Edgewater?

A1 The previous Council considered a number of locations, Edgewater being one of them. It is understood that the Edgewater quarry is not zoned for use as a depot. The previous Council also took into consideration the views of the surrounding residents who have a strong affinity with the area in question, and the expectation is that ultimately it will become a recreation area.

Q2 What would the costs be to construct the Works Depot at the Edgewater quarry site?

A2 The City has not undertaken any costings for this option, as the Council did not make a decision in this regard.

Q3 Is the City by way of a contract legally locked into the LandCorp Depot site, and if the Commissioners decided to opt out in favour of Edgewater or some other site, would there be a financial loss to the City; and if yes, how much?

A3 The administration is currently preparing information which will be presented to Commissioners. A Business Plan was advertised in The West Australian on Tuesday, 10 August 2004 for public comment and this is a pre-requisite to the purchase of the site.

And again, questions I asked which were taken on notice on 10 August 2004 and answered (sic) on 31 August 2004.

Q1 How many "Closed Doors Secret Strategy Session Meetings" (as per Council's three weekly cycle meeting schedule) was the proposed new works depot discussed at?

- A1 The proposed new Works Depot was discussed at two Strategy Sessions.
- Q2 *Why was the apparently more expensive Land Corp site chosen over the Quarry Site as owned by the City of Joondalup in Edgewater?*
- Q3 *Presumably, and as expected under governmental best practice standards, all options would have been fully explored; what is the total dollar cost of constructing the works depot at the Edgewater quarry site?*
- A2-3 The City's position on the Quarry site is covered in confidential items relating to the acquisition of a site for the purpose of constructing a Works Depot. A report recommending the release of these previously confidential items has been prepared for the consideration of Council.

Notwithstanding, these questions were addressed at the Special Council meeting to adopt the budget on Thursday 19 August 2004.

In light of the above and report No 1 Site Acquisition - Works Depot – [80513] in tonight's Briefing Session Agenda, I am yet to be convinced that the City gave the Edgewater quarry site adequate consideration as a potential depot site.

Q1 *Can Council please provide a detailed list that clearly outlines precisely what action/investigation was taken by way of fully exploring the Edgewater quarry site?*

A1 Australian Property Consultants identified the Quarry site Edgewater as a potential site within the City of Joondalup in its report to the City dated 14 December 2001. The City Depot Site Committee also considered the site at its meeting and site tour of 8 February 2002.

Q2 *Did that action include the surveying of residents in the area to ascertain support or opposition to the Edgewater depot site? If not, why not? If yes, what was the level and extent of community consultation?*

A2 No. Residents were not surveyed as the quarry site, Edgewater was not selected as a preferred site by Council.

Q3 *I refer to the following quote by Australian Property Consultants in tonight's agenda:*

"The quarry site is a possibility however would require City of Joondalup to go through a formal rezoning process including community consultation and Western Australian Planning Commission approvals. The likelihood of achieving a rezoning from parks and recreation in our experience is highly unlikely, however, the final decision rests with the Western Australian Planning Commission. As requested we have confirmed that crown land can be transferred to City of Joondalup however it has to be purchased at current unimproved market value."

(a) *Is the reason for the City "not undertaken any costings" for the Edgewater Quarry Option, based on the simple assumption that it 'may be difficult to achieve the required rezoning'?*

A3(a) As has previously been advised, the City has not undertaken any costings for this option as the Council did not make a decision in this regard.

Q3(b) Is the assumption of 'difficult to achieve' based on the premise/experience of trying to rezone an existing park or recreational site, rather than an 'ugly unused quarry site'?

A3(b) No.

Q3(c) What preliminary investigations were undertaken to rezone the quarry site?

A3(c) Information on the process required to rezone a site was provided to the City Depot Site Committee as part of a briefing on all sites under consideration by the Committee on 8 February 2002.

Q4 Is the City by way of a contract legally locked into the LandCorp Depot site, and if the Commissioners decided to opt out in favour of Edgewater or some other site, would there be a financial loss to the City; and if yes, how much?

A4 The City is not legally bound to the LandCorp Hodges Drive site. However, if the Commissioners decided not to pursue with the site, the financial loss to the City would be in delaying the commencement of construction of a new works depot and lost consultancy fees from site-specific work. This would amount to approximately \$150,000 in consultancy fees, as well as cost escalation of the project, which in the last financial year was 14% and the next financial year estimated at 9%.

Q5 If the City could avoid purchasing the LandCorp Depot site by selecting (what appears to be a more suitable technical site that includes natural sound barriers; good location; easy vehicular access, and limited if any residential impacts) the Edgewater Quarry site, or some other; would this prevent the City going into deficit for the first time ever to the tune of \$3 million? If not why not?

A5 It is not possible to provide a definitive answer as an alternative site has not been costed.

The following questions were submitted by Mr M Caiacob, Mullaloo to the Briefing Session held on 7 December 2004:

Re: Item 1 – Works Depot

Q1 Considering the amended Structure Plan for the JCCDPM South has not yet been finalised in order to permit the siting of the municipal works depot, is it premature to authorise purchase of the said land, when the current zoning would not permit the land usage of a works depot?

A1 I am not sure the current zoning would not permit a works depot. The Structure Plan is under way now and I do not believe it is premature to start the process.

Q2 Could I please be advised what assessment criteria are used to judge public submissions and how the relevance of any submissions is incorporated in the report.

A2 It is my understanding that all submissions that were made are answered on their individual merits and responses have been provided in the report this evening.

The following questions were submitted by Ms S Hart, Greenwood to the Briefing Session held on 7 December 2004:

Q1 My questions regarding Meath Care in relation to closing submissions were given to one of the staff. I have still not received an answer.

A1 These will be provided.

Q2 Re: Network City – I looked at the City’s submission on the website and at 2.40 pm it had disappeared. Has the City received our application for a Special Electors meeting?

A2 The request was received by the City today. In accordance with the Local Government Act, the meeting is required to be held within 35 days, which will be between now and 11 January 2005.

Q3 Commissioner Paterson indicated Commissioners would hold the Special Electors meeting prior to any Council decision being made. Will the City hold the meeting prior to next Tuesday.

A3 Commissioners will deal with this issue next Tuesday evening, 14 December 2004.

The following questions was submitted by Mr M Sideris, Mullaloo to the Briefing Session held on 7 December 2004:

Q1 I submitted questions in relation to Item 11 – CJ286-11/04 and resubmitted those questions which, I understand, will be taken on notice. When will I receive a response to those questions and will the response to those questions be put before Commissioners?

A1 The questions relate to Item 31 - Tender Number 024-04/05 - Supply & Delivery of one Eight Cubic Metre Refuse Truck With / Without Trade- In and Disposal of one Used Refuse Truck. The responses to queries from Mr Sideris will be put into his submission and provided to Commissioners. The City will respond to Mr Sideris in the next couple of days.

3 DEPUTATIONS

4 APOLOGIES AND LEAVE OF ABSENCE

5 DECLARATIONS OF FINANCIAL INTEREST/INTEREST THAT MAY AFFECT IMPARTIALITY

Comr Clough stated his intention to declare a financial interest in Item 4 – Proposed Joondalup Shuttle Bus as he is a consultant for the Joondalup Health Campus, one of the supporters of the shuttle bus.

6 REPORTS

ITEM 1	SPECIAL MEETING OF ELECTORS HELD 11 JANUARY 2005 – [75029] [22548] [10400] ..	1
ITEM 2	MINUTES OF THE SELECTION COMMITTEE FOR A CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER – [20006]	15
ITEM 3	2005/06 BUSINESS & COMMUNITY DIRECTORY - JOONDALUP BUSINESS ASSOCIATION – [03082] [00004]	17
ITEM 4	PROPOSED JOONDALUP SHUTTLE BUS – [56564]	26
ITEM 5	MINUTES OF CBD ENHANCEMENT PROJECT STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING – 19 JANUARY 2005 – [53469]	36
ITEM 6	FINANCIAL REPORT FOR THE PERIOD ENDING 30 NOVEMBER 2004 – [07882]	39
ITEM 7	FINANCIAL REPORT FOR THE PERIOD ENDING 31 DECEMBER 2004 – [07882]	41
ITEM 8	WARRANT OF PAYMENTS 30 NOVEMBER 2004 – [09882]	43
ITEM 9	WARRANT OF PAYMENTS 31 DECEMBER 2004 – [09882]	46
ITEM 10	TENDER NUMBER 025-04/05 SUPPLY AND DELIVERY OF SIX 2WD RIDE-ON ROTARY MOWERS WITH/WITHOUT TRADE-IN AND DISPOSAL OF TWO USED MOWERS – [86566]	48
ITEM 11	GROUPED DWELLINGS – THIRTEEN (13) SINGLE BEDROOM DWELLINGS (TWO STOREY) ON LOT 743 (79A-79B) ADMIRAL GROVE, HEATHRIDGE – [00653]	51
ITEM 12	DELEGATED AUTHORITY REPORT FOR THE MONTHS OF NOVEMBER AND DECEMBER 2004 – [07032]	57
ITEM 13	SUBDIVISION REFERRALS PROCESSED 1 NOVEMBER – 31 DECEMBER 2004 - [05961]	58
ITEM 14	ART COLLECTION PURCHASES – [14158]	60
ITEM 15	MINUTES OF THE SENIORS INTERESTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETINGS HELD ON 17 NOVEMBER AND 15 DECEMBER 2004 – [55511]	64
ITEM 16	AMENDMENT OF RESOLUTION MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT LOT 517 (91) REID PROMENADE JOONDALUP – [89530]	66
ITEM 17	MIXED USE COMMERCIAL & RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT: LOT 510 (69) GRAND BOULEVARD, JOONDALUP – [19436]	68
ITEM 18	PURPOSE BUILT SPECIAL CARE FACILITY – KARA EDUCATION CENTRE AT RESERVE 35844 (15) CHESSELL DRIVE, DUNCRAIG – [57094]	77

ITEM 19	FINAL ADOPTION OF BURNS BEACH STRUCTURE PLAN NO.10 – PORTION OF LOT 9017 BURNS BEACH ROAD, BURNS BEACH – [29557]	85
ITEM 20	RECONSIDERATION OF CONDITION OF DEVELOPMENT APPROVAL: LOT 2 (160B) WATERFORD DRIVE, HILLARYS – [43516]	96
ITEM 21	AMENDMENT TO RESERVE 27732 (LOCATION 14623) AND RESERVE 47851 (LOCATION 15444), WEST COAST DRIVE, SORRENTO AND INCLUSION OF UNALLOCATED CROWN LAND (141) WEST COAST DRIVE, SORRENTO INTO RESERVE 47831 – [05071]	104
ITEM 22	PROPOSED RECORDING STUDIO (CHANGE OF USE TO USE NOT LISTED): LOT 54 (21) DELAGE STREET, JOONDALUP – [58561]	109
ITEM 23	PROPOSED SINGLE HOUSE (RETROSPECTIVE APPROVAL FOR PATIO WITH SIDE SETBACK AND BUILDING HEIGHT ENVELOPE VARIATIONS): LOT 785 (10) HAYNES ROAD, SORRENTO – [14991].....	115

7 REPORT OF THE 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 SPECIAL MEETING OF ELECTORS HELD 11 JANUARY 2005 – [75029] [22548] [10400]

WARD - All

PURPOSE

For Council to note the Minutes of the Special Meeting of Electors held on Tuesday 11 January 2005 and to give consideration to the resolutions passed at that meeting.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

As requested by the electors of the City of Joondalup, a special meeting of electors was held on 11 January 2005 to discuss issues relating to Network City and Liveable Neighbourhoods.

In accordance with the Local Government Act 1995, any decisions made at a special meeting of electors are required to be considered by the Council at either an ordinary or special meeting of the Council.

BACKGROUND

A Special Meeting of Electors was called following receipt of a 106-signature petition from residents of the City of Joondalup. The details of the matters to be discussed at the special meeting were:

- Network City – community planning strategy for Perth and Peel. What it means to every suburb in the City of Joondalup;
- Liveable Neighbourhoods – what it means to every suburb in the City of Joondalup;
- Community workshops funded by the State Government, when will these happen?
- The City of Joondalup's response and submission to the State Government on behalf of ratepayers, regarding Network City and Liveable Neighbourhood;
- Any other matter raised from the floor.

DETAILS

In accordance with the provisions of the Local Government Act 1995, a Special Meeting of Electors was held on 11 January 2005 to discuss issues relating to Network City and Liveable Neighbourhoods.

There were approximately 95 members of the public in attendance. The minutes of the meeting are attached - Appendix 1 refers.

The 17 resolutions passed at the meeting are set out below in *italics*, followed by a comment and suggested course of action as to how each matter should be dealt with.

Electors' Resolution No 1

MOVED Michael Caiacob, 7 Rowan Place, Mullaloo, SECONDED Allison Walker, 27 Sweeney Way, Padbury that the City further add to its Network City submission to the Western Australian Planning Commission (WAPC) by:

- 1 including a copy of the transcript of this meeting;*
- 2 indicating that ratepayers of the City of Joondalup support the City's concerns expressed with regards to the lack of community consultation with their communities over the Network City strategy, the lack of detail provided in the documents, and the effects to the planning status quo of the existing residential areas.*

The Motion was Put and

CARRIED

Officer's Comment

The minutes of the Special Electors Meeting have been forwarded to the Western Australian Planning Commission to be included with the City's previous submission. The correspondence to the WAPC also highlighted that the ratepayers in attendance at the meeting passed the above motion.

Recommended Response

It is recommended that Council:

- 1 NOTES that the minutes of the Special Electors Meeting held 11 January 2005 have been forwarded to the Western Australian Planning Commission to be included in the City's previous submission on the Network City strategy document.**
- 2 NOTES that the correspondence sent to the Western Australian Planning Commission highlighted that the meeting passed Motion No 1.**

Electors' Resolution No 2

MOVED Michael Caiacob, 7 Rowan Place, Mullaloo, SECONDED Sue Hart, 32 Pullan Place, Greenwood that the City further add to its Network City submission to the Western Australian Planning Commission (WAPC) by way of acknowledging that many existing landowners in the City of Joondalup have selected the density, amenity, and urban planning surrounding their properties and localities and they have selected these properties by way of informed choice.

The Motion was Put and

CARRIED

Officer's Comment

It is acknowledged that residents select their residence for many different reasons. It is also acknowledged that the way people live has changed and will continue to change, and these choices and lifestyles must also be respected and accommodated.

Recommended Response

It is recommended that Council:

- 1** NOTES that the minutes of the Special Electors Meeting held on 11 January 2005 have been forwarded to the Western Australian Planning Commission to be included in the City's previous submission on the Network City document;
- 2** AGREES that landowners choose their residence for many different reasons, and good planning will continue to provide lifestyle and housing choices, transport links, and community and business development for the benefit of all the community in a sustainable manner.

Electors' Resolution No 3

MOVED sue hart, 32 Pullan Place, Greenwood, SECONDED Ken Zakrevsky, 49 Korella Street, Mullaloo that the City of Joondalup be commended for accepting that the consultation undertaken by the State Government is less than adequate; .0774% of the community from Perth to Peel was totally inadequate for such a monumental project.

The Motion was Put and

CARRIED

Officer Response:

As outlined in the City's submission on the Network City strategy, it is strongly recommended that additional consultation must be carried out with the community in order to consider the aspirations and views of the local community.

Recommended Response

It is recommended that Council NOTES the motion expressing commendation to the City of Joondalup in regard to its position on community consultation in relation to the Network City strategy document.

Electors' Resolution No 4

MOVED Sue Hart, 32 Pullan Place, Greenwood, SECONDED Allyn Bryant, 6b Stocker Court, Craigie that the City of Joondalup are open, honest and accountable to all ratepayers in the City by way of information and the big picture and advise us fully of any similar ideas and/or concepts associated with Network City or the like.

The Motion was Put and

CARRIED

Officer's Comment

Following assessment of the submissions made during the public comment period, should the Western Australian Planning Commission proceed with the Network City strategy, the City will ensure that the community is informed and involved in any proposals related to the Network Strategy

Recommended Response

It is recommended that Council AGREES that, should the Network City Strategy be adopted by the Western Australian Planning Commission, the City of Joondalup will inform and involve the community in proposals related to the implementation of the Network City strategy.

Electors' Resolution No 5

MOVED Sue Hart, 32 Pullan Place, Greenwood, SECONDED Don Carlos, 45 Swanson Way, Ocean Reef that a detailed, comprehensive community consultation policy be developed and advertised for 60 days. At the time staff consult with the community, the community's concerns and issues raised are recorded in reports to Council and Commissioners without editing or omission.

The Motion was Put and

CARRIED

Officer's Comment

Council has an endorsed Policy 2.6.3 Public Participation and is in the process of developing a strategy that provides guidance to staff when undertaking public participation and community consultation projects. It is anticipated the strategy and guidelines will be presented to Council for endorsement in early 2005.

Recommended Response

It is recommended that Council NOTES the motion and considers endorsement of the public participation strategy and consulting citizen's guidelines upon their ascent to Council.

Electors' Resolution No 6

MOVED Sue Hart, 32 Pullan Place, Greenwood, SECONDED Lyn Chilby, 4 Erica Court, Greenwood that the City of Joondalup accept and acknowledge that some aspects of Network City are dictatorial and paternalistic and we accept nothing less from the staff and the City than to protect our choices, our public open space, our amenity, and our lifestyle choices wholly.

The Motion was Put and

CARRIED

Officer's Comment

It is agreed that the choices and lifestyles of all the community should be protected and enhanced wherever possible. It is important to acknowledge that there are many views within a community and there is not one view on what constitutes amenity or lifestyle. It is agreed that the City of Joondalup residents should have choices. It must also be acknowledged that today's choices have ramifications on the lifestyles and choices of future generations, particularly in regard to the sustainability of the growth in the Perth area. In order to protect amenity in the future important decisions must be made in regard to the future growth in the Perth area.

Recommended Response

It is recommended that Council AGREES that public open space, amenity and lifestyle choices are important, and that sustainable decisions must be made to protect the choices and lifestyles of the existing and coming generations.

Electors' Resolution No 7

MOVED Monique Moon, 6 Carew Place, Greenwood, SECONDED Sue Hart, 32 Pullan Place, Greenwood that extensive community consultation is carried out in each municipality to ensure communities are aware of the implementation intent of Network City, and what it means for their areas; identify clearly through consultation:

- 1 each existing and proposed activity centre, activity road and transport road;*
- 2 what land uses can be expected to occur in each of the various sizes of activity centres from the local size to the regional size and activity roads and indicate in the strategy the hierarchy of these activity centres;*
- 3 identify what and how changes to existing residential, urban, and net residential densities will occur;*
- 4 ensure consultation occurs on this strategy to make the process accountable, open and honest.*

The Motion was Put and

CARRIED

Officer's Comment

As expressed in the submission to the Western Australian Planning Commission, the City of Joondalup expects that the Western Australian Planning Commission will ensure that 'local dialogue' will occur with the community.

Recommended Response

It is recommended that Council NOTES that the City as part of the submission to the Western Australian Planning Commission has expressed that it is expected and essential that 'local dialogues' will occur with the community in regard to the implementation of the Network City Strategy.

Electors' Resolution No 8

MOVED Monique Moon, 6 Carew Place, Greenwood, SECONDED Sue Hart, 32 Pullan Place, Greenwood that the State Government identifies what changes would need to occur to the Metropolitan Region Scheme, the Town Planning Schemes, 5AA State policies and planning framework prior to endorsing the Network City strategy. It is too late after the strategy is endorsed for communities to have input into the location of centres, the desirability for higher densities or changes to quiet streets becoming feeder roads, changes to open space and to voice environmental concerns not identified in this strategy.

The Motion was Put and

CARRIED

Officer's Comment

As previously indicated, the City has expressed in its submission to the Western Australian Planning Commission, that it is expected and essential that the Western Australian Planning Commission will ensure that 'local dialogue' will occur with the community

Recommended Response

It is recommended that Council:

- 1 NOTES that the minutes of the Special Electors Meeting held 11 January 2005 have been forwarded to the Western Australian Planning Commission to be included in the City's previous submission on the Network City strategy document.**
- 2 NOTES that the City as part of the submission to the Western Australian Planning Commission has expressed that it is expected and essential that 'local dialogues' will occur with the community in regard to the implementation of the Network City Strategy.**

Electors' Resolution No 9

MOVED Monique Moon, 6 Carew Place, Greenwood, SECONDED Allison Walker, 27 Sweeney Way, Padbury that where it is stated in the Strategy to provide a City plan that will be implemented and it states "will provide certainty and deliberate results" it ensures certainty for the community, just not reasonable certainty as stated under the title. What is reasonable certainty, reasonable to whom?

The Motion was Put and

CARRIED

Officer's Comment

The statements within the document have been drafted by the Western Australian Planning Commission and it is therefore not possible to state with accuracy what is meant by reasonable certainty, however it is appropriate to conclude that 'reasonable certainty' relates to all stakeholders and is intended to ensure a clear approach to accommodating future growth in Perth is established.

Recommended Response

It is recommended that Council SUPPORTS the concept of the Network City strategy providing certainty in the approach to planning for the future of Perth

Electors' Resolution No 10

MOVED Marilyn Zakrevsky, 49 Korella Street, Mullaloo SECONDED Ken Zakrevsky, 49 Korella Street, Mullaloo that the sentiments of all speakers at the Special Meeting of Electors be given consideration and included in the City of Joondalup's submission on Network City.

The Motion was Put and

CARRIED

Officer's Comment

The sentiments of the meeting are contained in the minutes of the Special Meeting, and have been forwarded to the Western Australian Planning Commission for inclusion in the City's submission

Recommended Response

It is recommended that Council NOTES that the minutes of the Special Electors Meeting held 11 January 2005 have been forwarded to the Western Australian Planning Commission to be included in the City's previous submission on the Network City strategy document.

Electors' Resolution No 11

MOVED M Macdonald, 5 Mair Place, Mullaloo, SECONDED Sue Hart, 32 Pullan Place, Greenwood that we request that the City informs the State Government that the ratepayers of the City of Joondalup require more certainty with respect to the maintenance of their lifestyle and property values than Liveable Neighbourhood Policy 3 document will provide, and request that the document contain a clause to allow ratepayers a third party right of appeal with respect to future development approvals.

The Motion was Put and

CARRIED

Officer's Comment

The issue of appeal rights is not specific to the Liveable Neighbourhoods document and it would not be appropriate that the document contain such a clause. Appeal rights are determined by the State Government under separate legislation. The motion will be forwarded to the Western Australian Planning Commission as part of the minutes of the Special Meeting.

Recommended Response

It is recommended that Council NOTES that the minutes of the Special Electors Meeting held 11 January 2005 have been forwarded to the Western Australian Planning Commission to be included in the City's previous submission on the Network City strategy document.

Electors' Resolution No 12

MOVED Cheryl Edwardes, 8 Nadine Place, Woodvale SECONDED Allison Walker, 27 Sweeney Way, Padbury that the Commissioners of the City of Joondalup advise the State Government that the ratepayers of the City of Joondalup:

- 1 have already voted overwhelmingly against any form of precinct planning that could threaten their current lifestyles;*
- 2 do not want to see open spaces lost forever;*
- 3 have already overwhelmingly rejected the concept of high density living in their area and any change to lifestyle should provide genuine choice and from the community up, not imposed by the State Government down.*

The Motion was Put and

CARRIED

Officer's Comment

It is noted the Precinct Planning only occurred in a small number of suburbs, and was not a City wide exercise. The Network City strategy is a strategic document and is not a blanket formula to be used across all suburbs. It is agreed that further consultation must be undertaken with the community before the local strategies are implemented.

Recommended Response

It is recommended that Council NOTES that the minutes of the Special Electors Meeting held 11 January 2005 have been forwarded to the Western Australian Planning Commission to be included in the City's previous submission on the Network City strategy document.

Electors' Resolution No 13

MOVED Sue Hart, 32 Pullan Place, Greenwood SECONDED Allyn Bryant, 6B Stocker Court, Craigie that the City of Joondalup seriously considers developments and rezoning applications along the coastline as was discussed at the workshop for Tourism to keep the status quo and to show nature at its best to the rest of the world.

The Motion was Put and

CARRIED

Officer's Comment

It is acknowledged that the coastline is an important asset to the City of Joondalup residents, and residents of Perth. All development proposals and rezoning proposals are seriously considered on their particular merits and location, and the possible impacts on the coastal environment.

Recommended Response

It is recommended that Council AGREES that the coastline is an important asset to the Joondalup community and Perth residents in general, and all rezoning and development proposals are and will be seriously considered in regard to the possible impacts on the coastline.

Electors' Resolution No 14

MOVED Ken Zakrevsky, 49 Korella Street, Mullaloo SECONDED Allison Walker, 27 Sweeney Way, Padbury that everything that is brought up by the community is given serious attention and not just "noted".

The Motion was Put and

CARRIED

Officer's Comment

All matters raised by the community are given appropriate attention, and recommendations are made to the Council on appropriate action where necessary.

Recommended Response

It is recommended that Council SUPPORTS and ACKNOWLEDGES that issues raised by the community are given serious attention, and recommendations are made to the Council where necessary.

Electors' Resolution No 15

MOVED Katherine Woodmass, 25 Calbourne Way, Kingsley SECONDED Allison Walker, 27 Sweeney Way, Padbury that the Joint Commissioners prove that they are listening to the community by putting a motion to rescind the approval of the Meath Care facility until the impact of the excavations on the wetland and the surrounding areas is fully understood.

The Motion was Put and

CARRIED

Officer's Comment

Whilst the development approval for the Meath Aged Care Facility has been issued by the City of Joondalup, processes were in place to consider the impact of excavations on the wetland, prior to determination of the application by the Council. This included consideration of the risk of acid sulphate soils at the rezoning stage, self-assessment of the risk at the development approval stage (refer to www.planing.wa.gov.au - Planning Bulletin No. 64 Acid Sulphate Soils) and comments from the Department of Environment (DOE) specifically in relation to the development application and proposed excavation works. It was considered that the risk in relation to the development of the site through excavation and the risk of disturbing acid sulphate soils would be minimal.

An undertaking has been given by the applicants that:

- (a) further bore hole testing will occur to confirm the water table level in relation to the proposed excavation works;
- (b) a minimum clearance of 0.5 m will occur between the highest recorded water table level taken during the testing and the basement level; and
- (c) during excavation or construction, if the water table is encountered, work will cease until an acid sulphate management plan is approved by the DoE.

There is no opportunity to revoke the Council's resolution as approval has already been issued.

Recommended Response

That Council NOTES that the City is satisfied with the additional advice from the Department of Environment in relation to the issue of acid sulphate soils in regards to the Aged Care Facility Site, Hocking Road Kingsley.

Electors' Resolution No 16

MOVED Katherine Woodmass, 25 Calbourne Way, Kingsley SECONDED Sue Hart, 32 Pullan Place, Greenwood that the Strategy Sessions which currently occur behind closed doors become an open session so that the City's residents can know exactly what is going on.

The Motion was Put and

CARRIED

Officer's Comment

The strategy sessions have been established for some time and allow elected members and officers to discuss issues of a strategic nature. The strategic sessions allows for a more conducive environment for elected members and officers to discuss matters and generally officers an environment which can improve the working relationship between the two parties. No decisions or debate occurs at such sessions, it is an exchange of information sharing and gathering. The Council has introduced revised guidelines for the strategy sessions.

Recommended Response

It is recommended that Council CONTINUES to operate the current decision making process

Electors' Resolution No 17

MOVED Beth Van Der Linden, 35 Barridale Drive, Kingsley, SECONDED Sue Hart, 32 Pullan Place, Greenwood that the green areas and trees be retained, keeping commercial areas separate to living areas, with living areas being accessible for healthy living and not for money-making ventures.

The Motion was Put and

CARRIED

Officer's Comment

Financial considerations (money-making ventures) are not part of the considerations in regard to planning related decisions. The draft Network City document is not a blanket statement attempting to remove green areas or integrate commercial activities into residential areas. It is considered, however, that facilities such as schools, child care facilities, doctors' surgeries are suitable to be appropriately located in residential areas to serve the local community.

Recommended Response

It is recommended that Council ACKNOWLEDGES that the draft Network City strategy is not a blanket statement about removing green areas or integrating commercial areas into residential areas.

Statutory Provision:

Decisions made by electors at an Electors' Meeting are the recommendations of those electors present, on the matters discussed and considered at the meeting. As with recommendations made at Council committee meetings, they are not binding on the Council. However, the Council must consider them.

Section 5.33 of the Local Government Act 1995 detailed below covers this matter:

Decisions made at Electors' Meetings

- 5.33 (1) All decisions made at an Electors' Meeting are to be considered by the Council at the next ordinary council meeting or, if this is not practicable –

- (a) at the first ordinary council meeting after that meeting; or
 - (b) at a special meeting called for that purpose,
- whichever happens first.
- (2) If at a meeting of the Council a local government makes a decision in response to a decision made at an Electors' Meeting, the reasons for the decision are to be recorded in the minutes of the Council Meeting.

COMMENT

Motions carried at the Special Meeting of Electors have been addressed individually and are submitted to the Council for consideration.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 Minutes of the Special Meeting of Electors held on 11 January 2005

VOTING REQUIREMENTS

Simple majority

RECOMMENDATION

That Council:

- 1 NOTES the minutes of the Special Meeting of Electors held on 11 January 2005 forming Attachment 1 to this Report;**
- 2 in relation to Motions 1, 2, 8, 10, 11 and 12 of the Special Meeting of Electors held on 11 January 2005 NOTES that the minutes of the Special Electors Meeting held 11 January 2005 have been forwarded to the Western Australian Planning Commission to be included in the City's previous submission on the Network City strategy document;**
- 3 in relation to Motion 1 of the Special Meeting of Electors held on 11 January 2005, NOTES that the correspondence sent to the Western Australian Planning Commission highlighted that the meeting passed Motion No 1;**
- 4 in relation to Motion 2 of the Special Meeting of Electors held on 11 January 2005 AGREES that landowners choose their residence for many different reasons, and good planning will continue to provide lifestyle and housing choices, transport links, and community and business development for the benefit of all the community in a sustainable manner;**

- 5 in relation to Motion 3 of the Special Meeting of Electors held on 11 January 2005 NOTES the motion expressing commendation to the City of Joondalup in regard to its position on community consultation in relation to the Network City strategy document;
- 6 in relation to Motion 4 of the Special Meeting of Electors held on 11 January 2005 AGREES that, should the Network City Strategy be adopted by the Western Australian Planning Commission, the City of Joondalup will inform and involve the community in proposals related to the implementation of the Network City strategy;
- 7 in relation to Motion 5 of the Special Meeting of Electors held on 11 January 2005 NOTES the motion and considers endorsement of the public participation strategy and consulting citizen's guidelines upon their ascent to Council;
- 8 in relation to Motion 6 of the Special Meeting of Electors held on 11 January 2005 AGREES that public open space, amenity and lifestyle choices are important, and that sustainable decisions must be made to protect the choices and lifestyles of the existing and coming generations;
- 9 in relation to Motion 7 of the Special Meeting of Electors held on 11 January 2005 NOTES that the City as part of the submission to the Western Australian Planning Commission has expressed that it is expected and essential that 'local dialogues' will occur with the community in regard to the implementation of the Network City Strategy;
- 10 in relation to Motion 8 of the Special Meeting of Electors held on 11 January 2005 NOTES that the City as part of the submission to the Western Australian Planning Commission has expressed that it is expected and essential that 'local dialogues' will occur with the community in regard to the implementation of the Network City Strategy;
- 11 in relation to Motion 9 of the Special Meeting of Electors held on 11 January 2005 SUPPORTS the concept of the Network City strategy providing certainty in the approach to planning for the future of Perth;
- 12 in relation to Motion 13 of the Special Meeting of Electors held on 11 January 2005 AGREES that the coastline is an important asset to the Joondalup community and Perth residents in general, and all rezoning and development proposals are and will be seriously considered in regard to the possible impacts on the coastline;
- 13 in relation to Motion 14 of the Special Meeting of Electors held on 11 January 2005 SUPPORTS and ACKNOWLEDGES that issues raised by the community are given serious attention, and recommendations are made to the Council where necessary;
- 14 in relation to Motion 15 of the Special Meeting of Electors held on 11 January 2005 NOTES that the City is satisfied with the additional advice from the Department of Environment in relation to the issue of acid sulphate soils in regards to the Aged Care Facility Site, Hocking Road Kingsley;

- 15 in relation to Motion 16 of the Special Meeting of Electors held on 11 January 2005 CONTINUES to operate the current decision making process;**
- 16 in relation to Motion 17 of the Special Meeting of Electors held on 11 January 2005 ACKNOWLEDGES that the draft Network City strategy is not a blanket statement about removing green areas or integrating commercial areas into residential areas.**

Appendix 1 refers.

To access this attachment on electronic document, click here: [Attach1brf150205.pdf](#)

V:\Reports\2005\special electors report 11 jan 2005.doc

ITEM 2 MINUTES OF THE SELECTION COMMITTEE FOR A CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER – [2006]

WARD - All

PURPOSE

For Council to note the minutes of meetings of the Selection Committee for a Chief Executive Officer.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Minutes of meetings of the Selection Committee for a Chief Executive Officer are submitted for noting. It is recommended that Council disbands the Selection Committee now that its role is complete.

BACKGROUND

At its meeting held on 8 June 2004 (Item CJ133-06/04 refers), Council established a Selection Committee for the recruitment and selection of a new Chief Executive Officer, comprising:

Commissioner J Paterson
Commissioner M Anderson
Commissioner P Clough
Commissioner S Smith
Commissioner A Fox

DETAILS

Meetings of the Selection Committee for a Chief Executive Officer were held on:

- 8 July 2004
- 21 September 2004
- 14 October 2004
- 1 December 2004; 7 December 2004; 21 December 2004; 6 January 2005, 7 January 2005; 17 January 2005 and 21 January 2005.

The minutes of these committee meetings are attached for noting – Attachment 1 refers.

COMMENT

At the Special Meeting of Council held on 21 January 2005 (Item C2-01/05 refers) Council appointed Mr Garry Hunt as the Chief Executive Officer for the City of Joondalup for a maximum period of five years. As the Selection Committee has completed its role, it is recommended that it now be disbanded.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 Minutes of meetings of the Selection Committee for a Chief Executive Officer held on:

- 8 July 2004
- 21 September 2004
- 14 October 2004
- 1 December 2004; 7 December 2004; 21 December 2004; 6 January 2005, 7 January 2005; 17 January 2005 and 21 January 2005.

VOTING REQUIREMENTS

Absolute majority.

RECOMMENDATION

That Council:

- 1 NOTES the following minutes of the meetings of the Selection Committee for a Chief Executive Officer, forming Attachment 1 to this Report:**
 - (a) confirmed minutes of 8 July 2004;**
 - (b) confirmed minutes of 21 September 2004;**
 - (c) confirmed minutes of 14 October 2004;**
 - (d) unconfirmed minutes of 1 December 2004; 7 December 2004; 21 December 2004; 6 January 2005, 7 January 2005; 17 January 2005 and 21 January 2005;**
- 2 BY AN ABSOLUTE MAJORITY, DISBANDS the Selection Committee for a Chief Executive Officer.**

Appendix 3 refers.

To access this attachment on electronic document, click here: [Attach3brf150205.pdf](#)

ITEM 3 2005/06 BUSINESS & COMMUNITY DIRECTORY - JOONDALUP BUSINESS ASSOCIATION – [03082] [00004]

WARD - All

PURPOSE

For Council to give consideration to supporting the production of the 2005/06 Business & Community Directory with the Joondalup Business Association.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Joondalup Business Association (JBA) has advised the City that it has commenced the process for the publication of the 2005/06 Business & Community Directory. It has requested that the City contributes \$50,000 plus GST to the project.

In 2000 the City produced its own Community Directory for the cost of \$32,000. In 2001 the Council resolved not to continue with the production of its own publication and contribute the funds towards the production of a business and community directory to be produced by the JBA.

The JBA has advised that for a financial contribution of \$50,000 the City would receive the following:

- Welcome page;
- 19 pages for listing Council services;
- 9 pages for Community listings;
- 10 pages for maps of the City; and
- Front and inside covers.

This year's request for funding is an increase of \$10,000 to that contributed by the City to last year's publication.

Market research conducted in late 2003, immediately following the distribution of that year's directory, revealed that the publication was a desired product for the community. However it appears that the number of businesses advertising in the directory has been declining since its inception in 2001.

The City has a number of options available to it: -

- Agree to support the directory to an amount of \$40,000 (as per last year) with certain conditions embracing the principles of previous decisions;
- Agree to an amount of \$20,000 with certain conditions as per above. This option is based on the fact that this will be the fifth year the directory has been produced and it could be assumed that the initial funding was to establish the product and now it should be self funding;
- Endorse the concept of the directory and advertise to an amount of \$10,000 and the City produces its own community directory;

- Underwrite any losses to the publication to an amount of \$40,000 but still be entitled to advertising space which will strengthen the product;
- Not support the business and community directory proposal and examine options for communicating the relevant community based information;
- Agree to the proposal as submitted by the JBA.

The publication has been running for a few years and it could be assumed that the publication should be making a profit for the JBA but indications from it is that is making a loss on the product.

It is therefore recommended that the City supports the production of the 2005/06 Business & Community Directory to an amount of \$40,000 plus GST as per last year subject to a number of conditions.

BACKGROUND

The Joondalup Business Association (JBA) has advised that it has currently commenced the planning for the 2005/06 Business & Community directory and is seeking the support and the involvement of the City of Joondalup. The JBA has requested the City subscribe for its community related advertising space for the amount of \$50,000 plus GST.

The JBA (when it was known as the North West Metro Association) produced a business directory in 1999, which included Council related information at no cost to the City. In 2000, the City produced its own sixteen (16) page Council Services Directory at a cost of \$32,000 and this was distributed to every household.

In March 2001, the JBA approached the City to support a joint venture in producing a combined Business and Community directory. The City at that time agreed to subscribe to the directory to the value of \$32,000 to acquire sixteen (16) pages of Council-related information and agreed to no longer produce its own Council Services Directory.

The City has continued to support the publication since that time with further amounts of \$32,000 for the 2001/02 and 2002/03. The City initially agreed to subscribe to the directory for the 2003/04 year to the amount of \$32,000, but further agreed to increase its contribution by \$6,500 to secure the cover and inside cover of the publication. For the current edition the City subscribed for the relevant advertising to the amount of \$40,000.

For the publication of the 2002/03 Business and Community Directory, the JBA agreed to the following conditions of the funding:

- 1 Agrees to contribute an amount of \$32,000 (plus GST) to the Joondalup Business Association towards the production of the 2002/03 Business and Community Directory only;*
- 2 Advises the Joondalup Business Association that the funding is subject to the City being granted the following for the 2002/03 edition and all future editions of the Business and Community Directory:*
 - (a) allocation of appropriated free space for information pertaining to Council services (currently this would need to be approximately 16 full A4 pages);*

- (b) *two representatives being included on the working party for the production of the Business and Community Directory;*
- (c) *allocation of free editorial space for a joint City of Joondalup Mayoral Message at the front of the Directory.*

This commitment made by the JBA has been used as the basis of future subscriptions by the City to support the publication.

At the meeting of Council held on 2 December 2003, it was resolved as follows:

“That Council AGREES to contribute an amount of \$40,000 (plus GST) to the Joondalup Business Association towards the production of the 2004/05 edition of the Joondalup Business and Community Directory with following terms and conditions:

- 1 the City being allocated appropriate space for information pertaining to Council services (currently this is 16 full A4 pages) with the Community front and inside cover as per 2003/04;*
- 2 the City having two representatives on the working party for the production of the Directory;*
- 3 the City allocated editorial space and photograph for a joint message from the Mayor and JBA President at the front of both sides of the Directory;*
- 4 the JBA commit to continuing to develop and improve the directory’s content and its appeal to a wider audience including identification of new markets and extended distribution channels within the community for the directory;*
- 5 the print-run of the Directory is suitably increased to allow for wider distribution, and for the City to be provided a minimum of 6,500 copies for use in new resident welcome & citizenship packs, libraries, recreation centres and customer service centres, and*
- 6 continued inclusion of Community organisation/groups listings as supplied by the City.”*

The JBA failed to deliver the required extra number of copies of the directory as required by part 5 of the 2 December 2003 resolution of the Council.

DETAILS

The JBA has invited the City to continue its participation for the 2005/06 Business & Community Directory by subscribing for advertising space for an amount of \$50,000 plus GST. For this subscription, the JBA has indicated that the City will receive 39 full colour pages, which includes: -

- Welcome page;
- 19 pages for listing Council services;
- 9 pages for Community listings;
- 10 pages for maps of the City; and
- Front and inside covers.

The City has only ever committed to the required number of pages necessary to communicate the relevant community related information relating to community services. It was never intended to be charged for the provision of maps and community listings. These inclusions have evolved at the request of the JBA to strengthen the publication.

The JBA has advised that at current costs its proposal represents approximately \$80,000 worth of advertising. This would be based on the schedule of fees distributed by the JBA at \$1990 per full-page advertisement. The JBA has indicated the following costings to produce 60,000 copies of the directory: -

2003/04 - Edition

Income

Sale of advertising	\$103,171
---------------------	-----------

Expenditure

Printing	\$89,366
Distribution	\$13,375
Salaries/wages/commission	\$17,699
Miscellaneous	\$3,873

Total Profit (Loss)	(\$21,142)
----------------------------	-------------------

2004/05 – Edition

Income

Sale of advertising	\$140,788
---------------------	-----------

Expenditure

Printing	\$118,029
Stationery	\$1,473
Bank Fees	\$193
Salaries/wages/commission	\$30,104
Advertising	\$33
Telemarketer	\$1,327
Reimbursements/Cancellations	\$1153
Miscellaneous	\$1421

Total Profit (Loss)	(\$12,949)
----------------------------	-------------------

The Options available to the City are as follows: -

Option 1

Provide a financial contribution to the Joondalup Business Association, in accordance with the City's budgeted amount of \$40,000 (plus GST), subject to:

- 1 the City being allocated appropriate space for information pertaining to Council services (currently this is 21 full A4 pages) with the Community front and inside cover as per 2004/05;

- 2 the City having two representatives on the working party for the production of the Directory;
- 3 the City allocated editorial space and photograph for a joint message from the Chairman of Commissioners and JBA President at the front of both sides of the Directory;
- 4 the JBA commit to continuing to develop and improve the directory's content and its appeal to a wider audience including identification of new markets and extended distribution channels within the community for the directory;
- 5 the print-run of the Directory is suitably increased to allow for wider distribution, and for the City to be provided a minimum of 6,500 copies for use in new resident welcome & citizenship packs, libraries, recreation centres and customer service centres, and
- 6 continued inclusion of Community organisation/groups listings as supplied by the City.

Option 2

Provide a reduced financial contribution to the Joondalup Business Association under the above terms, say to the value of \$20,000. Given that this is the fifth year the Directory will be produced, the product has proven to be strong and should therefore be self-funding.

Option 3

The City to endorse the concept of the Directory and provide support in the form of purchasing advertising space in the Directory, for example to the value of \$10,000, to promote the City. The City would then produce its own dedicated Council Services Directory.

Option 4

Underwrite any potential losses to the value of \$40,000. This limits the financial risk for the JBA, if it fails to draw the revenue from the sales of advertisements. The Council would still not produce its own Directory to provide a stronger product for the JBA with which to sell advertisements and maximise the chances of success. In order to enhance the product the City would still request the necessary advertising space to promote the Council services.

Option 5

That the City undertake the production of its own directory and extend an offer to the JBA to put the business listings in the Council Directory free of charge, so providing the JBA with additional benefits for members and as a tool for increasing membership.

Option 6

That the City not agree to support the Business & Community directory as proposed by the JBA and initiate its own dedicated Council Services directory.

Option 7

That the City agrees to the request as proposed by the JBA.

The City has not fully costed the option of producing its own directory, but based on a similar product produced in the year 2000, being an A5 booklet containing Council and Community related information is estimated to cost to print at \$21,315, plus GST (for 60,000 copies). Distribution costs are unknown but it is generally \$3,000 to distribute to ever household in the City of Joondalup. These costs may vary depending on size and weight of the directory.

Upon examination of the publication it has been identified that there has been a dramatic decline in the number of businesses advertising in the directory. The initial directory of 2001/02 included 81 pages of business advertising, however the current directory has only 30 pages of business advertising. The following statistics for business advertising is as follows: -

- 2001 – 460 businesses (253 adverts & 207 line adverts)
- 2002 – 291 businesses (190 adverts & 101 line adverts)
- 2003 – 186 businesses (150 adverts & 36 line adverts)
- 2004 – 178 businesses (169 adverts & 9 line adverts)

It is no longer possible for the JBA to include the A-Z of business within the region due to the fact that the information is too expensive to acquire and reproduce. As a result of the decline in businesses advertising and the inability to reproduce the A-Z of businesses the publication mainly consists of community related information. It is estimated that there are approximately 3000 business located in the City of Joondalup with only 10% being members of the Joondalup Business Association.

Financial Implications:

The City as part of its 2004/05 budget allowed for an amount of \$40,000 to assist in the production of a Business & Community directory.

Account No:	1 510 3720 0001 9999
Budget Item:	Governance Corporate Costs, Printing
Budget Amount:	\$126,000
YTD Amount:	\$26,847
Actual Cost:	\$40,000 plus GST

Strategic Implications:

Strategic Plan Outcome

The City of Joondalup provides social opportunities that meet the community needs

1.3 To continue to provide services that meet changing needs of a diverse and growing community.

1.3.3 Provide support, information and resources.

Strategic Plan Outcome

The City of Joondalup is recognised for investment and business development opportunities.

3.5 To provide and maintain sustainable economic development.

3.5.1 Develop partnerships with stakeholders to foster business development opportunities.

Sustainability Implications:

The production of a joint Business & Community directory will mean the need for only one publication to be produced and assist in providing valuable information to the community and businesses.

Community Consultation:

The 2004/05 directory was distributed by the JBA in September/October of 2003. In November 2003 the City undertook some research on the City's communications methods, which included some questions regarding the Business & Community directory. The results of the survey indicated a positive reaction to the directory.

- Awareness of the directory was 82% (extremely high)
- Readership/Usage of directory 49% (well above average)
- 56% rated directory as 'Very useful' (above average percentage)
- Feedback received from the Research undertaken by the City, including 300 telephone interviews, indicating that the directory in its new format has above average awareness, usage and satisfaction levels.
- All residents interviewed during in-depth interviews had retained the document in their homes with their mainstream White & Yellow Page books.
- The City received more queries with regards distribution of the 2003/04 Directory than in previous years, again highlighting an increased usage and demand of the directory.
- The City's participation enhances promotion of the Directory into the business sector, making the product as a whole more viable.

COMMENT

This would be the fifth year that the Business & Community directory has been produced in partnership with the JBA. The research undertaken by the City has indicated that the product is strong and that there is a demand and expectation within the community for such a product.

While it is fully appreciated that the research depicts that the directory is a required product within the community, the research does not detail whether the directory is retained for purely community related information or business related information or indeed both.

There is a concern that with what appears a decline in the amount of businesses willing to advertise in the directory and the inability to be able to list all businesses within the City and not just those who choose to advertise in the directory, the publication is strongly orientated towards the community related information. There may be more benefit for the City in producing its own community information related directory.

A further concern is that the directory has been produced for the last four years and indications from the JBA is that it has never made a profit. It is known that other cases where the business association has undertaken such a venture it has managed to include the Council/Community related information free of charge. The entire project was funded by the sales of the advertising space.

When the Council agreed to fund the 2002/03 directory, it was anticipated that future editions of the publication would be done so at a profit for the JBA, therefore being able to include the Council related information at no cost to the City to strengthen the recognition and creditability of the product.

The JBA has committed to the project by engaging the services of a full time employee to increase sales revenue from advertising for this year's directory. The JBA has advised that the salary for that employee contribute to 20% of the total project cost.

In the past Council has agreed to fund the project in a way of assisting the JBA. It is a way of showing support for the business community, through the JBA, and as a local government is taking a leadership role in the economic vitality of the City. This is in addition to the many other grants provided to the JBA in local business initiatives.

It is therefore recommended that at this stage it still appears to be most effective, from both cost and communications perspectives, to continue with this joint publication. To maximise the benefit of this publication it is recommended that the City proceed with Option 1 as outlined in this report.

The level of financial contribution in Option 1 ensures the professionalism of the Directory, in particular the Community component, being maintained to the current level with pages allocated for City Services / Facilities as well as Community Services in general.

It is envisaged that continuing participation from the City will assist in further improvement of the content and distribution of future editions of the Community Directory.

ATTACHMENTS

Nil

VOTING REQUIREMENTS

Simple Majority

RECOMMENDATION

That:

- 1 Council PROVIDES a financial contribution to the Joondalup Business Association (JBA), in accordance with the City's budgeted amount of \$40,000 (plus GST), for the production of the 2005/06 Business & Community Directory subject to:**
 - (a) the City being allocated appropriate space for information pertaining to Council services (currently this is 21 full A4 pages) with the Community front and inside cover as per the 2004/05 publication;**
 - (b) the City having two representatives on the working party for the production of the Directory;**
 - (c) the City allocated editorial space and photograph for a joint message from the Chairman of Commissioners and JBA President at the front of both sides of the Directory;**
 - (d) the JBA commit to continuing to develop and improve the directory's content and its appeal to a wider audience including identification of new markets and extended distribution channels within the community for the directory;**
 - (e) the print-run of the Directory is suitably increased to allow for wider distribution, and for the City to be provided a minimum of 6,500 copies for use in new resident welcome & citizenship packs, libraries, recreation centres and customer service centres; and**
 - (f) continued inclusion of Community organisation/groups listings and regional maps as supplied by the City at no cost to the City.**
- 2 EXPENDITURE in (1) above be charged to Account No. 1 510 3720 0001 9999 - Governance Corporate Costs, Printing.**

Mr Clough stated his intention to declare a financial interest in Item 4 – Proposed Joondalup Shuttle Bus as he is a consultant for the Joondalup Health Campus, one of the supporters of the shuttle bus.

ITEM 4 PROPOSED JOONDALUP SHUTTLE BUS – [56564]

WARD - Lakeside

PURPOSE

To provide information on the proposed Joondalup Shuttle Bus Service for the Joondalup City Centre.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The draft discussion paper for the Joondalup Shuttle Bus Service is shown in Attachment 1. The Joondalup Shuttle Bus service aims to build in the successful Campus Shuttle Bus service provided by Edith Cowan University (ECU) and will extend its route to service the Joondalup City centre and surrounds.

The City has been working with key stakeholders in the development of this proposal. The costs associated with this service would be shared between the key stakeholders Transperth (34%), ECU (33%) and the City of Joondalup (33%). The Joondalup Health Campus has also agreed to provide \$5,000 towards this initiative.

Two scenarios are presented in the discussion paper and these vary in cost according to the number of buses operating and whether they operate in a single direction or in both directions. The costs to the City over one year (fully serviced and inclusive of fuel costs) vary from \$61,050 for Scenario 1 to \$116,985 for Scenario 2. Scenario 2 is dependant on the installation of the traffic lights at the Kendrew-Grand Boulevard intersection.

There is considerable political and external interest and support for this project. The State Government has demonstrated its support for this project and is prepared to make a one-off start up contribution of \$40,000 for the cost of signage, bus stops, timetables, brochures and service provision in the 2004/05 financial year. The State Government has also agreed to make a further \$65,000 contribution to the installation of traffic lights at the Kendrew/Grand Boulevard intersection to facilitate the right turn into Grand Boulevard and allow the two way bus service to become operational as soon as possible as outlined in Scenario 2 of the discussion paper.

In order for the City to fund the Shuttle Bus proposal, the City has identified in its 2004/05 mid year budget review process, surplus funds to enable this service to commence in February 2005.

This report recommends that Council:

- 1 NOTES the report for the Joondalup Shuttle Bus Service and associated attachments;

- 2 SUPPORTS in principle the establishment of the Joondalup Shuttle Bus service to commence in February 2005 in accordance with scenario one - (1) shuttle bus operating in an anticlockwise route, operating on a 15 minutes frequency between 8.00am to 6.00pm, Monday to Friday;
- 3 LISTS for consideration in the 2004/05 mid year budget review the amount \$25,450 to fund the service from February – June 2005;
- 4 REQUESTS the Chief Executive Officer to commence negotiations with the State Government on the contractual arrangements for the service and to address the following outstanding issues relating to the service being:
 - (a) The installation of lights at Kendrew Crescent and Grand Boulevard;
 - (b) The potential for increased revenues flowing to the State Government through increase use of train and bus links and how these revenues can be accessed to subsidise the shuttle bus service;
 - (c) Who will be responsible for ongoing monitoring and review of the service and how this will occur;
 - (d) Further discuss the feasibility of making the drop off point for the Joondalup Health Campus in the entrance to the hospital.
- 5 ACKNOWLEDGES and THANKS all the stakeholders for their contribution to the development of the proposal and advises the stakeholders of Council's position on the Joondalup Shuttle Bus proposal.

BACKGROUND

The establishment of a Joondalup Shuttle Bus Service to service the Joondalup City Centre originated from the CBD Enhancement Project Steering Committee. This issue has been an ongoing item of discussion and development for the Committee since late 2003.

Edith Cowan University (ECU) initiated the ECU Joondalup Campus Shuttle Bus service in 2003 to service students travelling to and from Joondalup train station and the ECU Joondalup Campus. City of Joondalup staff, met with the TravelSmart Officer at ECU Joondalup Campus to discuss the potential to expand the highly successful Campus Shuttle Bus service for the Joondalup CBD and surrounds.

Several meetings have been convened with key stakeholders since July 2004 to discuss a Joondalup Shuttle Bus service for the Joondalup City Centre. Representatives from the City of Joondalup, ECU, West Coast College of TAFE, Joondalup Health Campus, Lakeside Joondalup Shopping Centre, Path Transit and a local Member of Parliament attended the meetings. It was agreed that the City would work with ECU to develop a proposal for all stakeholders regarding the funding and benefits of the Joondalup Shuttle Bus service for the Joondalup City Centre.

This issue was also raised at the Joondalup Regional Stakeholders Group meeting on 28 July 2004.

A draft discussion paper on the Joondalup Shuttle Bus service was distributed to stakeholders in September 2004 seeking feedback.

DETAILS

The Joondalup Shuttle Bus service aims to build in the successful Campus Shuttle Bus service provided by ECU and will extend its route to service the Joondalup City centre and surrounds.

Student numbers at ECU Joondalup are predicted to double from the current approximate amount of 4,000 students, to 8,000 students by 2007, and demand for this service is predicted to rapidly increase.

As Joondalup develops into a major regional centre, visitor numbers to the City Centre are also expected to increase, putting enormous pressure on the existing transport provisions. This growth will place additional demands on other areas such parking and traffic congestion.

According to Department of Planning and Infrastructure, 83% of all trips made within the City of Joondalup are made by car. The distance travelled in over a third of trips is less than three kilometres. In addition, over 50% of trips range less than 1 km in distance and 80% of trips ranging from 1 and 3 kilometres are made by car.

Research also indicates that there is great potential for change in current commuter use within the City of Joondalup. For example, up to 44% of all trips could use alternative modes such as for walking, cycling and public transport instead of the car.

By improving the connectivity of commuters from the train to the immediate surrounds, through the introduction of a regular shuttle service, evidence suggests that there will be greater use of the public transport system. The introduction of a Shuttle Bus Service within the City Centre is one mechanism of addressing these issues and addressing the potential for change from car use to alternative commuter use. This initiative also has the potential to result in numerous benefits by alleviating the growing pressure on traffic and parking congestion in the City.

The shuttle bus entails the use of Path Transit buses, similar to those used for the Fremantle, Subiaco and Cottesloe CAT service.

The proposed route for the shuttle bus is 4.8 kilometres long and is shown in the attached map (Attachment 2). Proposed positioning of bus stops and bus shelters are also shown on the map. Operation times would be between 8.00am to 6.00pm on Monday to Friday and the service would operate at a 15-minute frequency.

There are two different scenarios presented in the discussion paper. The scenarios provide different cost options based on the number of buses in operation and whether they operate in a clockwise and/or anticlockwise route. The total costs vary from \$185,000 to \$354,500.

It is proposed that the shuttle bus will initially operate as a free service to commuters and be subsidized by the City's stakeholders.

A summary of key benefits is provided in the discussion paper and this includes:

- Reduction in parking congestion;
- Reduced infrastructure requirements and costs;
- Increased funds for State Government;
- Improved health and lifestyle;
- Reduced noise impacts;

- Improved accessibility for people around CBD and surrounds (particularly the business community); and
- Social community needs.

Consultation:

Several meetings have been convened since July 2004 with key stakeholders to discuss a shuttle bus service for the Joondalup City Centre. Representatives from the City of Joondalup, ECU, West Coast College of TAFE, Joondalup Health Campus, Lakeside Joondalup Shopping Centre and Path Transit attended these meetings and all have indicated strong support for this initiative.

The following issues are raised relating to the proposed Joondalup Shuttle Bus service:

- In order for Council to fund the Shuttle Bus service for potential commencement in February 2005, this item would need to be listed in the mid year budget for 2004/05 as proposed in the report;
- The opportunity to reduce the number of trips during non peak times in an effort to reduce costs will require investigation;
- The service will require monitoring and six (6) month update followed by a twelve (12) month review on the service utilisation rates will also be required;
- Further negotiations regarding contributions from stakeholders other than ECU, COJ and Path Transit will be required;
- The installation of traffic signals at Kendrew Crescent is dependant on Main Roads WA and could impose considerable additional costs to Council for traffic management required for Scenario two (2) (ie. two buses operating in a clockwise and anti-clockwise direction) if Main Roads WA do not agree to install the traffic signals;
- Clarification is required on how any revenue from the potential to introduce a 'fee for service' as a revenue source will be distributed amongst stakeholders and also how Path Transit can transfer any future revenue from increased use of public transport to the Joondalup Shuttle Bus Service; and

With regard to the suggestion to reduce the number of trips during non-peak times in an effort to reduce costs, Path Transit has advised the preferred option is to maintain a viable timetable that everyone can remember and to provide a service with regular and reliable trips throughout the given operating times.

The need to incorporate a break clause in the agreement for the provision of annual reviews to be undertaken and for an initial review after six months to assess whether amendments need to be made to the frequency of the service during non-peak periods should be addressed at the time, if and when the agreement is finalised.

Initial research into funding opportunities indicates that there are limited opportunities for funding such an initiative. However, the Australian Government Regional Partnerships is a potential funding opportunity. Funding via this source is available all year round and is available to Local Governments. Criteria via this funding source require clear benefits to the community, or where the project creates or enhances opportunities in the community. The criteria also favour projects that establish partnerships, where individuals, private sector businesses, community and /not-for-profit organizations, other organizations and any local, state and/or Australian Government agencies make a financial and/or in-kind contribution to

the project. Further research will be undertaken to investigate the Regional Partnerships funding.

With regard to further negotiations with stakeholders other than ECU, COJ and Path Transit, the City has been advised that the Joondalup Health Campus has agreed to provide funding to the value of \$5,000 towards this project (See Attachment 3), which will directly offset contributions from ECU and the City. Transperth has agreed to this arrangement. A number of other relevant stakeholders have advised that they are supportive of the shuttle bus service but are not in a position at this stage to contribute financially. However they may be able to assist in promoting the service in other ways.

With regard to costs associated with the installation of traffic signals at Kendrew Crescent, the City has received a letter from Main Roads WA to advise that it does not support the installation of traffic signals at the Grand Boulevard/Kendrew intersection at this stage (See Attachment 4). However, the media statement released by Minister Alannah MacTiernan and the article in the Community News quotes the Minister as stating “This will be the case until traffic lights are installed at the Kendrew-Grand Boulevard intersection to facilitate the right turn into Grand Boulevard” and “The lights will make it possible to introduce a second bus, running clockwise, to give commuters the best level of service possible”.

This, and a letter received from the Public Transport Authority (Attachment 5) states that the State Government is prepared to make a contribution of \$65,000 towards the traffic lights in order to progress early delivery of a two way CAT bus operation. Approximate costs for installation of traffic lights is \$130,000.

Financial Implications:

The costs associated with the establishment and ongoing costs for the Joondalup Shuttle Bus will need a partnership approach between the stakeholders in order to be viable. This is of particular importance, given the limited opportunities for revenue generation within the City of Joondalup, unlike other local governments offering a similar service. A proposed breakdown of stakeholder contributions is provided in the draft discussion paper and involves a shared funding contribution between the three major parties as follows:

Transperth	34%
Edith Cowan University	33%
City of Joondalup	<u>33%</u>
TOTAL	100%

Two scenarios are presented in the discussion paper and these vary in cost according to the number of buses operating and whether they operate in one direction only or in both directions.

Scenario 1: One (1) shuttle bus operating in a anticlockwise route, operating on a 15 minute frequency between 8.00am to 6.00pm, Monday to Friday and;

Scenario 2: Two (2) shuttle buses running in both clockwise and anticlockwise directions, operating on a 15-minute frequency between 8.00am to 6.00pm, Monday to Friday. Scenario 2 is dependant on the installation of traffic lights at the Kendrew-Grand Boulevard intersection.

The cost associated with each scenario over a five-year period (fully serviced and inclusive of fuel costs) is as follows:

Scenario 1: Total cost to stakeholders Year 1 - \$185,000

Stakeholder	% Contribution	Year 1 \$	Year 2 \$	Year 3 \$	Year 4 \$	Year 5 \$	TOTAL \$
City of Joondalup	33	61,050	62,576	64,140	65,743	67,386	\$320,895

Scenario 2: Total cost to stakeholders Year 1 - \$354,500

Stakeholder	% Contribution	Year 1 \$	Year 2 \$	Year 3 \$	Year 4 \$	Year 5 \$	TOTAL \$
City of Joondalup	33	116,985	119,910	122,907	125,980	129,129	\$614,911

The above figures are based on a projected estimate of a 2.5% Consumer Price Index increase from the State budget papers over a five-year period.

The State Government has demonstrated its support for this project and is prepared to make a one off start up contribution of \$40,000 for the cost of signage, bus stops, timetables, brochures and service provision in the 2004/05 financial year. The State Government has also agreed to make a further \$65,000 contribution to the installation of traffic lights at the Kendrew/Grand Boulevard intersection to facilitate the right turn into Grand Boulevard and allow the two way bus service to become operational as soon as possible as outlined in Scenario 2 of the discussion paper.

The City has also been advised that the Rottnest Island Authority has indicated an interest in using the buses. If the buses were provided to another party, then Transperth would have to purchase new buses, which would incur an additional cost of \$20,000 per bus quoted in the Joondalup Shuttle Bus proposal.

Strategic Implications:

The establishment of a Joondalup Shuttle Bus links with the City's Strategic Plan 2003-2008 as follows:

Objectives 3.4: To provide integrated transport to meet regional and local needs.

Strategy 3.4.1: Advocate and facilitate the creation of transport linkages.

As Joondalup develops into a major regional centre visitor numbers to the City Centre are also expected to increase, putting enormous pressure on the existing transport infrastructure. This growth will also place additional demands on areas such as parking and traffic. The introduction of the Joondalup Shuttle Bus is a long-term strategic approach to addressing these issues.

Sustainability Implications:

The introduction of a Shuttle bus service for the City Centre has the following sustainability implications:

Social

The introduction of a Shuttle bus service for the City Centre will encourage greater use of public transport such as trains and will help alleviate the growing pressure on traffic and parking congestion in the City as it grows and develops into a regional centre.

A study undertaken by ECU indicates that in 2003, the bus carried more than 3800 passengers per week in peak periods. This represents a significant reduction in the potential number of cars entering the City Centre and surrounds and thereby potentially reducing associated noise impacts.

The Joondalup Shuttle Bus will provide easy safe access in all weather conditions and improve accessibility particularly for seniors and people with disabilities.

In addition, this service will encourage greater use of public transport such as trains and will help alleviate the growing pressure on traffic and parking congestion in the City as it grows and develops as a regional centre.

Environmental

Currently, transport accounts for 14% of Australia's greenhouse gas emissions and is the most rapidly growing source. Vehicle emissions produce photochemical smog and urban haze. The 1998 State of the Environment Report identified that vehicles are the main source of emissions in urbanized areas, being responsible for 40-90% of the various pollutants in our air. Major vehicle pollutants include carbon monoxide, particulate matter, oxides of nitrogen and lead, with diesel powered vehicles contributing about two thirds of the particle matter emitted (RES, 2000).

As the Joondalup City Centre continues to grow traffic within the City is expected to markedly increase. This will result in higher amounts of vehicle emissions and pollutants entering the air, contributing further to the deterioration in air quality.

The provision of a Joondalup Shuttle bus will reduce these impacts.

Economic

Whilst the introduction of the Joondalup Shuttle bus will incur specific costs as outlined in the section on financial implications, it represents an opportunity to leverage Council contributions with key stakeholders to share these costs.

These costs should be considered by offset costs in the long term such as the reduction of infrastructure requirements such as parking bays for each of the major stakeholders. Parking bays incur significant costs for their establishment and maintenance. A case study undertaken by ECU identified that parking bays cost around \$3,000 to \$20,000 each and maintenance and opportunity costs add to this figure. Results also indicate that on its busiest days, the

introduction of ECU's Shuttle bus reduces demand for parking spaces at the Joondalup Campus by approximately 150 bays.

The Joondalup Shuttle Bus is also likely to increase the number of train commuters and thereby increase revenue for the State Government through increased passengers. ECU has demonstrated that the Shuttle Bus has been directly responsible for increasing the number of train users to Joondalup throughout the day – especially during peak times – by up to 30%. This equates to approximately \$180,000 worth of revenue from train tickets per year (based on a \$1.80 ticket, 2,500 passengers per week and 40 weeks).

COMMENT

This project has generated considerable interest from external parties including the State Government, Edith Cowan University, the Inner City Residents Association and the media. This has resulted in media attention and the release of the following:

- Media statement from the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure released 11 January 2005 (See Attachment 6);
- Media release from ECU dated 18 January 2005 (See Attachment 7);
- Article in Community News, page 3, 13 January 2005 (See Attachment 8).

The City has received a letter from the Inner City Residents Association (See Attachment 9) stating that of all the residents who reviewed the draft Discussion Paper on the Joondalup Shuttle Bus, over 90% are in favour of the project. The letter also noted that the Association is disappointed that the Shuttle Bus does not service the commercial tenancies along Regents Park Road and City North, in particular the aged and student populations.

There is a clear need and in principle support for the establishment of the Joondalup Shuttle Bus Service. Whilst the City does not have funds set aside for this project in the 2004/05 financial years, the State Government's support for this project presents an opportunity to enable the commencement of the project in February 2005 and be billed for expenses in arrears during the 2005/06 financial year. The State Government's offer of a one-off start up contribution of \$40,000 in addition to the \$65,000 contribution for the installation of traffic lights represents significant value and support for this project that may not necessarily be available should the City decide to assess this project during the 2005/06 budget deliberations.

Furthermore, it is expected that the figures provided in the draft discussion paper for the Shuttle Bus would increase by \$20,000 per bus, given the likelihood of the current Transperth buses being no longer available in mid 2005 and the subsequent need to purchase new buses at that time.

Based on the information provided there are three options available to the City as described below:

Option 1: February 2005 commencement with Council funds.

The City would officially commit to the commencement of the one way Shuttle Bus service option in February 2005, utilizing Council funds reprioritised in the mid year budget review process for 2004/05. The City would accept the State Government's offer for a one off start up contribution of \$40,000 in the 2004/05 financial year in addition to the \$65,000 towards the installation of traffic lights to facilitate the two way bus service in 2005/06.

Option 2: February 2005 commencement with State Government funds.

The City would officially commit to the commencement of the one-way Shuttle Bus service option in February 2005, utilizing State Government funds. The State Government would bill the City of Joondalup in arrears in the 2005/06 financial year for related expenses in the 2004/05 financial year. The City would accept the State Government's offer for a one off start up contribution of \$40,000 in the 2004/05 financial year in addition to the \$65,000 towards the installation of traffic lights to facilitate the two way bus service in 2005/06.

Option 3: Defer decision to the 2005/06 budget process.

The City would not officially commit to the commencement of the Shuttle Bus service in February 2005 and would decide its position following the assessment of the project through the Strategic Financial Management Committee and the 2005/06 budget deliberation process. This may incur additional costs to the City related to the likely need to purchase new buses for the service at an estimated \$20,000 per bus. The City would not be eligible for the \$40,000 'one off' start up contribution offered by the State Government. It is unknown whether the State Government proposal to provide \$65,000 financial contribution towards the installation of traffic lights would still be available.

There is considerable political and external interest and support for this project. It is recommended that the City accepts the State Government support for this project and endorse the Joondalup Shuttle Bus service for commencement in February 2005. It is also recommended that Scenario 1 be the preferred option until the installation of traffic signals at the Grand Boulevard/Kendrew intersection in an effort to keep associated costs at a minimum and until a review of the service is undertaken.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1	Draft Discussion Paper on the Joondalup Shuttle Bus Service
Attachment 2	Map showing proposed route of Joondalup Shuttle Bus service route
Attachment 3	Letter from the Joondalup Health Campus dated 20 January 2005
Attachment 4	Letter from Main Roads WA dated 29 November 2004
Attachment 5	Letter from Public Transport Authority
Attachment 6	Media Statement by the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure – released 11 January 2005
Attachment 7	Media Release by ECU dated 18 January 2005
Attachment 8	Media article on page 3, Community News, 13 January 2005
Attachment 9	Letter from the Inner City Residents of Joondalup Inc. dated 18 January 2005

VOTING REQUIREMENTS

Simple Majority

RECOMMENDATION

That Council:

- 1 **NOTES** the report for the Joondalup Shuttle Bus Service and associated attachments forming Attachment 1 to this Report;
- 2 **SUPPORTS** in principle the establishment of the Joondalup Shuttle Bus service to commence in February 2005 in accordance with scenario one - (1) shuttle bus operating in an anticlockwise route, operating on a 15 minutes frequency between 8.00am to 6.00pm, Monday to Friday;
- 3 **LISTS** for consideration in the 2004/05 mid year budget review the amount \$25,450 to fund the service from February – June 2005;
- 4 **REQUESTS** the Chief Executive Officer to commence negotiations with the State Government on the contractual arrangements for the service and to address the following outstanding issues relating to the service being:
 - (a) The installation of lights at Kendrew Crescent and Grand Boulevard;
 - (b) The potential for increased revenues flowing to the State Government through increase use of train and bus links and how these revenues can be accessed to subsidise the shuttle bus service;
 - (c) Who will be responsible for ongoing monitoring and review of the service and how this will occur; and
 - (d) Further discuss the feasibility of making the drop off point for the Joondalup Health Campus in the entrance to the hospital.
- 5 **ACKNOWLEDGES** and **THANKS** all the stakeholders for their contribution to the development of the proposal and advises the stakeholders of Council's position on the Joondalup Shuttle Bus proposal.

Appendix 4 refers.

To access this attachment on electronic document, click here: [Attach4brf150205.pdf](#)

ITEM 5 MINUTES OF CBD ENHANCEMENT PROJECT STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING – 19 JANUARY 2005 – [53469]

WARD - Lakeside

PURPOSE

The unconfirmed minutes of the CBD Enhancement Project Steering Committee meeting held on 19 January 2005 are submitted for noting by Council.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The CBD Enhancement Project Steering Committee met on Wednesday 19 January 2005.

Items of business discussed included:

- Swap Mart in the Joondalup City Centre;
- Review of the CBD Enhancement Project Steering Committee;
- Joondalup Night Markets;
- Replacement of CBD Enhancement Project Steering Committee Members.

A brief update was provided on the Committee's ongoing business items, which include the Inner City Public Transport Central Area Transit (CAT) service and the City of Joondalup Economic Development Strategy.

This report recommends that Council

- 1 *NOTES the unconfirmed minutes of the CBD Enhancement Project Steering Committee meeting held on 19 January 2005, shown at Attachment 1 to this Report;*
- 2 *ACCEPTS BY AN ABSOLUTE MAJORITY the resignation of Ms O'Halloran from the CBD Enhancement Project Steering Committee and thanks her for her contribution to the Committee.*

BACKGROUND

A meeting of the CBD Enhancement Project Steering Committee was held on Wednesday 19 January 2005.

DETAILS

The minutes of the CBD Enhancement Project Steering Committee meeting held on Wednesday 19 January 2005 are provided at Attachment 1.

Items discussed at the meeting included:

1 Swap Mart in the Joondalup City Centre

The Rotary Club of Karrinyup is developing a proposal to run a Swap Mart/Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Market in the underground parking area of the Joondalup Library and the West Perth Football Club is drafting a proposal for a car boot sale in an adjacent location. Both parties committed to a coordinated approach to ensure that their proposals are complementary, before submitting them to the CBD Enhancement Project Steering Committee.

2 Review of role and functions of the CBD Enhancement Project Steering Committee

This item notes that the functions and future direction of the Committee has recently been reviewed and provides a summary of qualitative feedback received from interviews with Committee members. This item further presents the interim findings from the joint research project that has been undertaken between Edith Cowan University and the City of Joondalup throughout 2004.

The main issues resulting from this preliminary analysis relate to:

- The need for a more holistic approach to promotion of services available to local businesses;
- The most effective medium for promotion and marketing;
- The need for a more diverse industry spread;
- The need for a more consistent rental price structure; and
- The need to continue business skills development programs.

The report highlights the plan to develop a strategic work plan for the Committee and to clarify administrative matters related to the role and objectives of the Committee.

3 Joondalup Night Markets

The attendance at the 2004/05 Night Markets has grown from approximately 1200 people at the 19 November 2004 opening night, to 2200 people at the last market held on 7 January 2005. A record crowd for the 2004/05 season was recorded on 17 December 2004, with an estimated 2,500 people in attendance. Quality entertainment and reasonable weather has led to growing attendance at the 2004/05 Night Markets.

4 Replacement of CBD Enhancement Project Steering Committee Members

As a result of recent resignations, including from Ms O'Halloran who announced her resignation at the meeting, advertisements for two new Committee members have been placed in the Joondalup Community Newspaper and have been distributed to Joondalup Business Association members. A new Youth Advisory Committee (YAC) member will be sought at the next YAC meeting in February 2005. Ms O'Halloran announced her resignation from the Committee.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 Minutes of CBD Enhancement Project Steering Committee meeting held on 19 January 2005.

VOTING REQUIREMENTS

Absolute Majority.

RECOMMENDATION

That Council:

- 1 NOTES the unconfirmed minutes of the CBD Enhancement Project Steering Committee meeting held on 19 January 2005, shown at Attachment 1 to this Report;**
- 2 ACCEPTS BY AN ABSOLUTE MAJORITY the resignation of Ms O’Halloran from the CBD Enhancement Project Steering Committee, and thanks her for her contribution to the Committee.**

Appendix 5 refers.

To access this attachment on electronic document, click here: [Attach5brf150205.pdf](#)

ITEM 6 FINANCIAL REPORT FOR THE PERIOD ENDING 30 NOVEMBER 2004 – [07882]

WARD - All

PURPOSE

The November 2004 financial report is submitted to Council to be noted.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The November 2004 year to date report shows an overall variance (under spend) of \$7.1m when compared to the year to date adopted budget.

This variance can be analysed as follows:

- The **Operating** position (Change in Net Assets Before Reserve Transfers) shows an actual surplus of \$34.4m compared to a budgeted surplus of \$31.0m at the end of November 2004. The \$3.4m variance is due primarily to a favourable variance in rates instalment interest and charges, government grants income, employee costs, consultancy costs, administration costs, finance related costs, contributions and minor equipment purchases.
- **Capital Expenditure** is \$1.1m under spent due to the deferral of heavy and light vehicle purchases.
- **Capital Works and Corporate Projects** expenditure is \$3.7m against a year to date budget of \$6.3m. This is a timing difference of which \$2.4m relates to normal Capital Works while \$0.2m relates to Capital Works classified as Corporate Projects. Total committed funds in relation to all Capital Works are \$11.2m.

DETAILS

The financial report for the period ending 30 November 2004 is appended as Attachment A.

Statutory Provision:

In accordance with Section 6.4 of the Local Government Act (1995) a local government is to prepare an annual financial report for the preceding year and such other financial reports as are prescribed. Regulation 34 of the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996 details those other financial reports which need to be prepared and states that they are to be presented to Council and recorded in the minutes of the meeting at which they are presented.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 Financial Report for the period ending 30 November 2004.

VOTING REQUIREMENTS

Simple majority.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Financial Report for the period ending 30 November 2004 be NOTED.

Appendix 6 refers.

To access this attachment on electronic document, click here: [Attach6brf150205.pdf](#)

ITEM 7 FINANCIAL REPORT FOR THE PERIOD ENDING 31 DECEMBER 2004 – [07882]

WARD - All

PURPOSE

The December 2004 financial report is submitted to Council to be noted.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The December 2004 year to date report shows an overall variance (under spend) of \$10.8m when compared to the year to date adopted budget.

This variance can be analysed as follows:

- The **Operating** position (Change in Net Assets Before Reserve Transfers) shows an actual surplus of \$29.1m compared to a budgeted surplus of \$25.0m at the end of December 2004. The \$4.1m variance is due primarily to a favourable variance in rates instalment interest and charges, government grants income, employee costs, consultancy costs, administration costs, waste management costs, finance related costs and minor equipment purchases.
- **Capital Expenditure** is \$1.8m under spent due to the deferral of heavy and light vehicle purchases and IT related projects.
- **Capital Works and Corporate Projects** expenditure is \$4.8m against a year to date budget of \$9.7m. This is a timing difference of which \$2.9m relates to normal Capital Works while \$2.0m relates to Capital Works classified as Corporate Projects. Total committed funds in relation to all Capital Works are \$11.2m.

DETAILS

The financial report for the period ending 31 December 2004 is appended as Attachment A.

Statutory Provision:

In accordance with Section 6.4 of the Local Government Act (1995) a local government is to prepare an annual financial report for the preceding year and such other financial reports as are prescribed. Regulation 34 of the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996 details those other financial reports which need to be prepared and states that they are to be presented to Council and recorded in the minutes of the meeting at which they are presented.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 Financial Report for the period ending 31 December 2004.

VOTING REQUIREMENTS

Simple majority.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Financial Report for the period ending 31 December 2004 be NOTED.

Appendix 7 refers.

To access this attachment on electronic document, click here: [Attach7brf150205.pdf](#)

ITEM 8 WARRANT OF PAYMENTS 30 NOVEMBER 2004 – [09882]**WARD - All****PURPOSE**

The Warrant of Payments for the month ended 30 November 2004 is submitted to Council for approval.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report details the cheques drawn on the funds during the month of November 2004 and seeks approval by Council for the payments listed.

FUNDS	DETAILS	AMOUNT
Director Corporate Services & Resource Management Advance Account	67953 – 68457 & EFT 1122 – 1328	\$6,679,824.24
Municipal Account	000716 – 000722 & 32A – 33A	\$10,782,444.19
Trust Account		Nil
	TOTAL	\$17,462,268.43

The Director Corporate Services & Resource Management Advance Account is an imprest account and was reimbursed from the Municipal Account during the month. The difference in total between the Municipal Account and the Director of Corporate Services & Resource Management Advance Account is attributable to the direct debits by the Westpac Bank and the Commonwealth Bank for bank charges, credit card charges, investments and dishonoured cheques being processed through the Municipal Fund. During the month, the City received a large proportion of its rates and invested the surplus cash. The investment of these funds are included as payments in the Municipal Account and is the reason for the large difference between the Municipal Account and the Director of Corporate Services & Resource Management Advance Account payments. The cheque and voucher registers are appended as Attachments A & B.

The total of all other outstanding accounts received but not paid at the close of November 2004 was \$1,001,304.79

CERTIFICATE OF THE DIRECTOR OF CORPORATE SERVICES & RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

This warrant of payments to be passed for payment, covering vouchers numbered as indicated and totalling \$17,462,268.43 which is to be submitted to Council on 22 February 2005 has been checked, is fully supported by vouchers and invoices and which have been duly certified as to the receipt of goods and the rendition of services and as to prices, computations and costing and the amounts shown were due for payment.

.....
 PETER SCHNEIDER
 Director Corporate Services & Resource Management

CERTIFICATE OF CHAIRMAN OF COMMISSIONERS

I hereby certify that this warrant of payments covering vouchers numbered as indicated and totalling \$17,462,268.43 was submitted to Council on 22 February 2005.

.....
 JOHN PATERSON
 Chairman of Commissioners

DETAILS

Statutory Provision:

The Council has delegated to the CEO the exercise of its power to make payments from the Municipal and Trust Funds, therefore in accordance with Regulation 13(1) of the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996, a list of accounts paid by the CEO is prepared each month showing each account paid since the last list was prepared. In addition regulation 13 (4) requires that after the list of payments has been prepared for a month, the total of all other outstanding accounts is to be calculated and a statement of that amount is to be presented to the Council.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A	Warrant of Payments for Month of November 2004
Attachment B	Municipal Fund Vouchers for Month of November 2004

VOTING REQUIREMENTS

Simple majority.

RECOMMENDATION

That Council APPROVES for payment the following vouchers, as presented in the Warrant of Payments to 30 November 2004, certified by the Chairman of Commissioners and Director Corporate Services & Resource Management and totalling \$17,462,268.43.

FUNDS	DETAILS	AMOUNT
Director Corporate Services & Resource Management Advance Account	67953 – 68457 & EFT 1122 – 1328	\$6,679,824.24
Municipal Account	000716 – 000722 & 32A – 33A	\$10,782,444.19
Trust Account		Nil
	TOTAL	\$17,462,268.43

Appendix 8 refers.

To access this attachment on electronic document, click here: [Attach8brf150205.pdf](#)

ITEM 9 WARRANT OF PAYMENTS 31 DECEMBER 2004 – [09882]**WARD - All****PURPOSE**

The Warrant of Payments for the month ended 31 December 2004 is submitted to Council for approval.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report details the cheques drawn on the funds during the month of December 2004 and seeks approval by Council for the payments listed.

FUNDS	DETAILS	AMOUNT
Director Corporate Services & Resource Management Advance Account	68458 – 68988 & EFT 1329 - 1548	\$8,579,213.53
Municipal Account	000723 – 000731 & 36A – 37A	\$14,906,941.55
Trust Account		Nil
	TOTAL	\$23,486,155.08

The Director Corporate Services & Resource Management Advance Account is an imprest account and was reimbursed from the Municipal Account during the month. The difference in total between the Municipal Account and the Director of Corporate Services & Resource Management Advance Account is attributable to the direct debits by the Westpac Bank and the bank charges, credit card charges, investments and dishonoured cheques being processed through the Municipal Fund. During the month, the City received a large proportion of its rates and invested the surplus cash. The investment of these funds is included as payments in the Municipal Account and is the reason for the large difference between the Municipal Account and the Director of Corporate Services & Resource Management Advance Account payments. The cheque and voucher registers are appended as Attachments A & B.

The total of all other outstanding accounts received but not paid at the close of December 2004 was \$974,879.19

CERTIFICATE OF THE DIRECTOR OF CORPORATE SERVICES & RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

This warrant of payments to be passed for payment, covering vouchers numbered as indicated and totalling \$23,486,155.08 which is to be submitted to Council on 22 February 2005 has been checked, is fully supported by vouchers and invoices and which have been duly certified as to the receipt of goods and the rendition of services and as to prices, computations and costing and the amounts shown were due for payment.

.....
 PETER SCHNEIDER
 Director Corporate Services & Resource Management

CERTIFICATE OF CHAIRMAN OF COMMISSIONERS

I hereby certify that this warrant of payments covering vouchers numbered as indicated and totalling \$23,486,155.08 was submitted to Council on 22 February 2005.

.....
 JOHN PATERSON
 Chairman of Commissioners

DETAILS

Statutory Provision:

The Council has delegated to the CEO the exercise of its power to make payments from the Municipal and Trust Funds, therefore in accordance with Regulation 13(1) of the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996, a list of accounts paid by the CEO is prepared each month showing each account paid since the last list was prepared. In addition regulation 13 (4) requires that after the list of payments has been prepared for a month, the total of all other outstanding accounts is to be calculated and a statement of that amount is to be presented to the Council.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A – Warrant of Payments for Month of December 2004
 Attachment B – Municipal Fund Vouchers for Month of December 2004

VOTING REQUIREMENTS

Simple majority.

RECOMMENDATION

That Council APPROVES for payment the following vouchers, as presented in the Warrant of Payments to 31 December 2004, certified by the Chairman of Commissioners and Director Corporate Services & Resource Management and totalling \$23,486,155.08.

FUNDS	DETAILS	AMOUNT
Director Corporate Services & Resource Management Advance Account	68458 – 68988 & EFT 1329 - 1548	\$8,579,213.53
Municipal Account	000723 – 000731 & 36A – 37A	\$14,906,941.55
Trust Account		Nil
	TOTAL	\$23,486,155.08

Appendix 9 refers.

To access this attachment on electronic document, click here: [Attach9brf150205.pdf](#)

ITEM 10 TENDER NUMBER 025-04/05 SUPPLY AND DELIVERY OF SIX 2WD RIDE-ON ROTARY MOWERS WITH/WITHOUT TRADE-IN AND DISPOSAL OF TWO USED MOWERS – [86566]

WARD - All

PURPOSE

To accept the tender submitted by Tocojepa Pty Ltd T/As Total Toro, for the supply of six new Groundsmaster 328-D mowers and the disposal of six used mowers, plant numbers 98163 to 98168 inclusive.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The City's 2004/05 budget provided for the purchase of mobile plant, as detailed in the Fleet Replacement Program. Funding for the cost of the change-over, is to be sourced from the Mobile Plant Reserve Account.

Included in the 2004/05 budget was provision for the purchase of six replacement ride on rotary mowers together with the disposal of six 2001 Model Toro 325D mowers, plant numbers 98163 to 98168 inclusive, all of which are allocated to Operations Services.

It is recommended, in relation to Tender number 025-04/05 for Supply of Six 2WD Ride-on Rotary Mowers and Disposal of Six Used Mowers, that Council:

- 1 DEEMS the tender submitted by E & M J Rosher Pty Ltd to be non-conforming due to failure to comply with the Specification in the Request for Tender;*
- 2 CHOOSES the tender submitted by Tocojepa Pty Ltd T/As Total Toro, for the supply of six new Groundsmaster 328-D mowers at a total cost of \$157,200 excluding GST;*
- 3 CHOOSES the tender submitted by Tocojepa Pty Ltd T/As Total Toro, for the disposal by trade-in of six used mowers, plant numbers 98163 to 98168 inclusive, at \$39,800 excluding GST;*
- 4 AUTHORIZES the Chief Executive Officer (CEO), on behalf of the City, to enter into a contract with Tocojepa Pty Ltd T/As Total Toro in accordance with their submitted tender, subject to any minor variations that may be agreed between the CEO and Tocojepa Pty Ltd T/As Total Toro.*

BACKGROUND

The six mowers to be replaced were purchased in 2001 and have been fully utilized mowing parks, verges & median strips. All six machines are Toro 325D models and the recommended replacement mower is the Toro 328D, which superseded the 325D late in 2002.

DETAILS

Two tenders were received from: E & M J Rosher and Tocojepa Pty Ltd T/As Total Toro. Regulation 18(2) of the *Local Government (Functions and General) Regulations 1996* allows for the rejection of a tender that fails to comply with any requirement specified in the invitation to tender.

The tender from E & M J Rosher Pty Ltd did not meet the specified requirements for a 3-belt operation on the cutting deck, two front and two rear jockey wheels, and welded mounting plates with internal wiring within the roll over protection frame, for the strobe warning lights.

The remaining tender met all the essential requirements and was submitted for further consideration.

Under the City's Contract Management Framework and the Code of Tendering AS 4120-1994, an Evaluation Panel, using a weighted multi-criterion assessment system, assesses conforming tenders. The Selection Criteria for Tender 025-04/05 are as follows:

- 1 Tenderers demonstrated ability to provide after sales service and product spare parts
- 2 Proposed supply meets the design and specification
- 3 Delivery date for the new supply
- 4 Whole of life costings

The conforming tender submission from Tocojepa Pty Ltd T/As Total Toro for the Groundsmaster 328-D mowers is considered by the Evaluation Panel to be the best value purchase option for the City of Joondalup.

Statutory Provision:

The statewide public tender was advertised, opened and evaluated in accordance with the *Local Government (F&G) Regulations 1996*. This ensures compliance with the provision that tenders are required to be publicly invited if the consideration under a contract is expected to be or worth more than \$50,000.

In accordance with the provisions of Section 5.42 of the *Local Government Act 1995*, the Chief Executive Officer has the delegated authority to accept purchases to a limit of \$100,000. As this purchase exceeds this limit, it requires Council approval.

Policy Implications:

The City's Policy 2.5.7, on purchasing goods and services, encourages local business in the purchasing and tendering process. Both tenders received, including the recommended tenderer, Tocojepa Pty Ltd T/As Total Toro, are located outside the Region.

Financial Implications:

Based on the Tocojepa Pty Ltd T/As Total Toro tender, the financial position excluding GST is:

Make & Model New Supply	Recommended Supply Cost	Recommended Disposal Return	Budget New Supply	Budget Trade	Budget Surplus
Toro 328D	\$157,200	\$39,800	\$156,000	\$30,000	\$8,600

COMMENT

The net surplus on budget of \$8,600 (excluding GST) is due to the higher than expected trade in price on the old mowers, plant numbers 98163 to 98168 inclusive.

ATTACHMENTS

Nil

VOTING REQUIREMENTS

Simple Majority

RECOMMENDATION

That in relation to Tender 025-04/05, Council:

- 1 DEEMS the tender submitted by E & M J Rosher Pty Ltd to be non-conforming due to failure to comply with the Specification in the Request for Tender;**
- 2 CHOOSES the tender submitted by Tocojepa Pty Ltd T/As Total Toro, for the supply of six new Groundsmaster 328-D mowers at a total cost of \$157,200 excluding GST;**
- 3 CHOOSES the tender submitted by Tocojepa Pty Ltd T/As Total Toro, for the disposal by trade-in of six used mowers, plant numbers 98163 to 98168 inclusive, at \$39,800 excluding GST;**
- 4 AUTHORISES the Chief Executive Officer (CEO), on behalf of the City, to enter into a contract with Tocojepa Pty Ltd T/As Total Toro in accordance with their submitted tender, subject to any minor variations that may be agreed between the CEO and Tocojepa Pty Ltd T/As Total Toro.**

ITEM 11 GROUPED DWELLINGS – THIRTEEN (13) SINGLE BEDROOM DWELLINGS (TWO STOREY) ON LOT 743 (79A-79B) ADMIRAL GROVE, HEATHRIDGE – [00653]

WARD - Marina

PURPOSE

To request Council's consideration of an application for thirteen (13) single bedroom dwellings (two-storey) on Lot 743 (79A-79B) Admiral Grove, Heathridge.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The proposal is to develop thirteen (13) new, brick and tile, single bedroom dwellings on the subject site. The proposed units are two-storey and of a semi-detached nature.

The subject site is located along Admiral Grove, Heathridge with the closest corner being Caridean Street. Adjoining the property to the west of the site is Heathridge Shopping Centre. The property adjacent, south of the subject site is, Admiral Park (open space). This property is separated by a one-way vehicular egress, which services the Heathridge Shopping Centre. The residential properties within close vicinity, are generally single residential and are zoned R20.

The subject development has its main frontage onto Admiral Grove for five (5) of the proposed units, with the remaining eight (8) units fronting the Heathridge Shopping Centre. All vehicular access is proposed to be from Admiral Grove with all parking being maintained internally.

The Minister for Planning approved the rezoning of the subject site from 'Business' to 'Centre', on 6 April 2004 (District Planning Scheme No 2 - Amendment No. 19). On 30 April 2004, under the provisions of Part 9 of the City of Joondalup's District Planning Scheme No 2 (DPS2), Structure Plan No 4 (Lots 742 & 743 Caridean Street & Admiral Grove, Heathridge) was adopted by resolution of the Western Australian Planning Commission.

It is considered that the subject development will create a suitable interface between the existing commercial and residential development in the area. The development in its current form meets the criteria as set out by Structure Plan No 4 (Lots 742 & 743 Caridean Street & Admiral Grove, Heathridge), District Planning Scheme No. 2 and the Residential Design Codes 2002, and is recommended for approval.

BACKGROUND

Suburb/Location: Lot 743 Admiral Grove, Heathridge
Applicant: Iliadis & Associates Architects
Owner: Department of Housing and Works
Zoning: **DPS:** Centre (R40)
MRS: Urban
Strategic Plan: 3.3 – To continue to meet changing demographic needs.
Land Area: 2007m²

Application History

18 October 2004	Application received
17 November 2004	Amended plans received, modifying the proposed finished floor levels. (These plans were submitted by the applicant, without request)
20 December 2004	Further information requested, requiring amendments to new plans and compliance with all criteria as set out by the Structure Plan, which had not been completed.
30 December 2004	Requested information received, including amended plans.

DETAILS

The proposed development has the following features:

- Thirteen (13) semi-detached, two storey, single bedroom dwellings;
- Each unit is to be brick and tile with frontages to both Admiral Grove and the Heathridge Shopping Centre;
- Vehicular access is provided from Admiral Grove;
- Car parking is to be located on-site;
- A one (1) metre pedestrian access has been provided along the western boundary (shopping centre) as part of a legal agreement between the owners of the subject property and the City.

Statutory Provision:

In considering the application, Structure Plan No 4 (Lots 742 & 743 Caridean Street & Admiral Grove, Heathridge), DPS2 and the Residential Design Codes 2002 (RDC) are relevant statutory documents.

The following table summarizes the development details:

Single Bedroom Dwellings

Standard	Required	Provided
Front/ Rear Setback: (Admiral Grove & Western Boundary)	1.0m minimum, 3.0m maximum	1.15m minimum, 1.694m maximum
Side Setbacks: (as per Structure Plan No 4)		
Southern side	1.5m	1.735m
<i>Ground</i>	1.5m	1.735m
<i>Upper</i>		
Northern Side	Nil	1.195m
<i>Ground</i>	1.5m	1.523m
<i>Upper</i>		

Height	As per Residential Design Codes 2002.	Structure Plans allows for setback variations.
Outdoor Living Area	Minimum 20m ²	20m ²
Storerooms	Minimum 4.0m ²	4.0m ²
Minimum Site Area	146.7m ² - (as per Structure Plan No 4)	154.38 m ²
Maximum Dwelling Size (Plot Ratio)	65m ² – (as per Structure Plan No 4)	64.17m ²

Car Parking

Use	Parking Standard	No of Bays Required	No of Bays Provided
Single Bedroom Dwellings	1 per dwelling + 1 visitor bay for every 4 dwellings	16	16

Consultation:

Consultation for the proposed development was not considered to be necessary. The proposal was advertised for public comment during the Structure Plan and Amendment process in which a draft development plan was incorporated into the application. The draft development proposal incorporated into the Structure Plan and Amendment process is considered to be similar in nature to the proposal, which is the subject of this application.

It is not required to advertise the subject application in accordance with Structure Plan No 4, DPS2 or the Residential Design Codes 2002.

Strategic Implications:

The City of Joondalup recognises the changing demographic needs of the community and aims to provide a range of residential living choices.

COMMENT

In general, it is considered that the development of the site for single bedroom dwellings, as foreshadowed in Structure Plan No 4 (Lots 742 & 743 Caridean Street & Admiral Grove, Heathridge) is appropriate.

As per clause 5.1.2 of Structure Plan No 4, there are certain criteria that a development must comply with for an approval to be granted.

Certain setback variations are permitted, as part of this Structure Plan, in which this development is consistent with, as shown in the table above. A nil setback has been allowed between individual dwellings and is permitted on both ground and first floors of the development. A zero lot setback for the ground floor is permitted along the northern boundary, which the applicant has not utilised in this situation, having a minimum setback of 1.195m to the storeroom of Unit 6.

Clause (V), of Structure Plan No 4, states that the application does not have to comply with Element 8 (Privacy) of the Residential Design Codes 2002. Furthermore, Clause (XIII) of Structure Plan No 4, states that the application does not have to comply with Element 9 (Design for Climate) of the Residential Design Codes 2002

Access to the site is only permissible from Admiral Grove, which the applicant has complied with in this instance. Although pedestrian access is permitted into the shopping centre site to the west, no vehicular traffic is permitted.

Clause (IX) of Structure Plan No 4 states that both visitor and residents' parking shall be located internally such that garages and parking spaces are largely hidden from the street. It is considered that the applicant has complied with this requirement in this instance.

Clause (X) of Structure Plan No 4 requires the applicant to provide a 1.0 metre wide pedestrian access way along the shopping centre boundary (west), to provide a direct link to Caridean Street. This area is to be landscaped, paved, maintained and adequately provided in terms of lighting. The applicant in this instance has provided a 1.0 metre wide brick paved access way. No details with regards to landscaping and lighting for this area have been provided. It is deemed that this could be incorporated as a condition.

Clause (XI) of Structure Plan No 4, states that the site should maintain a minimum of 40% open space. The applicant has complied with this requirement by providing over 52% of open space within the site.

Structure Plan No 4, has certain guidelines, which the applicant must comply with in relation to fencing. The structure plan does not encourage fencing along the primary street frontage, however, if fencing is to be provided, it is required that the fencing is permeable, solid or a combination of both types to a maximum height of 1.0m. Where there is fencing proposed along the primary street frontage, the side fencing within the primary street frontage area, is required to be of the same height (1.0m), same style and materials as the fencing provided in the primary street frontage. The applicant in this instance has provided fencing along the primary street frontage, being Admiral Grove, which is deemed to comply with this requirement.

Any fencing, which is proposed along the southern boundary, is required to be a maximum height of 1.8 metres with the solid component not to exceed 750mm. The plans, which have been submitted by the applicant, do not show any fencing proposed along this elevation. The existing retaining wall along the southern boundary is to be maintained.

Clause (XIX), of Structure Plan No 4, states that the applicant/ owner of the land shall enter into a legal agreement with the City of Joondalup, to create a pedestrian access way between the subject lot and the shopping centre. Furthermore, necessary notations are required to be applied on the title of the lot to ensure that the proposed dwellings are designated and used as "Single Bedroom Dwellings". This was required, prior to the completion of the amendment or structure plan process. This requirement has not been completed to date. The applicant is aware of this issue and is currently in the process of completing this requirement.

It is considered that a determination on the proposed development should not be withheld due to the fact that Clause (XIX), of Structure Plan No 4 has not been met. This could be included as a condition of planning approval, which would be required to be fulfilled, prior to a Practical Completion Certificate being given to the applicant/owner and prior to occupation.

The applicant is proposing a variation to the finished floor level of this development application, for the units located along the Admiral Grove frontage. Small portions of the front of Units 1, 2, 3, 4 & 5 are raised from between 0.75m and 1.55m above the front boundary of the subject property.

It is noted that the existing topography of the land from the front to the rear of the subject property, increases by approximately 4.1 metres. The proposed dwellings along Admiral Grove are, for the most part, built at natural ground level. Therefore the variation in floor levels to the front portion of these units is considered to have a minor impact on the streetscape in relation to an increase in bulk. Furthermore, is not necessary for the applicant to comply with the Council's Policy 3.1.9 for Height and Scale of Buildings Within a Residential Area under the Structure Plan. The requirements of clause 3.7.1 of the Residential Design Codes 2002 govern the heights of the proposed development, which the applicant has met.

Conclusion

It is considered that the use of the subject site for the development of thirteen (13), two-storey, single bedroom dwellings is acceptable. The layout of the development maintains a suitable interface between the adjacent residential dwellings to the east and that of the adjoining commercial development to the west of the site. The development of this unimproved land is seen to be a benefit for the local community and will offer diversity in the range of living choices within the area.

It is considered that the development in its current form has met the criteria as set out by Structure Plan No 4 (Lots 742 & 743 Caridean Street & Admiral Grove, Heathridge), District Planning Scheme No. 2 and the Residential Design Codes 2002, and is therefore recommended for approval.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1	Location Plan
Attachment 2	Development Plans

VOTING REQUIREMENTS

Simple Majority

RECOMMENDATION

That Council APPROVES the application dated 18 October 2004 submitted by Iliadis & Associates Architects, on behalf of the Department of Housing and Works for Thirteen (13) Single Bedroom Dwellings (Two Storey) on Lot 743 (79A-79B) Admiral Grove, Heathridge subject to the following conditions:

- 1 Prior to issuance of a Practical Completion Certificate and occupation of the proposed single bedroom dwellings, the owner/s of Lot 743 (79A-79B) Admiral Grove, Heathridge shall enter into a legal agreement with the City to allow for a pedestrian access between Lot 743 (79A-79B) Admiral Grove, Heathridge and Lot 742 (83) Caridean Street, Heathridge, to the satisfaction of the City. The owner/s shall be responsible for the payment of all costs of and incidental to the preparation and execution of this legal agreement;**

- 2 The owner/s of Lot 743 (79A-79B) Admiral Grove, Heathridge shall provide necessary notations on the Certificate of Title of the land to state that the proposed dwellings are designated as “Single Bedroom Dwellings”, to the satisfaction of the City;
- 3 The minimum distance between the gutter-line of the dwellings and the boundary shall be no less than 750mm;
- 4 Common areas shall be landscaped and thereafter maintained to the satisfaction of the City. A landscape plan, indicating landscaping location and types, shall be submitted to the City within 30 days of the dwellings being occupied;
- 5 All stormwater shall be collected on-site and disposed of in a manner acceptable to the City;
- 6 The private yard areas shall be nominated and suitably screened from adjoining dwellings and the street prior to the development first being occupied;
- 7 The parking bay/s, driveway/s, crossover and points of ingress and egress shall be designed and constructed in accordance with the Australian Standard for Off-street Parking (AS2890) to the satisfaction of the City, before occupation of the dwellings;
- 8 The provision of three (3) visitor bays, permanently marked and maintained at all times to the satisfaction of the City;
- 9 The proposed one (1) metre wide, pedestrian access-way, to the west of the subject site shall be landscaped, paved and maintained and adequately provided in terms of lighting, to the satisfaction of the City, prior to occupation of the dwellings;

Footnote:

- 1 The applicant/owner is required to lodge an application for a building licence under the provisions of the Building Regulations and approval from the City before commencing any works whatsoever;
- 2 In relation to Condition No. 6, please note that all fencing proposed for the subject development must comply with the requirements of Structure Plan No 4 (Lots 742 & 743 Caridean Street & Admiral Grove, Heathridge) and may require approval from the City prior to installation;
- 3 In relation to Condition No 7, car bay grades are not to exceed 6%.

Appendix 10 refers.

To access this attachment on electronic document, click here: [Attach10brf150205.pdf](#)

ITEM 12 DELEGATED AUTHORITY REPORT FOR THE MONTHS OF NOVEMBER AND DECEMBER 2004 – [07032]

WARD - All

PURPOSE

To submit items of Delegated Authority to Council for noting.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report provides a resumé of the Development Applications processed by Delegated Authority during November and December 2004 (see attachments 1 and 2). Please note that figures for January are not available at the time of preparing this report.

The total number of Development Applications determined (including Council and delegated decisions) is as follows:

Month	No	Value (\$)
November 2004	79	5,287,116.00
December 2004	90	44,229,381.00

The number of DAs received in November and December 2004 was 96 and 83 respectively.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 November 2004 Approvals
Attachment 2 December 2004 Approvals

VOTING REQUIREMENTS

Simple Majority

RECOMMENDATION

That Council NOTES the determinations made under Delegated Authority in relation to the applications described in this report, for the months of November and December 2004.

Appendix 11 refers.

To access this attachment on electronic document, click here: [Attach11brf150205.pdf](#)

ITEM 13 SUBDIVISION REFERRALS PROCESSED 1 NOVEMBER – 31 DECEMBER 2004 - [05961]

WARD - North Coastal, South, Lakeside, Marina, South Coastal, Whitfords

PURPOSE

This report is to advise Council of subdivision referrals received by the City for processing in the period 1 November – 31 December 2004.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Attachment 1 is a schedule of the Subdivision Referrals processed by the City from 1 November – 31 December 2004. Applications were dealt with in terms of the delegation of subdivision control powers by the Chief Executive Officer (C55-08/04).

DETAILS

Fourteen subdivision referrals were processed within the period. The average processing time taken was 20 days which compares favourably with the statutory timeframe of 42 days. The subdivision applications processed enabled the potential creation of three (3) residential lots and six (6) strata residential lots. One application was not supported and two applications were deferred. These applications are as follows:

Ref: SU126395 – 500 Burns Beach Road, Burns Beach

This application was not supported as approval of the subdivision would be premature in the absence of an Agreed Structure Plan and therefore prejudice the overall planning of the area.

Ref: SU126503 – 20 Balga Way, Mullaloo

The City requested that this application be deferred to enable the applicant to amend the current green title proposal to a survey strata proposal.

Ref: SU127019 – 4 Sunlander Drive, Currambine

The City requested that this application be deferred to enable the applicant to provide additional information regarding vehicle access to certain lots and the integration of the proposed dual use pathway.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1 Schedule of Subdivision Referrals

VOTING REQUIREMENTS

Simple Majority

RECOMMENDATION

That Council NOTES the action taken by the subdivision control unit in relation to the applications described in this report for the months of November and December 2004.

Appendix 12 refers.

To access this attachment on electronic document, click here: [Attach12brf150204.pdf](#)

ITEM 14 ART COLLECTION PURCHASES – [14158]

WARD - All

PURPOSE

To endorse the acquisition of four artworks for the City of Joondalup art collection, as recommended by the City's Art Collection Curator.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A meeting was held on 21 December 2004 between the Manager Community Development Services, Cultural Development Coordinator and the City's Art Collection Curator to discuss the purchase of new artworks for the collection.

It is recommended that two artworks be purchased for the City of Joondalup Art Collection:

- "Reflection", 2004 oil on canvas painting by Jo Darbyshire for \$4,400 (inc GST)
- "Stratum", 2004 oil on canvas painting by Indra Geidans for \$3,000 (inc GST)

It is noted that two further artworks have been purchased for the City of Joondalup Art Collection. These artworks are purchased as part of a Delegated Authority to the City's Art Collection Coordinator for purchase of under \$1,000:

- "Slow Infinity of Dreaming", 2004 fibre textile artwork by Elisa Markes-Young for \$750
- "Jupiter Well", 2004 Screenprint by Helicopter Tjugurrayi for \$500

BACKGROUND

The Art Collection has the following objectives:

- To support contemporary Western Australian Art and Artists
- To provide the citizens of the City of Joondalup access to high quality visual art within the boundaries of the region.

The objective of the collection is to establish a collection of good quality artwork by contemporary Western Australian artists with a second priority of having a regional focus.

It is a policy that artworks over the value of \$1,000 be viewed by the Art Collection Working Party for a recommendation to Council.

DETAILS

Details of the four artworks of interest are listed below. Recommended for purchase are those over the value of \$1,000. Those artworks under the value of \$1,000 have already been purchased at the recommendation of the City's Art Collection Curator.

Artist	Title	Medium	Art gallery	Price GST inc	Price GST exc
Jo Darbyshire	<i>Reflection</i>	Oil on Canvas	Direct from artist	\$4,400	\$ 4,000
Indra Geidans	<i>Stratum</i>	Oil on Canvas	Art Place	\$3,000	\$ 2,727
Elisa Markes Young	<i>Slow Infinity of Dreaming</i>	Textile, mixed media	Direct from Artist	\$ 750*	\$ 750
Helicopter Tjugurrayi	<i>Jupiter Well</i>	Screenprint	Fremantle Art Centre	\$ 500	\$ 455
TOTAL				\$8,650	\$ 7,932

* The purchase price of this artwork does not include GST, as the artist is not GST registered.

Financial Implications:

Funds for the purchase of the artworks are as detailed below.

Account No:	1 4430 6781 0001 A007
Budget Item:	Art Purchases
Budget Amount:	\$10,000
Actual Cost:	\$7,932
Remaining Budget:	\$2,067

COMMENT

The Curator recommended the purchase of the following artworks for the reasons stated:

“Reflection”, 2004 oil on canvas painting by Jo Darbyshire for \$4,400 (inc GST)

- This artwork was recently exhibited in the 2004 Joondalup Invitation Art Award and highly commended by the judging panel.
- It is an outstanding painting that explores the theme of water and reflections; its fluid style represents both surface reflections and underwater realms. It is a cohesive culmination of several years’ painting styles by the artist.
- Jo Darbyshire is a well-respected Western Australian artist. She has held international residencies, several solo exhibitions at Gallery East and regularly exhibits in Melbourne.
- Jo Darbyshire is a painting lecturer at Edith Cowan University and is well represented in State and National Collections including: Artbank, Art Gallery of WA, BankWest, Edith Cowan University, Lawrence Wilson Art Gallery, Murdoch University and Royal Perth Hospital.

“Stratum”, 2004 oil on canvas painting by Indra Geidans for \$3,000 (inc GST)

- This well executed artwork would be a worthy purchase for the City of Joondalup art collection and sit well with both the current collection of abstract and landscape paintings.

- As the name “Stratum” indicates, this work can be viewed on numerous levels; from the micro study of the subjects ageing & wrinkled skins to the macro view of the landscapes’ valleys and folds.
- Indra Geidans is a successful mid-career Western Australian artist who has had numerous solo exhibitions in Australia and Europe, been awarded many grants, awards and commissions for her artworks.
- Indra is well-represented in many state, national and private collections including: Art Gallery of WA, University of WA, Edith Cowan University, Bunbury City Collection, City of Bayswater Collection, Royal Perth Hospital, Federal Law Courts of Australia.

The Curator reported the purchase of the Artworks below for the reasons stated:

“Slow Infinity of Dreaming”, 2004 fibre textile artwork by Elisa Markes-Young for \$750*

- This artwork is part of a series “the Slow Infinity of Dreaming” where the artist has explored numerous abstract shapes and patterns in textile media. The richly coloured artworks are a well-crafted fibre works that have been knitted and stitched onto board and presented in a framed box format.
- This artwork will complement the one other textile piece that is represented in the Joondalup Art Collection.
- Elisa Markes Young is a promising local emerging artist, having won several Art Awards in 2003-2004 and has artworks represented in various collections across Western Australia.
- Elisa is an active member and Secretary of the Joondalup Community Arts Association and is represented in various collections including: City of Wanneroo, Royal Perth Hospital and various private collections.

“Jupiter Well”, 2004 Screenprint by Helicopter Tjugurrayi for \$500 (inc GST)

- This vibrant screen print is a translation from the artist’s traditional painting style into print. It depicts an aspect of the landscape that he grew up in – Jupiter Well, in the Gibson and Great Sandy Desert.
- Purchase of prints in an affordable way to collect artworks by sought after indigenous artworks. This artwork will complement other indigenous prints in the collection by Sally Morgan and Queenie McKenzie.
- Helicopter began painting in 1995 and has since participated in numerous exhibitions in Australia and in Europe. He is a much sought after artist and his paintings are held in major private and state collections.

ATTACHMENTS

Nil.

VOTING REQUIREMENTS

Simple majority

RECOMMENDATION

That Council ENDORSES the acquisition of the following art works for the Art Collection at the cost of \$7,932 (excl. GST) from Account Number 1 4430 6781 0001 A007 – Art Purchases.

Artist	Title	Medium	Art gallery	Price GST inc.	Price GST excl.
Jo Darbyshire	<i>Reflection</i>	Oil on Canvas	Direct from artist	\$4,400	\$ 4,000
Indra Geidans	<i>Stratum</i>	Oil on Canvas	Art Place	\$3,000	\$ 2,727
Elisa Markes Young	<i>Slow Infinity of Dreaming</i>	Textile, mixed media	Direct from Artist	\$ 750*	\$ 750
Helicopter Tjugurrayi	<i>Jupiter Well</i>	Screenprint	Fremantle Art Centre	\$ 500	\$ 455
TOTAL				\$8,650	\$ 7,932

* The purchase price of this artwork does not include GST, as the artist is not GST registered.

ITEM 15 MINUTES OF THE SENIORS INTERESTS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETINGS HELD ON 17 NOVEMBER AND 15 DECEMBER 2004 – [55511]

WARD - All

PURPOSE

To provide Council with the minutes of the Seniors Interest Advisory Committee meetings held Wednesday 17 November (confirmed) and Wednesday 15 December 2004 (unconfirmed).

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A meeting of the Seniors Interest Advisory Committee was held on Wednesday 17 November 2004 and Wednesday 15 December 2004. The minutes of these meetings are submitted for noting by Council.

It is recommended that Council NOTES the minutes of the Seniors Interest Advisory Committee held on Wednesday 17 November 2004 (confirmed) and 15 December 2004 (unconfirmed) forming Attachments 1 and 2 to this Report.

DETAILS

Meeting held on 17 November 2004

Lew Thorstensen conducted a presentation followed by a discussion session on the topic - **“The future of employment for seniors”**

Information from this session will be taken in to account during the review of the Seniors Plan 2004 – 2008 which will be conducted over the next few months.

At the completion of the presentation the following recommendation was put to the meeting.

“MOVED Kevan Rowe, **SECONDED** Audrey Poole that the City of Joondalup adopts a policy of affirmative action in the employment of seniors.”

Officers Comment – this recommendation will be taken into account during the review of the Seniors Plan 2004 – 2008 which will be conducted during April and May of 2005.

Meeting held on 15 December 2004

A presentation paper by committee member Margaret March was circulated to the committee. Margaret March did not attend the meeting. A discussion session was held on the topic - **“Information, issues and trends with regard to seniors taking part in physical activity”**

No specific actions arose as a result of this presentation, the information will however be taken into account during the review of the Seniors Plan 2004 – 2008 which will be conducted over the next few months.

The subject of discounted fees for seniors accessing the City's Leisure Centres programs was raised during the meeting. Members of the committee were informed that the City was conducting a review of Fees and Charges for seniors as part of the Seniors Plan, and that comments would be fed to the review process.

ATTACHMENTS

- | | |
|--------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Attachment 1 | Minutes of the Seniors Interests Advisory Committee Meeting held 17 November 2004 |
| Attachment 2 | Minutes of the Seniors Interests Advisory Committee Meeting held 15 December 2004 |

VOTING REQUIREMENTS

Simple Majority

RECOMMENDATION

That Council NOTES:

- 1 the minutes of The Seniors Interest Advisory Committee held on Wednesday 17 November 2004 (confirmed) and Wednesday 15 December 2004 (unconfirmed), forming Attachments 1 and 2 to this Report;**
- 2 that the Committee's recommendation regarding affirmative action in the employment of seniors will be considered in the review of the Seniors Action Plan 2004 – 2008 to be conducted in April and May 2005.**

Appendix 14 refers.

To access this attachment on electronic document, click here: [Attach14brf150205.pdf](#)

ITEM 16 AMENDMENT OF RESOLUTION MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT LOT 517 (91) REID PROMENADE JOONDALUP – [89530]

WARD - Lakeside

PURPOSE

For Council to consider an amendment of the resolution dated 14 December 2004 for the subject development at Lot 517 (91) Reid Promenade, Joondalup.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

At the meeting on 14 December 2004, Council resolved to approve the development subject to conditions. There are typographic modifications needed to conditions in the resolution to reflect the change to how plot ratio is calculated and the effect of this change on car parking. Due to an amendment to the Joondalup City Centre Development Plan and Manual (JCCDPM) the plot ratio calculations have altered from gross lettable area to net lettable area.

The required modifications relate to conditions 3 ‘L’ & 3 ‘V’. It is recommended that Council adopts these changes as it resolves a potential inconsistency between the two conditions and allows the resolution to be clear to the landowner, applicant and community. The inconsistency relates to the allocation of the parking spaces that are to be provided on-site.

It is important to note that the report is only to consider the amendment of the conditions, not the merits of the development application.

BACKGROUND

Suburb\Location: Lot 517 (91) Reid Promenade Joondalup
Applicant: R-A-D
Owner: Mimi Ferguson
Zoning: DPS: JCCDPM
MRS: Centre

DETAILS

The property is contained within the Residential\Mixed Use Precinct of the Central Business District. The applicant proposed to develop thirty-four serviced apartments, twelve multiple dwellings and one commercial ground floor tenancy.

A report on this application was first considered at the meeting held on 23 November 2004, where Council resolved to defer a decision on the matter. At the meeting held on 14 December 2004 Council then approved the development subject to conditions. The report from the meeting on 14 December 2004 is contained in attachment 1.

The approval resolution contained potential conflicts in the conditions relating to the allocation of parking spaces. The purpose of the report is to resolve the possible conflicts, not reconsider the merits of the proposal.

COMMENT

Council resolved to approve the subject development on 14 December 2004 subject to conditions. The resolution included the following conditions:

- 3 (l) *Twelve bays, at one bay per dwelling, are to be allocated for the multiple dwellings & eight for the commercial unit including tandem bays.*
- 3 (v) *A minimum of twenty-two car parking bays are to be provided.*

The inconsistency with the conditions, detailed above, creates a potential conflict in relation to the number of car parking bays required and the provision of the car parking bays for the separate uses. That is in relation to condition 3 'L' the commercial unit only requires 6 car-parking bays however 8 have been allocated. The change to the car parking requirements was a result of an amendment to the JCCDPM in relation to the calculation of plot ratio changing from gross lettable area to net lettable area. Net lettable area reduces the amount of lettable area on site.

In respect to condition 3 'V' this condition could be reworded to state that a minimum of 22 car parking bays are required if 'cash in lieu' is paid for the development's shortfall of car parking. Alternatively the condition may either be removed or a change made in the footnote of the approval to provide further clarification. It is recommended that the condition be removed. Condition 3 'L' should be amended as follows:

- (l) *twelve bays, at one bay per dwelling, are to be allocated for the multiple dwellings and six bays for the commercial unit including tandem bays.*

ATTACHMENTS

Nil.

VOTING REQUIREMENTS

Absolute majority

RECOMMENDATION

That Council BY AN ABSOLUTE MAJORITY, AMENDS its decision of 14 December 2004 at Item CJ332-12/04 for the proposed Mixed Use Development at Lot 517 (91) Reid Promenade Joondalup by:

1 DELETING condition 'L' as follows:

- (l) Twelve bays, at one bay per dwelling, are to be allocated for the multiple dwellings & eight for the commercial unit including tandem bays;**

and REPLACING it with the following condition:

Twelve bays, at one bay per dwelling, are to be allocated for the multiple dwellings and six bays for the commercial unit including tandem bays.

2 DELETING condition 'V' as shown below:

- (v) A minimum of twenty-two car parking bays are to be provided;**

3 RENUMBERING the conditions as appropriate.

ITEM 17 MIXED USE COMMERCIAL & RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT: LOT 510 (69) GRAND BOULEVARD, JOONDALUP – [19436]

WARD - Lakeside

PURPOSE

To request Council's determination of an application for a mixed use development in the City North precinct of the City Centre at Lot 510 (69) Grand Boulevard, Joondalup.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

An application has been received from Meynert & Associates Architects for the development of a building for one office/commercial unit and 6 multiple dwellings. Overall the proposal comprises 96m² of office space and 569m² for residential purposes. The building is 3 storeys in height and includes parking from the rear laneway. 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) in regard to plot ratio, the density for residential units and the requirements for parking. Given that the development will contribute to the desired character of the City Centre area and is compatible with existing developments in the area, the proposed development is supported.

BACKGROUND

Suburb/Location: Joondalup
Applicant: Meynet & Associates Architects
Owner: Equimex Pty Ltd
Zoning: **DPS:** Centre
MRS: Urban
Strategic Plan: Joondalup City Centre Development Plan and Manual

Lot 510 (69) Grand Boulevard Joondalup is currently vacant 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, residential, leisure and entertainment, cultural facilities, community facilities and medical suites.

19/08/2004 Application received
24/08/2004 Additional information regarding ventilation to undercroft car park requested
01/09/2004 Additional information received
28/10/2004 Amended plans demonstrating changes to residential plot ration requested
25/11/2004 Amended plans received

DETAILS

The proposed development includes the following features:

- A mixed use development is proposed consisting of 6 multiple dwellings and 1 office or commercial unit;
- The height of the building is three storeys;
- The total number of car parking bays provided is 8;
- The upper level residential units are accessed via stairs located in the parking areas and the front entrance foyer;
- The residential units include a centrally located communal courtyard;
- The residential and office units address the street frontage with zero setback;
- Balconies have been provided for the residential units.

Statutory Provision:

The provisions of District Planning Scheme No 2 (DPS2), the Joondalup City Centre Development Plan and Manual (JCCDPM) and the R-Codes control development within this area.

District Planning Scheme No 2

The site is zoned Centre under DPS2 and is subject to the Joondalup City Centre Development Plan and Manual.

When determining this application Clauses 4.2.4, 4.5, 4.8 and 6.8 of the DPS2 apply and 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 R-20 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:

- (c) consult the affected parties by following one or more of the provisions for advertising uses pursuant to clause 6.7.1; and*

- (d) *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. 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.*

4.11 *Car Parking – Cash in Lieu or Staging*

4.11.2 *Council may accept cash- in- lieu of the provision of any required land for parking subject to being satisfied that there is adequate provision for car parking or a reasonable expectation in the immediate future that there will be adequate provision for public car parking in the proximity of the proposed development.*

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
- (k) any other matter which in the opinion of the Council is relevant.

Development Standards Table

The following table summarises the development details:

Standard	Required	Provided
Front Setback	0m	0m
Side Setback	As per BCA*	0m
Plot Ratio	1.0 542m ² maximum	1.227 (665m ²)
Height	3 storeys maximum	3 storeys
Storerooms	1 per dwelling, 4m ² area	1 per dwelling, 4m ²

* Under the BCA a nil side setback can be permitted for buildings.

Consultation:

The proposed development was not advertised, as the form of development is expected under the JCCDPM.

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 Centre area.

It is considered that the proposal is in line with many objectives of the City's Strategic Plan and City Development.

COMMENT

Urban Design

The proposed zero setback to Grand Boulevard will contribute to creating an urban wall along the streetscape edge, 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 upper floor residential balconies overlook the public streets and therefore provide surveillance of public areas. The building can be accessed internally from the car parking area at the rear to both the residential and office units. The front and rear (western

and eastern) facing windows on the upper storey are less than 50% of the face of the building and therefore comply with solar access requirements of the JCCDPM.

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 one (1) office or commercial tenancy. In this form, the space is flexible enough in the future to accommodate the permitted uses under the JCCDPM, including retail, entertainment and restaurant/café. The residential accommodation ranges from one (1) to three (3) bedroom units and therefore, also contributes to the range of housing stock available in the City

Residential Density

There are no specific residential density requirements in the ‘general city’ precinct of City North. Clause 4.2.4 of the DPS2 specifies that unless otherwise specified on the map the R-20 density applies unless Council determines that a higher code should apply. The proposal has an equivalent density of R-81. This density is consistent with other approved developments within the City Centre.

The organisation will be reviewing the JCCDPM and this is scheduled to occur in the current financial year.

It is recommended that the Council determines that the proposed density at R-81 is considered to be appropriate given that the site is in a prominent location within the City, where higher densities are appropriate and encouraged.

Plot Ratio

For General City Use the JCCDPM requires that the development have a maximum plot ratio of 1.0 or 542m². The plot ratio for the residential component is 1.050 being a floor area of 569m² and plot ratio for the commercial component is 0.177 or 96m². The overall plot ratio for the development is 1.227.

It is considered that the required plot ratio of 1.0 is counter-productive to the development of an appropriate style and bask of building that achieves the form expected and desirable (for example, a 3 storey building) within the City Centre. There is no provision under the JCCDPM to vary the plot ratio requirement for the residential units but the overall plot ratio where there is a commercial unit can be altered where the total plot ration for residential does not exceed 1.0.

The plot ratio of the office development is considered to be appropriate as it will integrate with other existing developments in the area and will generally add value to the City Centre by having quality commercial space and creating employment opportunities. The commercial premises may in the future accommodate other permitted uses under the JCCDPM including office, entertainment, and/or café.

It is therefore recommended that, in accordance with clause 4.5 of DPS2 and having regard to the criteria of clause 6.8, the Council determines 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 affect upon the occupiers of the development or on the locality.
- The plot ratio for the residential units, which includes the area of storerooms exclusively for the use of the residential units, be reduced to the required plot ratio of 1.0.
- A total plot ratio of 1.177 for a mixed-use residential and commercial development at Lot 510 (69) Grand Boulevard in considered appropriate in this instance.

It is recommended that the Council resolves to support the development subject to compliance with a plot ratio of 1.0 for the residential component of the development with the amended plans approved by the Manager Approvals, Planning and Environmental Services.

Car Parking

The JCCDPM specifies the following car parking standards:

Use	Parking Provision	No of Bays Required	No of Bays Provided
Commercial	1 Bay per 30m ²	3	2
Residential	1 bay per residential unit	6	6
Total		9	8 bays are provided

The proposed development requires nine (9) car parking bays, eight (8) bays have been provided and as such, the applicant has requested that a shortfall of 1 bay for the commercial unit be considered along with a cash in lieu payment of \$8100.00. The approval of a shortfall of one (1) car parking bay is considered appropriate as:

- Access for the parking is via the rear lane thus minimising disruption to vehicle and pedestrian movement;
- There is opportunity in the future, if it is determined that a need exists, to modify the road reserve and provide on street parking within the locality of the proposed development.

It is therefore recommended that, in accordance with clause 4.5 of DPS2 and having regard to the criteria of clause 6.8, that the Council determines that a parking requirement of eight (8) bays is appropriate in this instance and that the applicant pay the City of Joondalup cash-in-lieu of an additional one (1) required parking bay. The standard valuation for a car parking bay within the Joondalup City Centre is \$8100.00. This valuation is applied to conditions of development approval where cash in lieu for parking is considered appropriate.

Setbacks

Under the JCCDPM, a nil front setback is required, indicating that the desired outcome is the creation of strong urban spaces, with urban walls creating a strong presence to the street. The office and residential units comply with the required nil front setback. Essentially the design promotes the interaction between the office tenancies and the adjoining public streets creating animated spaces at a human scale.

Conclusion

The proposed development will be a positive addition to the City Centre. It will provide accommodation and office facilities to meet the future demands of the growing City Centre. There will be the creation of an urban area that is compatible with the overall City Centre environment. Therefore the residential density, plot ratio, setback and car parking standards are considered appropriate in this instance.

It is therefore recommended that the development be approved, subject to appropriate conditions.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1	Location Plan
Attachment 2	Areal Photo
Attachment 2	Development Plans

VOTING REQUIREMENTS

Simple Majority

RECOMMENDATION

That Council:

- 1 EXERCISES discretion under clauses 4.2.4, 4.5, 4.8.1 of District Planning Scheme No 2 and determines that:**
 - (a) The proposed plot ratio for the development of 1.177 in lieu of 1.0;**
 - (b) The equivalent development density of R-81 in lieu of R-20;**
- 2 DETERMINES under clause 4.11 that a cash-in-lieu payment of \$8 100 for a shortfall of 1 carbay is appropriate in this instance;**
- 3 APPROVES the application dated 19 August 2004 submitted by Meynet & Associates Architects for a mixed use development comprising 1 office and 6 residential units on the proposed Lot 510 (69) Grand Boulevard, Joondalup subject to the following conditions:**
 - (a) The provision of 9 car bays to be provided on site;**
 - (b) The applicant is to submit an amended plan demonstrating compliance with the maximum plot ratio of 1.0 for the residential portion of the development. The amended plan is to be submitted for approved by the Manager Approvals, Planning & Environmental Services Prior to the lodging of a building licence;**
 - (c) The gradient between the disabled parking bay and the building entrance at rear to be a maximum of 5%;**

- (d) Provision must be made for disabled access, parking and facilities in accordance with the Australian Standards for Design for Access and Mobility (AS 1428.1);**
- (e) The rear parking area to be open to the public at all times and two parking bays, which includes one disabled parking bay, to be marked and permanently available for the use of the commercial unit;**
- (f) The parking bays, driveways and points of ingress and egress to be designed in accordance with the Australian Standard for Offstreet Carparking (AS2890). Such areas are to be constructed, drained, marked and thereafter maintained to the satisfaction of the City prior to the development first being occupied. These works to be done as part of the building programme;**
- (g) An onsite stormwater drainage system with the capacity to contain a 1:100 year storm 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 stormwater drainage system is required to be shown on the Building Licence submission and be approved by the City prior to the commencement of construction;**
- (h) A separate application being made to the City for Approval to Commence Development and sign licence prior to the installation of any advertising signage;**
- (i) With reference to condition (b) design levels of the proposed development must ensure a smooth transition between the development and the adjoining pavement within the road reserve to the satisfaction of the City;**
- (j) Any roof mounted or freestanding plant or equipment such as air conditioning units to be located and/or screened so as not to be visible from or beyond the boundaries of the development site;**
- (k) The ground floor level of the building should be at the finished pedestrian paving level;**
- (l) Roof where pitched shall be greater than twenty-five degrees otherwise parapets shall be provided to flat roofs;**
- (m) The glazed area of the east west facades should not exceed 50% with the exception of the ground floor;**
- (n) Ground floor glazing for the commercial unit should be maximized. At least 50% of the area of the commercial unit shall be glazed and the horizontal dimension of the glazing shall comprise 75% of the frontage;**
- (o) Obscured or reflective glazing shall not be used at the ground level;**
- (p) Pedestrian shelter shall be provided to the commercial ground floor unit in accordance with the Joondalup City Centre Plan and Manual;**

- (q) Any advertising signage shall be subject to an application for Planning Approval;**

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 In relation to condition 3(a) cash-in-lieu payment will be accepted in regard to the shortfall of 1 bay for the commercial unit;**
- 3 The cash value that will be accepted for each parking bay is the sum of the construction cost and land component. A sum of \$8 100 per parking bay has been adopted for this purpose. Cash-in-lieu parking will contribute towards a fund for the Council to meet future parking demand within the locality;**
- 4 It is determined that the definition of plot ratio under the JCCDPM includes storerooms for the exclusive use of residential units;**
- 5 It is advised that the City will not support the erection of telecommunications infrastructure on any part of the proposed building.**

Appendix 16 refers.

To access this attachment on electronic document, click here: [Attach16brf150205.pdf](#)

ITEM 18 PURPOSE BUILT SPECIAL CARE FACILITY – KARA EDUCATION CENTRE AT RESERVE 35844 (15) CHESSELL DRIVE, DUNCRAIG – [57094]

WARD - South Coastal

PURPOSE

For Council to consider approval for a new special care and rehabilitation facility at 15 Chessell Drive, Duncraig. The proposed facility will be a joint project between the Association for the Advancement of Brain Injured Children of WA (Inc) (AABIC), Nascha and Valued Independent People (Inc) (VIP).

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The AABIC, Nascha and VIP are seeking planning approval to undertake a joint building project at 15 Chessell Drive, Duncraig. The proposed development adjoins the Percy Doyle Reserve local open space on the western and southern boundaries and the Patricia Teade Aged Persons Villas on the northern boundary. The site currently accommodates a demountable building (approximately 200m² in area), which was erected on the lot in 1979 and used by AABIC and Nascha to provide services to the disability sector.

The intention of the proposed development is to remove the existing demountable building located on the site and to construct a new building accommodating the services already provided through AABIC and Nascha and adding an additional centre for VIP activities. The proposed facility would have a total area (including a covered outdoor area and covered client drop off/pick up) of approximately 1152m².

The site is currently zoned residential R20 under District Planning Scheme No 2. The proposed use is not listed within the City of Joondalup Zoning Table. At its meeting of 23 November 2004 Council unanimously carried a motion, (having regard to Clause 3.3 of District Planning Scheme No.2) to:

- “1 *Determine that the proposed special care school at Reserve 35844 (15) Chessell Drive Duncraig, is a use not listed but is consistent with the objectives of and purpose of the zone;*
- 2 *Endorse the advertising of the proposed use in accordance with the procedures set down for an “a” use in clause 6.6.3 of District Planning Scheme No.2.”*

The proposed complex complies with the development requirements of District Planning Scheme No 2 (DPS2). The proposal for a purpose built special care facility, being a use not listed was advertised in accordance with the provisions of DPS2 and there were four (4) submissions being non-objections. It is recommended that Council approves the special care facility at Reserve 35844 (15) Chessell Drive, Duncraig.

BACKGROUND

Suburb/Location:	Duncraig
Applicant:	Helen Morgan
Owner:	The Association for the Advancement of Brain Injured Children of WA (Inc)
Zoning:	DPS: R20
	MRS: Urban

The proposal is to construct a joint special care school and rehabilitation facility to be used by AABIC, Nascha (a Macedonian word meaning “ours”) and VIP. All of these not-for-profit organisations provide services to clients with intellectual disabilities. The new purpose-built facility would replace an existing demountable building that is used by AABIC and Nascha.

AABIC is a not-for-profit organisation that aims to assist and support families of brain injured children by providing home based programs designed to improve neurological development and gross motor skills. AABIC is run by a voluntary committee who manage a program to provide loan equipment, subsidy assistance and advocacy and support to client families.

Nascha is an organisation that promotes and supports independent living and integration within the community and to improve the quality of life for people with disabilities.

VIP is a not-for-profit organisation that aims to provide flexible home and neighbourhood daytime occupation, community access and participation services to people with a disability. VIP’s clients are mainly young adults with a range of moderate to severe intellectual disabilities, often combined with physical disabilities. VIP currently provides services to 82 clients operating from three centres located in residential areas of Nollamara, Girrawheen and Hamersley.

A joint development between AABIC, Nascha and VIP would benefit these organisations and the disability sector in general by providing the additional financial and human resources required to enable the optimal development and use of the site.

The land is owned by AABIC under a crown grant conditional upon the land being used for the purpose of a special school site. The Hon Minister for Planning and Infrastructure has given approval in principle for the change of the conditional tenure to “Education, Recreational, Administration and Services to People with Disabilities”, subject to the approval of the City of Joondalup.

DETAILS

Statutory Provision:

The provisions of DPS2 and the Residential Design Codes (R Codes) control development within this area.

Council has already made a decision (at the November 2004 Council Meeting) under Clause 3.3 of DPS2 that the proposed unlisted use is consistent with the objectives of and purpose of the Residential Zone.

The relevant clauses relating to a determination of the development application include:

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.*

4.8.2 *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*
- (k) any other matter which in the opinion of the Council is relevant.*

6.8.2 *In addition to the matters referred to in the preceding subclause of this clause, the Council when considering whether or not to approve a “D” or “A” use application shall have due regard to the following (whether or not by implication or otherwise they might have required consideration under the preceding subclauses of this clause):*

- (a) the nature of the proposed use and its relationship to the use of other land within the locality;*
- (b) the size, shape and character of the parcel of land to which the application relates and the nature and siting of any proposed building;*
- (c) the nature of the roads giving access to the subject land;*
- (d) the parking facilities available or proposed and the likely requirements for parking, arising from the proposed development;*
- (e) any relevant submissions or objections received by the Council; and such other matters as the Council considers relevant, whether of the same nature as the foregoing or otherwise.*

COMMENT

Centre Operations

AABIC would use the centre primarily during normal business hours for administrative purposes. Clients would attend the centre from time to time to access hire equipment and resources. AABIC would also hold monthly board meetings and other occasional meetings at the centre. Three (3) offices within the centre would be rented to Nascha for administration and counselling services.

The centre will primarily be used for the daily operations of VIP to provide “alternatives to employment” and occasional respite services. The approximate number of VIP clients visiting the centre on a daily basis will be 22. These clients will be supervised by 10 staff members. Most of the clients are transported to the centre by mini bus between the hours of 8:30am and 9:30am and leave the centre approximately between 2:30 and 3:00pm. Some clients (six to twelve) and staff will remain at the centre after 2:30pm to engage in additional activities.

Rational for the Proposal

A joint development between AABIC, Nascha and VIP would benefit these organisations and the disability sector in general by providing the additional financial and human resources required to enable the optimal development and use of the site. The organisations have a close association in the provision of services. Part of VIP’s role is to provide “further education” to their clients, many of whom participate in AABIC programs as children. The proposed centre would assist in meeting the needs for disability services and facilities in the northern suburbs.

Design and Amenity

The proposal for the new special care school and rehabilitation facility is for a development totalling 1152m² including a covered outdoor area and vehicle drop off/pick up bay. This equates to a provision of open space for the lot of 71.59%, which is over the general

requirement of 50% for residential development at R20 zoning. The development would be constructed to specifically cater for the needs of clients with disabilities and would include:

- Living areas
- Activity rooms
- Conference rooms
- Kitchens, bathrooms and storage facilities
- Training and meeting rooms; and
- Administrative office facilities

The proposed brick and tile building would be positioned well back from the front of the lot and has been designed to fit in with and complement the surrounding environment. The applicant is proposing, where possible, to retain mature trees and shrubs and provide additional landscaping to ensure that the project is aesthetically appropriate to the residential zoning. The Percy Doyle Reserve is adjacent to the western and southern boundaries of the property and a pocket of bushland on the southern part of the reserve screens views of the property from houses located to the south and south east. It is recommended that a landscape plan be provided and approved by the Manager Approvals, Planning and Environmental Services.

There is currently a smaller scale facility (approximately 200m²) use by AABIC and Nascha that has been operating at the site since 1979 and the proposed development will generally not detract from the residential nature of the area.

Car Parking

Clause 4.8 of DPS2 provides that, where no parking standards are provided, a parking standard is to be determined. For the purpose of calculating parking requirements, under Table 2 of DPS2 the proposed development can be considered similar to a Health Centre. Application of the Health Centre car parking standards will result in the following:

Ratio	Required	Provided
Health Centre 1 bay per 30m ² NLA	29 bays	32 bays
Totals	29 bays	32 bays

The applicant has indicated that approximately 18 staff will work at the centre, some on a part-time basis and approximately 22 VIP clients will attend the centre daily but most will travel to the centre by minibus. Given these figures, the provision of 32 parking bay is considered acceptable to accommodate the needs of the facility.

Therefore it is recommended Council exercises discretion under clause 4.8 of DPS2 and accepts the Health Centre car parking standards for the proposed development.

Setback requirements

The setbacks for the proposed development are determined under clause 4.7 of DPS2 – Building Setbacks for Non Residential Buildings.

Setback	Required	Provided
Front	9.0 metres	17.0 metres minimum
Southern Side Boundary	3.0 metres	5.9 metres
Northern Side Boundary	3.0 metres	6.4 metres
Rear	6.0 metres	6.4 metres

Community Consultation:

The proposed development was advertised for 21 days in accordance with clause 6.7.1 of DPS2 for a period of 21 days by way of a sign on site, a notice in the local paper and letters sent to 64 local residents being the properties deemed most affected by the proposal. A total of 4 submissions was received, all being non-objections.

Concluding Comments:

Information provided by Health & Environmental Services and Building Services indicate that the internal layout of the building may need to change to comply with the relevant Acts in relation to a public building and the provision of food preparation. Discussions with the applicant have also revealed that there may be minor changes to the development plan needed to finetune the provision of services to clients. Any changes to the development plans will require a new development approval. Given that the development will provide services to the disability sector within the northern corridor and there are no objections to the proposed development it is recommended that Council grants delegated authority to the Manager Approvals, Planning & Environmental Services to determine development applications for the proposed purpose built special care facility on the Reserve 35844 (15) Chessell Drive, Duncraig.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1	Location Plan
Attachment 2	Aerial Photo
Attachment 3	Development Plans
Attachment 4	Site Photos

VOTING REQUIREMENTS

Absolute Majority

RECOMMENDATION

That Council:

- 1 **EXERCISES** discretion under clauses 3.3, 4.8 of District Planning Scheme No 2 and determines that:
 - (a) the proposed special care school at Reserve 35844 (15) Chessell Drive, Duncraig is a use not listed but is consistent with the objectives of and purpose of the zone;
 - (b) the parking standards of 1 bay per 30m² NLA is appropriate in this instance;

- 2 **APPROVES** the application dated 04 June 2004 submitted by Helen Morgan for a purpose built special care facility on the Reserve 35844 (15) Chessell Drive, Duncraig, subject to the following conditions:
 - (a) The development requires a bin storage area which includes a hose cock and a concrete industrial floor waste that grades evenly and is connected to sewerage;
 - (b) A landscaping plan to be provided prior to the lodgement of a building licence and approved to the satisfaction of the Manager Approvals, Planning and Environmental Services;
 - (c) The parking bays, driveways and points of ingress and egress to be designed in accordance with the Australian Standard for Offstreet Carparking (AS2890). Such areas are to be constructed, drained, marked and thereafter maintained to the satisfaction of the City prior to the development first being occupied. These works to be done as part of the building programme;
 - (d) The gradient between the disabled parking bay and the building entrance at the rear to be a maximum of 5%;
 - (e) Provision must be made for disabled access and facilities in accordance with the Australian Standards for Design for Access and Mobility (AS 1428.1);
 - (f) The building is to comply with Health (Public Building) Regulations 1992;
 - (g) Where food is prepared for patrons, the kitchen shall comply with the Health (Food Hygiene) Regulations 1993;
 - (h) A staff toilet is required to be provided separate to patron facilities;

- 3 **BY AN ABSOLUTE MAJORITY, DELEGATES** authority to the Manager Approvals, Planning & Environmental Services under Clause 8.6 of the District Planning Scheme No 2 to determine development applications for the proposed purpose built special care facility on the Reserve 35844 (15) Chessell Drive, Duncraig;

- 4 CHANGES to the development plans may require a new development application.**

Footnote:

- 1 The applicant is advised that where extensive food preparation is carried out, the floor plan may need to be amended to provide a service access to the outside.**

Appendix 17 refers.

To access this attachment on electronic document, click here: [Attach17brf150205.pdf](#)

ITEM 19 FINAL ADOPTION OF BURNS BEACH STRUCTURE PLAN NO.10 – PORTION OF LOT 9017 BURNS BEACH ROAD, BURNS BEACH – [29557]

WARD - North Coastal

PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is for Council to consider the submissions received as a result of public advertising of the proposed Burns Beach Structure Plan No.10, and proposed minor modifications, for the purpose of final adoption as an Agreed Structure Plan.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Council considered the proposed Burns Beach Structure Plan No. 10 on Portion of Lot 9017 at its meeting on 2 November 2004 (CJ 267-11/04) where it was resolved to adopt the Structure Plan and to make it available for the purposes of advertising.

The draft Structure Plan was advertised for a 28 days period from 11 November to 9 December 2004. A total of ninety-four (94) submissions were received, ten (10) of which supported or did not object to the proposal and eighty four (84) of which objected to the proposal. Sixty-one (61) of the submissions received were proforma submissions, nineteen (19) were not from residents/landowners within the immediate locality, four (4) submissions were from the same submitter and three (3) submissions were received after the close of advertising.

A summary of all submissions and responses is provided with this report for consideration by Council (See Attachments 3 & 4). The issues raised relate primarily to the retention of bushland, a desire for a buffer between the existing Burns Beach residences and the proposed lots, car parking, building height, location, extent and maintenance of public open space, traffic and safety and development of the foreshore. The issues raised in public submissions that are relevant to the Structure Plan process have been adequately addressed by the applicant, and do not alter the City's position in relation to progressing the Structure Plan.

Two necessary minor modifications were identified during the advertising period, partly as a result of the submissions received and also to provide greater clarity, both modifications being in relation to the proposed maximum building height. Since the proposed modifications do not alter the intent or details of the Structure Plan, re-advertising is not considered warranted.

It is recommended that Council:

- 1 Pursuant to clause 9.6 of the City of Joondalup's District Planning Scheme No. 2 RESOLVES that the modified Burns Beach Structure Plan No. 10 shown in Attachment 2 to this Report be adopted and submitted to the Western Australian Planning Commission for final adoption and certification;*

- 2 *Subject to certification by the Western Australian Planning Commission, ADOPTS the modified Burns Beach Structure Plan No. 10 as an Agreed Structure Plan and authorises the affixation of the Common Seal to, and the signing of, the Structure Plan document;*
- 3 *ADVISES the developer to involve the City in discussions during all stages of development of the subject site with regard to any intentions by the developer or any telecommunications carriers to locate telecommunications facilities within, or adjacent to, the Burns Beach Structure Plan No. 10 area;*
- 4 *ADVISES the applicant to include the provision of up to 120 car parking bays along the foreshore road and adjacent to POS 6, including details of the location, dimensions and form of such bays, in the Foreshore Management Plan in relation to the Burns Beach Structure Plan area, to the satisfaction of City of Joondalup.*

BACKGROUND

Suburb/Location:	Portion Lot 9017 Burns Beach Road, Burns Beach
Applicant:	Development Planning Strategies
Owner:	Burns Beach Property Trust
Zoning:	DPS: Urban Development
	MRS: Urban and Parks & Recreation
Strategic Plan:	Strategy 3.3 – Provide residential living choices to meet changing demographic needs

At its meeting on 2 November 2004, Council considered the draft Burns Beach Structure Plan for the purpose of initiation of public advertising where it was resolved:

- 1 *Pursuant to clause 9.4 of the City of Joondalup District Planning Scheme No. 2, adopt the draft Burns Beach Structure Plan No. 10 as per Attachment No.2 to Report CJ267-11/04 for the purpose of public advertising and make it available for public comment for 28 days, subject to the receipt of the following to the satisfaction of the City during the period of public consultation:*
 - (a) *further justification or alternatives to the proposed road arrangement around the proposed areas of open space, denoted as POS 8 & POS 9 on Plan 1;*
 - (b) *written advice from all telecommunications carriers currently operating in Western Australia that they do not require or intend to provide any telecommunications infrastructure, including mobile towers, in the proposed structure plan area in the near future.*
- 2 *ADVISE the applicant that the City encourages the developer to actively pursue the development of a possible future swimming beach and associated facilities located immediately north of the developable area of the subject site in conjunction with the Department of Conservation and Land Management, the Department for Planning and Infrastructure and the City of Joondalup. Consideration should be given to the impacts of development on the internal road system, car parking, the foreshore, bush land and the amenity of the future residents of Burns Beach, as well as the possible northward extension of the proposed road near the foreshore.*

Lot 9017 comprises several parcels of land over the suburbs of Currambine, Kinross and Burns Beach and is the subject of ongoing subdivision (see Attachment 1). The subject portion of Lot 9017 is located north of Burns Beach Road and west of Marmion Avenue, immediately north of the pocket of residences within the suburb of Burns Beach.

The area subject of the proposed Structure Plan is approximately 291 hectares in area. It includes the 147 hectares part of the site immediately north of Burns Beach Road zoned “Urban” under the Metropolitan Region Scheme (MRS) and “Urban Development” under the City’s District Planning Scheme No. 2 (DPS2) (Amendment No. 21), as well as the 144 hectares abutting this developable land to the north that is reserved for “Parks & Recreation” purposes (CJ166-07/04 refers). Any development of the northern part (144 hectares) of the site needs to be in accordance with the provisions of the MRS in accordance with the City’s DPS2.

The northern part and much of the southern part of the proposed Structure Plan area were identified in the former draft Perth Bushplan and subsequent Bush Forever plan on the basis of its representation of ecological community types, maintaining ecological process, scientific or evolutionary importance and its value meeting coastal reserve criteria. The land is not, however, identified in the current draft Metropolitan Region Scheme Amendment No.1082/33 that seeks to establish Special Control Areas over Bush Forever sites as this draft Amendment post dates the gazettal of the MRS Amendment 992/33 that zoned the southern portion of the land for development.

Future urban development of the subject land has been opposed by individuals and environmental groups over the course of approximately 6 years. The City also expressed concerns about the environmental impacts of development of the subject portion of Lot 9017. As a result, an additional 24 hectares of land was reserved for conservation (northern part of the Structure Plan area) in a negotiated outcome as a result of the MRS rezoning of the land and the development area reduced accordingly. This negotiated outcome was also reflective of community concerns.

DETAILS

The draft Structure Plan is intended to facilitate the future development of approximately 1600 low and medium density dwellings with density codes of R20 and R40, a primary school and associated senior- sized sporting oval, a beach shop/lunch bar/restaurant, a local shop and fifteen (15) areas of public open space (POS) distributed across the subject site, together with road and dual use and pedestrian path works external, yet adjacent to the subject site.

Five (5) development precincts and the Parks and Recreation Reserve land to the north are identified with associated objectives and development provisions, as follows:

- Residential R20 Precinct
- Residential R40 Precinct
- Special Residential Precinct
- Local Shop Precinct
- Beach Shop/Lunch Bar/Restaurant Precinct
- Parks & Recreation Reserve

In regard to the issues highlighted above, the following advice is offered:

Road Arrangement

The applicant has been working with the City regarding the proposed road arrangement around POS 8 and 9 on the Structure Plan and has provided a satisfactory alternative. The result is a slight modification to the road width of the central boulevard and the inclusion of roundabouts along this boulevard at each end of the POS areas.

In view of the minor nature of the changes to the road arrangement and therefore the overall number of lots and lot layout, it is not considered necessary to amend the plan provided in the Structure Plan. The details of the amended road arrangement will therefore be provided and approved at the subdivision stage, as is normal practice.

Telecommunications Infrastructure

The applicant has contacted the four main telecommunications carriers (Telstra, Optus, Hutchison and Vodafone) and requested confirmation that they have no intention of providing any telecommunications infrastructure, including mobile towers, in the Structure Plan area in the near future. A letter of response was received from Mobile Carriers Forum (MCF) on behalf of these companies (see Attachment 6) that states that the existing mobile tower located at Tamala Park adequately meets the current servicing needs.

The letter also notes that further development of Burns Beach would create a need for greater network capacity and coverage than is currently provided. In this event, a mobile telecommunications facility may indeed be necessary and MCF expressed a keenness to work with the developers of Burns Beach to achieve an efficient and integrated outcome. This advice is contrary to Council's resolution, which came from experiences of the City in relation to the locations of other mobile towers in the City. In particular, the City may be concerned where a low impact facility is proposed such that no development approval from the City is required, or where high impact facilities are proposed within public spaces such as parks. It is noted that the Telecommunications Act controls the installation of telecommunication facilities.

It is also noted that the fifteen (15) areas of POS within the Structure Plan area and the primary school/sporting oval site appear to be the only sites of sufficient area to accommodate any future required high impact telecommunications facilities. The applicant has advised that the developer has met with an officer at the Department for Planning and Infrastructure (DPI) and received verbal advice that it is not likely to object to a mobile tower being located within foreshore land adjacent to a future possible beach area north of the subject site. Conversely, the applicant suggests that a tower may be suitably located in the regional open space north of the subject site with no detrimental impacts on the reserve.

Regardless of any future need for such facilities, and the limited suitable sites in the Burns Beach area, should Council not support final adoption of the Structure Plan on the basis that the developer cannot receive the required confirmation from telecommunications carriers, such a decision is unlikely to be supported by the WAPC. This is due to the Structure Plan and development application processes being two separate processes and it would not be appropriate for the WAPC to refuse to certify the Structure Plan in the absence of any development applications for such structures. Rather, the City could request the developer to continue discussions with the telecommunications carriers and keep the City informed of any intended locations so that it may have the opportunity to comment in the early stages of planning for these facilities.

It is recommended that an advice to this effect be included in Council's resolution.

Future swimming beach

The developer has commenced discussions with the Department of Conservation and Land (CALM), the Department for Planning and Infrastructure (DPI) and the City regarding the possible future development of a swimming beach and associated facilities immediately north of the subject site, as noted on the Structure Plan. This beach will be considered further in conjunction with a foreshore management plan that is required by the City and the DPI at the subdivision stage. Details of vehicular and pedestrian access, car parking and associated facilities, such as change rooms, toilets and possible clubrooms, would be the subject of ongoing discussions between the developer, CALM, the City and DPI as development of this area would be a long term project.

Statutory Provision:

Clause 9.1 of DPS2 states that Council may require the preparation of a Structure Plan as a prerequisite to its support for a proposal to rezone or classify land in the district. Clause 3.12.2 of DPS 2 states that no subdivision or development is to commence on land zoned "Urban Development", as is the subject site.

Consultation:

Clause 9.5 of DPS2 requires Structure Plan proposals to be advertised in accordance with the provisions of clause 6.7 prior to further consideration by Council. Advertising was undertaken for a period of twenty eight (28) days from 11 November to 9 December 2004. All adjoining landowners were notified in writing, three signs were erected on the site and a notice was placed in the Joondalup Community newspaper.

A total of ninety four (94) submissions were received, ten (10) of which supported or did not object to the proposal and eighty four (84) of which objected to the proposal. Sixty one (61) of the submissions received were proforma submissions, nineteen (19) were not from residents/landowners within the immediate locality, four (4) submissions were from the same submitter and three (3) submissions were received after the close of advertising.

Under clause 9.6 of DPS2, Council is to consider all submissions received during the advertising period (Attachment 3). After consideration of all submissions, the Council is to either resolve to adopt the Structure Plan, with or without modification, or to refuse to adopt the Structure Plan. Three copies of the Structure Plan are then submitted to the Western Australian Planning Commission (WAPC) for final adoption and endorsement.

Key Issues arising from Public Advertising

Objections to the draft Structure Plan include the following major issues:

- retention of bushland;
- a desire for a buffer between the existing Burns Beach residences and the proposed lots in the Structure Plan area;
- car parking;
- building height;
- location, extent and maintenance of public open space;

- traffic and safety; and
- development of the foreshore.

These issues will be discussed further in this report. It should be noted that three (3) of these seven (7) issues were the subject of the 61 proforma submissions

Strategic Implications:

The draft Structure Plan would facilitate the development of a variety of lots sizes, and therefore housing forms, with the future subdivision of the southern part of the subject site. Provision of a variety of residential living choices is in line with the City's Strategic Plan.

Sustainability Implications:

The draft Structure Plan provides for small lot subdivision of low and medium density which will facilitate better utilisation of the existing infrastructure, community facilities and public transport system in the locality, in line with the State's planning objectives. The future subdivision and dwelling forms support sustainability principles with the lots being predominantly (69%) oriented with preferred solar orientation to maximise energy efficiency, in accordance with the WAPC's Liveable Neighbourhoods document which provides a guide to subdivision design. Furthermore, smaller lot sizes proposed assist in encouraging efficient building designs.

COMMENT

A significant proportion of the objections received (61 of 94, being 65%) were in the form of a proforma letter. For clarity, a summary of the comments in the proforma letter and the corresponding comments of the City are at Attachments 4 & 5 respectively. The issues raised are discussed further under the headings of the key issues arising from public submissions.

Environmental Issues

Many of the public submissions relate to environmental issues regarding the foreshore and dune systems in the locality, and the loss of bushland (see Attachment 3). These issues are very specific and not within the capacity of the City to fully assess, however these would have been considered by the Environmental Protection Authority (EPA), the DPI and the City during the process of amending the MRS and the City's District Planning Scheme DPS2. The extent of the land available for development has previously been defined, and it is not the purpose of the current structure planning process to revisit these boundaries. The City is therefore limited in the extent to which it can allay concerns about these environmental issues. Notwithstanding this, any development on the subject site needs to comply with policies of the Western Australian Planning Commission (WAPC) in relation to foreshore reserves and the City's requirements, which includes the preparation of a Foreshore Management Plan at the subdivision stage.

Whilst the bushland will largely be cleared with development of the subject site, the developer has expressed a desire to retain native vegetation where possible in public open space (POS) areas, in particular within proposed POS 15 on the corner of Burns Beach Road and Marmion Avenue where a stand of Christmas trees is located, as well as Banksia stand located within proposed POS 11. Moreover, the developer was required at the rezoning stage to set aside 144 hectares of bushland in the northern part of the Structure Plan area, which has been

reserved for Parks and Recreation and will be vested in the Department of Conservation and Land Management (CALM) for its care and management.

Landscape Buffer

All of the proforma letter submissions, and a number of the other submissions, included a request for a 30 metre landscape buffer zone between the existing residences in Burns Beach and the future proposed lots in the Structure Plan area (see Attachment 4). The draft Structure Plan indicates this land as part of the Residential R20 Precinct. Whilst this request has been seriously considered, there are several valid planning reasons not to request the applicant to provide a landscape buffer and these are set out in Attachment 5. The current proposal within the draft Structure Plan is considered to be the best planning outcome and is therefore supported in its current form.

Car Parking

All of the proforma submissions, and a number of the other submissions, request additional car parking and suggest that this should be provided along Burns Beach Road near the existing Burns Beach residences. This area is road reserve land that is not within the draft Structure Plan area and the City is not currently considering the provision of car parking along Burns Beach Road.

Nevertheless, a foreshore road extending the length of the developable portion of the Structure Plan area is proposed and the City will require a significant number of bays to be constructed along this road at the subdivision stage. In addition, car parking will be required adjacent to foreshore POS 6 where a beach shop/lunch bar/restaurant is proposed. The applicant has undertaken a more thorough assessment of the car parking options in these locations and advised that up to 120 bays could be provided, as opposed to the preliminary figure of 80 bays noted within the explanatory report provided with the Structure Plan.

It is recommended that, should Council adopt the Structure Plan, the applicant be advised that the provision of up to 120 car parking bays be shown along the foreshore road and adjacent to POS 6 within the Foreshore Management Plan at the subdivision stage, including details of location, dimensions and form of the bays.

Building Height

The proposed maximum building height in the draft Structure Plan is 10 metres. The applicant has reviewed this height further to public comments and modified the Structure Plan to reflect an allowable height of 9.5 metres, which is similar to that in the Hillarys and Cook Avenue Structure Plans. For comparison, the allowable height of buildings in the Iluka Structure Plan area, which is opposite the subject site, is in accordance with the Residential Design Codes (R Codes) at 9 metres. However, it should be noted this height is in addition to retaining walls that on occasions adds significant height in Iluka.

The difference between the allowable building height for building in the Iluka Structure Plan area and that proposed for the Burns Beach lots is that the developer of the Burns Beach Structure Plan area intends lots to be generally developed in accordance with the natural topography of the subject site with only minimal retaining (no more than 0.5 metres). This intention is reflected in the proposed definitions of “Building Height” and “Natural Ground Level” with the latter specifying finished levels of lots are to be not more than 0.5 metres

greater than the level of the mid-point of the road at the frontage of each lot. The modified 9.5 metre maximum building height is therefore considered to be acceptable.

Public Open Space

All of the proforma letter submissions suggested a reduction in the number of POS (4 instead of 15) areas as a way of reducing on-going watering and maintenance costs. It is suggested that this would reduce 1600-1800m² of POS area. It is acknowledged that the POS areas will need to be managed and maintained by the City, however reducing the number of POS areas will not necessarily alter the watering and maintenance requirements as the total overall area still needs to be the same (10% of the subdivision).

Moreover, the proposed distribution of open space across the subject site is in line with the WAPC's Liveable Neighbourhoods document that encourages POS areas to be within walking distance of residences so they serve as neighbourhood parks and promote a community focus.

In addition, the proposed distribution of POS areas supports some of the drainage requirements for the overall site, which would otherwise result in the construction of extensive drainage sumps and, therefore, reduce the overall functionality and usability of the POS areas. No change to the POS areas is considered necessary.

Traffic and Safety

Some public concerns have been expressed about the current traffic situation on Marmion Avenue and Burns Beach Road, as well as potential traffic and safety concerns associated with the proposed primary school site on Burns Beach Road.

The City is currently assessing a traffic report that includes existing and projected vehicular movements in the vicinity of the Structure Plan area. This assessment will be undertaken in consultation with Main Roads WA who is responsible for regional roads, including Marmion Avenue, and appropriate measures imposed as conditions of subdivision.

The location of the proposed primary school has been determined in consultation with the Department of Education, the DPI and the City. It is noted that there is no other primary school in the immediate locality and therefore it is likely to be attended by children living in the adjoining suburbs of Iluka and Kinross. Therefore, the location of the school needs to be accessible to these areas. It is less desirable option to locate a school in the middle of a residential area where traffic and noise associated with this use can significantly impact on residential amenity.

The school is proposed to be surrounded by roads to facilitate efficient traffic movements during peak traffic times and also to provide a variety of drop off/pick up places in the form of on-street car parking bays located along these roads. The details of on-street car parking bays will be assessed at the subdivision stage.

Foreshore Development

Public submissions included various requests for a swimming beach and other associated beach facilities to be provided on the foreshore adjacent to the southern part of the Burns Beach Structure Plan area. The beach in this locality is rocky and not suitable for swimming

and, therefore, the City has discouraged the inclusion of a swimming beach in the location. In addition, the dunes are also very steep in this area. Both of these factors may compromise safety if access to the beach in this locality is encouraged through the development of a swimming beach.

On this basis, a potential future swimming beach is noted on the Structure Plan adjacent to the regional reserve on the northern portion of the subject site. As is noted previously in this report, discussions are proceeding with CALM and DPI in relation to developing a beach, associated facilities and car parking in this locality.

Whilst it is in the interests of the developer to assist in the development of the foreshore, it is not reasonable for the developer to fully bear the cost of providing public facilities on land outside of the Structure Plan area. The City will continue to liaise with the developer regarding the suitable development of the foreshore as part of the Foreshore Management Plan.

Other Minor Modifications to Structure Plan

Two further minor modifications to the draft Structure Plan have been identified as necessary for clarity.

Definitions

The proposed definition of allowable building height relates to height above natural ground level, in line with the definition under the R Codes. However, no definition of natural ground level has been provided and it is proposed that the following definition be included in the Structure Plan:

“NATURAL GROUND LEVEL” shall mean the finished level of the lot relative to the finished Australia Height Datum (AHD) level of the road that it fronts (existing or as established at subdivision stage) and immediately adjacent to the lot. The finished level of the lot shall be +/- 0.5 metres from the AHD level of the mid point of the road and measured from the midpoint of the frontage of each lot frontage.

This definition is based on the definition under the R Codes, incorporating allowance for a variance of the finished lot levels not greater than 0.5 metres to accommodate minimal retaining only for the future lots.

The proposed “Ground Floor Level” definition is the same as the definition used in the Cook Avenue Structure Plan where it was relevant only to future development of the grouped dwelling lot in the Structure Plan area. This definition is not, however, relevant to the Burns Beach Structure Plan with the proposed modification to include a definition of natural ground level and it is therefore recommended that it be deleted.

Conclusion

The Burns Beach Structure Plan site has a long history in terms of public opposition to development through the rezoning process and has attracted a high level of public scrutiny through the Structure Plan process. For this reason, Council required additional public consultation prior to submission of the Structure Plan.

Concerns raised in public submissions received during the City's advertising period have been addressed in this report, or relate to the earlier rezoning process. Some minor modifications to the Structure Plan are considered to be necessary to address some of the public concerns and to provide clarity to the provisions of the Structure Plan. Car parking concerns can be adequately addressed at the subdivision stage and details included in the Foreshore Management Plan.

In addition, some environmental issues still need to be resolved and will continue to be addressed in the context of the Foreshore Management Plan at the subdivision stage. The City's position in this regard will be conveyed to the DPI with its comments on the future subdivision.

The developer is unable to comply with Council's previous resolution in relation to telecommunications facilities because the proposed 1600 additional residences in the Structure Plan area may necessitate such facilities. Nevertheless, it is considered that the City can be adequately involved in determining a suitable location for any future required facilities through the development application process. It is recommended that the developer be advised to include the City in any such discussions to achieve a suitable planning outcome.

The City's recommendation for support of the modified Structure Plan is based on planning grounds and consideration of factors raised within this report.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1	Location Plan
Attachment 2	Modified Burns Beach Structure Plan No. 10 (Part 1)
Attachment 3	Schedule of Submissions
Attachment 4	Proforma letter from submitters
Attachment 5	Response to proforma letter
Attachment 6	Letter regarding future telecommunications facilities

VOTING REQUIREMENTS

Simple Majority

RECOMMENDATION

That Council:

- 1 Pursuant to clause 9.6 of the City of Joondalup's District Planning Scheme No. 2 RESOLVES that the modified Burns Beach Structure Plan No. 10 shown in Attachment 2 to this Report be adopted and submitted to the Western Australian Planning Commission for final adoption and certification;**
- 2 Subject to certification by the Western Australian Planning Commission, ADOPTS the modified Burns Beach Structure Plan No. 10 as an Agreed Structure Plan and authorises the affixation of the Common Seal to, and the signing of, the Structure Plan documents;**

- 3 ADVISES the developer that the City wishes to be included in discussions during adjoining landowner stages of development of the subject site with regard to any intentions by the developer or any telecommunications carriers to locate telecommunications facilities within, or adjacent to, the Burns Beach Structure Plan No. 10 area;**
- 4 ADVISES the applicant to include the provision of up to 120 car parking bays along the foreshore road and adjacent to POS 6, including details of the location, dimensions and form of such bays, in the Foreshore Management Plan in relation to the Burns Beach Structure Plan area, to the satisfaction of City of Joondalup.**

Appendix 18 refers.

To access this attachment on electronic document, click here: [Attach18brf150205.pdf](#)

V:\devserv\REPORTS\REPORTS 2005\020511hg.doc

ITEM 20 RECONSIDERATION OF CONDITION OF DEVELOPMENT APPROVAL: LOT 2 (160B) WATERFORD DRIVE, HILLARYS – [43516]

WARD - Whitfords

PURPOSE

This report is for Council to reconsider conditions ‘C’ & ‘D’ of its resolution, dated 23 November 2004 (CJ290-11/04 refers) for the property at Lot 2 (160B) Waterford Drive, Hillarys.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

At its meeting on 23 November 2004, Council resolved to approve an application for retrospective development approval for additions on Lot 2 (160B) Waterford Drive, Hillarys.

The applicant has requested that the City reconsider conditions ‘C’ and ‘D’ of the development approval. Conditions ‘C’ and ‘D’ are as follows:

- (c) *the northern windows of the deck shall be screened to a minimum height of 1.6 metres in accordance with the Residential Design Codes to prevent overlooking into the neighbouring property;*
- (d) *the southern windows of the deck shall be screened to a minimum height of 1.6 metres in accordance with the Residential Design Codes to prevent overlooking into the neighbouring property;*

It is considered that condition ‘C’ should not be removed as it is not unreasonable to protect the privacy of the adjoining landowner and it cannot be adequately demonstrated that the development complies with the Performance Criteria of 3.8.1 of the Residential Design Codes (R-Codes). However, there is some scope to revoke the condition and make it more flexible to allow the landowner to choose the type of screening to achieve compliance with the Acceptable Development Provision under 3.8.1 and still maintain views. It is therefore recommended that Council revokes condition ‘C’ and replaces it with a new condition allowing greater flexibility for the applicant.

With regard to condition ‘D,’ as development has already been carried out in respect to compliance with the condition, it is not open to reconsideration under clause 6.10.2 of DPS2. The City’s solicitors have confirmed this.

BACKGROUND

Suburb/Location: 160B Waterford Drive Hillarys
Applicant: Mr & Mrs Baumgartner
Owner: Mr & Mrs Baumgartner
Zoning: **DPS:** Residential R20
MRS: Urban

The original approval, including a number of variations to the R-Codes and Building Height Envelope for the development, was granted by the City on 14 March 2004, subject to conditions.

The adjoining neighbour lodged a Section 18(2) Appeal against the City's approval as he considered that the City had failed to enforce the requirements of District Planning Scheme No 2 (DPS2). During the course of the Appeal, it was discovered that the proponent had constructed the development in a manner that does not comply with the Development Approval or Building Licence issued for the proposal. To rectify the non-compliance with the Development Approval, an application for Retrospective Development Approval was lodged and approved by Council on 23 November 2003, subject to conditions. The landowners have requested Council reconsiders conditions 'C' & 'D' of its resolution.

DETAILS

Statutory Provision:

When determining an application, Clause 6.8 of the DPS2 applies 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; and*
- (k) *any other matter which in the opinion of the Council is relevant.*

R-Codes

Clause 2.3.4 of the R-Codes allow for the exercise of discretion, which shall be exercised having regard to 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 contest 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*
- (vii) orderly and proper planning.*

Consultation:

The retrospective development application was advertised for neighbours comment. In regard to the proposed reconsideration of condition ‘C’, the adjoining neighbour objected to the overlooking, although this was not the case with the original application for Development Approval.

The adjoining landowners suggested that they did not originally object to the development because they thought the deck roof would not be fixed and understood the roof was now to be fixed in nature. The roof to the deck is a ‘vergola’, which is openable and not totally weatherproof according to the landowners.

With regards to condition ‘D’ the adjoining landowner has consistently objected to overlooking from the proposal.

Financial Implications:

If the applicant appeals the matter to the State Administrative Appeals Tribunal cost will be incurred to the City.

Community Consultation:

Refer to consultation section.

COMMENT

Reconsideration of Development Approvals

The City may revoke or amend a planning approval, which has been granted prior to the commencement of the use in accordance with Section 6.10.2 of DPS2. Section 6.10.2 is as follows:

‘The Council may, on application in writing from the owner of the land in respect of which Planning Approval has been granted, revoke or amend the planning approval, prior to the commencement of the use or development subject of the Planning Approval.’

The City has received legal advice on the application of Section 6.10.2 of DPS2 in relation to the subject development as it has already commenced. It has been advised that the City is open to use this clause to amend or revoke condition ‘C’ prior to the commencement of compliance with the condition. As this has not yet been achieved, it is considered that Council may revoke the condition.

With regard to conditions ‘D’, as compliance with this condition has already been achieved, it is not considered open to Council to reconsider the condition. The City’s solicitors have confirmed this. Condition ‘D’ can be appealed to the State Administrative Tribunal of Western Australia, which has replaced the Town Planning Appeals Tribunal.

Council is restricted to only reconsidering the conditions requested by the landowner not any other issues relating to the development.

Condition ‘C’

Condition ‘C’ of the retrospective Development Approval issued by the City is as follows:

- (c) *the northern windows of the deck shall be screened to a minimum height of 1.6 metres in accordance with the Residential Design Codes to prevent overlooking into the neighbouring property;*

Visual Privacy

With the original Development Application for the site, a variation to the cone of vision to the northern neighbour from the deck was approved. The retrospective Development Approval required that the deck be screened to a height of 1.6 metres with the sundeck remaining open. This was on the basis that the combined length of the deck and sundeck had increased, and therefore the combined affect on the adjoining neighbour was greater.

Both the deck and sundeck overlook the rear yard of the adjoining property including a patio area, swimming pool and clothes drying area. The overlooking is attributed to the building height and fall of the land towards the rear of the site. This was considered with the application for retrospective Development Approval that the overlooking did comply with the performance criteria of the R-Codes.

The Performance Criteria for Visual Privacy under the R-Codes is as follows:

P1 Avoid direct overlooking between active habitable spaces and outdoor living areas of the development site and the habitable rooms and outdoor living areas within adjoining residential properties taking into account of:

- *The positioning of windows to habitable rooms on the development site and the adjoining property;*
- *The provision of effective screening; and*
- *The less need to prevent overlooking of extensive back gardens, front gardens or area visible from the street.*

The landowners have put the following justifications to have the condition revoked or amended:

We believe this decision is not orderly and proper planning because “we were given approval of 14 March 2003 by the City not to screen these windows.”

Officer’s Comment

The retrospective Development Approval supersedes the original approval granted to the development and therefore compliance with the new condition is required. The departure from the approval plans altered the overall impact of visual privacy on the neighbour when the deck and sundeck were assessed together.

‘We did not apply for retrospective planning approval on this issue, only the variations for our approved plans to our as constructed building.’

Officer’s Comment

The application for retrospective Development Approval clearly states on the application form that the development is for ‘Additions’, which is reasonably construed as being the whole of the development. This is how the development has been assessed.

‘As constructed our deck to the northern side was 50.8cm longer than originally approved and not 70cm as outlined in the COJ list of departures no iii/letter 1/7/2004 from the COJ to Modern Home Improvers. The departures of 50.8cm is entirely part of the open part of the deck (balcony), 2,519 metres instance of 2,011 metres and the part with the vergola roof is constructed with the same length as originally approved. The only difference is that it was built 67mm further away from our northern neighbour than originally approved.’

Officer’s Comment

The combined length of the deck has increased from 5.0m to 5.2m as shown in the attachments. The setback of the deck has increased from the northern boundary from 6.820 metres from 6.753 metres. The angular length (northern face) of the deck has increased from 5.0 metres to 5.7 metres. It is assumed that the landowner’s reference to 50.8cm refers to the angular length (northern face) of the deck. The northern face of the deck has not been dimensioned on the plans and as such a scaled measurement has been taken. As a consequence, a discrepancy between the two figures (the City’s and landowner’s) may occur. Notwithstanding this, the deck has increased in length.

‘In the draft COJ agenda for the briefing session for the 26 October 2004 the Planning department comments were that the development is slightly closer to the boundary and that the variation sought is slightly greater. This is incorrect, it is the other way round. We would like to emphasise that the northern window which the COJ wants us to screen now is constructed as originally approved.’

Officer's Comment

This issue was addressed in a memorandum to the Commissioners prior to the Council Meeting. The effect of privacy on the adjoining neighbour should be considered in regards to the combined length of the deck and sundeck.

'The owners of 162 Waterford Drive did not object to the deck in the first instance on 4 March 2004 and the second time in regards to the open balcony.'

Officer's Comment

This is acknowledged. Neighbours comments are considered on their planning merits in light of the development application at hand. Changes to the development from that originally approved required a reassessment of the visual privacy issues. It was the officer's professional judgement conveyed through the Council report that the deck area would require screening, as the development did not comply with the visual privacy requirements of the R-Codes.

The neighbours were of the opinion that the deck roof was fixed and therefore the area could be used permanently. However, the roof is a 'vergola' which is openable and not totally weatherproof.

'We have lost substantial values on our home due to loss of views caused by the City condition to force us to screen the southern deck windows. Now you have already taken 60 degrees away from our property within screening of the northern deck. Now you want to take away 120 degree views and leave us with 60 degrees.'

Officer's Comment

Property values cannot be addressed through planning controls in this case. The views from the property have been restricted to maintain the privacy of the adjoining residents. As a compromise, the sundeck area has remained unscreened, which allows 360 degree views of the surrounding area. The sundeck was allowed to remain open as it was unlikely to be used for substantial periods of time and the effect on adjoining neighbour is therefore considered minimal.

'We have greatly improved privacy to our northern neighbours at our cost by investing in screen fencing. Before we looked straight at each other from our pools from the ground floor. It also gave the neighbour more privacy from our upper floor.'

Officer's Comment

The screen fence introduced by the applicant does provide more privacy between the properties. From the upper storey the effect is minimal (refer to attached photographs).

'We do not consider it proper planning to grant our northern neighbour objections 1.5 years after they have given us no objections claiming as their reason that they did not understand our plans.'

Officer's Comment

As the development has changed from the original approval, it was reasonable to reassess the affect of visual privacy on the adjoining property. It would be contrary to orderly and proper planning to not assess visual privacy issues.

'We designed a triangular Alfresco Area with a balcony to please our neighbours although we ended up with less space and it cost us more.'

Officer's Comments

Regardless of the design of the development, the Visual Privacy requirements of the R-Codes will apply. Different designs may have impacted more or less on the adjoining landowners.

Conclusion

The subject deck and sundeck windows directly overlook the private open space of the adjoining northern neighbour's property, as illustrated in the photographs. It is not considered that the development meets the Performance Criteria of the R-Codes and therefore it is warranted to allow the condition to remain. However, it would be open to Council to amend\revoke the condition of Development Approval to permit a different form of screening to allow the landowners to maintain their views and retain the privacy of the adjoining neighbours. This may be, for example, a privacy screen near the boundary to screen the view into the adjoining property or the provision of louvers on the windows, which allows an outlook to remain, but the privacy of the adjoining development to be maintained. To allow some flexibility for the landowner in achieving compliance with the condition and to meet the requirements of the R-Codes, it is recommended that condition 'C' of the Resolution of 23 November 2004 be revoked and replaced with the following condition.

The windows to the upper storey deck, as marked in red on the approval plan shall achieve compliance with Visual Privacy Clause 3.8.1 A1 of the Residential Design Codes 2002 within 60 days of the date of this decision to the satisfaction of the Manager of Approvals, Planning & Environmental Services.

As previously mentioned condition 'D' cannot be considered as it is outside the scope of authority granted by Section 6.10.2 of DPS2.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment One	Site Plan
Attachment Two	Development Plans
Attachment Three	Photographs

VOTING REQUIREMENTS

Absolute majority

RECOMMENDATION

That Council:

1 REVOKES, BY AN ABSOLUTE MAJORITY, condition 3(C) of its Resolution CJ290-11/04 dated 23 November 2004 for Retrospective Planning Approval Lot 2 (160B) Waterford Drive, Hillarys:

- (c) The northern windows of the deck shall be screened to a minimum height of 1.6 metres in accordance with the Residential Design Codes to prevent overlooking into the neighbouring property.

and replaces the condition as follows:

- (c) The windows to the upper storey deck as marked in red on the approval plan shall achieve compliance with Visual Privacy Clause 3.8.1 A1 of the Residential Design Codes 2002 within 60 days of the date of this decision to the satisfaction of the Manager of Approvals, Planning & Environmental Services.

2 ADVISES the landowners that the City is unable to consider the request for reconsideration of condition ‘D’ of Resolution CJ290-11/04 dated 23 November 2004, as it is outside the scope of authority granted by Section 6.10.2 of District Planning Scheme No 2.

Appendix 19 refers.

To access this attachment on electronic document, click here: [Attach19brf150205.pdf](#)

ITEM 21 AMENDMENT TO RESERVE 27732 (LOCATION 14623) AND RESERVE 47831 (LOCATION 15444), WEST COAST DRIVE, SORRENTO AND INCLUSION OF UNALLOCATED CROWN LAND (141) WEST COAST DRIVE, SORRENTO INTO RESERVE 47831 – [05071]

WARD - Marina

PURPOSE

This report is for Council to consider amendment to the boundaries of Reserves 27732 and 47831 in Sorrento, in order for the existing lease with the Sorrento Surf Life Saving Club to be on a reserve that has power to lease. The Department for Planning and Infrastructure (DPI) has also requested the City to include an area of Unallocated Crown Land (UCL) into Reserve 47831 whilst considering adjustment to the subject reserve boundaries.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In January 1987, the City and the Sorrento Surf Life Saving Club (SSLSC) entered into a lease agreement for use of a surf club building. The lease agreement incorrectly details the address of the Club as being on Reserve 47831, Location 15444 (165L) West Coast Drive, Sorrento (there is a small portion only of the building on Reserve 47831) and the City has power to lease on this reserve. However, most of the building is located on Reserve 27732, Location 14623 (189) West Coast Drive, Sorrento that does not have power to lease. Further, there is also a small portion of the building located on an area of UCL to the south of the surf club (Attachments 1 and 2).

Advice was taken from the DPI to ascertain the best method of rectifying the situation, and it was suggested the most efficient method would be for Reserve 27732 to have a new southern boundary to stop north of the SSLSC. The balance area of Reserve 27732, that includes the surf club building, to then be amalgamated into Reserve 47831. This then corrects the situation of the lease document being incorrectly addressed (the building is now actually on Reserve 47831) and as Reserve 47831 has power to lease, this anomaly also has been satisfactorily resolved.

This adjustment of reserve boundaries has also provided the DPI with an opportunity to request the City to consider including amalgamation of an area of UCL into the adjacent Reserve 47831. With any UCL, if the DPI gets an opportunity to divest itself of it to a local government (or public utility) it endeavours to do so, especially if maintenance of the land is actually being undertaken by the local government. A copy of the SSLSC lease area is attached for information (Attachment 3).

It is therefore recommended that Council:

- 1 SUPPORTS the amendment to the southern boundary of Reserve 27732 (189) West Coast Drive, Sorrento as shown on Attachment 1 to this Report;*

- 2 *after the adjustment indicated in 1. above, SUPPORTS the amalgamation of the balance area of Reserve 27732 (189) West Coast Drive, Sorrento into Reserve 47831 (165L) West Coast Drive, Sorrento;*
- 3 *SUPPORTS the inclusion of Unallocated Crown Land (141) West Coast Drive, Sorrento into Reserve 47831;*
- 4 *ADVISES the Department for Planning and Infrastructure accordingly and as per the details shown on Attachment 1 to this Report;*
- 5 *PROVIDES details of the level of advertising undertaken together with the results of that advertising to the Department for Planning and Infrastructure to be forwarded to the Department of Land Administration;*
- 6 *Considers and NOTES the submission received and ADVISES the submitters of Council's decision accordingly.*

BACKGROUND

Suburb/Location: Reserve 27732 and 47831 and Unallocated Crown Land

Applicant: City of Joondalup

Owner: Crown

Zoning: **DPS:** Parks and Recreation

MRS: Parks and Recreation

Strategic Plan: 4.1 – To manage the business in a responsible and accountable manner.

DETAILS

In January 1987, the City and the SSLSC entered into a lease agreement. The agreement enables SSLSC to lease the City owned building. As shown on Attachments 1 and 2, the SSLSC is located mainly on Reserve 27732, but has small portions of the building on Reserve 47831 and some adjacent UCL to the south. The lease agreement between the City and the SSLSC described the SSLSC as being on Reserve 20561, (now known as Reserve 47831), and though a very small portion is on Reserve 47831, the majority of the building on Reserve 27732 and Reserve 27732 does not have the power to lease. The surf club lease area is shown in Attachment 3.

In addition, the UCL is unallocated or vacant crown land that does not have a management order over it and as the City does manage this land, it is timely to include it into an adjacent reserve that does have a management order with the City. This will correctly reflect the existing situation and there will be no physical changes as a result of this modification.

The area of unallocated land is approximately 2464m² and the portion of Reserve 27732 to be included into Reserve 47831 is 6646m² (see Attachment 1).

The matter has been referred to the DPI's - Land Asset Management Services whereby it advised the City on how best to deal with the situation and it gave its conditional agreement subject to the proposal being advertised for a period of 30 days, the City reporting the matter to the Council, and the DPI's Statutory Planning Division also providing comment.

On drafting of the original lease in 1987, the error was not detected by the (then) Department of Land Administration (DOLA), as the lease between the City and the SSLSC was not forwarded to DOLA to seek approval by the Minister for Lands, as it should have been. Such approval is necessary pursuant to the provisions of the former Land Act (now section 18.2 of the Land Administration Act), and will now be sought.

Statutory Provision:

The fact that Reserve 27732 is a Section 20A ‘Public Recreation’ reserve, the “Guidelines for the Administration Section 20A Public Recreation Reserves” are observed. These Guidelines were produced by the Department of Land Information (DLI) and deal with excisions of reserved land. Under the Guidelines, where a portion of Section 20A reserve is to be considered for excision or amendment, it needs to be proved that such an action would not disadvantage the local community. Therefore prior to approval being granted, the City has to satisfy the Minister for Lands that the proposal has been widely publicised within the locality. A sign on site is required together with an advertisement in a local newspaper and, if considered appropriate, canvassing of landowners in proximity to the subject site. Details of the level of advertising undertaken together with the results of that advertising are required to be forwarded to the DPI with any request to amend a reserve’s purpose.

Consultation:

The proposal was advertised from 19 October 2004 to 18 November 2004. Advertising consisted of adjoining landowners being notified in writing, an advertisement in the Community Paper and the West Australian and a sign was erected on the site.

Upon closure of the advertising period a total of 8 submissions were received. All of the submissions objected to the proposal. It is noted that the objections received focus on possible commercial development of the beach and/or connected to SSLSC as a result of the proposed modification. Such a commercial development is not the purpose of the proposed modification. Furthermore the actions sought to be approved will in no way represent any physical change to the subject Reserves, or any rezoning of the subject land.

Policy Implications:

Nil

Sustainability Implications:

Nil

COMMENT

This process is intended to allow the City to correct the lease agreement it has with the SSLSC not only from the legal point of view but also to satisfy the DPI’s requirements. To do this, the club building must be situated on a reserve that has power to lease. There are no formal proposals for the development of this land with the City at this time.

The lease details for the SSLSC describes the Club as being on Reserve 47831. This Reserve has power to lease, which is necessary on Crown land for lease documents to be set up. The SSLSC is in fact, mainly on Reserve 27732 and this reserve does not have the power to lease. The SSLSC is also partly on land described as Unallocated Crown Land.

The matter has been discussed with the DPI and it was agreed that the most effective way to rectify the anomaly was to include the Club site into Reserve 47831, the club will then wholly be on a reserve that does have the power to lease. At the same time, the DPI suggested that the UCL also be included into Reserve 47831.

These main issues of objection raised during the submission period included that there may be a major commercial development on the land, ratepayers have not been adequately consulted, environmental considerations have not been investigated, and the beach area should not be leased.

In response to the submissions it is noted that the proposed reserve adjustments do not relate to a commercial development, and the proposal has been advertised in accordance with the relevant guidelines consisting of a 30-day advertising period. There are no environmental considerations as the subject matter being advertised and the lease agreement relates to the surf clubrooms only and not the beach area. All submissions are detailed at Attachment 4.

It is noted that the nature of the subject reserves are not intended to be physically changed in any manner. The adjustment of boundaries to Reserve 27732 and 47831 and the inclusion of the UCL into Reserve 47831 simply rectifies an anomaly that occurred in 1987 when the lease was set up and reflects the current situation whereby the City manages the UCL. Approval is recommended accordingly.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1	Site Plan
Attachment 2	Diagram of Surf Club lease area.
Attachment 3	Schedule of Submissions

VOTING REQUIREMENTS

Simple Majority

RECOMMENDATION

That Council:

- 1 SUPPORTS the amendment to the southern boundary of Reserve 27732 (189) West Coast Drive, Sorrento as shown on Attachment 1 to this Report;**
- 2 after the adjustment indicated in 1. above, SUPPORTS the amalgamation of the balance area of Reserve 27732 (189) West Coast Drive, Sorrento into Reserve 47831 (165L) West Coast Drive, Sorrento;**
- 3 SUPPORTS the inclusion of Unallocated Crown Land (141) West Coast Drive, Sorrento into Reserve 47831;**
- 4 ADVISES the Department for Planning and Infrastructure accordingly and as per the details shown on Attachment 1 to this Report;**

- 5 PROVIDES details of the level of advertising undertaken together with the results of that advertising to the Department for Planning and Infrastructure to be forwarded to the Department of Land Administration;**
- 6 Considers and NOTES the submission received and ADVISES the submitters of Council's decision accordingly.**

Appendix 20 refers.

To access this attachment on electronic document, click here: [Attach20brf150205.pdf](#)

X:\devserv\REPORTS\REPORTS 2005\020520gc.doc

ITEM 22 PROPOSED RECORDING STUDIO (CHANGE OF USE TO USE NOT LISTED): LOT 54 (21) DELAGE STREET, JOONDALUP – [58561]

WARD - Lakeside

PURPOSE

To request the Council to determine the land use class of a proposal to conduct a recording studio within an existing warehouse development at Lot 54 (21) Delage Street, Joondalup.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The applicant is proposing to locate a recording studio and rehearsal rooms within the Joondalup Service Industrial Area at the above address. The unit would consist of six soundproofed recording rooms and one office/storeroom. The proposed hours of operation are from 6pm-12am Monday-Friday and 12pm-12am on Sundays. The proposal is not intended to open on Saturday. As the proposed operation falls outside normal business hours, it is expected that there will be no impact upon the amenity of other uses within the lot and those of adjoining lots. The nearest residential area is approximately 200 metres away and is separated by the freeway reserve. It is not expected that noise from the lot will disturb and inconvenience any residential area. In any event, noise attenuation measures can be instituted during the Building Licence process.

Since the use for such an activity is not listed under District Planning Scheme No 2 (DPS2), the Council may determine that the use is consistent with the objectives and purposes of the Service Industrial zone and is therefore permitted.

The Service Industrial Zone is intended to provide for a wide range of business, industrial and recreational developments which the Council may consider would be inappropriate in Commercial and Business Zones. The developments may however, be capable of being conducted in a manner, which will prevent them being obtrusive, or detrimental to the local amenity. The Zone is distinct from other industrial areas within the Perth Metropolitan Region. Factory and manufacturing uses are almost non-existent and the range of land uses present includes places of worship, showrooms and recreation centres. It is considered that the proposed land use adds to the diversity of land-uses already existing within the zone and is appropriate as it satisfies the objectives of clause 3.10.

BACKGROUND

Suburb/Location: 21 Delage Street, Joondalup
Applicant: Bradley Wesson and Glenn Dyson
Owner: JCR Management Pty Ltd
Zoning: **DPS:** Service Industrial
MRS: Urban

The recording studios are proposed in one of eight units located at Lot 54 (21) Delage Street, Joondalup. The subject lot is within close proximity to Winton Road and abuts other lots consisting of a mix of vacant land and showrooms on the southern, eastern and western sides.

DETAILS

Statutory Provision:

Clause 3.2 indicates, subject to the provisions of the Scheme, the permissibility of use classes within the various zones. However, the nature of the proposed development does fall within any of the definitions provided under Schedule 1. Therefore, Council is required to make a determination under clause 3.3 of DPS2. That clause and other relevant clauses are shown below:

3.3 Unlisted Uses

If the use of the land for a particular purpose is not specifically mentioned in the Zoning Table and cannot reasonably be determined as falling within the interpretation of one of the use categories the Council may:

- (a) determine that the use is consistent with the objectives and purposes of the particular zone and is therefore permitted; or*
- (b) determine that the proposed use may be consistent with the objectives and purpose of the zone and thereafter follow the procedures set down for an 'A' use in Clause 6.6.3 in considering an application for planning approval; or*
- (c) determine that the use is not consistent with the objectives and purposes of the particular zone and is therefore not permitted.*

3.10 The Service Industrial Zone

3.10.1 The Service Industrial Zone is intended to provide for a wide range of business, industrial and recreational developments which the Council may consider would be inappropriate in Commercial and Business Zones and which are capable of being conducted in a manner which will prevent them being obtrusive, or detrimental to the local amenity.

The objectives of the Service Industrial Zone are to:

- (a) accommodate a range of light industries, showrooms and warehouses, entertainment and recreational activities, and complementary business services which, by their nature, would not detrimentally affect the amenity of surrounding areas;*
- (b) ensure that development within this zone creates an attractive façade to the street for the visual amenity of surrounding areas.*

3.10.2 Development in the Service Industrial Zone shall conform, among other things, with the general provisions set out below.

- (a) Buildings shall be set back a minimum of 6 metres from the street boundary. Setbacks to side and rear boundaries shall comply with the Building Code of Australia.*

- (b) *Where a lot has a boundary with more than one street, the Council shall designate one such boundary as the frontage and may approve buildings up to a minimum distance of 3 metres from the other street boundaries.*
- (c) *That portion of a lot within 3 metres of its boundary with a road reserve shall only be used for:*
 - (i) *an approved means of access;*
 - (ii) *landscaping;*
 - (iii) *an approved Trade Display*

and that portion of a lot between 3 metres of its boundary with a road reserve and the building line setback shall only be used for the parking, loading or unloading of vehicles, and for landscaping.

- (a) *With the exception of lots around which authorised screen walls have been erected, landscaping to the satisfaction of Council shall be planted and maintained by the owners on all portions of the property not covered by approved buildings, storage areas, accessways or parking areas (notwithstanding that shade trees shall be planted and maintained by the owners in car parking areas to the Council's satisfaction). Owners shall plant and maintain landscaping to Council's satisfaction on adjacent street verges.*
- (b) *Screen walls 1.8 metres high to a specification approved by and to the satisfaction of the Council shall be provided to screen the rear areas of all lots where necessary to protect the amenity of any adjoining residential lots.*
- (c) *Provisions relating to Building Construction:*
 - (i) *every building shall have a façade of brick, plate glass or other approved material to all street frontages;*
 - (ii) *where under the Building Code of Australia, metal clad walls are permitted, they must have a factory applied painted finish to the satisfaction of the City Building Surveyor.*

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*
- (k) *any other matter which in the opinion of the Council is relevant.*

6.8.2 *In addition to the matters referred to in the preceding subclause of this clause, the Council, when considering whether or not to approve a “D” or “A” use application, shall have due regard to the following (whether or not by implication or otherwise they might have required consideration under the preceding subclauses of this clause):*

- (a) *the nature of the proposed use and its relationship to the use of other land within the locality;*
- (b) *the size, shape and character of the parcel of land to which the application relates and the nature and siting of any proposed building;*
- (c) *the nature of the roads giving access to the subject land;*
- (d) *requirements for parking, arising from the proposed development;*
- (e) *any relevant submissions or objections received by the Council; and*
- (f) *such other matters as the Council considers relevant, whether of*
- (g) *the same nature as the foregoing or otherwise.*

Consultation:

No advertising was undertaken since the proposed use is considered consistent with the objectives of the Service Industrial zone.

COMMENT

The primary activities that will be conducted within the premises include recording and rehearsal rooms for musicians combined with equipment hire. The unit would consist of six soundproofed recording rooms and one office/storeroom. The proposed hours of operation are from 6pm-12am Monday-Friday and 12pm-12am on Sundays. There is no intention to open on Saturday. The immediate area surrounding the proposed lot consists of two vacant lots, air conditioning and pool showrooms, offices and vehicle repair outlets.

As the proposed operation falls outside normal business hours, it is expected that there will be no impact upon the amenity of other uses within the lot and those of adjoining lots. The nearest residential area is located in Connolly, approximately 200 metres away from the subject lot and is separated by a freeway reserve. It is unlikely that noise from the subject lot will disturb or inconvenience any residential areas. In any event an acoustic consultant's report demonstrating that this proposal meets the requirements of the Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations should be submitted.

In determining an application for a use not listed under the Scheme, the City may determine that the use is consistent with the objectives and purposes of the Service Industrial Zone and is therefore permitted. If the City determines the unlisted use is consistent, then it has to follow the procedures set down for an 'A' use in Clause 6.6.3 in considering the application for planning approval. Lastly, the City may determine that the use is not consistent with the objectives and purposes of the particular zone and is therefore not permitted.

Following a discussion with the proprietor, the maximum number of people that would be accommodated at any one time would be 26 (two staff members and 24 customers). There is no specific car-parking standard for a recording studio, and therefore, the following standard is recommended:

- 1 bay per 4 visitors; and
- 1 bay per staff member.

	Persons	Bays Required	Provided
Staff	2	2	Five car bays are allocated to the unit and there are 12 car parking spaces that form part of the common property
Customers	24	6	
Total	26	8	See comments below

The original development application required the provision of 48 parking spaces and 50 were provided. During the strata titling of the site, 5 car parking spaces were allocated to Unit 4 (the subject of this application) and 12 were set aside as common property (visitors). It is noted that the strata management has consented to the proposed use, which is conducted primarily outside of normal business hours. On this basis, and subject to the imposition of the appropriate conditions covering hours of operation, it is believed that demand for parking created for this use will not conflict with the demand created for parking for the other land-uses within the lot.

The Service Industrial Zone is intended to provide for a wide range of business, industrial and recreational developments which the Council may consider would be inappropriate in Commercial and Business Zones. and which are capable of being conducted in a manner, which will prevent them being obtrusive, or detrimental to the local amenity. The zone is distinct from other industrial areas within the Perth Metropolitan Region. Factory and manufacturing uses are almost non-existent and the range of land uses present include places of worship, showrooms and recreation centres. It is considered that the proposed land use adds to the diversity of land-uses already existing within the Zone and is appropriate as it satisfies the objectives of clause 3.10.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1	Locality Plan
Attachment 2	Development Plan

VOTING REQUIREMENTS

Simple Majority

RECOMMENDATION

That Council:

- 1 RESOLVES under clause 3.3 that a recording studio is consistent with the objectives and purposes of a Service Industrial Zone;**
- 2 APPROVES the application dated 25 November 2004, submitted by Bradley Wesson and Glenn Dyson on behalf of the owner, JCR Management Pty Ltd, for a recording studio at Lot 54 (21) Delage Street, Joondalup, subject to:**
 - (a) the hours of operation being from 6PM to 12AM Monday to Friday and 12PM-12AM Sunday;**
 - (b) the applicant is to be advised to submit an acoustic consultant's report demonstrating that this proposal meets the requirements of the Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations 1997 Act prior to the issue of a Building Licence.**

Appendix 21 refers.

To access this attachment on electronic document, click here: [Attach21brf150205.pdf](#)

ITEM 23 PROPOSED SINGLE HOUSE (RETROSPECTIVE APPROVAL FOR PATIO WITH SIDE SETBACK AND BUILDING HEIGHT ENVELOPE VARIATIONS): LOT 785 (10) HAYNES ROAD, SORRENTO – [14991]

WARD - South Coastal

PURPOSE

To request Council to determine a development application for the retrospective approval of a patio, that requires special consideration due to its height, at Lot 785 (10) Haynes Road, Sorrento.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The patio formed part of a previous Development Application (DA03/0128), which also included retrospective approval for unauthorised retaining walls. The retaining walls and northern patio were granted approval on the condition that the southern patio was removed within 30 days.

Following this approval, an application was made to the Town Planning Appeal Tribunal to challenge the condition requiring removal of the said patio. The application was made outside the 60 days appeal period and therefore dismissed by the Tribunal.

A new Development Application was submitted to the City on 18 February 2004 for the patio and it is likely that an appeal will be lodged with the Tribunal should it be refused or conditionally approved.

Notwithstanding the favourable comments from the adjoining owners most directly affected by the proposal, the patio has a significant adverse impact upon the amenity of the adjoining properties. It disrupts direct access to sunlight to the outdoor living space as it is situated in the southern lot's northern boundary.

There is no evidence of similar types of development within the immediate locality. The patio detracts from the amenity of the locality and is also not supported by the property owner at 39 Jervis Way.

The variations to the proposed patio are considered excessive and it is believed that the development conflicts with the intent of the Residential Design Codes and Building Height Policy.

BACKGROUND

Suburb/Location: 10 Haynes Road, Sorrento
Applicant: Glasshouse Conservatories
Owner: BA Boucker, CD Boucker
Zoning: **DPS:** Residential R20
MRS: Urban

The patio was part of a previous Development Application (DA03/0128) which also included retrospective approval for unauthorised retaining walls. The retaining walls and northern patio were granted approval but the application was conditioned to effect removal of the southern patio on the basis that the projection through the building height envelope was considered excessive and was also the subject of an objection, which did have planning merit when compared to the objectives of the R-Codes.

Some time after the Development Application was conditionally approved, an appeal was made to the Town Planning Appeal Tribunal to dispute the condition requiring removal of the said patio. The application was made outside the 60 day appeal period and therefore dismissed by the tribunal.

A new application was made on 18 February 2004 for the patio and it is likely that an appeal will be lodged with the Tribunal should it be refused or conditionally approved.

DETAILS

Statutory Provision:

Clause 6.12 permits Council to give planning approval to a development already commenced or carried out. Such approval shall have the same effect for all purposes as if it had been given prior to the commencement or carrying out the development, but provided that the development complies with the provisions of the Scheme as to all matters other than the provisions requiring Council's approval prior to the commencement of the development.

Clause 6.6.2 of District Planning Scheme No 2 (DPS2) requires that the 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 for 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 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 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
- (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' of the R-Codes. The intent of the relevant 'performance criteria' of the R-Codes is:

- 1 to ensure adequate daylight, direct sun and ventilation for buildings and the open space associated with them;
- 2 to moderate the visual impact of building bulk on a neighbouring property;
- 3 to ensure access to daylight and direct sun for adjoining properties; and
- 4 to assist with the protection of privacy between adjoining properties.

Development Standards under R-Codes 2002

R-Code Standard	Acceptable Development Standard	Provided
Boundary Wall Length	9.0 metres	12.6 metres
Boundary Wall Height	3.0 metre max, 2.7 metre average	4.5 metres

Policy 3.1.9 – Height and Scale of Buildings Within a Residential Area

Policy 3.1.9 states that applications, which exceed the building threshold envelope shall be deemed to be non-complying applications for which Council's development approval is required. Non complying applications shall be processed as follow;

- (a) In cases which notified landowners have raised no concerns or objections AND the application is supported by the Manager Approval Services, the application shall be processed under delegated authority;
- (b) In cases in where notified landowners have raised concerns or objections OR the application is not supported by the Manager Approval Services, the application is to be presented to Council for determination.

Consultation:

The proposal was advertised to 6 nearby landowners for a period of 14 days. The advertising extended to the property owners within 15.0 metres of the subject lot.

Submission	Technical Comment
1 Letter of Objection The construction contravenes the by-laws. It is over height.	Noted. The development does not comply with the relevant acceptable development provisions of the R-Codes.
2 Letters of no objection (3)	Noted

COMMENT

The southern patio requires Council consideration due to its height

The R-Codes defines natural ground level as the levels on the site, which precede the proposed development, excluding any site works unless approved by Council or established as part of the subdivision of the land preceding development. It may be argued that the previous application for this development (DA03/0128) approved the retaining wall and fill component, the natural ground level for this application should now be at the top of the retaining wall. This is not the case, as the City's previous decision used the earlier ground levels at the common boundary as a basis for determining the height of the overall development. It was resolved that the patio on top of the retaining wall was excessive and should be removed.

Notwithstanding the favourable comments from the adjoining owners most directly affected by the proposal, the patio has a significant adverse impact upon the amenity of these adjoining properties. It interferes with direct access to sunlight to the outdoor living space as it is situated in the southern lot's northern boundary. The impact is exacerbated by the patio's excessive height, which is greater than the relevant provisions of the R-Codes. The height of the patio is 4.5 metres above natural ground level instead of 3.0 metres, which represents a significant impact upon the amenity of the adjoining property.

The City's Building Height Policy can permit structures on the boundary to a maximum height of 3.5 metres. Again, the patio exceeds this requirement and measures at 4.5 metres. The intent of the policy is to ensure that all development within a residential area of significant height and scale is given appropriate consideration with due regard to the protection and enhancement of the amenity and streetscape character of the surrounding area.

Despite the positive comments from the adjoining owners most affected by the proposal, the City is required to assess the patio in accordance with the intent of the policy. There is no evidence of similar types of development within the immediate locality. The patio detracts from the amenity of the locality and is also not supported by the property owner at 39 Jervis Way.

The variations requested are considered excessive and despite favourable comments from two affected property owners, it is believed that the proposed patio conflicts with the intent of the R-Codes and the City's Building Height Policy. To approve such a development would set an undesirable precedent for the locality.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment 1	Location Plan
Attachment 2	Plans of Proposal
Attachment 3	Photos of Development

VOTING REQUIREMENTS

Simple Majority

RECOMMENDATION

That Council:

- 1 REFUSES the retrospective development application submitted by Glasshouse Conservatories on behalf of the owners, BA Boucker and CD Boucker for retrospective approval of a patio to the existing dwelling on Lot 785 (10) Haynes Road, Sorrento, for the following reasons:**
 - (a) The development would be contrary to the proper and orderly planning of the locality as:**
 - (i) the development does not comply with clause 3.3.2 of the Residential Design Codes 2002 in terms of boundary wall length and height;**
 - (ii) the development does not comply with Policy 3.1.9 – Height and Scale of Buildings within a Residential Area;**
 - (b) Approval of the development would set an undesirable precedent for the locality;**
 - (c) Approval of the development would be contrary to District Planning Scheme No 2;**
- 2 ADVISES the applicant that all unauthorised structures are to be removed within 30 days of the date of this decision.**

Appendix 22 refers.

To access this attachment on electronic document, click here: [Attach22brf150205.pdf](#)

V:\devserv\reports\2005020502am

9 REPORT OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

10 MOTIONS OF WHICH PREVIOUS NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

11 DATE OF NEXT MEETING

The next meeting of Council has been scheduled for **7.00 pm** on **15 March 2005** to be held in the Council Chamber, Joondalup Civic Centre, Boas Avenue, Joondalup

12 CLOSURE

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. A draft version of the Standing Orders Local Law 2005 is currently with the City's solicitors and upon return will be presented to the Commissioners for consideration.

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 to the Policy Manual Review Committee.

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 presentation was made at Strategy Session held on 8 February 2005.

11 May 2004 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:

“General Business

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.”

Status: This matter will be addressed through the Policy Review Committee.

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.

LANDSCAPING PLANS FOR JOONDALUP REGIONAL CULTURAL FACILITY AND REDESIGN OPTIONS OF COUNCIL CHAMBER (ex CJ248-11/04 – JOONDALUP REGIONAL CULTURAL FACILITY SITE ACQUISITION)

“3 REQUIRE that a report detailing forward landscaping plans for the site be prepared for consideration of Council taking into account the cultural and performing arts needs of the community, which will be assessed through a collaborative consultation process involving educational institutions, performing arts groups, arts consultants and other stakeholders;

Status: In relation to Point 3, consultation will take place as soon as is practicable and it is envisaged that a report will be submitted to Council in the first quarter of 2005.

5 REQUIRE an urgent review be conducted and interim report prepared and presented at the December 2004 Council meeting with regard to the costs and options of redesigning the Council Chamber to meet the provisions of the Governance Review and allow for greater availability and usage for performing arts and other community events.”

Status: In relation to Point 5, a meeting has been held with architects to discuss possible project plan options.

RELEASE OF REPORT OF THE FORENSIC AUDITOR – ex C70-11/04

“That due to questions and motions raised at the Annual Meeting of Electors held on 22 November 2004, the Joint Commissioners CONSIDER releasing, at the Council meeting immediately following receipt of the information outlined below, the report of the Forensic Auditor into the employment contract of the former Chief Executive Officer that is currently marked confidential subject to:

The Acting CEO being requested to contact the following for comment on this proposed course of action, asking them to provide any information they consider should be taken into account by the Council when it makes its decision:

- Deloitte Touché Tohmatsu, the Forensic Auditor
- Mr McIntyre, who is conducting the current Inquiry into the City of Joondalup
- Fiocco’s Lawyers”

Status: Correspondence was forwarded to the relevant parties following the Annual General Meeting.

Fiocco Lawyers had no objection; Mr McIntyre had no position, however, Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu objected to the release of information on the basis that, without full understanding of the scope and context of the audit, it may not be correctly interpreted in the public arena. On that basis, it is not proposed to release the information at this time.

GOVERNANCE REVIEW PANEL REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS (ex CJ299 - 12/04 Annual General Meeting of Electors held on 22 November 2004)

In relation to Motion 1 of the Annual General Meeting of Electors held on 22 November 2004, the Joint Commissioners:

- AGREE not to release the contents of the Governance Review Panel – Final report at this stage and will review the decision not to release the report pending the response from the Minister.
- the document referred to as Responses to Recommendations the “City of Joondalup Governance Review 2003” LIE ON THE TABLE until such time as the Review becomes public.

Status: Letter received by the City on 20 December 2004 advising that as the final report is the ‘property’ of the City and it is the decision of the City for it to be released. A report will be presented to the March round of meetings.

REVIEW OF DOCUMENTS (ex CJ299 - 12/04 - Annual General Meeting of Electors held on 22 November 2004)

In relation to Motion 1 of the Annual General Meeting of Electors held on 22 November 2004, the Joint Commissioners:

- 2 (c) NOTE their decision of 23 November 2004 (Item CJ276-11/04 refers) and AGREE to undertake a review of the:
- (i) guidelines relating to public question time;
 - (ii) protocols and procedures relating to strategy and briefing sessions;
 - (iii) City's Standing Orders Local Law;
 - (iv) City's Code of Conduct;
 - (v) electronic controls within the Council Chamber;
 - (vi) Induction program for Mayors and Councillors/Commissioners;

Status: Reviews of the relevant governance documents have commenced and will be presented to the Council on an as-required basis.

ESTABLISHMENT OF PROTOCOLS (ex CJ299 - 12/04 Annual General Meeting of Electors held on 22 November 2004)

in relation to Motion 1 of the Annual General Meeting of Electors held on 22 November 2004, the Joint Commissioners:

- 2 (d) ESTABLISH clear protocols relating to:
- (i) the attendance of invited guests or specialist advisors to Council meetings;
 - (ii) the working relationship between the Mayor and CEO that complements the relevant sections of the Local Government Act 1995;
 - (iii) elected members requiring access to information and requests for action;
 - (iv) necessary requirements for proposing amendments and changes to recommendations at Council meetings.

Status: Reviews of the relevant governance documents have commenced and will be presented to the Council on an as-required basis.

CONSIDERATION OF PUBLIC STATEMENT TIME AT COUNCIL MEETINGS AND BRIEFING SESSIONS (ex CJ299 - 12/04 Annual General Meeting of Electors held on 22 November 2004)

In relation to Motion 11 of the Annual General Meeting of Electors held on 22 November 2004, the Joint Commissioners:

- (b) AGREE to give consideration to the inclusion of a public statement time when reviewing the guidelines relating to public question time;
- (c) AGREE to the community being involved in developing protocols for public question time and statement time within the constraints imposed by the Local Government Act 1995 and the need for Council meetings to progress the ordinary business of the Council.

Status: Reviews of the relevant governance documents have commenced and will be presented to the Council on an as-required basis.

REVIEW OF CODE OF CONDUCT – NON-VILIFICATION OF RATEPAYERS (ex CJ299 - 12/04 Annual General Meeting of Electors held on 22 November 2004)

In relation to Motion 12 of the Annual General Meeting of Electors held on 22 November 2004, NOTE that recommendation No 25 referred to in the motion is a recommendation of the Governance Review Panel and cannot be altered by the City, however, the issue on non-vilification of ratepayers will be considered as part of the review of the Code of Conduct.

Status: This will be taken into consideration when reviewing the Council's Code of Conduct.

REVIEW OF GUIDELINES RELATING TO PUBLIC QUESTION TIME (ex CJ299 - 12/04 Annual General Meeting of Electors held on 22 November 2004)

In relation to Motion 13 of the Annual General Meeting of Electors held on 22 November 2004 NOTE that issues relating to the conduct at public question time will be taken into consideration when reviewing the guidelines relating to public question time.

Status: Reviews of the relevant governance documents have commenced and will be presented to the Council on an as-required basis.

OCEAN REEF BOAT HARBOUR DEVELOPMENT PROJECT (ex CJ299 - 12/04 - Annual General Meeting of Electors held on 22 November 2004)

In relation to Motion 18 of the Annual General Meeting of Electors held on 22 November 2004, REQUEST a detailed report be submitted for consideration by the Joint Commissioners addressing the issue of community consultation and coastal management in relation to the Ocean Reef Boat Harbour Development project.

Status: The Ocean Reef Boat Harbour Development Project Control Group, comprising representatives from the City, Department of Planning and Infrastructure, LandCorp and Clifton Coney Group, is finalising a study program, consultant briefs and costs estimates and it is proposed to present a report to Council in the first quarter of 2005.

REQUEST FOR FUNDING ASSISTANCE PURSUANT TO POLICY 2.2.8 - LEGAL REPRESENTATION FOR ELECTED MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES – ACTING CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER AND MANAGER AUDIT & EXECUTIVE SERVICES – ex C74-12/04

- 4 REQUEST the Director Corporate Services and Resource Management to provide a report to the next meeting of Council on:
- (a) the management of legal advice to the City in relation to the Inquiry;
 - (b) any possible conflict in relation to the engagement of Mr McLeod by Mr Clayton Higham.

Status: On 24 December 2004 the Director Corporate Services and Resource Management was subpoenaed to the Inquiry. The CEO is directly responsible for pursuing matters identified in this Item.

REQUEST FOR FUTURE FUNDING ASSISTANCE PURSUANT TO POLICY 2.2.8 - LEGAL REPRESENTATION FOR ELECTED MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES – ELECTED MEMBERS (SUSPENDED) – ex C75-12/04

That consideration of the requests for assistance for legal funding made by:

- 1 Cr Mackintosh (suspended) for the Inquiry into the City of Joondalup for the additional amount of \$7,457.43;
- 2 Cr Kimber (suspended) for the Inquiry into the City of Joondalup for the additional amount of \$2,392.42;
- 3 Cr O'Brien (suspended) for the Inquiry into the City of Joondalup for the additional amount of \$7,447.43;

be DEFERRED until the meeting of Joint Commissioners to be held on 22 February 2005.

Status: The CEO is reviewing this matter and will report within the next week.

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: 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 City is currently developing a Tourism Plan that may provide an economic development opportunity that could provide a clear link for the development of Country town relationship. For example many country regions are driving a tourism development agenda and cross marketing of tourism products could be developed that enable interchange between tourists to the City and the country regions.

Past attempts to select an appropriate Country Town to form a relationship with the City have failed due to a lack of basis and aligned support. Given the background of this initiative it is necessary for Administration to ensure the formation of a new relationship is aligned to Council’s overarching plans and strategies. This will inevitably drive sustainability of such an initiative.

This item has been determined as a low priority for Council in 2005 and will be reconsidered in 2006.

OPTIONS FOR PURCHASE OF CORPORATE VEHICLES (ex CJ230-10/04)

4 request the Sustainability Advisory Committee to investigate and report to the Council on options (including hybrid vehicles) relating to the operating of corporate vehicles that adhere to best practice sustainability principles.

Status: The Sustainability Advisory Committee has formed a working group of three members to work with Council Officers to look at this matter.

STRATEGIC FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE (ex CJ249-11/04)

4 Request the preparation of a report on a review of the Integrated Planning Framework for the 2006/07 planning cycle.

Status: A report was provided to the meeting of the Strategic Financial Management Committee of 8 February 2005 detailing a proposed process for the planning and budget cycle for 2006/07. This item may therefore be removed from the agenda.

OVERVIEW OF THE OFFICIAL VISIT TO JINAN (SHANDONG PROVINCE), CHINA BY THE JOONDALUP DELEGATION – SEPTEMBER 2004 (ex CJ250-11/04)

8 REQUEST that a further report is presented to Council outlining developments arising from the Jinan delegation visit scheduled for November 2004 and to provide details for a 5-10 year plan to establish and sustain the sister-city relationship that includes details on how the relationship will be measured and monitored.

Status: A report was presented to the Meeting of Council on 14 December 2004 outlining the outcomes of the November 2004 visit, however a further report will be submitted in early 2005, after detailed negotiations on specific programs have been undertaken and finalised in order for KPIs and a long term Relationships Plan can be established.

ESTABLISHMENT OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT TRAINING AND EXCHANGE PROGRAMME (ex CJ306 - 12/04 - Overview of the Official Visit From Jinan Delegation (Shandong Province), China to Joondalup – November 2004)

- 2 NOTE that negotiations are occurring to pursue agreements between the two Cities that will provide mutual benefits and request that a further report outlining progress of negotiations toward the establishment of local government training and exchange program between City of Jinan and City of Joondalup officers is presented to Council early in 2005;
- 3 REQUEST that a policy and long-term plan for managing the relationship be developed and be brought before Council in early 2005;

Status: The training program is in the negotiation phase with the City of Jinan officials. The City of Jinan is committed to a training program and have unofficially advised they would like to send 25 mid level officers to Joondalup in April 2005, however, this will be dependant upon the details of the program being finalised and issues of accommodation and costings are agreed.

Work is currently in progress to develop a long-term relationship plan. A survey has been prepared to seek feedback from stakeholders and this will provide data that will be used to formulate the principles, protocols and strategies for the plan.

EDGEWATER QUARRY SITE - (ex CJ300 - 12/04 - Site Acquisition - Works Depot)

REQUEST the City's officers in acknowledgement of public submissions received to the Business Plan and in the interests of the long-term strategic planning for the City, undertake a needs and opportunities analysis of the Edgewater Quarry site and report back to Council.

Status: A project plan is being prepared to guide the needs and opportunities analysis. Currently research on previous work that has been done on this site is being collated and will provide the background to the project plan. A report outlining the project plan will be submitted to Council by March 2005.

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, dependant upon resources available and overriding demands for other reports that include tight timeframe, high priority, or statutory constraints.

It is anticipated that a report will be presented to the Meeting of Council to be held in March 2005.

TOM SIMPSON PARK AND TEN LOTS IN MERRIFIELD PLACE, MULLALOO (ex CJ299 - 12/04 Annual General Meeting of Electors held on 22 November 2004)

In relation to Motion 16 of the Annual General Meeting of Electors held on 22 November 2004 NOTE that a report will be presented to the Joint Commissioners in early 2005 on the matter of including Lot 1 Oceanside Promenade and the grassed road reserve adjacent to Tom Simpson Park into Tom Simpson Park, and the reservation of 10 lots in Merrifield Place, Mullaloo;

Status: It is anticipated that a report will be presented to the Meeting of Council to be held in March 2005

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 31 August 2004. Additional advice has now been received and the matter will be referred to the next available Meeting of Council.

CITY OF JOONDALUP SUBMISSION ON THE WESTERN AUSTRALIAN PLANNING COMMISSION’S DRAFT NETWORK CITY: COMMUNITY PLANNING STRATEGY FOR PERTH AND PEEL – ex CJ339 - 12/04

ADVISE the Western Australian Planning Commission that further community consultation is required and that a further submission following a Special Electors Meeting to be held in January 2005 will be made on Network City

Status: The minutes of the Special Electors Meeting held on 11 January 2005 were forwarded to the WAPC as a further submission to be included with the City’s original submission. This item may therefore be removed from the agenda.

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: A report was presented to Executive Management on 11 October 2004, with a further report outlining the City’s requirements to be decided at a future Executive meeting. The City’s decision was forwarded for consideration at the WALGA North Zone meeting on 25 November 2004.

At the WALGA North Zone meeting held on 25 November 2004 it was agreed that the item regarding the proposed Community Safety and Crime Prevention partnership be deferred to allow member Councils to provide their responses to the City of Stirling.

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.

LEISURE CENTRES (ex CJ299 - 12/04 - Annual General Meeting of Electors held on 22 November 2004)

In relation to Motion 8 of the Annual General Meeting of Electors held on 22 November 2004:

- (b) AGREE to review industry related fees and charges to ensure the leisure centres programs and services are at an equitable price;
- (c) DEVELOP a membership specifically for Seniors to be launched in conjunction with the opening of the new facilities at Craigie Leisure Centre;

Status: A review of industry fees and charges for leisure centres has been completed. The review looked at similar facilities and services to Craigie Leisure Centre, outlining competitors’ prices and developing an industry average for particular prices.

The review clearly outlined Craigie Leisure Centre offers facilities and services in line with the industry average.

A new Seniors membership has been developed for the opening of the aquatic facilities at Craigie Leisure Centre. The GOLD membership will provide a range of specifically designed seniors’ exercise classes at both Craigie Leisure Centre and Sorrento Duncraig Leisure Centre and will include aqua-aerobics, gym and group fitness classes. The discount price will be retained for City of Joondalup residents.

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.

ABORIGINAL FLAG (ex CJ334 – 12/04 Minutes of the Youth Advisory Council Meeting – 22 September 2004)

4 that the City’s position regarding the Aboriginal flag be addressed as part of the Cultural Plan.

Status: The Cultural Mapping Document identified indigenous recognition and heritage issues that might be addressed in the City’s Cultural Plan. The flying of the aboriginal flag in the forecourt of the Council administration building was identified as a desirable initiative to promote recognition of indigenous culture by the City.

The aboriginal flag has been flown on various occasions in the past, including NAIDOC week in 2004.

POLICY POSITION – YOUTH CURFEW (ex CJ334 – 12/04 Minutes of the Youth Advisory Council Meeting – 22 September 2004)

- 2 the recommended policy position that the City of Joondalup actively resists any course of action such as a youth curfew that limits the right of young people to move freely within the public domain until adequate and direct consultation has occurred with young people and other stakeholders and all other proactive approaches have been explored, and that a detailed report regarding this recommendation be provided to Council;

Status: The Youth Advisory Council will meet on Wednesday 16 February 2005. This item is listed for discussion and action regarding the preparation of the report will be decided.

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)

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;

Status: 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 north-western portion of the Iluka subdivision. It is at that time that consideration to the second fire break can be given by the City.

PROPOSED PARKING RESTRICTIONS – HAWKER AVENUE, FARNE CLOSE AND SANDAY PLACE, WARWICK (ex CJ260-11/04)

- 4 *REQUEST the Acting Chief Executive Officer to conduct a further parking survey within relevant localities that are affected by patrons utilising the Warwick Rail Station and the Greenwood Station following a six month period after the commissioning of the Greenwood Rail Station.*

Status: A further parking survey will be conducted in June/July 2005.

LOT 118 – MARMION AVENUE, MINDARIE – PROGRESS REPORT – ex CJ282-11/04

- 1 ENDORSE the proposed Bush Forever Negotiated Planning Solution (NPS) outlined in Report CJ282-11/04 subject to the deletion of any reference to the formation of a Joint Development Group and AUTHORISE the Chief Executive Officer to complete documentation for a Negotiated Planning Solution relating to Bush Forever on Lot 118 Marmion Avenue, Mindarie and submit the documentation to Council for formal agreement in conjunction with recommendations relating to valuations now being obtained and to include advice to Council relating to the need to prepare a Business Plan and consult the community on this matter;

- 4 SUPPORT the proposal of the Chief Executive Officer to prepare a further report to Council setting out how, and under what legal structure, the owner Councils should progress the intended development of Lot 118 Marmion Avenue, Mindarie.

Status: A report will be presented to Council in March/April 2005.

LIGHTING - MULLALOO BEACH CAR PARKS AND TOM SIMPSON PARK, MULLALOO (ex CJ299 - 12/04 Annual General Meeting of Electors held on 22 November 2004)

In relation to Motion 17 of the Annual General Meeting of Electors held on 22 November 2004, the Joint Commissioners:

REQUEST that the installation of better lighting to the Mullaloo Beach Carparks area and Tom Simpson Park be investigated with an audit undertaken to advise on options and costs, to be considered as part of the 2005/2006 budget deliberations;

Status: A report will be submitted to Council Meeting to be held 15 March 2005.

TENDER NO 014-04/05 PROVISION OF SECURITY AND PATROL SERVICES IN THE CITY OF JOONDALUP – CITY WATCH (ex CJ272-11/04)

5 REQUEST a report be submitted to Council for consideration prior to the extension of the contract beyond two years.

Status: The requested report will be provided to Council in November 2006.

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

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

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

Status: The City reviewed the contract specifications for the recently awarded tender for the Provision of Security and Patrol Services. These changes to the contract specifications were developed as a result of a detailed and independent evaluation of the services. A review and subsequent report will be undertaken with a report considering any contract extension beyond two years, being presented to Council prior to December 2006.

OUTSTANDING PETITIONS

<p>A 264-signature petition has been received from residents of the City of Joondalup in relation to the extension of Ocean Reef Road requesting a consultation process which includes the option of dedicating the land as a Community Recreational Reserve - as a community and tourist passive recreational amenity as parkland with walkways and the restoration and regeneration of the original natural environment.</p> <p>Comment: This matter is subject to community consultation.</p>	<p>18 May 2004</p> <p>Strategic and Sustainable Development</p>
<p>A 25-signature petition from Kallaroo residents opposing on safety grounds, the proposed site (Batavia Place) for the location of a carpark for the Pre-Primary at Springfield Primary School, Bridgewater Drive, Kallaroo.</p> <p>Comment: The application has been referred back to the applicant to consider alternative options.</p>	<p>11 November 2003</p> <p>Planning and Community Development</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>Infrastructure and Operations</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: The Development Application for Lot 62/63 Hocking Road, Kingsley has been approved and the relevant parties will be advised as appropriate. This item may therefore be removed from the agenda.</p>	<p>10 August 2004</p> <p>Planning & Community Development</p>
<p>A 55-signature petition has been received from residents of the City of Joondalup strongly urging the City to reconsider the decision to increase fees for the Movements for Healthy Bodies and Teen Aerobics classes presented at Sorrento Duncraig Leisure Centre.</p> <p>Comment: All submissions will be taken into consideration as part of the Fees and Charges Review, which is scheduled for 2005.</p>	<p>12 October 2004</p> <p>Planning and Community Development</p>
<p>A 10-signature petition has been received on behalf of residents of Dirk Hartog Cove requesting that the City fund the extension of the brick wall surrounding the Estate situated between Ocean Reef Road and Dirk Hartog Cove, Heathridge.</p> <p>Comment: Investigations are currently in progress.</p>	<p>23 November 2004</p> <p>Planning and Community Development</p>

<p>A 57-signature petition has been submitted on behalf of Greenwood residents requesting the Council to investigate ways of curbing unruly traffic behaviour in Sherington Road, Greenwood.</p> <p>Comment: This Petition will be considered as part of the 2005/06 Draft Budget deliberations.</p>	<p>23 November 2004</p> <p>Infrastructure and Operations</p>
<p>Three petitions of 46, 22 and 36 signatures respectively plus one letter of support has been received from residents of the City of Joondalup expressing support for the rezoning of Lot 61 (41 Leach Street, Marmion (Old CSIRO Facility site) from Local Reserves ‘Parks and Recreation’ to ‘Urban Development’.</p> <p>Comment: The petition will be considered along with all other submissions during assessment of the application. This item may therefore be removed from the agenda.</p>	<p>14 December 2004</p> <p>Planning and Community Development</p>
<p>A 67-signature petition has been received from residents strongly objecting to a car park being located on Crown land located at the end of Fourth Avenue, Burns Beach.</p> <p>Comment: It is understood that the petition relates to the proposed Burns Beach Structure Plan. The petition will be considered along with all other submissions during assessment of the application. This item may therefore be removed from the agenda.</p>	<p>14 December 2004</p> <p>Planning and Community Development</p>

REPORTS/PRESENTATIONS REQUESTED BY COMMISSIONERS

	DATE OF REQUEST - REFERRED TO -
<p>Use of the Council Chamber</p> <p>Discussion ensued on the ability to make the chamber available for hire, on a cost-recovery basis, for certain formal occasions. It was requested that guidelines be prepared to assist the Mayor/Chairman in approving use of the Council Chamber.</p> <p>Comment: A report will be presented to a future Strategy Session.</p>	<p>9 November 2004</p> <p>Office of the CEO</p>
<p>Council Meetings</p> <p>Cmr Anderson requested a report on the costs associated with holding a Council meeting at a suitable location besides the Council Chamber within the City of Joondalup.</p> <p>Comment: Research of appropriate venues is currently being undertaken along with examination of the legislative requirements. A report will be presented to Council in the near future.</p>	<p>26 October 2004</p> <p>Office of the CEO</p>
<p>Upgrade of Street Lighting within the City of Joondalup</p> <p>Cmr Anderson requested a report on the costings to upgrade street lighting within the City of Joondalup to Australian Standards.</p> <p>Comment: A report will be submitted to Council Meeting to be held on 15 March 2005.</p>	<p>7 December 2004</p> <p>Infrastructure and Operations</p>