



City of  
**Joondalup**

# **DRAFT AGENDA FOR BRIEFING SESSION**

to be held on

**13 SEPTEMBER 2005**

in Conference Room 1,  
Joondalup Civic Centre, Boas Avenue, Joondalup  
commencing at 6.30 pm

## **Public Question Time**

**Members of the public are requested to lodge questions  
in writing by 4 pm on Monday 12 September 2005.  
Answers to those questions received within that timeframe will,  
where practicable, be provided in hard copy form  
at the Briefing Session.**

**GARRY HUNT  
Chief Executive Officer  
9 September 2005**

## **PROTOCOLS FOR BRIEFING SESSIONS**

The following protocols for the conduct of Briefing Sessions were adopted at the Council meeting held on 9 August 2005.

### **INTRODUCTION**

The modern role of the Elected Council is to set policy and strategy, and provide goals and targets for the local government (City of Joondalup). The employees, through the Chief Executive Officer, have the task of implementing the decisions of the Elected Council.

A well-structured decision-making process that has established protocols will provide the elected body with the opportunity to:

- have input into the future strategic direction set by the Council;
- seek points of clarification;
- ask questions;
- be given adequate time to research issues;
- be given maximum time to debate matters before the Council;

and ensure that the elected body is fully informed to make the best possible decision for all the residents of the City of Joondalup.

### **PURPOSE OF BRIEFING SESSIONS**

Briefing Sessions will involve Elected Members, staff, and external advisors (where appropriate) and will be open to the public.

Briefing Sessions will provide the opportunity for Elected Members to be equally informed and seek additional information on matters prior to the presentation of such matters to the next ordinary meeting of Council for formal consideration and decision.

### **Protocols for Briefing Sessions**

The following protocols will apply to Briefing Sessions that are conducted by the City of Joondalup.

- 1 Briefing Sessions will be open to the public except for matters that relate to a confidential nature. The guide in determining those matters of a confidential nature shall be in accordance with the Local Government Act 1995.
- 2 Dates and times for Briefing Sessions will be set well in advance where practicable, and appropriate notice given to the public.
- 3 The Chief Executive Officer will ensure timely written notice and an agenda for each Briefing Session will be provided to all Elected Members, Members of the public and external advisors (where appropriate).
- 4 The Mayor is to be the Presiding Member at Briefing Sessions. If the Mayor is unable or unwilling to assume the role of Presiding Member, then the Deputy Mayor may preside at the Briefing Session. If the Deputy Mayor is unable or unwilling, those

Elected Members present may select one from amongst themselves to preside at the Briefing Session.

- 5 The Presiding Member at the commencement of each Briefing Session shall:
  - (a) Advise Elected Members that there will be no debate on any matters raised during the Sessions;
  - (b) Ensure that the relevant employee, through liaising with the Chief Executive Officer, provides a detailed presentation on matters listed on the agenda for the Session;
  - (c) Encourage all Elected Members present to participate in the sharing and gathering of information;
  - (d) Ensure that all Elected Members have a fair and equal opportunity to participate in the Session; and
  - (e) Ensure the time available for the Session is liberal enough to allow for all matters of relevance to be identified;
  
- 6 Elected Members, employees and relevant consultants shall disclose their interests on any matter listed for the Briefing Sessions. When disclosing an interest the following should be considered:
  - (a) Interests are to be disclosed in accordance with the provisions of the Local Government Act 1995 and the City's Code of Conduct;
  - (b) Persons disclosing a financial interest will not participate in that part of the Session relating to the matter to which their interest applies and shall depart the room;
  - (c) An exception shall be applied to the disclosing of interests by consultants where the consultant will be providing information only, and will be able to remain in the Session;
  - (d) As matters raised at a Briefing Session are not completely predictable, there is some flexibility in the disclosures of interests. A person may disclose an interest at such time as an issue is raised that is not specifically listed on the agenda for the Session.
  
- 7 Elected Members have the opportunity to request matters to be included on the agenda for consideration at a future Briefing Session by:
  - (a) A request to the Chief Executive Officer; or
  - (b) A request made during the Briefing Session.
  
- 8 A record shall be kept of all Briefing Sessions. As no decisions are made at a Briefing Session, the record need only be a general record of the items covered but shall record any disclosure of interests as declared by individuals. A copy of the record is to be forwarded to all elected members.
  
- 9 Members of the public may make a deputation to a Briefing Session by making a written request to the Mayor by 4pm on the working day immediately prior to the scheduled Briefing Session. Deputations must relate to matters listed on the agenda of the Briefing Session.

- 10 Other requirements for deputations are to be in accordance with the Standing Orders Local Law where it refers to the management of deputations.

### **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, 13 SEPTEMBER 2005 commencing at 6.30 pm

### **ORDER OF BUSINESS**

- 1 OPEN AND WELCOME**
- 2 DEPUTATIONS**
- 3 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

**The following questions were submitted to the Briefing Session held on 23 August 2005:**

*Re SAT Appeal – Lot 407 Glenelg Place, Connolly.*

*Q1 Will the City please elaborate on the term "short stay accommodation"?*

*Q2 Is this the same 'short stay accommodation' as described in the Mullaloo Beach Tavern development previously?*

A1-2 Short stay accommodation is a generic term used to describe temporary occupancy of a dwelling or unit. The appropriate land use class under the terms of District Planning Scheme no. 2 is "residential building". The Connolly development and the Mullaloo development include "residential building" as a land use class.

*Q3 What guarantees does the City give that these short stay accommodations will not be sold off as independent units?*

A3 The City has no jurisdiction to control the sale of individual units. The use of land is not necessarily related to how the land is sold or subdivided. If such units were to be used for permanent residential purposes, approval for a change of use would be required.

*Q4 Can the City confirm this is what happened at Mullaloo Beach Tavern (short stay accommodations sold off)?*

A4 No, Council does not have the power to determine the method of marketing for private developments. The Council has however approved the development for certain land uses, and the conversion of one land use to another would require a fresh application to the Council.

*Q5 Why is the City not protecting the amenity of the residents of Connolly, who were united in not wanting this type of development near them?*

A5 It is presumed this question relates to the SAT Appeal – Lot 407 Glenelg Place, Connolly. The matter comes before the Council because the issue is in the jurisdiction of the State Administrative Tribunal. The SAT has given a direction that Council respond to it by providing a list of conditions of approval

for the SAT to consider. The Council does not have a choice in considering this matter.

- Q6 *Why is the City staff not defending its ratepayers and a Council decision on this issue?*
- A6 The City has vigorously defended the decision of Council in the SAT through the services of an independent advocate and the calling of local community members as witnesses. This approach was taken because the Council's determination of the development application differed from the officer's recommendation.
- Q7 *Will the Commissioners consider standing by their previous decision and protect the amenity of ratepayers?*
- A7 The Council has the background to this issue before it in making a further resolution about the development, and this will be taken into account.
- Q8 *Warrant of Payments - What goods and or services were provided to the City for cheque Nos 72085, 72087, 72147, 3383 EFT, 3313EFT, 3359EFT, 72106, 3314EFT, 3398EFT, 72089, 3400EFT, 72086, 72106, 72096,72037, 3429EFT, 72325, 3435EFT, 72211, 3423EFT, 72208, 3417EFT, 3443EFT, 71979, 72244, 72012, 72319, 72214, 72090, 72099, 3468EFT, 72108, 72084, 72102, 72088, 3318EFT, 72247, 3342EFT, 3513EFT, 3522EFT, 72248, 72107, 72028, 3346EFT, 3581EFT, 72138, 72063, 3351EFT, 3584EFT, 72146, 3356EFT, 3547EFT, 72135, 72107, 72028, 3346EFT, 3581EFT.*
- A8 Due to the extensive research required to answer the 57 items identified, the question was taken on notice. A response will be included in the Agenda for the Council Meeting to be held on 20 September 2005.

**Mr M Caiacob, Mullaloo:**

- Q1 *Re Item 3 – Disposal of City owned land – Lot 3 Trappers Drive, Woodvale:*
- Was the valuation for land cognisant of expected price increase over 20 years, CPI and 'highest and best' use of the land, as the City is paying for the depot site?*
- A1 The valuation was undertaken on a commercial basis and is the current valuation.
- Q2 *Re Item 15 – SAT Appeal – Lot 407 Glenelg Place, Connolly.*
- As the City did not have time to present to Council on 19 July, could I be advised where the authority was obtained to submit the revised conditions to the SAT?*
- A2 This matter came before Council for refusal and was referred to the SAT. SAT has dealt with it and directed Council to provide conditions.
- Q3 *Was the provision of information to the SAT done from the day-to-day operations, Delegated Authority or did it go back to Council for approval?*
- A3 The conditions are going before Council. Council has made a 'in principle' decision. The conditions on the approved recommendation previously were in the Minutes and available to the public, including the SAT.



**Mr S Kobelke, Sorrento:**

- Q1 *Re: Outstanding business items relating to legal advice. Will Council have a decision when the Inquiry finishes, to enable these matters to be resolved?*
- A1 Mr McIntyre will prepare a report that will be presented to the Minister and will be subject to advice from the Crown Solicitors. The report will then be tabled in Parliament. Matters cannot be acted upon until the City receives the report.
- Q2 *Will the City's solicitors move quickly to answer the questions and advise the Commissioners, particularly on the items relating to the Mayor's payment?*
- A2 Where possible, yes. It is unknown what the outcome of the Inquiry will be. It would be expected that there would be answers to most of the issues.
- Q3 *Re: Item 9. Proposed Child Care Centre – Marybrook Road, Heathridge.*
- Could you comment on the impact on the increased car use in the area on residents other than the adjoining neighbours?*
- A3 Consideration was given to the impact of the proposal on the function of the road and on those that use the road.

**Mr H Joubert, Joondalup:**

- Q1 *I am the applicant for Item 15 – SAT Appeal – Lot 407 Glenelg Place, Connolly. I have just become aware of the conditions provided within the agenda. Are you aware that some of the statements made in the report are not correct? I did not agree to pay any costs or fees in relation to the path and the parking agreement.*
- A1 Officers will contact Mr Joubert to discuss this issue.

**Mr S Kobelke, Sorrento:**

- Q1 *Re Item 15 – SAT Appeal – Lot 407 Glenelg Place, Connolly. Will the Commissioners consider putting an attachment or further addition to the motion reinforcing the Commissioners' comments that this application should not be approved?*
- A1 *Response by Cmr Paterson:* This comment will be taken on board.

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

Acting Director Planning & Community Development, Mr David Djulbic, declared an interest that may affect his impartiality in Item 8 – Adoption of Modifications to the Joondalup City Centre Development Plan and Manual - Southern Business District due to the negotiations for the acquisition process of the Hodges Drive Depot site.

Chief Executive Officer, Mr Garry Hunt, declared an interest that may affect his impartiality in Item 8 – Adoption of Modifications to the Joondalup City Centre Development Plan and Manual – Southern Business District due to the negotiations for the acquisition process of the Hodges Drive Depot site.

## 6 REPORTS

|         |   |     |
|---------|---|-----|
| ITEM 1  | OVERVIEW OF THE OFFICIAL VISIT FROM JINAN DELEGATION (SHANDONG PROVINCE), CHINA TO JOONDALUP – AUGUST 2005 AND TO PROVIDE FURTHER NOTIFICATION OF AN INVITATION TO VISIT JINAN IN OCTOBER 2005 – [52469] [11014].....                       | 1   |
| ITEM 2  | MATERIAL VARIANCES FOR THE FINANCIAL YEAR ENDING 30 JUNE 2006 – [80566]   | 10  |
| ITEM 3  | TENDER 001-05/06 SWEEPING OF PAVEMENTS, CAR PARKS AND PATHWAYS IN JOONDALUP CITY CENTRE – [77572].....  | 13  |
| ITEM 4  | TENDER 003-05/06 PLUMBING MAINTENANCE SERVICES – [86572].....   | 18  |
| ITEM 5  | TENDER 008-05/06 GRAFFITI CONTROL SERVICES – [11573].....   | 22  |
| ITEM 6  | TENDER 014-05/06 SORRENTO BEACH REDEVELOPMENT STAGE 2 – [67573].....  | 27  |
| ITEM 7  | MEETING OF THE CONSERVATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE HELD ON 24 AUGUST 2005 – [12168].....  | 32  |
| ITEM 8  | PROPOSED DRAFT CURRAMBINE DISTRICT CENTRE STRUCTURE PLAN (STRUCTURE PLAN NO 6) - LOTS 9505, 929 AND 1574 DELAMERE AVENUE, HOBSONS GATE & SHENTON AVENUE, CURRAMBINE – [47351] [39557].....  | 38  |
| ITEM 9  | ADOPTION OF MODIFICATIONS TO THE JOONDALUP CITY CENTRE DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND MANUAL - SOUTHERN BUSINESS DISTRICT – [00152].....  | 45  |
| ITEM 10 | EDUCATIONAL ESTABLISHMENT - CARPARK ADDITION (610 NEW BAYS) – LOT 502 (38) COLLIER PASS, JOONDALUP – [22460].....   | 52  |
| ITEM 11 | CLOSE OF ADVERTISING FOR AMENDMENT NO 29 TO DISTRICT PLANNING SCHEME NO 2 TO REZONE FROM 'COMMERCIAL' TO 'RESIDENTIAL' AND AMEND THE DENSITY CODE FROM R20 TO R40: LOT 674 (107) EDDYSTONE AVENUE, CNR PERILYA ROAD, CRAIGIE – [83567]..... | 61  |
| ITEM 12 | FOUR COMMERCIAL TENANCIES AND FOUR GROUPED DWELLINGS - LOT 519 (27) DAVIDSON TERRACE (NORTHEAST CNR REID PROMENADE) JOONDALUP – [76521].....  | 66  |
| ITEM 13 | DEDICATION OF PORTION OF OCEAN REEF ROAD, OCEAN REEF – [07131].....   | 74  |
| ITEM 14 | PROPOSED TWO STOREY DEVELOPMENT OF THIRTY SIX MULTIPLE DWELLINGS PLUS BASEMENT CAR PARKING AREA – LOT 251 (5) EASTLEIGH LOOP CURRAMBINE – [38659].....  | 77  |
| ITEM 15 | SHOWROOM ADDITIONS – LOT 13 (57) JOONDALUP DRIVE, EDGEWATER – [38480].....  | 96  |
| ITEM 16 | APPOINTMENT OF REPRESENTATIVES TO THE TAMALA PARK REGIONAL COUNCIL – [41196].....   | 101 |
| ITEM 17 | APPLICATION FOR THE CANCELLATION OF A PORTION OF RESERVE 39624 (CASTLECRAG PARK) CASTLECRAG DRIVE, KALLAROO – [64266].....  | 106 |

- 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                    OVERVIEW OF THE OFFICIAL VISIT FROM JINAN DELEGATION (SHANDONG PROVINCE), CHINA TO JOONDALUP – AUGUST 2005 AND TO PROVIDE FURTHER NOTIFICATION OF AN INVITATION TO VISIT JINAN IN OCTOBER 2005 – [52469] [11014]**

**WARD:**                    All

**RESPONSIBLE DIRECTOR:**                    Mr Garry Hunt  
Chief Executive Officer

---

**PURPOSE**

To provide an overview and highlight the outcomes of the visit to the City of Joondalup by the delegation from the City of Jinan, Shandong Province, China from 18-19 August 2005 and to consider a formal invitation to the City of Joondalup to lead a delegation to attend the China Shandong (Jinan) Twin Cities Tourism Conference to be held from 21-23 October 2005 in Jinan.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Friendly relations between the City of Joondalup and the City of Jinan in eastern China have been developing since 2000. A Memorandum of Friendly Talks was signed between the two Cities in 2002 and in September 2004 the Chairman of Commissioners led a delegation to Jinan where a Protocol of Friendly Relations was signed. This was followed by a visit to the City of Joondalup by delegates from Jinan in November 2004 when an official protocol agreement formalising the Sister City Relationship between the two Cities was duly signed.

The City was advised in April 2005 that a delegation to be lead by Mayor Bao Zhiqiang of Jinan City would arrive in Joondalup in August 2005. Council received a report CJ306-12/04 - Notification of visits between Joondalup and Jinan sister cities during 2005 and subsequently endorsed the visit for Mayor Bao and his delegation to visit Joondalup in August and further requested the Chief Executive Officer to commence hosting arrangements to enable the visit. The report also provided advice to Council with respect to an invitation from Mayor Bao for the City of Joondalup to send a delegation to Jinan in October 2005 for the China Shandong (Jinan) Twin Cities Tourism Conference to be held from 21-23 October 2005 in Jinan. Council deferred their decision to accept the invitation pending the finalisation of the draft Joondalup – Jinan Relationship Plan being accepted by Council.

The City finalised the draft Joondalup-Jinan Relationship Plan, which will guide the development of the Sister City Relationship over the next 5 years. The draft Relationship Plan recommends, among other details, biennial visits between the two Cities rather than annually. The draft Plan has been released for public comment and report will be submitted to Council after the submission period closes at the end of September 2005.

The invitation extended to the City of Joondalup to attend the China Shandong (Jinan) Twin Cities Tourism Conference needs to be considered in light of the delivery of the pending City of Joondalup Inquiry Report. The Report of Inquiry is expected for public release in October 2005. Given the seriousness and significance of this Inquiry into the City of Joondalup and the unknown potential outcomes, it is considered that the timing of a visit to Jinan would not be conducive to the current priorities of the City and it will be necessary for the Commissioners and the Chief Executive Officer to be available to address any outcomes of the Inquiry report.

An option is still available for the stakeholders of Joondalup to form a separate delegation without Council involvement and this is a matter that the stakeholders themselves need to consider.

This report recommends that Council:

- 1 *NOTES the report on outcomes of the visit from the Jinan delegation in August 2005;*
- 2 *IS UNABLE to accept the invitation to attend the China Shandong (Jinan) Twin Cities Tourism Conference on this occasion as the Report of the Inquiry into the City of Joondalup is scheduled to be released in October 2005, and given the unknown outcomes of that report it is considered as not being conducive to the current priorities of the City;*
- 3 *ADVISES Mayor Bao of Jinan of its decision accordingly and thanks him for his kind consideration;*
- 4 *ADVISES the Joondalup Stakeholders Group of the decision of Council.*

## **BACKGROUND**

Friendly relations between the City of Joondalup and the City of Jinan in eastern China have been developing since 2000. A Memorandum of Friendly Talks was signed between the two Cities in 2002 and, in late 2003, the City received an invitation to lead a delegation to Jinan in September 2004 where a Protocol of Friendly Relations to establish a formal Sister City relationship was signed. In August 2004 the Chairman of Commissioners extended an invitation to official representatives from the City of Jinan to form a delegation to visit Joondalup in November 2004. The delegation lead by Mr Duan Yihe, Director of the Standing Committee of Jinan's People Congress from Jinan was received by the City of Joondalup from November 19 – 22, 2004. During this visit the two Cities signed an official protocol agreement formalising the Sister City relations between the two Cities

In March 2005 the City of Joondalup received advice from the Jinan Foreign Affairs Office that Mayor Bao was proposing to make a visit to Joondalup in August 2005 and furthermore Mayor Bao was extending an official invitation to the City of Joondalup to travel to Jinan to attend the China Shandong (Jinan) Twin Cities Tourism Conference to be held from 21-23 October 2005.

Council at its meeting on 12 April 2005 resolved to:

- 1 *APPROVE that the delegation from Jinan, China lead by Mayor Bao Zhiqiang is received in August 2005;*
- 2 *Request the Chairman of Commissioners to issue official invitations to Mayor Bao Zhiqiang and his delegation;*
- 3 *REQUEST the Chief Executive Officer to commence arrangements for the hosting of the delegation and to provide a report back to Council in the near future outlining the details of the itinerary as well as a promotion and education program for business and community to be appropriately involved in the forthcoming visit in August 2005;*
- 4 *DEFER the decision to accept the invitation from Mayor Bao Zhiqiang of the Municipal People's Government of Jinan for the Chairman of Commissioners to lead a delegation to Jinan to attend the International Tourism Fair from 21-23 October 2005 until the draft relationship plan is presented to Council in May 2005;*

- 5 *AUTHORISE the Chairman of Commissioners to hold formal discussions with the City's key stakeholders to seek their level of interest, support and attendance at the proposed visits between the Sister Cities during 2005;*
- 6 *ADVISE Mayor Bao Zhiqiang of the Municipal People's Government of Jinan that travel and accommodation costs would be borne by each delegate and/or their respective organisations;*
- 7 *LIST for consideration a budget allocation of \$15,000 in the 2005-06 budget to ensure costs associated with hosting an inbound delegation and an outbound delegation can be met.*

With respect to the Council resolution to DEFER the decision to accept the invitation from Mayor Bao Zhiqiang of the Municipal People's Government of Jinan for the Chairman of Commissioners to lead a delegation to Jinan to attend the International Tourism Conference from 21-23 October 2005 until the draft Relationship Plan is presented to Council, it should be noted that Council at its meeting on 9 August 2005 (CJ157-08/05 refers) received the draft Joondalup – Jinan Relationship Plan and resolved to:

- 1 *ENDORSE the draft Plan shown as Attachment A to be disbursed to all interested parties for a comment period no longer than 30 days;*
- 2 *Present the draft plan to Mayor Bao and his delegation from Jinan in August 2005 seeking support for the draft plan;*
- 3 *Request a further report on the draft plan be presented to Council for final endorsement following the receipt of comments from interested parties and the Jinan delegation.*

Full details of the history of the relationship with Jinan can be found in the following reports, previously submitted to Council:

|             |  |
|-------------|--|
| CJ007-02/04 | Invitation to further formalise friendly relations with Jinan in Shandong Province, China                    |
| CJ155-07/04 | Delegation to formalise friendly relations with Jinan in Shandong Province, China                            |
| CJ250-11/04 | A Protocol for Friendly Relations with the City of Jinan in Shandong Province, China – September 2004        |
| CJ306-12/04 | Overview of the Official Visit from Jinan Delegation (Shandong province), China to Joondalup – November 2004 |
| CJ306-12/04 | Notification of visits between Joondalup and Jinan sister cities during 2005                                 |
| CJ157-08/05 | Draft Jinan – Joondalup Relationship Plan  |

## **DETAILS**

### **Issues and options considered:**

The invitation extended to the City of Joondalup to attend the China Shandong (Jinan) Twin Cities Tourism Conference needs to be considered in light of the delivery of the pending City of Joondalup Inquiry Report. The Report of Inquiry is expected for public release in October 2005. Given the seriousness and significance of this Inquiry into the City of Joondalup and the unknown potential outcomes, it is considered that the timing of a visit to Jinan would not be conducive to the current priorities of the City and it will be necessary for the Commissioners and the Chief Executive Officer to be available to address any outcomes of the Inquiry report.

An option is still available for the stakeholders of Joondalup to form a separate delegation without Council involvement and this is a matter that the stakeholders themselves need to consider.

### **Overview of the Jinan Delegation Visit to Joondalup August 18-19 2005.**

The main objectives of the Jinan delegation's visit to Joondalup in August 2005 lead by Mayor Bao Zhiqiang were to gain a more in-depth understanding of the business, trade and exchange opportunities that can be offered by the City of Joondalup and its key industries of business, health, safety, education and tourism to China and to also identify any linkages that the City of Joondalup could facilitate on behalf of the City of Jinan to exploit other trade opportunities that are not available within the City of Joondalup. The concept of Joondalup becoming a gateway for Jinan was raised in the discussions with Mayor Bao during this visit.

### **Brief details of trip**

The Jinan delegation comprised 8 representatives from Government and key industry sectors from the City of Jinan and are listed as follows:

|   | <b>Name</b>       | <b>Title</b>   |
|---|-------------------|--|
| 1 | Mr. Bao Zhiqiang  | Mayor, City of Jinan   |
| 2 | Mr Hu Zhanping    | Secretary-General, Jinan Municipal Government  |
| 3 | Mr Fu Zhenkuan    | Deputy President China Council for the Promotion of International Trade - Jinan Branch |
| 4 | Mr Sun Xiaogang   | Director, Jinan Hi-Tech Zone   |
| 5 | Mr Li Zhongxue    | Director, Jinan Foreign Affairs Office   |
| 6 | Mr Meng Xianghuan | Director, Jinan Foreign Trade and Economic Cooperation Bureau                          |
| 7 | Mr Lin Shuhong    | Deputy Director, General Office Jinan Municipal Government                             |
| 8 | Ms Liu Yanqiu     | Division Chief, Jinan Foreign Affairs Office   |

In total, the delegation spent 2 days in Joondalup undertaking a number of key activities to further understanding between the two Cities and raising awareness within the City of Joondalup community of the sister city relationship. A number of key events were especially set up for community interaction and were all very well attended. A summarised itinerary is provided as follows:

### **Summarised Itinerary**

| <b>Date</b>                   | <b>Time</b>  | <b>Details</b>  |
|-------------------------------|--------------|---|
| Thursday<br>18 August<br>2005 | 7.35am       | Delegation arrives Perth International Airport and are taken to the Joondalup Resort    |
| Thursday<br>18 August<br>2005 | 10.00 -11.30 | Tour of Western Australian Police Academy and morning tea                               |
| Thursday<br>18 August<br>2005 | 11.30-14.00  | Tour of ECU and Luncheon at ECU hosted by the Vice Chancellor Professor Millicent Poole |

| <b>Date</b>                   | <b>Time</b>   | <b>Details</b>  |
|-------------------------------|---------------|---|
| Thursday<br>18 August<br>2005 | 16.00 – 17.00 | Official Sister Ceremony<br>Civic Chambers Joondalup – Hosted by Commissioner Paterson - Open to community  |
| Thursday<br>18 August<br>2005 | 17.00 – 18.30 | Industry Meetings<br>1 Mayoral meeting<br>2 Education, Training and Relationship Plan<br>3 Hi Tech and Science<br>4 Trade, Economy and Business   |
| Thursday<br>18 August<br>2005 | 18.30 – 21.00 | Official Dinner – Civic Chambers Joondalup hosted by Commissioner John Paterson   |
| Friday 19<br>August<br>2005   | 7.30-9.30am   | Breakfast Meeting and Tour of West Coast College hosted by Ms Sue Slavin Managing Director West Coast TAFE – A table was set aside for community members and was quickly filled through Expressions of Interest |
| Friday 19<br>August<br>2005   | 10.00 – 11.00 | Tour of Craigie Leisure Centre and morning tea with residents of Joondalup  |
| Friday 19<br>August<br>2005   | 11.00 – 12.00 | Meeting at the Chinese Consulate General Office – East Perth  |
| Friday 19<br>August<br>2005   | 12.30 – 14.00 | Luncheon at Parliament House hosted by The Honourable Mr Robert (Bob) Kucera, Minister for Multicultural Affairs and Mr Tony O’Gorman and Mr Ken Travers, State Members for Joondalup                           |
| Friday 19<br>August<br>2005   | 15.00 – 16.00 | Tour and presentation – Bentley Technology Park hosted by Mr Peter Why  |
| Friday 19<br>August<br>2005   | 18.30 – 21.00 | Farewell Dinner function held at AQWA Hillarys hosted by Chairman John Paterson   |
| Saturday<br>20 August<br>2005 | 6.00am        | Delegation leaves for Perth Domestic airport  |

### **OUTCOMES FROM THE JINAN VISIT**

A focal point of the delegation’s visit was to hold industry meetings in order to provide a networking forum for industry sector leaders to meet and discuss opportunities with the Jinan delegates.

The City facilitated 4 industry meetings:

- 1 Mayoral meeting

Attendees:

Mayor Bao Zhiqiang – Mayor of Jinan  
Mr John Paterson - Chairman of Commissioners, City of Joondalup  
Mr Garry Hunt - Chief Executive Officer, City of Joondalup.

The key issues raised by Mayor Bao were:



- That the City of Jinan has a number of sister city relationships and the Mayor has a duty to progress these relationships.
- The City has 12 relationships, one of which has been with a UK local government for 20 years.
- The activities with the Police and proposed visit by the public servants in 2006 are significant achievements.
- The information on the dairy cattle was appreciated, as the City of Jinan is very interested in the import of cattle for its dairy industry.
- All sister city relationships are administered by the Government of Jinan.
- The City of Jinan is keen for the City Joondalup to visit the exhibition in late October 2005.

## 2. Education, Training and Relationship Plan

### Attendees:

|                   |   |
|-------------------|---|
| Mr Hu Zhanping    | Secretary General Jinan Municipal Government                      |
| Mr Li Zhongxue    | Director Jinan Foreign Affairs Office                             |
| Ms Liu Yanqui     | Division Chief Jinan Foreign Affairs Office                       |
| Dr Glenda Jackson | Edith Cowan University  |
| Mr Paul Linnane   | West Coast TAFE   |
| Dr Glenn Watkins  | International Institute of Business Technology (IIBT)             |
| Mr David Xu       | International Institute of Business Technology (IIBT)             |
| Ms Rhonda Hardy   | Manager Strategic and Sustainable Development – City of Joondalup |

## 3 Hi Tech and Science

### Attendees:

|                       |   |
|-----------------------|---|
| Mr Sun Xiaogang       | Director, Jinan Hi-Tech Zone                        |
| Professor Tony Watson | Pro Vice Chancellor, Edith Cowan University         |
| Mr Lip Yien Teh       | Project Manager, Department of Industry & Resources |
| Ms Sandi Evans        | Facilitator   |

## 4 Trade, Economy and Business

### Attendees:

|                    |  |
|--------------------|--|
| Mr Fu Zhenkuan     | Deputy President, China Council for the Promotion of Intl Trade, Jinan |
| Mr Meng Xianghuan  | Director, Jinan Foreign Trade & Economic Cooperation Bureau            |
| Mr David Curry     | Vice President, David Curry & Associates                               |
| Mr Russell Poliwka | President, Joondalup Business Association                              |
| Ms Nicole Stoffers | Department of Industry & Resources                                     |
| Mr Alan Green      | Director, Compaq Marketing   |
| Mr James Chan      | Joondalup Resort   |
| Mr Danny Tan       | Danny Tan Travel Agents  |
| Mr Raymond Been    | Shandong Publishing  |
| Mr Peter Flatt     | Manager ING Real Estate  |
| Mr Ross Dowling    | Edith Cowan University (Tourism & Hospitality)                         |
| Mr Michael Smith   | Westspan Corp & China Link   |
| Mr Michael Lee     | Compass Group  |
| Mr David Purslow   | David Purslow & Associates   |
| Ms Juan Lu         | Interpreter  |

**Link to Strategic Plan:**

This item links to the City's Strategic Plan 2003-08 under Key Focus Area One - Community Well-being through the following outcome:

*“The City of Joondalup is recognised globally as a community that value and facilitates Lifelong Learning”*

- 1.1 *To develop, provide and promote a diverse range of lifelong learning opportunities.*
- 1.1.1 *Continue the development of the City as a learning city – plan for student growth*
- 1.1.2 *Continue the development of learning precincts and relationships with local stakeholders and service providers*

- 1.2 *To meet cultural needs and values of community*

- 1.2.1 *Continue to enhance and create new cultural activities and events*

*And under Key Focus Area Three – City Development*

*“The City of Joondalup is recognised for investment and business opportunities.”*

- 3.5 *To provide and maintain sustainable economic development*
- 3.5.1 *Develop partnerships with stakeholders to foster business development opportunities*
- 3.5.2 *Assist the facilitation of local employment opportunities*

**Legislation – Statutory Provisions:**

There are no legislative requirements that relate to this report.

**Risk Management considerations:**

Ethical Risk A key risk associated with the Jinan-Joondalup relationship at this point is the timing of the invitation to lead the delegation to Jinan and the release of the Inquiry Report into Joondalup. It is envisaged that the City would not have community support at this time when local issues surrounding the Inquiry will likely be seen as the priority.

Project Risk There is a risk that by not accepting the invitation there may be a detrimental impact to our relationship from the Jinan perspective. The City in anticipating this issue has provided advice to the Jinan Government alerting them to the issues at hand and the pending inquiry report. The City has also advised its key stakeholders that a delegation could be undertaken themselves without City participation and this would likely satisfy all stakeholders and the City of Jinan.

Funding Risk The draft Joondalup-Jinan Relationship Plan articulates that the two Cities should embark upon biennial outbound visits. To this end the City of Joondalup would be able to easily maintain its expenditure each year to within its given budget allocation of \$15,000. Should the City increase the visitations in a given year then a funding reallocation would be required.

**Financial/Budget Implications:**

The current level of funding that has been allocated to the Joondalup – Jinan Relationship to date has been as follows:

|        |          |  |
|--------|----------|--|
| 2001/2 | \$15,000 | Utilised by former Mayor Bombak's outbound visit |
| 2002/3 | \$15,000 | Not utilised                                     |
| 2003/4 | \$15,000 | Not utilised                                     |
| 2004/5 | \$15,000 | Utilised for outbound and inbound delegations    |
| 2005/6 | \$15,000 | Utilised for an inbound delegation               |

It is envisaged that a minimum amount of \$15,000 should be allocated annually to meet expenses related to either an inbound or an outbound visit.

**Policy implications:**

At this point in time the City does not have any associated policy to guide Sister City Relationships. It may be necessary for this matter to be referred to the Policy Review Committee to consider if the City needs an overarching policy to guide formation and direction of sister city relationships in general.

**Regional Significance:**

The potential for sister city relationships to grow regional economic development is quite significant. The potential for development with a country like China and its massive markets has real opportunities for the northwest metropolitan region.

A sister city relationship has the ability to grow an appreciation of cultural differences and it is through the development of robust relationships built on trust and like values that will give the region's economy a competitive advantage when dealing with Chinese markets.

**Sustainability implications:**

The Sister City Relationship with Jinan, China has been built on social, environmental, economic and governance outcomes. The draft Relationship Plan is clearly built to reflect the 4 constructs of sustainability. To date social and economic outcomes have been achieved. The Relationship Plan, once endorsed, will further add substance to this relationship with respect to its sustainability.

**Consultation:**

A web page has been constructed that contains up to date information on the progress of the relationship with online opportunities for the community to comment or provide ideas for the City to consider. The draft Joondalup-Jinan Relationship Plan can be found on the web page and is open for public comment until the end of September 2005.

**COMMENT**

To date the Joondalup-Jinan Sister City relationship has been highly successful. Key achievements in the past 12 months since the official signing of protocols to the relationship include:

- 1 The delivery of a 3-month police-training program with 20 officers from the Jinan Police Bureau being trained in Joondalup.
- 2 The development of a draft long-term relationship plan.

- 3 Agreement from Jinan to participate in a 6 month public servant training program for 30 officers from Jinan to be trained in Joondalup in early 2006.
- 4 A number of business initiatives have been kicked off including China–Link and Salon Culinaire.
- 5 A ‘2+2’ agreement between ECU and Jinan University to provide degree courses to students who complete two years of training in Jinan then 2 years in Joondalup.
- 6 Hosting of 2 very successful civic delegations by the City of Joondalup and the provision of social opportunities for community to participate in the relationship.

Considering the newness of this relationship both Cities can be very proud of these achievements in such a short period of time. The City has also received a number of calls from small business operators in Joondalup looking to make connections into China. All these enquiries are directed through the City to the Jinan Foreign Affairs Office who are instrumental in connecting our people to the right people in Jinan.

## **ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment A Letter of Thanks and Official Invitation from Mayor Bao Zhiqiang.

## **VOTING REQUIREMENTS**

Simple majority

## **RECOMMENDATION**

### **That Council:**

- 1 NOTES the report on outcomes of the visit from the Jinan delegation in August 2005;**
- 2 IS UNABLE to accept the invitation to attend the China Shandong (Jinan) Twin Cities Tourism Conference on this occasion as the Report of the Inquiry into the City of Joondalup is scheduled to be released in October 2005, and given the unknown outcomes of that report it is considered as not being conducive to the current priorities of the City;**
- 3 ADVISES Mayor Bao of Jinan of its decision accordingly and thanks him for kind consideration;**
- 4 ADVISES the Joondalup Stakeholders Group of the decision of Council.**

*Appendix 1 refers*

To access this attachment on electronic document, click here: [Attach1brf130905.pdf](#)

## ITEM 2 MATERIAL VARIANCES FOR THE FINANCIAL YEAR ENDING 30 JUNE 2006 – [80566]

**WARD:** All

**RESPONSIBLE DIRECTOR:** Mr Peter Schneider  
Corporate Services and Resource Management

---

### PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to seek Council determination as to what constitutes a material variance in the Statement of Financial Activity, in respect of which an explanation is to be provided to Council.

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Recent amendments to the Local Government Act 1995 and the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996 require that each financial year a local government is to adopt a materiality level for reporting variances in the monthly statement of financial activity.

*This report recommends that Council ADOPTS for the Financial Year ending 30 June 2006 a variance amount of \$50,000 or 5 percent of the appropriate base, whichever is higher, to be a material variance for the purposes of reporting under Regulation 34 (5) of the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996.*

### BACKGROUND

The Local Government (Financial Management) Amendment Regulations (No. 2) 2005 included a replacement to Regulation 34 requiring the local government to prepare each month a statement of financial activity, reporting on the sources and applications of funds for that month as set out in the Rate Setting Statement included in the annual budget.

Regulation 34 (1) lists the details to be included in the statement of financial activity, among which are **material variances** between budget estimates and actual amounts of expenditure, revenue and income to the end of the month to which the statement relates.

Regulation 34 (2) (b) requires an **explanation** to be provided to Council for each of the material variances shown in each statement of financial activity.

Regulation 34 (5) prescribes that each financial year, a local government is to adopt a **percentage or value**, calculated in accordance with accounting standard AAS 5, to be used in statements of financial activity for reporting material variances.

This report recommends the percentage or value to be adopted in determining material variances for the purposes of Regulation 34 of the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996 as amended, during the current financial year.

### DETAILS

Accounting Standard AAS 5 defines **materiality** in relation to information to mean that information which if omitted, misstated or not disclosed has the potential to adversely affect decisions or the discharge of accountability by management or the governing body of the entity.

The Standard also provides that an amount, which is equal to or greater than 10 per cent of the appropriate base, may be presumed to be material, whilst an amount equal to or less than 5 per cent of the appropriate base may be presumed not to be material unless there is evidence to the contrary.

Having regard to the content of AAS 5 and considering other limits prescribed in the Local Government Regulations, particularly in respect of tendering, it is proposed that the Council adopts a combined percentage and value for material variance, to be an amount of \$50,000 or 5 percent of the appropriate base, whichever is higher.

In determining whether the variance amount of an item is material, the variance is to be compared with the corresponding budgeted revenue and expense amount to the end of the month to which the statement of financial activity relates.

**Issues and options considered:**

Australian Accounting Standard AAS 5

**Link to Strategic Plan:**

**Outcome:** The City of Joondalup is a sustainable and accountable business

**Objective:** To manage the business in a responsible and accountable manner

**Strategies:** Ensure financial viability and alignment to the Plan

**Legislation – Statutory Provisions:**

Regulation 34 of the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996

**Risk Management considerations:**

Adoption of the materiality limits will satisfy statutory compliance requirements.

**Financial/Budget Implications:**

Not Applicable

**Policy implications:**

Policy 2.4.1 – Accounting, has as its objective “to provide a framework for the financial management of the City of Joondalup which is clear, transparent and meets statutory obligations”.

**Regional Significance:**

Not Applicable

**Sustainability implications:**

Reporting of variances assists in maintaining the ongoing financial sustainability of the City.

**Consultation:**

Not Applicable

**COMMENT**

The adoption of the recommended materiality limits will satisfy the requirements of AAS 5 and the amended Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996.

**ATTACHMENTS**

Not Applicable

**VOTING REQUIREMENTS**

Simple Majority.

**RECOMMENDATION**

**That Council ADOPTS for the Financial Year ending 30 June 2006 a variance amount of \$50,000 or 5 percent of the appropriate base, whichever is higher, to be a material variance for the purposes of reporting under Regulation 34 (5) of the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996.**

**ITEM 3                    TENDER 001-05/06 SWEEPING OF PAVEMENTS, CAR PARKS AND PATHWAYS IN JOONDALUP CITY CENTRE – [77572]**

**WARD:** All

**RESPONSIBLE DIRECTOR:** Mr Peter Pikor (Acting Director)  
Infrastructure and Operations

---

**PURPOSE**

For Council to consider the acceptance of Asteranch Pty Ltd trading as Clean Sweep as the successful Tenderer for the Sweeping of Pavements, Car Parks and Pathways in Joondalup City Centre (Number 001-05/06).

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Tenders were advertised on 27 July 2005 through statewide public notice for the sweeping of pavements, car parks and pathways in Joondalup City Centre. Tenders closed on 11 August 2005. Two submissions were received from:

- Asteranch Pty Ltd trading as Clean Sweep
- Gregory W & Anne R Blight trading as Coastal Sweeping Services

It is recommended, in relation to Tender Number 001-05/06 for the Sweeping of Pavements, Car Parks and Pathways in Joondalup City Centre, that Council:

- 1 *CHOOSES Asteranch Pty Ltd trading as Clean Sweep as the successful tenderer for the Sweeping of Pavements, Car Parks and Pathways in Joondalup City Centre in accordance with Tender Number 001-05/06 Sweeping of Pavements, Car Parks and Pathways in Joondalup City Centre and the Schedule of Rates included as Attachment 1 to this Report;*
- 2 *AUTHORISES the Chief Executive Officer (CEO), on behalf of the City, to enter into a contract with Asteranch Pty Ltd trading as Clean Sweep in accordance with their submitted tender, subject to any minor variations that may be agreed between the CEO and Asteranch Pty Ltd trading as Clean Sweep;*
- 3 *DETERMINES that the contract is to be for an initial period of twelve (12) months with an option to extend, subject to satisfactory performance reviews, for a further maximum period of twenty-four (24) months, in twelve (12) month increments, with the total term of the contract not to exceed three (3) years;*
- 4 *DELEGATES the power to the CEO to, on behalf of the City, determine in accordance with (3) whether the annual performance of Asteranch Pty Ltd trading as Clean Sweep under the contract has been satisfactory and if satisfied in that respect, to exercise the options to extend the contract.*

**BACKGROUND**

Asteranch Pty Ltd trading as Clean Sweep are the current Contractor and have successfully undertaken this work for the City since 2002.



## DETAILS

Tenders were advertised on 27 July 2005 through statewide public notice for the sweeping of pavements, car parks and pathways in Joondalup City Centre. Tenders closed on 11 August 2005. Two submissions were received from:

- Asteranch Pty Ltd trading as Clean Sweep
- Gregory W & Anne R Blight trading as Coastal Sweeping Services

The first part of the tender evaluation process is to check conformance to the Compliance Criteria, in order to ensure that all essential requirements have been met. Tenders not meeting all the essential requirements are deemed to be non-conforming and are eliminated from further consideration.

Both submissions met all the essential requirements and were carried forward into the second part of the evaluation process, which involves an independent assessment of the qualitative and quantitative criteria by each member of the Evaluation Panel. Each member of the Evaluation Panel assessed the tender submissions individually against the selection criteria using the weightings determined during the tender planning phase. The Evaluation Panel then convened to submit and discuss their assessments, leading to a ranking of each submission in order of merit.

Under the City's Contract Management Framework, the tenders were assessed by the Evaluation Panel using a weighted multi-criterion assessment system and AS 4120-1994 'Code of Tendering', ensuring compliance with *Regulation 18(4)* of the *Local Government (Functions and General) Regulations 1996*.

The Selection Criteria for Tender Number 001-05/06 are as follows:

### Selection Criteria

Demonstrated understanding of the required tasks

- Appreciation of requirements
- Outline of methodology

Capacity

- Details of resources for the Contract, including company details, skills and specialised equipment

Local infrastructure

- After hours contacts
- Additional personnel and resources if required

Demonstrated experience in completing similar projects

- Similar work carried out, including scope of work, periods and dates, and referees

Social and economic effects on the local community

- Maintained or increased opportunities for local employment
- Maintained or increased arrangements with local service providers
- Value added services to the City

#### Safety management policy

- Safety procedures to be used for the Contract
- Details of safety records for the past two years

#### Quality Assurance

- Details of any Quality Assurance system
- Applicability to the Contract

#### **Issues and options considered:**

Asteranch and Coastal Sweeping are the two main contractors involved in Road Sweeping and have both successfully undertaken this work previously for the City. The tenders submitted by both organisations reflect this situation, as they were very competitive.

#### **Link to Strategic Plan:**

This requirement is linked to the Strategic Plan in accordance with the following items:

3 City Development

Objective 3.1 To develop and maintain the City of Joondalup assets and built environment.

Strategies 3.1.1 Plan the timely design, development, upgrade and maintenance of the city's infrastructure.

#### **Legislation – Statutory Provisions:**

The statewide public tender was advertised, opened and evaluated in accordance with the *Local Government (Functions & General) Regulations 1996*, where tenders are required to be publicly invited if the consideration under a contract is, or is expected to be, more, or worth more, than \$50,000. The expected consideration for this contract is estimated to exceed the Chief Executive Officer's Delegated Authority in relation to the acceptance of tenders to \$250,000.

#### **Risk Management considerations:**

Contract performance risk is minimal as the recommended Tenderer has effective quality assurance and safety management procedures, and have extensive resources and plant readily availability. The recommended tenderer is the currently contracted to the City for the sweeping of Residential and Arterial roads.

#### **Financial/Budget Implications:**

Ongoing expenditure will be in accordance with the City's Maintenance and Capital Works Budgets, as authorised by Council annually and reviewed periodically. The budget amount for this requirement is \$155,000 per annum. Based on current demand and requirements the expenditure is not expected to exceed this amount for the initial contract period of one (1) year. The total cumulative contract value over the three (3) year period of the contract is approximately \$465,000 (excluding GST).

The City of Joondalup is a registered business entity for GST purposes. The nett effect on the price submitted by the successful tenderer is that the City pays GST but is able to claim an input tax credit for the amount of GST paid.

**Policy implications:**

The City's Policy 2.5.7 Purchasing Goods and Services encourages local business in the purchasing and tendering process and has been applied and incorporated into the selection criteria. The preferred tenderer is located in Bellevue, which is not in either the City or the Region, while Coastal Sweeping Services are located in Joondalup.

**Regional Significance:**

Not Applicable

**Sustainability implications:**

This contract is essential to ensure the environment of the City is presented at a high standard. To minimise effluent and debris entering the storm water drainage system, regular sweeping of the streets and kerbs is essential.

**Consultation:**

Not Applicable

**COMMENT**

The Evaluation Panel considered that Asteranch Pty Ltd trading as Clean Sweep has the capability and resources to carry out the work on a best value for money basis and therefore recommend them as the preferred tenderer.

**ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment 1            Schedule of Rates

**VOTING REQUIREMENTS**

Absolute Majority

**RECOMMENDATION**

**That Council in relation to Tender Number 001-05/06 for the Sweeping of Pavements, Car Parks and Pathways in Joondalup City Centre:**

- 1        CHOOSES Asteranch Pty Ltd trading as Clean Sweep as the successful tenderer for the Sweeping of Pavements, Car Parks and Pathways in Joondalup City Centre in accordance with Tender Number 001-05/06 Sweeping of Pavements, Car Parks and Pathways in Joondalup City Centre and the Schedule of Rates included as Attachment 1 to this Report;**
- 2        AUTHORISES the Chief Executive Officer (CEO), on behalf of the City, to enter into a contract with Asteranch Pty Ltd trading as Clean Sweep in accordance with their submitted tender, subject to any minor variations that may be agreed between the CEO and Asteranch Pty Ltd trading as Clean Sweep;**
- 3        DETERMINES that the contract is to be for an initial period of twelve (12) months with an option to extend, subject to satisfactory performance reviews, for a further maximum period of twenty-four (24) months, in twelve (12) month increments, with the total term of the contract not to exceed three (3) years;**

- 4 DELEGATES the power to the CEO to, on behalf of the City, determine in accordance with (3) whether the annual performance of Asteranch Pty Ltd trading as Clean Sweep under the contract has been satisfactory and if satisfied in that respect, to exercise the options to extend the contract.**

*Appendix 2 refers*

*To access this attachment on electronic document, click here: [Attach2brf130905.pdf](#)*

**ITEM 4                      TENDER 003-05/06 PLUMBING MAINTENANCE SERVICES – [86572]**

**WARD:** All

**RESPONSIBLE DIRECTOR:** Mr Peter Pikor (Acting Director)  
Infrastructure and Operations

---

**PURPOSE**

For Council to give consideration to the acceptance of RW & JA Olsen trading as Joondalup Plumbing Services as the successful Tenderer for the Supply of Plumbing Maintenance Services (Number 003-05/06).

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Tenders were advertised on 27 July 2005 through statewide public notice for the Supply of Plumbing Maintenance Services. Tenders closed on 11 August 2005. Two submissions were received from:

- Joondalup Plumbing Service
- AAA Hillarys Plumbing and Gas

It is recommended, in relation to Tender Number 003-05/06, that Council:

- 1 *CHOOSES RW & JA Olsen trading as Joondalup Plumbing Services as the successful tenderer for the Supply to the City of Plumbing Maintenance Services in accordance with Tender Number 003-05/06 Supply of Plumbing Maintenance Services and the Schedule of Rates included as Attachment 1 to this Report;*
- 2 *AUTHORISES the Chief Executive Officer (CEO), on behalf of the City, to enter into a contract with RW & JA Olsen trading as Joondalup Plumbing Services in accordance with the tender submitted by RW & JA Olsen trading as Joondalup Plumbing Services, subject to any minor variations that may be agreed between the CEO and RW & JA Olsen trading as Joondalup Plumbing Services;*
- 3 *DETERMINES that the contract is to be for an initial period of twelve (12) months commencing on 14 October 2005 and ending on 13 October 2006, with an option to extend, subject to satisfactory annual performance reviews, for a further maximum period of twenty-four (24) months, in twelve (12) month increments, with the total term of the contract not to exceed three (3) years;*
- 4 *DELEGATES the power to the CEO to, on behalf of the City, determine in accordance with (3) whether the annual performance of RW & JA Olsen trading as Joondalup Plumbing Services under the contract has been satisfactory and if satisfied in that respect, to exercise the options to extend the contract.*

**BACKGROUND**

Joondalup Plumbing have successfully undertaken plumbing works for City of Joondalup facilities since 1999/2000. Its work has been of high quality and responsive to the City's needs throughout this period.

## DETAILS

Tenders were advertised on 27 July 2005 through statewide public notice for the Supply of Plumbing Maintenance Services. Tenders closed on 11 August 2005. Two submissions were received from:

- AAA Hillarys Plumbing and Gas
- Joondalup Plumbing Service

The first part of the tender evaluation process is to check conformance to the Compliance Criteria, in order to ensure that all essential requirements have been met. Tenders not meeting all the essential requirements are deemed to be non-conforming and are eliminated from further consideration.

Both submissions met all the essential requirements and were carried forward into the second part of the evaluation process, which involves an independent assessment of the qualitative and quantitative criteria by each member of the Evaluation Panel. Each member of the Evaluation Panel assessed the tender submissions individually against the selection criteria using the weightings determined during the tender planning phase. The Evaluation Panel then convened to submit and discuss their assessments, leading to a ranking of each submission in order of merit.

Under the City's Contract Management Framework, the tenders were assessed by the Evaluation Panel using a weighted multi-criterion assessment system and AS 4120-1994 'Code of Tendering', ensuring compliance with *Regulation 18(4)* of the *Local Government (Functions and General) Regulations 1996*.

The Selection Criteria for Tender Number 003-05/06 are as follows:

### Selection Criteria

Demonstrated understanding of the required tasks

- Appreciation of requirements
- Outline of methodology

Capacity

- Details of resources for the Contract, including company details, skills and specialised equipment

Local infrastructure

- After hours contacts
- Additional personnel and resources if required

Demonstrated experience in completing similar projects

- Similar work carried out, including scope of work, periods and dates, and referees

Social and economic effects on the local community

- Maintained or increased opportunities for local employment
- Maintained or increased arrangements with local service providers
- Value added services to the City

#### Safety management policy

- Safety procedures to be used for the Contract
- Details of safety records for the past two years

#### Quality Assurance

- Details of any Quality Assurance system
- Applicability to the Contract

#### **Issues and options considered:**

Not Applicable

#### **Link to Strategic Plan:**

This requirement is linked to the Strategic Plan in accordance with the following items:

3                      *City Development*

*Objective 3.1            To develop and maintain the City of Joondalup's assets and built environment.*

*Strategies 3.1.1        Plan the timely design, development, upgrade and maintenance of the city's infrastructure.*

#### **Legislation – Statutory Provisions:**

The statewide public tender was advertised, opened and evaluated in accordance with the *Local Government (Functions & General) Regulations 1996*, where tenders are required to be publicly invited if the consideration under a contract is, or is estimated to be, more, or worth more, than \$50,000. The expected consideration for this contract is estimated to exceed the Chief Executive Officer's Delegated Authority in relation to the acceptance of tenders to \$250,000.

#### **Risk Management considerations:**

To ensure that the City's facilities are maintained in full working order for public use.

#### **Financial/Budget Implications:**

The City of Joondalup is a registered business entity for GST purposes. The nett effect on the price submitted by the successful tenderer is that the City pays GST but is able to claim an input tax credit for the amount of GST paid.

Ongoing expenditure will be in accordance with the City's Maintenance and Capital Works Budgets, as authorised by Council annually and reviewed periodically. The budget amount for this requirement is \$370,000 per annum. Based on current demand and requirements the expenditure is not expected to exceed this amount for the initial contract period of one (1) year. The total cumulative contract value over the three (3) year period of the contract is approximately \$1,110,000 (excluding GST).

#### **Policy implications:**

The City's Policy 2.5.7 Purchasing Goods and Services encourages local business in the purchasing and tendering process and has been applied and incorporated into the selection

criteria. The preferred tenderer is located in Currambine and AAA Hillarys Plumbing and Gas are located in Hillarys.

**Regional Significance:**

Not Applicable

**Sustainability implications:**

Not Applicable

**Consultation:**

Not Applicable

**COMMENT**

The Evaluation Panel considered that RW & JA Olsen trading as Joondalup Plumbing Services have the capability and resources to carry out the work on a best value for money basis and therefore recommend them as the preferred tenderer.

**ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment 1            Schedule of Rates

**VOTING REQUIREMENTS**

Absolute Majority

**RECOMMENDATION**

**That Council in relation to Tender Number 003-05/06:**

- 1        CHOOSES RW & JA Olsen trading as Joondalup Plumbing Services as the successful tenderer for the Supply of Plumbing Maintenance Services in accordance with Tender Number 003-05/06 Supply of Plumbing Services and the Schedule of Rates included as Attachment 1 to this Report;**
- 2        AUTHORISES the Chief Executive Officer (CEO), on behalf of the City, to enter into a contract with RW & JA Olsen trading as Joondalup Plumbing Services in accordance with their submitted tender, subject to any minor variations that may be agreed between the CEO and RW & JA Olsen trading as Joondalup Plumbing Services;**
- 3        DETERMINES that the contract is to be for an initial period of twelve (12) months with an option to extend, subject to satisfactory performance reviews, for a further maximum period of twenty-four (24) months, in twelve (12) month increments, with the total term of the contract not to exceed three (3) years;**
- 4        DELEGATES the power to the CEO to, on behalf of the City, determine in accordance with (3) whether the annual performance of RW & JA Olsen trading as Joondalup Plumbing Services under the contract has been satisfactory and if satisfied in that respect, to exercise the options to extend the contract.**

*Appendix 3 refers*

To access this attachment on electronic document, click here: [Attach3brf130905.pdf](#)



**ITEM 5                      TENDER 008-05/06 GRAFFITI CONTROL SERVICES –  
[11573]****WARD:** All**RESPONSIBLE  
DIRECTOR:** Mr Peter Pikor (Acting Director)  
Infrastructure and Operations

---

**PURPOSE**

For Council to give consideration to the acceptance of Graffiti Systems Australia as the successful Tenderer for the Supply of Graffiti Control Services (Number 008-05/06) incorporating the removal of graffiti and the application of anti graffiti sealing to Council buildings and associated structures within the City of Joondalup.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Tenders were advertised on 27 July 2005 through statewide public notice for the Supply of Graffiti Control Services. Tenders closed on 11 August 2005. Six submissions were received from:

- FCT Surface Cleaning
- Kleenit
- Graffiti Busters
- Graffiti Systems Australia
- PM Industries
- Graffiti Off

It is recommended, in relation to Tender Number 008-05/06 for the Supply of Graffiti Control Services, that Council:

- 1     *CHOOSES Graffiti Systems Australia as the successful tenderer for the Supply of Graffiti Control Services in accordance with Tender Number 001-05/06 Supply of Graffiti Control Services and the Schedule of Rates included as Attachment 1 to this Report;*
- 2     *AUTHORISES the Chief Executive Officer (CEO), on behalf of the City, to enter into a contract with Graffiti Systems Australia in accordance with their submitted tender, subject to any minor variations that may be agreed between the CEO and Graffiti Systems Australia;*
- 3     *DETERMINES that the contract is to be for an initial period of twelve (12) months with an option to extend, subject to satisfactory performance reviews, for a further maximum period of twenty-four (24) months, in twelve (12) month increments, with the total term of the contract not to exceed three (3) years;*
- 4     *DELEGATES the power to the CEO to, on behalf of the City, determine in accordance with (3) whether the annual performance of Graffiti Systems Australia under the contract has been satisfactory and if satisfied in that respect, to exercise the options to extend the contract.*

## BACKGROUND

The removal of graffiti from Council facilities has been undertaken by external contractors in the past to enable the use of a wider variety of products. Where the buildings require coatings to minimise the necessity for the removal process, the Contractor is qualified to undertake the works, while in-house crews are utilised for the basic removal of graffiti from fixtures, private property fences and signs.

## DETAILS

Tenders were advertised on 27 July 2005 through statewide public notice for the Supply of Graffiti Control Services. Tenders closed on 11 August 2005. Six submissions were received from:

- FCT Surface Cleaning
- Kleenit
- Graffiti Busters
- Graffiti Systems Australia
- PM Industries
- Graffiti Off

The first part of the tender evaluation process is to check conformance to the Compliance Criteria, in order to ensure that all essential requirements have been met. Tenders not meeting all the essential requirements are deemed to be non-conforming and are eliminated from further consideration.

All the submissions met all the essential requirements and were carried forward into the second part of the evaluation process, which involves an independent assessment of the qualitative and quantitative criteria by each member of the Evaluation Panel. Each member of the Evaluation Panel assessed the tender submissions individually against the selection criteria using the weightings determined during the tender planning phase. The Evaluation Panel then convened to submit and discuss their assessments, leading to a ranking of each submission in order of merit.

Under the City's Contract Management Framework, the tenders were assessed by the Evaluation Panel using a weighted multi-criterion assessment system and AS 4120-1994 'Code of Tendering', ensuring compliance with *Regulation 18(4)* of the *Local Government (Functions and General) Regulations 1996*.

The Selection Criteria for Tender Number 008-05/06 are as follows:

### Selection Criteria

Demonstrated understanding of the required tasks

- Appreciation of requirements
- Outline of methodology

Capacity

- Details of resources for the Contract, including company details, skills and specialised equipment

#### Local infrastructure

- After hours contacts
- Additional personnel and resources if required

#### Demonstrated experience in completing similar projects

- Similar work carried out, including scope of work, periods and dates, and referees

#### Social and economic effects on the local community

- Maintained or increased opportunities for local employment
- Maintained or increased arrangements with local service providers
- Value added services to the City

#### Safety management policy

- Safety procedures to be used for the Contract
- Details of safety records for the past two years

#### Quality Assurance

- Details of any Quality Assurance system
- Applicability to the Contract

#### **Issues and options considered:**

The City has critical requirements for the removal of graffiti within specified timeframes, and it is considered by the Evaluation Panel that the recommended tenderer has the capacity to service those requirements in a competent manner.

#### **Link to Strategic Plan:**

This requirement is linked to the Strategic Plan in accordance with the following items:

Item 3                      City Development

Objective 3.1.        To develop and maintain the City of Joondalup assets and built environment.

Strategies 3.1.1 Plan the timely design, development, upgrade and maintenance of the city's infrastructure.

#### **Legislation – Statutory Provisions:**

The statewide public tender was advertised, opened and evaluated in accordance with the *Local Government (Functions & General) Regulations 1996*, where tenders are required to be publicly invited if the consideration under a contract is, or is expected to be, more, or worth more, than \$50,000. The expected consideration for this contract is estimated to exceed the Chief Executive Officer's Delegated Authority in relation to the acceptance of tenders to \$250,000.

**Risk Management considerations:**

Contract performance risk is minimal as the recommended Tenderer has effective quality assurance and safety management procedures, and has adequate resources and plant readily available to undertake the requirements of the City. Regular inspections will be undertaken by the City to monitor the performance of the Contractor. The recommended tenderer is the currently contracted to the City for Graffiti Control Services.

**Financial/Budget Implications:**

Ongoing expenditure will be in accordance with the City's Maintenance and Capital Works Budgets, as authorised by Council annually and reviewed periodically. The budget amount for this requirement is \$150,000 per annum, and based on current demand and requirements the expenditure is not expected to exceed this amount for the initial contract period of one (1) year. The total contract cumulative value over the three (3) year period of the contract is approximately \$450,000 (excluding GST).

The City of Joondalup is a registered business entity for GST purposes. The nett effect on the price submitted by the successful tenderer is that the City pays GST but is able to claim an input tax credit for the amount of GST paid.

**Policy implications:**

The City's Policy 2.5.7 Purchasing Goods and Services encourages local business in the purchasing and tendering process and has been applied and incorporated into the selection criteria. The preferred tenderer is located in Welshpool, which is not in either the City or the Region. FCT Surface Cleaning is located in Karrinyup, which is within the Region, while the remaining tenderers are not located in either the City or the Region.

**Regional Significance:**

Not Applicable

**Sustainability implications:**

Not Applicable

**Consultation:**

Council officers will coordinate requirements with the Contractor and liaise with user groups of leased facilities prior to the Contractor commencing any works.

**COMMENT**

The Evaluation Panel consider that Graffiti Systems Australia have the capability and resources to carry out the work on a best value for money basis and therefore recommend them as the preferred tenderer.

**ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment 1            Schedule of Rates

**VOTING REQUIREMENTS**

Absolute Majority

## RECOMMENDATION

That Council, in relation to Tender Number 008-05/06 for the Supply of Graffiti Control Services:

- 1 **CHOOSES** Graffiti Systems Australia as the successful tenderer for the Supply of Graffiti Control Services in accordance with Tender Number 001-05/06 Supply of Graffiti Control Services and the Schedule of Rates included as Attachment 1 to this Report;
- 2 **AUTHORISES** the Chief Executive Officer (CEO), on behalf of the City, to enter into a contract with Graffiti Systems Australia in accordance with their submitted tender, subject to any minor variations that may be agreed between the CEO and Graffiti Systems Australia;
- 3 **DETERMINES** that the contract is to be for an initial period of twelve (12) months with an option to extend, subject to satisfactory performance reviews, for a further maximum period of twenty-four (24) months, in twelve (12) month increments, with the total term of the contract not to exceed three (3) years;
- 4 **DELEGATES** the power to the CEO to, on behalf of the City, determine in accordance with (3) whether the annual performance of Graffiti Systems Australia under the contract has been satisfactory and if satisfied in that respect, to exercise the options to extend the contract.

*Appendix 4 refers*

To access this attachment on electronic document, click here: [Attach4brf120905.pdf](#)

## ITEM 6 TENDER 014-05/06 SORRENTO BEACH REDEVELOPMENT STAGE 2 – [67573]

**WARD:** All

**RESPONSIBLE DIRECTOR:** Mr Peter Pikor (Acting Director)  
Infrastructure and Operations

### PURPOSE

For Council to give consideration to choosing Sanaya Pty Ltd trading as DME Contractors as the successful tenderer for the Sorrento Beach Redevelopment Stage 2 (Tender Number 014–05/06).

### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Tenders were advertised on 30 July and 3 August 2005 through statewide public notice for the Sorrento Beach Redevelopment Stage 2. Tenders closed on 19 August 2005 and six submissions were received, being:

- The Haines Family Trust trading as DVH Industries Pty Ltd
- Mako Civil Pty Ltd
- Sanaya Pty Ltd trading as DME Contractors
- DB Cunningham Pty Ltd trading as Advantearing Civil Engineers
- Industrial Roadpavers (WA) Pty Ltd
- Works Infrastructure Pty Ltd

It is recommended, in relation to Tender Number 014-05/06, that Council:

1 *AUTHORISES BY AN ABSOLUTE MAJORITY, in accordance with Section 6.8(1) of the Local Government Act 1995, re allocation of \$38,856 from Project 6658 Various Arterial Roads Locations Storm Water Drainage to Project 1011 Sorrento Beach Project Stage 2;*

2 *CHOOSES Sanaya Pty Ltd trading as DME Contractors as the successful tenderer for the Sorrento Beach Redevelopment Stage 2 in accordance with the Lump Sum Price of \$1,738,856 excluding GST. In addition the City has allocated \$100,000, exclusive of GST, as a contingency measure for the resultant contract;*

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <i>Lump Sum Tendered Price</i>               | <i>\$1,738,856 Exclusive of GST</i>        |
| <i>City of Joondalup Project Contingency</i> | <i>\$ 100,000 Exclusive of GST</i>         |
| <i>Total Project Cost</i>                    | <i><u>\$1,838,856</u> Exclusive of GST</i> |

3 *AUTHORISES the Chief Executive Officer (CEO), on behalf of the City, to enter into a contract with Sanaya Pty Ltd trading as DME Contractors in accordance with their submitted tender, subject to any minor variations that may be agreed between the CEO and Sanaya Pty Ltd trading as DME Contractors.*

### BACKGROUND

On 17 December 2002 (CJ323 – 12/02) Council approved the Sorrento Beach Development Concept Plan. This major enhancement included the bulk earthworks, drainage, limestone retaining walls, creation of a recreation reserve, which incorporate reticulated, grassed areas,

wooden boardwalks, beach access paths and outlooks, barbecues, shade shelters and the refurbishment of an existing toilet block.

The City subsequently programmed this project to be carried out in two construction stages and funded over four financial years.

Stage One 2002- 2003 and 2003-2004 \$1.9 Million

Stage Two 2004-2005 and 2005-2006 \$1.8 Million

Council approved the contract for Stage One of this project on 29 July 2003 (CJ 184 – 07/03).

Stage One was completed and opened to the public on 26 January 2005.

On 28 July 2005, Council approved funding to enable Stage Two tender to be advertised. Following approval of the contract for Stage Two, it is envisaged that Stage Two works will be completed early in 2006.

## DETAILS

Tenders were advertised on 30 July and 3 August 2005 through statewide public notice for the Sorrento Beach Redevelopment Stage 2. Tenders closed on 19 August 2005. Six submissions were received from:

- The Haines Family Trust trading as DVH Industries Pty Ltd
- Mako Civil Pty Ltd
- Sanaya Pty Ltd trading as DME Contractors
- DB Cunningham Pty Ltd trading as Advantearing Civil Engineers
- Industrial Roadpavers (WA) Pty Ltd
- Works Infrastructure Pty Ltd

The first part of the tender evaluation process is to check conformance to the Compliance Criteria, in order to ensure that all essential requirements have been met. Tenders not meeting all the essential requirements are deemed to be non-conforming and are eliminated from further consideration.

All submissions met all the essential requirements and were carried forward into the second part of the evaluation process, which involves an independent assessment of the qualitative and quantitative criteria by each member of the Evaluation Panel. Each member of the Evaluation Panel assessed the tender submissions individually against the selection criteria using the weightings determined during the tender planning phase. The Evaluation Panel then convened to submit and discuss their assessments, leading to a ranking of each submission in order of merit.

Under the City's Contract Management Framework, the tenders were assessed by the Evaluation Panel using a weighted multi-criterion assessment system and AS 4120-1994 'Code of Tendering', ensuring compliance with *Regulation 18(4)* of the *Local Government (Functions and General) Regulations 1996*.

The Selection Criteria for Tender Number 014-05/06 are as follows:

### Selection Criteria

Demonstrated understanding of the required tasks

- Appreciation of requirements
- Outline of methodology

#### Capacity

- Details of resources for the Contract, including company details, skills and specialised equipment

#### Local infrastructure

- After hours contacts
- Additional personnel and resources if required

#### Demonstrated experience in completing similar projects

- Similar work carried out, including scope of work, periods and dates, and referees

#### Social and economic effects on the local community

- Maintained or increased opportunities for local employment
- Maintained or increased arrangements with local service providers
- Value added services to the City

#### Safety management policy

- Safety procedures to be used for the Contract
- Details of safety records for the past two years

#### Quality Assurance

- Details of any Quality Assurance system
- Applicability to the Contract

#### **Link to Strategic Plan:**

3.1 To develop and maintain the City of Joondalup's Assets and Built Environment.

#### **Legislation – Statutory Provisions:**

The statewide public tender was advertised, opened and evaluated in accordance with the *Local Government (Functions & General) Regulations 1996*, where tenders are required to be publicly invited if the consideration under a contract is, or is expected to be, more, or worth more, than \$50,000. The consideration for this contract exceeds the Chief Executive Officer's Delegated Authority in relation to the acceptance of tenders to \$250,000.

#### **Risk Management considerations:**

A comprehensive report was obtained from Dun and Bradstreet encompassing Commercial, Financial and Risk Evaluation matters. The report indicated that Sanaya Pty Ltd trading as DME Contractors achieved a dynamic score rating of 'low', which is in line with industry average. The dynamic score as compiled by Dun and Bradstreet, is a mechanism used to measure the degree of possible risk to an organisation and identify any exposure in entering into a contract with that organisation.

As Sanaya Pty Ltd trading as DME Contractors had a dynamic score rating as 'low', the evaluation panel considered that contracting with Sanaya Pty Ltd trading as DME Contractors represented minimal risk.



**Financial/Budget Implications:**

| Account No:  | Project Number 1010    |           |               |
|--|------------------------|-----------|---------------|
| Budget Item:   | Sorrento Beach Project |           |               |
|  | Excluding GST          | GST       | Including GST |
| Budget Amount:   | \$1,800,000            | \$180,000 | \$1,980,000   |
| YTD Amount:  | \$0                    | \$0       | \$0           |
| Tender Price:  | \$1,738,856            | \$173,885 | \$1,912,741   |
| Project Contingency                                    | \$ 100,000             | \$ 10,000 | \$110,000     |
| Total Project Costs                                    | \$1,838,856            | \$183,885 | \$2,022,741   |
| Funding Shortfall<br>To be funded from Project<br>6658 | \$ 38,856              |           |               |

Due to the nature of this project, there is a requirement to allocate a contingency amount of \$100,000. The total project cost will be greater than the available budget funds by \$38,856, and it is proposed that this shortfall will be funded from project number 6658 - Various arterial roads locations storm water drainage. The budget for project 6658 is \$88,000, which is available, and with the transfer of \$38,856 to project number 1011 Sorrento Beach Project Stage 2, the remaining budget will be \$49,144.

The City of Joondalup is a registered business entity for GST purposes. The nett effect on the price submitted by the successful tenderer is that the City pays GST but is able to claim an input tax credit for the amount of GST paid.

**Policy implications:**

The City's Policy 2.5.7 Purchasing Goods and Services encourages local business in the purchasing and tendering process and has been applied and incorporated into the selection criteria. The preferred tenderer, Sanaya Pty Ltd trading as DME Contractors is located in Wangara, which is within the Region.

**Regional Significance:**

This enhanced recreation reserve links directly into Hillary's Boat Harbour, which is one of Western Australia's top tourist attractions.

**Sustainability implications:**

This project has taken into consideration the sustainable implications in that the project has been funded over a four (4) year period to meet the budget constraints. From an environmental perspective, a key component of the design was the establishment of the primary fordune system to not only assist in protecting the new infrastructure, but also enable the public to experience the natural beach environs, and the design also enables easy and convenient access to all sections of the community, including the elderly and disabled.

**Consultation:**

During 2002 an extensive public consultation process was undertaken by the City to develop the Concept Plan for the Sorrento Beach Development. On 17 December 2002 (CJ323 – 12/02) Council approved this plan.

Further consultation has been carried out with both the Sorrento Surf Lifesaving Club and Department for Infrastructure (Hillary's Boat Harbour), throughout all phases of the project delivery.

## COMMENT

The Evaluation Panel considered that Sanaya Pty Ltd trading as DME Contractors have the capability, appropriate infrastructure and resources to carry out the work on a best value for money basis and in a competent manner.

The Evaluation Panel therefore recommend Sanaya Pty Ltd trading as DME Contractors as the preferred tenderer.

## ATTACHMENTS

Nil

## VOTING REQUIREMENTS

Absolute Majority

## RECOMMENDATION

**That Council in relation to Tender Number 014-05/06:**

**1 AUTHORISES BY AN ABSOLUTE MAJORITY, in accordance with Section 6.8(1) of the Local Government Act 1995, re allocation of \$38,856 from Project 6658 Various Arterial Roads Locations Storm Water Drainage to Project 1011 Sorrento Beach Project Stage 2;**

**2 CHOOSES Sanaya Pty Ltd trading as DME Contractors as the successful tenderer for the Sorrento Beach Redevelopment Stage 2 in accordance with the Lump Sum Price of \$1,738,856 excluding GST. In addition the City has allocated \$100,000 exclusive of GST as a contingency measure for the resultant contract;**

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Lump Sum Tendered Price</b>               | <b>\$1,738,856 Exclusive of GST</b>        |
| <b>City of Joondalup Project Contingency</b> | <b><u>\$ 100,000</u> Exclusive of GST</b>  |
| <b>Total Project Cost</b>                    | <b><u>\$1,838,856</u> Exclusive of GST</b> |

**3 AUTHORISES the Chief Executive Officer (CEO), on behalf of the City, to enter into a contract with Sanaya Pty Ltd trading as DME Contractors in accordance with their submitted tender, subject to any minor variations that may be agreed between the CEO and Sanaya Pty Ltd trading as DME Contractors.**

**ITEM 7                      MEETING OF THE CONSERVATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE  
HELD ON 24 AUGUST 2005 – [12168]****WARD:** All**RESPONSIBLE  
DIRECTOR:** Mr Peter Pikor (Acting Director)  
Director Infrastructure and Operations

---

**PURPOSE**

To submit the unconfirmed minutes of the Conservation Advisory Committee Meeting held on 24 August 2005 for endorsement by Council.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The intention of this report is to inform Council of the proceedings of the meeting of the Conservation Advisory Committee meeting that was held on 24 August 2005.

There was one item of business on the August agenda, the Biodiversity Strategy. The Committee was given an overview on the progress of the City's Local Biodiversity Strategy. At the July 2005 CAC meeting Mr Ryan Taylor (Acting Manager Perth Biodiversity Plan) had explained to the Committee the methodology required to achieve the milestones associated with the development of a local biodiversity strategy.

Committee members noted that Council had made good progress in assessing the Council reserves that contained bushland and that substantial on ground management activities had already been undertaken in reserves having being identified as having high ecological values. The Committee considered that reserves identified as having high ecological significance should be given protection through the District Planning Scheme 2. Members noted that under this scheme there is provision to protect areas of environmental significance.

The Committee requested staff to provide the Committee with a list of reserves that have been identified by Council staff as having environmental significance using the assessment templates developed by the Perth Biodiversity Project.

The Committee resolved the following recommendations:

- 1        REQUESTS that Council endorse the concept of protecting natural areas of significance, with high landscape and/or environmental values by listing those areas under Schedule 5 of the District Planning Scheme No 2;
- 2        RECOMMENDS that Council recognises the significant work already completed by City Staff, in identifying natural areas of high environmental value, as identified by the Perth Biodiversity Project assessment process and forming part of the development of the City of Joondalup's Biodiversity Strategy;
- 3        REQUESTS that Council require a report from staff, listing natural areas (within the City of Joondalup) that were identified using the Perth Biodiversity Project assessment process; these are to be included under Schedule 5 of the District Planning Scheme 2. This report is to be first reviewed by the Conservation Advisory Committee prior to a recommendation going to Council.

The Conservation Advisory Committee is seeking support from Council to protect the significant natural areas it manages, and identified by the PBP process by placing them in Schedule 5 of the District Planning Scheme 2. This course of action is supported, and would form part of the progression required to produce a local biodiversity strategy at the City of Joondalup. Staff have assessed the hundred reserves that contain bushland and are managed by the City. These reserves have been placed in order of management priority. The number of these reserves that the committee wishes to be placed on schedule 5 of the District Planning Scheme 2 is to be determined. A future report on this process will be submitted to Council for its consideration.

*It is recommended that Council;*

- 1 *NOTES the unconfirmed Minutes of the Conservation Advisory Committee held on 24 August 2005 forming Attachment 1 to this Report;*
- 2 *NOTES that a list of bushland reserves managed by the City in order of management priority has been prepared and that the Chief Executive Officer will provide a future report on the process impact of the proposal to protect natural areas of significance under Schedule 5 of District Planning Scheme No. 2;*
- 3 *NOTES the Conservation Advisory Committee's meeting recommendation to recognise the significant work already completed by City staff in identifying natural areas of high environmental value.*

## **BACKGROUND**

The Conservation Advisory Committee is a Council Committee that advises on issues relating to biodiversity and the management of natural areas within the City of Joondalup. The Committee meets on a monthly basis.

Committee membership comprises of a representative from each of the City's Bushland Friends Groups and community members with specialist knowledge of biodiversity issues. The Conservation Advisory Committee assisting Council in developing a Local Biodiversity Strategy falls within the terms of reference of that Committee.

In 2002, the City of Joondalup signed a memorandum of understanding (MOU) with the Western Australian Local Government Association (WALGA) for the protection of native vegetation within the City of Joondalup. The MOU demonstrated the commitment of the City of Joondalup through the Perth Biodiversity Project (A WALGA initiative) to the protection of local biodiversity within the City.

In 2003/04 a sum of \$30,000 was approved in the budget to fund the development of a Local Biodiversity Strategy in the City of Joondalup. The development of a Local Biodiversity Strategy was commenced in accordance with The Local Biodiversity Planning Guidelines that were produced by the Perth Biodiversity Project. These guidelines were designed to provide a consistent approach to local biodiversity planning across local government.

In 2004 an ecologist was engaged by the City to assess the remnant native vegetation occurring within the City's Reserves. These reserves were then placed in order of ecological and management priority.

In the 2004/05 budget a sum of \$150,000 was approved to commence on ground operational work within the 27 reserves that were identified as having management priority.

## DETAILS

### Issues and Options

The intent of local biodiversity planning is to achieve the following:

- Conserve local biodiversity.
- Address Local Government roles and responsibilities
- To develop a strategy endorsed by Council and the WA Planning Commission.
- Obtain Community support for the implementation of the strategy.

The Conservation Advisory Committee has been active and supportive of Council's efforts to develop a local biodiversity strategy. Council has been able to achieve a number of milestones as part of its local biodiversity planning exercise. The most important being a broad assessment of all the bushland areas that falls within Council's management responsibility.

The Committee at its August meeting considered that Council should further develop its Local Biodiversity Strategy by protecting its significant natural areas within Schedule 5 of the District Planning Scheme 2.

The Local Biodiversity Planning Guidelines produced by the Perth Biodiversity Project promote the use of town planning schemes to protect areas of significant local and regional biodiversity. The use of town planning schemes, are an integral component of the development of a local biodiversity strategy.

The City of Joondalup's District Planning Scheme No 2 lists among its aims and objectives as:

- To provide the Council and residents with appropriate mechanisms to protect identified places of landscape or environmental value within the City.
- To ensure that adequate regard is given to the protection of the natural environment in the determination of land use and development proposals in accordance with sustainable development principles.

To achieve the above aims and objectives Part 5 Special Controls Landscape/Environment Protection form part of the document. The details of which follow:

Schedule 5 contains details of those places and objects within the City that the Council has classified as having significance for the purpose of protection of the landscape or environment.

If the Council at any time considers that a place or object has significance from the point of view of protection of the environment or landscape, the Council may classify the place or object accordingly and shall add details thereof to Schedule 5 by amendment to the Scheme.

If Council at any time considers that any Schedule 5 place or object should no longer be subject to the provisions of this clause the Council may initiate an amendment to the Scheme for the deletion of the place or object from Schedule 5.

Notwithstanding any other provisions of the Scheme to the contrary, the approval of the Council is required for the following development on or in relation to any place of landscape value or environmental value listed in Schedule 5.

- (a) the clearing, excavation or filling of any land;
- (b) the felling, removal, killing or causing of irreparable damage to any tree;
- (c) the erection of any fence;
- (d) the commencement or carrying out of any renovation, modification, refitting, decoration or demolition of any building; or
- (e) the alteration or removal of any building or object or part thereof.

The Council may enter into agreements with any State or Commonwealth government authority or other body in Western Australia for the preservation or conservation of any place or object listed in Schedule 5.

At the August Conservation Advisory Committee meeting the following motions were put and carried.

- 1 REQUESTS that Council endorse the concept of protecting natural areas of significance, with high landscape and/or environmental values by listing those areas under Schedule 5 of the District Planning Scheme No 2;
- 2 RECOMMENDS that Council recognises the significant work already completed by City Staff, in identifying natural areas of high environmental value, as identified by the Perth Biodiversity Project assessment process and forming part of the development of the City of Joondalup's Biodiversity Strategy;
- 3 REQUESTS that Council require a report from staff, listing natural areas (within the City of Joondalup) that were identified using the Perth Biodiversity Project assessment process; these are to be included under Schedule 5 of the District Planning Scheme 2. This report is to be first reviewed by the Conservation Advisory Committee prior to a recommendation going to Council.

### **Link to Strategic Plan:**

### **Key Focus Area**

Caring for the Environment

### **Outcomes**

The City of Joondalup is environmentally responsible in its activities.

### **Objectives**

To plan and manage our natural resources to ensure environmental sustainability.

### **Strategies**

- 2.1.1 Maintain and protect natural assets to retain biodiversity.
- 2.1.2 Further develop environmentally effective and energy-efficient programs.
- 2.1.3 Develop a coordinated environmental framework, including community education.

### **Legislation – Statutory Provisions:**

The Local Government Act 1995 allows a council to establish committees to assist a Council to exercise the powers and discharge duties that can be delegated to a committee.

**Risk Management considerations:**

Not Applicable

**Financial/Budget Implications:**

Not Applicable

**Policy implications:**

Not Applicable

**Regional Significance:**

Not Applicable

**Sustainability Implications:**Environmental

Conservation Advisory Committee objective “ To make recommendations to Council for the Conservation of the City of Joondalup’s natural biodiversity”.

Social

To promote partnerships between Council and the Community to protect the City of Joondalup’s natural biodiversity as contained within its various natural areas (bushland, wetlands and the coastal environment).

**Consultation:**

The Conservation Advisory Committee provides a forum for community consultation and engagement on natural areas.

**COMMENT**

The Conservation Advisory Committee has been working with Council to produce a local biodiversity strategy for the City. Natural areas of high ecological value have been identified by utilising structured processes made available to Council by the Western Australian Local Government Association, through the Perth Biodiversity Project (PBP). The Local biodiversity Guidelines produced by the PBP, advise that natural areas identified through this process be protected by the use of town planning schemes.

The Conservation Advisory Committee is seeking support from Council to protect the significant natural areas it manages, and identified by the PBP process by placing them in Schedule 5 of the District Planning Scheme 2. This course of action is supported, and would form part of the progression required to produce a local biodiversity strategy at the City of Joondalup. Staff have assessed the hundred reserves that contain bushland and are managed by the City. These reserves have been placed in order of management priority. It is a yet unspecified number of these reserves that the CAC wish to place on schedule 5 of the District Planning Scheme 2. A future report on this process will be submitted to Council for its consideration.

**ATTACHMENTS**

Attachment 1                      Minutes of 24 August 2005 meeting of the Conservation Advisory Committee.

**VOTING REQUIREMENTS**

Simple majority

**RECOMMENDATION****That Council:**

- 1** NOTES the unconfirmed Minutes of the Conservation Advisory Committee held on 24 August 2005 forming Attachment 1 to this Report;
- 2** NOTES that a list of bushland reserves managed by the City in order of management priority has been prepared and that the Chief Executive Officer will provide a future report on the process impact of the proposal to protect natural areas of significance under Schedule 5 of District Planning Scheme No. 2;
- 3** NOTES the Conservation Advisory Committee's meeting recommendation to recognise the significant work already completed by City staff in identifying natural areas of high environmental value.

*Appendix 5 refers*

To access this attachment on electronic document, click here: [Attach5brf130905.pdf](#)



**ITEM 8**                      **PROPOSED DRAFT CURRAMBINE DISTRICT CENTRE  
STRUCTURE PLAN (STRUCTURE PLAN NO 6) - LOTS 9505,  
929 AND 1574 DELAMERE AVENUE, HOBSONS GATE &  
SHENTON AVENUE, CURRAMBINE – [47351] [39557]**

**WARD:**                      North Coastal

**RESPONSIBLE  
DIRECTOR:**              Mr David Djulbic (Acting Director)  
   Planning and Community Development

---

**PURPOSE**

The proposed Currambine District Structure Plan (Structure Plan No 6) is brought before Council for its consideration and consent to advertise in accordance with the provisions of District Planning Scheme No 2 (DPS2).

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The intent of this structure plan is to guide the future subdivision and development of both improved and unimproved land comprising the Currambine District Centre in a coordinated and integrated manner following ‘main-street’ urban design principles (refer Attachment 2 – Indicative Concept Plan).

The structure plan area comprises three (3) separate lots of a combined area of approximately 18.35 hectares and is bounded by Shenton Avenue to the South, Marmion Avenue to the West, Delamere Avenue to the East and North, and includes internal roads being Hobsons Gate and Chesapeake Way.

A total of four (4) land use zones are proposed under the structure plan, being ‘Residential’, ‘Civic and Cultural’, ‘Commercial’ and ‘Business’ and are in conformity with the current zoning of the land under DPS2.

The Commercial and Business zones also seek to allow for ‘shop top’ housing forms of development at an R100 and R40 density respectively. This form of development is expected to be similar to the form of development found within the Joondalup Central Business District, however the scale of development (particularly with respect to height and building bulk) will be considerably lower.

Lot 929 is listed as the Currambine District Centre under Schedule 3 of DPS2, with a retail net lettable area of 10,000m<sup>2</sup>. The proposed structure plan does not propose to increase this existing retail floorspace allocation.

Should the draft structure plan be considered satisfactory, the proposal is required to be advertised for public comment prior to further consideration by the Council.

The draft structure plan has been subject to significant negotiations between the City and the applicants. The draft structure plan is now considered to be in a form suitable for the purposes of public advertising in accordance with the provisions of DPS2.

The town planning and urban design principles used to prepare the structure plan are in accordance with the Council’s previous resolution for the centres future growth to evolve from an internalised shopping centre model to a more traditional main street model.

The objectives and criteria proposed for each zone are appropriate as they collectively ensure that a high standard of future land subdivision and development will be achieved.

It is recommended that Council:

- 1 Pursuant to clause 9.4 of the City of Joondalup District Planning Scheme No 2, ADOPTS the draft Currambine District Centre Structure Plan (Structure Plan No 6) as per Attachment 3 to this Report - for the purpose of public advertising and make it available for public comment for 28 days;
- 2 NOTES that the City is not contributing to the costs associated with the preparation of the Currambine District Centre Structure Plan.

## BACKGROUND

|                         |   |
|-------------------------|---|
| <b>Suburb/Location:</b> | Currambine District Centre<br>Lot 9503 - 8.85 hectares (vacant land)<br>Lot 929 - 7.5 hectares (existing shopping centre & cinema)<br>Lot 1574 - 2 hectares (vacant land owned by the City) |
| <b>Applicant:</b>       | The Planning Group & Roberts Day  |
| <b>Owner:</b>           | Davidson Pty Ltd, Roman Catholic Archbishop and City of Joondalup (Community purpose site)  |
| <b>Zoning:</b>          | <b>DPS:</b> Commercial, Business, Residential & Civic and Cultural<br><b>MRS:</b> Urban   |

The area encompassed by the Currambine District structure plan comprises approximately 18.35 hectares and is bounded by Shenton and Delamere Avenues, Chesapeake Way, Hobson Gates and Marmion Avenue (refer Attachment 1).

The subject land is zoned 'Commercial', 'Business', 'Civic and Cultural' and 'Residential – R40' under District Planning Scheme No 2 (DPS2). Lot 929 is listed as the Currambine District Centre under Schedule 3 of DPS2, with a retail net lettable area of 10,000m<sup>2</sup>.

The current retail floorspace upon Lot 929 is approximately 5642m<sup>2</sup>, comprising 4083m<sup>2</sup> of supermarket, 1330m<sup>2</sup> of specialty stores and 229m<sup>2</sup> of office functions.

Amendment 662 to the City of Wanneroo Town Planning Scheme No 1 (finalised 27 March 1995) rezoned the land from 'Rural' and 'Residential Development' to 'Commercial', 'Mixed Business', 'Service Station' and 'Civic'.

As part of the above rezoning, the Council required the owners to transfer to the City the land to be zoned 'Civic' for the purposes of recreation and construction thereon of community facilities and a town square. This arrangement was formalised via a legal agreement being entered into between the landowners and the City dated 14 July 1995. The legal agreement facilitated the transfer, free of all costs and encumbrances of a 2 hectare parcel of land in the location shown in attachment 1. Of this two (2) hectare land parcel, 0.5 hectares is intended to be used for community purposes, with the remaining 1.5 hectares for recreation purposes. The entire 2 hectares was to be credited towards the landowners 10% Public Open Space (POS) subdivisional commitment.

The above legal agreement did not stipulate a definitive timeframe for the transfer of the community purpose site, however the Western Australian Planning Commission (WAPC) subdivision number 117546 sought to excise the two (2) hectare public purposes site from the subject land, with a condition of that subdivision approval requiring the land to be created as a separate lot and transferred in fee simple free of cost to the City. The subdivider has

finalised subdivisional works and conditions of the above WAPC subdivision approval and land ownership was subsequently transferred to the City in June 2004.

Davidson Pty Ltd and the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Perth own the entire area (except for Lot 1574 which is owned by the City) with a sub lease in favour of Woolworths Pty Ltd over part of that area, being Lot 929.

## **DETAILS**

### **Issues and options considered:**

The proposed structure plan seeks to facilitate additional development of the Currambine Market Place Shopping Centre that incorporates surrounding vacant land and existing fragmented development into what the applicant's propose to be an innovative and community focused main street "Small Town Centre".

The proposed Currambine District Centre structure plan consists of two parts, Part 1 and Part 2. Due to the size of the traffic report, only the structure plan document has been attached to this Council report. Full copies of the structure plan document, including traffic report, have been made available in the Commissioners reading room. Full copies of the structure plan document, including traffic report, will also be made available for inspection by the public during the public comment period should Council consent to it being advertised. It will also be made available for viewing on the City's website.

Part 1 is the statutory planning section setting out the objectives and development provisions that determine the intended overall form of development on the subject land, particularly where these provisions differ from those required under both DPS2 and Residential Design Codes (R Codes).

Part 1 of the proposed structure plan is divided into four precincts that directly relate to the four existing zones within DPS2, which are, 'Commercial', 'Business', 'Residential and 'Civic & Cultural'.

Part 1 also sets out the definitions, objectives, permitted land uses, applicable residential density coding (R Codes) and development provisions relating to each of the above precincts.

Part 2 of the structure plan is the explanatory report, which provides background to the objective, purpose and intentions of the proposed structure plan. It also includes background information (including traffic report), the processes proposed for implementation and administration of the structure plan.

The structure plan is shown diagrammatically within the indicative concept plan (refer Attachment 3). The proposed structure plan's main components are:

- A new North/South orientated 'Main-street' that will run through the site between Marmion and Delamere Avenues providing both a vehicular and pedestrian link to commercial, business and residential areas.
- The proposed future community purposes building being located on a prominent corner on the above proposed main street with improved street exposure and views of the parklands.
- Highly visible plaza and town square, blending shopping, entertainment and dining with cultural activities to encourage night use.
- Car parking will be provided on street, in under croft areas of proposed future buildings and in parking cells behind buildings with 'Main Street' frontage.

The following details are provided with respect to the structure plan relating to vehicular & pedestrian access, residential density and development height, the City's Centres strategy and the City's DPS2.

#### Vehicular & Pedestrian Access

The draft structure plan seeks to create a new 'Main-street' by extending Chesapeake Way south to ultimately intersect with Shenton Avenue. Dual use paths are proposed that run along each side of the proposed mainstreet.

The structure plan seeks to utilise and enhance all existing vehicular access points currently available to the centre from the surrounding road network. The structure plan also seeks to utilise and enhance pedestrian pathways and linkages both internally and externally.

A detailed traffic report has been prepared and forms an appendix to the structure plan (refer Attachment 2).

#### Residential Density and Development Height

A residential density of R40 has been applied to land zoned 'Business' and 'Residential' within the structure plan. The R40 density code is a medium density code where the minimum and average lot size requirement for each dwelling is 200m<sup>2</sup> and 220m<sup>2</sup> respectively.

A residential density of R100 is proposed to be applied to land zoned 'Commercial' within the structure plan. The R100 density code is a high density code where a minimum lot size requirement of 100m<sup>2</sup> is required for each dwelling.

The structure plan allows for 'shop top' housing (dwellings above commercial development) to be considered and developed within both the 'Commercial' and 'Business' zones. The Residential Zone is to be developed solely for housing and could be developed as single or grouped dwellings at the R40 density.

A two storey height limit has been applied to all future development within the structure plan area.

#### City of Joondalup Centres Strategy (Policy 3.2.8)

The Currambine District Centre is classified as a small town centre within the City's Centres Strategy. The recommendations for Currambine under the City's Centres Strategy are as follows:

*No expansion over 10,000m<sup>2</sup> be permitted until it can be demonstrated that the planned commercial structure of the centres in the north of the City has been substantially developed to their planned sizes and trading patterns have settled.*

*Nothing in the recommendation above shall preclude the incremental expansion of Currambine along 'main street principles' as envisaged under Section 5.2.6 of the Metropolitan Centres Policy contained in Statement of Planning Policy No 9 (17/10/00).*

Clause 1.4.7 of the City's Centres Strategy relates to Mixed Business Areas/Community Business Parks, whereby it is recommended that mixed business areas be provided within the Currambine Small Town Centre.

### District Planning Scheme No 2 (DPS2)

The provisions of DPS2 will apply to the area subject to the proposed draft structure plan and the structure plan provisions seek to further complement those in DPS2. Land uses that may be considered under DPS2 within the 'Commercial', 'Business', Civic & Cultural and 'Residential' Zones will be wholly applied to the structure plan and no additional land uses outside of these are proposed.

### Options

The Council has the following options when considering the draft structure plan:

- Determine that the structure plan is satisfactory and commence advertising.
- Determine that the structure plan should not be advertised until specified matters have been included or addressed.
- Determine that the structure plan should not be agreed to for stated reasons.

### **Link to Strategic Plan:**

Consideration of this amendment is consistent with the City's Strategic Plan 2003 – 2008 by providing increased commercial opportunities and housing choices and therefore sustainable economic and social development.

### **Legislation – Statutory Provisions:**

Under clause 9.4.1 (a) of DPS 2, Council may determine that the structure plan is satisfactory, send a copy to the Commission, and advertise it under the provisions of clause 9.5 and 6.7 of DPS2.

Under clause 9.4.1 (b), Council may determine that the structure plan should not be advertised until specified matters have been included in it or have otherwise been attended to by the proponent.

Under clause 9.4.1 (c), Council may determine that the structure plan should not be agreed to for stated reasons.

Should Council determine that the structure plan are satisfactory, the proposal is to be advertised for public comment in accordance with clause 9.5 and 6.7 of DPS2.

Upon completion of public advertising, Council is required to review all submissions within sixty days and then proceed to either refuse or adopt the structure plan, with or without further modifications.

### **Risk Management considerations:**

Not Applicable

### **Financial Implications**

Lot 1574 is owned by the City whereby future opportunities exist to develop the land for public open space and a community purposes building.

### **Policy Implications**

Not Applicable

**Regional Significance:**

This structure plan proposal has marginal regional significance, however is locally significant as it caters for retailing, business and housing related needs of both existing and future residents residing either within or nearby the centre.

**Sustainability Implications:**

The proposed structure plan would enable the City to consider future subdivision and development on the site that will provide 'Main-Street' development promoting both economic and social sustainability.

**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. Clause 6.7 of DPS2 requires a minimum advertising period of 21 days, however, advertising for a period of twenty eight (28) days is recommended in this instance. Advertising would consist of notification of all adjoining landowners, two (2) signs being erected in prominent locations on the site, a notice being placed in the Joondalup Community newspaper and on the Council website.

**COMMENT**

The structure plan has been subject to negotiations between the City and the applicants. The draft structure plan is now considered to be in a form suitable for the purposes of public advertising in accordance with the provisions of DPS2.

The structure plan seeks to guide the development of the entire site towards becoming an innovative, community focused district centre. The structure plan follows main street design principles and seeks to achieve a strong sense of place and support for social, economic and environmental sustainability.

The principles used to prepare the structure plan are based upon the Council's previous resolution for the centre's future growth to evolve from an internalised shopping centre model to a more traditional main street model.

Whilst the conversion from one model to another is challenging given the existing shopping centre has been largely developed utilising the internalised shopping centre model, the structure plan seeks to incorporate and address these built form constraints to create a main street built form.

The objectives and criteria for each zone seek to create a high standard of future land subdivision and development.

The use of the R40 and 100 residential density codes seek to facilitate the development of residential dwellings within the structure plan area. The resultant residential population assists patronage, vitality and passive surveillance of the centre, particularly at night.

The comments and recommendations contained within the traffic report have been reviewed, however the proposal for a new intersection onto Shenton Avenue is not supported at this time. This intersection proposal is to be further investigated in consultation with Main Roads WA, where it is intended that further technical information be obtained, reviewed and reported to the Council upon completion of the public advertising period.

The comments, ideas and suggestions contained within any submissions received during the advertising period will be reviewed and commented upon in a future report to the Council. The structure plan will also be referred to the WAPC for comment.

The structure plan may be further modified and refined to reflect comments contained within submissions received during the advertising period. The advertising process is therefore anticipated to add value to the structure plan consideration and determination process in order to achieve the best possible result for the community who utilise this centre.

## **ATTACHMENTS**

|              |                                    |
|--------------|------------------------------------|
| Attachment 1 | Aerial Site Plan & Lot details     |
| Attachment 2 | Indicative Concept Plan            |
| Attachment 3 | Currambine District Structure Plan |

## **VOTING REQUIREMENTS**

Simple Majority

## **RECOMMENDATION**

### **That Council:**

- 1** pursuant to clause 9.4 of the City of Joondalup District Planning Scheme No 2, **ADOPTS** the draft Currambine District Centre Structure Plan (Structure Plan No 6) as per Attachment 3 to this Report - for the purpose of public advertising and make it available for public comment for 28 days;
- 2** **NOTES** that the City is not contributing to the costs associated with the preparation of the Currambine District Centre Structure Plan.

*Appendix 6 refers*

To access this attachment on electronic document, click here: [Attach6brf130905.pdf](#)

[Attach15brf130905.pdf](#)

*Acting Director Planning & Community Development, Mr David Djulbic, declared an interest that may affect his impartiality in Item 8 – Adoption of Modifications to the Joondalup City Centre Development Plan and Manual - Southern Business District due to the negotiations for the acquisition process of the Hodges Drive Depot site.*

*Chief Executive Officer, Mr Garry Hunt, declared an interest that may affect his impartiality in Item 8 – Adoption of Modifications to the Joondalup City Centre Development Plan and Manual – Southern Business District due to the negotiations for the acquisition process of the Hodges Drive Depot site.*

## **ITEM 9                    ADOPTION OF MODIFICATIONS TO THE JOONDALUP CITY CENTRE DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND MANUAL - SOUTHERN BUSINESS DISTRICT – [00152]**

**WARD:**                    Lakeside

**RESPONSIBLE            Mr David Djulbic (Acting Director)**  
**DIRECTOR:**              Planning and Community Development

---

### **PURPOSE**

This report is for Council to consider submissions received as a result of public advertising of the inclusion of objectives, permitted uses and development provisions for the Southern Business District as modifications to the Joondalup City Centre Development Plan and Manual.

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Council considered the inclusion of objectives, permitted uses and development provisions for the Southern Business District within the Joondalup City Centre Development Plan and Manual (JCCDPM), as shown in Attachment 2, at its meeting on 23 November 2004 (CJ293-11/04 refers). At this meeting, Council resolved to allow the commencement of public advertising. Further to the close of advertising, the landowner sought modifications to the draft document, principally to enable additional flexibility of land uses in relation to the area referred to in document as the “Depot Site”. In addition, the Department for Planning and Infrastructure (DPI) provided comments that required some modifications to be made to the document.

Council considered the proposed modifications at its meeting on 28 June 2005 (CJ132-06/05 refers) and resolved to make the modified document available for public comment for a period of 21 days. Upon the close of advertising period, two (2) submissions were received, both objecting to the proposal (see Attachment 3).

The proposed modifications do not alter the intent of the Southern Business District and considered to be enhancements to the intent of the JCCDPM that will be of assistance during the assessment and development stages.

It is therefore recommended that Council:

- 1        *Pursuant to clause 9.6 and 9.7 of the City of Joondalup’s District Planning Scheme No 2, RESOLVES to adopt the amended Joondalup City Centre Plan and Manual to include objectives, permitted uses and development provisions for the Southern Business District, as shown in Attachment No 2 to this Report, and submit it to the Western Australian Planning Commission for final adoption and certification;*



- 2 *Subject to certification by the Western Australian Planning Commission, AUTHORISES the affixation of the Common Seal to, and signing of, the amended Joondalup City Centre Plan and Manual documents.*

## BACKGROUND

|                         |  |
|-------------------------|--|
| <b>Suburb/Location:</b> | Lots 10, 11, 13, 902, Reserve 41707 & Pt Location 7898 |
| <b>Applicant:</b>       | Honeybush drive, Joondalup Drive and Hodges Drive      |
| <b>Owner:</b>           | Masterplan Consultants WA Pty Ltd                      |
| <b>Zoning:</b>          | Landcorp   |
| <b>DPS:</b>             | Centre Zone  |
| <b>MRS:</b>             | Central City Area                                      |

The Joondalup City Centre Development Plan and Manual (JCCDPM) is an Agreed Structure Plan adopted under the District Planning Scheme No 2 (DPS 2) and applies to the 'Centre Zone' which includes the subject lot. The JCCDPM is divided into seven districts of different characters that are distinguished by their land use activities, densities and building form. Not all districts, however, have planning controls or guidelines set out to provide development standards. The Southern Business District is one of these districts, having only been provided with background data stating that this district is to have "an emphasis on mixed business and technology development".

### Location

Lots 10,11,13 and Reserve 41707 Honeybush Drive, Pt Location 7898 Joondalup Drive and Lot 902 Hodges Drive are located between Joondalup Drive, Hodges Drive, the Mitchell Freeway and Eddystone Avenue (Attachment 1). The railway reserve for the Perth City to Currambine rail line dissects the site between the Mitchell Freeway at the junction of Joondalup Drive and Hodges Drive. The subject lots are zoned Centre Zone and are located within the Joondalup City Centre. The site comprises a total area of 35 hectares.

The site is very prominent due to its key location at the junction of the Mitchell Freeway and Hodges Drive. The site is also significantly elevated on the northern portion of the site. The site is also prominent by virtue of being effectively isolated by roads from the rest of the City Centre, Edith Cowan University Campus located on the opposite side of Joondalup Drive to the east of the site and the Joondalup Gate business area located to the south.

### History

Landcorp has been involved in extensive discussions with the City regarding the future development of the subject site for several years. A draft structure plan for the site was submitted previously in 2000, however, vehicular access to the site was a major obstacle to progressing the proposal.

Lot 902 has since been identified and included in the modifications to the JCCDPM as the site for the City's new works depot. Should negotiations be successful, the future depot would be located on a 4 hectare portion of the 5.42 hectares of Lot 902. The Western Australian Planning Commission (WAPC) has approved the subdivision of Lot 902. The subdivision of Lot 902 includes the construction of a bridge over the railway reserve from Joondalup Drive that will enable vehicular access to all lots in the Structure Plan area, including the future depot site.

Council's previous resolutions:

Council considered the inclusion of objectives, permitted uses and development provisions for the Southern Business District, including a designated Depot Precinct on a portion of Lot 902, within the JCCDPM at its meeting on 23 November 2004 (CJ293-11/04 refers). At this meeting, Council resolved to adopt the amendments to the JCCDPM and allow the commencement of public advertising. Further to the close of advertising, the landowner sought modifications to the draft document, principally to enable additional flexibility of land uses in relation to the area shown as the "Depot Site". In addition, the Department for Planning and Infrastructure had provided comments that required some modifications to be made to the document.

Council considered the proposed modifications at its meeting on 28 June 2005 (CJ132-06/05 refers) and resolved the following:

- 1 *NOTES the submissions received and ADVISES the submitters of the Council's resolution;*
- 2 *NOTES the amendments proposed to the draft structure plan;*
- 3 *Pursuant to clause 9.6 of the City of Joondalup's DPS2, ADOPTS for the purposes of public advertising the modification to the Joondalup City Centre Development Plan and Manual to include objectives, permitted uses and development provisions for the Southern Business District, as per Attachment 2 to Report CJ132-06/05 and makes it available for public comment for a period of 21 days.*

**DETAILS****Issues and options considered:**Proposed Modifications to JCCDPM

Only a background data statement regarding the Southern Business District is included in the JCCDPM. No objectives, permitted uses or development provisions are provided for within this District. The JCCDPM therefore needs to be amended to incorporate these details.

In this instance, Part 1 (Attachment 2) addresses the following issues:

- Structure Plan Precincts, being the following:
  - Bulk Retail/Showroom Precinct
  - Bulk Retail/Showroom and/or Technology Park Precinct
  - Service Industry Precinct
  - Bulk Retail/Showroom/Service Industry Precinct (*formerly the Depot Site Precinct*)
  - Drainage Precinct
- Interpretations
- Future Subdivision (further to subdivision of a portion of the land previously approved)
- Objectives, Permitted Uses and Development Provisions for each Precinct

The second component, Part 2, is the explanatory report providing the background and supporting documentation to Part 1 and includes the following:

- Land Analysis, Services/Infrastructure and Access/Road Network for the subject site;
- Town Planning Context (zoning and strategic planning background);
- Market Demand.

#### Further proposed modifications

The landowner has sought further modifications to the draft document that are essentially as follows:

- Renaming the Depot Precinct to Bulk Retail/Showroom/Service Industry Precinct to allow for additional land use and development flexibility,
- Modifying and rewording several provisions contained within the document relating to land use and development of land within all precincts to improve the document and provide greater clarity.

In addition, DPI provided comments that required some modifications to be made to the document.

Details of all proposed modifications are outlined below:

- *Remove references to 'retail warehouse' as this is not a term that is defined in DPS2 or the structure plan.*
- *Plan 1 - location of vehicle cross-easements shown on all lots fronting Joondalup Drive.*
- *In relation to clauses:*
  - 6.2 *Permitted uses modified to exclude lunch bars and caretakers residence.*
  - 6.3.1 *Modify setback provision to clarify that minimum and maximum setbacks apply to 70% of the front facade*
  - 6.3.2 *Clause added regarding building orientation*
  - 6.3.7 *Clause added prohibiting reflective glazing*
  - 6.3.8 *Maximum fence height of 1.8m added*
  - 7.2 *Deleted Educational Establishment (repeated from previous clause)*
  - 8.2 *Amended the Permitted Uses to include Light Industry and Lunch Bar*
  - 9.0 *Precinct title changed to 'Bulk Retail/Showroom/Service Industry*
  - 9.2 *Land uses expanded to include the uses permitted in the Bulk Retail/Showroom/Service Industry Precinct. Depot use retained as a permitted use.*

9.3 *Clauses modified to expand permitted land uses and modify development provisions as appropriate*

9.3.5 *Height requirements modified to be consistent with other precincts.*

9.3.6 iii) *Clause added prohibiting reflective glazing*

9.3.7 *Boundary fencing clause modified to be consistent with other precincts*

6.3.8 *Maximum fence height of 1.8m added*

10.0 *Adjacent regional road network added to objective.*

### Options

Council, in considering the proposed amendments to the JCCDPM, may:

- Not adopt the amendments to the JCCDPM.
- Adopt the amendments to the JCCDPM and forward these to the WAPC for final adoption and certification.

### **Link to Strategic Plan:**

The proposed amendment to the JCCDPM will support the City's Strategic Plan of promoting and maintaining sustainable economic development (objective 3.5) by facilitating opportunities for the commercial development of a significant portion of land within the City Centre.

### **Legislation – Statutory Provisions:**

Under clause 9.6 of DPS 2, the Council is required to consider all submissions received during the advertising period (see Attachment 3). After consideration of all submissions, the Council are to either resolve to adopt the structure plan, with or without modification, or to refuse to adopt the structure plan. If Council adopts the structure plan, three copies are then submitted to the Western Australian Planning Commission (WAPC) for final adoption and endorsement.

### **Risk Management considerations:**

There are no known risks associated with the proposed amendments to the Southern Business District within the JCCDPM.

### **Financial/Budget Implications:**

There are no financial or budget implications associated with the proposed amendments to the Southern Business District within the JCCDPM. The outcome of the City's negotiations regarding the purchase of portion of Lot 902 for potential use as the City's Works Depot is not dependent on the outcome of the structure plan process.

### **Policy implications:**

There are no policy implications associated with the proposed amendments to the Southern Business District within the JCCDPM.

**Regional Significance:**

The proposed amendments to the JCCDPM relating to the Southern Business District are regionally significant as they seek to facilitate the future commercial growth of the greater Joondalup Central Business District in order for it to achieve the overarching intent of being the largest satellite central business district (CBD) outside of the Perth CBD.

**Sustainability implications:**

The proposed amendments to the JCCDPM will facilitate the future subdivision of the 35 hectare site for the purpose intended noted in the JCCDPM. In so doing, it will assist in achieving economic sustainability for the City Centre.

**Consultation:**

Clause 9.5 of DPS 2 requires structure plan proposals to be advertised, in accordance with clause 6.7 of DPS 2. The proposed amendments to the JCCDPM were advertised for a period of 21 days by way of all adjoining landowners, submitters from the original advertising period and service authorities being notified in writing, two signs being erected on the site, a notice being placed in the Joondalup Community newspaper on 21 June 2005 and a notice placed on the City's website.

The advertising period closed on 11 August 2005 and 2 submissions were received, both objecting to the proposal. The submissions are summarised in Attachment 3.

**COMMENT**Submissions

The issues arising from public advertising (in italics) and a brief summary of the evaluating comments to each are as follows:

- *Concern about vehicular access being provided on to Hodges Drive for safety reasons.*

The development provisions for this precinct states that vehicular access is to be achieved using the internal access road that includes a bridge over the railway. Nevertheless, left-in/left-out access only may be permitted from Hodges Drive, subject to the approval of Main Roads WA.

- *Concerns about greenhouse gases, global warming, loss of habitat and impacts of clearing and development on future generations.*

The issues raised are not specific to the site or the structure plan process. The land is privately owned and zoned appropriately for development. Council is required to deal with any applications in accordance with the provisions of DPS 2, which includes statutory timeframes.

Other

The objective of clause 10.0 is to identify appropriate drainage areas in the structure plan area to service its drainage needs. As it will also need to accommodate drainage from the regional road network that surrounds the site, the City has included reference to this need in clause 10.0.

The proposed modifications do not change the intent of the objectives of the Southern Business District. The main proposed modifications are the renaming of the previous Depot Precinct which has been modified to the Bulk Retail/Showroom/Service Industry Precinct, and the expansion of the permitted land uses to enable a greater range of land uses to be developed. Previously, the only permitted use was a municipal depot.

The other proposed modifications are considered to be enhancements to the intent of the JCCDPM that will be of assistance during the assessment and development stages.

Advertising of the proposal has not resulted in any issues that would require the proposed modifications to the JCCDPM to be further modified. Final approval of the inclusion of provisions for the Southern Business District of the JCCDPM is therefore recommended.

## **ATTACHMENTS**

|              |   |
|--------------|---|
| Attachment 1 | Location Plan   |
| Attachment 2 | Modified Southern Business District within the JCCDPM (current) |
| Attachment 3 | Schedule of submissions   |

## **VOTING REQUIREMENTS**

Simple Majority

## **RECOMMENDATION**

### **That Council:**

- 1 Pursuant to clause 9.6 and 9.7 of the City of Joondalup's DPS2, RESOLVES to adopt the modified Joondalup City Centre Plan and Manual to include objectives, permitted uses and development provisions for the Southern Business District, as shown in Attachment No 2 to this Report, and submit it to the Western Australian Planning Commission for final adoption and certification;**
- 2 Subject to certification by the Western Australian Planning Commission, AUTHORISES the affixation of the Common Seal to, and signing of, the modified Joondalup City Centre Plan and Manual documents.**

*Appendix 7 refers*

*To access this attachment on electronic document, click here: [Attach7brf130905.pdf](#)*

**ITEM 10**                      **EDUCATIONAL ESTABLISHMENT - CARPARK ADDITION  
(610 NEW BAYS) – LOT 502 (38) COLLIER PASS,  
JOONDALUP – [22460]****WARD:**                      Lakeside**RESPONSIBLE  
DIRECTOR:**                Mr David Djulbic (Acting Director)  
   Planning and Community Development

---

**PURPOSE**

For Council to give consideration on the application for planning approval for 610 new at grade car parking bays for the Edith Cowan University (ECU) site at Lot 502 (38) Collier Pass, Joondalup.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The applicant is proposing to construct 610 new at grade car bays on Lot 502 (38) Collier Pass. No 38 Collier Pass is triangular in shape and is located between Collier Pass, the railway line and Grand Boulevard. The development site is also located to the west of the main campus and separated by Grand Boulevard. Access to the new car parking area is proposed to be via the proposed four-way intersection of Grand Boulevard and Kendrew Crescent, which has been identified for the installation of new traffic signals.

The development site is currently subject to the Joondalup City Centre Development Plan & Manual (JCCDPM) where the subject site is identified as being suitable for “Residential Mixed-Use” land uses. However, ECU has recently lodged a new draft structure plan application with the City. The draft structure plan is proposed to provide a comprehensive framework for future development of the ECU Joondalup Campus for the consideration and approval of future development proposals by Council. The draft structure plan is currently being assessed.

Clause 9.11 of the City’s District Planning Scheme No 2 allows Council to consider an application in respect of an application for planning approval, before the adoption of a Structure Plan.

The construction of additional car bays was required by Council as part of a recent planning approval for a new Health & Wellness building within the Edith Cowan University (ECU) site. The application was approved by Council at its meeting dated 17 May 2005 (CJ092 - 05/05). In this report, it was stated that the application should be approved subject to the imposition of appropriate conditions with particular reference to the future parking needs of the campus. Consequently, one of the conditions of approval was for the applicant to provide a minimum of 594 on-site car bays prior to the occupation of the Health & Wellness building. The car parking application has been submitted for consideration in order to comply with the relevant condition of approval relating to the Health & Wellness building, even though the proposed Structure Plan has yet to be endorsed.

In spite of the current status of the proposed Structure Plan for the campus land holdings, it is recommended that the car parking proposal before Council be approved, subject to conditions with particular reference to the design and access/egress of the parking area. The current application before Council is consistent with the draft Structure Plan, as submitted, and the likely development scenario for the pocket of land, which has been longstanding.

## BACKGROUND

|                         |                                      |
|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| <b>Suburb/Location:</b> | Lot 502 (38) Collier Pass, Joondalup |
| <b>Applicant:</b>       | Capital Projects Group ECU           |
| <b>Owner:</b>           | Edith Cowan University               |
| <b>Zoning:</b>          | <b>DPS:</b> Centre R20               |
|                         | <b>MRS:</b> Central City Area        |

### Approval of Health and Wellness Building

Planning approval was given on 17 May 2005 for a new Health & Wellness building on the ECU Joondalup Campus at a cost of \$29 million. It was noted as part of this planning approval, that there will be a loss of parking bays for the campus site as a result of the Health & Wellness building. To ameliorate any further loss of parking bays through the new development, a condition was imposed as part of that approval which stated the following:

- 1) The applicant is to provide a minimum of 594 on-site car bays, prior to the occupation of the Health & Wellness Building, to the satisfaction of the Manager Approvals, Planning & Environmental Services.

### History of Application

|            |  |
|------------|--|
| 13/04/2005 | Meeting to discuss the proposed development and future development for ECU, including parking provisions and a Structure Plan for the site. This meeting was held between the City, the applicant and ECU Manager Project Services.                      |
| 14/04/2005 | Application received. Awaiting submission of draft structure plan for the site.  |
| 18/04/2005 | Draft structure plans received. Awaiting initial assessment to ascertain whether parking application aligned with that of the draft structure plan and whether the application can/will be dealt with prior to the adoption of the draft structure plan. |
| 16/05/2005 | Application referred internally to various departments within the City, for comment.   |
| 20/07/2005 | Further internal referrals required. Relevant comment received the same day.   |

## DETAILS

The applicant is proposing to construct 610 new car bays on a site located to the west of the main ECU Campus site between the railway line, Collier Pass and Grand Boulevard. This development application has been submitted as a result of the loss of existing car bays proposed through the development of the Health & Wellness Building, approved by Council at its meeting dated 17 May 2005 (CJ092 - 05/05).

The demand for parking, according to the ECU figures, and the requirements for parking were previously tabled in the Council Report for the Health & Wellness building. These figures were derived from independent traffic/ parking studies conducted by ECU, which occur on an annual basis during each semester. According to the ECU figures, by 2007 there will be an overall shortfall of parking of 114 car bays (See table below). These figures were based on there being 600 new car bays provided as part of this development application. Through this development application, which is proposing the construction of 610 new car bays, this would leave a shortfall of 104 car bays, according to the ECU's figures.



The following table provides a comparison of the anticipated parking demand, as determined through previous car parking studies, which have been carried out independently by the University.

**TABLE 1 – Comparison of Anticipated/ Actual Car Parking Demand by ECU figures**

| Year                                    | No of Car bays Provided | No of Car bays Required | Difference |
|---|-------------------------|-------------------------|------------|
| Projected number of bays required 2005  | 2,017                   | 2,249                   | - 232      |
| Projected number of bays required 2006  | 2,417                   | 2,400                   | + 17       |
| Projected numbers of bays required 2007 | 2,617                   | 2,731                   | - 114      |

The applicant is proposing to begin construction of the car bays within 2005 to allow for completion by Semester 1, 2006. The applicant is proposing to stage the development of these car bays with 400 being provided as part of Stage 1 and the remaining car bays constructed as part of Stage 2, being completed for use at the start of Semester 1 2007.

The applicant has submitted a draft structure plan application over the whole site (Lot 502), which was received on 18 April 2005. The structure plan and is currently undergoing some minor modifications by the proponent (Hames Sharley) in order for it to correlate with the existing Joondalup City Centre Development Plan and Manual (JCCDPM). These changes are mainly text based. The structure plan has illustrated the subject car parking area on the “draft structure plan map” and “indicative development plan”, corresponding with that of the current application.

**Issues and options considered:**

Council has the discretion to:

- Approve the application without conditions;
- Approved the application with conditions; or
- Refused the application.

**Link to Strategic Plan:**

The Strategic Plan states that the development of Joondalup as a Learning City is a key strategy, including planning for student growth and creating learning opportunities.

**Legislation – Statutory Provisions:**

The City of Joondalup District Planning Scheme No 2 (DPS2) and the Joondalup City Centre Development Plan and Manual (JCCDPM) are relevant statutory documents.

When considering an application for Planning Approval, the following clauses of District Planning Scheme No 2 are specifically relevant to this application:

*Table 2 (Clause 4.8) – Car Parking Standards*

*Tertiary College – 1 bay per 3 Students*

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.*

9.11 *Development prior to adoption of structure plan*

*If Council is required to consider an application in respect of a development, use or subdivision proposal before a Structure Plan has been prepared and adopted, then the Council shall, in addition to any other matters required by this Scheme to be considered, have regard to the following considerations:*

- (a) *as an overriding consideration, the intent of the application;*
- (b) *the desirability from a planning point of view of having an Agreed Structure Plan in place before development or subdivision occurs; and*
- (c) *the interests of orderly and proper planning, and concern for the amenity of the relevant locality in the short, intermediate and long term.*

**Risk Management considerations:**

Not applicable.

**Financial/Budget Implications:**

There is approved funding within the 2005-2006 budget for the construction of new traffic signals at the Grand Boulevard/ Kendrew Crescent intersection.

**Policy implications:**

Not applicable.

**Regional Significance:**

Not applicable.

**Sustainability implications:**

Education is a key service within the City of Joondalup. It is considered that the number of students within the ECU Campus is projected to increase over the next two years and beyond, which will have an impact on spending within the City, which in turn will be of benefit to business owners within the City and towards the encouragement of economic growth.

**Consultation:**

The application was not advertised as the car parking area is considered to be in keeping with the use of the land and is ancillary to the functioning of the University.

**COMMENT**

Edith Cowan University is considered to be a major focal point of the Joondalup City Centre area. Therefore it is important that the design, built form and use of development within the campus site is in keeping with the surrounding area and the intended function of the area.

Draft Structure Plan

ECU has lodged a draft structure plan application over the whole landholding (Lot 502). The draft structure plan is currently being evaluated. Figure 7 (proposed structure plan map) and Figure 8 (indicative development plan) contained within this structure plan identifies the proposed parking location. It is considered that the location, as identified under the structure plan, is similar in nature to that of the parking proposed within this subject development application. There are some minor variations to the parking layout between the structure plan and development application, which are not considered to affect the outcome or assessment of the proposed structure plan.

Parking Demand

As per the previous approval for a new Health & Wellness building within the Edith Cowan University (ECU) site, which was approved by Council at its meeting dated 17 May 2005 (CJ092 - 05/05), the existing and future proposed parking figures/ requirements were based on the parking standards set out in City's District Planning Scheme No 2 (Table 2, Clause 4.8 – Car Parking Standards). The DPS parking standard sets a parking rate of 1 bay per 3 students accommodated, which results in a surplus of 6 car bays in 2007, as per the table below.

**TABLE 2 - PARKING FIGURES (DISTRICT PLANNING SCHEME NO. 2)**

| <b>Year</b>                             | <b>No of Car bays Provided</b> | <b>No of Car bays Required</b> | <b>Difference</b> |
|---|--------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------|
| Projected number of bays required 2005  | 2,017                          | 2,085                          | + 68              |
| Projected number of bays required 2006  | 2,417                          | 2,228                          | + 189             |
| Projected numbers of bays required 2007 | 2,617                          | 2,611                          | + 6               |

It is noted that the figures above were based on the fact that an additional 600 car bays were to be provided through this subject development application. However, within this development application, the applicant is proposing to construct 610 new car bays. Therefore the overall surplus of parking would be 16 car bays according to the requirements set out in the City's DPS2.

In accordance with Table 1 illustrated in the “Details” section of this report, which is based on regular parking studies carried out by ECU, the required parking in 2007 is insufficient by a total of 114 bays. However, ECU continually undertake measures to promote public transport including the provision of an existing shuttle bus service to and from the University and Joondalup/ Edgewater train stations.

The City currently has a Public Parking Strategy in place for the City Centre area. A review of the Public Parking Strategy document is currently being undertaken, in which the “Joondalup City Centre Public Parking Strategy Working Party” has been created to conduct the review process. The revised strategy document is currently in draft form. The current parking development application is for the exclusive use of ECU. Therefore the review of the public parking strategy will not be affected by this proposal.

Therefore it is considered that the number of car bays provided within this application is sufficient and in compliance with the requirements that have been set out in the City’s District Planning Scheme No 2. It is also considered that the provision of these new parking bays has fulfilled Condition No. 1 of the approval for a new Health & Wellness building within the Edith Cowan University (ECU) site, which was approved by Council at its meeting dated 17 May 2005 (CJ092 - 05/05). The number of bays provided satisfies the condition of the previous approval for approval for a new Health & Wellness building within the Edith Cowan University (ECU) site, which was approved by Council at its meeting dated 17 May 2005 (CJ092 - 05/05).

#### Parking Layout & Access

The layout of the car park and access road will be required to be designed and constructed to the relevant Australian Standards and to the City’s specifications.

It is recommended that the dual use path that is proposed to join the car parking area from the western side to the existing northwest development, be modified and extended around the northern and eastern perimeters of the car park so that it can be better utilised. It is also recommended that a path be provided along the central car park access road to allow a central access for all users of the proposed car parking area.

The access to this car parking area is proposed to be via the eastern side of the subject lot through an intersection with Grand Boulevard. It is noted that the intersection of Grand Boulevard is to accommodate future traffic signals. The development of these traffic signals is a joint venture between the City of Joondalup, ECU, Main Roads Western Australia and the Public Transport Authority. The development of this car park area will ensure the need for these signals to be provided as part of this development. These signals will need to be built in conjunction with the development of this car park and would need to be designed and constructed to the City’s standards prior to the use of the car parking area.

It should be noted that the Council has provided funds within the 2005-2006 budget to contribute towards the installation of these traffic signals. The process for the installation of these traffic signals has now reached the implementation phase.

The applicant has provided 4 disabled bays within this development. The usual requirement for the supply of disabled bays, for tertiary institutes, is 2% of the overall numbers. Therefore the requirement for disabled car bays should be a minimum of 12 bays for this development.

It is considered that with the alterations and improvements as stated above that the parking layout and access is acceptable, from both a vehicular and pedestrian aspect.

### Site Works & Drainage

The applicant will be required to carry out site works as part of this development application as the existing land is largely undulating, typified by small rises in the land. The proposed site levels shown on the plans, which have been submitted, are considered to complement that of the existing land maintaining a gradient, which slopes from north to south. It is considered that the site works have been minimised to that which is only necessary for the development of these car-parking bays. Any further clearing or site works should not be approved until such time that the draft structure plans has been adopted.

The applicant has not provided any drainage details as part of this application. As the applicant is not required to submit plans for a building licence, it is considered necessary that all required plans are provided and approved before any construction takes place. Therefore it is recommended that the applicant provide adequate drainage plans and details, which are to be approved by the City, prior to any construction or site works occurring.

### Landscaping (Existing & Proposed)

A large portion of the site is bushland, which is burnt and recovering from fire. The remaining portion of the vegetation is in good condition with some examples of Jarrah, Casuarina and Tuart Trees on low-lying areas.

At this stage the proposed extensive changes to the existing ground level would see the removal of a large portion of this vegetation. It is noted that a large portion of the lot is already cleared and disturbed. However, the Council should encourage the applicant to retain or transplant, where possible, vegetation in good condition.

The applicant has not provided a landscaping plan as part of this development application in which, a landscaping plan will be requested to be submitted and approved prior to the construction of the car parking area.

Further, landscaping should also be provided in the form of shade trees at a minimum rate of 1 tree per 4 car bays, as per Scheme requirements.

### Lighting

It is recommended that the proposed car parking area be provided with adequate lighting to ensure the safety of the individuals who will utilise this car parking area after hours. This lighting will need to be designed in accordance with the Australian Standards and meet the general needs of the users.

### Conclusion

It is considered that the car parking area proposed within this application is a necessary requirement forming part of a previous Council resolution for a proposed new Health & Wellness building within the Edith Cowan University (ECU) site, which was approved by Council at its meeting dated 17 May 2005 (CJ092 - 05/05).

The location and design of the car parking area is also deemed to be similar in nature to that which has been identified under the draft structure plan for the ECU site, which is currently being assessed by the City. Therefore it is considered that a decision being made for this application, prior to the adoption of the structure plan, will not have any detrimental affects on the outcome or assessment of the structure plan. It is recommended that Council exercise its discretion under Clause 9.11 of the City's District Planning Scheme No 2 in this regard.

It is important that the proposed car parking area is developed in conjunction with that of the proposed traffic signals to be located at the intersection of Grand Boulevard to the east of the

proposed car parking area and west of the main ECU campus site. The construction of these traffic signals will form an integral part of the access/ egress to the proposed car parking area.

The application is therefore recommended for approval, subject to conditions.

## **ATTACHMENTS**

|              |  |
|--------------|--|
| Attachment 1 | Location Plan  |
| Attachment 2 | Site plans, floor plans & elevations (original plans and new plans)  |
| Attachment 3 | ECU Draft Structure Plan - Figure 7 (proposed structure plan map) and Figure 8 (indicative development plan) |

## **VOTING REQUIREMENTS**

Simple Majority

## **RECOMMENDATION**

### **That Council:**

- 1 EXERCISES discretion under clause 9.11 of the City's District Planning Scheme No. 2 and determines that the consideration of an application in respect of a development proposal before the adoption of a new Structure Plan is appropriate in this instance;**
- 2 APPROVES the application for planning approval, dated 14 April 2005, submitted by Capital Projects Group ECU on behalf of the owners, Edith Cowan University for a car park addition (610 new bays) on Lot 502 (38) Collier Pass, Joondalup subject to the following conditions:**
  - (a) The proposed car parking area shall not be utilised until such time as the proposed traffic signals to be located at the access point/Grand Boulevard/Kendrew Crescent intersection have been become operational.**
  - (b) The parking bay/s, driveway/s and points of ingress and egress to be designed in accordance with the Australian Standard for Off-street Car parking (AS2890) unless otherwise specified by this approval. Such areas are to be constructed, sealed, drained, marked and thereafter maintained to the satisfaction of the Manager Approvals, Planning & Environmental Services prior to the development first being occupied.**
  - (c) A minimum of twelve (12) disabled car parking bay(s) being provided and located convenient to the pedestrian pathways, to the satisfaction of the Manager Approvals, Planning & Environmental Services.**
  - (d) The dual use path that is proposed to join the car parking area from the western side to the existing northwest development, shall be modified and extended around the northern and eastern perimeters of the car park, as marked in RED on the approved plans, to the satisfaction of the Manager Approvals, Planning & Environmental Services.**
  - (e) A pedestrian path along the central car park access road being provided, as marked in RED on the approved plans, to allow a central access for all users of the proposed car parking area to the satisfaction of the Manager Approvals, Planning & Environmental Services.**

- (f) Installation of lighting in the car parking areas to deter theft and anti social behaviour shall be provided to the satisfaction of the Manager Approvals, Planning & Environmental Services.
- (g) Any floodlighting being designed in accordance with Australian Standards for the Control of Obtrusive Effects of Outdoor Lighting (AS4282) and shall be where possible internally directed to not overspill into nearby lots or the road reserve.
- (h) The applicant shall submit plans and details illustrating an onsite stormwater drainage system or alternative discharge treatment system with the capacity to contain a 1:100 year storm of a 24-hour duration. The proposed stormwater drainage system or alternative discharge treatment system is required to be approved by the City prior to the commencement of any site works and thereafter maintained to the satisfaction of the Manager Approvals, Planning & Environmental Services.
- (i) The lodging of detailed landscape plans, to the satisfaction of the Manager Approvals, Planning & Environmental Services, prior to any site works commencing.
- (j) The car parking area shall be provided with one shade tree for every four 4 bays prior to the development first being occupied. The trees shall be located within tree wells protected from damage by vehicles and maintained to the satisfaction of the Manager Approvals, Planning & Environmental Services.
- (k) Landscaping and reticulation to be established in accordance with the approved plans prior to the development first being utilised and thereafter maintained to the satisfaction of the Manager Approvals, Planning & Environmental Services.
- (l) The pedestrian pathways, landscaping areas, parking areas and/or associated access ways shall not be used storage (temporary or permanent) and/or display and/or be obstructed in any way at any time, without the prior approval of the Manager Approvals, Planning & Environmental Services.
- (m) Retaining walls are to be provided where the angle of natural repose of the soil cannot be maintained. Drawn details, signed by a practising Structural Engineer, must be submitted for Council's Planning Approval in addition to the Building Licence, prior to construction.

*Appendix 8 refers*

To access this attachment on electronic document, click here: [Attach8brf130905.pdf](#)

**ITEM 11**                    **CLOSE OF ADVERTISING FOR AMENDMENT NO 29 TO DISTRICT PLANNING SCHEME NO 2 TO REZONE FROM 'COMMERCIAL' TO 'RESIDENTIAL' AND AMEND THE DENSITY CODE FROM R20 TO R40: LOT 674 (107) EDDYSTONE AVENUE, CNR PERILYA ROAD, CRAIGIE – [83567]**

**WARD:**                    Pinnaroo

**RESPONSIBLE**            Mr David Djulbic (Acting Director)  
**DIRECTOR:**              Planning and Community Development

---

**PURPOSE**

The purpose of this report is for the Council to consider submissions received during the advertising period and to consider adopting as final, Amendment No 29 to District Planning Scheme No 2 (DPS2) without modification.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

Lot 674 (107) Eddystone Avenue, corner Perilya Road, Craigie is currently zoned 'Commercial', with a density code of R20. Amendment No 29 proposes to rezone the lot to 'Residential' and apply a density code of R40 (Attachments 1 & 2) to facilitate the future development of eight grouped dwellings upon the lot (Attachment 3).

Council at its meeting on 26 April 2005 (CJ077-04/05) resolved to initiate Amendment No 29 to DPS 2 for public advertising. The advertising period closed on 17 August 2005 and a total of seven (7) submissions were received, four (4) of which supported the proposal and three (3) of which objected.

The current 'Commercial' zoning allows the Council to consider grouped dwelling developments as a discretionary ('D') use under clause 6.6.2 of DPS2, however, any residential development would be anticipated to be a component of the commercial development of the site. Rezoning the land to 'Residential' will allow future grouped dwelling development on the subject lots to be considered as a permitted ('P') use under DPS2.

The objections raised have been addressed in the Schedule of Submissions (Attachment 5). Several of the points raised in the objection relate to potential conflicts that may arise with the existing shopping centre. It is noted that the existing shopping centre adjoins a residential area, and the shopping centre is required to operate according to the required environmental standards in regard to noise and odour emissions.

The development of residential dwellings will assist in maximising use of public transport and other community facilities that are available in close proximity to the site. This promotes environmental and economic sustainability. The proposed land use is considered to be compatible with adjoining and surrounding uses.



It is therefore recommended that Council grant final approval to Amendment 29 to DPS2 as follows:

*That Council:*

- 1 *Pursuant to Town Planning Regulations 17(2) ADOPTS Amendment No 29 to the City of Joondalup's District Planning Scheme No. 2 without modification for the purposes of rezoning Lot 674 (107) Eddystone Avenue from 'Commercial' to 'Residential' and recode from R20 to R40;*
- 2 *AUTHORISES the affixation of the Common Seal and to endorse the signing of the amendment documents;*
- 3 *NOTES the submissions received and advise the submitters of the Council;*
- 4 *ADVISES the applicant that the concept plan submitted with the Amendment is not endorsed at this time, and will require the submission of development application. The development application will be required to adequately address the interface between the subject site and the shopping centre site.*

## **BACKGROUND**

**Suburb/Location:** Lot 674 (107) Eddystone Avenue, Craigie  
**Applicant:** Joe Conway, Director Conway Projects  
**Owner:** Family Holdings Pty Ltd  
**Zoning:** **DPS:** Commercial  
**MRS:** Urban

A service station was constructed on the site in 1978 and was operated until 2001. Demolition of the building and structures took place in August 2002, after preliminary investigation and environmental assessment had been undertaken.

To the east of the site, on the opposite side of Eddystone Avenue, a lot has recently been rezoned from 'Mixed Use' to 'Residential' and the density code amended from R20 to R40 to facilitate the future development of fourteen (14) grouped dwellings. A development application for the site was approved by Council at its 2 August 2005 meeting.

Amendment 29 was considered by Council at its meeting on 26 April 2005 (CJ077-04/05). The resolution was as follows:

- 1 *Pursuant to section 7 of the Town Planning and Development Act 1928, ADOPTS Amendment No 29 to the City of Joondalup District Planning Scheme No 2 to rezone Lot 674 (107) Eddystone Avenue, Craigie from 'Commercial' with a density code of R20 to 'Residential' with a density code of R40, for the purposes of advertising for a period of 42 days;*
- 2 *Prior to the advertising period commencing, FORWARDS the proposed amendment to the Environmental Protection Authority in order to decide if an environmental review of the site is required.*

IT Environmental was commissioned by Shell Engineering to conduct soil validation at the former Shell Craigie service station site. The conclusion was that the site has been fully remediated and is now suitable for alternative land uses. The proposed amendment was also referred to the Environmental Protection Authority (EPA), who subsequently advised that the proposal did not require an environmental assessment

## **DETAILS**

### **Issues and Options considered:**

The proposed amendment applies to lot 674 (107) Eddystone Avenue, cnr Perilya Rd, Craigie and is sought to facilitate the residential development of eight (8) single storey grouped dwellings.

The applicant seeks to rezone the land to 'Residential' so that future grouped dwelling development upon the site is a permitted use. The applicant also seeks to increase the residential density code applicable to the land from R20 to R40.

Under the current coding a maximum of four (4) dwellings could be accommodated. Under the proposed density a maximum of nine (9) dwellings could be accommodated, however the indicative development submitted by the applicant shows eight (8) grouped dwellings.

The indicative development plan shows the development of single storey dwellings, which will front both Eddystone Avenue and Perilya Road. The relationship between the subject site and the shopping centre site will be addressed through the design of the units, and will include windows on the west wall of the dwellings and appropriate uniform fencing.

Council has the following options when considering the proposal:

- Adopt the proposed amendment to DPS2 without modifications.
- Adopt the proposed amendment to DPS2 with modifications
- Refuse the proposed amendment to DPS2

In all the above options, the proposal is then forwarded to the Western Australian Planning Commission for determination.

### **Link to Strategic Plan:**

The proposal supports objective 3.3.1 of the City's Plan 2003 – 2008 that seeks to 'continue to meet changing democratic needs'. Strategy 3.3.1 is also important in that the proposal seeks to provide residential living choices, through an increase in residential density applicable to the land.

### **Legislation – Statutory Provisions:**

The Town Planning and Development Act 1928 enables local authorities to amend a Town Planning Scheme.

Under provision 17(2) of the Regulations, Council is required to consider all submissions received during the advertising period. After considering all submissions the Council can either resolve to not proceed with the amendment or adopt the amendment, with or without modifications.

### **Sustainability implications:**

The rezoning will facilitate the development of eight (8) medium density dwellings. The development of medium density housing is considered appropriate given the location of the subject site in close proximity to the Craigie Plaza Shopping Centre and community facilities. The development may increase the number of people living within walking distance of the shopping centre by providing additional housing choices and an increased density and will assist in providing greater patronage. This accords with strategy 3.3.1 'Provide Residential

Living Choices' of the City's Strategic Plan and the state government policy – Liveable Neighbourhoods Community Design Code.

### **Consultation:**

The proposed amendment was advertised for a period of 42 days from 6 July 2004 to 17 August 2005. Advertising was in the form of a sign erected on site, adjoining landowners being notified in writing and advertisements placed in the West Australian (6 July 2005) and the local newspaper (7 July 2005). The proposal was also placed on the Council website.

Upon closure of public advertising a total of seven (7) submissions were received, three (3) of which were considered objections to the proposed amendment, three of which were from government agencies who had no objection and the remaining one (1) submission supported the proposed amendment.

### **COMMENT**

The proposed amendment would facilitate future residential development, which would be in a built form that is complementary to surrounding existing residential development. Approval of the proposed amendment will facilitate the provision of residential living choices in accordance with the City's Strategic Plan. Although a concept plan has been submitted, this plan is not endorsed at this stage and will be subject to a development application. It is appropriate to advise the applicant that the interface between the subject site and the shopping centre site will need to be satisfactorily addressed.

It is anticipated that the Craigie Plaza Shopping Centre will benefit from additional patronage as a result of the subject site being developed for residential purposes by creating additional demand for local retail services. The development of lots for residential purposes is expected to take advantage of the existing bus service, community services and retail facilities that are available in close proximity to the site, which promotes environmental and economic sustainability.

Several of the points raised in objection to the proposed amendment relate to the issues that may arise given the location of the existing shopping centre and tavern. It is noted that the existing shopping centre and tavern currently adjoin a residential area. While the proposed rezoning will introduce additional dwellings in the vicinity of these commercial uses, this in itself would be difficult to justify as a reason for not supporting the rezoning, given the location of existing residential areas. Both the shopping centre and tavern are required to operate according to the required environmental standards in regard to noise and odour emissions.

With respect to traffic issues the current zoning of the land allows the City to consider land uses that may have a higher traffic generating capability, compared to a relatively low traffic generating residential use sought under the proposed amendment.

It is recommended that the amendment be granted final approval without modification and the documents be subsequently endorsed and submitted to the WAPC for recommendation to the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure to grant final approval.

### **ATTACHMENTS**

|              |  |
|--------------|--|
| Attachment 1 | Proposed Amendment No 29 to District Planning Scheme No 2 Zoning Map |
| Attachment 2 | Proposed Amendment No 29 to District Planning Scheme No 2 R Code Map |
| Attachment 3 | Indicative site plan for future 8 grouped dwelling development       |
| Attachment 4 | Town Planning Scheme Amendment process flow chart                    |

Attachment 5            Schedule of Submissions

## **VOTING REQUIREMENTS**

Simple majority

## **RECOMMENDATION**

### **That Council:**

- 1        Pursuant to Town Planning Regulations 17(2) ADOPTS Amendment No 29 to the City of Joondalup's District Planning Scheme No. 2 without modification for the purposes of rezoning Lot 674 (107) Eddystone Avenue from 'Commercial' to 'Residential' and recode from R20 to R40;**
- 2        AUTHORISES the affixation of the Common Seal and to endorse the signing of the amendment documents;**
- 3        NOTES the submissions received and advise the submitters of the Council decision;**
- 4        ADVISES the applicant that the concept plan submitted with the Amendment is not endorsed at this time, and will require the submission of development application. The development application will be required to adequately address the interface between the subject site and the shopping centre.**

*Appendix 9 refers*

*To access this attachment on electronic document, click here: [Attach9brf130905.pdf](#)*

**ITEM 12**                      **FOUR COMMERCIAL TENANCIES AND FOUR GROUPE  
DWELLINGS - LOT 519 (27) DAVIDSON TERRACE  
(NORTHEAST CNR REID PROMENADE) JOONDALUP –  
[76521]**

**WARD:**                              Lakeside

**RESPONSIBLE  
DIRECTOR:**                      Mr David Djulbic (Acting Director)  
   Planning & Community Development

---

**PURPOSE**

To request the Council's determination of an application for planning approval for a development containing four commercial tenancies and four grouped dwellings in the Central Business District of the City Centre.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The application is for a two storey development on the north-east corner of Davidson Terrace and Reid Promenade within the Central Business District (CBD) of the Joondalup City Centre. The development includes four commercial tenancies at ground floor level and four upper storey grouped dwellings.

The proposed 4 residential dwellings are located at first floor level above the commercial tenancies and therefore, the proposed residential units are defined as group dwellings.

There are no specific residential density requirements in the Central Business District. Clause 4.2.4 of the text to Council's District Planning Scheme No 2 (DPS2) indicates that unless otherwise specified on the Scheme Map, the R-20 density applies unless Council determines that a higher density coding should apply. The proposed density of development is approximately R36.

Council discretion is requested under clause 4.2.4 of the District Planning Scheme No. 2 for a residential density coding of R40 to be applied to the site in lieu of R20. Based on the standards for R40, variation to the Codes is required for each of the proposed dwellings to be provided with a balcony having a minimum area of 10m<sup>2</sup> in lieu of providing an outdoor living area of 20m<sup>2</sup>.

The proposed development is smaller in scale and bulk than other surrounding developments, however, the proposed development does meet the objectives for this locality. Therefore, it is recommended that the application for planning approval be granted.

**BACKGROUND**

**Suburb/Location:**      Joondalup City Centre  
**Applicant:**                      Mark Anthony Design  
**Owner:**                              Kotisan Pty Ltd  
**Zoning:**                      **DPS:** Centre  
   **MRS:** Urban  
**Strategic Plan:**              Joondalup City Centre Development Plan and Manual

The development site, which is currently vacant, is located on the corner of Davidson Terrace and Reid Promenade within the Central Business District of the Joondalup City Centre. To the east of the site on Reid Promenade is a three storey multiple unit residential development and to the north on Davidson Terrace is a five-storey development (currently under construction) with commercial at ground level and multiple dwellings above. Across Reid Promenade, the corner site has been approved for the temporary use of the site as a garden centre and diagonally across Davidson Terrace is a vacant site. On the north western corner of Reid and Davidson Terrace is a landscaped car parking area.

The proposed development consists of four commercial tenancies at ground level and four group dwelling units at the first floor. Three of the residential units have 3 bedrooms and one unit with 2 bedrooms, all units have balconies that overlook the street or the rear parking area.

Development standards contained within the JCCDPM;

| Standard                 | Required   | Provided                  |
|--------------------------|--|---------------------------|
| Front Setback            | 0m   | 0m                        |
| Side Setback             | As per BCA*  | 0m                        |
| Secondary setback street | 0m   | 0m                        |
| Plot Ratio               | 1.0 1102m <sup>2</sup> maximum   | 0.79 (848m <sup>2</sup> ) |
| Height                   | 13.5m at street frontage   | 9.0m maximum              |
| Parking                  | 1 bay per 30m <sup>2</sup> Net lettable area (Commercial) and 1 bay per dwelling (Residential) = total parking bays 17 | 17 Parking Bays provided  |

## DETAILS

### Link to Strategic Plan:

The proposed development is consistent with the City's Strategic Plan 2003 – 2008 by providing a range of commercial and residential accommodation that contributes to a vibrant City Centre and community.

### Legislation – Statutory Provisions:

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 4.2.3, 4.2.4, 4.5 and 6.8 of the DPS2 apply:

*4.2.3 Unless otherwise provided for in the Scheme the development of land for any of the residential purposes dealt with by the Residential Planning Codes shall conform to the provisions of those Codes.*

*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.*

#### *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.*

**Risk Management considerations:**

Not applicable

**Financial/Budget Implications:**

Not applicable

**Policy implications:**

Not applicable

**Regional Significance:**

The proposed development is located within the Central Business District of the Joondalup City Centre. The Joondalup City Centre is planned to be a multi-functional centre, which provides a range of services and opportunities for the residents of the north-west Corridor.

**Sustainability implications:**

The proposed mixed use development has the potential to contribute to a multi-functional city centre and therefore contribute to sustainable development within the City of Joondalup.

**Consultation:**

The proposed development was not advertised as the form and scale of the development is consistent with other similar developments within the CBD and is expected under the provisions of the JCCDPM.

**COMMENT**Land Use

The proposal provides for both residential dwellings and commercial/office space, and as such, the proposed uses comply with the preferred uses identified within the CBD under the JCCDPM. The proposal provides four (4) office or commercial tenancy of varying sizes. In this form, the space is flexible enough in the future to accommodate other permitted uses under the JCCDPM, including retail, entertainment and restaurant/café.

Residential Density

There are no specific residential density requirements in the designated General City Use area within CBD of the Joondalup City Centre. Clause 4.2.4 of the DPS2 specifies that unless otherwise specified on the Scheme Map the R-20 density applies until Council determines that a higher density coding should apply for that site. The proposal has an equivalent density of R36. Given that there is no such density coding as R36 is specified in the Residential Design Codes 2002, it is considered that a density coding of R40 is appropriate for the purpose of assessing the residential component of the development. A



residential density of R40 is a lower residential density than the two adjoining developments on Davidson Terrace and Reid Promenade.

It is recommended that Council determine that the proposed density at R-40 in lieu of R20 is considered to be appropriate given that the site is in a prominent location within the City Centre, where higher densities are appropriate and encouraged.

#### R-Codes Requirements for Group Housing R-40

Clause 4.2.3 of DPS2 requires that unless otherwise provided for in the Scheme the development of land for any of the residential purposes dealt with by the Residential Design Codes shall conform to the provisions of those Codes.

The JCCPDM does not specify development requirements for group housing development within the General City land use area of the CBD. For the purpose of determining the application the development standards of R40 as detailed in the R-Codes have been applied.

Development standards (R-40) for group dwellings contained within the R-Codes;

| <b>Standard</b> | <b>Required</b>                      | <b>Provided</b>   |
|-----------------|--------------------------------------|---|
| Open space      | 45%                                  | 54.9%   |
| Outdoor living  | 20m <sup>2</sup>                     | Unit A – 6.38m <sup>2</sup><br>Unit B – 10.52m <sup>2</sup><br>Unit C - 14.27m <sup>2</sup><br>Unit D – 7.5m <sup>2</sup> |
| Storerooms      | 1 per dwelling, 4m <sup>2</sup> area | 1 per dwelling, 4m <sup>2</sup>   |

#### Outdoor Living Areas

The Residential Design Codes defines Outdoor Living Area:

The area external to a Single House or Grouped Dwelling to be used in conjunction with that dwelling such that it is capable of active or passive use but excludes any area with a dimension of less than one metre minimum dimension or which, by reason of its development or topography, is not readily accessible from the dwelling.

The performance criteria of clause 3.4.2 of the R-Codes for outdoor living areas requires an outdoor area capable of use in conjunction with a habitable room of the dwelling, and if possible, open to the winter sun.

The proposed residential units by the definition contained in the R-Codes are considered as group dwellings by virtue of the fact that there is no residential dwelling either above or below. This aside, the design of the development with commercial at ground level and residential units at first floor requires that the provision of open space is by way of a balcony for each residential unit. This design is compatible with the intent of preferred development within the Joondalup CBD.

The 4 residential group dwellings have balconies that are accessible from a living area. The balconies of units C and D are open to the winter sun. The balconies of units A and B are not directly open to the winter sun but in this instance it is considered appropriate to have the balconies situated on the southern side of the building to provide visual surveillance of the public street. It is considered that the proposed balconies meet the performance criteria of clause 3.4.2 of the Residential Design Codes 2002.

Clause 3.4.3 of the R-Codes – requires multiple dwellings to be provided with at least one balcony opening directly from a habitable room and with a minimum dimension of 2m and a

minimum area of 10m<sup>2</sup>. By definition, the proposed dwellings are classed as group dwellings, the actual design of the residential units are in keeping with multiple dwellings, which would require the provision of a balcony. Each of the 4 group dwellings have a balcony but units A and D have balconies with areas less than 10m<sup>2</sup>. It is considered that the design of these units can be altered to provide a combined balcony area to each unit of 10m<sup>2</sup>.

It is recommended that the Council exercises discretion under clause 3.4.2 of the R-Codes and determine that a balcony for each group dwelling meets the performance criteria for outdoor living areas and impose a condition of planning approval that requires units A and D to have a combined minimum balcony area of 10m<sup>2</sup>.

### 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 commercial and residential units comply with the required nil front setback. Essentially, the design promotes the interaction between the commercial tenancies and the adjoining public streets creating animated spaces at a human scale. The design of the development also includes awning over entrances to the development. Awnings over the public street are encouraged as they provide shelter for pedestrians.

The proposed zero setback to the corner site at Davidson Terrace and Reid Promenade 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 commercial units

### Landscaping

The proposed awnings will interfere with three of the existing street trees. One of the trees on Davidson Terrace is dying and will be replaced. The two trees on Reid Promenade are to be relocated or a mature replacement tree is to be provided at the expense of the owner/applicant. It is also recommended that the owner/applicant provide one shade tree within the rear parking area.

### **Conclusion**

The design of the development articulates the street corner and has facades at ground level that address both Davidson Terrace and Reid Promenade. Entrances to the development include awnings that provide shelter to pedestrians. The design and land uses of the proposed development with commercial at ground level and residential units at first floor meets the objectives of the JCCDPM. The scale of the building, while smaller than the two adjoining sites is consistent with other existing one and two storey developments along Davidson Terrace and Reid Promenade.

The proposed development will be a positive addition to the City Centre. It will provide residential accommodation and commercial space to meet the future demands of the growing City Centre. The residential density of R-40 is considered appropriate in this instance. It is therefore recommended that the development application be approved, subject to appropriate conditions.

## ATTACHMENTS

|              |                   |
|--------------|-------------------|
| Attachment 1 | Location Plan     |
| Attachment 2 | Aerial photo      |
| Attachment 3 | Development plan  |
| Attachment 4 | Colour Elevations |
| Attachment 5 | Site photos       |

## VOTING REQUIREMENTS

Simple Majority

## RECOMMENDATION

### That Council:

- 1 **EXERCISES** discretion under clauses 4.2.4, of District Planning Scheme No 2 and determine that the equivalent development density of R-40 in lieu of R-20 is appropriate in this instance;
- 2 **EXERCISES** discretion under clauses 2.3.4 of the Residential design codes 2002 and 4.2.3 of District Planning Scheme No 2 and determines that the performance criteria of clause 3.4.3 of the R-Codes has been met and balconies with a minimum area of 10m<sup>2</sup> in lieu of outdoor living of 20m<sup>2</sup> is acceptable in this instance;
- 3 **APPROVES** the application for planning approval dated 13 June 2005 submitted by Mark Anthony Design for 4 commercial tenancies and 4 grouped dwellings on the proposed Lot 519 (27) Davidson Terrace, Joondalup subject to the following conditions:
  - (a) Units D and A to have a minimum combined balcony area of 10m<sup>2</sup> for each unit.
  - (b) Parking bay 17 as shown red on the approved plan is to have a minimum width of 2800mm in accordance with the Australian Standards.
  - (c) Two shade trees on Reid Promenade that conflict with the proposed awnings as shown in red on the approved plans are to be relocated or replaced with a mature tree at the expense of the owner/applicant. The applicant is to liaise with the City's Operations Services in relation to the relocation of the street trees.
  - (d) The gradient between the disabled parking bay and the building entrance at rear to be a maximum of 5%.
  - (e) 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)
  - (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 (d) 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) Obscured or reflective glazing shall not be used at the ground level.
- (l) Any advertising signage shall be subject to a new 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 It is advised that the City will not support the erection of telecommunications infrastructure on any part of the proposed building.
- 3 In relation to condition (e) disabled toilet facilities will be required for all commercial units. The doorway to the foyer and unit 2 will need to open outwards but not encroach beyond the boundaries of the lot.
- 4 Windows within 3 metres of a boundary are to be fire rated in accordance with the provisions of the Building Codes of Australia.

*Appendix 10 refers*

To access this attachment on electronic document, click here: [Attach10brf130905.pdf](#)

**ITEM 13                      DEDICATION OF PORTION OF OCEAN REEF ROAD, OCEAN REEF – [07131]****WARD:** Marina**RESPONSIBLE DIRECTOR:** Mr David Djulbic (Acting Director)  
Planning and Community Development

---

**PURPOSE**

Council is requested to support dedication of a portion of road currently being constructed that forms part of Ocean Reef Road, but which has not been formally dedicated as road reserve.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

As part of the extension of Ocean Reef Road a dedication is now required for a portion of road between Hodges Drive and Resolute Way (Attachment 1 & 2). The portion of Ocean Reef Road to the north of Resolute Way and to the south of Hodges Drive is already dedicated.

The dedication of the land is an administrative function and does not have any significant impacts for the City of Joondalup.

*It is therefore recommended that Council APPROVES the dedication of the land, as detailed and contained in Attachment 1 to this Report as road under Section 56 of the Land Administration Act.*

**BACKGROUND**

**Suburb/Location:** Ocean Reef Road  
**Applicant:** City of Joondalup  
**Zoning:** **DPS:** Regional Reserve – Parks and Recreation, Residential  
**MRS:** Urban, Parks and Recreation

**DETAILS****Issues and options considered:**

A portion of Ocean Reef Road, between Hodges Drive and Resolute Way has not been dedicated. The road to the north of Resolute Way and south of Hodges Drive has already been dedicated.

As part of the Ocean Reef Road extension (reports CJ075-04/05 and CJ303-12/04 refers) a dedication is now required.

The land has always been set aside for road reserve, and as the road is now currently under construction it is required to be dedicated.

The City is currently carrying out construction works on this road and it is envisaged that the road will be open to the public in October 2005.

**Link to Strategic Plan:**

This policy aligns with the objectives and strategies of the City's Strategic Plan which regard to continuing to facilitate the changing needs of the community, and to provide integrated transport to meet regional and local needs.

**Legislation – Statutory Provisions:**

A dedicated road reserve is one that has been created by lawful process, whether by approval of a plan creating the road, or by publication in the government Gazette or State Newspaper of a notice of dedication, or by registration against Crown Land Title of an order declaring that the land had been set aside for such purposes.

In this situation a resolution is required to dedicate the land as public road in accordance with Section 56 of the Land Administration Act.

**Risk Management considerations:**

There are no risk management considerations.

**Financial/Budget Implications:**

There are no further financial or budget implications.

**Policy implications:**

There are no policy implications.

**Regional Significance:**

There are no regional significance implications for the proposal.

**Sustainability implications:**

The proposed road extension will enable better connectivity and community interaction.

**Consultation:**

The community has been involved in a consultation process for that section of road currently being constructed (CJ303-12/04 refers).

**COMMENT**

The portion of Ocean Reef Road has not formally been dedicated as road reserve. As part of the extension of Ocean Reef Road the portion road between Hodges Drive and Resolute Way is now required to be dedicated.

**ATTACHMENTS**

|              |  |
|--------------|--|
| Attachment 1 | Location Plan of land to be dedicated as road reserve. |
| Attachment 2 | Site Plan of road reserve                              |

**VOTING REQUIREMENTS**

Simple Majority

**RECOMMENDATION**

**That Council APPROVES the dedication of the land, as detailed and contained in Attachment 1 to this Report as road under Section 56 of the Land Administration Act.**

*Appendix 11 refers*

*To access this attachment on electronic document, click here: [Attach11brf130905.pdf](#)*

**ITEM 14                                    PROPOSED TWO STOREY DEVELOPMENT OF THIRTY SIX  
MULTIPLE DWELLINGS PLUS BASEMENT CAR PARKING  
AREA – LOT 251 (5) EASTLEIGH LOOP CURRAMBINE –  
[38659]**

**WARD:**                                    North Coastal

**RESPONSIBLE                            Mr David Djulbic (Acting Director)  
DIRECTOR:**                            Planning and Community Development

---

**PURPOSE**

To request Council's determination of an application for planning approval for the development of thirty six multiple dwellings at Lot 251 (5) Eastleigh Loop, Currambine.

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The development site is located at 5 Eastleigh Loop Currambine. The lot has a land area of 4707m<sup>2</sup> and is zoned Residential with a density coding of R80 under the City of Joondalup District Planning Scheme No 2 (DPS2). Apart from the adjoining sites that are reserved under the Metropolitan Region Scheme, all other immediate land uses are low-density single residential developments, even though the land is zoned Residential and coded R80.

The site is adjacent to the Currambine rail station and carpark to the north, the rail reserve to the east, Paddington Street to the west and Eastleigh Loop to the south (see Attachment 1).

The applicant proposes to construct three two storey buildings consisting of thirty six multiple dwellings with the majority of parking available in the basement parking area. Multiple dwellings are a discretionary land use within the Residential zone.

The applicant has sought discretion under the performance criteria of the R-Codes and DPS2 including variations to:

- side setbacks,
- building height threshold limits,
- open space,
- car parking and
- cone of vision.

The majority of these variations occur within the site or adjacent to non-residential properties.

Submissions in relation to the development have been received, including a petition signed by 44 people.

The development is required to be determined by Council as the number of multiple dwellings proposed (thirty six) is beyond the delegation limits set out in the Notice of Delegation (ten multiple dwellings).

The proposed development complies with the allocated density coding for the area and will assist in meeting key objectives of the Strategic Plan. It will contribute to the diversity of housing choice, help create employment opportunities and support the local economy. Additionally, it will promote passive surveillance of the Currambine rail and parking facility and adjacent residential streets.



Having regard to the submissions received and the provisions of the DPS2, R-Codes and other relevant documents, it is recommended that the application for planning approval be granted, subject to appropriate conditions.

## BACKGROUND

|                         |                               |
|-------------------------|-------------------------------|
| <b>Suburb/Location:</b> | Currambine                    |
| <b>Applicant:</b>       | Dryka and Partners Architects |
| <b>Owner:</b>           | Currambine Gardens Pty Ltd    |
| <b>Zoning:</b>          | <b>DPS:</b> Residential R80   |
|                         | <b>MRS:</b> Urban             |

The property is situated adjacent to the “Park n’ Ride” carpark and Currambine rail station to the north, the rail reserve to the east, Paddington Street to the west and Eastleigh Loop to the south (see Attachment 1). The City of Joondalup District Planning Scheme No 2 (DPS2) zoning for the subject site and surrounding residential lots is Residential R80.

The density coding of the land at R80 is in keeping with the Western Australian Planning Commission’s Policy No DC 1.6 Development Near Metropolitan Rapid Transit Stations – Amended 1992 (WAPC DC 1.6), which aims to ensure that provision is made in subdivision design for public transport services.

The land was given a density code of R80 in 1991 after negotiations with the State Government for the subdivision of the land. The then City of Wanneroo proposed, as part of amendment No. 452 of Town Planning Scheme No. 1, to develop the subject land at a density of R40. The Department of Planning and Urban Development (Now Department for Planning and Infrastructure) consented to the amendment subject to some modifications, including a requirement to code the subject land at a density of R80.

In subsequent years, due to market forces, the development of the land occurred at a much lower density, resulting in the predominantly single residential nature of the area as it is today.

In 2003 both the Council and the Western Australian Planning Commission (WAPC) did not support an application for strata subdivision of the subject site into 14 lots, as it was considered that the proposal could not meet the density requirements of WAPC DC 1.6.

The WAPC and City of Joondalup subsequently received and supported a subdivision of the lot into three separate lots. The WAPC indicated that the subdivision into three lots ‘*preserves the ability to develop the lots at a higher density, which should bring the scheme closer to satisfying the requirements of DC 1.6*’. The then owner did not complete the subdivision, and as such the lot remains as one single parcel of land.

|            |   |
|------------|---|
| 28/02/2005 | Current application received by Council.              |
| 30/03/2005 | Further information requested.                        |
| 27/04/2005 | Further information requested.                        |
| 27/04/2005 | Referral to Main Roads.                               |
| 16/05/2005 | Further information received including amended plans. |
| 16/05/2005 | Main Roads comments received.                         |
| 14/07/2005 | Public Transport Authority referral.                  |
| 14/07/2005 | Advertising commenced.                                |
| 20/07/2005 | Objection received.                                   |
| 20/07/2005 | Advertising sign placed on site.                      |
| 22/07/2005 | Objection received.                                   |
| 26/07/2005 | Objection received.                                   |
| 27/07/2005 | Objection received.                                   |
| 28/07/2005 | Four objections received.                             |

29/07/2005 No objection received.  
 29/07/2005 Two objections received.  
 29/07/2005 Advertising concluded.  
 28/07/2005 Public Transport Authority comments received.  
 03/08/2005 Advertising sign removed from site.  
 04/08/2005 Petition received.

## DETAILS

### Description of the development

The proposal consists of:

- 1 Three 2 storey buildings comprising thirty six multiple dwellings.
- 2 Each dwelling being three bedrooms, two bathrooms with living and dining areas leading out to either an alfresco area (ground floor) or balcony (first floor) overlooking the central open space or Eastleigh Loop.
- 3 Seventy-one (71) car parking bays. The parking allocation includes twenty-one dedicated single bays for units 1-21, 30 dedicated parking bays for units 22-36 (2 bays per unit), thirteen spare bays for residents and or visitors and 7 dedicated parking bays for visitors at street level.
- 4 The majority of parking is located beneath the ground floor, partially undercroft and partially underground due to the fall of the level of the site.
- 5 A central open space including a pool and spa area.
- 6 An open space area including a water feature.

### External variations

The following is a list of variations to the Acceptable Development criteria of the Residential Design Codes 2002 (R-Codes) and Council policies proposed in the application that affect the external boundaries of the subject site:

| <b>Wall Setback Variations</b>                                       | <b>Acceptable Development</b> | <b>Proposed</b> |
|--|-------------------------------|-----------------|
| Unit 3 (first floor) setback to Paddington Avenue                    | 4.6m                          | 4.0m            |
| Unit 3 (first floor) setback to north boundary – carparking facility | 4.8m                          | 3.5m            |
| Unit 36 (first floor) setback to east boundary – rail line           | 2.5m                          | 1.5m            |
| Unit 36 (first floor) setback to east boundary – rail line           | 2.5m                          | 1.5m            |

| <b>Cone of Vision Variations</b>   | <b>Acceptable Development</b> | <b>Proposed</b> |
|--|-------------------------------|-----------------|
| Unit 36 (first floor) to south boundary – adjoining residential property | 4.5m                          | 2.4m            |
| Unit 35 (first floor) to south boundary – adjoining residential property | 4.5m                          | 2.4m            |

| <b>Policy Variations</b>  | <b>Acceptable Development</b> | <b>Proposed</b> |
|---|-------------------------------|-----------------|
| Projection through the threshold limits of the City of Joondalup Policy 3.1.9 – Height and Scale of Buildings within a Residential Area – Units 1-8 | 8.5m                          | Max 9.8m        |

### Internal variations

The following is a list of variations to the Acceptable Development criteria of the Residential Design Codes 2002 (R-Codes) and Council policies included in the proposal that address the assumed internal boundaries of the site.

Setbacks between buildings within the lot are measured in accordance with Clause 3.3.1 A1(iii) of the R-Codes, which states that:

*‘Separate multiple dwelling buildings on the same site, or portions of the same multiple dwelling building, setback from each other as though there were a boundary between them’.*

| <b>Wall Setback Variations</b>              | <b>Acceptable Development</b> | <b>Proposed</b>           |
|---|-------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Unit 8 setback from unit 11 and vice versa  | 5.6m                          | 3.7m<br>(7.4m separation) |
| Unit 8 setback from unit 23 and vice versa  | 5.3m                          | 2.2m<br>(6.0m separation) |
| Unit 24 setback from unit 11 and vice versa | 5.3m                          | 1.5m<br>(5.0m separation) |

| <b>Cone of Vision Variations</b>   | <b>Acceptable Development</b> | <b>Proposed</b> |
|--|-------------------------------|-----------------|
| Units 2 & 4 balcony/alfresco to units 5 & 7 balcony/alfresco and vice versa    | 7.5m                          | 6.2m            |
| Units 6 & 8 balcony/alfresco to units 21 & 23 balcony/alfresco and vice versa  | 7.5m                          | 6m              |
| Units 22 & 24 balcony/alfresco to units 9 & 11 balcony/alfresco and vice versa | 7.5m                          | 5m              |

| <b>Open Space Variation</b> | <b>Acceptable Development</b> | <b>Proposed</b> |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|
| 4707m <sup>2</sup>          | 60% Open Space                | 54% Open Space  |

| <b>Parking Variation</b> | <b>Acceptable Development</b> | <b>Proposed</b> |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------|
| 36 Dwellings             | 75 Parking Bays               | 71 Parking Bays |

### **Issues and options considered:**

Council has the discretion to:

- Approve the application without conditions;
- Approve the application with conditions; or
- Refuse the application.

**Link to Strategic Plan:****The proposal will contribute to certain Key Focus Area Outcomes of City Development.**

The proposal will address Strategies 3.3.1 and 3.3.2, which seek to provide residential living choices and integrate plans to support community and business development.

It will address Strategy 3.4.1 and 3.4.2, which seek to advocate and facilitate the creation of transport linkages and align uses of land and modes of transport.

It will also address Strategy 3.5.2, which seeks to assist the facilitation of local employment opportunities by providing an increased population to frequent nearby commercial land uses.

In addition, the proposal links to State Planning Policy with regard to the WAPC DC 1.6, which seeks to encourage high-density accommodation varieties within reasonable walking and cycling distance of stations and public transport hubs and interchanges.

**Legislation – Statutory Provisions:**City of Joondalup District Planning Scheme No 2

Clause 3.3.2 describes a ‘D’ land use as a use which is not permitted, but to which Council may grant its approval after following the procedures laid down by sub-clause 6.6.2. The proposed development is a “D” use within the Residential Zone.

The following clauses are also relevant under the existing District Planning Scheme No 2:

**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;*
- (f) *such other matters as the Council considers relevant, whether of the same nature as the foregoing or otherwise.*

**Risk Management considerations:**

Not Applicable

**Financial/Budget Implications:**

Not Applicable

**Policy implications:**

The applications exceeds the City of Joondalup Policy 3.1.9 – Height and Scale of Buildings within a residential area threshold limit and as such, Council is required to consider this policy in relation to the proposed development.

**Regional Significance:**

Not Applicable

**Sustainability implications:**

The proposed development seeks to achieve sustainability by providing diversity of housing choice and density of housing adjacent to public transport nodes. This will be achieved through the utilisation of existing infrastructure.

**Consultation:**

Comments were sought in accordance the requirements of the R-Codes and DPS2 via letters and a sign placed on the site.

Letters were sent to 38 surrounding and adjoining owners likely to be impacted by the development, advising them of the proposed development, with plans and supporting documentation made available for perusal at the City's offices for two weeks from 14 July 2005 to 29 July 2005.

The signage placed on site was erected on 20 July 2005 and removed on 3 August 2005.

One letter of no objection and ten letters of objection have been received from adjacent and nearby owners with regard to the development. A petition, containing 44 signatures was also received as a late submission.

A summary of the submissions and responses to those submissions is shown below:

| <b>Objection/Comment</b>   | <b>Technical Comment</b>   |
|--|--|
| <p>The parking shortage may result in 'spill-over' parking along Paddington Avenue and Eastleigh Loop.</p> <p>Extra traffic calming measures should be considered e.g. roundabout where Eastleigh Loop joins Paddington Ave.</p>   | <p>The parking provided within the site meets the Performance Criteria of Clause 3.5.1 of the Residential Design Codes 2002.</p> <p>The existing traffic network was designed to accommodate density to Residential R80. The development proposes a lower density of approximately R76.</p>  |
| <p>There are too many units in the area</p> <p>There are too many rentals in the area.</p> <p>The application will increase traffic in Eastleigh Loop, which is unsafe, as the road has not been designed with the capacity for this development.</p> <p>The proposal will devalue properties within the immediate area.</p> <p>The units will encourage misconduct.</p> | <p>The immediate surrounding area is zoned to encourage high-density housing.</p> <p>The Council does not have control over whether dwellings are used on an owner-occupied or rental basis.</p> <p>The existing traffic network was designed to accommodate density to Residential R80. The development proposes a lower density of approximately R76.</p> <p>This is not a planning consideration and no evidence has been submitted to justify this conclusion.</p> <p>Misconduct is a civil matter and subject to civil law. The dwellings have been designed to promote passive surveillance of the surrounding area.</p> |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>The residents were told that the site would be used for an aged care facility.</p>  | <p>The subject site is zoned Residential R80. Various land use options are available to the owner.</p>   |
| <p>Opposed to access from Eastleigh Loop. Would prefer a solid wall to the Eastleigh Loop elevation.</p>   | <p>The development is proposed to address Eastleigh Loop with vehicular access from Eastleigh Loop. Access via Eastleigh Loop meets the relevant criteria.</p>   |
| <p>The proposed access and egress point directly affects my property.</p> <p>The proposed three-storey complex is repulsive.</p>   | <p>An assessment of the access and egress point has been done and the proposal meets the relevant criteria.</p> <p>The façade of the development appears as a two-storey development from the Eastleigh Loop frontage.</p>   |
| <p>High-density housing will encourage misconduct.</p> <p>The residents were told that the site would be used for an aged care facility.</p> <p>The proposal will devalue properties within the immediate area.</p> <p>The proposal will reduce privacy, safety and amenity.</p> <p>The application will increase traffic in Eastleigh Loop.</p> | <p>Misconduct is a civil matter and subject to civil law. The design of the dwellings promotes passive surveillance of the surrounding area.</p> <p>The subject site is zoned Residential R80. A number of land uses are discretionary at this site.</p> <p>This is not a planning consideration and no evidence has been submitted to justify this conclusion.</p> <p>The proposal has been assessed against the provisions of the Residential Design Codes 2002. The design of the dwellings promotes passive surveillance of the surrounding area. The discretions requested will be addressed later in this report.</p> <p>The existing traffic network was designed to accommodate density to Residential R80. The development proposes a lower density of approximately R76.</p> |
| <p>The proposal will affect our access to sunlight.</p> <p>The proposal will affect our privacy.</p> <p>The proposal will affect the amenity of the streetscape – being predominantly single housing.</p> <p>The residents were told that the site would be used for an aged care facility.</p>  | <p>The proposal meets the overshadowing provisions of Clause 3.9.1 of the R-Codes.</p> <p>The proposal has been assessed against the provisions of the R-Codes. The discretions requested will be addressed later in this report.</p> <p>The proposal meets the requirements of the Residential Design Codes 2002. The land is zoned Residential R80 to encourage diversity of housing types.</p> <p>The subject site is zoned Residential R80. Various land use options are available to the owner.</p>   |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p>The proposal will devalue properties within the immediate area.</p> <p>The proposal will affect the safety of the children who live and play in the street.</p>   | <p>This is not a planning consideration and no evidence has been submitted to justify this conclusion.</p> <p>The existing traffic network was designed to accommodate density to Residential R80. The development proposes a lower density of approximately R76.</p>  |
| <p>The parking shortage may result in verge parking along Paddington Avenue and Eastleigh Loop.</p> <p>The application will increase traffic in Eastleigh Loop.</p>  | <p>The parking provided within the site meets the Performance Criteria of Clause 3.5.1 of the Residential Design Codes 2002.</p> <p>The existing traffic network was designed to accommodate density to Residential R80. The development proposes a lower density of approximately R76.</p>  |
| <p>The proposal is too large a development in the suburb.</p>  | <p>The subject site is zoned Residential R80. Previous attempts to reduce the density have been refused at both local and state level.</p>   |
| <p>The residents were told that the site would be used for an aged care facility.</p>  | <p>The subject site is zoned Residential R80. Various land use options are available to the owner.</p>   |
| <p>The proposal does not meet the aims of the R-Codes.</p> <p>The proposal has not been designed to contribute to the social and built-form infrastructure of the local community.</p> <p>The proposal has an excessive number of units.</p> <p>The units will attract student and share accommodation and be over populated.</p> <p>The proposal will increase the quantity of traffic in the street.</p> <p>The scale, bulk and form of the development are out of character with the locality.</p> <p>The proposed height is unacceptable and does not have a sufficient roof form.</p> | <p>The proposal has been assessed against the relevant provisions of the R-Codes.</p> <p>The proposal meets the expected development of the subject site and appropriately addresses the existing infrastructure.</p> <p>The density of the development complies with the Acceptable Development provisions of the R-Codes.</p> <p>The Council does not have control over whether dwellings are used on an owner-occupied or rental basis.</p> <p>The existing traffic network was designed to accommodate density to Residential R80. The development proposes a lower density of approximately R76.</p> <p>The proposal meets the relevant provisions of the Residential Design Codes 2002.</p> <p>The proposal has been assessed against Council Policy 3.1.9 – Height and Scale of Building within a Residential Area. The discretions requested will be addressed later in this report.</p> |



|   |   |
|---|---|
| <p>The proposed setback variation to Paddington Avenue is not considered appropriate.<br/>The design is not responsive to the streetscape.</p>                        | <p>The setback provided meets the Performance Criteria of Clause 3.2.1 of the Residential Design Codes 2002.<br/>The proposal has been assessed against the relevant provisions of the R-Codes.</p> |
| <p>Petition (Late submission)<br/><br/>The petition does not comment on the application. Rather, it extends support for stopping the development in its entirety.</p> | <p>No technical objection was made. As such, no technical comment is given.</p>   |

The petition consisted of 44 signatures. Of the 44 signatures, 10 were multiples of signatures from individual properties, 6 had previously submitted individual objections, 5 were not the owner of the property objecting, and 10 signatures were not attributed to properties in the vicinity.

Of the remaining 13 signatures on the petition received from property owners reasonably affected by the proposal, 4 had received consultation letters and had not responded.

Comments were also sought in accordance the requirements of the DPS2 from external parties, being the Public Transport Authority and Main Roads WA.

The Public Transport Authority (PTA), owner of the adjacent rail reserve and carpark, and Main Roads WA, with regard to the freeway reserve, both indicated no objection to the proposal. Additionally, the PTA responded as follows:

*'The PTA welcomes developments of this nature as it encourages use of the public transport system.*

*Given that the freeway will be between the subject development and the rail reserve the PTA has no objections nor does it wish to impose any conditions at this time'*

## **COMMENT**

Multiple dwellings are a discretionary land use within the Residential zone. As such, it is a use that is not permitted but Council may grant its approval after following the procedures set out in subclause 6.6.2. The proposed land use would be in keeping with the objectives of the Residential Zone (Clause 3.4) of DPS2.

The proposed use (Multiple Dwellings) and density of the development comply with the acceptable development criteria of the R-Codes Clause 3.1.1 – Site Area Requirements. The R-Codes allow for a maximum density of 37.65 units, whilst the proposal includes 36 units. The location of the units is generally distanced from nearby residential properties, and where the units address the most immediately affected properties, the finished floor levels of the units are below street level.

## **Consideration Of Proposed Variations**

### Variations External to Development

The following identifies those variations that are considered likely to impact on the streetscape or adjoining properties.

### Design Element 2 - Streetscape

The primary street is considered to be Eastleigh Loop. Table 1 – General site requirements of the Residential Design Codes 2002 (RDC) requires a primary street setback average of 4 metres. The proposal meets this requirement as it has an average greater than 8 metres. It is considered that the proposal meets the acceptable development standards in this regard.

Under the R-Codes, the secondary street setback (Paddington Avenue) is required to meet the development standards of Table 2 and Element 3 of the R-Codes. Proposed unit three, which is on the first floor, has a setback requirement of 4.6 metres whereas the applicant is proposing a setback of 4 metres.

The required setback is a result of the length and height of the building. At this point of the development site, the proposed structure is at its highest due to the natural contour of the site and the proposed provision of a basement parking level. The variation is for a small portion of the building and additionally, an average greater than 4.6 metres is achieved for the frontage in its entirety.

The immediately adjacent lot is a carpark for the Currambine rail station. Directly opposite, residential properties address internal streets and the façade of these residences from Paddington Avenue is a solid brick estate wall (see attached photos). To the south, lots have been developed as single residential or grouped dwellings and are predominantly single storey. To the north, lots have been developed as single houses, grouped and multiple dwellings. Multiple dwellings addressing Currambine Boulevard are three storeys in height.

The setback variation is considered minor and will not significantly affect the amenity of the streetscape or privacy and open space of adjoining dwellings. As the proposed variation meets the relevant performance criteria, it is recommended that the setback variation to the secondary street be approved in this case.

### Design Element 3 – Boundary Setbacks

The proposal includes three setback variations to the external boundaries of the site.

A setback variation from Unit Three on the first floor of 3.5 metres in lieu of 4.8 metres is the result of the length and height of the wall at the northwest corner of the site. The variation also occurs due to the provision of a major opening from a bedroom at this point.

The windows facing out over the carpark will contribute to passive surveillance of the southern end of the carpark, which is currently screened from surveillance by dense shrubbery on the subject site. It is considered that the resultant surveillance will improve safety in this facility, a desired outcome also of WAPC Policy DC 1.6.

It is considered that the setback variation will not affect direct sunlight and ventilation or privacy to the subject site or adjoining property. The impact of building bulk on the carpark is minimal, and a setback of 3.5 metres is considered acceptable. Additionally, the proposal meets preferred surveillance outcomes of both Local and State Government Policies.

As the setback variation complies with the performance criteria of the R-Codes it is recommended that the variation be supported.

Two setback variations to the eastern boundary adjacent to the rail line are also proposed. In both cases the variation is for 1.5 metres in lieu of 2.5 metres and the variation is to the first floor (Unit Thirty-six) only.

It is considered that the setback variation will not affect direct sunlight and ventilation or privacy to the subject site or adjoining property. The affect of building bulk on the rail line is considered to be neutral and a setback of 1.5 metres is considered acceptable.

As the setback variation complies with the performance criteria of the R-Codes it is recommended that the variation be approved in this case.

#### Design Element 7 – Building Height

City of Joondalup DPS2 Policy 3.1.9 – Height and Scale of Buildings within a Residential Area (Policy 3.1.9) - overrides this Design Element of the R-Codes unless otherwise stated in a structure plan adopted by the Council. As such, Element 7 of the R-Codes is not a consideration in this case.

Policy 3.1.9 provides a threshold limit for building height for residential properties, beyond which, Council is required to consider the impact of such projection. The projection past this threshold limit has attracted an objection which requires consideration by Council.

The point at which the proposal projects through the building height threshold envelope is immediately adjacent to a non-residential site. Residential properties directly opposite the site on Paddington Avenue address Ghan Place and as such, the Paddington Avenue frontage is the rear property boundary of those sites. As such, the visual impact of the height variation to the properties on the opposite site of Paddington Avenue will be minimal.

Further, the level of the land falls from the Eastleigh Loop frontage to the north. Subsequently, the visual affect of the height projection is reduced from the Eastleigh Loop façade, with all parts of the building falling below the building height envelope from this point of view.

It is considered that there will not be any loss of views of significance due to the height of the structure. Additionally, that portion of the proposed development that is immediately adjacent to a residential property (at number 11 Eastleigh Loop) is partially below ground level and has the appearance of a two-storey building.

It is considered that the variations to building height Policy 3.1.9 are unlikely to cause excessive building bulk to any adjoining or nearby residential property, that the impact to residential properties is greatly reduced by the location of the projection and that the height of the development adjacent to a residential property is acceptable in a residential area.

In addition, the height of the development largely complies with the desired outcomes of Element 7 of the R-Codes, being that the proposal does not affect access to daylight, direct sun or views of significance.

It is recommended that the projection past the building height threshold be supported.

#### Design Element 8 – Privacy

The external variations occur from bedroom three of the first floor of unit numbers thirty-five and thirty-six. The overlooking is into the immediately adjacent property at 11 Eastleigh Loop, and falls within the rear yard of that property. The rear of the adjacent property is considered to be the active outdoor living area of the adjacent site, and as such the overlooking is considered unacceptable in this case.

It is recommended that the bedroom windows of these units be fixed and obscured or raised to a minimum sill height of 1.6 metres in order to protect the privacy of the adjoining property.

## **Variations Internal to Development**

The following identifies those variations that are considered likely to impact future residents of the proposed development.

The proposed storerooms located within the basement parking area are required under Australian Standards to have a travel distance no greater than 20 metres to a single exit. In this instance approximately half of the storerooms have a distance greater than 20 metres. It is considered that the design of the stores can be changed and that additional secure exit points can be created to accommodate this requirement. It is therefore recommended that Council include a special condition that stores shall not exceed the maximum travel distance to a single exits of 20 metres.

### Design Element 3 – Boundary Setbacks

Three internal setback variations are proposed. The setbacks are measured to internal units as if there were a boundary between them. The setback variations are between first floor units towards the centre of the site only. The units are generally offset so that the impact of the setback variation between units is minimised.

The configuration of the dwellings aids in the delineation of a private open space area for the development and allows for regular passive surveillance of the internal areas and the Eastleigh Loop frontage. Additionally, the configuration of the units allow for a greater streetscape setback average to be achieved whilst providing a more diverse streetscape appearance due to the angled positioning of the buildings.

Whilst the setback is measured as if there were an equidistant boundary between the two units, the physical separation between the units is generally acceptable. The greatest variation proposed is assessed as being 1.5 metres in lieu of 5.3 metres, whilst the physical separation of the units is a minimum of 5 metres. It is considered that the physical separation of the units is adequate separation, and as the variations do not limit access to sunlight, ventilation or privacy, the proposal is deemed to have met the performance criteria of the R-Codes.

As the setback variations comply with the performance criteria of the R-Codes it is recommended that the variation be approved in this case.

### Design Element 4 – Open Space

The proposal includes a variation to the requirements of the R-Codes with regard to open space provision. The R-Codes acceptable development provisions require 60% (2824.2m<sup>2</sup>) open space on R80 zoned lots (2824.2m<sup>2</sup> in this case). The applicant proposes 54% (2547m<sup>2</sup>).

The provision of basement parking in the proposal results in the majority of the open space provided being useable open space. With the exception of 7 visitors bays, the vehicular access way and a bin store area, all open space provided is useable outdoor area comprising a large communal open space area, a smaller water feature area and grassed and landscaped gardens.

The communal open space provides a pool, spa and cabana area. Twelve of the units have either direct access to this area, or overlook this area from private outdoor living areas. The open space complements the buildings, provides useable space for the future needs of residents with regard to the density and location of the development and the streetscape setbacks provide ample area for landscaping to allow attractive streetscapes.

Additionally, the property is within 200 metres of a large local park, contributing to the provision of active outdoor area available to residents of the development.

As the proposal meets the performance criteria of the R-Codes, and considering that the open space is predominantly useable outdoor area rather than carparking and the like, it is recommended that the variation to open space be approved in this case.

#### Design Element 5 – Access and Car Parking

The parking requirement for the proposed development is specified under clause 3.5.1 of the Residential Design Codes 2002. The parking requirement is as follows;

| <b>Parking Provision</b>   | <b>No of Bays Required</b>   | <b>No of Bays Provided</b>   |
|--|--|--|
| 0.35 spaces per dwelling plus 0.015 spaces per sqm of plot ratio area, to a maximum of two spaces per dwelling | 12.6 bays (0.35 per dwelling)<br>62.39 bays (0.015 spaces per sqm of plot ratio) | 64 bays dedicated to residential dwellings<br>7 spaces for visitor parking |
| <b>Total</b>   | <b>75 parking bays</b>   | <b>71 parking bays</b>   |

The applicant proposes seventy-one (71) parking bays in lieu of the required seventy-five (75) equating to an overall shortfall of 5.33% (or 4 car parking spaces).

The acceptable development standards of the R-Codes require that not less than 10% of the parking allocation be for the exclusive use of visitors. In this instance 10% would equate to 7.6 parking bays or 8 bays if rounded up. The applicant has provided 7 visitor parking bays at street level accessed via Eastleigh Loop.

Twenty one of the residential units have one dedicated parking bay and 15 of the units have 2 dedicated parking bays. In addition there are 13 parking bays that can be used by either residents of the units or visitors.

The R-Codes performance criteria refers directly to '*the location of the proposed development in relation to public transport and other facilities*' and '*the availability of on-street and other off-site parking*'.

The development is located immediately adjacent to Currambine rail station and associated car parking area. Having regard to the location of the major public transport station, it is reasonable to assume that a number of the units may be occupied by residents that have only one or no vehicles. All units have dedicated parking, 15 of the units have parking for two vehicles and there is an additional 20 bays (7 visitor bays and 13 bays not allocated) for use by either residents or visitors and the proximity of the adjoining railway station car parking area, it is considered that the demand for on-street parking will be minimal.

The single entry and egress point allows for travel in both directions as required by the R-Codes and is provided so as to minimise the number of vehicle crossovers for both safety and aesthetics.

The development proposes a security gate at the entry to the basement parking to provide for safe internal pedestrian travel within the development. Additionally, the basement parking conceals all parking from the street other than visitors bay as required by the R-Codes.

As the development complies with the performance criteria of the R-Codes, and the variation is considered minor, it is recommended that the parking variation be approved in this case.

### Design Element 8 – Privacy

The proposal includes three internal variations to Element 8 of the R-Codes.

The internal variations occur between the balconies/alfresco areas of the central and western most units. The proposed minimum separation is 5 metres in lieu of 7.5 metres. The units in question are offset, and as such overlooking is generally angled. Additionally, the areas being overlooked are generally quite visible from the communal open space area and the street.

It is considered that the separation of living areas and bedrooms internal to the units is in compliance with the acceptable development standards of the R-Codes and that the minor variations between the balconies are acceptable.

As the proposed internal cone of vision variations are in compliance with the performance criteria of the R-Codes, it is recommended that the internal cone of vision variations be approved in this case.

### Design Element 10 – Incidental Development

It is considered that the application generally complies with the requirement of Element 10. Where there is some ambiguity, it is recommended that conditions be placed on any planning consent.

In this regard, all stores will be conditioned to meet the minimum area of 4sqm, the bin store area will be required to meet all health requirements and all clothes drying facilities shall be required internally to the units or screened from the street and communal areas.

Additionally, any roof plant, external drainpipes, air-conditioning units, antennas and other external fixtures shall be required to be screened from the south and west boundary, and to a lesser extent to the north boundary.

## **CONCLUSION**

The Council is required to assess the proposed development against the City of Joondalup District Planning Scheme No 2, R-Codes and the Council's other relevant policies. Predominantly, the development complies with the acceptable development provisions of the R-Codes. The majority of variations proposed are immediately adjacent non-residential properties, meet all the relevant performance criteria of the R-Codes and are considered to have a minimal impact on adjacent residential properties.

The proposed development will assist in meeting key objectives of the Strategic Plan and State Planning Strategy and the objectives of the DPS2. It will contribute to the diversity of housing choice, help create employment opportunities and support the local economy.

Having regard to the:

- details of the application;
- the submissions received during the consultation process; and
- provisions of the District Planning Scheme No 2,

it is recommended that Council approve the application with conditions.

**ATTACHMENTS**

|              |  |
|--------------|--|
| Attachment 1 | Locality Plans                                       |
| Attachment 2 | Development Plans                                    |
| Attachment 3 | Photos   |
| Attachment 4 | Western Australian Planning Commission Policy No 1.6 |

**VOTING REQUIREMENTS**

Simple Majority

**RECOMMENDATION**

**That:**

- 1 Council EXERCISES discretion under clause 2.3.4 of the Residential Design Codes 2002 and determines that the performance criteria under clauses 3.3.1, 3.4.1, 3.5.1, 3.8.1 has been met and that;**
- (a) setback of 4 metres in lieu of 4.6 metres from Unit 3 to the west boundary.**
  - (b) setback of 3.5 metres in lieu of 4.8 metres from Unit 3 to the north boundary;**
  - (c) setback of 1.5 metres in lieu of 2.5 metres from Unit 36 to the east boundary;**
  - (d) 54% provision of open space in lieu of 60%;**
  - (e) 71 parking bays in lieu of 75 parking bays;**
  - (f) 7 visitors bays in lieu of 8 parking bays;**
  - (g) and the following internal variations:**

| <b>Wall Setback Variations</b>                     | <b>Wall Setback Variations</b> | <b>Proposed</b>                   |
|--|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| <b>Unit 8 setback from unit 11 and vice versa</b>  | <b>5.6m</b>                    | <b>3.7m<br/>(7.4m separation)</b> |
| <b>Unit 8 setback from unit 23 and vice versa</b>  | <b>5.3m</b>                    | <b>2.2m<br/>(6.0m separation)</b> |
| <b>Unit 24 setback from unit 11 and vice versa</b> | <b>5.3m</b>                    | <b>1.5m<br/>(5.0m separation)</b> |

| <b>Cone of Visions Variations</b>   | <b>Acceptable Development</b> | <b>Proposed</b> |
|---|-------------------------------|-----------------|
| <b>Units 2 &amp; 4 balcony/alfresco to units 5 &amp; 7 balcony/alfresco and vice versa</b>    | <b>7.5m</b>                   | <b>6.2m</b>     |
| <b>Units 6 &amp; 8 balcony/alfresco to units 21 &amp; 23 balcony/alfresco and vice versa</b>  | <b>7.5m</b>                   | <b>6m</b>       |
| <b>Units 22 &amp; 24 balcony/alfresco to units 9 &amp; 11 balcony/alfresco and vice versa</b> | <b>7.5</b>                    | <b>5m</b>       |

are appropriate in this instance.

- 2 due regard has been held to Policy 3.1.9 and that the building height threshold projection beyond 8.5 metres to the west boundary (proposed 9.8 metres) is appropriate in this instance;
- 3 Council **APPROVES** the application for Planning Approval dated 28/02/2005 submitted by Dryka and Partners Architects the applicant on behalf of the owner Currambine Gardens Pty Ltd for thirty-six multiple dwellings on Lot 251 (5) Eastleigh Loop, Currambine, subject to the following conditions:
  - (a) The window to bedroom three of Units 35 *and* 36, shall be fixed and obscured OR the sill height shall be raised to a minimum of 1.6 metres above the finished floor level of the subject units, in order to provide privacy to 11 Eastleigh Loop;
  - (b) A refuse management plan is required to be submitted indicating on site management of refuse collection the satisfaction of the Manager, Approvals Planning and Environmental Services before the issuing of a building licence;
  - (c) Details of bin wash down facilities are required to be submitted to the satisfaction of the Manager, Approvals Planning and Environmental Services before the issuing of a building licence;
  - (d) Details of a Mechanical Ventilation Services Plan are required to be submitted to demonstrate compliance with AS1668.2 – 1991 to the satisfaction of the Manager, Approvals Planning and Environmental Services before the issuing of a building licence;
  - (e) The driveway is to be designed and constructed to the satisfaction of the Manager, Approvals Planning and Environmental Services before occupation of the multiple dwellings;
  - (f) The parking bays, driveways and points of ingress and egress are required to be designed and constructed in accordance with AS 2890.1. Such areas are to be constructed, drained, marked and thereafter maintained to the satisfaction of the Manager, Approvals Planning and Environmental Services prior to the development first being occupied;



- (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) External doors to stairs shall open in the direction of egress;
- (i) Stores shall not exceed the maximum travel distance to a single exit of 20 metres;
- (j) The lodging of a detailed landscaping plan(s) to the satisfaction of the City for the development site with the Building Licence application. For the purpose of this condition a detailed landscaping plans shall be drawn to a scale of 1:100 and show the following:
  - (i) the location and type of existing and proposed trees and shrubs within the site;
  - (ii) any lawns to be established;
  - (iii) areas to be reticulated or irrigated;
- (k) All significant Grass Trees, Zamia Palms, mature Christmas Trees, Banksias and Allocasuarinas, together with suitable understorey shall be retained in areas outside of the development footprint;
- (l) The approved landscaping shall be implemented and thereafter maintained by the Body Corporate using the best practice known to the satisfaction of the Manager, Approvals Planning and environmental Services;
- (m) Shade trees shall be provided in the visitor parking area and shown on the landscaping plan required in condition (j);
- (n) The bin store shall be screened by vegetation;
- (o) The existing verge trees shall be retained and protected;
- (p) Visitors car parking shall be signposted;
- (q) Parking bays allocated to units shall be marked with the relevant unit number;
- (r) All stores shall have a minimum dimension of 1.5 metres and a minimum area of 4 square metres;
- (s) The applicant shall submit a plan demonstrating compliance with the Residential Design Codes 2002 Clause 3.5.5 – Pedestrian Access – with regards to the provision of a pedestrian access to the site additional to the vehicular access point;
- (t) Television aerials, satellite dishes, air-conditioning units, plumbing and rainwater pipes and other external fixtures shall be screened from the primary and secondary street;
- (u) Clothes drying facilities shall be provided for each multiple dwelling and be completely screened from the primary and secondary street;

- (v) The Body Corporate rules and regulations when established shall require all residents of the development to screen all clothes drying from the primary and secondary street.

**Footnotes:**

- 1 The development shall comply with the provisions of the Health (Swimming Pool) Regulations 1964;
- 2 With regard to (k) above, this will create a natural setting for the development with unique icons of WA flora contributing to the biodiversity of the area and the sustainability of the development;
- 3 The applicant is advised that a fence is required to protect all natural vegetation for retention, preventing uncontrolled access, dumping of building materials and damage during construction;
- 4 The verge vegetation to be improved with groundcovers;
- 5 The applicant is advised that if there is insufficient room on the verge for all of the bins, then a 'special service' collection will be necessary at a slightly enhanced cost.

*Appendix 12 refers*

To access this attachment on electronic document, click here: [Attach12brf130905.pdf](#)

## **ITEM 15                      SHOWROOM ADDITIONS – LOT 13 (57) JOONDALUP DRIVE, EDGEWATER – [38480]**

**WARD:** Lakeside

**RESPONSIBLE DIRECTOR:** Mr David Djulbic (Acting Director)  
Planning and Community Development

### **PURPOSE**

To request the Council's determination of an application for planning approval for minor additions to an existing showroom development, at Lot 13 (57) Joondalup Drive, Edgewater.

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The development site is located at 57 Joondalup Drive and is known as Joondalup Gate. The lot has a land area of 6.1840 hectares and is zoned Business under the City of Joondalup District Planning Scheme No 2 (DPS2).

The site is located adjacent to the Mitchell Freeway/railway line to the West, Edgewater Station carpark to the southwest, a Western Power sub-station to the south, drainage sump to the north and Joondalup Drive to the east. Residential properties overlooking Joondalup Drive to the east are accessed via the adjacent Harvest Loop/Joondalup Drive intersection (See Attachment 1).

The applicant proposes to extend portions of three existing buildings out to the edge of the covered walkways (Refer to Attachment 2). The total extension equates to 96m<sup>2</sup>.

Discretion has previously been used by Council to permit development on the site with a 107 bay or 13.2% shortfall in the number of car parking spaces. The proposed additions will result in a further increase in the shortfall of car parking to 111 bays or 13.7%, an increase of 0.5%.

The Notice of Delegation allows certain officers of the City to make a determination on applications for Planning Approval, subject to certain conditions. One of those conditions is that if there is a shortfall in car parking, the shortfall cannot be more than 10%. As the car parking for this development site already exceeds 10%, the matter is required to be referred to Council for determination.

The proposed development complies with the intentions of the Business Zone in the DPS2 and will assist in meeting key objectives of the Strategic Plan. It will contribute to the investment and business development opportunities, help create employment opportunities and support the local economy.

Having regard to the provisions of the DPS2, it is recommended that the application for planning approval be granted.

### **BACKGROUND**

**Suburb/Location:** Edgewater  
**Applicant:** John McKenzie & Associates Architects  
**Owner:** Joondalup Gate Pty Ltd  
**Zoning:**       **DPS:** Business  
                      **MRS:** Urban

The development site comprises of various buildings identified as C1 and C2, C3 and C4, C8, N1, N2 and N3. The buildings vary in size and contain multiple tenancies. During the history of the development, several parking discretions have been applied to reach the existing total of 1 bay per 34.55m<sup>2</sup>, whilst the required parking provision for the development is 1 bay per 30m<sup>2</sup>. This represents a 13.2% parking deficit over the site.

In determining a previous application in 2003, buildings comprising C3 and C4 were subject to discussions regarding a reduction in the number of parking bays required for those buildings. It was established at the time that a discretion of 1 bay per 50m<sup>2</sup> be approved with the Council undertaking to monitor the effect of the discretion.

There have been no parking issues recorded for the development site, and no overflow parking has been observed.

## **DETAILS**

### **Description of the development**

The current proposal consists of minor additions to the existing showrooms that will result in a:

- 1 59m<sup>2</sup> extension to building C4; and
- 2 37m<sup>2</sup> extension to building N1.

### **Issues and options considered:**

Council has the discretion to:

- Approve the application without conditions;
- Approve the application with conditions; or
- Refuse the application.

### **Link to Strategic Plan:**

### **The proposal will contribute to certain Key Focus Area Outcomes of City Development.**

It will address Strategy 3.5.1 and 3.5.2, which seek to develop partnerships with stakeholders to foster business development opportunities and assist the facilitation of local employment opportunities.

### **Legislation – Statutory Provisions:**

Clause 3.2.2 describes a 'P' land use as a use that is permitted, but which may be subject to any conditions that the Council may wish to impose in granting its approval.

The following clauses are also relevant under the existing District Planning Scheme No 2:

#### 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.*

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:*

- (l) interests of orderly and proper planning and the preservation of the amenity of the relevant locality;*
- (m) any relevant submissions by the applicant;*
- (n) any Agreed Structure Plan prepared under the provisions of Part 9 of the Scheme;*
- (o) any planning policy of the Council adopted under the provisions of clause 8.11;*
- (p) any other matter which under the provisions of the Scheme the Council is required to have due regard;*
- (q) any policy of the Commission or its predecessors or successors or any planning policy adopted by the Government of the State of Western Australia;*
- (r) 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;*
- (s) the comments or wishes of any public or municipal authority received as part of the submission process;*
- (t) the comments or wishes of any objectors to or supporters of the application;*
- (u) 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*
- (v) any other matter which in the opinion of the Council is relevant.*

**Risk Management considerations:**

Not Applicable

**Financial/Budget Implications:**

Not Applicable

**Policy implications:**

Not Applicable

**Regional Significance:**

Not Applicable

**Sustainability implications:**

Not Applicable

**Consultation:**

Comments were not sought, as it was considered that the proposal would cause no significant impact or loss of amenity. Additionally, the nearest residential property is approximately 95 metres away and is separated from the development site by Joondalup Drive and an existing landscaping strip.

**COMMENT****Consideration of proposed parking variation**

The existing buildings comprise a total net lettable area of 24,329m<sup>2</sup> requiring 811 bays, whilst the proposed development would result in an increase of total net lettable area to 24,425m<sup>2</sup> and an increase in bays required to 815. There are currently 704 bays provided on site.

The applicant proposes a total extension of 96m<sup>2</sup> divided between three separate tenancies. The proposed works will result in a parking provision of 1 bay per 34.69m<sup>2</sup>, which represents a 13.7% deficit over the site, a 0.5% increase in the site deficit.

The development site generally comprises large showroom developments displaying and providing for the storage of bulky goods. The type and style of businesses within the site are not considered to be high traffic generators, and there have been no parking issues regarding the site at the current parking deficit.

The impact of the proposed additions, and the additional parking generated by the additions, is not considered to negatively impact the overall development

Having regard to the extent of discretion being sought which is considered minor, and that there have been no recorded parking issues related to the site, the application is recommended for approval.

An issue has been raised with regard to the identification of an existing disabled toilet in Unit 58, and therefore a condition is recommended in the approval to address this matter.

## CONCLUSION

The Council is required to assess the proposed development against the City of Joondalup District Planning Scheme No 2. The variation proposed is considered to be minimal and is not expected to have an impact on:

- the operations of the centre;
- Joondalup Drive; or
- the residential properties which are located on the eastern side of Joondalup Drive.

The proposed development will assist in meeting key objectives of the Strategic Plan and the objectives of the DPS2. It will contribute to developing partnerships with stakeholders to foster business development opportunities, creation of employment opportunities and support the local economy.

Having regard to the:

- details of the application; and
- provisions of the District Planning Scheme No 2,

it is recommended that Council approves the application with conditions.

## ATTACHMENTS

|              |                  |
|--------------|------------------|
| Attachment 1 | Locality Plans   |
| Attachment 2 | Development Plan |

## VOTING REQUIREMENTS

Simple Majority

## RECOMMENDATION

### That Council:

- 1 EXERCISES discretion under clause 4.8.2 of the City of Joondalup District Planning Scheme No. 2 and determines that parking provided at 704 bays in lieu of 815 bays is appropriate in this instance;**
- 2 APPROVES the application for Planning Approval dated 28/02/2005 submitted by John McKenzie & Associates Architects the applicant on behalf of the owner Joondalup Gate Pty Ltd for Showroom Additions at 57 Joondalup Drive, Edgewater, subject to the existing disabled toilet in Unit 58 being designated and shown on plans that are to be submitted for a building licence.**

*Appendix 13 refers*

To access this attachment on electronic document, click here: [Attach13brf130905.pdf](#)

**ITEM 16**                      **APPOINTMENT OF REPRESENTATIVES TO THE TAMALA PARK REGIONAL COUNCIL – [41196]**

|                              |  |
|------------------------------|--|
| <b>WARD:</b>                 | All  |
| <b>RESPONSIBLE DIRECTOR:</b> | Mr David Djulbic (Acting Director)<br>Planning & Community Development |

---

**PURPOSE**

To give consideration to the appointment of two (2) Commissioners to represent the City of Joondalup on the Tamala Park Regional Council (TPRC).

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

An Establishment Agreement for the TPRC has been created for setting up of a Regional Council for development of approximately 165 hectares of Lot 118 Mindarie. The seven owner Councils propose to use the vehicle of a Regional Council to manage the development of portion of Lot 118 Mindarie.

A Regional Council will provide legal status for commercial activity conducted on behalf of the participant Councils. Each of the participant Councils will provide elected personnel to be part of the Regional Council. The number of elected members from each participant Council will follow ownership share in Lot 118 land.

Election of the Chairperson would be from members, with a term of two years applying to the offices of member and Chairman.

As part of the Establishment Agreement, provision has been made for the City of Joondalup to have two members on the Council. This allocation is based on the City's 2/12<sup>th</sup> share of ownership.

*It is recommended that Council:*

- 1 in accordance with the provisions of the Establishment Agreement APPOINTS two (2) Commissioner representatives of the City of Joondalup to the Tamala Park Regional Council;*
- 2 NOTES the previous decision of Council of 5 April 2005 that:*

*“Council, in the interests of good governance AGREES that the City of Joondalup nominated representative on the Tamala Park Regional Council shall not be a member of the Mindarie Regional Council.”*

**BACKGROUND**

At its meeting held on 28 June 2005 (CJ129-06/05 refers), the Council adopted the Business Plan for a major land transaction on Lot 118 Mindarie, and the establishment of a Regional (Development) Council.

**DETAILS**



An Establishment Agreement for the TPRC has been created for setting up of a Regional Council for development of approximately 165 hectares of lot 118 Mindarie. The seven owner Councils propose to use the vehicle of a Regional Council to manage the development of portion of lot 118 Mindarie. The key points of the Agreement being:

The regional purpose for the TPRC is:

- (a) to undertake, in accordance with the objectives, the rezoning, subdivision, development, marketing and sale of the land; and
- (b) to carry out and do all other acts and things which are reasonably necessary for the bringing into effect of the matters referred to in paragraph (a) of this clause.

The objectives of the TPRC are:

- To develop and improve the value of the land;
- To maximise, within prudent risk parameters, the financial return to the participants;
- To balance economic, social and environmental issues; and
- To produce a quality development demonstrating the best urban design and development practice.

### **Representation**

A Regional Council will provide legal status for commercial activity conducted on behalf of the participant Councils. Each of the participant Councils will provide elected personnel to be part of the Regional Council. The number of elected members from each participant Council will follow ownership share in lot 118 land.

Election of the Chairperson would be from members, with a term of two years applying to the offices of member and Chairman.

As part of the Establishment Agreement, provision has been made for the City of Joondalup to have two members on the Council. This allocation is based on the City's 2/12<sup>th</sup> share of ownership.

### **Issues and options considered:**

At Council's meeting held on the 5 April 2005 (CJ050-04/05 refers) Council resolved in part that:

*"in the interests of good governance, AGREES that the City of Joondalup nominated representative on the Tamala Park Regional Council shall not be a member of the Mindarie Regional Council."*

With that in mind the nominated representatives for the Tamala Park Regional Council cannot be sitting members of the Mindarie Regional Council.

### **Link to Strategic Plan:**

Development of Lot 118 will be consistent with each of the four key focus areas of the City's Strategic Plan as follows:

*Caring for the Environment:* Conservation of environmental assets through reservation of portions of the land containing regionally significant bushland; supporting efficient use of water, energy and other resources through incorporation of best practice urban design principles in the development (e.g. water sensitive design, transit oriented design).

*Community Wellbeing:* Providing a cohesive system of integrated land use planning through planning that balances built form and land use, community needs and the environment, and through supporting and encouraging the delivery and utilisation of a safe, effective transport network.

*City Development:* Encourage local employment and economic development through the urban design of the development (e.g. promote mixed use development and a business enterprise precinct).

*Organisational Development:* Manage the development to provide a maximum return on the investment to benefit the City's ratepayers and community.

### **Legislation – Statutory Provisions:**

The Regional Council will be established under Section 3.61 of the Local Government Act (LGA). It is necessary to form a body that has a legal capacity to act on behalf of all of the stakeholders in the Lot 118 development land. Investigations into different joint venture arrangements has indicated that although there can be agreements made about land development, the only way in which local authorities can conveniently form a legal body to act conjointly on their behalf is through a Regional Council established under the LGA.

The LGA sets out specific requirements for the establishment of the Regional Council. The overarching requirement is the preparation of an Establishment Agreement, which follows the requirements of the Act. The Establishment Agreement, once compiled, is submitted to the Minister for Local Government for approval.

### **Risk Management considerations:**

The Regional Council, in performing its duties, will be required to work within the framework as set out within the establishment agreement, relevant statutory regulations and adopt necessary policies and procedures to achieve the Regional Council's objectives.

### **Financial/Budget Implications:**

The planning and development of Lot 118 will involve financial implications for Council, although it should be noted that all costs and returns are shared amongst the seven owner Councils according to their ownership share of the land (this City's share is two-twelfths). It is noted that the City has allocated as part of the 2005/06 Budget, \$40,000, as its owner's share in administrative and associated costs necessary to establish the new Regional Council and associated activities.

It is also emphasised that the compensation payable to the owners under the proposed Bush Forever NPS will provide seeding capital to cover or offset initial stages of subdivisional works. Cash flow analysis based on the owners' earlier structure plan was that the development could achieve positive cash flow returns within two years of commencement.

### **Policy implications:**

Not Applicable

### **Regional Significance:**

Lot 118 is a critical piece of land in the WAPC projections for urban land releases in the northern corridor. Development of the land will feed into the efficient utilisation of local infrastructure and the viability of local businesses.

Following the development of Burns Beach Lot 2 to the south (approximately 1,100 lots) and Somerly immediately adjacent to the north (approximately 1,400 lots remaining), Lot 118 is the one remaining large land parcel to be developed south of Neerabup Road.

Following extensive research by the CEO Group and solicitors, it has become apparent that the logical vehicle for decision making and to provide legal status for transactions throughout a prolonged development period is a Regional Council established under the Local Government Act.

A Regional Council will require an Establishment Agreement setting out the way in which the Council operates. The form of the Agreement is set out in Local Government legislation. The Minister administering the Local Government Act must approve the Agreement.

### **Sustainability implications:**

Included within the objectives of the Regional (Development) Council is to balance economic, social and environmental considerations to produce a quality development demonstrating the best urban design and development practice.

### **Consultation:**

Negotiations relating to Bush Forever outcomes, the establishment of a Regional Council and a new lease with the Mindarie Regional Council are included in a Business Plan which is discussed in the comments section of the report. This Business Plan was subject to a public comment period of 42 days.

At later stages there will be further consultation processes associated with the preparation of the Structure Plans for the future urban development.

## **COMMENT**

### **Establishment of Regional Council – Current Status**

The proposals for the Regional Council involved a whole series of land transactions:

- A change to the Mindarie Regional Council (MRC) lease;
- Transfer of Bush Forever land to Western Australian Planning Commission (WAPC);
- An agreement to transfer land from the fee simple ownership of 7 Councils to a new Regional Council;
- A development proposal for the fee simple land transferred to the new Regional Council.

All of these land transactions required prior advertising of a Business Plan.

The Business Plan advertising has been completed. All 7 Councils have now resolved to proceed to implement the Business Plan. Councils have also agreed to proceed with the completion of the new Regional Council Establishment Agreement, the MRC lease amendment and the Negotiated Planning Solution (NPS) with the WAPC.

The Establishment Agreement for the new Regional Council is in final draft form. The documentation is ready for distribution and signing except that plans to be included are awaiting minor details that need to be coordinated with the detail that will appear in the NPS documents.

The Department of Local Government & Regional Development has been kept abreast of documentation changes that have occurred over time. The Department has recently advised

that it anticipates no difficulty in progressing the Establishment Agreement when it is received as a formal application from participant Councils.

The formal application for approval of the Establishment Agreement by the Minister for Local Government is being delayed until such time as documentation relating to the NPS with the WAPC is advanced – at least to the stage where the principal elements of the agreements have been formally endorsed by the WAPC. Officers of the WAPC have signified approval to the NPS negotiations.

It was noted at the most recent meeting of the CEO group held on the 27 August 2005, that there could be a move to convene the first regional council meeting during November/December 2005, subject to all previously outstanding mentioned matters being finalised.

It is expected that the following could form part of the agenda for the first Council meeting:

- a) Consideration of standing orders, code of practice, purchasing and other administrative policies to enable a starting framework for the operation of the Council.
- b) The details of the NPS that affect the progress with land development.
- c) A report on the provisions of the lease with the MRC that require cooperation between MRC and other Lot 118 stakeholders.
- d) The status of structure planning for the north-west corner of Lot 118.
- e) A suggestion that the new Council develop a strategic plan to guide Council operations.
- f) Two outline project plans, one covering administrative issues in establishing a Regional Council, the second would provide a possible outline for progressing development of Lot 118 land.

## **ATTACHMENTS**

Nil

## **VOTING REQUIREMENTS**

Simple Majority

## **RECOMMENDATION**

### **That Council:**

- 1 in accordance with the provisions of the Establishment Agreement APPOINTS two (2) Commissioner representatives of the City of Joondalup to the Tamala Park Regional Council;**
- 2 NOTES the previous decision of Council of 5 April 2005 that:**  
  
***“Council, in the interests of good governance AGREES that the City of Joondalup nominated representative on the Tamala Park Regional Council shall not be a member of the Mindarie Regional Council.”***



|                         |   |
|-------------------------|---|
| <b>Suburb/Location:</b> | Reserve 39624 No 77 Castlecrag Drive, Kallaroo      |
| <b>Applicant:</b>       | Nicholas and Claudine Hadfield                      |
| <b>Owner:</b>           | Crown Land-City of Joondalup Management Order (Own) |
| <b>Zoning:</b>          | <b>DPS:</b> Parks and Recreation - Local            |
|                         | <b>MRS:</b> Urban                                   |

The subject portion of Castlecrag Park that the applicant wishes to purchase adjoins the applicant's lot to the southwest (refer Attachment 1), is relatively flat and sandy and is not vegetated.

The subject portion of POS adjoins an embankment with an estimated height difference of approximately 5 metres between the ground level of the subject portion and the ground level of Castlecrag Park. The embankment is densely vegetated with indigenous species of flora.

## DETAILS

### Issues and options considered:

Reserve 39624 is densely vegetated with open grassed areas that can be used for recreational activities. Reserve 39624 functions as a 'Green Route' linking Castlecrag Drive and Aristrade Avenue (refer Attachment 1). Each application for purchase of a portion of reserve is considered on the merits of the request.

The issues associated with the proposed purchase of a portion of the POS include:

- Consideration to the supply of public open space within the locality and the purpose and function the subject reserve serves for the community.
- The merits of the request to purchase.

The options available to Council in considering this proposal are:

- To not support the proposed purchase of the subject portion of Reserve 39624. It may be appropriate to investigate any erosion issues.
- To initiate advertising of the proposal to dispose of a portion of POS for public comment.

### Applicant's Submission

The applicant has raised the following comments to attempt to justify support of the cancellation and purchase of the subject portion of Castlecrag Park:

- *We wish to secure more privacy from the southern adjoining landowner (Lot 761 Queenscliff Court, Kallaroo) through planting of trees along the common boundary.*
- *Purchasing the subject portion of Reserve 39624 would increase safety and prevent vandalism to the exposed portion of wall along the common boundary, as the wall has been graffiti in the past.*
- *Lost a portion of land due to erosion of the embankment in the northwest corner of our lot.*
- *To make the visual aspect much more attractive by vegetating the land instead of being flat and sandy.*

**Link to Strategic Plan:**

The following objective and strategy in the City's Strategic Plan 2003 – 2008 is applicable to this report:

Objective 3.1 – To develop and maintain the City of Joondalup's assets and built environment.

Strategy 3.1.3 – Create and maintain parklands that incorporate nature and cultural activities accessible to residents and visitors.

**Legislation – Statutory Provisions:**

A reserve is the setting aside of Crown Land for a specific purpose, generally a public purpose. Under Section 41 of the Land Administration Act 1997 (LAA), the Minister for Lands may set aside Crown Land by a Ministerial Order in the public interest. Reserve 39624, Castlecrag Park was ceded by the developer when the land was subdivided and set aside under Section 20A of the Town Planning and Development Act as a reserve for public recreation. The land set aside for recreation use as a consequence of S.20A of the Town Planning and Development Act is clearly identified as reservation for "Public Recreation".

Once created, a reserve is usually placed under the care, control and management of a State Government department, Local Government or incorporated community group by way of a Management Order. A Management Order under the LAA does not convey ownership of the land, however it only allows so much control as is essential for the management of the land.

The provisions under Department Land and Information (DLI) guidelines to dispose of S.20A reserves indicate that an application to cancel and subsequently excise a portion of land set aside for recreation purposes is to be extensively advertised by way of an onsite sign and a notice placed in the local circulating newspaper. The application would also be required to be externally referred to relevant State Government departments.

**Risk Management considerations:**

Not Applicable.

**Financial/Budget Implications:**

DLI guidelines to dispose of S.20A reserves state when the disposal of a reserve is supported, the funds received from the sale of the land must be used to fund the purchase of replacement recreation land or to undertake capital improvements to other recreation reserves in the general locality.

**Policy implications:**

The objective of Council's Policy 5.2.2 (Council Reserves and Parks) is to provide a variety of Public Open Spaces that fulfil the community's recreational and environmental needs.

**Regional Significance:**

Public Open Spaces are created and made accessible for the use of the community for recreational activity, passive or active. While the subject POS is a local reserve, the principle of retaining POS for the community is of significance.

**Sustainability implications:**

Not Applicable

**Consultation:**

In the event that Council wishes to consider an application to cancel and subsequently sell any portion of a S.20A Reserve, the proposal to amend the reserve would be extensively advertised by way of an onsite sign, a notice placed in the circulating local newspaper, on Council's website and in Council's offices. The advertising period is to be no less than thirty (30) days.

**COMMENT**

In general, the DLI Section 20A Guidelines state that a reserve created under Section 20A is required to be retained for its designated purpose. DLI will consider amending or cancelling and disposing of a reserve when it can be demonstrated that this action will have a minimal impact on the vicinity.

POS is a result of the developer being required to cede 10% of the gross sub-divisible area of new residential neighbourhoods. The land is provided free of cost to the Crown and is nominated as recreational reserve. The purpose of Public Open Space is to allow for community interaction through recreational activity, which contributes to a healthier community. Public Open Space also serves as 'Green Route' linkages. These designated 'Green Routes' provide linkages throughout communities, encourage alternative means of transport through the hard and soft landscape design of the POS and contribute to the amenity of the area. POS also allows for the retention of significant and indigenous species of vegetation.

The applicant has indicated that the purchase of the subject portion of POS is to enable improved privacy from the adjoining residence, to deter unsocial behaviour and to alleviate erosion issues.

While these reasons may benefit the purchaser of the subject portion of land, the reason for providing POS, and the implications of disposal must not be overlooked.

The subject portion of POS is located at the top of a bank, with the majority of the adjoining POS being at a lower level. While it may be argued that the subject portion of POS is not useable space, the area was provided as part of the required POS, and it is not desirable to decrease the amount of POS provided.

With regard to the erosion of the subject portion of the POS, this aspect is being investigated by the City.

Even though the request of the applicant involves the subsequent purchase of small portion of Reserve 39624, Castlecrag Park, it is considered that the loss of public open space would not be in the best interests of the community, or of orderly and proper planning.

**ATTACHMENTS**

- |              |   |
|--------------|---|
| Attachment 1 | Location Plan and showing the subject portion of Reserve 39624 and proposed boundary alignment. |
| Attachment 2 | Photos of Castlecrag Park.  |



**VOTING REQUIREMENTS**

Simple Majority

**RECOMMENDATION****That Council:**

- 1 DOES NOT SUPPORT the cancellation and subsequent purchase of a portion of Reserve 39624 Castlecrag Park No 77 Castlecrag Drive, Kallaroo as the loss of public open space is not considered to be in the best interests of the community, or orderly and proper planning;**
- 2 NOTES that the City is investigating any erosion issues that are associated with Lot 787 (5) Stewart Court, Kallaroo and the adjoining Reserve 39624 Castlecrag Park, Kallaroo.**

*Appendix 14 refers*

*To access this attachment on electronic document, click here: [Attach14brf130905.pdf](#)*

- 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**

### BUSINESS OUTSTANDING FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS

#### 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:

**Status:** The Council at its meeting held on 9 August 2005 agreed to seek public comment on the draft 2005 Standing Orders Local Law. Appropriate advertising has commenced, with a report to be presented back to the Council following the consultation period, November 2005.

#### 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 relating to the development of Council policies will be submitted to the Policy Committee. It is anticipated that the Policy Committee will meet on an on-going basis.

An internal review of the existing policies of the Council distinguishing between Council and City policies has commenced in accordance with the decision of Council dated 26 April 2005. The review has been completed and a report will be presented during the month of September 2005.

#### REVIEW OF THE POLICY MANUAL (ex Briefing Session 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:** These matters will be referred to the newly formed Policy Committee. It is anticipated that the Policy Committee will meet on an on-going basis.

An internal review of the existing policies of the Council has commenced in accordance with the decision of Council dated 26 April 2005. The review has been completed and a report will be presented to the Policy Committee during the month of September 2005.

## POLICY REVIEW - ex CJ064-04/05

“4 ADOPTS a new policy to replace Policy 2.3.1, based on the Council policy framework in Attachment 1 to Report CJ064-04/05, and that policy to include reference to the Policy Committee and its terms of reference;”

**Status: As part of the review of the existing Council policies distinguishing between Council and City policies, a revised policy to previous Policy 2.3.2 has been drafted. This will be included in the report to Council as part of the revised City policies in September 2005.**

## 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;

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 3, consultation will take place as soon as is practicable following the finalisation of the purchase of the site which requires the lot to be formally subdivided. It is envisaged that a report will be submitted to Council once the purchase has been finalised.**

**In relation to Point 5, a meeting has been held with architects to discuss possible project plan options. Concept plans and costings have been finalised and will be presented to the Council in the near future.**

**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.**

This document was admitted as evidence into the McIntyre Inquiry into the City of Joondalup. Advice has been sought from McLeod’s Lawyers relating to the ability of members of the public gaining access to this document. The McIntyre Inquiry is currently anticipated to conclude at the end of September 2005.

**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 Council:

- 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: (i) The attendance of such persons has been dealt with as part of the Standing Orders Local Law review which is currently out for public comment.**

**(ii) The issue of relationships has been addressed as part of the**

**Governance Framework for the City of Joondalup. A report will be presented on the framework to Council in October 2005;**

- (iii) **The issue of elected members accessing information has been addressed as part of the Governance Framework for the City of Joondalup. A report will be presented on the framework to Council in October 2005;**
- (iv) **This issue has been dealt with as part of the Standing Orders Local Law review which is currently out for public comment.**

**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. A review of the Code will be present to the incoming elected Council as recommended by the Governance Panel – Final Report.**

**TENDER REGULATIONS – (ex CJ043-03/05 2004 COMPLIANCE AUDIT RETURN)**

“3 EXPRESSES its concern that the Tender Regulations have not been followed and advises the Department of Local Government and Regional Development that the Council has requested that a report on this matter be submitted to the Audit Committee;”

**Status: The matter has been referred to Stanton Partners to review the issue of non-compliance with the Tender Regulations. Once the review has been undertaken, a report will be provided to the Audit Committee for consideration.**

**REVIEW OF WARD BOUNDARIES AND ELECTED MEMBER REPRESENTATION - ex CJ084-05/05**

“2 REQUESTS the Chief Executive Officer to prepare a discussion paper regarding the review of ward boundaries and elected member representation to be presented to the Council for further consideration;”

**Status: A discussion paper will be prepared with a report to be presented to the Council in October 2005.**

**OUTCOME OF REVIEW OF PROCUREMENT PROCESSES – (ex CJ121-06/05 – REVIEW OF THE CORPORATE DELEGATED AUTHORITY MANUAL)**

“3 REQUESTS the Chief Executive Officer to advise the Audit Committee at the earliest possible opportunity of the outcome of the review of the procurement processes.”

**Status: This matter will be presented to the next Audit Committee meeting.**

## PROTOCOLS FOR PUBLIC QUESTION AND STATEMENT TIME – ex CJ144-07/05

“2 REQUESTS a further report on the protocols relating to public question and statement time following the conclusion of the public comment period as detailed in (1) above.”

**Status: It is anticipated that a report will be presented to Council in October 2005, following the completion of the public consultation period.**

## REVISED SET OF KPIs FOR COUNCIL PROJECTS – ex JSC2-07/05 – STRATEGIC FINANCIAL PLAN 2005/06 TO 2008/09

“3 REQUESTS the Chief Executive Officer to submit a report to Council on a revised set of KPIs for Council projects.”

**Status: The report will be submitted to the October Strategy Session.**

## CLIFTON CONEY GROUP APPOINTED AS INTERIM PROJECT MANAGERS – ex CJ156-08/05 - OCEAN REEF MARINA STRUCTURE PLAN DEVELOPMENT

“2 Council NOTES that the Clifton Coney Group has been appointed as interim Project Managers up to the appointment of key consultants for the preparation of the structure plan as detailed in (1) above and is required to submit a proposal to manage the structure plan process in accordance with its term contract;

3 the proposal in Point 2 above to be submitted to Council for determination;”

**Status: It is anticipated that a report will be submitted to Council in September/October 2005.**

## LEGAL REPRESENTATION COSTS TO THE CITY IN RELATION TO THE MCINTYRE INQUIRY – ex CJ168-08/05 - REPORT ON FUNDING TO DATE TO THE CITY OF JOONDALUP PURSUANT TO POLICY 2.2.8 – LEGAL REPRESENTATION FOR ELECTED MEMBERS AND EMPLOYEES

“5 NOTES that a further report be prepared by Administration at a later date that quantifies the legal representation costs to the City. This report will not be able to be completed until the McIntyre Inquiry hands down its final report.”

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

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

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

**Status: This 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: Research has been completed and a Report is being drafted and due for finalising in September 2005.**

DEVELOPMENT OF A STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES COMMITTING POLICIES OF COUNCIL TO SUSTAINABILITY OBJECTIVES – ex CJ064-04/05 – POLICY REVIEW

“5 REFERS to the newly formed Policy Committee for attention the resolution of the Sustainability Advisory Committee dated 14 October 2004 concerning development of a statement of principles that commits all policies of Council to sustainability objectives.”

**Status: This will be referred to the first meeting of the Policy Committee. An internal review of the existing policies of the Council has commenced in accordance with the decision of Council dated 26 April 2005. It is anticipated that this review will be completed by mid July 2005, with a report to be presented to the Policy Committee during the month of September 2005.**

DRAFT JINAN-JOONDALUP SISTER CITIES RELATIONSHIP PLAN – ex CJ157-08/05

“3 REQUESTS a further report on a final Plan be presented to Council for endorsement following the receipt of comment from interested parties and the Jinan delegation.”

**Status: A report will be finalised following the 30 days comment period.**

CONSOLIDATION OF INDICATORS THAT HAVE PARALLEL OBJECTIVES – ex CJ171-08/05 – CORPORATE REPORTING SYSTEMS

“3 REQUESTS the Chief Executive Officer to provide a report on consolidating those indicators that have parallel objectives, so that a composite rating can be produced.”

**Status: A review of the indicators will be undertaken and a report will be considered by the Chief Executive Officer after the review has been completed.**

CREDIT CARD PAYMENT DETAILS (ex CJ009-02/05 - WARRANT OF PAYMENTS – 31 DECEMBER 2004)

“2 REQUESTS the Chief Executive Officer to provide a report to Council in due course on the detail to be provided in the Warrant of Payments in relation to credit card payments, such report to outline:

- the role of the Council;
- processes used by other local governments;
- advice from the Department of Local Government;
- legal requirements;
- recommendations of the City’s Auditors;
- any other information considered appropriate by the CEO;”

**Status: A report will be submitted to Council in October 2005.**



**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: A report will be presented to Council following a review of the City’s asset portfolio. Funding for the Strategic Asset Management Plan is listed for consideration in the 2005/06 Draft Budget.**

**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 Council 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: A report will be presented to Council following a review of the City’s asset portfolio. Funding for the Strategic Asset Management Plan is listed for consideration in the 2005/06 Draft Budget.**

**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 as soon as possible. It should be noted that review initiation is dependent on data release from the WAPC, and is anticipated to occur before December 2005.**

**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.**

**Chief Executive Officer to meet with officers of the Crime Prevention Unit.**

**WALGA has facilitated a Safety and Crime Prevention meeting. The following recommendation from this meeting is to be forwarded to the State Council via the various zone meetings:**

**That the Association does not support the State Local Government Community Safety and Crime Prevention Partnership until there is:**

- **acceptance by State Government of Local Government evidence based planning methods to develop community safety and crime prevention strategies;**
- **a flexible funding arrangement for community safety and crime prevention plans for Local Government;**
- **sustainable growth funding from State to Local Government to support the Local Government Community Safety and Crime Prevention plans and their implementation;**
- **a feasibility study undertaken into a regional based approach to community safety and crime prevention through a network of State Government funded staff to support Local Government develop a collaborative based approach to community safety and crime prevention planning and initiatives;**
- **Acknowledgement by the State Government that the management of graffiti and anti social behaviour are key issues of concern to Local Government.**

**The development of a MOU between State and Local Government that outlines the roles and responsibilities of State and Local Government in relation to community safety and crime prevention planning.**

**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: Funding for development of the Leisure Plan was approved in the 2004/05 budget and worked commenced in November 2004. The development of the Leisure Plan will take approximately six months. The Leisure Plan is underway at this time and will provide guidance on this matter.**

**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 of Aboriginal issues and the level of 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.**

**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 has failed to achieve a quorum for the three meetings held in 2005. This has meant that this issue has not progressed and cannot be reported to Council by the proposed date of April 2005.**

**The discussion and development of a report pertaining to the Youth Curfew has been interrupted because of the issues regarding member recruitment and meeting attendance of the Youth Advisory Council.**

An evaluation of the Youth Advisory Council is being conducted following prolonged challenges in recruitment and quorum attainment at monthly meetings. Past and current members, stakeholders and council staff have been invited to contribute to the evaluation process. A report will be written once all data has been analysed.

**Due to the difficulties associated with the operation of the Youth Advisory Council, it is recommended that the topic of the Youth Curfew be removed from the Agenda as an outstanding item.**

**STRATEGIC PLAN FOR CITY'S ART COLLECTION – (ex CJ014-02/05 - ART COLLECTION PURCHASES)**

“3 REQUESTS that a strategic plan be developed for the art collection that takes into account an acquisition and disposal plan, and contains a strategy for the display of art works throughout the City's offices and appropriate buildings within the City of Joondalup, such as Edith Cowan University.”

**Status: The draft Art Acquisition Policy is to be considered as part of the organisational Policy Review process.**

LAND REQUEST FOR PROPOSED COMMUNITY HOUSE IN CRAIGIE LOT 671 (178) CAMBERWARRA DRIVE (CORNER OF PERILYA ROAD) – (ex CJ186-08/05)

- “1 DEFERS consideration of the land request for proposed Community House in Craigie, Lot 671 (178) Camberwarra Drive (corner of Perilya Road);
- 2 OBTAINS from the Department of Community Development detailed outcomes for this proposed service, clearly stating how the community house will meet identified community needs;
- 3 RECEIVES from the Department of Community Development projected costs of building the community house, giving reasons why the funds currently available will be inadequate if the arrangements for the sale of the land, Lot 671 (178) Camberwarra Drive, Craigie goes ahead;
- 4 REQUESTS the Chief Executive Officer to provide relevant information on budgetary implications should the sale of Lot 671 (178) Camberwarra Drive, Craigie not be realised;
- 5 REQUESTS that when this report is resubmitted, Option 4 is explored further, with a long term cost benefit analysis.”

**Status: A further report will be forwarded to the Council once the requested information is available for inclusion in an updated report.**

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 northwestern portion of the Iluka subdivision. It is at that time that consideration to the second firebreak 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 memo has been prepared and will be forwarded to the Commissioners.**

**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.**

**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: This project is currently on hold until a determination is made on the acquisition of the Hodges Drive Depot site.**

**LONG-TERM STRATEGY AND FINANCIAL PLAN FOR PARKING IN THE JOONDALUP CBD – (ex JSC3-07/05 -MINUTES OF THE STRATEGIC FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE)**

“2 REQUESTS that a report be submitted to Council in due course on a long-term strategy and financial plan for parking in the Joondalup CBD.”

**Status: This has been referred to the internal Parking Strategy Working Group.**

**SITE ACQUISITION – WORKS DEPOT – (ex CJ176-08/05)**

“1 REFERS back the report to the Officers for further clarification of issues surrounding the Normalisation Agreement;

3 REQUESTS the Chief Executive Officer to report on options for alternative sites as soon as practical;”

**Status: A report is being prepared and will be provided to the Council Meeting in October.**

### OUTSTANDING PETITIONS

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>Two petitions of 144 and 125-signatures respectively have been received requesting the City of Joondalup make provision for a 50 metre, 8 lane outdoor pool at the Craigie Leisure Centre in the City's financial budget for 2005/06.</p> <p><b>Comment: Council has approved a \$10.3 million budget for the refurbishment of the Craigie Leisure Centre. The project has focussed on the existing facilities including enhancements to the 25-metre and children's play area. The City has accommodated the future provision through the development of a geothermal heating system of sufficient capacity to heat a 50-metre pool. Funding has not been allocated for a 50 – metre pool in the SFP 2005/06 – 2008/09.</b></p> <p><b>Any further development to the facilities at the City of Joondalup's Craigie Leisure Centre would need to be as a result of detailed research into the current and future usage of the facilities at the centre.</b></p> | <p>28 June 2005</p> <p>Planning and<br/>Community<br/>Development</p>   |
| <p>A 44-signature petition has been received from Currambine residents opposing development application DA05/0123 for 36 multiple units with undercroft parking, including setback variations, 5 Eastleigh Loop, Currambine.</p> <p><b>Comment: The petition is being considered in conjunction with the report to Council on DA05/0123.</b></p>   | <p>9 August 2005</p> <p>Planning and<br/>Community<br/>Development</p>  |
| <p>A 710-signature petition has been received from residents in the City of Joondalup in relation to on-going use of Seacrest Reserve by the Wanneroo Joondalup Tee Ball Club for the 2005/06 season.</p> <p><b>Comment: This issue has now been resolved to the satisfaction of the petitioner. This Item may therefore be removed from the agenda.</b></p>   | <p>30 August 2005</p> <p>Planning and<br/>Community<br/>Development</p> |

**REPORTS/PRESENTATIONS REQUESTED BY COMMISSIONERS**

|  | <b>DATE OF REQUEST<br/>- REFERRED TO -</b>      |
|--|---|
| <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><b>Comment: As part of the review of the Council and City's policies, consideration is being given to incorporating relevant guidelines.</b></p> | <p>9 November 2004</p> <p>Office of the CEO</p> |
| <p>Customer Satisfaction Monitor</p> <p>Cmr Fox requested that a report be submitted to Council on options open to the City, either to undertake its own customer satisfaction monitor or jointly with other groups.</p> <p><b>Comment: A Report will be prepared for the November Council Meeting.</b></p>  | <p>23 August 2005</p> <p>Office of the CEO</p>  |
| <p>Provision of Information to Council Members</p> <p>Cmr Smith requested that a report be submitted to Council on the possibility of adopting protocols relating to the method and time limitations on all information provided to Council members, where such information is applicable to decisions being made at Council meetings.</p> <p><b>Comment: Options relating to possible protocols are being examined.</b></p>                     | <p>23 August 2005</p> <p>Office of the CEO</p>  |