

# Attachment 1

Council Resolutions Relating to the Review of  
Local Planning Scheme No 6



**Attachment 1- Council Resolutions Relating to the Review of Local Planning Scheme No. 6**

18 March 2025- Ordinary Meeting of Council	Officer Comment
<p>C25/249- Motions Carried at the Annual General Meeting of Electors Held 3 February 2025</p> <p>That the Council:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Note Motion 1 (see below) carried at the Annual General Meeting of Electors held on Monday, 3 February 2025</li> <li>2. Note that the review of Local Planning Scheme No.6 is an iterative process and all feedback received will be carefully considered prior to Council making any decisions.</li> <li>3. <u>Request the Chief Executive Officer prepare and present a Detailed Engagement Report to Council prior to Council endorsement of the Local Planning Scheme No.6 Review.</u></li> </ol> <p>3 February 2025- AGME Motion 2</p> <p>That the Council;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In accordance with Key Priority 3* of the City of Melville Community Annual Report 2023-2024, immediately address the apparent non-compliance in the recently presented consultation process diagram for LPS6 review (23/01/25) with respect to the City’s Stakeholder Engagement Policy (CP – 002) which mandates that all relevant stakeholders be given a fair and meaningful opportunity to participate. Specifically, we the community, should be given the opportunity to:             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Review the Report of Findings (Report) from the recent LPS6 community consultation.</li> <li>b. Have the Report amended (including but not limited to outcomes and recommendations made) where the Report fails to respond appropriately to the feedback, comments and concerns resulting from the community consultation process.</li> <li>c. Carry out the above before submission to Council for approval and subsequent progression to the Statutory Scheme Amendment Process.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	<p>In accordance with the Council resolution, the City has provided a Detailed Engagement Report detailing the 2024 community engagement.</p> <p>This report is an attachment to the June Council item.</p>
<p><b>18 November 2025- Ordinary Meeting of Council</b></p> <p>UP25/91- Bull Creek and Murdoch Train Stations Precinct Plans</p> <p>That the Council:</p>	<p><b>Officer Comment</b></p> <p>In response to this Council resolution, the City has identified an additional five opportunity areas south of Leach Highway</p>

## OFFICIAL

1. Notes the challenges identified in the report and acknowledges that delivery of high density housing in the areas surrounding the Bull Creek and Murdoch Train Stations is a long-term strategic opportunity.
2. Based on the report recommendations:
  - a. Retain current zoning within the Bull Creek station and Murdoch station Further Information Areas, with a view to preserving future opportunity for redevelopment when appropriate and feasible, with the areas identified for future planning within the City's Local Planning Strategy.
  - b. Defer pursuing redevelopment opportunities within the Bull Creek and Murdoch Station precincts in the short term, while continuing development of the Murdoch Specialised Precinct, and noting that future consideration of redevelopment will occur following further community engagement and strategic planning.
  - c. Seek dialogue with the Chair of the WA Planning Commission and Minister for Planning and Lands regarding potential joint planning, funding and delivery of Bull Creek and Murdoch station precincts.
  - d. Seek alignment with the State Government and WAPC on appropriate planning processes for the precincts.
3. Requests the CEO to initiate discussions with the WAPC Chair and the Minister for Planning and Lands to specify the City's interest in the planned growth of the residential areas around the two train stations, and to discuss appropriate mechanisms to realise this goal, as per 2(c) & 2(d) above.
4. Incorporate best practice Transit-Oriented Development principles within the station precinct planning, including strong pedestrian and cycle linkages, infrastructure services, green corridors, accessible public spaces, high amenity streetscapes, housing density (including meeting the needs of key worker accommodation and market demand).
5. Request the CEO to, at the appropriate time, undertake a City-led visioning exercise, in consultation with the community, to understand their vision and aspirations for the Station Precinct areas and to assist with informing the City's dialogue with the relevant State Government agencies, Ministers and Members of Parliament.
6. **Requests the CEO, to investigate, and include for consideration as part of the LPS 6 Review, opportunities to accommodate additional housing density and mixed-use development within the southern part of the City, guided by the following principles:**

that align with the intent of the Local Planning Strategy and that the City considers to be suitable for housing infill.

This is reflected in the updated infill proposal to be considered by Council.

OFFICIAL

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <u>Locating future growth where transport accessibility, employment and infrastructure capacity can best support it</u></li> <li>b. <u>Promoting a balanced approach to infill and redevelopment that aligns with State Planning Policies whilst maintaining local character and liveability; and</u></li> <li>c. <u>Ensuring long-term land use planning considers sustainability, housing diversity and the efficient use of existing services.</u></li> </ul>	
<p><b>9 December 2025- Ordinary Meeting of Council</b></p>	<p><b>Officer Comment</b></p>
<p>UP25/92- Response to Petitions- Local Planning Scheme 6 Review</p> <p>That the Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Notes the interim report in response to the petitions received in relation to the review of Local planning Scheme 6; and</li> <li>2. <u>Acknowledges that an additional response to the petitions will be provided within a Detailed Engagement Report, which is due to be considered by Council in Q2 of 2026 following the completion of further technical work.</u></li> </ul>	<p>The Detailed Engagement Report includes a response to the petitions received, however it's also noted that the updated housing infill proposals no longer includes four of the five petition areas, with the fifth also changed to a lower comparable density increase.</p>
<p>UP25/75- LPS6 Review- Staging and Implementation Plan</p> <p>That the Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <u>Endorse the Staging and Implementation Plan to guide the proposed timing and stakeholder engagement for the remaining tasks of Stage 1 of the Local Planning Scheme 6 Review.</u></li> </ul>	<p>The City continues to progress the LPS6 Review based on the approach detailed in the Staging and Implementation Plan (the Plan).</p> <p>The decision to seek Council resolution on the updated density changes and engagement approach is a progression on the approved Plan, and reflects the City's desire not only for transparency but to ensure there is alignment on the scope of changes.</p>
<p><b>17 February 2026- Ordinary Meeting of Council</b></p>	<p><b>Officer Comment</b></p>
<p>M26/67- Response to the Annual General Meeting of Electors 2026 Motions Carried</p> <p>That the Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Acknowledges AGME Motion 2 (see below); and</li> <li>2. <u>Directly address the items raised in the motion by conducting the Review of LPS 6 as a whole of City review with a) particular focus on key transport nodes with access to mass transport infrastructure such as train and bus stations and</u></li> </ul>	<p>The revised draft density change areas reflect a pivot away from Canning Highway as a focus for density. Density changes proposed around Booragoon, which have the potential to also feed traffic onto Canning Hwy have also been reviewed, and in many instances removed or reduced in intensity.</p>

OFFICIAL

<p><b><u>b) introduce proposals to limit increases in density along or feeding into Canning Highway at least until such time as the State Government addresses traffic congestion on Canning Highway.</u></b></p> <p>2 February 2026- AGME Motion 2 That the Council due to proven capacity issues with Canning Highway, and before the draft LPS6 is presented to Council:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Replaces Canning Highway as the Primary transport corridor with Leach Highway,</li><li>2. Increases residential density along Leach Highway and between Leach Highway and South Street to provide urgent, equitable, reasonable, sustainable and affordable housing opportunities.</li><li>3. Postpones density increases along Canning Highway and in feeder suburbs between Stock Road and Reynolds Road and reconsiders when appropriate infrastructure capacity is available.</li></ol>	<p>The newly included change areas are focussed primarily around Primary Distributor roads like South St, and along District Distributor roads like Parry Avenue.</p> <p>The remaining density changes around Riseley Centre and Booragoon are considered modest and appropriate, considering the significance of these centres. Traffic modelling also suggests the impact on congestion from the growth modelled from these change areas is manageable.</p>
<p>M26/67- Response to the Annual General Meeting of Electors 2026 Motions Carried</p> <p>That the Council:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Acknowledges AGME Motion 3; and</li><li>2. <b><u>Directly address the concerns raised in the motion by the community in the LPS 6 review; and</u></b></li><li>3. <b><u>Liaise with the Western Australian Government and Education Department officials provide a detailed report regarding the impact of increasing densification in the Booragoon Activity Centre and surrounds, and whether this will result in overcapacity and detrimental impacts to key stakeholders at Applecross Senior High School.</u></b></li></ol> <p>2 February 2026- AGME Motion 3 That the Council:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Recognise ongoing, capacity issues at Applecross Senior High School (SHS), to which currently proposed Local Planning Scheme 6 density increases will add significant additional pressure. In particular:<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. Recognise that Applecross SHS enrolments have grown significantly year on year with the school now operating well beyond its built capacity of 1,563 students (i.e. more than 25% with 1,962 student enrolments by Semester 2,</li></ol></li></ol>	<p>The Department of Education (the Department) advised that population growth associated with increased density is likely to place additional pressure on school infrastructure.</p> <p>Nonetheless, the Department had no in principle objections to the City's LPS6 Review, and concluded that:</p> <p>“The Department will continue to monitor residential growth and public school enrolment demand within the City and welcomes the opportunity to collaborate with the City in forward planning to ensure the education needs of the future population are adequately met”.</p> <p>The Department specifically acknowledged the levers available to address capacity issues that exist or may arise in the future based on increased enrolment numbers. These included-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Modifying school catchment areas;</li><li>2. Relocating specific education programs or functions;</li><li>3. Expanding or augmenting existing school sites;</li></ol>

OFFICIAL

<p>last year; a 14% increase over the past 5 years and over 400 students since 2018).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>b. Recognise that the Applecross SHS site is now severely constrained - now reliant on 24 temporary transportable classrooms to try to alleviate overcrowding, but has now exhausted remaining space - no more is available.</li><li>c. Recognise that Applecross SHS student enrolments have consistently been underestimated by the Department of Education (DoE).</li><li>d. Recognise that although the DoE is progressing a major upgrade plan for built capacity of 2500 students in the medium term, the current trend of rising enrolments (an average increase of 61 enrolments per year) will consume all of this extra capacity within 10 years.</li><li>e. Recognise that Applecross SHS also faces additional demand from developments either already zoned, approved or underway in its intake area, such as at Canning Bridge and R100 high density zoning, along Almondbury Road - including the recent DAP-2024-13 (for 57 apartments) which was rejected by the City but then overruled and approved by the Department of Planning at 7 storeys (instead of the precinct 4 storey limit).</li><li>f. Recognise that due to such ongoing pressures, there is little to no capacity currently or in planned future Applecross SHS upgrades to accommodate proposed LPS6 density increases; 51% of which are, at this time, within the Applecross SHS intake area.</li></ul> <p>2. RECONSIDER proposed LPS6 density increases with the Applecross SHS catchment including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. Conduct robust and detailed assessment of future ASHS capacity to support any proposed LPS6 density increases.</li><li>b. Provide a detailed report on such assessment supported by credible, robust and reliable lines of evidence. This shall include:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>i. A cautious review of predictions concerning student numbers and any other advice provided by the DoE. This shall include specific assessment of uncertainty concerning any predictions and any other advice provided by the DoE.</li><li>ii. For any LPS6 density increases which are proposed within the Applecross SHS intake area, provide credible, robust and reliable</li></ul></li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>4. Acquiring off-site facilities (e.g. for early childhood or kindergarten); and</li><li>5. Building new schools (albeit a more responsive design to account for the spatial constraints of building in an established suburban/urban context).</li></ul> <p>The City nonetheless acknowledges the concerns raised in the AGM motion, and is continuing to investigate the issue, specifically through engaging the Department. Requests are currently with both the officers at the DoE and more recently with the Ministers for Education and Planning requesting additional information pertinent to the review.</p> <p>It's also noted that as a consequence of other changes, including removing a significant amount of density previously proposed along Canning Hwy, and reducing or removing higher densities that were proposed around Booragoon, the City has ultimately scaled back the level of change within the Applecross High School catchment.</p> <p>If the information expected to be provided by the DoE or relevant Ministers does not resolve the issue, Council would have the opportunity to explore further changes to the draft densities being considered as part of the review of LPS6, before the draft plan ultimately progresses to the State government for their input.</p>
---	---

OFFICIAL

<p>evidence which demonstrates beyond reasonable doubt that Applecross SHS will have capacity to accommodate them.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>iii. Recommend removal of proposed density increases for which future Applecross SHS capacity cannot be demonstrated beyond reasonable doubt.</li><li>c. Provide this detailed report to elected members and to the community for review, resolution of questions/concerns and where required, revision prior to Council endorsement.</li></ul> <p>3. Revise LPS6 proposed density changes so that any proposed density increases within the ASHS intake area are matched to Applecross SHS capacity which has been demonstrated beyond reasonable doubt to actually exist.</p>	
--	--