



— *City of* —  
***Melville***

**MINUTES**

**OF THE**

**ORDINARY MEETING OF THE COUNCIL**

**HELD ON**

**20 FEBRUARY 2007**

**DISCLAIMER:**

The City of Melville disclaims any liability for any loss arising from any person or body relying on any statement, discussion, recommendation or decision made during this meeting.

Where an application for an approval, a licence, or the like is considered or determined during this meeting, the City of Melville warns that neither the applicant nor any other person or body should rely upon that discussion or determination until written notice of either an approval and the conditions which relate to it or the refusal of the application has been issued by the City.

**DISTRIBUTED: 23 FEBRUARY 2007**



— City of —  
**Melville**

10 Almondbury Road Booragoon WA 6154  
Postal Address: Locked Bag 1, Booragoon WA 6954  
Tel: 08 9364 0666  
Fax: 08 9364 0285  
Email: [melinfo@melville.wa.gov.au](mailto:melinfo@melville.wa.gov.au)  
Web: [www.melville.wa.gov.au](http://www.melville.wa.gov.au)

**MINUTES OF THE ORDINARY MEETING OF THE COUNCIL HELD IN THE COUNCIL CHAMBERS, MELVILLE CIVIC CENTRE, 10 ALMONDBURY ROAD, BOORAGOON, COMMENCING AT 6.39PM ON TUESDAY, 20 FEBRUARY 2007.**

**1. PRESENT**

Her Worship the Mayor, Katherine Jackson JP

**COUNCILLORS**

Cr D J Macphail (Deputy Mayor)  
Cr A Ceniviva  
Cr R A Aubrey  
Cr P M Phelan; Cr C M Halton  
Cr M J Barton; Cr L J Wyatt  
Cr J R Bennett; Cr L M Reynolds  
Cr H R Everett, Cr J Phillips

**WARD**

City  
City  
Bull Creek/Leeming  
Palmyra/Melville/Willagee  
Bicton/Attadale  
University  
Applecross/Mount Pleasant

**2. IN ATTENDANCE**

A McAllister  
M Jenkinson  
  
C McClure  
M Tieleman  
R G C Willis

B Taylor

M Ridgwell  
T Hirst  
R Dougall

**POSITION TITLE**

A / Chief Executive Officer  
A / Director Strategic Community Development  
Director Strategic Urban Planning  
Director Customer & Corporate Services  
Director Technical & Development Services  
Manager Information & Corporate Support  
Property & Corporate Support Manager  
Senior Administration Officer  
Minutes Secretary

There were 6 members of the Public present in the Public Gallery and 1 member of the press in the Media Gallery.

**3. APOLOGIES AND APPROVED LEAVE OF ABSENCE**

Cr C W Robartson

Bull Creek/Leeming

#### 4. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

Mr N Peterson and Mrs S Peterson of Bicton

*“After more than a year the State Administrative Tribunal finally handed down its decision on the 20<sup>th</sup> of December 2006 dismissing both of Mr Kallidis’ appeals against the conditions of his building approval BA-2002-1612 and retrospective planning approval DA2002-3/A for a two storey dwelling on Lot 2, 113 Point Walter Road Bicton.*

Question 1:

*For the sake of clarity, and so that we are all on the “same page”, I would like either Mr Keith Weymes or Mr Tony Capabianco to clarify the current status of each of the conditions stipulated on the building approvals, that is, provide a concise statement of whether each one complies or not.*

*I would also request that a response be given to each individual condition and where a condition is considered to comply please state 1) under what criteria it is deemed to comply and 2) how and when that criteria was determined.*

*From P04/3106 16 March 2004*

*The planting of a semi mature street tree at the owners full cost, prior to occupation of the residence, to the satisfaction of the Manager Planning and Development Services.”*

**The Manager Planning & Development Services, Mr Keith Weymes advised that:**

The funds were paid to the City of Melville.

*“A masonry fence approximately 1.8m high, plus 600mm glass blocks (or other suitable material to the satisfaction of the Manager Planning & Development Services), be constructed along the southern boundary of Lot 2, with the western extremity to match the existing masonry wall on Lot 1, and the western extremity to be to the eastern side of the kitchen window on Lot 2. The top of the coursing of the masonry wall to match the existing masonry wall on Lot 1.”*

**The Manager Planning & Development Services, Mr Keith Weymes advised that:**

A Building Licence has been issued for the works.

**4. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME (cont'd)**

*“The rear yard on Lot 2 is to be at natural ground level in accordance with levels depicted on survey plan prepared by Guidice Surveys, and any variation to the ground levels, or to the height of adjacent fencing, will require a further planning approval of the Council.”*

**The Manager Planning & Development Services, Mr Keith Weymes advised that:**

This condition will be required to be satisfied when development is completed.

*“The pool enclosure is to have a maximum height along the southern boundary of less than the height of the fence mentioned in Condition (2) above, with a maximum pitch of 25 degrees - the roof fabric to be non-reflective and translucent.”*

**The Manager Planning & Development Services, Mr Keith Weymes advised that:**

When constructed it will need to comply.

*“The area between the pool and the southern boundary fence to be non-accessible, but designed to accommodate Pool Safety Standards, and to be planted and/or landscaped, and maintained in accordance with a landscaping plan approved by the Manager Planning & Development Services.”*

**The Manager Planning & Development Services, Mr Keith Weymes advised that:**

The pool and surrounds have not yet been constructed/completed and will need to comply with the condition.

*“The pool equipment is to be located no closer than 7m from the outdoor living area on Lot 1, or suitably enclosed to the satisfaction of the Manager Planning & Development Services.”*

**The Manager Planning & Development Services, Mr Keith Weymes advised that:**

A building licence has been issued for a suitable enclosure.

*“The fence between the fencing mentioned in Condition (2) above, and the front of the dwelling, is to be a sufficient fence as defined by the Council Local Law and 1.8m in height measured from the higher ground level.”*

**The Manager Planning & Development Services, Mr Keith Weymes advised that:**

A Building Licence has been issued for the works.

**4. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME (cont'd)**

*“All openings to lower kitchen, games room (western and southern), dining/lounge (west), balcony, patio, pool area, sun deck and other raised areas to be screened to comply with the Residential Design Codes and Element 8 of the R Codes.”*

**The Manager Planning & Development Services, Mr Keith Weymes advised that:**

All will comply with the privacy requirements of the codes when the fences/ walls have been constructed.

*“Detailed plans to be submitted to the satisfaction of the Manager Development & Neighbourhood Amenity with respect to the above conditions.”*

**The Manager Planning & Development Services, Mr Keith Weymes advised that:**

All will comply with the privacy requirements of the codes when the fences/ walls have been constructed.

*“From P04/3105 12 October 2004*

*The opening to the eastern wall of the double garage and glass blocks to the western wall of the planter box.”*

**The Manager Planning & Development Services, Mr Keith Weymes advised that:**

This needs to be complied with. Glass blocks to be either removed or rendered over to comply with the existing approval.

*“The type and manner of privacy screening required to the southern and western sides of the second floor sundeck in accordance with condition 8 (visual privacy) of the council’s resolution in February 2004 will be determined via an inspection of lot 2 (113b) Point Walter Road, Bicton by City of Melville officers when the floor frame of the second floor sun deck has been installed and is adequately accessible.”*

**The Manager Planning & Development Services, Mr Keith Weymes advised that:**

Preliminary inspection during construction suggested compliance. Final inspection to be undertaken when construction complete.

**4. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME (cont'd)**

*“The adequacy of the proposed opaque blinds to be installed to the southern and western sides of the first floor balcony in accordance with condition 8 (visual privacy) of the councils resolution in February 2004 shall be determined via an inspection of Lot 2 (113b) Point Walter Road, Bicton by the City of Melville officers on completion of the required installation works. Should the proposed opaque blinds be deemed inadequate an alternative privacy screening measure to the southern and western sides of the first floor balcony will be required to the satisfaction of the Manager Planning & Development Services.”*

**The Manager Planning & Development Services, Mr Keith Weymes advised that:**

Works satisfactorily address the privacy requirements of the Codes as determined by SAT.

“Question 2:

*Is either Mr Weymes or Mr Capabianco aware that construction of the privacy wall with glass blocks has not yet begun? Nor has any of the other privacy treatments that Mr Kallidis has been directed by the SAT to complete by 19<sup>th</sup> March 2007 as per the building approvals granted.”*

**The Manager Planning & Development Services, Mr Keith Weymes advised that:**

Yes

*“How are the council officers “policing” the directions handed down by the SAT? What penalties, if any, apply for further non-compliance?”*

**The Manager Planning & Development Services, Mr Keith Weymes advised that:**

There is no breach at present. The penalties would be set by a court in accordance with the TP and Development Act if an offence was proved.

“Question 3:

*Since it would appear that Mr Kallidis has no intention of complying with the SAT directions can the CEO, Mr Eric Lumsden, give me an assurance that the council will take swift and decisive action against Mr Kallidis on or soon after the 19<sup>th</sup> March 2007?”*

**The A / Chief Executive Officer, Mrs A McAllister advised that:**

The Council is required to be ‘reasonable’ in all its dealings with all people and would have to consider what action is appropriate at that time. It is inappropriate to make that judgement prior to the event occurring and without hearing the facts of the case.

**4. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME (cont'd)**

*“What form might this action take?”*

**The Manager Planning & Development Services, Mr Keith Weymes advised that:**

The actions could vary from monitoring the progress of the construction and if not progressing, to issuing notices or commencing prosecution action.

“Question 4:

*I would ask that the CEO, Mr Eric Lumsden, given a declaration of the approximate cost to the City of Melville, and ultimately it's rate payers, of the appeals instigated by Mr Kallidis.”*

**The A / Chief Executive Officer, Mrs Anne McAllister advised that:**

The cost breakdown is as follows:

Legal fees relevant to matters associated with the property are approximately	\$17,000
Acoustic Consultant	\$3,861
Other costs e.g. staff costs	unknown.

*“Also whether or not the City of Melville will be seeking to recover these costs and if so when this will occur?”*

**The A / Chief Executive Officer, Mrs Anne McAllister advised that:**

The Council has requested that our costs be awarded however this was dismissed by SAT.

*“Lastly, will there be any other legal action instigated against the owner/builder?”*

**The A / Chief Executive Officer, Mrs Anne McAllister advised that:**

No legal action is proposed at this time. The Council is required to be 'reasonable' in all its dealings with all people and would have to consider what action is appropriate at that time. It is inappropriate to make that judgement prior to the event occurring and without hearing the facts of the case.

**4. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME (cont'd)**

Mr J Addvalue of Applecross

“Question 1

*Safety & Convenience – Nisbet Rd, Applecross*

*Nisbet Road provides access to Waylen Bay. It runs from The Strand to Tweeddale Road and then on to Canning Highway through Links Road, Armstrong and Ullapool. Between Tweeddale and Duncraig it has no footpaths.*

*Between Duncraig and The Strand it has a short stretch of footpath on its Western Verge. The footpath is short and very narrow, with several of its small slabs broken.*

*The adjacent verge has been massively built up, and so a retaining wall borders the footpath, reducing the effective width of the footpath. (The extent of the infill can be seen when one walks up from The Strand and looks towards the development.)*

*Hordes of cyclists use this portion of Nisbet Road, cycling at speed down Duncraig Road and then turning right into Nisbet to continue along The Strand.*

*The present provision for pedestrian traffic, especially mums with prams and small children, is highly unsatisfactory, from the points of convenience and safety.*

*Will the Council provide a wide footpath on the western verge of Nisbet Street between Duncraig Road and The Strand?*

*On another note, congratulations to Council on the decision to provide a footpath in Forbes Road.”*

**The Director Technical & Development Services, Mr Robert Willis advised that:**

From the information submitted there appears to be a case for a footpath however I will need to check the footpath programme to find out if there was any proposal. An undertaking was given to advise further in writing.

## 5. AWARDS AND PRESENTATIONS

A record of functions attended by the Mayor, and Elected Members representing the Mayor for the Council, for the period 19 December 2006 to 19 February 2007, forms an attachment to the Minutes of the Meeting.

[Mayoral Representation February 2007.pdf](#)

### **COUNCIL RESOLUTION**

Cr J R Bennett moved, seconded Cr H R Everett -

**THAT THE RECORD OF FUNCTIONS ATTENDED BY THE MAYOR, AND ELECTED MEMBERS REPRESENTING THE MAYOR ON BEHALF OF THE COUNCIL, FOR THE PERIOD 19 DECEMBER 2006 TO 19 FEBRUARY 2007, BE NOTED.**

Her Worship the Mayor, K J Jackson submitted the motion, which was declared  
**CARRIED WITHOUT DISSENT(12/0)**

## 6. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

### 6.1 ANNUAL MEETING OF ELECTORS 29 NOVEMBER 2006

#### **COUNCIL RESOLUTION**

Cr J R Bennett moved, seconded Cr H R Everett -

**THAT THE MINUTES OF THE ANNUAL MEETING OF ELECTORS HELD ON 29 NOVEMBER 2006 BE CONFIRMED AS A TRUE AND CORRECT RECORD.**

Her Worship the Mayor, K J Jackson submitted the motion, which was declared  
**CARRIED WITHOUT DISSENT (12/0)**

### 6.2 ORDINARY MEETING OF THE COUNCIL 19 DECEMBER 2006

#### **COUNCIL RESOLUTION**

Cr D J Macphail moved, seconded Cr R Aubrey -

**THAT THE MINUTES OF THE ORDINARY MEETING OF COUNCIL HELD ON 19 DECEMBER 2006 BE CONFIRMED AS A TRUE AND CORRECT RECORD.**

Her Worship the Mayor, K J Jackson submitted the motion, which was declared  
**CARRIED WITHOUT DISSENT (12/0)**

**6.3 GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE MEETING 30 JANUARY 2007**

**COUNCIL RESOLUTION**

Cr D J Macphail moved, seconded Cr R Aubrey -

**THAT THE MINUTES OF THE GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON 30 JANUARY 2007 BE CONFIRMED AS A TRUE AND CORRECT RECORD.**

Her Worship the Mayor, K J Jackson submitted the motion, which was declared  
**CARRIED WITHOUT DISSENT (12/0)**

**7. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST**

- Cr H R Everett P07/1001
- Cr H R Everett T05/1021

**8. APPLICATIONS FOR NEW LEAVES OF ABSENCE**

Cr H R Everett Applecross / Mt Pleasant

**COUNCIL RESOLUTION**

Cr M J Barton moved, seconded Cr P M Phelan -

**THAT CR H R EVERETT'S REQUEST FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE BE APPROVED.**

Her Worship the Mayor, K J Jackson submitted the motion, which was declared  
**CARRIED WITHOUT DISSENT (12/0)**

**9. IDENTIFICATION OF MATTERS FOR WHICH MEETING MAY BE CLOSED**

Nil.

## 10. PETITIONS

On Thursday, 4 January 2007 a Petition bearing 31 signatures was received by the City of Melville. The Petition reads as follows:

*“We, the undersigned and all being electors and or residents of the City of Melville, do humbly pray that parking restrictions be applied to both sides of Fletcher Street in the suburb of Applecross, City of Melville.*

*During 2006 there has been as increase in all day parking in Fletcher Street by persons who are non-residents of the street, nor visitors to the residents of the street, nor trades or service people assisting residents of the street, nor persons attending businesses of the street.*

*On most working days, there is no available parking space for residents, visitors of residents or trade and service people attending residents.*

*Most cars parking in the street arrive between 0700 hrs and 0830 hrs and depart between 1700 and 1800 hours each working day.*

*There are a number of unit properties in the street that require visitors to park on the street, a number of visitors are senior citizens and are required to walk some distance due to the lack of parking.*

*We recommend a 4 hour parking limit during the working week, Monday to Friday, be applied to Fletcher Street”.*

### **COUNCIL RESOLUTION**

Cr H R Everett moved, seconded Cr J Phillips -

**THAT THE PETITION BEARING 31 SIGNATURES WHICH WAS RECEIVED ON THURSDAY, 4 JANUARY 2007 BE NOTED AND THAT A REPORT BE PRESENTED TO THE NEXT AVAILABLE ORDINARY MEETING OF COUNCIL FOR CONSIDERATION.**

Her Worship the Mayor, K J Jackson submitted the motion, which was declared  
**CARRIED WITHOUT DISSENT (12/0)**

## 11. REPORTS OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

## **CONTENTS PAGE**

T05/1021 - ALMONDBURY ROAD TRAFFIC REVIEW .....	12
T07/2000 – APPECROSS VILLAGE SHOPPING CENTRE TOILETS.....	23
P07/3000 - PROPOSED SHADE SAIL ON LOT 868 (41) QUEENS ROAD, ARDROSS.....	30
C07/8000 – CANNING BRIDGE PARKING .....	37
C07/6004 - REVIEW AND CONSOLIDATION OF CONFERENCE ATTENDANCE POLICY 14-003 AND ELECTED MEMBERS ALLOWANCES & EXPENSES POLICIES 14-013 .....	46
P07/1000 – CITY OF MELVILLE LOCAL COMMERCIAL STRATEGY REVIEW.....	59
P07/1001 - MELVILLE CITY CENTRE VISION PLAN/CENTRE PLAN.....	69
P07/3002 - PAINT COLOUR TO BE APPLIED TO PORTION OF REFLECTIVE ROOF COVER ON EXISTING TWO STOREY SINGLE DWELLING ON LOT 90 (49) SWAN ROAD ATTADALE .....	83
P07/5000 - SUPPORT INITIATION OF AMENDMENT TO THE METROPOLITAN REGION SCHEME FOR REZONING OF THE HEATHCOTE LOWER LAND FROM “PUBLIC PURPOSES – HOSPITAL” TO “PARK AND RECREATION” .....	88
P07/5001 – FINAL APPROVAL FOR AMENDMENT NO. 42 TO CITY OF MELVILLE COMMUNITY PLANNING SCHEME NO. 5, BY AMENDING SCHEDULE 3 ADDITIONAL USES AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS TO INCLUDE THE USES OF THEATRE, RESTAURANT/CAFÉ AND SHOPS ON LOT – LOT 55 (391) CANNING HIGHWAY, LOT 831 (38) AND LOT 830 (38A) WADDELL ROAD, PALMYRA .....	91
P07/5002 – FINAL APPROVAL FOR AMENDMENT NO.45 TO COMMUNITY PLANNING SCHEME NO. 5 BY AMENDING SCHEDULE 3 ADDITIONAL USES AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS TO INCLUDE THE USE OF OFFICE ON LOT 146 (844) CANNING HIGHWAY, APPECROSS .....	95
P07/5003 - FINAL APPROVAL FOR AMENDMENT NO.46 TO COMMUNITY PLANNING SCHEME NO. 5 BY INSERTING A NEW PROVISION ENTITLED FRAGMENTATION OF LAND THE SUBJECT OF PLANNING APPROVAL .....	98
P07/5004 - FINAL APPROVAL FOR AMENDMENT NO.49 TO COMMUNITY PLANNING SCHEME NO. 5 BY AMENDING SCHEDULE 3 ADDITIONAL USES AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS TO INCLUDE THE USE OF OFFICE ON LOT 312 (11A) ALDOUS PLACE, BOORAGOON.....	101
CO23/06 – ROAD RESURFACING PROGRAMME 2006-2009 (REC) (ATTACHMENT)..	104

## **CONTENTS PAGE (Continued)**

C07/7001 –DISPOSAL OF LAND – LOT 195 (65) ARKWELL STREET, WILLAGEE .....	107
C07/5000 - COMMON SEAL REGISTER .....	110
C06/6000 – INVESTMENT STATEMENTS .....	113
C06/6001 – SCHEDULE OF ACCOUNTS.....	116
C07/6002 – FINANCIAL STATEMENTS .....	118

**T05/1021 - ALMONDBURY ROAD TRAFFIC REVIEW (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

Ward	:	Applecross/Mt Pleasant City
Category	:	Operational
Subject Index	:	Black Spot
Customer Index	:	Insert Customer Index from Dataworks
Disclosure of any Interest	:	No Officer involved in the preparation of this report has a declarable interest in this matter.
Previous Items	:	P06/1001 – Melville City Centre Vision Plan/Centre Plan and associated Memorandum of Understanding draft local Commercial Strategy (March 2006) T05/1029 – Committee Request – Investigation of traffic at the Canning Highway and Norma Road intersection, Alfred Cove (March 2006) T05/1021 – 2006/2007 State and National Black Spot Programmes (August 2005) <b><u>1021 P1 April 2006.pdf</u></b> T04/1021 – Almondbury Road traffic review (November 2004) <b><u>1021 P2 April 2006.pdf</u></b> T04/1021 – Almondbury Road traffic review (August 2006)
Works Programme	:	Roundabout construction and closure of Bragor Place during 2006/07 financial year. Possible traffic calming, minor works and shared path construction proposed for 2007/08 financial year.
Funding	:	\$200,000 State Black Spot Program funding \$100,000 proposed for possible traffic management treatments in 2007/08 (subject to review) \$50,000 proposed for minor works on Ardessie Street and Links Road in 2007/08. \$45,000 for construction of a shared path on the western side of Ardessie Street.
Responsible Officer	:	Philip Gale; Manager Infrastructure Services

**SUMMARY**

This report provides an update on operational issues that address the recommendations made by Council in April 2006 regarding planned road safety improvements on Almondbury Road, Ardross. The traffic/transport issues raised during the community consultation for the strategic Melville City Centre Plan consultation are also considered in this report as they mostly relate to the operation of Almondbury Road or the potential impacts of removing turning restrictions on that road.

**T05/1021 - ALMONDBURY ROAD TRAFFIC REVIEW (REC) (ATTACHMENT)****BACKGROUND**

As a result of a report about the traffic operation of Almondbury Road being considered at the Ordinary Meeting of Council held on 18 April 2006, a number of recommendations were adopted. This report provides an update on operational issues that address Recommendations 1 to 5 inclusive, that are planned with the main objective of improving road safety on Almondbury Road and roads in the vicinity.

The traffic/transport issues raised during the community consultation for the strategic Melville City Centre Plan consultation are also considered in this report as they mostly relate to the operation of Almondbury Road or the potential impacts of removing turning restrictions on that road.

**DETAIL**

Comments on the Council's previous Resolutions 1 to 5 from the 18 April 2006 Meeting are as follows:

*Resolution 1*

*That in order to address the significant crash history of Almondbury Road and having regard to the results of the survey of residents, the technical advice received from officers and independent traffic engineers as well as the results of the Value Management workshop conducted on Saturday 18 March 2006, Council give in-principle support to the installation of roundabouts, that allow all turning movements to be made, on Almondbury Road at the entrances to the Garden City Shopping Centre, and the southern end of Bragor Place be closed.*

This recommendation was noted and any further action is now pending the Council's consideration of Recommendation 2 below.

*Resolution 2*

*That subject to the advertising of the 'Garden City' Master Plan in April 2006 the Council, further consider the detailed design of the intersection treatment with the Master Plan proposals including appropriate traffic forecasts for various traffic management solutions.*

The Melville City Centre Plan consultation period finished on 20 December and a separate report on that plan is included on the agenda for the Ordinary Meeting of Council in February at which this report will be considered.

It should be noted that the detailed level of traffic assessment undertaken for the Melville City Centre Plan is exceptional, for what is a strategic level plan. It has been carried out to enable an informed decision to be made of the potential and perceived traffic impacts on the precinct in a fully developed or 'worst-case' scenario.

**T05/1021 - ALMONDBURY ROAD TRAFFIC REVIEW (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

The following 2 traffic reports were written to support the Melville City Centre Plan:

1. Garden City Shopping Centre Redevelopment, Traffic and Transport Assessment by Connell Wagner, and
2. Proposed Expansion of Garden City Shopping Centre, Assessment of Traffic Impacts on Surrounding Areas by Uloth and Associates.

The Mayor and Elected Members have been given copies of these reports and they are available for viewing on the City of Melville website.

The Traffic and Transport Assessment above concludes:

*“The traffic analysis work in this report indicates that the traffic demand generated by the proposed Garden City Shopping Centre should not create any major traffic impacts within the surrounding road network.*

*As recommended in the City of Melville’s Community Consultation Workshopping of the Almondbury Road Traffic Treatments, modifications to the Almondbury Road shopping centre intersections to allow full traffic manoeuvres, have been included in this traffic assessment. The modelling indicates some possible introduction of both local and through traffic into the northern suburbs. The possible induced traffic levels are considered to be a modelled overestimate and any possible induced traffic can be controlled by traffic management measures within this precinct, if deemed necessary.*

*Further detailed traffic assessment work may be necessary for the Development Application process.”*

The Assessment of Traffic Impacts on Surrounding Areas report above includes traffic modelling information and a technical analysis of traffic generated by an expanded Garden City Shopping Centre (to 85,959 m<sup>2</sup>), with all current turning restrictions removed on Almondbury Road.

The report predicts an overall increase in traffic generated by the shopping centre of approximately 9,600 vehicles per day (vpd) distributed across a number of roads, primarily distributor roads in the vicinity. Appropriately, the more major arterial roads of Marmion Street and Riseley Street are predicted to carry the majority of that additional traffic.

In regards to the section of Ardross immediately north of the shopping centre, the traffic modelling has predicted small increases in traffic volumes on Cunningham Street, McCallum Crescent, and Searle Road of 150 vpd or less on each road, if the shopping centre is expanded and the turning restrictions are removed on Almondbury Road. The traffic model has predicted larger increases of 520 vpd on Drew and Links Road. The overall total increase in traffic on local roads north of the centre is predicted to be 830 vpd, with 24% of that increase generated from within that area.

**T05/1021 - ALMONDBURY ROAD TRAFFIC REVIEW (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

At the request of officers, these figures were reviewed by the consultant for a scenario involving the provision of an additional right-turn lane on Riseley Street, at Almondbury Road. This would slightly reduce delays for that turning movement and increase the queuing capacity for vehicles making that turn, in an effort to encourage use of Riseley Street to access the City Centre rather than local roads. The model has estimated this will result in an overall traffic increase on local roads north of the centre of 620 vpd, a reduction of 210 vehicles per day.

*Resolution 3*

*That negotiations be undertaken with the owners of Garden City Shopping Centre in regards to the detailed design of the modification of the Almondbury Road access and egress point of the shopping centre and to obtain a suitable contribution from them for these works and any other traffic management works that may be required as a result of any negative traffic issues arising from traffic generated by their centre.*

The first part of this recommendation will be addressed once a detailed design has been completed for any major modifications to the Almondbury Road layout and/or at the time of any submission of any Development Application for expansion of the shopping centre by AMP. The second part of this recommendation will be addressed as a commitment by AMP to financially contribute to infrastructure costs for traffic management under a legal agreement secured in the Memorandum of Understanding between AMP and the City of Melville for the City Centre.

*Resolution 4*

*That a review of traffic movements be undertaken three (3) months and twelve (12) months after construction of traffic management treatments.*

This recommendation will be followed up after any modification of the layout of Almondbury Road, whether or not that involves the construction of a roundabout(s). Further traffic data would be collected in strategic locations to determine whether those modifications have resulted in any changes to traffic patterns, and if so, whether traffic calming is warranted to address those changes.

*Resolution 5*

*That an independent road safety audit be undertaken of the roads adjacent to the Applecross Senior High School and Ardross Primary School and also in areas of major school related pedestrian activity on Almondbury Road and Riseley Street.*

A Road Safety Audit was undertaken in September. [T05 1021B February 2007.pdf](#) A copy of the audit forms an attachment to this report and includes a copy of the Corrective Action Report completed by officers.

Addressing the audit recommendations will generally involve maintenance and minor works on the roads adjacent to the schools and some road safety/parking education and enforcement with the school communities. City of Melville officers will be liaising with representatives of both schools before actioning some of those recommendations.

**T05/1021 - ALMONDBURY ROAD TRAFFIC REVIEW (REC) (ATTACHMENT**

Whilst a number of the recommendations will be actioned using existing minor works or maintenance funding budget there is a need to allocate future funding for some projects including:

- The construction of a 2.5m wide shared path along the western side of Ardessie Street, from Leverburgh Street to Grimsay Road, at an estimated cost of \$45,000.
- Minor works such as kerb extensions to parking embayments on Ardessie Street and Links Road at an estimated cost of \$50,000.

The existing 1.2 metres wide footpath on the eastern side of Ardessie Street referred to in the audit is actually being upgraded during the current financial year as part of the City's footpath replacement program. It was planned to be upgraded to 1.8 metres wide but it is recommended that it be installed at 2.0 metres wide, the desirable width for shared paths.

**Melville City Centre Plan**

A total of 8 submissions were received during the recent community consultation for the Melville City Centre Plan and the issues raised in those submissions are listed in the table [T05\\_1021A February 2007.pdf](#) that forms an attachment to this report. In summary, the traffic or transport issues raised in those submissions are:

- The perceived insufficient parking capacity of the shopping centre;
- Concern about the ability to maintain agreements relating to an access gate;
- The need for improved pedestrian access to the shopping centre from Marmion and Riseley Streets;
- Sustainability;
- Health concerns about exhaust fumes from vehicles using the Main Street;
- Detailed intersection design issues;
- Support for removal of the turning restrictions on Almondbury Road;
- The need for a road link between Almondbury Road and Davy Street;
- Support for the construction of roundabouts on Almondbury Road;
- The need for equity in sharing the traffic load;
- Concern about the impact of the proposed roundabout on adjacent properties;
- Concern about the potential increase in traffic on local roads;
- Concern about the accuracy of the traffic reports;
- Concern about the potential reduction in amenity and safety on local roads.

**POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

The consultation undertaken for this project was carried out in accordance with the Public Communication policy current at the time and any works on Almondbury Road will be the subject of a road safety audit, in accordance with Council Policy No. 27-002, Road Safety Audits.

**T05/1021 - ALMONDBURY ROAD TRAFFIC REVIEW (REC) (ATTACHMENT)****PUBLIC CONSULTATION/COMMUNICATION**

Community consultation on the removal of turning restrictions on Almondbury Road, at the 2 entrances to the Garden City Shopping Centre was carried out with regard for Council policy and has included:

- A community survey in November 2005 that resulted in support of removal of the turning restrictions on Almondbury Road by 75% of persons who responded to the survey.
- A Value Management Workshop held with community members in March 2006 that evaluated 5 possible traffic treatment options and which resulted in the proposed roundabouts option achieving the highest level of support.

That consultation is described in more detail in the April 2006 report on this matter. A Special Meeting of Electors was also held on 17 May 2006 which gave concerned community members an opportunity to express their views about any modification of Almondbury Road.

The community consultation for the Melville City Centre Plan was conducted during November and December and a total of 8 submissions were received, all commenting on traffic and transport issues to varying degrees. Further consultation carried out for that strategic project is detailed in the separate report on that plan included on the agenda for the February Ordinary Meeting of Council at which this report will be considered.

**STATUTORY AND LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

Almondbury Road is under the care and control of the City of Melville.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

\$200,000 funding from the State Black Spot Program funding has been approved for the current financial year for the installation of 2 roundabouts on Almondbury Road and the closure of the southern end of Bragor Place.

It is recommended that the following projects are included in the 2007/08 budget:

Possible traffic calming treatments (subject to monitoring and review)	\$100,000
Minor works around Ardross Primary and Applecross Senior High School	\$ 50,000
Install a 2.5m wide shared path along the western side of Ardessie Street	\$ 45,000

**T05/1021 - ALMONDBURY ROAD TRAFFIC REVIEW (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

**STRATEGIC AND RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS**

<b>Risk Statement</b>	<b>Level of Risk*</b>	<b>Risk Mitigation Strategy</b>
The number of vehicle crashes in Almondbury Rd will remain high if current road layout remains unchanged.	Moderate consequences are certain (based on existing crash history), resulting in an <b>Extreme</b> level of risk	Install roundabouts that have been approved 'in-principle' to reduce frequency and severity of crashes.

<b>Risk Statement</b>	<b>Level of Risk*</b>	<b>Risk Mitigation Strategy</b>
Removal of turning restrictions on Almondbury Road could result in increased traffic flow on roads north of the shopping centre.	Minor consequences are likely, resulting in a <b>Medium</b> level of risk	Monitor roads in that area to determine what impact occurs and whether traffic calming is warranted to address those changes.

\* As derived from using the Risk Assessment Matrix

**COMMENT**

The need to address the significant reported crash history of Almondbury Road was identified by officers when reviewing locations for potential Black Spot projects in mid 2004. Most attention is given to addressing intersection crashes as they typically have the highest frequency and severity of crashes. However, it was noticed that crashes on Almondbury Road had increased to a point where that road has the unenviable position of having the most crashes in a 500-metre section of road for a road managed by the City of Melville.

At that time, there were a total of 55 crashes over a 5-year period to the end of 2003 in that section of road, which has now risen to 73 crashes in the 5-year period to the end of 2005. Note, that this does not include any crashes that have occurred at the intersection of Almondbury Road / Coomoorra Road / Riseley Street.

The frequency of crashes in that section of road has risen noticeably since the current road layout was installed in 2000, at the time of the most recent expansion of the Garden City Shopping Centre. The need for such a treatment was never identified as being necessary in the traffic studies that were undertaken at the time. That treatment was installed to address the concerns of a minority of residents in the section of Ardross immediately north of the shopping centre, who expressed the view that traffic would become a problem.

Emphasising the need that action needs to be taken to reduce these crashes is that the next locations on the same list for road section crashes are mainly occupied by Riseley Street, North Lake Road and Marmion Street, all major distributor roads which carry higher volumes of traffic than Almondbury Road. This suggests that despite the significantly lower traffic volumes there is currently a greater risk of being involved in a crash on Almondbury Road than on Marmion or Riseley Streets.

**T05/1021 - ALMONDBURY ROAD TRAFFIC REVIEW (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

The installation of roundabouts on Almondbury Road, at each entry to the Garden City Shopping Centre, is a road safety countermeasure that has been proposed as a measure to reduce the number and severity of crashes along that road. The roundabouts will improve the safe operation of the road by reducing the travel speed of vehicles in proximity to the shopping centre driveways; reducing the frequency of right-angle crashes; and remove the need for motorists to perform undesirable U-turns and other turning movements to access/egress the shopping centre. \$200,000 funding from the State Black Spot Program funding has been approved for the current financial year for the installation of 2 roundabouts on Almondbury Road and the closure of the southern end of Bragor Place.

If this project proceeds in this financial year, though, it will be necessary to apply to Main Roads Western Australia for a change in the scope of works as the project is now estimated to cost more than originally submitted. It will also be necessary to change the scope of works of the current project to constructing a roundabout (1) at the westernmost (cinema) entrance to the shopping centre and closing Bragor Place. This revised project has a slightly higher Benefit-Cost than the original project, which would assist in gaining approval for the scope of works change.

Note that the original concept was for a mini-roundabout at the westernmost entrance to the shopping centre. It is now intended that it actually be constructed as a standard size roundabout so that it operates as effectively as possible. The potential impact of construction of that roundabout on residential properties on the opposite side of Almondbury Road would be minimised by moving it partly into the shopping centre site, which has the support of AMP representatives.

The second roundabout planned at the easternmost (Kmart/Myer) entrance to the shopping centre could then be constructed in the next 1-2 years, subject to suitable funding from the City of Melville, AMP, the State Black Spot Program, or a combination of these sources. This relates directly to Recommendation 3 above, regarding a contribution from the owners of the shopping centre for these and any other traffic management works.

It has been previously acknowledged that the removal of the turning restrictions on Almondbury Road would result in increases in traffic on roads immediately north of the shopping centre. However, it is considered that any increase will not be significant and would be within both the function and capacity of those roads. It is fully intended that traffic volumes on those roads be monitored after any modifications to Almondbury Road to determine whether those modifications have resulted in any changes to traffic patterns, and if so, whether traffic calming is warranted to address those changes.

The traffic modelling undertaken by Uloth and Associates predicts small increases in traffic on Cunningham Street, McCallum Crescent and Searle Road, with greater increases predicted on Drew Road, between Links Road and Riseley Street. However, the size of the increases on Drew Road and Links Road are considered to be an overestimate (by both the consultants and officers), as the model used is based on travel-time and it has assumed that some motorists travelling south on Riseley Street will use the Drew Road – Links Road route to access the shopping centre at the cinema entrance. This is because that route is slightly shorter than continuing south along Riseley Street to the same point.

**T05/1021 - ALMONDBURY ROAD TRAFFIC REVIEW (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

This is considered unlikely because:

- When travelling north from the centre there are minimal delays turning left onto Riseley Street from Almondbury Road.
- When travelling south along Riseley Street, approaching Drew Road, there is no way to tell the length of the traffic queues or the delays being experienced at the traffic signals at the Almondbury Road / Riseley Street intersection.
- Delays experienced turning right from Riseley Street into Drew Road would discourage that movement.
- The Drew Road – Links Road route is not, and would not, be signed as an access route to the shopping centre.

Also, to encourage the use of Riseley Street rather than local roads, the performance of the Almondbury Road / Riseley Street intersection will be investigated with a view to keeping delays for vehicles turning right into Almondbury Road to an acceptable level. This might be achieved by modifying the traffic signal phasing or the installation of a second right-turn lane for traffic turning into Almondbury Road.

Whilst it is intended to continue to monitor these roads there has been some community concern expressed about the delay likely to occur between identifying a problem and treating it, because of the length of time involved in Council's reporting and budgeting processes. To address this concern, it is recommended that if the installation of the roundabouts is finally approved that funding of a nominal figure of \$100,000 be allocated in accordance with the Garden City Legal Agreement for possible traffic calming in Ardross, West of Riseley Street. The conclusion of Connell Wagner's Traffic & Transportation Assessment, that an expanded Garden City Shopping Centre "should not create any major traffic impacts within the surrounding road network" is supported. The majority of the predicted increase in traffic generated by the centre is expected to occur, appropriately, on the more major roads of Marmion and Riseley Streets. Any increases in volumes on more local roads are expected to be small and within the function and capacity of those roads.

It is considered that the community submissions to the Melville City Centre Plan consultation do not raise any major traffic or transport issues that have not already been, or will be, addressed. Some of those issues will be dealt with during the detailed design phase of any traffic treatments and monitoring of traffic volumes will ensure concerns about increased traffic on local roads are addressed.

The community are always, quite reasonably, concerned about the potential increase of traffic volume on local roads. It is considered that the installation of roundabouts and the removal of turning restrictions on Almondbury Road will improve road safety by reducing the crash history of that road and improve access between the shopping centre and the section of Ardross immediately north of the centre. This is not expected to result in significant changes in traffic volumes on local roads in that area.

**T05/1021 - ALMONDBURY ROAD TRAFFIC REVIEW (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**Disclosures of Interest

<b>Item No</b>	:	T05/1021 – Almondbury Road Traffic Review
<b>Member</b>	:	Cr H R Everett
<b>Type of Interest</b>	:	Proximity Interest in Accordance with the Act (s 5.60B)
<b>Nature of Interest</b>	:	Alterations to Almondbury Road Traffic Review could adversely affect traffic outside my home in McCallum Crescent.
<b>Extent of Interest</b>	:	Resides in close proximity
<b>Request</b>	:	Stay and Observe
<b>Decision of Committee</b>	:	N / A
<b>Decision of Council</b>	:	Stay and Observe

**COUNCIL RESOLUTION**

Cr R Aubrey moved, seconded Cr J R Bennett -

**THAT CR H R EVERETT BE ALLOWED TO STAY AND OBSERVE.**

Her Worship the Mayor, K J Jackson submitted the motion, which was declared  
**CARRIED WITHOUT DISSENT (11/0)**

**T05/1021 - ALMONDBURY ROAD TRAFFIC REVIEW (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

**COUNCIL RESOLUTION (1021)**

Cr D J Macphail moved, seconded Cr R Aubrey -

1. THAT THE PROPOSED INSTALLATION OF TWO ROUNDABOUTS ON ALMONDBURY ROAD, AND THE CLOSURE OF BRAGOR PLACE BE APPROVED,
2. THAT THE INSTALLATION OF A ROUNDABOUT AT THE WESTERN (CINEMA) ENTRANCE TO GARDEN CITY SHOPPING CENTRE AND THE CLOSURE OF BRAGOR PLACE PROCEED THIS FINANCIAL YEAR USING THE STATE BLACK SPOT PROGRAM FUNDS.
3. THAT A CHANGE OF SCOPE TO THE STATE BLACK SPOT PROGRAM SUBMISSION FOR THE INSTALLATION OF ONE ROUNDABOUT AND THE CLOSURE OF BRAGOR PLACE BE SUBMITTED TO MAIN ROADS WA.
4. THAT THE SECOND ROUNDABOUT ON ALMONDBURY ROAD, AT THE EASTERN ENTRANCE TO GARDEN CITY SHOPPING CENTRE, AND AN ADDITIONAL RIGHT-TURN LANE ON RISELEY STREET, AT ALMONDBURY ROAD, BE INSTALLED IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE GARDEN CITY EXPANSION.
5. THAT A REVIEW OF TRAFFIC MOVEMENTS BE UNDERTAKEN 3 MONTHS AND 12 MONTHS AFTER CONSTRUCTION OF ANY TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT TREATMENTS.
6. THAT THE FOOTPATH ON THE EASTERN SIDE OF ARDESSIE STREET BE UPGRADED TO A WIDTH OF 2.0 METRES.
7. THAT \$50,000 BE ALLOCATED IN THE 2007/08 BUDGET TO ADDRESS THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE ROAD SAFETY AUDIT UNDERTAKEN AROUND THE ARDROSS PRIMARY AND APPECROSS SENIOR HIGH SCHOOLS.
8. THAT \$45,000 BE ALLOCATED IN THE 2007/08 BUDGET FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF A 2.5M WIDE SHARED PATH ON THE WESTERN SIDE OF ARDESSIE ROAD, FROM LEVERBURGH STREET TO CALGARY STREET.

Her Worship the Mayor, K J Jackson submitted the Motion which was declared

**CARRIED WITHOUT DISSENT (11/0)**

**T07/2000 – APPLECROSS VILLAGE SHOPPING CENTRE TOILETS (REC)  
(ATTACHMENT)**

Ward	:	Applecross/Mt Pleasant
Category	:	Operational
Subject Index	:	Applecross Village
Customer Index	:	Petition
Disclosure of any Interest	:	No Officer involved in the preparation of this report has a declarable interest in this matter.
Previous Items	:	T06/2000-Applecross Village Shopping Centre-Petition for Toilets
Works Programme	:	Capital Works Program
Funding	:	Capital Works Program
Responsible Officer	:	Philip Gale; Manager Infrastructure Services

**SUMMARY**

Following a petition for the installation of public toilets in Applecross Village Shopping Centre and a report to Council in February 2006 a survey has been undertaken with shop owners and shoppers in Applecross Village. This item reports on the results of that survey.

**BACKGROUND**

A petition signed by one hundred and eighty (180) residents was received and presented to the November 2005 meeting of the Council with the following recommendation:

*“That the petition bearing one hundred and eighty signatures from residents of the City of Melville, in relation to the provision of public toilets at the Applecross Village, be referred to the next available Technical Services Committee for consideration.”*

This item was presented to Council in February 2006 detailing the proposal to install a self cleaning toilet of the type used throughout Australia in similar situations.

The recommendations adopted by Council in item T06/2000 were:

- 1. That the proposal to provide public toilets at Applecross Village Centre be adopted.*
- 2. That funding of one hundred and fifty thousand dollars (\$150,000) from the Commercial Centre Programme be allocated to the provision of a toilet at Applecross Village Shopping Centre in the 2007/2008 Financial Year.*
- 3. That the Council note that as a result of the above decision an annual increase of approximately six thousand dollars (\$6,000) per annum will be required to fund maintenance and operational costs excluding vandalism.*
- 4. That further public consultation be undertaken prior to any works being undertaken regarding location and design.*
- 5. That the petitioners be advised of the Council decision.*

**T07/2000 – APPLECROSS VILLAGE SHOPPING CENTRE TOILETS (REC)  
(ATTACHMENT)**

The location of a facility such as this is determined by several factors the prime one being the security and safety of users. The City of Melville adopts and applies CPTED (Crime Prevention through Environmental Design) principles in its planning of projects. The issues relating to the siting of the toilets is dealt with in the Detail section of this report as it is relevant to comments received during the consultation.

**DETAIL**

It was determined that in line with recommendation 4 a survey would be undertaken to gauge the level of support for the proposal. The target group was to be all shop-owners in the Applecross Village Centre and also shoppers were invited to make comment. It was considered that residents in surrounding streets would be unaffected by the installation of a toilet in the proposed location.

[T06\\_2000A\\_February\\_2007.pdf](#) A copy of the information distributed to shop owners forms an attachment to this report. The surveys were distributed by hand to shop owners and a display detailing the proposal was erected at the proposed location inviting shoppers to make comment. Shoppers were advised that survey forms and reply paid envelopes were available from the adjacent newsagents.

The questionnaire consisted of a single question; *“do you support the installation of a public toilet in Applecross Village similar to the examples shown in the attached plans and photos”*. A response box was included for ticking either yes or no. The questionnaire also gave the opportunity for the respondents to make comment.

To measure the responses received it is necessary to categorise into the grouping:

- Support the proposal in it's entirety
- Support the proposal but not the location
- Do not support the proposal regardless

It is preferable to break the responses into two groups i.e., shop owners and the shoppers as there is likely be a different rational behind the response given.

**Survey of Shop Owners**

Forty eight survey forms were distributed to shop owners. 25 responses were received giving a return rate of 52% a summary of the responses is given below:

- |                                             |    |
|---------------------------------------------|----|
| • Support the proposal                      | 13 |
| • Support the proposal but not the location | 9  |
| • Do not support the proposal               | 3  |

**T07/2000 – APPLECROSS VILLAGE SHOPPING CENTRE TOILETS (REC)**  
**(ATTACHMENT)****Survey of Shoppers**

Twenty six responses were received from shoppers.

- Support the Proposal 7
- Support the proposal but not the location 13
- Do not support the proposal 8

It is demonstrated in the above figures that shop-owners are more supportive of the proposal in its entirety than shoppers. This may be in part due to the frequency with which shoppers request to use a toilet on shop premises, a view that has been expressed by several shop owners.

Combining the shop-owners and shoppers responses gives the following results:

- Support the Proposal 20 38% of responses
- Support the proposal but not the location 22 42% of responses
- Do not support the proposal 11 20% of responses

There were 42 responses that acknowledged that a toilet facility was needed in the Applecross Village this represents 79% of responses.

The results clearly demonstrate that there is a perceived need for a public toilet in the vicinity of the Applecross Village shopping Centre. In reference to the responses that supported the proposal but not the location it should be noted that the location was chosen for the following reasons.

**Security and Safety**

When undertaking planning and design of works the City of Melville adopts the CPTED principles (Crime Prevention through Environmental Design).

In reference to the siting of toilets the following comments have been extracted from the ACT Crime Prevention & Urban Design Resource Manual published by the Australian Capital Territory Government. In section 4.12 Public Toilets the objectives given are;

- To ensure safety for all people using public toilets.
- To ensure that facilities are well maintained and that repairs are made promptly.
- To locate facilities to take advantage of natural surveillance to discourage non-legitimate uses.

Under the heading of *Issues to Consider* it lists the following;

- Location - Locate public toilets adjacent to high traffic areas rather than in isolated locations, but do not place seats and phones too near toilets as this legitimises loitering.
- Visibility - Design approaches and entrances to be highly visible so that people cannot loiter or enter without being seen.

**T07/2000 – APPECROSS VILLAGE SHOPPING CENTRE TOILETS (REC)  
(ATTACHMENT)**

The proposed location for the toilet has been selected for the reasons given above and to be convenient for the user.

Several respondents to the survey suggested alternative locations for the siting of the toilet which they believed would be preferable. These suggestions are listed below:

- *To the rear of the shopping centre* - There are obvious security and safety issues and fails in the application of CPTED principles. Furthermore the only available space at the rear would be on private land.
- *Within one of the existing car parks fronting onto Ardross Street* - Whilst this could probably be accommodated within CPTED principles it would require:
  1. Sacrificing a minimum of two (2) parking bays in an area that is very busy and it would be unwise to reduce parking capacity.
  2. As the land is privately owned it would need to either purchased by the City of Melville or be secured through some kind of license agreement.
  3. For security and safety reason the entrance door to the toilet will have to be on the street frontage. To place the door on any other side would compromise safety both through the limited surveillance and the hazard presented from traffic within the car park.

Given the factors mentioned above it is considered that placing the toilet within an existing car park is not a viable alternative location.

The concerns regarding the siting of the toilet appear to arise from two issues being the appearance of the structure. To address this it is suggested that further work be done to consider designs that are in harmony with the existing streetscape by the use of colour and design in as far as is practically possible.

The other issue that has been raised is one of sensitivity to the placing of a public toilet. There have been similar issues raised at similar locations throughout Australia. It has been found that once installed the sensitivity issue diminishes over time with familiarity. Furthermore there are many instances of these facilities being situated within major community precincts such as Perth CBD, Northbridge, Subiaco Centro and Fremantle. In these locations they are frequently used by all the community and are well accepted as part of the streetscape.

## **POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

Planning permission will be a requirement prior the proposal proceeding.

**T07/2000 – APPLECROSS VILLAGE SHOPPING CENTRE TOILETS (REC)  
(ATTACHMENT)****PUBLIC CONSULTATION/COMMUNICATION**

A questionnaire and information pack including a reply paid envelope was distributed by hand to all shop owners in the Applecross Village Shopping Centre. In addition a display was erected at the proposed location providing information on the proposal and inviting shoppers to obtain a questionnaire and reply paid envelope from the adjacent newsagent.

**STATUTORY AND LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

None

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

To install a toilet at the proposed location will cost approximately \$130,000. This includes the cost of providing a sewer connection from the existing mains sewer line in Macleod Road. To maintain the toilet on annual basis will cost \$7,000 per annum.

**STRATEGIC AND RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS**

The design and siting of the toilet will minimise the risk to users by the application of CPTED principles.

<b>Risk Statement</b>	<b>Level of Risk*</b>	<b>Risk Mitigation Strategy</b>
That some patrons won't use the facility due to the perceived embarrassment of entering a toilet in plain view.	Minor consequences with possible likelihood, resulting in a medium level risk.	Using architectural design to make the facility more aesthetically pleasing and less conspicuous as a public toilet.

**T07/2000 – APPLECROSS VILLAGE SHOPPING CENTRE TOILETS (REC)**  
**(ATTACHMENT)**

<b>Risk Statement</b>	<b>Level of Risk*</b>	<b>Risk Mitigation Strategy</b>
Possible physical attacks on patrons	Major Consequence which are unlikely to occur. Therefore Medium Level of risk.	The facility is to be located in a prominent position on Ardross Street according to CPTED principles. Design of structure deters loiterers and other people can't enter when someone is in there. There is also a duress alarm installed within the unit.

<b>Risk Statement</b>	<b>Level of Risk*</b>	<b>Risk Mitigation Strategy</b>
Vandalism	Negligible Consequences which are possible, resulting in a low level of risk.	The design and materials used in the facility reduces the consequences of the vandalism and the prominent position of the facility under local surveillance will reduce the likelihood.

**COMMENT**

The survey has demonstrated that there is a strong support for a public toilet facility within the Applecross Village shopping Centre. Anecdotal evidence from shop owners has shown that they are frequently asked by shoppers if they may use their toilet facilities. There is some concern expressed by some shop owners that this may compromise their security whilst they leave their premises unattended while they direct the shopper to the toilet. In addition where the premises is used for the cooking of food then the toilets are strictly for the use of staff only and it is an infringement of the health act for the general public to use them.

There is a lot of concern from respondents over the siting of the toilets. Given the CPTED criteria that it is necessary to locate the toilet in an area of high natural surveillance and that it not be on private land then the proposed location would be deemed the most appropriate to meet these criteria.

It is proposed that the eventual design of the toilet and the immediate surround can be designed to alleviate the concerns regarding the appearance. [T06 2000 February 2007.pdf](#) Photos of similar toilet facilities in prominent locations form an attachment to this report.

**T07/2000 – APPLECROSS VILLAGE SHOPPING CENTRE TOILETS (REC)  
(ATTACHMENT)**

**Officer Recommendation**

1. That the results of the survey indicating the recognised need for a public toilet in the Applecross Village Shopping Centre be noted.

**Option 1**

2. That a public toilet be installed at the location indicated on Plan 922A3-06PG and a design for the toilet incorporating streetscape elements be prepared in consultation with Ward Councillors.
3. That the sum of \$130,000 be set aside for the installation of a public toilet in the Applecross Village Shopping Centre in 2007/2008 capital works program.

**Option 2**

2. That due to the lack of public support in respect to the location proposed, the public toilet not proceed at the site indicated on Plan 922A3-06PG.
3. That this request not proceed until such time as an acceptable location is identified by the community that complies with appropriate safety, security & amenity criteria in accordance with CPTED principles.

**COUNCIL RESOLUTION (2000)**

Cr H R Everett moved, seconded Cr J Phillips -

1. **THAT THE RESULTS OF THE SURVEY INDICATING THE RECOGNISED NEED FOR A PUBLIC TOILET IN THE APPLECROSS VILLAGE SHOPPING CENTRE BE NOTED.**
2. **THAT DUE TO THE LACK OF PUBLIC SUPPORT IN RESPECT TO THE LOCATION PROPOSED, THE PUBLIC TOILET NOT PROCEED AT THE SITE INDICATED ON PLAN 922A3-06PG.**
3. **THAT THIS REQUEST NOT PROCEED UNTIL SUCH TIME AS AN ACCEPTABLE LOCATION IS IDENTIFIED BY THE COMMUNITY THAT COMPLIES WITH APPROPRIATE SAFETY, SECURITY & AMENITY CRITERIA IN ACCORDANCE WITH CRIME PREVENTION THROUGH ENVIRONMENTAL DESIGN (CPTED) PRINCIPLES.**

Her Worship the Mayor, K J Jackson having the Casting Vote declared the Motion

**CARRIED (7/6)**

**P07/3000 - PROPOSED SHADE SAIL ON LOT 868 (41) QUEENS ROAD, ARDROSS**  
**(REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

Ward	:	Applecross / Mount Pleasant
Category	:	Planning / Building Development
Application Number	:	DA-2006-1737
Property	:	41 Queens Road, Ardross WA 6153
Proposal	:	Shade sail
Applicant	:	Taskers Pty Ltd
Owner	:	Mr D A O'Donoghue and Ms F Crocker
Disclosure of any Interest	:	No officer involved in the preparation of this report has a declarable interest in this matter.
Responsible Officer	:	Keith Weymes, Manager Planning & Development Services
Previous Items	:	Nil

**SUMMARY**

This application is for a shade sail on Lot 868 (41) Queens Road, Ardross. The shade sail is proposed to cover the front upper floor balcony of the existing 2 storey residence and involves a significant variation to the permitted height under City of Melville Policy.

It is recommended that the application be approved subject to a number of conditions.

**BACKGROUND**

The subject lot was created under subdivision application WAPC 117058 for 2 side-by-side green title lots.

The City of Melville approved the existing 2 storey single dwelling (DA-2004-592) on 17 May 2004.

**Scheme Provisions**

MRS Zoning	:	Urban
CPS 5 Zoning	:	Living Area Precinct – Ardross
R-Code	:	R20
Use Type	:	Residential
Use Class	:	P

**P07/3000 - PROPOSED SHADE SAIL ON LOT 868 (41) QUEENS ROAD, ARDROSS  
(REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

**Site Details**

Lot Area : 457sqm  
Retention of Existing Vegetation : No  
Street Tree(s) : Yes – Queensland Box Tree – Fair Condition  
Street Furniture (drainage pits etc) : No  
Site Details : [P07 3000 Property Map.pdf](#)

[P07 3000 February 2007.pdf](#) A copy of the plans forms part of the Attachments to the Agenda, which were distributed to Members of the Council on Wednesday, 14 February 2007.

**DETAIL**

**Development Requirements**

Development Requirement	Required/ Allowed	Proposed	Comments	Delegation to approve variation	Plan Notation
Shade Sail Height	3.0 metres, up to a maximum of 3.5 metres	<b>5.5 metres</b>	<b>Does Not Comply</b>	DTDS	
Materials	To complement existing dwelling	“Steel Grey” shade cloth and “Ironstone” columns	Complies		
Size	60 square metres if located in front of the building setback line	14 sqm	Complies		

(Note: Non-compliance is emphasised in bold)

**P07/3000 - PROPOSED SHADE SAIL ON LOT 868 (41) QUEENS ROAD, ARDROSS  
(REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

**Setbacks**

Wall	Required	Proposed	Comments	Delegation to approve Variation	Plan Notation
Front (N)	4.5 metres	4.5 metres	Complies		
Side (E)	Council Policy – Posts 0.3 metres, Other part 0.15 metres  R-Codes – 1.2 metres	0.4 metres, however up to 50% of an adjoining accessway can be used in calculating setbacks  Effective Setback = 2.4 metres	Complies with Council Policy, however setbacks are based upon a maximum height of 3.5 metres.  Complies with R-Codes based upon inclusion of 50% of adjoining accessway		
Side (W)	1.2 metres	4.0 metres	Complies		

**POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

City of Melville Development and Building Controls Policy 06-PL-019 (Pergolas) outlines the general development requirements for pergolas and similar structures. Amongst these requirements are:

- Maximum height of 3.5 metres above natural ground level, if favourable comments from the adjoining landowner/s are provided;
- Located on the boundary if favourable comments from the adjoining landowner/s are provided;
- To a maximum area of 60 square metres if located in front of the building setback line and not closer than 4.5 metres from the front boundary. May be setback 3 metres if favourable comments from the adjoining landowner/s are provided.

The policy requires any applications involving variations to the height and setbacks to be referred to the Council for determination.

**PUBLIC CONSULTATION/COMMUNICATION**

Advertising Required: Yes  
 Neighbour's Comment Supplied: Yes  
 Reason: Variation to maximum height; variation to side setback  
 Support/Object: 4 support, 0 object.

**P07/3000 - PROPOSED SHADE SAIL ON LOT 868 (41) QUEENS ROAD, ARDROSS  
(REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

<b>Affected Property</b>	<b>Summary of Submission</b>	<b>Support/ Objection</b>	<b>Officer's Comment</b>	<b>Action (Condition/ Support/ Dismiss)</b>
38 Queens Road, Mount Pleasant	Acknowledge the specifications and height of shade sail and authorise the installation of shade sail.	Support	Noted	
39A Queens Road, Ardross	Acknowledge the specifications and height of shade sail and authorise the installation of shade sail.	Support	Noted	
40 Queens Road, Ardross	Acknowledge the specifications and height of shade sail and authorise the installation of shade sail.	Support	Noted	
41A Queens Road, Ardross	Acknowledge the specifications and height of shade sail and authorise the installation of shade sail.	Support	Noted	

**REFERRALS TO GOVERNMENT AGENCIES**

Not required.

**STATUTORY AND LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

Should the City of Melville refuse the application for planning approval, or impose a condition in the event of the application being approved, the applicant will have the right to have the decision reviewed in accordance with Part XIV of the Planning and Development Act 2005.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

None.

**STRATEGIC AND RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS**

None.

**P07/3000 - PROPOSED SHADE SAIL ON LOT 868 (41) QUEENS ROAD, ARDROSS**  
**(REC) (ATTACHMENT)****COMMENT**

The proposed shade sail at 41A Queens Road, Ardross is proposed to be located above the upper floor balcony of the existing two storey dwelling. The shade sail will be “steel grey” shade cloth with “ironstone” support columns. The 2 front support columns are proposed to be attached to the front of the existing garage, with the remaining 2 corners being affixed to the roof of the dwelling.

The shade sail proposes a significant variation to the maximum height permitted under Council policy.

**Maximum Height**

City of Melville Development and Building Controls Policy 06-PL-019 (Pergolas) stipulates a maximum shade sail height of 3 metres, which may be varied to a maximum height of 3.5 metres if there are no objections from the above natural ground level adjoining landowners.

The proposed shade sail will be 5.5 metres above the existing ground level, which is a 2 metre variation to the maximum height stipulated under the Council policy.

The applicant has sought comment from all of the adjoining landowners, and no objections have been indicated. In support of the variation, the applicant has made the following comments:

*“The maximum height will come to 5.5 metres at the roof level ... we feel this will not be detrimental to the streetscape or the amenity of the adjoining properties given that the shade sail does not protrude from the house itself. Also the height does not protrude the height level of the roof... The shade cloth colour will be ‘Steel Grey’ with columns to be ‘Ironstone’. These two colours match in with the existing colour bond (sic) and painting of the render of the property. We feel that it blends in nicely and is no where (sic) near unsightly”.*

Although there is no performance based criteria contained within the relevant Council policy, it can be considered that a height variation should be assessed under the following:

- Impact on Streetscape:

The immediate streetscape surrounding the property comprises numerous mature street trees and well-established and well-maintained gardens. The shade sail does not protrude further into the primary street setback area than the existing garage, which is at a similar setback to the adjoining properties. It can be considered that the proposed shade sail will not unduly impact the streetscape in any greater way than a second storey roof may have the potential to.

**P07/3000 - PROPOSED SHADE SAIL ON LOT 868 (41) QUEENS ROAD, ARDROSS  
(REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

- Impact on Adjoining Properties:

The shade sail is generally setback in accordance with City of Melville Policy and the Residential Design Codes 2002, other than the eastern side, which is setback 0.4 metres in lieu of 1.2 metres. The eastern side of the shade sail abuts a vehicle accessway, and therefore can be considered to have only a minor impact upon amenity.

The shade sail is located on the northern side of the property, and is therefore not likely to cast any significant shadow impact on adjoining properties, nor prevent access to air ventilation.

No objections have been indicated by any of the adjoining landowners, which suggests that there is not likely to be any significant impact upon the amenity of these landowners.

- Enhancement of Existing Dwelling:

It has been indicated that the colours of the shade sail will be complementary to the existing dwelling, which currently has a dark grey colorbond roof and a light grey rendered finish to the walls. The shade sail is therefore likely to be consistent with the existing dwelling and will not unduly affect its visual appearance as viewed from the street and adjoining properties.

### **Poles**

The two front corners of the shade sail are proposed to be affixed to poles that will be attached to the front of the existing garage, with the two remaining corners being affixed to the roof of the existing dwelling. From an amenity perspective, it is considered that having the two front poles attached to the internal side of the balcony balustrade rather than the external face of the balcony balustrade would have a less detrimental impact on the streetscape and the general development. It is therefore recommended that this be imposed as a condition of planning approval should the development be approved.

### **Conclusion**

In considering the above, the proposed shade sail can be considered reasonable, and is recommended for approval.

**P07/3000 - PROPOSED SHADE SAIL ON LOT 868 (41) QUEENS ROAD, ARDROSS  
(REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

**COUNCIL RESOLUTION (3000)**

**APPROVAL**

Cr L M Reynolds moved, seconded Cr C Halton -

**THAT THE APPLICATION FOR A SHADE SAIL ON LOT 868 (41A) QUEENS ROAD,  
ARDROSS BE APPROVED SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING CONDITIONS:**

**SPECIAL CONDITIONS:**

- 1. THE TWO FRONT POLES OF THE SHADE SAIL BE AFFIXED ON THE  
INTERNAL SIDE OF THE EXISTING BALCONY BALUSTRADE, TO BE SHOWN  
ON THE DEVELOPMENT PLANS PRIOR TO THE ISSUE OF A BUILDING  
LICENCE.**
- 2. ALL STREET TREES TO BE RETAINED.**

**STANDARD CONDITIONS:  
RESGD7; RESSD02; 04; 19**

Her Worship the Mayor, K J Jackson submitted the motion, which was declared

**CARRIED WITHOUT DISSENT (12/0)**

**C07/8000 – CANNING BRIDGE PARKING (AMREC)**

Ward	:	Applecross/Mt Pleasant
Category	:	Operational
Subject Index	:	Parking
Customer Index	:	N/A
Disclosure of any Interest	:	No Officer involved in the preparation of this report has a declarable interest in this matter.
Previous Items	:	PO5/8008 – Canning Bridge Parking Precinct Pay and Display Parking; November 2005. PO6/8008 – Canning Bridge Precinct Parking; August 2006.
Funding	:	Not Applicable
Responsible Officer	:	Malcolm Jenkinson Manager Neighbourhood Amenity

**SUMMARY**

This report updates the provisions made in the two (2) previous reports regarding parking in Canning Bridge. This report draws upon an analysis of car parking bay utilisation during November and December 2006, and acknowledges that the proposed car park incorporating the existing Canning Bridge Library car park and Lot 15, Canning Beach Road has not yet been constructed. Construction is scheduled to begin March 2007.

This report makes recommendations to improve the strategy put in place in August 2006. That strategy is an interim solution until the more complete Riverside and Canning Bridge Precinct place plans are adopted.

Price points should be consistent in the area. For on street and off street parking this is \$1 per hour to a maximum of \$6 per day. For the Raffles it is \$2 per hour to a maximum of \$16 per day. All day parking should be increased in Forbes Road and some bays, including possibly in the Raffles be made available for 12 month leases. Some minor signage changes are recommended.

**BACKGROUND**

Providing a good balance of parking opportunities for casual or visitor parkers and for longer term or all day parkers is a delicate balance of available space. The Council has already resolved that over the next two (2) to three (3) years there is adequate provision of both on street and off street bays to meet these needs. Changes may be made to the public provision of parking bays in the precinct as part of the longer term review of the entire area currently under way by the Director of Strategic Urban Planning.

The background to the review is that a scheme to alter the timed on street parking in the area to a metered and timed scheme began on the 1<sup>st</sup> of May 2006 following Council approval in 2005. For 3 weeks following the introduction which was heavily advertised and thoroughly canvassed during 2005 and 2006, cautions only were issued to users, who in response elected to start parking in the residential streets, primarily Kishorn Road and Third / Fourth Streets to avoid paying parking fees. In response to residents complaints a preventative parking scheme was rapidly instituted which brought protests from the parkers, many of whom were represented to the City as employees of Monadelphous Group.

**C07/8000 – CANNING BRIDGE PARKING (AMREC)**

That Scheme was suspended by the CEO pending a further review which produced a report to the Council in August 2006. The recommendation of that report (P06/8008) is reproduced below.

- “1. *That the City of Melville develop 29 Moreau Mews, Applecross as a temporary all day parking station no 26 for a period of three (3) years, and*
2. *That lot 15 Canning Beach Road, Applecross and the Library/Tivoli Theatre site be incorporated and developed into a parking station for a minimum period of two (2) years, and*
3. *That by absolute majority decision of the Council the fee structure at the Raffles car parking station be set as one dollar (\$1) per hour to a maximum of eight dollars (\$8) per day subject to any approvals needed under the raffles deed until the classification certificate for the Raffles hotel commercial precinct is issued and the fees variation be advertised in accordance with the Local Government Act 1995.*
4. *That by absolute majority decision of the Council the 2006/2007 budget be amended to include a budget item “development of off street car parking stations Canning Bridge Precinct” with a budget of one hundred and seventy-five thousand dollars (\$175,000) with that amount being funded by transferring one hundred and seventy-five thousand dollars (\$175,000) from the cash in lieu of car parking trust fund balance.”*

Moreau Mews was opened as a car park in October 2006. The Moreau Mews car park was expedited by officers to meet the objectives of the Council as they responded to the complaints of the Monadelphous Group and the residents of Kishorn Road, Third and Fourth Streets about the overflow parking in those streets.

The new Library car park incorporating Lot 15 is yet to be developed in accordance with the recommendation. Work will commence mid February 2007 and last for approximately five (5) weeks.

There are approximately 36 free car parking bays on Lot 15. These unofficial bays have a very large “skew” effect on parking in the area and became available as the Raffles residential complex was completed. The land had been leased to Multiplex for the construction workers for the duration of that work. When the lease expired, the parcel was left uncontrolled, except that it was cleared of rubbish and potentially hazardous materials.

The Library car park is a free, timed car park which is experiencing significant abuse from overstay by users which is being addressed through more frequent policing of the area by the Rangers.

**C07/8000 – CANNING BRIDGE PARKING (AMREC)**

The next impact on the area was the opening of the commercial restaurant / bar and bottle shop of the Raffles Hotel at about the same time the Tivoli Theatre players began their summer season. The effect of this was to introduce a new cohort of commuters who work at the Raffles and patrons of the Tivoli who are all vying for available spaces, with peak occupancy occurring on Thursday, Friday and Saturday nights and late afternoon/ early evenings (as the Tivoli players themselves arrive for rehearsal or preparation). This brought a series of complaints from the Tivoli players on behalf of the theatre company and their patrons. The first weekend of this “clash” there was considerable illegal parking in Canning Beach Road and environs. The spill over also impacted on IGA. Their car park behind the Caltex petrol station experienced significant “non-patron” parking at this time.

In response to this, Rangers working over time have been on duty in the area each Thursday and Friday evening through the summer to infringe where necessary and to direct drivers to the Raffles or Moreau Mews car parks. This response has worked well and there has been little subsequent disturbance for the Tivoli players. Road works on Canning Beach Road and its junction with Kintail Road are now also complete, including parking bays on Canning Beach Road. Negotiations are also underway with IGA management to have their car park become a City of Melville parking station.

A draft design of the combined proposed Lot 15/ Library car park has been made available. The design retains the existing trees despite the acknowledged necessity of removing them when the Riverside development is undertaken. As a result, the number of available bays is limited. The design is reproduced in Appendix 2.

**DETAIL**

At the request of the Chief Executive Officer, the review of the parking in the Canning Bridge area has been brought forward, following concerns that the strategic plan put in place during 2006 for the area may not be delivering the expected results. This is understandable, as a key element of that strategic approach has not yet been implemented. This report is designed to identify what refinement of that plan can be made to improve the public perception of parking in the area. Certainly the data collected demonstrates that in absolute terms there is enough provision for parking.

To assist in the review statistical data has been collected on the public carparks known as “Raffles”, “Apex”, Canning Bridge” and “Moreau Mews”. In addition, data was collected for the unofficial carpark which became available by default on Lot 15 Canning Beach Road when Multiplex allowed their lease over the land to expire. General observations were also taken on the availability of paid on street parking bays in the relevant streets of that scheme.

This review is presented by officers from Neighbourhood Amenity, following detailed consultation on behalf of Design Services. Library Services and Corporate Support have provided key input. Input has also been provided by Jeremy Edwards from the City of Swan.

**C07/8000 – CANNING BRIDGE PARKING (AMREC)**

The purpose of any car parking scheme is dependant on the circumstances of its existence. The scheme may exist to provide long stay parking (park and ride, commuter parking), to provide short stay parking (1-2 hour, timed, non return, on-street), to limit total availability (Heathcote), to provide mixed use (Garden City), to provide free access to amenities (Leeming Recreation Centre, Wireless Hill), to provide paid access to amenities or premium venues (Conference and Exhibition Centre) or a combination of one or more purposes. Canning Bridge has all of these requirements.

It is very clear from the research that has been done and the recommendations below that this report is not intended to be a new strategic approach to the issue of parking in the area. That strategic approach was adopted as shown below in the report to the Council in August 2006. One of the key recommendations in that report has not yet been implemented: that is the closing and redevelopment of "Lot 15" and the library car parks. This site is providing at least 36 free bays in the area and is thus skewing occupancy rates to a considerable extent.

It is human nature to "want something for nothing" and there will be complaints from users who cannot park "on the doorstep", particularly if they also have to pay parking fees. The author does not envisage, in the 2-3 year time frame that this report intends to provide for, that new, un-tapped parking resources will become available to solve that concern. There is no discussion in this report of creating any new bays or removing any existing ones. Thus there are no "design" issues to be addressed.

The second reason this is not a strategic approach is that there are 2 parallel processes in place which will achieve a new strategic plan for the area. The first is the "Riverside" project which includes a redevelopment of the Library / Lot 15 site as a whole, and the second is the strategic review of Canning Bridge being undertaken by Strategic Urban Planning. Both of these strategic approaches will change the nature of parking in the area when the final requirements are adopted.

This report reflects an underlying philosophical position. Users of the library are entitled to a certain amount of free parking whilst using the library, but not at other times or for other purposes. All other users of parking should pay a reasonable hourly rate for parking, and the area should be treated as a "whole" for this purpose. Library users will therefore be granted the first hour in the library car park "free of charge", but will have to pay if they intend to stay longer or for other purposes. By default, this provides a concession to all users of the Library car park. This will include patrons of the Tivoli and the community groups that use the Tivoli for their activities. The group felt this was reasonable in the circumstances.

Thus there is a move to align parking fees for all open air car parks. There is also a proposal to provide some dedicated "permit holder" bays in response to previously aired concerns from some Councillors. Finally there is some discussion about the opportunity to make a relatively small number of bays available to businesses under a lease arrangement, acknowledging a broader "commuter" issue, without compromising the "customer" needs.

This report should be read with some recollection of the complaints received when the Heathcote facility was opened and users said there was not enough parking for all who wanted to attend. The approach of the Council to that issue was that premium venues need to be carefully managed to prevent over use and limiting the availability of "free" parking on the door step was a simple and effective way of doing that.

**C07/8000 – CANNING BRIDGE PARKING (AMREC)**

Data on the utilisation of the area has been taking place since July 2006. Particular attention has been paid to the Raffles /Apex/ Moreau Mews car parks during November and December as agreed with the DSCD and the CEO in October 2006. Some of the statistical and general data capture described above is shown in greater detail as appendix 1; however it can be summarised as follows:

<b>Location</b>	<b>Finding</b>	<b>Structure</b>
Apex –	Very well used and fairly often, full	50c per hour 8am – 5pm; Mon – Friday Max \$4
Library –	Well used and full at peak times such as Tivoli performance nights	Free – 2 hour limit
Raffles –	Quite well used, especially at lunch times and evenings, Thursday /Friday	\$2 per hour, first 3 hours \$3 per hour thereafter, no limit
Moreau Mews –	Almost empty	\$1 per hour, 8am – 5pm, Mon – Fri Max \$8
Lot 15 –	Consistently full or nearly full – advice from Raffles management is that it is predominantly Raffles staff	Free, un-timed, not policed
On-street –	Good turn over and availability, Moreau Mews / Kishorn Road are busiest	\$1 per hour, max 2 hours Can feed the metre First Ave is all day parking at \$8 per day.

Lot 15 is over used, and the users park with deliberate disregard for the movement of vehicles. This is because many of them work in the Raffles and leave at the same time so it does not matter if they are “blocked in”. For the rest, they park where they can.

Moreau Mews is very under utilised which is to be expected with free parking on Lot 15.

The Raffles car park is getting reasonable mid length stay parking, but there is a note of caution; the data is collected in the run up to the Xmas festivities and this may have overstated the year round position.

Apex car park is very busy as it is much cheaper for all day parking than the alternatives.

On-street parking shows some good utilisation in some areas. The 6 bays on Forbes Road are rarely used and could usefully be converted to all day parking like First Avenue.

**SIGNAGE**

Following the introduction of the paid on street scheme, a detailed study of the signage was undertaken to identify any weakness in deployment. As a consequence, a number of alterations were made and several new signs were installed and street markings made more obvious. The group do not feel there is any requirement to review that range of signage again.

**C07/8000 – CANNING BRIDGE PARKING (AMREC)**

The Raffles signage is different from the City of Melville's normal signage designs. The Raffles signage was approved as part of a precinct development approval. There is scope to increase some of the directional signage inside the undercroft car park to assist patrons to both find the exits and then to use those exits and to avoid using the traffic ramps.

Signage outside the Raffles was also approved as part of the development plan. One sign, on Canning Beach Road had to be very carefully placed because of its proximity to a tree. There has been some feedback that the tree obscures the car park entrance sign; see appendix 3. This photograph is misleading as drivers do not arrive at the site by driving on the footpath which is where the photograph was taken from. The sign is very clear from the road in both directions as shown.

It was identified during December that the automatic illuminating mechanism on the sign was faulty; this has now been fixed and the sign does self illuminate at dusk.

The traffic counter which signifies whether the car park is full or not has been checked during January 07 and was found to be working correctly. Further routine audits of the system will occur.

The Tivoli players requested that they be provided with a removable A-frame sign, directing patrons to the Raffles car park for use on performance nights. This has been supplied without charge and is being used by them.

***ANTI SOCIAL BEHAVIOUR***

There has been an increase in anti social behaviour in the immediate vicinity of the Raffles since the commercial precinct opened. Complaints from residents in the Raffles refer to bottles and rubbish in the car park and the stair wells. Operations Services are reviewing with the Strata Body how to address issues of cleanliness. CSS and Police from Palmyra station are mobilised to monitor the area heavily. The complaints also allege that users are parking on the street outside of the marked bays to shorten the walking distance to the Raffles, particularly in Moreau Mews and Canning Beach Road. It is noticeable already that there is some overspill onto Canning Beach Road where the 3 hour bays are located. It is reasonable to expect that whilst Lot 15 / Library car park is being redeveloped this will get worse. Overtime hours are being worked to identify and infringe these drivers.

There have also been complaints in the press and from Dr Janet Woollard MLA about patrons misbehaving when they leave the Raffles and return to their vehicles parked on and around Moreau Mews. Moreau Mews, between Kintail Road and the river gets considerable night time business. There is already a discussion document issued to Elected Members regarding the possibility of not allowing parking or standing on one side of that part of Moreau Mews.

**POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

This report does not influence any current or planned policy adopted by the Council

**C07/8000 – CANNING BRIDGE PARKING (AMREC)**

**PUBLIC CONSULTATION/COMMUNICATION**

No external consultation has been carried out. The review analysed the use of the previously agreed parking provisions and has recommended some minor amendments which will simplify the fee structures for the public and improve other administrative matters.

**STATUTORY AND LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

The proposed amendments to the fees and charges will need to be advertised in accordance with the Local Government Act 1995

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

The cost of additional or replacement signage as appropriate will be met from existing funds. The simplification of the fee structure and the resultant anticipated increase in utilisation rates will assist in generating the income already budgeted for the current financial year.

**STRATEGIC AND RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS**

Risk management is a key consideration in any report. In this case, the modifications recommended have a minor impact apart from possible short term discontent with the proposed increase in fees at the Apex car park. In mitigation, it is noted that the Apex car park currently presents a very high risk because of its consistent very high / over use.

<b>Risk Statement</b>	<b>Level of Risk*</b>	<b>Risk Mitigation Strategy</b>
Risk of increased ongoing maintenance expenses due to expected increases in utilisation.	Minor consequences which are almost certain, resulting in a <b>High</b> level of risk	Equipment and signs are checked daily for functionality.
Risk of adverse public comment to the minor increase in fees at Apex car park		Fees at the Raffles are being reduced in an effort to spread the load.

\* As derived from using the Risk Assessment Matrix

**C07/8000 – CANNING BRIDGE PARKING (AMREC)****COMMENT**

Paid on-street parking was introduced as a specific response to years of complaints about poor availability of short term bays for customers visiting businesses in Canning Bridge. The anticipated, and planned for consequence was spill over parking of commuters, primarily to Kishorn, McRae, Third and Fourth streets. The prepared introduction of restricted parking in those streets stimulated the complaint of the Monadelphous Group on behalf of their employees. In this regard it is clear that the intended consequence of introducing paid on street parking is being met to a very large degree.

Moreau Mews was a vacant lot which was being held as an undeveloped parcel whilst the Strategic review of Canning Bridge was being carried out. There were drawings in place ready for it to be quickly developed into a public, long stay car park if the demand had been demonstrated. The investment for that was deemed too large to develop it without sufficient cause and so the construction had been withheld for at least 2 years from first preparation as part of the paid on-street parking proposal. The call from Monadelphous Group provided justification for the development of it as a temporary car park for commuters.

Clearly it would be naïve to have ignored the needs of commuters. Careful planning provided that the Moreau Mews car park was retained and then developed for them. The Council determined in its pricing structure for the Raffles public car park that it would be a premium location, and that as such it should actively discourage use of it by commuters, particularly with the imminent activation of the railway interchange.

In the August report to the Council there were considerations given regarding the possible provision of leased bays for the use of employees of businesses interested in providing them. Monadelphous Group would be an example, as would Offshore Marine Services who have also expressed a desire to enter into an agreement in recent weeks. The report presented to the Council did not recommend entering into lease agreements at that time, because the Moreau Mews development was considered sufficiently sized at 40 bays and well enough “priced” to make it un-necessary.

The paid on street scheme and the subsequent responses through the August 2006 Council report identified that provision should be made where appropriate for residents permit parking. This has not changed. As an improvement to the schemes however a number of on street bays have been identified as having little consistent use. These bays could be made into “permit holders only” bays, either with, or without time restrictions.

In the August report to the Council provision was made to develop a new, temporary car park for the Library, to include the parcel known as Lot 15. The car park is temporary because of the intended changes being developed as part of the Riverside project by Strategic Community Development. That construction has been included in the overall works program by adjusting the schedule agreed for the 2006 -07 budget.

In the mean time, the parcel known as Lot 15 is being heavily utilised, predominantly by staff of the Raffles commercial complex. That usage is clearly costing the Council considerable revenue, as identified in the occupancy levels described above. Lot 15 is not a formal car park and our Risk Management team has identified it as a potential risk to users because it is not lit at night, is not line marked and the surface and surrounds are not maintained in any way.

**C07/8000 – CANNING BRIDGE PARKING (AMREC)**

**COUNCIL RESOLUTION (8000)**

**APPROVAL**

Cr J Phillips moved, seconded Cr L M Reynolds -

- 1. THAT BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY DECISION OF THE COUNCIL;**
  - A) THE FEES OF THE APEX CAR PARK AND MOREAU MEWS CAR PARK BE SET AT \$1 PER HOUR, MAXIMUM \$6 PER DAY, FROM 8AM TO 6 PM; AND**
  - B) THE FEES OF THE RAFFLES CAR PARK BE SET AT \$2 PER HOUR, MAXIMUM \$16 PER DAY, 8 AM TO 10 PM; AND**
  - C) THE FEES OF THE NEW LIBRARY CAR PARK BE SET AT \$1 PER HOUR, 8AM TO 10 PM, MAX \$6 PER DAY AND THE FEES VARIATION BE ADVERTISED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1995.**
- 2. THAT BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY DECISION OF THE COUNCIL THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER BE GRANTED DELEGATED AUTHORITY TO TEMPORARILY WAIVE OR REDUCE PARKING FEES FOR PROMOTIONAL PURPOSES.**
- 3. THAT BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY DECISION OF THE COUNCIL PROVISION BE MADE TO PROVIDE LIBRARY USERS ONE HOUR OF FREE CAR PARKING IN THE LIBRARY CAR PARK PER VISIT.**
- 4. THAT BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY DECISION OF THE COUNCIL THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER BE GRANTED DELEGATED AUTHORITY TO ISSUE COMMERCIAL PARKING LEASES FOR BAYS IN THE APEX CAR PARK, LIBRARY CAR PARK AND MOREAU MEWS CAR PARK AT A COST IN THE RANGE OF \$800 TO \$1,000 PER ANNUM PLUS GST.**
- 5. THAT BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY DECISION OF THE COUNCIL THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER BE GRANTED DELEGATED AUTHORITY TO ISSUE COMMERCIAL PARKING PERMITS FOR USE IN THE RAFFLES CAR PARK AT A COST IN THE RANGE OF \$1,500 TO \$2,000 PER ANNUM PLUS GST**

Her Worship the Mayor, K J Jackson submitted the motion, which was declared

**CARRIED WITHOUT DISSENT (12/0)**

**C07/6004 - REVIEW AND CONSOLIDATION OF CONFERENCE ATTENDANCE POLICY  
14-003 AND ELECTED MEMBERS ALLOWANCES & EXPENSES POLICIES 14-013  
(REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

Ward	:	All
Category	:	Policy
Subject Index	:	Policy & Policy Development; Elected Members Profile
Customer Index	:	Elected Members
Disclosure of any Interest	:	No Officer involved in the preparation of this report has a declarable interest in this matter.
Previous Items	:	Nil
Works Programme	:	Not Applicable
Funding	:	2007/2008 Annual Budget
Responsible Officer	:	Marten Tieleman Director Customer & Corporate Services

**SUMMARY**

This report presents a review of the Conference Attendance Policy 14-003 and Elected Members Allowances & Expenses Policy 14-013 in relation to the payment of elected members conference expenses and allowances & expenses, with the objective of updating, consolidating them into one policy and simplifying the current policies.

**BACKGROUND**

Elected Members have requested that Policies 14-003 and 14-013 be reviewed and the payment of a Mayoral Allowance be reconsidered. Policy 14-003 was last reviewed in June 2005, following a review by the Department of Local Government & Regional Development of the manner in which accommodation, meal and daily sustenance expenses and allowances could be paid to Elected Members. Policy 14-013 was last reviewed by the Council at it's Ordinary Meeting held on Tuesday 16 May 2006 at which it considered and amended recommendations in relation to the payment of expenses and allowances made by the then House Committee.

The Proposed Policy 14-003 combines the former policies 14-003 and 14-013 and covers attendance by Elected Members at conferences/congresses and training and the payment of allowances to and reimbursement of, expenses incurred by elected members in the carrying out of their official duties.

[6004 February 2007.pdf](#) The Proposed Policy 14-003 – Elected Members Conference Attendance and Claims for Allowances and Expenses, forms part of the Attachments to the Agenda, which was distributed to the Elected Members of the Council on Friday 2 February 2007.

**C07/6004 - REVIEW AND CONSOLIDATION OF CONFERENCE ATTENDANCE POLICY  
14-003 AND ELECTED MEMBERS ALLOWANCES & EXPENSES POLICIES 14-013  
(REC) (ATTACHMENT)****DETAIL**

The payment of allowances and reimbursement of expenses is dealt with in the Local Government Act 1995 Sections 5.98, 5.98A, 5.99 and 5.99A and also the Local Government (Administration) Regulations 1996 Clauses 30 to 34AB.

Since the last review of these policies The Department of Local Government and Regional Development has issued an Operational Guideline in regards to the payment of Meeting Fees, Allowances and Expense Reimbursements for Elected Members. Our current policies have been compared to this guideline and updated to reflect the guidelines where appropriate to ensure sound government practise.

In summary the Act and the Regulations provide as follows:

**Meeting Attendance Fees**

- Elected Members are entitled to payment of prescribed minimum fees for attendance at Council or Committee Meetings. The current minimum fee is \$60 per meeting except in the case of the Mayor who is entitled to a minimum fee of \$120 per meeting. The current maximum fee is \$140 per meeting except in the case of the Mayor who is entitled to a maximum fee of \$280 per meeting. The total of meeting attendance fees that can be paid to an Elected Member in each year is \$7,000 except in the case of the Mayor who is entitled to a total not exceeding \$14,000 per annum.
- Instead of paying a Meeting Attendance Fee based on the number of meetings attended, a local government may decide to pay an annual fee of at least the prescribed minimum amount being \$2,400 for each Elected Member, other than the Mayor who is entitled to a prescribed minimum of \$6,000, but not greater than the prescribed maximum amount being \$7,000 for each Elected Member, other than the Mayor who is entitled to a prescribed maximum of \$14,000.

Councils are free to choose payment of meeting attendance fees within the prescribed ranges. The current City of Melville Policy is to pay the prescribed maximum annual fee to each Elected Member being \$7,000 - \$583.33 per month and \$14,000 - \$1,166.67 per month for the Mayor. Should Elected Members be absent for a cumulative period of in excess of 2 months per electoral year, the current policy states that the meeting attendance fees shall be pro-rated by the period of absence in excess of 2 months.

**Such meeting fees are in addition to any other allowances or expense reimbursements for ALL elected members.**

**C07/6004 - REVIEW AND CONSOLIDATION OF CONFERENCE ATTENDANCE POLICY  
14-003 AND ELECTED MEMBERS ALLOWANCES & EXPENSES POLICIES 14-013  
(REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

**Local Government Allowance for Mayors and Deputy Mayors**

- The Mayor is entitled to payment of the prescribed Minimum Annual Local Government Allowance for Mayors currently \$600. The prescribed Maximum Annual Local Government Allowance that the Mayor may be paid (at the discretion of the Council) is the greater of \$12,000 or 0.002% of the local government operating revenue, but no greater than \$60,000 per annum. As the calculation of 0.002% of the City of Melville operating revenue would result in a payment of one hundred and \$125,740 per annum, the maximum prescribed limit of \$60,000 would apply.

The current City of Melville policy is to pay the Minimum Local Government Allowance for the Mayor of \$600 per annum. The Mayor may elect to take the Minimum Local Government Allowance of \$600 and to be provided with an executive vehicle to Ford Fairlane Standard (currently valued at \$14,880), in which case the total of \$15,480 is to be deducted from the Council set annual expense claim reimbursement limit (currently \$52,100).

The Mayor has in the past elected to take both the car and the Minimum Local Government Allowance. The value of the vehicle is indexed by the annual movement in the Transport Index component of the Consumer Price Index (CPI) as published by the Australian Bureau of Statistics in March of each year.

**Note** Department of Local Government & Regional Development Local Government Operational Guidelines – Number 15 published 15 September 2006 entitled “Meeting Fees, Allowances and Expenses for Elected Members at page 9 paragraph 75 states as follows:-

*“It is also expressly stated in s5.98 [5] that the allowance is “to be paid” to the Mayor or President. The intent of the Act and regulations is that expenses are not to be charged to the local government and debited against an account titled “mayor’s/president’s allowance”.*

As noted previously the City of Melville currently pays the minimum Mayoral allowance of \$600 per annum and in lieu of paying a greater Mayoral Allowance has set a much higher expense reimbursement limit for the Mayor than for other Elected Members and included the provision of a Mayoral vehicle. These expense reimbursements are charged to an Elected Members expenses account not a Mayoral Allowances account thus Council is generally acting in accordance with the Act, Regulations and Guidelines. The provision of a Mayoral vehicle for private usage is not however specifically referred to in the Act, Regulations or Guidelines.

- A local government may decide by absolute majority decision to pay the Deputy Mayor an allowance up to the prescribed percentage (currently 25%) of the Annual Local Government Allowance to which the Mayor is entitled. If paid this annual allowance would range between \$150 and \$15,000. Whilst the current policy does not expressly state that the Deputy Mayor be paid this allowance, the position of Deputy Mayor is currently also provided with a greater expense reimbursement annual limit – of \$9,795 per annum which represents 18.8% of the \$52,100 expense reimbursement limit of the Mayor.

**C07/6004 - REVIEW AND CONSOLIDATION OF CONFERENCE ATTENDANCE POLICY  
14-003 AND ELECTED MEMBERS ALLOWANCES & EXPENSES POLICIES 14-013  
(REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

**Note** Local Government Operational Guidelines Number 15 states that payments of annual allowances and fees can either be in advance or in arrears but at page 4 paragraphs 26 states “*The Department is of the view it is preferable for such payments to be made in arrears. The principle of public accountability for public monies also supports that payment be in arrears.*” And again at paragraph 28 “*Accordingly it is preferable that payment be made after the period to which it relates. In this way the problems associated with payments in advance will not arise.*”

The Council’s current policy is to divide all annualised meeting fees and allowances into monthly payments and pay them on or about the middle of the month. This results in a maximum of half a month’s payment in advance. Although this diverges slightly from the recommendations in Local Government Operational Guideline Number 15 it should not present a problem in that at the time of payment it can be safely established that Elected Members will be entitled to payment of the meeting fee or allowance for the whole of that month.

**Elected Member Expense Claims Reimbursements**

- The Act provides for two (2) types of expense claim reimbursements -
  1. Those expenses that **must** be reimbursed by all local governments being as follows:
    - Rental charges for one telephone line - extent of reimbursement is actual cost;
    - Rental charges for one facsimile line - extent of reimbursement is actual cost;

For these telecommunications expenses the local government may decide by absolute majority decision that it will pay all members the prescribed minimum or maximum annual allowance for telecommunication expenses or an amount in between. The prescribed maximum is \$2,400 per annum and is to cover the above rental charges **plus** any other telecommunications expenses such as calls and purchase of phones.

The current policy provides for the payment of the maximum annual telecommunications allowance and it is not proposed to change this.

    - Child Care costs incurred where the Member is attending a Council or Committee Meeting – extent of reimbursement is actual cost or \$20 per hour whichever is the lesser;
    - Travel costs where a member is attending a Council or Committee Meeting – extent of reimbursement is the actual cost between the Elected Member’s place of work or home to the meeting and return;

The above expenses must be verified by sufficient information.

**C07/6004 - REVIEW AND CONSOLIDATION OF CONFERENCE ATTENDANCE POLICY  
14-003 AND ELECTED MEMBERS ALLOWANCES & EXPENSES POLICIES 14-013  
(REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

**Note** The Council does not have discretion in relation to the above expenses, which **must** be paid in addition to meeting attendance fees and any Mayoral or Deputy Mayoral allowances. Where a fully maintained and fuelled vehicle is provided by the Council to an Elected Member there would be no justification for the reimbursement of vehicle travel costs.

2. Those expenses that **may** be approved by any local government.
  - An expense incurred by a member in performing a function **under the express authority** of the local government;
  - Expenses of one other person accompanying the member while performing such a function, **if** the local government considers it appropriate for the member to be accompanied by that other person;
  - An expense incurred by a council member in performing a function in their capacity as a council member;
  - The Council may elect to also pay an annual Information Technology allowance of up to \$1,000 in lieu of reimbursement of actual information technology expenses incurred.

The extent of reimbursement in all of the above circumstances is the actual costs and must be verified by sufficient information. Whilst the Act and Regulations do not specify any maximum amounts in relation to these expenses the Council can determine maximums.

The extent of reimbursement is determined in the current policy to be \$52,100 per annum including the Telecommunications Allowance of \$2,400 and the Information Technology Allowance of \$1,000 for the Mayor, \$9,795 including the Telecommunications Allowance of \$2,400 and the Information Technology Allowance of \$1,000 for the Deputy Mayor and \$5,000 per Councillor plus a Special Capital Office Equipment allocation of \$1,700 for each Councillor in the first year of office and \$1,000 each year thereafter. **Note** under the current policy the Mayor and Deputy Mayor are **not** entitled to the Special Capital Office Equipment allocation. As the quantum of their expense allowance would be reduced should they be paid a Mayoral/Deputy Mayoral Allowance it is proposed that should that occur they also become entitled to the Special Capital Office Equipment expense reimbursement limit the same as other Elected Members.

The current policy contains an extensive list of expenses that the Council has determined will be reimbursed up to the expenditure limits shown in the Policy. It is important that Elected Members recognise that it is only expenses that are incurred as a result of carrying out their official duties that can be reimbursed.

## **POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

The Proposed Elected Members Conference Attendance and Claims for Allowances and Expenses Policy 14-003 replaces the current Conference Attendance Policy 14-003 and the Elected Members Allowances and Expenses Policy 14-013.

**C07/6004 - REVIEW AND CONSOLIDATION OF CONFERENCE ATTENDANCE POLICY  
14-003 AND ELECTED MEMBERS ALLOWANCES & EXPENSES POLICIES 14-013  
(REC) (ATTACHMENT)****PUBLIC CONSULTATION/COMMUNICATION**

No public consultation has been undertaken on this issue.

**STATUTORY AND LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

Sections 5.98, 5.98A, 5.99 and 5.99A of the Local Government Act 1995.  
Local Government (Administration) Regulations 1996 Clauses 30 to 34AB inclusive.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

Any additional expenditure as a result of changes to these policies will require additional budget funding in the 2007/2008 Annual Budget.

**STRATEGIC AND RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS****VISION 1 - THE ORGANISATION AND ITS PEOPLE**

An organisation that is challenging and rewarding to work for is efficient, effective and accountable and has the resource necessary to achieve our mission.

**Deployment Objective 1.1.5 - Leadership Skills and Behaviours that Enhance the Public Image.**

Elected Members and employees are encouraged and enabled to exhibit leadership skills and behaviours that reinforce organisational values and enhance the public image.

Elected members and employees understand their roles and actively pursue the Organisation's purpose, visions and objectives.

**COMMENT**

The current policy in relation to Claims for Allowances and Expenses is comprehensive and provides for Elected Members to be reimbursed for a wide range of expenses incurred in the performance of their functions. In the case of the Mayor and Deputy Mayor these expense limits appear to have been set in lieu of payment of a Mayoral and Deputy Mayoral Annual Local Government Allowance. Such a practice may be contrary to the intention of the Local Government Act, Regulations and Guidelines.

**C07/6004 - REVIEW AND CONSOLIDATION OF CONFERENCE ATTENDANCE POLICY  
14-003 AND ELECTED MEMBERS ALLOWANCES & EXPENSES POLICIES 14-013  
(REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

Policy 14-013 has therefore been reviewed with a view to ensuring harmony with Local Government Operational Guideline Number 15, as published by the Department of Local Government and Regional Development in September 2006. The reviewed policy also simplifies and clarifies the arrangements, in particular the payment of an annual Mayoral and Deputy Mayoral Allowance in lieu of expense claim reimbursements and so far as is possible replacing actual expense claim reimbursements to other Elected Members with annual allowances. The major changes to the revised policy are as follows –

- Combining the Conference Attendance Policy with the Claims for Allowances and Expenses Policy so that the one policy will cover all payments to Elected Members;
- Including the option to be exercised by the Council for an annual Mayoral Allowance to be paid up to the maximum amount as provided for in the Local Government Act and Regulations – i.e. \$60,000 less the value of the mayoral car currently valued at \$14,880 per annum, such value to be indexed by the transport index as published by the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) for the June quarter each year leaving a net cash allowance of \$45,120 payable by equal monthly instalments;
- Should the Council decide to pay an annual Mayoral Allowance implementation of a Deputy Mayoral Allowance up to the maximum of 25% of the Mayoral Allowance being \$15,000 as provided for in the Local Government Act and Regulations with such allowance being payable by equal monthly instalments;
- Dividing the expenses reimbursement limits into:-
  - Non-discretionary i.e. those expenses that Local Governments are required by the Local Government Act and Regulations to reimburse without an upper limit. Also clarifying that the Mayor and Deputy Mayor are also entitled to claim the non-discretionary expense reimbursements and
  - Discretionary expenses i.e. those expenses that a Local Government may reimburse which are subject to annual limits set by the Council with the;
- Enabling the Mayor and Deputy Mayor to access the Special Capital Office Equipment allocation of \$1,700 in the year they are elected and \$1,000 per annum thereafter;
- The Meeting Attendance and Sitting Fees remain the same as they are already set at the maximum level as prescribed under the Local Government Act and Regulations;
- A change in the 12 month period to commence from 1 July as opposed to 1 May in each year so that the payment of allowances and expenses coincides with the tax year and the Councils annual financial year, as opposed the former electoral year;
- An increase in the maximum per annum amount for conference attendance from \$3,500 to \$4,500 per annum to reflect cost increases since the quantum was reviewed two years ago.

**C07/6004 - REVIEW AND CONSOLIDATION OF CONFERENCE ATTENDANCE POLICY  
14-003 AND ELECTED MEMBERS ALLOWANCES & EXPENSES POLICIES 14-013  
(REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

**Officer Recommendation**

1. That by Absolute Majority Decision of the Council the amended Governance Policy 14-003 Entitled Conference Attendance and Claims for Allowances and Expenses, which has been amended to include the following major changes— Combining the two former policies – Conference Attendance 14-003 and Claims for Allowances and Expenses 14-013 into the one policy;
  - Providing the option for Council to pay an Annual Mayoral allowance up to the maximum amount as provided for in the Local Government Act and regulations – ie \$60,000 less the value of the Mayoral Car currently valued at \$14,880 per annum such value to be indexed by the transport index component of the consumer price index as published by the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) for the march quarter each year, leaving a maximum cash payment of up to \$45,120 per annum payable in monthly instalments at the rate of up to \$3,760 per month;
  - Providing the option for the Council to pay a Deputy Mayoral allowance at the maximum of 25% of the Mayoral allowance as provided for in the Local Government Act and regulations being up to \$15,000 per annum payable in monthly instalments at the rate of up to \$1,250 per month;
  - Providing for the current expense reimbursement limits for the Mayor & Deputy Mayor to be proportionally reset should the Council choose to pay a Mayoral or Deputy Mayoral allowance in excess of the minimum allowance but less than the maximum allowance;
  - Amending the policy to show that in accordance with the Local Government Act and regulations no maximum annual reimbursement amount applies to the expenses that must be reimbursed by Councils (non-discretionary expenses) but noting that individual reimbursements are subject to statutory limits and appropriate documentation;
  - Amending the policy to enable the Mayor and Deputy Mayor to access the special capital office equipment allocation of \$1,700 in the year they are elected and \$1,000 per annum thereafter;
  - Amending the policy to change the 12 month expenses and allowances period from 1 May to 1 July in each year so that the payment of allowances and expenses coincides with the Australian Tax Year and the Councils annual financial year as opposed to the former electoral year commencing 1 May;
  - Providing for an increase in the maximum per annum amount for conference attendance from \$3,500 to \$4,500 per annum to reflect cost increases since the quantum was reviewed two years ago;
  - Amending the policy to recognise that in addition to child care expenses other carer expenses may be incurred by elected members in respect of dependents in order to enable them to effectively carry out their function as an elected member and should therefore be reimbursed.

**Be Adopted**

**C07/6004 - REVIEW AND CONSOLIDATION OF CONFERENCE ATTENDANCE POLICY  
14-003 AND ELECTED MEMBERS ALLOWANCES & EXPENSES POLICIES 14-013  
(REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

2. That by Absolute Majority Decision of Council a Mayoral Allowance of \$60,000 per annum (or such other amount as determined by Resolution of Council) subject to the minimum allowance of \$600 (less the value of the Mayoral Vehicle of \$14,880 per annum) be paid and a Deputy Mayoral Allowance of 25% of that amount also be paid by equal monthly installments and the discretionary expense claim limits be reduced proportionately .

Or

2. That the Mayor continue to be paid the minimum Mayoral Allowance of \$600 per annum and be entitled to claim discretionary expenses incurred in the recognition of the official role as Mayor of the City of Melville up to the value of \$52,100 less the value of the Mayoral Vehicle of \$14,880 and the Deputy Mayor be entitled to claim discretionary expenses incurred in the fulfilment of their official role as Deputy Mayor of the City of Melville up to the value of \$9,795.
3. The quantum of the Mayoral and hence the Deputy Mayoral allowances be reviewed by Council following the October 2007 Elections.

**COUNCIL RESOLUTION**

Cr J Phillips moved, seconded Cr H R Everett -

1. That by Absolute Majority Decision of the Council the amended Governance Policy 14-003 Entitled Conference Attendance and Claims for Allowances and Expenses, which has been amended to include the following major changes—  
Combining the two former policies – Conference Attendance 14-003 and Claims for Allowances and Expenses 14-013 into the one policy;
  - Providing the option for Council to pay an Annual Mayoral allowance up to the maximum amount as provided for in the Local Government Act and regulations – ie \$60,000 less the value of the Mayoral Car currently valued at \$14,880 per annum such value to be indexed by the transport index component of the consumer price index as published by the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) for the march quarter each year, leaving a maximum cash payment of up to \$45,120 per annum payable in monthly instalments at the rate of up to \$3,760 per month;
  - Providing the option for the Council to pay a Deputy Mayoral allowance at the maximum of 25% of the Mayoral allowance as provided for in the Local Government Act and regulations being up to \$15,000 per annum payable in monthly instalments at the rate of up to \$1,250 per month;
  - Providing for the current expense reimbursement limits for the Mayor & Deputy Mayor to be proportionally reset should the Council choose to pay a Mayoral or Deputy Mayoral allowance in excess of the minimum allowance but less than the maximum allowance;

**C07/6004 - REVIEW AND CONSOLIDATION OF CONFERENCE ATTENDANCE POLICY  
14-003 AND ELECTED MEMBERS ALLOWANCES & EXPENSES POLICIES 14-013  
(REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

- Amending the policy to show that in accordance with the Local Government Act and regulations no maximum annual reimbursement amount applies to the expenses that must be reimbursed by Councils (non-discretionary expenses) but noting that individual reimbursements are subject to statutory limits and appropriate documentation;
- Amending the policy to enable the Mayor and Deputy Mayor to access the special capital office equipment allocation of \$1,700 in the year they are elected and \$1,000 per annum thereafter;
- Amending the policy to change the 12 month expenses and allowances period from 1 May to 1 July in each year so that the payment of allowances and expenses coincides with the Australian Tax Year and the Councils annual financial year as opposed to the former electoral year commencing 1 May;
- Providing for an increase in the maximum per annum amount for conference attendance from \$3,500 to \$4,500 per annum to reflect cost increases since the quantum was reviewed two years ago;
- Amending the policy to recognise that in addition to child care expenses other carer expenses may be incurred by elected members in respect of dependents in order to enable them to effectively carry out their function as an elected member and should therefore be reimbursed.

**Be Adopted**

2. That by Absolute Majority Decision of Council a Mayoral Allowance of \$60,000 per annum (or such other amount as determined by Resolution of Council) subject to the minimum allowance of \$600 (less the value of the Mayoral Vehicle of \$14,880 per annum) be paid and a Deputy Mayoral Allowance of 25% of that amount also be paid by equal monthly installments and the discretionary expense claim limits be reduced proportionately .

Her Worship the Mayor, K J Jackson, submitted the motion, which was declared

**LOST (5/7)**

Cr R Aubrey requested that names be recorded.

**For**

Cr C Halton  
Cr J R Bennett  
Cr H R Everett  
Cr J Phillips  
Her Worship the Mayor, K J Jackson

**Against**

Cr R Aubrey  
Cr P M Phelan  
Cr L Wyatt  
Cr M J Barton  
Cr L M Reynolds  
Cr A Ceniviva  
Cr D J Macphail

**C07/6004 - REVIEW AND CONSOLIDATION OF CONFERENCE ATTENDANCE POLICY  
14-003 AND ELECTED MEMBERS ALLOWANCES & EXPENSES POLICIES 14-013  
(REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

**COUNCIL RESOLUTION (6004)**

**ABSOLUTE MAJORITY**

Cr R Aubrey moved, seconded Cr P M Phelan -

1. **THAT BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY DECISION OF THE COUNCIL THE AMENDED GOVERNANCE POLICY 14-003 ENTITLED CONFERENCE ATTENDANCE AND CLAIMS FOR ALLOWANCES AND EXPENSES, WHICH HAS BEEN AMENDED TO INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING MAJOR CHANGES—**
  - **COMBINING THE TWO FORMER POLICIES – CONFERENCE ATTENDANCE 14-003 AND CLAIMS FOR ALLOWANCES AND EXPENSES 14-013 INTO THE ONE POLICY;**
  - **PROVIDING THE OPTION FOR COUNCIL TO PAY AN ANNUAL MAYORAL ALLOWANCE UP TO THE MAXIMUM AMOUNT AS PROVIDED FOR IN THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AND REGULATIONS – IE \$60,000 LESS THE VALUE OF THE MAYORAL CAR CURRENTLY VALUED AT \$14,880 PER ANNUM SUCH VALUE TO BE INDEXED BY THE TRANSPORT INDEX COMPONENT OF THE CONSUMER PRICE INDEX AS PUBLISHED BY THE AUSTRALIAN BUREAU OF STATISTICS (ABS) FOR THE MARCH QUARTER EACH YEAR, LEAVING A MAXIMUM CASH PAYMENT OF UP TO \$45,120 PER ANNUM PAYABLE IN MONTHLY INSTALMENTS AT THE RATE OF UP TO \$3,760 PER MONTH;**
  - **PROVIDING THE OPTION FOR THE COUNCIL TO PAY A DEPUTY MAYORAL ALLOWANCE AT THE MAXIMUM OF 25% OF THE MAYORAL ALLOWANCE AS PROVIDED FOR IN THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AND REGULATIONS BEING UP TO \$15,000 PER ANNUM PAYABLE IN MONTHLY INSTALMENTS AT THE RATE OF UP TO \$1,250 PER MONTH;**
  - **PROVIDING FOR THE CURRENT EXPENSE REIMBURSEMENT LIMITS FOR THE MAYOR & DEPUTY MAYOR TO BE PROPORTIONALLY RESET SHOULD THE COUNCIL CHOOSE TO PAY A MAYORAL OR DEPUTY MAYORAL ALLOWANCE IN EXCESS OF THE MINIMUM ALLOWANCE BUT LESS THAN THE MAXIMUM ALLOWANCE;**
  - **AMENDING THE POLICY TO SHOW THAT IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT AND REGULATIONS NO MAXIMUM ANNUAL REIMBURSEMENT AMOUNT APPLIES TO THE EXPENSES THAT MUST BE REIMBURSED BY COUNCILS (NON-DISCRETIONARY EXPENSES) BUT NOTING THAT INDIVIDUAL REIMBURSEMENTS ARE SUBJECT TO STATUTORY LIMITS AND APPROPRIATE DOCUMENTATION;**

**C07/6004 - REVIEW AND CONSOLIDATION OF CONFERENCE ATTENDANCE POLICY  
14-003 AND ELECTED MEMBERS ALLOWANCES & EXPENSES POLICIES 14-013  
(REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

- **AMENDING THE POLICY TO ENABLE THE MAYOR AND DEPUTY MAYOR TO ACCESS THE SPECIAL CAPITAL OFFICE EQUIPMENT ALLOCATION OF \$1,700 IN THE YEAR THEY ARE ELECTED AND \$1,000 PER ANNUM THEREAFTER;**
- **AMENDING THE POLICY TO CHANGE THE 12 MONTH EXPENSES AND ALLOWANCES PERIOD FROM 1 MAY TO 1 JULY IN EACH YEAR SO THAT THE PAYMENT OF ALLOWANCES AND EXPENSES COINCIDES WITH THE AUSTRALIAN TAX YEAR AND THE COUNCILS ANNUAL FINANCIAL YEAR AS OPPOSED TO THE FORMER ELECTORAL YEAR COMMENCING 1 MAY;**
- **PROVIDING FOR AN INCREASE IN THE MAXIMUM PER ANNUM AMOUNT FOR CONFERENCE ATTENDANCE FROM \$3,500 TO \$4,500 PER ANNUM TO REFLECT COST INCREASES SINCE THE QUANTUM WAS REVIEWED TWO YEARS AGO;**
- **AMENDING THE POLICY TO RECOGNISE THAT IN ADDITION TO CHILD CARE EXPENSES OTHER CARER EXPENSES MAY BE INCURRED BY ELECTED MEMBERS IN RESPECT OF DEPENDENTS IN ORDER TO ENABLE THEM TO EFFECTIVELY CARRY OUT THEIR FUNCTION AS AN ELECTED MEMBER AND SHOULD THEREFORE BE REIMBURSED.**

**BE ADOPTED**

Her Worship the Mayor, K J Jackson submitted the motion, which was declared  
**CARRIED WITHOUT DISSENT (12/0)**

**COUNCIL RESOLUTION (6004)**

Cr R Aubrey moved, seconded Cr P M Phelan -

2. **THAT THE MAYOR CONTINUE TO BE PAID THE MINIMUM MAYORAL ALLOWANCE OF \$600 PER ANNUM AND BE ENTITLED TO CLAIM DISCRETIONARY EXPENSES INCURRED IN THE RECOGNITION OF THE OFFICIAL ROLE AS MAYOR OF THE CITY OF MELVILLE UP TO THE VALUE OF \$52,100 LESS THE VALUE OF THE MAYORAL VEHICLE OF \$14,880 AND THE DEPUTY MAYOR BE ENTITLED TO CLAIM DISCRETIONARY EXPENSES INCURRED IN THE FULFILMENT OF THEIR OFFICIAL ROLE AS DEPUTY MAYOR OF THE CITY OF MELVILLE UP TO THE VALUE OF \$9,795.**
3. **THE QUANTUM OF THE MAYORAL AND HENCE THE DEPUTY MAYORAL ALLOWANCES BE REVIEWED BY COUNCIL FOLLOWING THE OCTOBER 2007 ELECTIONS.**

Her Worship the Mayor, K J Jackson submitted the motion, which was declared  
**CARRIED (9/3)**

**ADOPTION OF ITEMS NOT WITHDRAWN**

Cr P M Phelan moved, seconded Cr R Aubrey -

**THAT THE FOLLOWING REPORTS OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER EXCLUDING ITEMS T05/1021, T07/2000, P07/3000, C07/8000, AND C07/6004 BE RECEIVED AND THE RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED THEREIN BE ADOPTED.**

Her Worship the Mayor, K J Jackson submitted the motion, which was declared

**CARRIED WITHOUT DISSENT (12/0)**

**P07/1000 – CITY OF MELVILLE LOCAL COMMERCIAL STRATEGY REVIEW (REC)**  
**(ATTACHMENT)**

Ward	:	All Wards
Category	:	Strategic and Policy
Application Number	:	N/A
Property	:	N/A
Proposal	:	Review of Local Commercial Strategy
Applicant	:	City of Melville
Owner	:	City of Melville
Disclosure of any Interest	:	No Officer involved in the preparation of this report has a declarable interest in this matter
Responsible Officer	:	Craig McClure Director Strategic Urban Planning

**SCHEME PROVISIONS**

MRS Zoning	:	Urban
CPS 5 Zoning	:	City Centre, District Centres and Commercial Centre Frames
R-Code	:	N/A
Use Class	:	N/A

**SITE DETAILS**

Lot Area	:	N/A
Retention of Existing Vegetation	:	N/A

**RELEVANT POLICIES**

Nil

**STATUTORY AND LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

The Local Commercial Strategy, when adopted, will form part of the Scheme. Recommendations made will therefore become part of the Scheme for operational purposes.

**BACKGROUND**

The draft Local Commercial Strategy (hereafter referred to as LCS) provides a review of the existing LCS prepared by Shrapnel Urban Planning and adopted by Council in 1993. The strategy was amended (by the same consultant) in 1995 to cater for development at Garden City shopping centre. The Council endorsed most of the recommendations in the Shrapnel strategy and many recommendations have been embodied into the City of Melville Community Planning Scheme.

**P07/1000 – CITY OF MELVILLE LOCAL COMMERCIAL STRATEGY REVIEW (REC)  
(ATTACHMENT)**

The Shrapnel strategy has guided commercial development in the City over the past 10 years. The timeframe for the strategy was to the year 2006 however, recent and significant initiatives in the City, particularly in the Melville City Centre and at Canning Bridge, have witnessed a need to review the commercial activity within the City. The Shrapnel strategy was a successful model and most of its recommendations were implemented and many surpassed. Much of the work in the Shrapnel strategy remains valid and is incorporated in this review.

The review of the LCS initially occurred in 2003 following the release of data from the 2001 ABS Census and 2002 Commercial Land Use Survey conducted by the Department for Planning and Infrastructure. A draft LCS was prepared and consent to advertise the strategy was granted by the DPI in 2003. A 30 day advertising period resulted in 7 submissions. The draft strategy was not finalised pending delays in the progression of the Melville City Centre plans and during that time, other substantial development initiatives occurred across the City of Melville that required consideration in any strategy. As a result of the time delay, the draft strategy was updated (minor review) to incorporate and make reference to the changing development environment.

Factors considered in the review of the existing strategy include (in brief):

- The 1993 LCS was based on population projections obtained from the (then) Ministry for Planning derived from the 1991 census. More recent population projections by the DPI have been revised to show an increased population growth for Melville and Cockburn and other inner and middle metropolitan areas and slower growth in the outer areas.
- The 1993 LCS had a time horizon to 2006 and the City now requires longer projections up to 2026 or 25 years. Note: It is considered that in this period, the City of Melville will transform into an inner metropolitan suburb with associated characteristics including a need to increase residential densities (similar to South Perth). The social profile of the area will reflect that of an 'inner' City area rather than the 'suburban' profile of previous years. Consequently, the commercial and retailing structures in Melville will also change/expand.
- There has been considerable new development in the City since the 1993 LCS was prepared to a point where it could no longer be considered relevant. New development in the City is considered in the reviewed LCS.
- The commercial data used in the 1993 LCS was based upon the (then) Ministry for Planning 1991 Commercial Land use survey. Since that time, further surveys have been undertaken in 1993 and 1997. Data used in the reviewed LCS was derived from DPI Commercial Land use survey taken in 2001/2002 and the 2001 ABS Census.
- The 1993 LCS was based on the Metropolitan Centres Policy 1991. The Metropolitan Centres Policy was updated in 2000 and given statutory status as a Statement of Planning Policy.

**P07/1000 – CITY OF MELVILLE LOCAL COMMERCIAL STRATEGY REVIEW (REC)  
(ATTACHMENT)****Policy and Planning context**

The Western Australian Planning Commission (WAPC) requires a LCS as an important component of any review of a local town planning scheme. Alternatively, the WAPC may require the preparation of a new LCS where the development of a major commercial project is proposed which is outside the scope of the current adopted strategy or town planning scheme. The Melville City Centre project is an example of where a revised LCS would be required.

Both the Council and the WAPC are required to endorse a prepared LCS for it to have any official status.

The WAPC requires a LCS to take account of State Planning Policies. Of particular significance is Statement of Planning Policy 4.2 pertaining to Metropolitan Centres (2000). The Metropolitan Centres Policy (MCP) envisages commercial activity in the Perth Metropolitan Region occurring in a hierarchical manner. The hierarchy is as follows:

- Perth Central Business District;
- Strategic Regional Centres – Midland, Joondalup, Stirling, Rockingham, Armadale, Cannington, Fremantle, Morley;
- Other Regional Centres – Booragoon, Claremont, Belmont, Subiaco, Thompsons Lake, Karrinyup, Whitford City etc;
- District Centres;
- Neighbourhood and local centres.

The MCP sets out different functions for the various levels of the hierarchy with the Perth CBD having the highest and greatest commercial and business function. Other centres in the hierarchy vary in their primary function, and floor space limits are recommended for the different levels of the hierarchy. Other planning criteria (transport links, road access other land uses in the area) determine the level a commercial centre has in the MCP hierarchy.

The Melville City Centre (Booragoon) is the highest order centre in the City of Melville and is classified “other Regional Centre” in the MCP where a 50,000m<sup>2</sup> shopping floor space is recommended. District centres are recommended with a maximum floor space of 15,000m<sup>2</sup>. Of the 6 District Centres in the City, only 2 centres exceed the recommended policy size being Bull Creek Shopping Centre and Kardinya Park Shopping Centre. Details of centres size will be clarified and discussed in the body of the report.

With regard to neighbourhood and local shopping, the City has numerous neighbourhood and local shopping centres that are referred to in CPS 5 as “Community Centres”. The LCS poses no significant change to the structure and number of neighbourhood and local centres with the inclusion of a new centre at Murdoch University in the future and commercial functions at the Transit Orientated Development at Murdoch.

**P07/1000 – CITY OF MELVILLE LOCAL COMMERCIAL STRATEGY REVIEW (REC)  
(ATTACHMENT)**

For the information of Council, the reviewed LCS was compiled with the involvement of officers from the Department for Planning and Infrastructure in view of the complexity of the process and in order to involve the Department in the background reasoning and analysis of the report. Whilst DPI officers could provide no certainty on the success of the LCS through the WAPC, the contents, modelling and associated reasoning's in the LCS review were generally supported.

**RESULTS OF ADVERTISING**

The revised LCS (2006) was advertised to the community for a 30 day period commencing 21 November and concluded on 21 December 2006. The advertising program included the following:

- 2 advertisements in the Melville Times over a two week period and independent article published in the Melville Times;
- LCS document on the website;
- LCS document on display at all Council libraries and Civic Centre office for the duration of the advertising period;
- Individual notification sent to all surrounding local government authorities (Cities of Canning, South Perth, Cockburn, Fremantle and Town of East Fremantle) inclusive of CD version of the report;
- Individual notification sent to all commercial centre managers – Garden City, Bull Creek Shopping Centre, Kardinya Park Shopping Centre;
- Notification sent to all local politicians with interest in this area (9), 5 ratepayer associations, Melville Cockburn Chamber of Commerce, Retail Traders Association of WA and Property Council of Australia;

During the 2006 advertising period, one submission was received. Details of the comments made and the Officers response to those comments are listed in [P07 1000 February 2007.pdf](#) to this Agenda. In summary, the submission received from the City of Canning objected to the recommendation in the revised LCS particularly the growth at the Melville City Centre and criticized the validity and accuracy of the data used.

**P07/1000 – CITY OF MELVILLE LOCAL COMMERCIAL STRATEGY REVIEW (REC)  
(ATTACHMENT)****COMMENT**

The review of the 1993 Local Commercial Strategy is required to meet the changing aspirations of the City of Melville and its community and to a standard required for endorsement by the Western Australian Planning Commission.

The key aims of the revised LCS as required by the Metropolitan Centres Policy (MCP) and the City of Melville are to:

- Identify the future goals and objectives for the commercial centres to ensure that the City maintains and enhances its range of functions it has to fulfil – both local and tourist needs.
- Provide a comprehensive base for planning and development of commercial centres within the City of Melville.
- Establish aims, policies and proposals for retailing and other commercial development in the City.
- Identify specific centres and commercial locations requiring specific action, such as Centre Plans.
- Guide private sector investment and Council capital works expenditure.
- Provide Council with a basis for decision making in relation to applications for development consent, scheme amendments and future strategic directions.

It has become a 'norm' that the main function of a LCS is to establish the maximum floor space 'caps' for shopping centres which, if endorsed by the Western Australian Planning Commission, may be incorporated into the town planning scheme as a basis for Council determining development applications. The revised strategy is no exception and 'caps' are recommended for each commercial centre. However, the strategy further recommends that any increase in floor area capacity should not be considered as a right. An 'on merit' approach is prescribed meaning that applications made for extensions (where additional floor space is available) will only be considered for approval where the usual principles of sound urban planning are met.

**Commercial Centres in the City of Melville**

The City has a balanced shopping hierarchy comprising the Melville City Centre, which is a large Regional Centre, supplemented by 6 strategically located District Centres and larger neighbourhood centres, and a fairly even spread of smaller neighbourhood/local centres. Myaree is the mixed business (commercial and light industrial) area strategically located mid-city and presents good prospects for continuing commercial development by virtue of its location and increasing land value, highway location etc. The Canning Bridge area has, of recent years, experienced a reduced retail function and increased office/business and residential function. The Canning Bridge centre has become the focus for office and residential high density development in the City of Melville.

**P07/1000 – CITY OF MELVILLE LOCAL COMMERCIAL STRATEGY REVIEW (REC)  
(ATTACHMENT)**Melville City Centre

The Melville City Centre is a designated 'other Regional Centre' in the State Government Metropolitan Centres Policy. Regional Centres are promoted as:

*Multi-purpose centres providing a predominantly retail function, a mix of offices, community and entertainment facilities.*

Retail floor space in Regional Centres is generally confined to 50,000m<sup>2</sup>, although the Melville City Centre (Booragoon) was previously approved to accommodate 65,000m<sup>2</sup> in Community Planning Scheme No.5. Many other Regional Centres have floor space over the recommendations in the policy.

The analysis in the LCS recommends that the Melville City Centre could, without undue impact on other centres, expand in a staged format and based on an approved centre plan to:

- 74,100m<sup>2</sup> nla by 2006
- 77,400m<sup>2</sup> nla by 2026

The LCS recommends that these 'caps' be incorporated into the Community Planning Scheme.

To clarify, the analysis in sections 5.2 and 5.3 of the LCS demonstrate that the Melville City Centre main trade area has a population forecast of 134,115 by 2006 and 148,145 by 2026 (NB: the main trade area is not limited to the population of the Melville municipal area alone but includes 'trade' from surrounding areas (other local governments) given the 'Regional Centre' function of the Melville City Centre. In addition to this, the socio-economic characteristics of the main trade area indicate a strong economy, trading at least 10% above the metropolitan average with a population base capable of supporting high levels of retailing in comparison to other areas in the middle and inner sectors of the metropolitan region south of the river.

A retail model was used by consultants to assess future retail floor space requirements for the City of Melville. The model is complex (explained in Appendix 3 of the LCS) and includes assumptions built into the model for centres inside and outside of Melville, including other regional centres such as Belmont and strategic regional centres such as Fremantle and Cannington.

Notwithstanding that the modelling indicates that some of the district centres in the City of Melville may never reach their floor space capacities in CPS 5, the model was constrained downwards to divert trade potential from the Melville City Centre to the district centres and preserve their ability to grow should the need arise. The reason for this is so that (hypothetically) these centres have the potential to reach their allotted sizes at the cost of Melville City Centre. This implies that the Melville City Centre has been constrained below the MCP guidelines if applied directly to the main trade area population forecasts for 2006 and 2026.

**P07/1000 – CITY OF MELVILLE LOCAL COMMERCIAL STRATEGY REVIEW (REC)  
(ATTACHMENT)**District Centres

Overall it is recommended that all the DC's within the City of Melville retain their respective capped floor space limits as is currently outlined in Community Planning Scheme No.5. The existing floor space caps in the scheme are:

Canning Bridge DC	5,400m <sup>2</sup> NLA
Riseley Street DC	11,300M <sup>2</sup> NLA
Melville DC	12,000m <sup>2</sup> NLA
Petra Street DC	9,200m <sup>2</sup> NLA
Kardinya Park DC	20,000m <sup>2</sup> NLA
Bull Creek DC	15,6000m <sup>2</sup> NLA

*Canning Bridge DC*

Canning Bridge DC retail floor space (at 2002) is 4,327m<sup>2</sup> and the maximum potential floor space can increase by 1,073m<sup>2</sup> (on merit) to 5,400m<sup>2</sup>. New development underway at Canning Bridge is primarily residential and office with minimal retail (if any). It is expected that as residential occupancy increases within the DC, the demand for retail will also increase and give rise to redevelopment of older sites occupying prime locations. To facilitate this however, a Centre Plan with urban design guidelines should be prepared for the DC (and Frame). Further more, the introduction of the train station (on South Perth side) reinforces the need for a comprehensive Centre Plan. Upon the allocation of the balance 1,073m<sup>3</sup>, additional retail floor space can then reasonably occur using Main Street design principles that will be included in a future Centre Plan.

*Riseley Street DC*

Riseley Street DC retail floor space is 6,350m<sup>2</sup> (at 2002) and the potential in the strategy recommends an additional 4,950m<sup>2</sup> (on merit). The Riseley Street centre is a busy Main Street style commercial area by virtue of the land uses operating (many café/restaurants). Continued growth of the centre is constrained by the land configuration (crossing a main road), multiple tenancies in different ownership, car parking and access constraints. The reality of the Riseley Street centre expanding to the maximum 11,300m<sup>2</sup> is unlikely in the present circumstances. Notwithstanding this, a Centre Plan for the DC should be prepared that addresses future opportunities and endeavours to resolve some of the current issues stifling growth. Extending the land use mix in the Frame area and hence extending the commercial function may ameliorate some of the constraints of the centre.

*Melville DC*

Melville DC retail floor space is currently 9,205m<sup>2</sup> NLA (at 2002) with the potential to grow to 12,000m<sup>2</sup> (additional 2,795m<sup>2</sup>). Any expansion of the DC should be firmly tied to the refurbishment and consolidation of the existing centre and include adjacent retail facilities (i.e. IGA Bicton). Thus a Centre Plan should be a priority for the Melville Centre and include the Frame to promote an appropriate mix of commercial uses whilst being compatible with adjacent residential areas.

**P07/1000 – CITY OF MELVILLE LOCAL COMMERCIAL STRATEGY REVIEW (REC)  
(ATTACHMENT)***Petra Street DC*

The Petra Street centre is partially within the Town of East Fremantle although the figures referred to in the LCS are within the City of Melville only. The DC has the potential to increase floor space from 8,063m<sup>2</sup> (at 2002) to 9,200m<sup>2</sup> (additional 1,137m<sup>2</sup>). Similar to other DC's, the recommendation for this centre is that the City of Melville and Town of East Fremantle undertake a joint Centre Plan and include the Frame area promoting an appropriate mix of uses and enhancing the commercial functions of the area.

*Kardinya Park DC*

Kardinya Park DC retail floor space is currently 15,332m<sup>2</sup> (at 2002) with the potential to grow to 20,000m<sup>2</sup> (additional 4,678m<sup>2</sup>). The DC is functionally divided into two parts and any future growth should be used as incentive to refurbish the older eastern part of the centre and connect the two parts of the centre. Like other DC's, a centre plan should be prepared for the site.

*Bull Creek DC*

Bull Creek DC retail floor space is currently 15,336m<sup>2</sup> (at 2002) with the potential to grow to 15,600m<sup>2</sup> (additional 264m<sup>2</sup>). The Bull Creek centre serves a large trade area and is well patronised. The centre design is representative of the 'box' shopping centre with no main street aspects. Any redevelopment or expansion of the centre should ideally incorporate main street elements in design (external trading opportunities aligned with other commercial and perhaps residential opportunities) and a centre plan that incorporates surrounding and adjacent areas to better integrate the centre with the future Transit Orientated Development site at Murdoch would benefit the site. Additional floor space would be available to this centre with the introduction of a Main Street as part of an adopted Centre Plan.

Neighbourhood and Local Centres

The overall analysis has revealed that the extent of retail floor space in the 31 neighbourhood and local centres in the city has decreased since the 1993 strategy by some 3,880m<sup>2</sup>. However, the opening of the new supermarket at Willagee will remedy this floor space deficiency in the next commercial survey. The difficulty with managing growth in the smaller centres is directly related to the demographic and land use activities in the adjacent residential areas. For this reason, modelling growth is unreliable and results in small increases (if any) in floor space only.

Given the predominance of District Centres north of Leach Highway (including the Regional Centre), smaller neighbourhood/local centres south of Leach Highway have a greater capacity to grow than centres north of Leach Highway. The modelling figures recommended in the LCS promote this opportunity through floor space provision at these centres. Notwithstanding this, and similar to the circumstances for expansion of District Centres or the Regional Centre, any expansion of neighbourhood/local centres should be on merit and with regard to sound planning principles of urban design, aesthetics, safety and community benefit.

**P07/1000 – CITY OF MELVILLE LOCAL COMMERCIAL STRATEGY REVIEW (REC)  
(ATTACHMENT)**Other commercial areas

Myaree Mixed Business area is an older industrial area that is slowly redeveloping into a thriving commercial and service industrial area. In recognition of the changes occurring in the Myaree Mixed Business area, the Department for Planning and Infrastructure initiated an amendment to the Region Scheme to rezone the land from Industrial to Urban. Relative to this, the City embarked on an amendment to CPS 5 that will enhance development opportunities, provide for diversity and in the longer term through further planning, improve built form and streetscape appearance and meet some emerging objectives of the draft Network City strategy that recognises Myaree as an Activity Centre.

At the present time, Myaree supports over 18,186m<sup>2</sup> of retail floor space representing only 7% of the overall floor space of the area. Technically, this floor space is contrary to scheme requirements, however, its existence also demonstrates demand for retail activity in transitional industrial areas. Furthermore, the presence of this retail activity would not appear to impact upon the higher order designated MCP centres. Amendment 47 to CPS 5 considers this issue through the designation of appropriate zones and land uses compatible with the zone and the changing dynamics of the area. The recommendations in the LCS to limit shop development in Myaree are supported by the Amendment.

Murdoch University masterplan proposes a small commercial precinct up to 4,500m<sup>2</sup> in the future. The details of this centre are yet to be determined and have not been modelled as part of this strategy. Similarly, additional commercial activity is expected within the Fiona Stanley / TOD Activity Centre for which details and floor space figures are not yet available. Notwithstanding this, it is also assumed that with any future commercial developments within these precincts, that appropriate studies of capability and impact will be required to ensure that existing commercial centres are not unduly impacted. Furthermore, at the time of their development it is expected that employment and population figures within those precincts (with some trade from surrounding areas) will justify their development.

**CONCLUSION**

In conclusion, the revised LCS provides an updated and comprehensive perspective of the commercial (retail) opportunities that exist in the City of Melville. Whilst the strategy provides justification for growth at the City Centre as a priority in view of the ongoing Melville City Centre Vision Plan exercise, the strategy realistically evaluates the viability and capacity for growth of the existing commercial centres across the city without any reduction in floor space to any centre. Future opportunities exist at the Murdoch TOD, Murdoch University and main street developments in Myaree and some larger shopping areas, however, the dynamics of that can not be qualitatively assessed at this time in the absence of detailed plans. Future reviews of the LCS will address these developments (should they occur).

The review of the Local Commercial Strategy is one phase of the Scheme Review process. The document will form an adjunct to the new Town Planning Scheme and as a separate document it is able to be reviewed (and updated) by the Council and modified without requiring amendments to the Scheme.

The strategy will guide development in the City of Melville over the forthcoming decade.

**P07/1000 – CITY OF MELVILLE LOCAL COMMERCIAL STRATEGY REVIEW (REC)  
(ATTACHMENT)**

**COUNCIL RESOLUTION (1000)**

**ADOPT**

- 1. THAT THE COUNCIL ENDORSE THE LOCAL COMMERCIAL STRATEGY (OCTOBER 2006) UNDER CLAUSE 5.17 OF COMMUNITY PLANNING SCHEME NO.5 WITHOUT MODIFICATION.**
- 2. THAT THE WESTERN AUSTRALIAN PLANNING COMMISSION BE ADVISED OF THE RECOMMENDATION OF THE COUNCIL AND REQUESTED TO ENDORSE THE STRATEGY AS A PRIORITY.**
- 3. THAT THE LOCAL COMMERCIAL STRATEGY FORM THE BASIS FOR DETERMINATION OF COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS WITHIN THE CITY OF MELVILLE UNDER THE CURRENT AND PROPOSED TOWN PLANNING SCHEMES.**
- 4. THAT THE MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN AMP CAPITAL AND THE CITY OF MELVILLE BE ENDORSED BY BOTH PARTIES PRIOR TO THE SUBMISSION OF THE LOCAL COMMERCIAL STRATEGY TO THE WESTERN AUSTRALIAN PLANNING COMMISSION.**
- 5. THAT SUBMITTEES BE ADVISED OF THE COUNCILS DECISION.**

**CARRIED EN BLOC**

**P07/1001 - MELVILLE CITY CENTRE VISION PLAN/CENTRE PLAN (REC)**  
**(ATTACHMENT)**

Ward	:	All Wards
Category	:	Strategic and Policy
Application Number	:	N/A
Property	:	N/A
Proposal	:	City Centre Vision and Centre Plan
Applicant	:	City of Melville /AMP Capital
Owner	:	Various
Disclosure of any Interest	:	No Officer involved in the preparation of this report has a declarable interest in this matter
Responsible Officer	:	Craig McClure Director Strategic Urban Planning

**SCHEME PROVISIONS**

MRS Zoning	:	Urban
CPS 5 Zoning	:	City Centre, District Centres and Commercial Centre Frames

**SITE DETAILS**

Area	:	Land comprising the City Centre in the Community Planning Scheme equating to approx. 22 hectares and surrounding Frame area on Almondbury Road and Riseley Street.
------	---	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

**RELEVANT POLICIES**

Nil

**STATUTORY AND LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

The Melville City Centre Vision Plan provides the broad conceptual strategic direction for the future development of the city centre and requires adoption by the Council and referral to the Western Australian Planning Commission for its adoption. The Vision Plan is supported by a Centre Plan that contains the structural and functional elements of city centre growth (at a strategic level) and requires adoption by the Council and Western Australian Planning Commission. Development in the city centre is thereafter guided by the Vision and Centre plans (until reviewed).

The recommendations in the Local Commercial Strategy (reported separately) justify the increase floor space allocated to the City Centre. The Local Commercial Strategy is a requirement of planning legislation and its recommendations will be embodied in the reviewed Town Planning Scheme.

**P07/1001 - MELVILLE CITY CENTRE VISION PLAN/CENTRE PLAN (REC)  
(ATTACHMENT)****BACKGROUND**

In 2001, the City of Melville in conjunction with AMP Capital embarked on the creation of a Vision Plan for the future of the Melville City Centre and adjacent Commercial Centre Frames. The project was launched publicly with a community forum/workshop on 24 October 2001. The public forum explored community issues and expectations to be considered in development of the Vision Plan.

Following the public forum, Council staff, consultants, representatives from government agencies and the major stakeholder (AMP Henderson Global Investors) were involved in a 2 day Enquiry by Design workshop (12 and 13 November 2001) for the purpose of exploring opportunities and options for a Melville City Centre Vision Plan.

At the workshop, the City defined its objectives for the City Centre as:

- ❑ A strong, vibrant and diversified local economy with a range of business and employment opportunities.
- ❑ For the City Centre to be a focal point of the City with a multitude of uses and activities and to have a variety of business opportunities within the City.
- ❑ Statement of Intent from Community Planning Scheme No 5 in relation to the City Centre describes it as:  
*“The commercial, administrative, civic, entertainment and cultural centre of the City of Melville. With any expansion of retail or office floor space Council may require an equivalent floor area of housing, entertainment and cultural uses, government services, or other public uses. The Council may prepare an overall development plan and urban design guidelines for the precinct.”*

AMP Capital identified their objectives as:

- ❑ To enable coordinated growth of the City Centre in a manner that will be in line with the world's best practice.
- ❑ To allow cooperation in the preparation of the vision of the regional centre.
- ❑ To enable the creation of a Centre Plan that will outline a vision for the City Centre that will enable Garden City Shopping Centre and its surrounds to grow as the focus for the City of Melville.
- ❑ To develop a plan that will include integration of entertainment uses, restaurants, additional cinemas, community facilities and retail development in a high street style design to enable greater local use.

(Note: All landowners within the city centre were invited to attend the workshop, however only AMP management attended.)

**P07/1001 - MELVILLE CITY CENTRE VISION PLAN/CENTRE PLAN (REC)**  
**(ATTACHMENT)**The 2020 Vision Plan

The 2020 Vision plan considered the long term planning of the City Centre precinct to ensure that all potential usages and facilities can be appropriately provided for when the need arose. The Vision Plan sought to address the following principles:

- Integrated community
  - Provision of mix of uses
  - Open street environment
  - Accessibility after normal business hours
- Importance of public places
  - Development design recognising the distinctive character of the area
  - Create an external focus around the City Square and along Almondbury Road
  - Encourage infill of vacant spaces on the street to establish urban focus
  - Identify the streetscape – theme or identity
  - Encourage art in public spaces
- Sustainability and viability (commercial)
  - Balance of commercial uses
  - Residential density choice
  - Flexibility to accommodate mixed uses
  - Staging
- Pedestrian Priority
  - Create a safe environment
  - Increase surveillance of pathways and public spaces
  - Improve lighting and landscaping
  - Improve footpaths, crossing points with pedestrian priority
  - Use traffic calming road improvement to slow vehicles
  - Improve permeability and legibility in a layout providing direct and logical routes.
- Response to the natural environment
  - Use topography and site features
  - Recognise significant natural assets (Wireless Hill Reserve)
  - Provide climatic relief – sun, shade and wind
  - Identify in landscape themes/design the natural assets

The Vision Plan was advertised to the community in Feb/March 2003 in an extensive advertising campaign. 62 submissions were received by the close of the advertising period.

The 2020 Vision Plan was delayed pending a partial merger of AMP Capital and Westfield Shopping Centres and the inability of the major stakeholders to reach agreement on Community and Infrastructure benefits.

Since that time, a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) has been prepared that establishes the process for proceeding with more detailed elements of contributions and development outcomes on adoption of the Vision Plan/Centre plan. At the time of preparing this report, AMP are yet to sign the Memorandum of Understanding

**P07/1001 - MELVILLE CITY CENTRE VISION PLAN/CENTRE PLAN (REC)  
(ATTACHMENT)**Revised Vision Plan and Centre Plan

The 2020 Vision Plan has been revised and incorporates a more realistic and improved vision for the future development of the City Centre. The revised plan incorporates some significant changes from the previous plan, the most significant being:

1. New Main Street (connecting Almondbury Rd to Davy Street);
2. Development fronting Marmion Street
3. Revised internal layout of future and existing buildings across the city centre.

The Centre Plan documents provide the rationale behind the development of the Vision Plan and build upon the 2020 Vision Plan proposal. Traffic studies have also been revised with new data and to address local traffic issues.

The 5 key principles of the 2020 Vision Plan remain valid for the revised Vision Plan and Centre Plan documents. It is expected that all development proposals for the City Centre and Frame should conform to these principles and the development requirements of CPS 5.

**ADVERTISING**

To progress the amended Vision Plan/Centre Plan project and gauge community expectation, the revised documents were advertised to the community for a 30 day period commencing 21 November 2006 and concluding on 20 December 2006.

The advertising included the following:

- Two half page notices published in the Melville Times newspaper on 21 Nov and 28 Nov.
- Media release to accompany the notice in 21 Nov edition of Melville Times.
- Written notification sent to all owners of land in the City Centre, ratepayers groups, politicians;
- Full documentation on display at all Council Libraries and the Civic Centre;
- Full documentation on the City of Melville website.

The Melville City Centre project received further coverage in the 28 November edition of the Melville Times (with images) and the West Australian Newspaper on 1 December 2006 (with images).

NB: In view of the association between the Almondbury Rd traffic issues and the future City Centre plan, a public meeting was held on 4 December to discuss local traffic issues and long term plans. The community was informed of the public meeting via the two published notices on the City Centre proposal (21 and 28 Nov) and individual notification (approx 70 letters) was sent to all participants of an Electors Meeting conducted in May 2006. Twenty six residents/representatives attended the 4th December public forum along with 3 Councillors, traffic and planning consultants and representatives from AMP Capital.

**P07/1001 - MELVILLE CITY CENTRE VISION PLAN/CENTRE PLAN (REC)  
(ATTACHMENT)**

**Attachment 1 [P07\\_1001\\_February\\_2007.pdf](#)** presents the schedule of submissions received during the 30 day advertising period. In summary, 8 written submissions were received that primarily related to local road treatment issues on Almondbury Rd and traffic issues in the precinct north of the City Centre (Ardross). The results of the submissions revealed the following outcomes:

- 1 submission objected to future City Centre plans
- 1 submission supported future plans (subject to sustainable development principles)
- 1 submission commented on future plans (requested pedestrian paths to city centre)
- 5 submissions expressed concern with local traffic implications on Almondbury Rd and precinct north of City Centre. Of these submissions: 2 support the round-a-bout option in Almondbury Rd and 1 supports the slip-lane concept. The other 3 submissions are concerned with the increase in traffic in the precinct north of the City Centre (Links Rd, Searle St and McCallum Cres).

The community comments received are summarised below:

- The perceived insufficient parking capacity of the shopping centre,
- Concern about the ability to maintain agreements relating to an access gate,
- The need for improved pedestrian access to the shopping centre from Marmion and Riseley Streets,
- Sustainability,
- Health concerns about exhaust fumes from vehicles using the Main Street,
- Detailed intersection design issues,
- Support for removal of the turning restrictions on Almondbury Road,
- Identifying the need for a road link between Almondbury Road and Davy Street,
- Support for the construction of roundabouts on Almondbury Road,
- The need for equity in sharing the traffic load,
- Concern about the impact of the proposed roundabout on adjacent properties,
- Concern about the potential increase in traffic on local roads,
- Concern about the accuracy of the traffic reports,
- Concern about the potential reduction in amenity and safety on local roads.

**COMMENTS**

Since early 2004 and for reasons stated above, the progression of the Melville City Centre project was minimal. In 2006, discussions recommenced on the projects with a view to amending and finalising the Vision Plan, compiling a Centre Plan, reviewing traffic reports and finalising the MOU and local commercial strategy.

The Melville City Centre and Local Commercial Strategy (reported separately) projects have no formal Council commitment and were both advertised to the community over 2 years ago. Re-advertising both projects has resulted in a reduced number of submissions. During that time, both projects were informally reported to officers from the Department for Planning and Infrastructure and discussed with Elected Members at numerous Elected Members Workshops. Whilst no formal approvals were granted (other than to advertise the LCS and Vision Plan), officers from the DPI were generally supportive of both projects.

**P07/1001 - MELVILLE CITY CENTRE VISION PLAN/CENTRE PLAN (REC)  
(ATTACHMENT)**

Melville City Centre Vision Plan/Centre Plan

The Melville City Centre plan has a revised form that includes:

- Inclusion of a Main Street through the City Centre between Almondbury Road and Davy Street,
- Significant extension of the retail component of the centre to the south (fronting Marmion Street),
- Redevelopment of the food court and associated specialty stores on the north-west quadrant of the centre interfacing with the new Town Centre and supporting the redeveloped cinema complex and at-grade activities and attractions on the Main Street,
- Reduction in the size of bus station and retention of the bus station in its present location and in the long term underground,
- opportunities for office/residential development on land owned by the City of Melville,
- Improved connectivity of uses within the City Centre through reduction of ground level car parking (parking proposed to be relocated underground or roof-top with business/retail at ground level),
- Opportunity for a second main street on Almondbury Rd,
- Improved connection between Andreas Lane and the new proposed Main Street,
- Improved Civic Square opportunity for both the cinema operator and the City of Melville community facilities possibly including new/renovated library, community arts centre/gallery and associated commercial facility.

The revised Vision Plan forms part of the Centre Plan documents for the Melville City Centre. A centre plan ensures that centres of activity are developed as integrated, cohesive and accessible centres with a range of uses and high levels of employment. The State Government Metropolitan Centres Policy requires the preparation of centre plans for higher order centre such as the Melville City Centre and must provide the planning information and rationale to justify and support the long term vision.

Similar to the 2020 Vision Plan, the revised plans support the same objectives as identified earlier being:

- Integrated community
- Pedestrian priority
- Importance of public places
- Response to the natural environment
- Commercial viability and sustainability

The opportunities presented by the Melville City Centre Plans provide direction in addressing the existing segregated nature of activities across the centre. It is anticipated that in time, further integration will occur and will allow the centre to evolve to provide a wider range of activities that will make the centre more vibrant, safer and active.

**P07/1001 - MELVILLE CITY CENTRE VISION PLAN/CENTRE PLAN (REC)  
(ATTACHMENT)**

Improved community integration is provided through the following means:

1. Provision of a mix of uses- including an open street that is accessible 24 hrs which contains entertainment and commercial activities currently not available in the city centre after normal business hours. Improved civic facilities and use (patronage) of these facilities may also improve.
2. Opportunities for the community to live and work in and around the centre that provides for more activity around the centre, creates a safer environment (through people movements, activity, enhanced lighting etc) and gives 'life' to the city centre outside of the retail box shopping centre environment.
3. Improved pedestrian and access routes through delineation of access and activity routes around the centre (main street and secondary routes).
4. Residential opportunity offering a mix of housing choice close or within the city centre.

Pedestrian priority should be a primary issue for subsequent development works should the vision/centre plans be adopted. At the present time, pedestrians are disadvantaged in accessing the centre through location of car parks and lack of direct 'pedestrian priority' routes. Principles which should be embodied in any future development plans should include:

1. Creating a safer environment for pedestrians through casual surveillance of pathways, public spaces and car parking areas. After hour's activities, good lighting and appropriate landscaping are also critical.
2. An intermix of pedestrians and vehicles is desirable with an emphasis on pedestrian priority. Traffic calming, routing, delineated crossing points are all means to improve the pedestrian experience of the city centre.
3. Active streetscapes that link to the surrounding areas containing interesting building frontages, views, shade etc.
4. Permeability and legibility – road and pedestrian patterns should present a 'grid' format for clarity and ease of movement, improved site line and visual connectivity.

Importance of Public Places - the city centre belongs to the community and public spaces should include more than just civic facilities operated by the Council. Spaces on private and public land that are viewed and accessed by the community form part of this definition and for this reason, the design and siting of these spaces needs to be carefully integrated and managed. The centre plan seeks to draw together the Council administration and civic facilities with the commercial functions of the shopping centre and other uses into an area that proposes to mix all of the public and private entertainment areas, reflecting the community's desire for enhanced activity and sense of place.

Principles to consider in any future development proposals to ensure the importance of public spaces are:

1. encourage development which reinforces and complements the character of the area;
2. creation of an external focus to elements of the city centre;
3. encourage the infill of vacant spaces on streets and fronting buildings with large setbacks;
4. reinforce streetscape image through design of street furniture and fittings;
5. art in public spaces (recognising the character of the area)

**P07/1001 - MELVILLE CITY CENTRE VISION PLAN/CENTRE PLAN (REC)  
(ATTACHMENT)**Main Street/Civic Square

The most significant component of the revised plans centre around the Main Street and proposed civic square. The existing civic space between the shopping centre and Council facilities lacks vitality and adequate connection to the shopping centre. The revised format endeavours to link these elements and inject vitality to the western end of the city centre. The connection of Almondbury Rd to Davy Street (at grade) will provide a seamless connection of the roads surrounding the city centre. Whilst a road connection is available currently, this road acts as a vehicle connection only without an active edge (via buildings and activities), or sense of place or community identity. The Main Street will revitalise the western end of the city centre as well as provide for improved vehicle and pedestrian access through and around the centre in the long term. This road will support a public transport service (currently not available at the western end) that will directly service the entertainment facilities proposed. The northern boundary of the Main Street will consist of civic uses with complementary commercial uses and will complement the high-order retailing/commercial activity offered by the shopping centre. Development of an active and functional town square is a priority to ensure that the proposals for the western end of the city centre evolve to their full potential and meet the expectations of the community.

Whilst design guidelines need to be prepared addressing built form, accessibility, the environment etc it is anticipated that the built form along the Main Street will consist of low scale buildings of varying and complementary designs (all with external frontages) addressing the Main Street. The scaling down of these buildings to a 'pedestrian' level assists to generate a sense of place and create a 'market' place environment. This will be explored further should the plans progress.

Another major component of the city centre plan is the additional retailing fronting Marmion Street (on old service station site). This component of the plan has both positive and negative elements. One positive is that development will front the street and not be segregated by car parking (as currently exists elsewhere within the centre); the community will be provided with expanded commercial choice and there will be opportunity for new and improved built form. From a negative perspective, this new development could result in a 'bulky' format fronting the street with no human scale. This needs to be managed adequately and in order to ensure that sufficient pedestrian connections and access points are provided. Subsequent detailed planning will need to encapsulate this.

Response to the natural environment recognises the need to better integrate elements of significant adjacent natural assets with the city centre such as the features, topography and history offered by Wireless Hill. To ensure that adequate connections and representation is made of adjacent Wireless Hill, future design for the civic and commercial precincts should address linkages, signage, and even the 'story' of this natural feature. Subsequent landscape detail should ensure that the passive 'green' links are provided between the commercial/civic facilities and Wireless Hill, that any internal landscaping of streetscapes, car parking, and entry features etc is 'themed'. The promotion of the environmental value of adjacent Wireless Hill is both beneficial to the commercial centre and Wireless Hill through improved community awareness.

**P07/1001 - MELVILLE CITY CENTRE VISION PLAN/CENTRE PLAN (REC)  
(ATTACHMENT)**

With regards to viability, the development proposed (additional 11000m<sup>2</sup> NLA retail plus future office/commercial space) will contribute to a broader mix of uses available to the community; it will also enhance the identity of the Melville City Centre as a significant regional centre and encourage other complementary uses to co-locate in the centre through the Main Street opportunities. Improving the city's economic profile has positive benefits locally and regionally.

Transport and Traffic

In order to evolve the Vision Plan and Centre Plans, numerous traffic studies have been conducted since the projects inception in 2001. Traffic studies were revised in 2006 to account for changed development opportunities within the city centre and included analysis of local traffic issues raised by the community (with particular emphasis on Almondbury Road).

General principles were determined for the Melville City Centre by traffic consultants Connell Wagner. The principles are:

1. A proposed Main Street
2. Identifying traffic demand and distribution
3. Public transport
4. Internal vehicle circulation, and
5. Alternative transport modes.

To facilitate the exploration of these principles, the consultants undertook the preparation of a *transport strategy* that encompassed a background report, traffic volumes report, traffic issues report and summary report. The general recommendations from the transport strategy were numerous and reported to the Council in briefings and workshops and to the community during the two advertising periods (2003 and 2006) and currently are available for viewing on the City of Melville website.

To summarise anticipated traffic impacts, the consultants indicate that the upgraded shopping centre is expected to generate a further 9600 vehicles per day onto the existing road system surrounding the City Centre. It is expected that the bulk of this additional traffic will be accommodated on the existing arterial road system (Marmion Street and Riseley Street). Davy Street is predicted to increase by 8% to around 4860 vpd and Coomoora Rd is predicted to increase to around 8660 vpd, an increase of 3% on the current vehicle demand. In comparison Marmion Street will increase by 13% and Riseley Street by 16% (south of Marmion) and 8.5% (north of Coomoora). These traffic increases are considered relatively small and within the capacity of the road system to manage.

The more significant traffic impacts are on the local roads north of the city centre as shown below:

**P07/1001 - MELVILLE CITY CENTRE VISION PLAN/CENTRE PLAN (REC)  
(ATTACHMENT)**

TABLE 2  
ADDITIONAL TRAFFIC IMPACT OF PROPOSED EXPANSION  
GARDEN CITY SHOPPING CENTRE

LOCATION	'MODIFIED EXISTING' THURSDAY TRAFFIC <sup>1)</sup>	ADDITIONAL SHOPPING CENTRE TRAFFIC	FUTURE THURSDAY TRAFFIC	
			Total	Percentage Change
Cunningham Street - South of Canning Highway	1,880	+10	1,890	+0.5%
McCallum Crescent - South of Alexander Road	1,140	+20	1,160	+1.8%
Searle Road - South of Alexander Road	400	+10	410	+2.5%
Links Road - North of Almondbury Road	2,230	+10	2,240	+0.4%
Proposed 'Main Street' - Dwy 1 (sth of Almondbury Rd)	5,510	+140	5,650	+2.5%
- Dwy 8 (east of Davy St)	7,780	-1,110	6,670	-14.3%
Almondbury Road - West of Links Road	2,110	+30	2,140	+1.4%
- West of Driveway 1	3,780	+40	3,820	+1.1%
Riseley Street - North of Coomooro Road	19,180	+1,670	20,850	+8.7%
- South of Marmion Street	29,550	+4,740	34,290	+16.0%
Coomooro Road - East of Riseley Street	8,400	+260	8,660	+3.1%
- West of Reynolds Road	7,020	+220	7,240	+3.1%
Karoonda Road - East of Riseley Street	3,200	+100	3,300	+3.1%
Marmion Street - West of Davy Street	18,880	+2,530	21,410	+13.4%
Marcus Avenue - South of Marmion Street	5,600	+420	6,020	+7.5%
Davy Street - West of Driveway 8	4,520	+340	4,860	+7.5%
- East of Norma Road	3,940	+320	4,260	+8.1%

Notes: 1) 'Modified Existing' traffic flows are as shown in Table 1.  
Traffic volumes quoted are all 'vehicles per day'.

Source: Uloth and Associates

Whilst these figures do indicate an increase in vehicle movements on these local roads, the increases are relatively small and within the capacity of the roads. Attachment 1 provides further clarification addressing the issues raised by residents.

Perhaps the most significant local issue pertains to the removal or not of traffic restrictions on Almondbury Rd and the installation of roundabouts. Whilst this issue is very localised in nature, as compared to the long term strategic plan under consideration, the consequential impacts on any future development at the City Centre should be addressed and managed as early as possible. At the present time, the Western Almondbury Rd entrance to the shopping centre (near Cinema's) is a known traffic black spot and the City's Technical and Development Services division investigated options to improve safety on Almondbury Rd in May 2006 with the community. The outcomes of public meetings and community consultation have been previously reported to the Council and a final report on this local issue is listed elsewhere in the Agenda.

**P07/1001 - MELVILLE CITY CENTRE VISION PLAN/CENTRE PLAN (REC)  
(ATTACHMENT)**

From a strategic urban planning perspective, improvements to the road network that promote connectivity to a major centre of activity is preferable, and for this reason alone the recommended roundabout option presents a necessary improvement. Notwithstanding this functional reason, the local community has raised some concern (but not overwhelming opposition) to the roundabout proposal. The vision plan/centre plan design has focused development and increased activity at the Marmion Street frontage of the city centre and additional and improved car parking is proposed at both the Marmion Street and Riseley Street faces further encouraging the retention of traffic on arterial roads and not on local roads. The modelling for the centre indicates some introduction of both local and through traffic into the northern precinct, however, the figures are considered overestimates (confirmed by Technical and Development Services) and any possible traffic impacts can be controlled through traffic management measures. Continuous monitoring of the traffic impacts should be considered.

The growth trend in vehicle volumes recorded between 1996 and 2006 on roads surrounding and servicing the Melville City Centre are generally stable (as reported in Connell Wagner traffic report). The rationale for this reflects the City's maturity and the minimal influence of retail growth – the current trends in retail centre development and expansion is for less trips to be generated by the various land uses, as patrons undertake multiple task shopping over a longer stay. Other influences such as infill development, other traffic generating land uses and road network changes also impact regional traffic movement.

Comments from the Development and Technical Services Division on traffic (and as reported in Almondbury Road Traffic Review elsewhere in Agenda):

*The conclusion of Connell Wagner's Traffic & Transportation Assessment that an expanded Garden City Shopping Centre "should not create any major traffic impacts within the surrounding road network" is supported. The majority of the predicted increase in traffic generated by the centre is expected to occur, appropriately, on the more major roads of Marmion and Riseley Streets. Any increases in volumes on more local roads are expected to be small and within the function and capacity of those roads.*

*For some aspects of the transport infrastructure planned for the expanded shopping centre there still needs to be more detailed design and analysis undertaken to maximise safety and performance outcomes. This includes such issues as improving pedestrian access through the site, the layout of the bus station, bus access, design of a low speed environment for the Main Street, and the proximity of proposed access points to signalised intersections. However, such detail will be addressed at the Development Assessment stage rather than at the strategic level applicable to the Melville City Centre Plan.*

**P07/1001 - MELVILLE CITY CENTRE VISION PLAN/CENTRE PLAN (REC)  
(ATTACHMENT)**

*It is considered that the community submissions to the Melville City Centre Plan consultation do not raise any major traffic or transport issues that have not already been, or will be, addressed. Some of those issues will be dealt with during the detailed design phase of any traffic treatments and monitoring of traffic volumes will ensure concerns about increased traffic on local roads are addressed.*

*The community are always, quite reasonably, concerned about the potential increase of traffic volume on local roads. It is considered that the installation of roundabouts and the removal of turning restrictions on Almondbury Road will improve road safety by reducing the crash history of that road and improve access between the shopping centre and the section of Ardross immediately north of the centre. This is not expected to result in significant changes in traffic volumes on local roads in that area.*

**CONCLUSION**

Through the Melville City Centre Vision Plan and Centre Plan the city centre will develop over time to be a dynamic centre that provides an increased level of service to the City of Melville community through as broad a multitude of land-use and activities as is possible. The plan gives rise to a significantly improved social, cultural and entertainment hub for the local and visiting community. In part, Garden City shopping centre will transform from an internalised box shopping centre to focus on a new Main Street with shop fronts. From the community perspective, the improvements will give rise to a new level of activity currently not available within the zoned City Centre precinct. Details are yet to be explored and defined on the critical issues of built form, streetscape, amenity, traffic management etc. however, adoption of a plan that provides a 'guide' for future opportunities is a positive first step where no plan previously existed.

Development of the long term plan presents issues for further consideration over time and in subsequent reviews of the plan. One such issue is the adjacent Frame areas and particularly the Almondbury Rd Frame. Frame precincts are difficult to manage given the range of community expectations and the lifestyle choices of residents, combined with the general lack of integration of adjacent land uses. It is not unreasonable to predict that these areas will over time transform into inner-city living areas of medium and possibly high density housing or mixed use development further complementing the city centre. However, in the short term, these precincts need to be monitored and development carefully guided.

In light of these comments, it is recommended that the Melville City Centre Vision Plan and Centre Plan be adopted.

**P07/1001 - MELVILLE CITY CENTRE VISION PLAN/CENTRE PLAN (REC)**  
**(ATTACHMENT)**Disclosures of Interest

<b>Item No</b>	:	P07/1001 – Melville City Centre Vision Plan / Centre Plan
<b>Member</b>	:	Cr H R Everett
<b>Type of Interest</b>	:	Interest under Code of Conduct
<b>Nature of Interest</b>	:	I have a life Insurance Policy with AMP
<b>Extent of Interest</b>	:	
<b>Request</b>	:	Stay, Discuss and Observe
<b>Decision of Committee</b>	:	N / A
<b>Decision of Council</b>	:	Decision Not Required

**COUNCIL RESOLUTION (1001)****ADOPT**

- 1. THAT THE COUNCIL ADOPT THE MELVILLE CITY CENTRE VISION PLAN/CENTRE PLAN DOCUMENTS (NOV 2006) UNDER CLAUSE 9.6 OF COMMUNITY PLANNING SCHEME NO.5 AS A GUIDE TO CITY CENTRE AND FRAME PRECINCT DEVELOPMENT.**
- 2. THAT THE MELVILLE CITY CENTRE VISION PLAN/CENTRE PLAN DOCUMENTS (NOV 2006) AND SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED BE REFERRED TO THE WESTERN AUSTRALIAN PLANNING COMMISSION FOR ADOPTION AS A CENTRE PLAN FOR THE BOORAGOON REGIONAL CENTRE (AS IT IS DESCRIBED IN STATEMENT OF PLANNING POLICY NO. 4.2 – COMMERCIAL CENTRES POLICY STATEMENT FOR THE PERTH METROPOLITAN REGION) AND ENABLE DELEGATION OF DEVELOPMENT CONTROL TO THE CITY OF MELVILLE UNDER THE METROPOLITAN REGION SCHEME.**
- 3. THAT THE MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN AMP CAPITAL AND THE CITY OF MELVILLE BE ENDORSED BY BOTH PARTIES PRIOR TO THE SUBMISSION OF THE MELVILLE CITY CENTRE VISION PLAN/CENTRE PLAN DOCUMENTS TO THE DEPARTMENT FOR PLANNING AND INFRASTRUCTURE.**
- 4. THAT AMP CAPITAL BE ADVISED THAT DEVELOPMENT OF THE WESTERN END OF THE CENTRE PLAN INCORPORATING THE MAIN STREET AND CITY SQUARE ARE A PRIMARY COMPONENT OF THE PLAN AND SHOULD BE DESIGNED AND DEVELOPED AS THE FIRST PRIORITY UPON ENDORSEMENT OF THE CENTRE PLAN. SUCH INFRASTRUCTURE WORKS BEING REQUIRED AND IDENTIFIED IN THE MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING AND THE SUBSEQUENT LEGAL AGREEMENT.**
- 5. THAT THE CITY OF MELVILLE AND AMP CAPITAL (AND OTHER CITY CENTRE STAKEHOLDERS) CONTINUE TO WORK TOGETHER TO PROGRESS DESIGN GUIDELINES FOR CITY CENTRE DEVELOPMENT ENCOMPASSING BUILT FORM, STREETScape, LANDSCAPE, PEDESTRIAN CONNECTIONS AND LINKAGES AND ADDRESSING ENVIRONMENTAL AND SUSTAINABILITY PRINCIPLES AND DESIGNING OUT CRIME PRINCIPLES.**

**P07/1001 - MELVILLE CITY CENTRE VISION PLAN/CENTRE PLAN (REC)  
(ATTACHMENT)**

6. THAT THE CITY OF MELVILLE CONSIDER A TRAVELSMART CAMPAIGN TO PROMOTE OTHER MODES OF TRAVEL TO THE CITY CENTRE.
7. THAT THE INSTALLATION OF 2 ROUNDABOUTS IN ALMONDBURY ROAD, ARDROSS WITH OTHER NECESSARY INTERSECTION TREATMENTS BE ENDORSED AS THE PREFERRED TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT SOLUTION AND THAT TRAFFIC IMPACTS IN THE SURROUNDING ROAD NETWORK RESULTING FROM CITY CENTRE DEVELOPMENT BE MONITORED.
8. THAT AMP CAPITAL BE ADVISED THAT THE CITY WILL MONITOR TRAFFIC IMPACTS RESULTING FROM ANY CONSEQUENT DEVELOPMENTS WITHIN THE CITY CENTRE AND MAY REQUIRE THE RESOLUTION OF ISSUES OR CONTRIBUTION TOWARDS THE RESOLUTION OF ISSUES OR IMPACTS ARISING THERFROM.
9. THAT THE REVIEW OF COMMUNITY PLANNING SCHEME NO.5 AND NEW LOCAL PLANNING STRATEGY ADDRESS AND ENCOMPASS THE PRINCIPLES OF THE MELVILLE CITY CENTRE VISION PLAN AND CENTRE PLAN.
10. THAT THE CITY OF MELVILLE JOINTLY WITH CITY CENTRE LAND OWNERS BUDGET FOR WORKS ASSOCIATED WITH THE DESIGN AND CONSTRUCTION OF CIVIC FACILITIES AT THE WESTERN END OF THE CITY CENTRE AND APPROPRIATE STREETScape TREATMENTS WITHIN AND LEADING TO THE CITY CENTRE AND FRAME PRECINCTS.
11. THAT THE CITY OF MELVILLE AND AMP CAPITAL PROGRESS THE COMMITMENT (VIA MOU) TO THE ESTABLISHMENT OF COMMUNITY AND INFRASTRUCTURE BENEFITS.
12. THAT THE COMMUNITY AND RESPONDENTS BE ADVISED OF THE DECISION OF COUNCIL.

**CARRIED EN BLOC**

**P07/3002 - PAINT COLOUR TO BE APPLIED TO PORTION OF REFLECTIVE ROOF COVER ON EXISTING TWO STOREY SINGLE DWELLING ON LOT 90 (49) SWAN ROAD ATTADALE (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

Ward	:	Bicton / Attadale
Category	:	Planning / Building Development
Application Number	:	DA-2006-2027
Property	:	49 Swan Road, Attadale WA 6156
Proposal	:	Paint colour and area of existing roof cover to be painted on existing two storey single dwelling
Applicant	:	Mr D A Simmons
Owner	:	Mrs T K Simmons and Mr D A Simmons
Disclosure of any Interest	:	No officer involved in the preparation of this report has a declarable interest in this matter.
Responsible Officer	:	Keith Weymes, Manager Planning & Development Services
Previous Items	:	DA-2004-1244 and DA-2004-1244/A

**SUMMARY**

The application is for approval of a paint colour and for portion of existing roof cover to be painted on existing two storey single dwelling on Lot 90 (49) Swan Road, Attadale.

It is recommended that the application be approved.

**BACKGROUND**

The Council issued a planning approval (DA-2004-1244) dated 13 September 2004 for building additions to the existing two storey single dwelling on the property. The application for planning approval showed the roof cover being tiles and without specifying a colour and finish to the tiles. Condition 10 of that planning approval stated:

*“Roofing materials being of a non-reflective material (zinc or white colour metal roofing may only be permitted through special planning consent).”*

The applicant carried out the development and in addition re-roofed the existing dwelling with metal roof cover and applied metal roof cover to the approved building addition. The colour of the roof cover is the standard colourbond colour “surf mist.”

**P07/3002 - PAINT COLOUR TO BE APPLIED TO PORTION OF REFLECTIVE ROOF COVER ON EXISTING TWO STOREY SINGLE DWELLING ON LOT 90 (49) SWAN ROAD ATTADALE (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

A complaint was lodged with the City of Melville from a land owner suffering visual glare from the unauthorised roof cover. The Council investigated the matter and presented the applicant with a number of options to resolve the matter. The applicant submitted to the City of Melville an application for retrospective planning approval for the change in roof cover.

That application was approved subject to the following condition:

*“The entire roof being painted within two (2) months of this approval to a darker colour approved by the Manager Planning and Development Services and which has considerably less glare when viewed from 46A Swan Road Attadale.”*

The applicant failed to comply with the retrospective planning approval dated 24 May 2006.

The Council issued a direction dated 19 September 2006 under Section 214 of the Planning and Development 2005 directing the applicant to comply with the retrospective planning approval dated 24 May 2006.

The applicant submitted to the State Administrative Tribunal an application for a review of the direction dated 19 September 2006. The review matter also incorporates the retrospective planning approval dated 24 May 2006. This matter is still before the State Administrative Tribunal.

**Scheme Provisions**

MRS Zoning : Urban  
CPS 5 Zoning : Living Area – AT1  
R-Code : R15  
Use Type : Residential  
Use Class : P

**Site Details**

Lot Area : 793sqm  
Retention of Existing Vegetation : Yes  
Street Tree(s) : No  
Street Furniture (drainage pits etc) : No  
Site Details : [P07\\_3002\\_Property\\_Map.pdf](#)

[P07\\_3002\\_February\\_2007.pdf](#) A copy of the plans forms part of the Attachments to the Agenda, which were distributed to Members of the Council on Wednesday, 14 February 2007.

**P07/3002 - PAINT COLOUR TO BE APPLIED TO PORTION OF REFLECTIVE ROOF COVER ON EXISTING TWO STOREY SINGLE DWELLING ON LOT 90 (49) SWAN ROAD ATTADALE (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

**DETAIL**

**Development Requirements**

Not applicable.

**Setbacks**

Not applicable.

**POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

Development and Building Controls – Policy 06-PL-023 Reflective Roofing Materials

**PUBLIC CONSULTATION/COMMUNICATION**

No advertising required.

**REFERRALS TO GOVERNMENT AGENCIES**

Not required.

**STATUTORY AND LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

Should the Council refuse the applicant's request to paint a portion of the roof cover on the existing dwelling on the site then the applicant may have the right to have the decision of the Council reviewed under the current application for review with the State Administrative Tribunal.

Part 2.1 of the Community Planning Scheme No. 5 states that *"the general objective of the Scheme is to maintain and improve the quality of life and services for the residents of the City of Melville."*

Part 2.3.1(a) of the Community Planning Scheme No. 5 states that a housing objective of the Scheme is *"to enhance the character and amenity of existing residential areas."*

Section 7.8 of the Community Planning Scheme No. 5 states:

*"To provide guidelines on matters to be considered, the Council in determining an application for planning approval shall have due regard to the following:*

*(i) the design and external appearance, including the exterior cladding, of any new building and its effect upon the amenity of existing buildings and the area generally."*

**P07/3002 - PAINT COLOUR TO BE APPLIED TO PORTION OF REFLECTIVE ROOF COVER ON EXISTING TWO STOREY SINGLE DWELLING ON LOT 90 (49) SWAN ROAD ATTADALE (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

City of Melville Policy 06-PL-023 states:

*“Highly reflective roofing materials (e.g Zinc and white colour metal) are not permitted unless it can be demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Executive Manager Development and Neighbourhood Amenity (with power to sub-delegate) that there will be minimal adverse impact on the amenity of the area or on adjoining properties.”*

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

There are no anticipated financial implications.

**STRATEGIC AND RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS**

There are no anticipated strategic and risk management implications.

**COMMENT**

The provisions of the Community Planning Scheme No. 5 and City of Melville Policy are deficient in prescribing aspects/elements to be considered in

- (a) Assessing the potential for a roof to be reflective and
- (b) The assessment of the impact upon amenity from a reflective roof.

In recent times the City of Melville has considered the following elements:

- Change in levels – difference in ground levels may make the roof more or less visible.
- Height of buildings – the height of the building affects the ability to view the roof within the cone of vision.
- Angle of roof pitch – the angle of the pitch affects the ability to view the roof within the cone of vision.
- Viewing position relative to the position of the sun – viewing positions on the eastern, southern and western sides of the roof are most likely to be affected.
- Cone of vision and distance of viewing – the distance of the viewpoint to the roof may make the roof more or less visible.
- Presence of existing mature vegetation or other forms of screening – vegetation and built development may screen vision of the roof.

**P07/3002 - PAINT COLOUR TO BE APPLIED TO PORTION OF REFLECTIVE ROOF COVER ON EXISTING TWO STOREY SINGLE DWELLING ON LOT 90 (49) SWAN ROAD ATTADALE (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

The colour of the existing roof cover has the greatest visual impact on 46A Swan Road Attadale, 48 Swan Road Attadale and 1/50 Swan Road Attadale (collectively “the affected properties”) because:

- Due to the slope of the streetscape and difference in ground levels the affected properties are set higher than the development site which makes the roof cover more visible.
- The gable ends of the roof are east and west facing and therefore the greatest surface area of the roof faces the affected properties.
- The affected properties are located on the southern side of the development site.
- The affected properties are developed in a manner (habitable rooms, balconies and major openings facing north) to take advantage of the view to Perth City and the Swan River. The views experienced from the affected properties are not screened from the development site but the ‘glow’/glare of the roof cover affects the ability of the residents to enjoy those views.

The applicant proposes to paint the all southern, eastern and western faces of the roof cover as viewed from the affected properties. The applicant proposes to use the standard colorbond colour “Woodland Grey.” This colour contains grey hues which are likely to be less reflective when viewed from the affected properties. The northern elevation would remain coloured Surf Mist.

The development is 2 storied with a gable roof with the ridge running generally east west. There are essentially 2 separate roof elevations, the northern or river elevation and the southern or offending elevation. It is not possible to view both elevations from the same place or the street and therefore whenever viewed the dwelling would have a uniform roof colour.

Both the colour and the proposed partial painting are considered acceptable.

**COUNCIL RESOLUTION (3002)****APPROVAL**

**THAT THE APPLICATION FOR A PAINT COLOUR AND AREA OF EXISTING ROOF COVER TO BE PAINTED ON EXISTING TWO STOREY SINGLE DWELLING ON LOT 90 (49) SWAN ROAD ATTADALE, BE APPROVED AND SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING:**

**SPECIAL CONDITIONS:**

- 1. ALL FACES OF THE EXISTING ROOF COVER OTHER THAN THE NORTHERN ELEVATION BEING PAINTED THE STANDARD COLORBOND COLOUR “WOODLAND GREY” WITHIN 60 DAYS OF THE DATE OF THIS PLANNING APPROVAL.**

**CARRIED EN BLOC**

**P07/5000 - SUPPORT INITIATION OF AMENDMENT TO THE METROPOLITAN REGION SCHEME FOR REZONING OF THE HEATHCOTE LOWER LAND FROM “PUBLIC PURPOSES – HOSPITAL” TO “PARK AND RECREATION” (REC)**

Ward	:	Applecross – Mount Pleasant
Category	:	Scheme Amendment
Application Number	:	Not Applicable.
Property	:	58 – 100 Duncraig Road, Applecross
Proposal	:	Support Initiation of Amendment by the Department of Planning and Infrastructure, to the Metropolitan Region Scheme rezoning the Heathcote Lower Land from “Public Purposes – Hospital” to “Parks and Recreation”.
Applicant	:	City of Melville
Owner	:	The Crown
Disclosure of any Interest	:	No officer involved in the preparation of this report has a declarable interest in this matter.
Responsible Officer	:	Keith Weymes, Manager Planning & Development Services
Previous Items	:	Nil

**BACKGROUND**

On letter dated 9 June 2006 the City of Melville confirmed to the Hon Minister for Planning and Infrastructure, the City acceptance for the control and maintenance of the Lower Land reserve as set out in the Heathcote Co-ordination Agreement dated 9 January 2001.

**Scheme Provisions**

MRS Zoning	:	Public Purposes - Hospital
CPS 5 Zoning	:	Public Purposes – Hospital
R-Code	:	Not Applicable.
Use Type	:	Not Applicable.
Use Class	:	Not Applicable.

**Site Details**

Lot Area	:	24,246sqm
Retention of Existing Vegetation	:	Yes
Street Tree(s)	:	Yes
Street Furniture (drainage pits etc)	:	Not applicable.
Site Details	:	Not applicable.

**P07/5000 – SUPPORT INITIATION OF AMENDMENT TO THE METROPOLITAN REGION SCHEME FOR REZONING OF THE HEATHCOTE LOWER LAND FROM “PUBLIC PURPOSES – HOSPITAL” TO “PARK AND RECREATION” (REC)**

**DETAIL**

Support from the City of Melville for an Amendment to the Regional Metropolitan Scheme to be initiated by the Department of Planning and Infrastructure for rezoning of the Heathcote Lower Land from “Public Purposes – Hospital” to “Parks and Recreation”.

City of Melville has received a Management Order for the Lower Land Reserve under the provisions of the LAA 1997 and in accordance with the Heathcote Co-ordination Agreement.

**DEVELOPMENT REQUIREMENTS**

Not applicable.

**POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

Not applicable.

**PUBLIC CONSULTATION/COMMUNICATION**

Not applicable.

**REFERRALS TO GOVERNMENT AGENCIES**

Not applicable.

**STATUTORY AND LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

Not applicable.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

Not applicable.

**STRATEGIC AND RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS**

Not applicable.

**P07/5000 – SUPPORT INITIATION OF AMENDMENT TO THE METROPOLITAN REGION SCHEME FOR REZONING OF THE HEATHCOTE LOWER LAND FROM “PUBLIC PURPOSES – HOSPITAL” TO “PARK AND RECREATION” (REC)****COMMENT**

Correspondence dated 29 November 2006 has been received from the Office of the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure regarding the reservation of the Lower Land at Heathcote for “Parks and Recreation”, seeking support from the City of Melville in relation to the initiation of an amendment to the Metropolitan Region Scheme by the Department of Planning and Infrastructure, to rezone the Lower Land from the current use “Public Purposes – Hospital” to “Park and Recreation”.

Under the terms and conditions of the Heathcote Co-ordination Agreement in relation to the Lower Land, the City of Melville has agreed *“that it will accept responsibility for the control and maintenance of the Lower Land pursuant to a Management Order under the provisions of the LAA”*

The lower land involves an area of 24,246sqm and a letter dated 12 December has been received from the Department for Planning and Infrastructure (State Land Services) submitting a duplicate Management Order for the Reserve 48970, Lot 300, which has been set aside for the purposes of “Recreation”, which is in accordance with the Heathcote Co-ordination Agreement.

Section 8.1 Lower Land of the Heathcote Co-ordination Agreement states:

*“The City agrees that:*

- (1) It is intended that the Lower Land be reserved for Parks and Recreation under the Metropolitan Region Scheme and that the care, control and management of the Lower Land be placed with the City in accordance with the LAA;*
- (2) Full public access is to be provided to the Lower Land as a park and it is to be landscaped and maintained by the City to a standard commensurate with the Heathcote Heritage Precinct Land; and*
- (3) Some limited public parking will be permitted on the Lower Land.”*

In view of the above it is considered appropriate that the City of Melville supports the initiation of an amendment to the Metropolitan Region Scheme by the Department of Planning and Infrastructure and is recommended that the Council grant its support.

**COUNCIL RESOLUTION (5000)****SUPPORT**

- 1. THAT THE INITIATION OF AN AMENDMENT TO THE METROPOLITAN REGION SCHEME BY THE DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND INFRASTRUCTURE TO REZONE THE HEATHCOTE LOWER LAND FROM “PUBLIC PURPOSES – HOSPITAL” TO “PARKS AND RECREATION” BE SUPPORTED BY THE CITY OF MELVILLE.**
- 2. THAT THE HONOURABLE MINISTER FOR PLANNING AND INFRASTRUCTURE BE ADVISED OF THE COUNCIL DECISION.**

**CARRIED EN BLOC**

**P07/5001 – FINAL APPROVAL FOR AMENDMENT NO. 42 TO CITY OF MELVILLE COMMUNITY PLANNING SCHEME NO. 5, BY AMENDING SCHEDULE 3 ADDITIONAL USES AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS TO INCLUDE THE USES OF THEATRE, RESTAURANT/CAFÉ AND SHOPS ON LOT – LOT 55 (391) CANNING HIGHWAY, LOT 831 (38) AND LOT 830 (38A) WADDELL ROAD, PALMYRA (REC)**

Ward	:	Palmyra / Melville / Willagee
Category	:	Scheme Amendment
Application Number	:	CPS5 - 42
Property	:	391 Canning Highway, 38 and 38A Waddell Road, Palmyra
Proposal	:	To consider granting final approval to Amendment No. 42 following public consultation.
Applicant	:	City of Melville
Owner	:	City of Melville
Disclosure of any Interest	:	No officer involved in the preparation of this report has a declarable interest in this matter.
Responsible Officer	:	Keith Weymes, Manager Planning & Development Services
Previous Items	:	19 July 2005

## **BACKGROUND**

On 19 July 2005, the Council at its Ordinary Council Meeting initiated Amendment No. 42 to its Community Planning Scheme No. 5, amending Schedule 3 by addition of Item No. 47 to include Theatre, Restaurant / Café and Shops relating on Lot 55 (391) Canning Highway, Lot 831 (38) Waddell Road and Lot 830 (38A)Waddell Road, Palmyra.

## **SCHEME PROVISIONS**

MRS Zoning	:	Urban and Primary Regional Roads
CPS 5 Zoning	:	Primary Regional Roads, Commercial Centre Frame – Melville Frame.
R-Code	:	R50
Use Type	:	As per Use Class Table. The amendment will modify Schedule 3 by adding theatre, restaurant/café and shops as additional uses to the subject site.
Use Class	:	Not applicable.

## **DEVELOPMENT REQUIREMENTS**

Not applicable.

## **POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

Not applicable.

**P07/5001 – FINAL APPROVAL FOR AMENDMENT NO. 42 TO CITY OF MELVILLE COMMUNITY PLANNING SCHEME NO. 5, BY AMENDING SCHEDULE 3 ADDITIONAL USES AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS TO INCLUDE THE USES OF THEATRE, RESTAURANT/CAFÉ AND SHOPS ON LOT – LOT 55 (391) CANNING HIGHWAY, LOT 831 (38) AND LOT 830 (38A) WADDELL ROAD, PALMYRA (REC)**

**PUBLIC CONSULTATION/COMMUNICATION**

The amendment was advertised for 42 days between 15 August 2006 and 25 September 2006 in the Melville Times and The West Australian, including a sign erected on the front boundary of the property facing Stock Road, seeking public comments.

During the advertising period 3 submissions were received supporting the proposed amendment.

<b>Affected Property</b>	<b>Summary of Submission</b>	<b>Support/Objection</b>	<b>Officer's Comment</b>	<b>Action (Condition / Support/ Dismiss)</b>
Stock Road Senior Citizens Club (Inc)	Agree with the proposed amendment but concerned how the proposal will affect the parking in the area.	Support	Noted	Support
6A Durdham Crescent, Bicton	The existing buildings on this site are largely rundown and a suitable redevelopment and/or refurbishment would revitalise the area.	Support	Noted	Support
1A George Street, Alfred Cove	Good idea to permit higher density, mixed use on this site. Limit the size of signage and exterior advertising on the site	Support	Sign will have to comply with the City of Melville Community Planning Scheme No. 5 and Signs By Law.	Support

**REFERRALS TO GOVERNMENT AGENCIES**

Not applicable.

**STATUTORY AND LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

Not applicable.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

Not applicable.

**P07/5001 – FINAL APPROVAL FOR AMENDMENT NO. 42 TO CITY OF MELVILLE COMMUNITY PLANNING SCHEME NO. 5, BY AMENDING SCHEDULE 3 ADDITIONAL USES AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS TO INCLUDE THE USES OF THEATRE, RESTAURANT/CAFÉ AND SHOPS ON LOT – LOT 55 (391) CANNING HIGHWAY, LOT 831 (38) AND LOT 830 (38A) WADDELL ROAD, PALMYRA (REC)**

**STRATEGIC AND RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS**

Not applicable.

**COMMENT**

The proposal involves amending the City of Melville Community Planning Scheme No. 5 by amending Schedule 3: Additional Uses and Special Conditions, allowing in addition to any other use allowed by the Scheme for the above properties the following uses and conditions.

P use	Theatre;
P use	Restaurant / Café;
D use	Shop with a maximum floor space per tenancy of 200sqm and low vehicle trip generation rates;
D use	Take away food outlet but not including outlets which involve car based service.

The subject land is within a commercial / mixed-use node on Canning Highway as provided for in City of Melville Community Planning Scheme No. 5. In Network City, Canning Highway is classified as an Activity Corridor which means connections between activity centres that provide excellent high frequency public transport to support the land uses that will occur along the activity corridors and the activity centres.

The Stock Road Centre is described as an Activity Centre in the Network City, which means locations where a range of activities is encouraged. The subject land therefore from a regional and local perspective is suitable for commercial and mixed uses as provided for in City of Melville Community Planning Scheme No. 5 and Network City.

This proposed amendment recognises the existing uses on the sites as well as recognising there are future uses that have the potential to enrich the liveability of the residents in the locality by providing new and needed facilities and creating synergies with existing uses such as the theatre.

The proposed scheme amendment however does not provide for shops utilising large tenancies (ie supermarkets) or high vehicle trip attractions (ie car based express convenience stores) or car based take away food outlets.

During the advertising period 3 submissions were received mainly in support.

On the basis of the above, it is considered appropriate to amend the City of Melville Community Planning Scheme No. 5 by allowing additional uses on the subject land and it is recommended that the Council grants final approval to Amendment No. 42.

**P07/5001 – FINAL APPROVAL FOR AMENDMENT NO. 42 TO CITY OF MELVILLE COMMUNITY PLANNING SCHEME NO. 5, BY AMENDING SCHEDULE 3 ADDITIONAL USES AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS TO INCLUDE THE USES OF THEATRE, RESTAURANT/CAFÉ AND SHOPS ON LOT – LOT 55 (391) CANNING HIGHWAY, LOT 831 (38) AND LOT 830 (38A) WADDELL ROAD, PALMYRA (REC)**

**COUNCIL RESOLUTION (5001)**

**FINAL APPROVAL**

**THAT AMENDMENT NO.42 TO CITY OF MELVILLE COMMUNITY PLANNING SCHEME, NO 5, AMENDING SCHEDULE 3 ADDITIONAL USES AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS TO INCLUDE THEATRE, RESTAURANT/CAFÉ AND SHOPS ON LOT 55 (391) CANNING HIGHWAY, LOT 831 (38) WADDELL ROAD AND LOT 830 (38A) WADDELL ROAD, PALMYRA BE APPROVED WITH THE FOLLOWING RECOMMENDATION:**

- 1. THAT IT BE NOTED THAT THREE SUBMISSIONS, SUPPORTING THE PROPOSAL, WERE RECEIVED DURING THE ADVERTISING PERIOD.**
- 2. THAT IT BE NOTED THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AUTHORITY HAS NO OBJECTION TO THE AMENDMENT PROCEEDING.**
- 3. THAT FINAL APPROVAL FOR THE AMENDMENT BE GRANTED WITHOUT MODIFICATION AND THE AMENDMENT DOCUMENT BE SIGNED AND SEALED AND FORWARDED TO THE HONOURABLE MINISTER FOR PLANNING AND INFRASTRUCTURE REQUESTING FINAL APPROVAL.**

**CARRIED EN BLOC**

**P07/5002 – FINAL APPROVAL FOR AMENDMENT NO.45 TO COMMUNITY PLANNING SCHEME NO. 5 BY AMENDING SCHEDULE 3 ADDITIONAL USES AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS TO INCLUDE THE USE OF OFFICE ON LOT 146 (844) CANNING HIGHWAY, APPLECROSS (REC)**

Ward	:	Applecross / Mount Pleasant
Category	:	Scheme Amendment
Application Number	:	CPS5-45
Property	:	844 Canning Highway, Applecross WA 6153
Proposal	:	To consider granting final approval to Amendment No. 45 following public consultation where no submissions were received.
Applicant	:	Mr F J Sanchez
Owner	:	Mr F J Sanchez
Disclosure of any Interest	:	No Officer involved in the preparation of this report has a declarable interest in this matter.
Responsible Officer	:	Keith Weymes, Manager Planning & Development Services
Previous Items	:	19 September 2006

## **BACKGROUND**

On 19 September 2006, the Council at its Ordinary Meeting granted Final Approval to Amendment No. 45 to its Community Planning Scheme No. 5 by the inclusion within Schedule 3 - Additional Uses and Special Conditions Table of lot 145 (844) Canning Highway, Applecross with the permitted additional use of "office". Due to the advertising period of the Amendment not complying with the required statutory period of advertising, the amendment has been readvertised to comply with the requirement.

## **SCHEME PROVISIONS**

MRS Zoning	:	Urban
CPS 5 Zoning	:	Living Area Precinct - Canning Highway
R-Code	:	R25/40
Use Type	:	Office
Use Class	:	X - Use Not Permitted

## **SITE DETAILS**

Lot Area	:	1107sqm
Retention of Existing Vegetation	:	Not applicable
Street Tree(s)	:	Yes
Street Furniture (drainage pits etc)	:	No
Site Details	:	Not applicable.

## **DEVELOPMENT REQUIREMENTS**

Not applicable.

**P07/5002 – FINAL APPROVAL FOR AMENDMENT NO.45 TO COMMUNITY PLANNING SCHEME NO. 5 BY AMENDING SCHEDULE 3 ADDITIONAL USES AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS TO INCLUDE THE USE OF OFFICE ON LOT 146 (844) CANNING HIGHWAY, APPLECROSS (REC)**

**RELEVANT POLICIES**

Not applicable.

**PUBLIC CONSULTATION**

The amendment was advertised between 13 June 2006 and 20 July 2006 in the West Australian and the Melville Times including a sign being erected on the front boundary of the property seeking public comment. However this advertising of 38 days did not comply with the 42 days statutory requirement and the amendment has been advertised in The West Australian between 13 December 2006 and 24 January 2007.

No submissions were received during the advertising period.

**STATUTORY AND LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

Not applicable.

**COMMENT**

Lot 146 (844) Canning Highway, Applecross has an area of 1107 square metres. The subject property contains a single storey building that is currently vacant and was previously used as an Office (Home Occupation). The site is located on the north western corner of Canning Highway and Reynolds Road. Lot 146 abuts a real estate office that is located on the corner of Canning Highway and Reynolds Road (Additional Use). The property is owned by the owner of the subject property.

The proposal involves amending the Community Planning Scheme by amending the Additional Use Schedule No. 3 to allow in addition to any other use allowed by the Scheme in the precinct the permitted use of "Office" on Lot 146 (844) Canning Highway, Applecross.

The site is strategically located at an important node within the area. Given its Canning Highway and Reynolds Road context, being a high level regional and local road respectively, the use of the land for non-residential purposes is appropriate.

All vehicular parking will be provided off-street, behind and sleeved by the existing buildings. The applicant is to make arrangements for reciprocal parking and access between the subject site and Lot 145. There is to be no parking fronting Canning Highway and all access is proposed to be via Reynolds Road.

The proposal is supported in principle on the basis that the proposed amendment compliments the existing land uses in the immediate vicinity.

**P07/5002 – FINAL APPROVAL FOR AMENDMENT NO.45 TO COMMUNITY PLANNING SCHEME NO. 5 BY AMENDING SCHEDULE 3 ADDITIONAL USES AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS TO INCLUDE THE USE OF OFFICE ON LOT 146 (844) CANNING HIGHWAY, APPLECROSS (REC)**

It is considered appropriate to amend the City of Melville Community Planning Scheme No. 5 by allowing additional use of office on the subject property and it is recommended that the Council grants final approval to Amendment No. 45.

**COUNCIL RESOLUTION (5002)**

**FINAL APPROVAL**

**THAT AMENDMENT NO.45 TO CITY OF MELVILLE COMMUNITY PLANNING SCHEME NO. 5, AMENDING SCHEDULE 3 ADDITIONAL USES AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS TO INCLUDE THE USE OF OFFICE ON LOT 146 (844) CANNING HIGHWAY, APPLECROSS BE APPROVED WITH THE FOLLOWING RECOMMENDATION:**

- 1. THAT IT BE NOTED NO SUBMISSIONS WERE RECEIVED DURING THE STATUTORY ADVERTISING PERIOD.**
- 2. THAT IT BE NOTED THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AUTHORITY HAS NO OBJECTION TO THE AMENDMENT PROCEEDING.**
- 3. THAT FINAL APPROVAL FOR THE AMENDMENT BE GRANTED WITHOUT MODIFICATION AND THE AMENDMENT DOCUMENTS BE SIGNED AND SEALED AND FORWARDED TO THE HONOURABLE MINISTER FOR PLANNING AND INFRASTRUCTURE REQUESTING FINAL APPROVAL.**

**CARRIED EN BLOC**

**P07/5003 - FINAL APPROVAL FOR AMENDMENT NO.46 TO COMMUNITY PLANNING SCHEME NO. 5 BY INSERTING A NEW PROVISION ENTITLED FRAGMENTATION OF LAND THE SUBJECT OF PLANNING APPROVAL (REC)**

Ward	:	All
Category	:	Scheme Amendment
Application Number	:	CPS5-46
Property	:	All
Proposal	:	To consider granting final approval to Amendment No. 46 following public consultation where no submissions were received.
Applicant	:	City of Melville
Disclosure of any Interest	:	No Officer involved in the preparation of this report has a declarable interest in this matter.
Responsible Officer	:	Keith Weymes, Manager Planning & Development Services
Previous Items	:	20 September 2005

**BACKGROUND**

On 20 September 2005, the Council initiated Amendment No. 46 to its Community Planning Scheme No. 5 by adding following Clause 4.2, the following:

**4.3 Fragmentation of Land the Subject of Planning Approval**

## 4.3.1 In this clause:

“development land” means the lot or combination of lots, or the combination of a lot or lots with any part lot or lots, or a part lot or combination of part lots the subject of a planning approval.

4.3.2 Notwithstanding any other provision of the Scheme to the contrary, where the Council has given planning approval for the development of any development land and the boundaries of the development land are altered by subdivision or by other means, or where the development land is in any way fragmented into portions, the maximum plot ratio, residential density or site cover permitted by the Scheme for the development land shall not be exceeded for any portion or any combination of portions of the development land.

4.3.3 When the Council is considering a development proposal on any portion of development land, any existing development or any development the subject of a current planning approval on any portion is to be taken into consideration and aggregated for the purpose of calculating plot ratio, residential density or site cover.

**P07/5003 - FINAL APPROVAL FOR AMENDMENT NO.46 TO COMMUNITY PLANNING SCHEME NO. 5 BY INSERTING A NEW PROVISION ENTITLED FRAGMENTATION OF LAND THE SUBJECT OF PLANNING APPROVAL (REC)**

- 4.3.4 Where planning approval has been given in respect of any development land, the planning approval applies to the whole and to every portion of the development land while the planning approval remains current or while the approved development remains on the development land. Any application for planning approval relating to any portion of the development land is to be dealt with by the Council on the basis that the portion is subject to the previous planning approval unless the Council decides to the contrary.

**DEVELOPMENT REQUIREMENTS**

Nil

**SETBACKS**

Nil

**RELEVANT POLICIES**

Nil

**PUBLIC CONSULTATION**

The amendment was advertised between 13 June 2006 and 20 July 2006 in the West Australian and the Melville Times for public comment, however this advertising (38 days) did not comply with the 42 days statutory requirement and the amendment has been readvertised in The West Australian between 13 December 2006 and 24 January 2007.

No submissions have been received during the advertising period.

**STATUTORY AND LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

Nil

**P07/5003 - FINAL APPROVAL FOR AMENDMENT NO.46 TO COMMUNITY PLANNING SCHEME NO. 5 BY INSERTING A NEW PROVISION ENTITLED FRAGMENTATION OF LAND THE SUBJECT OF PLANNING APPROVAL (REC)****COMMENT**

A situation has arisen with respect to a recent development proposal where a development approval was granted which proposed to concentrate the development potential of a site into one off portion of the site. Upon receipt of the approval an application was subsequently lodged to subdivide the 'undeveloped' portion of the site which would then have the result in far more intense development than permitted by the Scheme on that section of the site with the development consent. More importantly it would have enabled the new site (balance) to be developed to the extent allowed by the Scheme in its own right without reference to the previous approval. This simple process could have provided for development at a density and intensity some 50% higher than the Scheme envisaged.

The Scheme does not contain any provision which provides that development on a site be measured cumulatively over the whole site.

From a planning view point the Scheme and any limitations should relate to the property on which the decision is made and any lot which is subdivided from that lot should then only enjoy either the development potential allowed by the Scheme or any residual or leftover development potential from the original decision whichever is the lesser.

To this extent the amendment has been prepared in consultation with the Council's Solicitors.

It is recommended that the Council grants final approval to Amendment No. 46.

**COUNCIL RESOLUTION (5003)****FINAL APPROVAL**

**THAT AMENDMENT NO.46 TO CITY OF MELVILLE COMMUNITY PLANNING SCHEME NO. 5 BE APPROVED WITH THE FOLLOWING RECOMMENDATION:**

- 1. THAT IT BE NOTED NO SUBMISSIONS WERE RECEIVED DURING THE STATUTORY ADVERTISING PERIOD.**
- 2. THAT IT BE NOTED THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AUTHORITY HAS NO OBJECTION TO THE AMENDMENT PROCEEDING.**
- 3. THAT FINAL APPROVAL FOR THE AMENDMENT BE GRANTED WITHOUT MODIFICATION AND THE AMENDMENT DOCUMENTS BE SIGNED AND SEALED AND FORWARDED TO THE HONOURABLE MINISTER FOR PLANNING AND INFRASTRUCTURE REQUESTING FINAL APPROVAL.**

**CARRIED EN BLOC**

**P07/5004 - FINAL APPROVAL FOR AMENDMENT NO.49 TO COMMUNITY PLANNING SCHEME NO. 5 BY AMENDING SCHEDULE 3 ADDITIONAL USES AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS TO INCLUDE THE USE OF OFFICE ON LOT 312 (11A) ALDOUS PLACE, BOORAGOON (REC)**

Ward	:	City Ward
Category	:	Scheme Amendment
Application Number	:	CPS5-49
Property	:	Lot 312 (11A) Aldous Place, Booragoon
Proposal	:	To consider granting final approval to Amendment No. 49 following public consultation where no submissions were received.
Applicant	:	Greg Rowe & Associates
Owner	:	Southern Metropolitan Regional Council
Disclosure of any Interest	:	No officer involved in the preparation of this report has a declarable interest in this matter.
Responsible Officer	:	Keith Weymes, Manager Planning & Development Services
Previous Items	:	21 February 2006

## **BACKGROUND**

On 21 February 2006, the Council at its Ordinary Meeting initiated Amendment No. 49 to its Community Planning Scheme No. 5 by amending Schedule 3 Additional Uses and Special Conditions to include the use of office on Lot 312 (11A) Aldous place, Booragoon.

## **Scheme Provisions**

MRS Zoning	:	Industrial
CPS 5 Zoning	:	Mixed Business Precinct
R-Code	:	R20/25
Use Type	:	Office
Use Class	:	X – not permitted as a stand alone use

## **Site Details**

Lot Area	:	1224sqm
Retention of Existing Vegetation	:	Not applicable.
Street Tree(s)	:	Not applicable.
Street Furniture (drainage pits etc)	:	Not applicable.
Site Details	:	Not applicable.

## **Development Requirements**

Not applicable.

## **POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

Not applicable.

**P07/5004 - FINAL APPROVAL FOR AMENDMENT NO.49 TO COMMUNITY PLANNING SCHEME NO. 5 BY AMENDING SCHEDULE 3 ADDITIONAL USES AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS TO INCLUDE THE USE OF OFFICE ON LOT 312 (11A) ALDOUS PLACE, BOORAGOON (REC)****PUBLIC CONSULTATION/COMMUNICATION**

The amendment was advertised between 10 October 2006 and 20 November 2006 in the Melville Times and The West Australian, including a sign being erected on the front boundary of the property seeking public comments.

At the end of the advertising period, no submissions were received.

**REFERRALS TO GOVERNMENT AGENCIES**

Not applicable.

**STATUTORY AND LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

Not applicable.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

Not applicable.

**STRATEGIC AND RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS**

Not applicable.

**COMMENT**

The amendment proposed to utilise the existing improvement on the site for the administrative headquarters for the Southern Metropolitan Regional Council. The amendment will result in the site being used primarily for an "office" use. This will occur without any major redevelopment of the site, as the existing improvement is currently sufficient for an office operation to occur.

The property is located on the periphery of the Myaree 'Mixed Business' zoning which abuts a large area of residential (R20) zoned land. The majority of the Mixed Business zoning is surrounded by a "Mixed Business Frame" which creates a buffer between the adjoining residential land and the uses associated with the Mixed Business zoning. There is no such buffer between the eastern side of the Myaree Mixed Business zoning and the adjoining residential land.

The proposal involves amending the City of Melville Community Planning Scheme No. 5 by amending the Additional Use Schedule No. 3 to allow the additional use – Office" on Lot 312 (11A) Aldous Place, Booragoon.

All vehicular carparking will be provided off-street within the existing carparking.

**P07/5004 - FINAL APPROVAL FOR AMENDMENT NO.49 TO COMMUNITY PLANNING SCHEME NO. 5 BY AMENDING SCHEDULE 3 ADDITIONAL USES AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS TO INCLUDE THE USE OF OFFICE ON LOT 312 (11A) ALDOUS PLACE, BOORAGOON (REC)**

It is emphasized that a taskforce was commissioned to research the current Mixed Business and Mixed Business Frame zonings in the Myaree area. A recommendation of that investigation has led to a new series of precincts/ zonings to be created which is part of a separate scheme amendment. Essentially the taskforce outlined the need for a greater transitional zoning mechanism to allow a mix of uses adjoining the residential land surrounding Myaree including encouragement of office use.

As the subject site is located in close proximity to major transport links, is situated within the Booragoon/ Myaree commercial precinct, and has been identified as an area that will undergo some changes with declining in industrial activities, the property has planning merit to be allow an Office use via a Town Planning Scheme Amendment.

No submissions were received during the advertising period.

On the basis of the above, it is considered appropriate to amend the City of Melville Community Planning Scheme No. 5 by allowing additional use - Office on Lot 312 Aldous Place, Booragoon and it is recommended that the Council grants final approval to Amendment No. 49.

**COUNCIL RESOLUTION (5004)****FINAL APPROVAL**

**THAT AMENDMENT NO.49 TO COMMUNITY PLANNING SCHEME NO. 5, AMENDING SCHEDULE 3 ADDITIONAL USES AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS TO INCLUDE THE USE OF OFFICE ON LOT 312 (11A) ALDOUS PLACE, BOORAGOON BE APPROVED WITH THE FOLLOWING RECOMMENDATION:**

- 1. THAT IT BE NOTED NO SUBMISSIONS WERE RECEIVED DURING THE STATUTORY ADVERTISING PERIOD.**
- 2. THAT IT BE NOTED THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AUTHORITY HAS NO OBJECTION TO THE AMENDMENT PROCEEDING.**
- 3. THAT FINAL APPROVAL FOR THE AMENDMENT BE GRANTED WITHOUT MODIFICATION AND THE AMENDMENT DOCUMENT BE SIGNED AND SEALED AND FORWARDED TO THE HONOURABLE MINISTER FOR PLANNING AND INFRASTRUCTURE REQUESTING FINAL APPROVAL.**

**CARRIED EN BLOC**

**CO23/06 – ROAD RESURFACING PROGRAMME 2006-2009 (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

Ward	: All
Category	: Operational
Subject Index	: Tenders CO23/06
Customer Index	: City of Melville
Disclosure of any Interest	: No Officer involved in the preparation of this report has a declarable interest in this matter.
Previous Items	: Not Applicable
Works Programme	: Not Applicable
Funding	: 2006/07 Budget
Responsible Officer	: Paul McAllister Client Liaison Contracts Manager

**SUMMARY**

This item is to accept the recommendation of the Contract and Tender Advisory Unit to award the tender for the Road Resurfacing Programme 2006-2009.

**BACKGROUND**

Tenders for the Road Resurfacing Programme 2006-2009 were invited by advertisement in The West Australian on Wednesday 6 December 2006, closing at 4.00 p.m. on Thursday 4 January 2007.

**DETAIL**

Four (4) sets of tender documents were issued and two (2) tenders were received as follows:

Boral Asphalt WA  
Hot Mix

**Price Schedule**

The Price Schedule forms part of the Attachments to the Agenda, which were distributed to the Members of the Council on Friday, 19 January 2007 under confidential cover.

**Tender Evaluation Process**

All tenders were evaluated using a weighted attribute method. Each tender was assigned a score from 0 to 5 on each criterion, then multiplied by the weighting and totalled to give a final score. The tenderer who achieved the highest score across all the attributes has been recommended.

**CO23/06 – ROAD RESURFACING PROGRAMME 2006-2009 (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

The Evaluation Sheet forms part of the Attachments to the Agenda, which were distributed to the Members of the Council on Friday, 19 January 2007 under confidential cover.

The Evaluation Committee consisted of the Purchasing Coordinator, the Client Liaison Contracts Manager, the Manager Infrastructure Services, the Senior Design Engineer and the Facilities/Assets Manager.

The criteria for this tender were based on the following specific attributes:

1. Relevant Experience
2. Technical Skills
3. Resources
4. Management Systems
5. Methodology
6. References
7. Price
8. Relevance to Purchasing Policy (Business location and product content)

**POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

Procurement of Goods and Services Through Direct Purchasing and Public Tendering Policy 13-005

**PUBLIC CONSULTATION/COMMUNICATION**

Not applicable

**STATUTORY AND LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

Section 3.57 of the Local Government Act states "A Local Government is required to invite tenders before it enters into a contract of a prescribed kind under which another person is to supply goods or services.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

There is an amount of \$1.4 million in the budget for road resurfacing for this financial year with a further \$1.5 million for 2007/2008 and \$1.6 million for 2008/2009.

The table below shows the unit rate and percentage increase in price from 2006 for the next three years. The current contractor is Boral Asphalt (WA). They are also the recommended supplier and their prices have been used in the table.

**CO23/06 – ROAD RESURFACING PROGRAMME 2006-2009 (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

The jump in prices was anticipated and has been allowed for in the budget for road resurfacing. By tendering for the next three years the City of Melville will benefit from fixed pricing for that period.

Red asphalt is only used for cycle paths which are only on 6 of the roads in the programme. The table below shows the increase in price from last year for the next 3 years

Mix Type	Marshall No	Qty Rate	Unit	2005/2006		2006/2007	% INCREASE	2007/2008		2008/2009	% INCREASE
				Price exc GST	Price exc GST			Price exc GST	Price exc GST		
AC7	50	Rate	/t	\$119.50	\$127.80		6.95%	\$134.19	5.00%	\$140.90	5.00%
SMA	50	Rate	/t	\$141.00	\$150.35		6.63%	\$157.87	5.00%	\$165.76	5.00%
RED	50	Rate	/t	\$153.00	\$189.45		23.82%	\$198.92	5.00%	\$208.86	5.00%

**STRATEGIC AND RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS**

No strategic implications are applicable to this item.

A Dun and Bradstreet Report was compiled on Boral Resources (WA) Ltd, the parent company of Boral Asphalt WA. This report showed a Dynamic Risk Score, used to predict the likelihood of financial distress during the next 12 months, as being Very Low.

**COMMENT**

Boral Asphalt WA and Hot Mix both addressed the selection criteria and both companies have completed work for the City of Melville in the past.

Boral Asphalt WA is our current contractor and their performance has been satisfactory. They are the highest scorer and the most economical, and are the recommended tenderer.

**COUNCIL RESOLUTION (CO23/06)**

**APPROVAL**

**THAT THE TENDER SUBMITTED BY BORAL ASPHALT WA FOR THE ROAD RESURFACING PROGRAMME 2006-2009 AS SPECIFIED BE ACCEPTED AS THE MOST ADVANTAGEOUS.**

**CARRIED EN BLOC**

**C077001 –DISPOSAL OF LAND – LOT 195 (65) ARKWELL STREET, WILLAGEE (REC)**  
**(ATTACHMENT)**

Ward	: Palmyra / Melville / Willagee
Category	: Operational
Subject Index	: 65 Arkwell Street, Willagee
Customer Index	: Australian Property Consultants
Disclosure of any Interest	: No Officer involved in the preparation of this report has a declarable interest in this matter.
Previous Items	: Nil
Works Programme	: Not Applicable
Funding	: The funds from the disposal of 65 Arkwell Street, Willagee will be transferred into the Land & Property Reserve.
Responsible Officer	: Mark Ridgwell Property & Corporate Support Manager

**SUMMARY**

This report seeks Councils endorsement of the disposal of surplus land located at Lot 195 (65) Arkwell Street, Willagee.

**BACKGROUND**

The City of Melville owns Lot 195 (65) Arkwell Street, Willagee in freehold. The site is vacant and contains a land area of 740sqm. As a stand alone lot coded R20 the property is capable of yielding one single dwelling.

**DETAIL**

The site had previously been identified for the purposes of drainage however the topography of the land makes the site unsuitable for such purpose. As a result there is no drainage system that discharges into the site. The stormwater from the catchment area bounded by Leach Highway to the north, Winnacott Street to the east and Webber Street to the west discharges into Webber Reserve, therefore the property located at number 65 Arkwell Street is not needed for the use of stormwater run-off disposal.

The City of Melville's Public Open Space Strategy states that the requirement for public open space within both the suburbs of Melville and Willagee is predominantly for active recreation and is poorly distributed. It is further suggested that open space needs to be better distributed with a greater number of small, quality open space areas with good playground equipment and landscaped areas, particularly along major roads.

Areas in Willagee which are more in need of additional open space are located further to the south generally around the extended alignment of Archibald Street.

**C07/7001 –DISPOSAL OF LAND – 65 (LOT195) ARKWELL STREET, WILLAGEE (REC)**  
**(ATTACHMENT)**

In respect to the subject site it is located 300m east of Webber Reserve and 450 metres north west of Winnacott Reserve, therefore the use of this site as public open space is not required.

The latest REIWA figures for the 12 months to September 2006 show that Willagee has, on average, experienced a 25.7% growth rate which makes its 5 year average growth rate 17.6%.

A confidential market valuation undertaken by the City of Melville's appointed auctioneer forms parts of attachments under separate cover and distributed to Elected Members on Wednesday, 14 February 2007.

**POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

There are no policies that relate to entering into the Deed of Variation of Lease.

**PUBLIC CONSULTATION/COMMUNICATION**

No external consultation has been carried out. As part of the marketing strategy for the Auction of 65 Arkwell Street, Willagee a sign will be placed onsite and advertising will be undertaken in the West Australian.

**STATUTORY AND LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

Section 3.58 of the Local Government Act 1995 states that;

“3.58. Disposing of property;

(1) In this section;

“Dispose” includes to sell, lease, or otherwise dispose of, whether absolutely or not;

“Property” includes the whole or any part of the interest of a local government in property, but does not include money.

(2) Except as stated in this section, a local government can only dispose of property to;

(a) The highest bidder at public auction; or

(b) The person who at public tender called by the local government makes what is, in the opinion of the local government, the most acceptable tender, whether or not it is the highest tender.”

**C07/7001 –DISPOSAL OF LAND – 65 (LOT195) ARKWELL STREET, WILLAGEE (REC)**  
**(ATTACHMENT)****FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

The funds from the disposal of 65 Arkwell Street, Willagee will be transferred into the Land & Property Reserve for the acquisition of more strategically valuable land within the City of Melville.

**STRATEGIC AND RISK MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS**

<b>Risk Statement</b>	<b>Level of Risk*</b>	<b>Risk Mitigation Strategy</b>
There is risk that the City of Melville will not see an adequate financial return on its freehold asset.	Minor consequences which are possible, resulting in a <b>Medium</b> level of risk	The limitation on the Chief Executive Officer to dispose of a site at not less than 95% of the market valuation

\* As derived from using the Risk Assessment Matrix

**COMMENT**

The site is unsightly and subject to illegal dumping and serves no strategic value. Development of the site would improve the streetscape as well as bringing more residents into the community of Willagee.

**COUNCIL RESOLUTION (7001)****ABSOLUTE MAJORITY**

- 1. THAT BY AN ABSOLUTE MAJORITY DECISION OF THE COUNCIL THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER BE GRANTED DELEGATED AUTHORITY TO DISPOSE OF 65 ARKWELL STREET, WILLAGEE; AND**
- 2. THAT THIS DELEGATION BE LIMITED TO THE APPROVED VALUE OF DISPOSAL BEING NOT LESS THAN 95% OF THE ASSESSED MARKET VALUATION DATED 25 JANUARY 2007; AND**
- 3. THAT HER WORSHIP THE MAYOR AND THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER BE AUTHORISED TO SIGN THE SALE OF LAND DOCUMENTS TO DISPOSE OF 65 ARKWELL STREET, WILLAGEE.**

**CARRIED EN BLOC**

**C07/5000 - COMMON SEAL REGISTER (REC)**

Ward	:	All
Category	:	Administration
Strategy/Policy/Operational	:	Operational
Subject Index	:	Common Seal Register
Disclosure of any Interest	:	No Officer involved in the preparation of this report has a declarable interest in this matter.
Previous Items	:	Standard Item
Works Programme	:	Not applicable
Funding	:	Not applicable
Responsible Officer	:	Bruce Taylor Manager Information & Corporate Support

**SUMMARY**

This report details the documents to which the City of Melville common seal has been applied and recommends that the information be noted.

**BACKGROUND**

Section 2.5 of the Local Government Act 1995 states that a Local Government is a Body Corporate with perpetual succession and a common seal. A document is validly executed by a Body Corporate when the common seal of the Local Government is affixed to it by the Chief Executive Officer, and the Mayor and the Chief Executive Officer attest the affixing of the seal.

**DETAIL**

<b>Document Type</b>	<b>Party</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>File Ref</b>
Deed of Licence	Willetton Hockey Club Inc	Portion of Trevor Gribble Reserve, Bull Creek	1478506
Deed of Extension of Lease	Tompkins Park Community and Recreations Association Inc.	The building known as Tompkins Park Community & Recreational Association on land part of Lot 9 on diagram 6262 and part of Lot 10 on diagram 6264	1586981
Deed of Variation of Lease	Melville Golf Centre PTY LTD	Portion of John Connell Reserve, Leeming	1529442
Section 70A Notification	Mr C Tatonetti, Ms J Lawn and Ms P Tatonetti	13 Neesham Street, Booragoon	1588777
		Purchase of 3 Wilcock Street Address	1590785

**C07/5000 – COMMON SEAL REGISTER (REC)**

Section 70A Notification	Chui Heng Yip	21 Tweeddale Road, Applecross	1594548
Deed of Licence	Minister for Education	Shared Use of Facilities for Melville Primary School	1479409
Instrument of Authorisation	Main Roads WA	West Australian Road Traffic Code Regulation 297(2) Instrument of Authorisation relation to Traffic Management for events.	1596009
Section 70A Notification		Lots 137-139 Brentwood	
Withdrawal of Caveat	Starworld Holdings Pty Ltd	26 Kintail Road and 13 Tweeddale Road, Applecross	1604106
Instrument of Authorisation	Main Roads WA	Removal of unattended animals and unattended vehicles from the Main Roads Network	1593887

**PUBLIC CONSULTATION**

Not applicable.

**COMMENT**

Nil.

**STATUTORY ENVIRONMENT**

Section 2.5 of the Local Government Act 1995.

**POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

Nil.

**C07/5000 – COMMON SEAL REGISTER (REC)**

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

Not applicable.

**STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS**

Not applicable.

**COUNCIL RESOLUTION (5000)**

**THAT THE ACTION OF HER WORSHIP THE MAYOR AND THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICE IN EXECUTING THE DOCUMENTS LISTED UNDER THE COMMON SEAL OF THE CITY OF MELVILLE, BE NOTED.**

**CARRIED EN BLOC**

**C06/6000 – INVESTMENT STATEMENTS (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

Ward	:	All
Category	:	Operational
Subject Index	:	Financial Statements and Investments
Customer Index	:	Not applicable
Disclosure of any Interest	:	No Officer involved in the preparation of this report has a declarable interest in this matter.
Previous Items	:	Standard item
Works Programme	:	Not Applicable
Funding	:	Not Applicable
Responsible Officer	:	Bob Searle; Manager Financial Services

**SUMMARY**

This report presents the investment statements for the months of December 2006 and January 2007 and recommends that the information detailed in the attachments be noted.

**BACKGROUND**

The investment of surplus cash holdings is undertaken in accordance with Council's investment policy, with the objective of maximising returns whilst maintaining acceptable levels of risk exposure.

**DETAIL**

[6000A-12 February 2007.pdf](#), [6000A-01 February 2007.pdf](#), [6000B-12 February 2007.pdf](#) and [6000B-01 February 2007.pdf](#) the Investment Statements for the months of December 2006 and January 2007, form part of the Attachments to the Agenda, which was distributed to the Members of the Council on Wednesday, 14 February 2007.

The Investment of Surplus Funds is undertaken in accordance with the Finance Investment Policy document for the City of Melville. [6000D February 2007.pdf](#) a graph showing the total levels of funds invested forms part of the Attachments to the Agenda, which was distributed to the Members of the Council on Wednesday, 14 February 2007.

**C06/6000 – INVESTMENT STATEMENTS (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

A report prepared by Grange Securities has again been included for members' information. [6000C February 2007.pdf](#) The reports form part of the Attachments to the Agenda, which was distributed to the Members of the Council on Wednesday, 14 February 2007.

**POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

Corporate Policy C14.

**PUBLIC CONSULTATION/COMMUNICATION**

Not applicable.

**STATUTORY AND LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996 Regulation 19 – Management of Investments.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

As at the end of January 2007, total interest, excluding Reserve Fund interest, earned was \$1,559,988 against a budget year to date of \$1,233,000. The full year budget is one million nine hundred and sixty eight thousand dollars (\$1,968,000).

Reserve Fund interest earned was \$818,850 against a budget year to date of \$506,100. The full year budget is eight hundred and sixty seven thousand eight hundred dollars (\$867,800).

**STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS**

Not applicable.

**C06/6000 – INVESTMENT STATEMENTS (REC) (ATTACHMENT)****COMMENT**

Base interest rates lifted slightly in the period. The rates for thirty day bank bills showed an increase of 0.022% whilst longer term returns showed a lower increase; with the ninety (90) rate increasing by 0.008%. The performance of the City of Melville portfolio managed by Grange Securities exceeded the agreed benchmark of the UBS Bank Bill Index plus 0.35% by 0.6% annualised and exceeded the benchmark by 0.78% over the last twelve months.

**COUNCIL RESOLUTION (6000)**

**THAT THE INVESTMENT STATEMENTS FOR THE MONTHS OF DECEMBER 2006 AND JANUARY 2007, AS DETAILED IN THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENTS BE NOTED:**

[6000A-12 February 2007.pdf](#)

[6000A-01 February 2007.pdf](#)

[6000B-12 February 2007.pdf](#)

[6000B-01 February 2007.pdf](#)

[6000C February 2007.pdf](#)

[6000D February 2007.pdf](#)

**CARRIED EN BLOC**

**C06/6001 – SCHEDULE OF ACCOUNTS (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

Ward	: All
Category	: Operational
Subject Index	: Financial Statement and Investments
Customer Index	: Not applicable
Disclosure of any Interest	: No Officer involved in the preparation of this report has a declarable interest in this matter.
Previous Items	: Standard item
Works Programme	: Not Applicable
Funding	: 2006/2007 Budget
Responsible Officer	: Bob Searle Manager Financial Services

**SUMMARY**

This report presents details of the payments made to suppliers for the provision of goods and services for the months of December 2006 and January 2007 and recommends that the Schedule of Accounts be noted.

**BACKGROUND**

Delegated Authority CE23 has been granted to the Chief Executive Officer to make payments from the Municipal and Trust Funds. This authority has then been on-delegated to the Director Customer and Corporate Services. In accordance with Regulation thirteen (13), two (2) and three (3) of the Local Government (Financial Administration) Regulations 1996 where this power has been delegated, a list of payments for each month is to be compiled and presented to the Council. The list is to show each payment, payee name, amount and date of payment and sufficient information to identify the transaction.

**DETAIL**

The Schedules of Accounts for the period ending 31 December 2006 [6001-12 February 2007.pdf](#) including Payment Registers numbers eleven and twelve were distributed to the Members of Council on Wednesday, 14 February 2007.

The Schedules of Accounts for the period ending 31 January 2007 [6001-01 February 2007.pdf](#) including Payment Registers numbers thirteen and fourteen were distributed to the Members of Council on Wednesday, 14 February 2007.

**C06/6001 – SCHEDULE OF ACCOUNTS (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

**POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

Management Procedure 1.8 - Certification of Accounts.

**PUBLIC CONSULTATION/COMMUNICATION**

Not applicable.

**STATUTORY AND LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

This report meets the requirements of the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996 Regulation 11 - Payment of Accounts, Regulation 12 - List of Creditors and Regulation 13 - Payments from the Trust Fund and the Municipal Fund.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

Expenditures were provided for in the 2006/2007 Budget.

**STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS**

Not applicable.

**COMMENT**

This is a regular monthly report for Elected Members information.

**COUNCIL RESOLUTION (6001)**

**THAT THE SCHEDULES OF ACCOUNTS FOR THE PERIODS ENDING 31 DECEMBER 2006 [6001-12 February 2007.pdf](#) AND 31 JANUARY 2007 [6001-01 February 2007.pdf](#) , AS APPROVED BY THE DIRECTOR CUSTOMER AND CORPORATE SERVICES IN ACCORDANCE WITH DELEGATED AUTHORITY CE23, AND DETAILED IN ATTACHMENT BE NOTED.**

**CARRIED EN BLOC**

**C07/6002 – FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (AMREC) (ATTACHMENT)**

Ward	: All
Category	: Operational
Subject Index	: Financial Statements and Investments
Customer Index	: Not applicable
Disclosure of any Interest	: No Officer involved in the preparation of this report has a declarable interest in this matter.
Previous Items	: Standard Item
Works Programme	: Not Applicable
Funding	: Not Applicable
Responsible Officer	: Bob Searle; Manager Financial Services

**SUMMARY**

This report presents the financial statements to the end of November and December 2006 and January 2007 and recommends that they be noted by Council.

**BACKGROUND**

The Financial Statements for the end of the month of November and December 2006 and January 2007 have been prepared and tabled in accordance with Regulation thirty-four (34) of the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996 as amended in March 2005, which requires that:

- (1) A local government is to prepare each month a statement of financial activity reporting on the sources and applications of funds, as set out in the annual budget under regulation 22(1)(d), for that month in the following detail-
  - (a) annual budget estimates, taking into account any expenditure incurred for an additional purpose under section 6.8(1)(b) or (c);
  - (b) budget estimates to the end of the month to which the statement relates;
  - (c) actual amounts of expenditure, revenue and income to the end of the month to which the statement relates;
  - (d) material variances between the comparable amounts referred to in paragraphs (b) and (c); and
  - (e) the net current assets at the end of the month to which the statement relates.
- (2) Each statement of financial activity is to be accompanied by documents containing-
  - (a) an explanation of the composition of the net current assets of the month to which the statement relates, less committed assets and restricted assets;
  - (b) an explanation of each of the material variances referred to in subregulation (1)(d); and
  - (c) such other supporting information as is considered relevant by the local government.

**C07/6002- FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (AMREC) (ATTACHMENT)**

- (3) The information in a statement of financial activity may be shown-
  - (a) according to nature and type classification;
  - (b) by program; or
  - (c) by business unit.
  
- (4) A statement of financial activity, and the accompanying documents referred to in subregulation (2), are to be-
  - (a) presented to the council-
    - (i) at the next ordinary meeting of the council following the end of the month to which the statement relates; or
    - (ii) if the statement is not prepared in time to present it to the meeting referred to in subparagraph (i), to the next ordinary meeting of the council after that meeting; and
  - (b) recorded in the minutes of the meeting at which it is presented.
  
- (5) Each financial year, a local government is to adopt a percentage or value, calculated in accordance with AAS 5, to be used in statements of financial activity for reporting material variances.

**DETAIL**

Work has been ongoing to develop reports from the new Financial system in such a way as to allow speedier reporting to Council.

This month reflects the outcome of this work, and as a result there are three months reports presented to Council rather than the two that would normally be the case.

Work is in progress on a mid year budget review and the outcomes of this review will be presented to the March Council meeting. The normal monthly review – “Notes on Operating Statements” is attached for the January month. The variances are greater than normally reported, but in the main this reflects the reduced emphasis that it has been possible to give to reviewing budget phasing in the face of the pressures of the implementation of the new system and development of reporting.

The following attachments form part of the Attachments to the Agenda, which was distributed to the Members of the Council on Wednesday, 14 February 2007.

**C07/6002- FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (AMREC) (ATTACHMENT)**

<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>LINK</b>
Statement of Financial Activity - November 2006	<a href="#">6002A-11 February 2007.pdf</a>
Operating Statements by Program for the period ended 30 November 2006	<a href="#">6002B-11 February 2007.pdf</a>
Representation of Working Capital as at November 2006	<a href="#">6002E-11 February 2007.pdf</a>
Reconciliation of Net Working Capital as at 30 November 2006.	<a href="#">6002F-11 February 2007.pdf</a>
Details of Budget Amendments requested during the month of November 2006	<a href="#">6002J-11 February 2007.pdf</a>
Statement of Financial Activity – December 2006	<a href="#">6002A-12 February 2007.pdf</a>
Operating Statements by Program for the period ended 31 December 2006	<a href="#">6002B-12 February 2007.pdf</a>
Representation of Working Capital as at December 2006	<a href="#">6002E-12 February 2007.pdf</a>
Reconciliation of Net Working Capital as at 31 December 2006.	<a href="#">6002F-12 February 2007.pdf</a>
Details of Budget Amendments requested during the month of December 2006	<a href="#">6002J-12 February 2007.pdf</a>
Statement of Financial Activity – January 2007	<a href="#">6002A-01 February 2007.pdf</a>
Operating Statements by Program for the period ended 31 January 2007	<a href="#">6002B-01 February 2007.pdf</a>
Representation of Working Capital as at January 2007	<a href="#">6002E-01 February 2007.pdf</a>
Reconciliation of Net Working Capital as at 31 January 2007	<a href="#">6002F-01 February 2007.pdf</a>
Notes on Operating Statements for January 2007 reporting on variances of 10% or greater	<a href="#">6002H February 2007.pdf</a>
Details of Budget Amendments requested during the month of January 2006	<a href="#">6002J-01 February 2007.pdf</a>

**POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

Not applicable.

**PUBLIC CONSULTATION/COMMUNICATION**

Not applicable.

**C07/6002- FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (AMREC) (ATTACHMENT)**

**STATUTORY AND LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

Local Government Act 1995 Division 3 – Reporting on Activities and Finance Section 6.4 – Financial Report.

Local Government (Financial Regulations) 1996 Part 4 – Financial Reports

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

Amendments to the 2006/2007 Budget have been included in the budget amendment report.

**STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS**

Not applicable.

**COMMENT**

The attached reports are the first to reflect the work that has been undertaken to speed up the production of information to Council.

**C07/6002- FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (AMREC) (ATTACHMENT)**

**COUNCIL RESOLUTION (6002)**

1. THAT THE STATEMENTS OF FINANCIAL ACTIVITY AND THE OPERATING STATEMENTS FOR THE PERIODS ENDING 30 NOVEMBER 2006, 31 DECEMBER 2006 AND 31 JANUARY 2007 AS DETAILED IN THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENTS BE ADOPTED:

<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>LINK</b>
STATEMENT OF FINANCIAL ACTIVITY - NOVEMBER 2006	<a href="#">6002A-11 February 2007.pdf</a>
OPERATING STATEMENTS BY PROGRAM FOR THE PERIOD ENDED 30 NOVEMBER 2006	<a href="#">6002B-11 February 2007.pdf</a>
REPRESENTATION OF WORKING CAPITAL AS AT NOVEMBER 2006	<a href="#">6002E-11 February 2007.pdf</a>
RECONCILIATION OF NET WORKING CAPITAL AS AT 30 NOVEMBER 2006.	<a href="#">6002F-11 February 2007.pdf</a>
STATEMENT OF FINANCIAL ACTIVITY - DECEMBER 2006	<a href="#">6002A-12 February 2007.pdf</a>
OPERATING STATEMENTS BY PROGRAM FOR THE PERIOD ENDED 31 DECEMBER 2006	<a href="#">6002B-12 February 2007.pdf</a>
REPRESENTATION OF WORKING CAPITAL AS AT DECEMBER 2006	<a href="#">6002E-12 February 2007.pdf</a>
RECONCILIATION OF NET WORKING CAPITAL AS AT 31 DECEMBER 2006.	<a href="#">6002F-12 February 2007.pdf</a>
STATEMENT OF FINANCIAL ACTIVITY - JANUARY 2007	<a href="#">6002A-01 February 2007.pdf</a>
OPERATING STATEMENTS BY PROGRAM FOR THE PERIOD ENDED 31 JANUARY 2007	<a href="#">6002B-01 February 2007.pdf</a>
REPRESENTATION OF WORKING CAPITAL AS AT JANUARY 2007	<a href="#">6002E-01 February 2007.pdf</a>
RECONCILIATION OF NET WORKING CAPITAL AS AT 31 JANUARY 2007	<a href="#">6002F-01 February 2007.pdf</a>
NOTES ON OPERATING STATEMENTS FOR JANUARY 2007 REPORTING ON VARIANCES OF 10% OR GREATER	<a href="#">6002H February 2007.pdf</a>

2. THAT BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY DECISION, THE BUDGET AMENDMENTS, AS LISTED IN THE BUDGET AMENDMENT REPORTS FOR NOVEMBER AND DECEMBER 2006 AND JANUARY 2007, AS DETAILED IN ATTACHMENTS [6002J-11 February 2007.pdf](#), [6002J-12 February 2007.pdf](#), AND [6002J-01 February 2007.pdf](#) BE ADOPTED.

**CARRIED EN BLOC**

**12. MOTIONS OF WHICH PREVIOUS NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN**

Nil.

**13. MOTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY OF THE COUNCIL**

Nil.

**14. CLOSURE**

There being no further business, Her Worship the Mayor, K J Jackson declared the Meeting closed at 8.00pm.