



— *City of* —  
***Melville***

**MINUTES  
OF THE  
ORDINARY MEETING OF THE COUNCIL  
HELD ON  
TUESDAY, 15 AUGUST 2006**

**DISTRIBUTED: 18 AUGUST 2006**



— 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 7.00PM ON TUESDAY 15 AUGUST 2006,**

**1. PRESENT**

Her Worship the Mayor, Katherine Jackson JP

**COUNCILLORS**

Cr D J Macphail (Deputy Mayor)  
Cr A Ceniviva  
Cr C W Robartson; Cr R A Aubrey  
Cr P M Phelan; Cr C M Halton  
Cr M J Barton; Cr L J Wyatt  
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**

E Lumsden PSM  
A McAllister

C McClure  
M Tieleman  
R G C Willis

P Gale  
B Taylor

K Weymes

M Ridgwell  
R Dougall

**POSITION TITLE**

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

There were six (6) members in the Public Gallery, and two (2) members in the Media Gallery.

### 3. APOLOGIES AND APPROVED LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Cr J R Bennett          University

### 4. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

#### **Mr B Hamer of Bicton**

*“1. We the Residents and Ratepayers ask how Council is going to control the additional trailers and traffic now that racks have been approved and 81 applications for Dinghies have been received to service 192 moorings. What is the Councils intentions?”*

The Director Technical & Development Services, Mr Robert Willis, provided the following response:

*With reference to the question it should be noted that the Council approved the installation of dinghy storage facilities, not racks. These facilities consist of a thirty centimetre (30cm) high platform on which dinghies will be stored flat. However due to space limitations one (1) only rack of one point three metres (1.3m) in height will hold seven (7) dinghies adjacent to Blackwall Reach reserve.*

- At the last count, there were one hundred and sixty-one (161) boats on the foreshore.*
- More than half of these were unmarked (displaying no registration numbers).*
- As this is a legal requirement for tender boats we can only assume the unmarked boats are recreational craft that have been abandoned or left for convenience.*
- That would mean more than one hundred (100) mooring owners are already transporting their dinghies to and from Blackwall Reach at present.*
- In addition, there is ample parking all along Blackwall Reach Parade with the exception of the intersection of Beach Street.*
- There is formal parking at Kent Street and at Bicton Baths (bottom of Braunton Street).*

*Based on this information, we would envisage there will be no additional traffic or trailer problems.*

*However, we will monitor access to the beach to make sure that moorings are not being accessed through sensitive areas. If damage does occur we will fence areas off and direct access accordingly.*

**4. Public Question Time**

**Mr James Addvalue of Applecross**

*“1. Is Applecross the City of Melville’s ‘forgotten area’, or is it just Kishorn Road, Applecross.”*

The Chief Executive Officer, Mr Eric Lumsden, provided the following response:

*No Applecross is not considered as the forgotten area.*

*“2. The Kishorn Road area between Armstrong Road and Macrae Road needs serious upgrading, some immediately so.”*

The Chief Executive Officer, Mr Eric Lumsden, provided the following response:

*The situation will be investigated.*

*“3. Is it the Councils intention to exacerbate the present difficult traffic situation that exists in the Moreau Mews / Kishorn Road junction area?”*

The Chief Executive Officer, Mr Eric Lumsden, provided the following response:

*No, the City of Melville is trying to find a solution to the traffic situation.*

*“4. If not, then the Council might choose to further investigate, or rescind, its proposal to provide extra parking bays at 29 Moreau Mews. I believe that the rationale for an additional parking area at that location is seriously flawed.”*

The Chief Executive Officer, Mr Eric Lumsden, provided the following response:

*The proposal is short term only subject to an overall strategic review for the area concerned.*

## 5. AWARDS AND PRESENTATIONS

- 5.1 Recreation Services was recognised with an award in the Heart Foundation Kellogg Local Government Awards. The City of Melville Recreation Centres and Health and Fitness staff were the overall winners in the category of “Provision and use of Facilities to Improve Heart Health.”

Note: The Council expressed their sincere thanks to all staff involved with the Recreation Centres, and for the excellent work in providing a recognized service to the City of Melville residents.

- 5.2 At the recently held Local Government Week, Cr Duncan Macphail was awarded with A Distinguished Service Award from the Western Australian Local Government Association.

- 5.3 Following on from the recent “Banners in the Terrace” competition held in conjunction with Local Government Week, the City of Melville banner was recognised in the “Creative Arts Professional” category.

- 5.4 At the recently held Local Government Week, Councillor Duncan Macphail placed his Councillor Business Card into a raffle competition and had his card drawn out.

Councillor Macphail’s prize was three thousand dollars (\$3,000) worth of advertorial space in the West Australian for the City of Melville. This raffle was sponsored by MarketForce.

- 5.5 A record of functions attend by the Mayor, and Elected Members representing the Mayor for the Council, for the period 18 July 2006 to 14 August 2006 forms an attachment to the Minutes of the Meeting.  
[Mayoral Representation August 2006.pdf](#)

Cr J Phillips moved, seconded Cr H R Everett –

**THAT THE RECORD OF FUNCTIONS ATTENDED BY THE MAYOR, AND ELECTED MEMBERS REPRESENTING THE CITY OF MELVILLE, FOR THE PERIOD TUESDAY 18 JULY 2006 TO MONDAY 14 AUGUST 2006, BE NOTED.**

The Mayor submitted the motion, which was declared

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

**6. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES**

**6.1 ORDINARY MEETING OF THE COUNCIL – 18 JULY 2006**

**6.2 SPECIAL MEETING OF THE COUNCIL – 25 JULY 2006**

**6.3 DEVELOPMENT & NEIGHBOURHOOD AMENITY COMMITTEE – 11 JULY 2006**

**6.4 COMMUNITY & TECHNICAL SERVICES COMMITTEE – 4 JULY 2006**

Cr C W Robartson moved, seconded Cr L M Reynolds –

**THAT THE MINUTES OF THE ORDINARY MEETING OF THE COUNCIL HELD ON TUESDAY, 18 JULY 2006; SPECIAL MEETING OF THE COUNCIL HELD ON TUESDAY, 25 JULY 2006; DEVELOPMENT & NEIGHBOURHOOD AMENITY COMMITTEE HELD ON TUESDAY, 11 JULY 2006; COMMUNITY & TECHNICAL SERVICES COMMITTEE HELD ON TUESDAY, 4 JULY 2006 BE CONFIRMED**

The Mayor submitted the motion,  
which was declared **CARRIED WITHOUT DISSENT (12/0)**

**7. DISCLOSURES OF INTEREST**

Nil.

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

Cr L M Reynolds	University
Cr J Phillips	Applecross / Mt Pleasant
Cr C W Robartson	Bull Creek / Leeming
Cr R Aubrey	Bull Creek / Leeming

Cr D J Macphail moved, seconded Cr M J Barton -

**THAT LEAVE OF ABSENCE FOR CR L M REYNOLDS, CR J PHILLIPS, CR C W ROBARTSON AND CR R AUBREY BE APPROVED.**

The Mayor submitted the motion, which was declared  
**CARRIED WITHOUT DISSENT (12/0)**

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

Nil.

**10. PETITIONS**

Nil.

**11. REPORTS OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER**

**11.1 ADOPTION**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

P06/3015	PROPOSED THREE (3) STOREY MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT CONTAINING OFFICES AND TWO (2) RESIDENTIAL UNITS ON LOT 32 (1) NORTH LAKE ROAD, ALFRED COVE	3
P06/5005	INITIATION OF AMENDMENT NO. 50 TO COMMUNITY PLANNING SCHEME NO. 5 BY REZONING WESTERN PORTION OF LOT 4049 ON CERTIFICATE OF TITLE 1942/7 (22) WINDELYA ROAD, MURDOCH FROM “REGIONAL RESERVATION – PUBLIC PURPOSES (UNIVERSITY)” TO “LIVING AREAS PRECINCT – M4 MURDOCH” WITH RESIDENTIAL DENSITY CODINGS OF “R40” AND “R60”, AND DESIGNATING NORM GODFREY RESERVE (NO. 44586) AS “LOCAL OPEN SPACE”	15
P06/8008	CANNING BRIDGE PRECINCT PARKING	25
T06/1021	INTERSECTION OF RISELEY STREET/KEARNS CRESCENT, ARDROSS	33
C06/8006	CARAWATHA PRIMARY SCHOOL – USE OF BUILDINGS	38
T06/1012	PEDESTRIAN CROSSING SAFETY ON CANNING HIGHWAY, APPLECROSS	45
C06/8005	REPORT ON OUTCOMES OF GARDEN CITY PRECINCT PROTOCOL	50
C06/5000	COMMON SEAL REGISTER	53
C06/6000	INVESTMENT STATEMENTS	55
C06/6001	SCHEDULE OF ACCOUNTS	58
C06/6002	FINANCIAL STATEMENTS	60



**P06/3015 - PROPOSED THREE (3) STOREY MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT CONTAINING OFFICES AND TWO (2) RESIDENTIAL UNITS ON LOT 32 (1) NORTH LAKE ROAD, ALFRED COVE (SMREC) (ATTACHMENT)**

Ward	:	Bicton / Attadale Ward
Category	:	Planning / Building Development
Application Number	:	DA-2006-25
Property	:	1 North Lake Road, Alfred Cove WA 6154
Proposal	:	Approval is sought for Three (3) Storey Mixed Use Development – Office and Residential on the subject site.
Applicant	:	Doepel Marsh Architects
Owner	:	Calmbay Investments Pty Ltd Warrigal Developments Pty Ltd Corio Investments Pty Ltd
Disclosure of any Interest	:	No officer involved in the preparation of this report has a declarable interest in this matter.
Responsible Officer	:	David Woo, Acting Manager Planning & Development Services
Previous Items	:	Nil

**SUMMARY**

Approval is sought for a Three (3) Level Mixed Used Development containing offices and two (2) residential units on the subject site. The property is located in the Commercial Centre Frame (Hislop) and is strategically located on Primary and Other Regional Roads network. A high quality development on this site would set a standard for the remaining properties located within the Hislop Frame. It is envisaged that the development when constructed would create other positive spinoff and provide diversity, vibrancy and offer choices to a variety of small businesses seeking small scale office tenancies in the locality. The application exceeds the plot ratio limit applicable to the area and is seeking plot ratio bonus from the Council.

It is recommended that the application should be approved as it is appropriately designed and encompasses sustainability principles.

**BACKGROUND**

The application was originally submitted in January 2006 with a substantially larger building footprint. Since then, the applicant has worked closely with officers of the Council and has reduced the internal building floor area and improved the appearance of the building elevations. The concerns raised by the objector to the proposal have also been addressed by the applicant through submission of revised drawings.

**P06/3015 - PROPOSED THREE (3) STOREY MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT CONTAINING OFFICES AND TWO (2) RESIDENTIAL UNITS ON LOT 32 (1) NORTH LAKE ROAD, ALFRED COVE (SMREC) (ATTACHMENT)**

**Site Details**

Lot Area : 1012sqm  
 Retention of Existing Vegetation : No  
 Street Tree(s) : Nil  
 Street Furniture (drainage pits etc) : Nil  
 Site Details : [P06\\_3015\\_PROPERTY\\_MAP.pdf](#)

[P06\\_3015\\_August\\_2006.pdf](#) A copy of the plans forms part of the Attachments to the Agenda, which were distributed to Members of the Council on Wednesday, 9 August 2006.

**DETAIL**

**Development Requirements**

Development Requirement	Required/ Allowed	Proposed	Comments	Delegation to approve variation	Plan Notation
<b>Private Open Space – Residential Component</b>	30sqm per dwelling	52sqm and 63sqm	Complies		
<b>Plot Ratio</b>	<b>0.6/607sqm</b>  <b>+ 0.07 bonus for achieving a 35/65 split under Policy No60</b>  <b>+ 0.1 bonus for achieving sustainability principles and provide community benefit</b>  <b>Total allowed = 0.77/779sqm</b>	<b>0.52/528 sqm (Office)</b>  <b>0.26/271 sqm (two residential apartments).</b>  <b>The mixed use building satisfies the sustainable building design principles plus community benefit</b>  <b>Total proposed = 0.79/799sqm</b>	See comments	<b>Council</b>	

**P06/3015 - PROPOSED THREE (3) STOREY MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT CONTAINING OFFICES AND TWO (2) RESIDENTIAL UNITS ON LOT 32 (1) NORTH LAKE ROAD, ALFRED COVE (SMREC) (ATTACHMENT)**

<b>Landscaping</b>	25% (253sqm).  15% under Amendment No. 1	19% (191sqm).  25% achieved if verge area is included in the calculations as the applicant proposes to provide lawn and verge trees within the verge.	Complies with Amendment No.1. 25% is considered excessive		
<b>Building Height</b>	8m to eaves;  10.5m maximum	Eaves – N/A (Flat Roof);  10.5m maximum;  <b>11.4m to lift shaft projection.</b>  <b>900mm height excess.</b>	N/A  Complies. <b>Clause 5.11(a)(ii) of CPS5 allows non-habitable tower or architectural feature to exceed the prescribed Height.</b>	<b>Council</b>	
Carparking	21 bays	23	Complies		
Residential	2 units – 2 bays each	4 bays	Complies		
Office	General Policy – 1 bay per 30sqm NLA (528sqm NLA = 17 bays)	19 bays	Complies		
Over-shadowing	25% (253sqm)	24.9% (252sqm)	Complies		

**P06/3015 - PROPOSED THREE (3) STOREY MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT CONTAINING OFFICES AND TWO (2) RESIDENTIAL UNITS ON LOT 32 (1) NORTH LAKE ROAD, ALFRED COVE (SMREC) (ATTACHMENT)**

**Setbacks**

Wall	Required	Proposed	Comments	Delegation to approve Variation	Plan Notation
<b>Front (East) Ground –</b>	6m As per R- Codes	6.1m	Complies	<b>DDNA</b>	
<b>1<sup>st</sup> Floor</b>	6m	6.1m	Complies		
<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Floor</b>	6m	6.8m	Complies		
<b>Rear (West)</b>	6m (5.7c of CPS5)	6.0m	Complies		
<b>North Side (Caltex) Ground –</b>	1.5m	Nil	<b>Variation supported. Abuts existing service station (Caltex). No amenity impact. It is recommended that the boundary walls be rendered or textured finish with appropriate curve lines or art work to add visual interest.</b>	<b>DDNA</b>	
<b>1<sup>st</sup> Floor</b>	2.2m / 5.5m	Nil / 1.5m	<b>As above. The offices on this level overlook the service station providing passive surveillance.</b>		

**P06/3015 - PROPOSED THREE (3) STOREY MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT CONTAINING OFFICES AND TWO (2) RESIDENTIAL UNITS ON LOT 32 (1) NORTH LAKE ROAD, ALFRED COVE (SMREC) (ATTACHMENT)**

<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Floor (residential)</b>	<b>1.8m / 7.2m</b>	<b>Nil / 1.5m</b>	<b>As above.</b>		
<b>South Side Adjoining Residential Ground –</b>	2.0m (cl.5.7 of CPS5)	2.0m -4.6m	Complies		
	2.0m	2.0m -4.6m	Complies		
<b>1<sup>st</sup> Floor</b>	2.2m	5.6m -9.3m	Complies		
<b>2<sup>nd</sup> Floor (residential)</b>					

**POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

Carparking (Non Residential PB47)  
 Mixed Use Development – Policy No. PB 51  
 Height of Buildings – Policy No. PB52  
 Mixed Use Plot Ratio Application and Community Benefit – Policy PB 60

**PUBLIC CONSULTATION/COMMUNICATION**

Advertising Required: Yes  
 Neighbour's Comment Supplied: No  
 Reason: 'S' Use under Table 1 of CPS5  
 Support/Object: One (1) objection

**P06/3015 - PROPOSED THREE (3) STOREY MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT CONTAINING OFFICES AND TWO (2) RESIDENTIAL UNITS ON LOT 32 (1) NORTH LAKE ROAD, ALFRED COVE (SMREC) (ATTACHMENT)**

Affected Property	Summary of Submission	Support/ Objection	Officer's Comment	Action (Condition/ Support/ Dismiss)
<p>89 Holman Street</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed structure will be massive/considerably large in size, which has a direct overshadowing impact on our property.</li> <li>Due to the proposed placement of large-scaled windows and being at three storey height, we have objections to the current plan as it leads to a permanent loss of privacy when using our swimming pool.</li> </ul>	<p>Objection</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The comments raised are understandable. It is emphasised that the issues raised by the objector have been conveyed to the applicant who have respectfully reduced the building bulk and scale of the building. And in so doing has reduced the extent of overshadowing from 35% to 25%, which is the acceptable limit under the R-Codes.</li> <li>As a consequence of revisions made by the applicant to provide relief to the affected neighbour, all south facing windows to offices and residential units have reduced in number and/or obscured to 1600mm high / converted to highlight windows</li> </ul>	

**P06/3015 - PROPOSED THREE (3) STOREY MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT CONTAINING OFFICES AND TWO (2) RESIDENTIAL UNITS ON LOT 32 (1) NORTH LAKE ROAD, ALFRED COVE (SMREC) (ATTACHMENT)**

**REFERRALS TO GOVERNMENT AGENCIES**

Required: Main Roads WA  
Reason: Other Regional Regional Roads  
Support/Object: Awaiting comments from Main Roads WA . Any requirements of Main Roads WA shall be complied with by the applicant.

**STATUTORY AND LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

Should Council refuse the application for planning approval, the applicant will have the right to have the decision reviewed in accordance with Part V of the Town Planning and Development Act 1928.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

There are no financial implications.

**STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS**

There are no strategic implications.

**COMMENT**

The proposed development generally complies with the City's Community Planning Scheme No. 5, Residential Codes and relevant Policies other than plot ratio, minor projection of the lift overrun and northern side setbacks.

**Plot Ratio**

The primary variation being sought by the applicant is plot ratio. The office component clearly complies with the zero point six (0.6) plot ratio prescribed in the precinct. In fact, the proposed office plot ratio is zero point five two (0.52) or seventy-nine square metres (79sqm) below the allowable limit. The complication is when the two (2) residential units on the second floor are included in the overall development then the overall plot ratio is exceeded by 0.19:1.

Given that the proposed development is a mixed use development encompassing offices and residential units, the total plot ratio calculations must include both landuses. Ironically, if the subject site was developed purely as two (2) residential units, it could result in an urban built form with an overall plot ratio of one thousand five hundred and eighteen square metres (1518sqm) (or an equivalent of 1.5:1). The reason is because residential units alone at R25 considered as low density are not subject to plot ratio requirement. However, when mixed with other commercial activities such as an office use the Scheme requirement of zero point six (0.6) "kicks in" for both landuses.

**P06/3015 - PROPOSED THREE (3) STOREY MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT CONTAINING OFFICES AND TWO (2) RESIDENTIAL UNITS ON LOT 32 (1) NORTH LAKE ROAD, ALFRED COVE (SMREC) (ATTACHMENT)**

It should be emphasised, however, that under Policy 60 entitled “Mixed Use Plot Ratio Bonus”, it allows upto twenty percent (20%) plot ratio bonus or a further 0.2:1 to be granted if the Council is satisfied that in granting the plot ratio bonus that the applicant has satisfied a few criteria including sustainable building design and community benefit.. The first ten percent (10%) or zero point one (0.1) requires the applicant to achieve a right balance and mix of residential and commercial uses. In this instance, the applicant proposes thirty-four percent (34%) of the total plot ratio floor space to be allocated for residential use and sixty-six percent (66%) for office use. Under Policy No. 60, the applicant is entitled to claim 0.07:1 (or 7%). If, however, a fifty/fifty (50/50) split was achieved then a full zero point one (0.1) (or ten percent [10%]) is entitled to be claimed.

Similarly, the second lot of zero point one (0.1) (or ten percent [10%]) is performance based having regard to achieving a landmark building outcome, sustainable building design principles, energy efficiency in building design, incorporate end of trip bicycle facilities such as shower/change room, bike storage, community benefit such as public art, seating benches accessible to the public, new footpath and the likes would qualify for the extra zero point one (0.1) (ten percent [10%]). Policy No. 42 entitled “ Energy Efficiency in Building Design” encourages orientation of building on site to optimise elements of natural heat and to encourage features to be incorporated into building design to optimise passive solar design. It is considered that the proposed building is appropriately designed and achieves a beneficial solution as it:

- Almost achieves 1.5 (N/S to 1(E/S) wall length ratio;
- Windows, particularly to the two (2) residential units, have been designed facing north;
- Extended eaves are provided to the North and East to the apartments for shade;
- External seals to be provided to all external doors to reduce heats loss.

It is considered that the development has satisfied the criteria for performance based outcomes and therefore qualifies for the plot ratio bonus. This would allow the proposed development a plot ratio of zero point six (0.6) plus (+) zero point zero seven (0.07) plus (+) zero point one (0.1) = zero point seven seven (0.77) (or seven hundred and seventy-nine square metres [779sqm]). The application proposes 0.79 (or seven hundred and ninety-nine square metres [799sqm]), an excess of twenty square metres (20sqm). Although the excess is not considered excessive, however, it is considered appropriate to enforce Policy No. 60 in order to maintain its integrity. For this reason, it is considered reasonable for the applicant to reduce the plot ratio to comply with the allowable maximum of zero point seven seven (0.77) (seven hundred and seventy-nine square metres [779] square metres).



**P06/3015 - PROPOSED THREE (3) STOREY MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT CONTAINING OFFICES AND TWO (2) RESIDENTIAL UNITS ON LOT 32 (1) NORTH LAKE ROAD, ALFRED COVE (SMREC) (ATTACHMENT)**

**Northern Side Setbacks**

The applicant is proposing setback variations to the northern side boundary facing the Caltex service station. The side setbacks as stipulated by the Hislop Frame planning precinct development requirements are 'as per the R-codes'. Even though the subject development abuts an existing commercial property, a nil setback to the northern is not as of right. Assessment of the required setbacks for each of the floors from the northern boundary based on length of walls, height of walls and major openings has identified setback variations to each floor. However, as no comment was received from the adjoining landowner during the advertising period, and that the adjoining lot is an open commercial property with the service station building being setback eight metres (8m) from the common boundary, the impact on the adjoining lot is minimal. Moreover, the north facing windows overlooking the service station also provides passive surveillance offering added community security to the locality.

The setback variation is considered acceptable and can be supported.

**Building Height**

The proposed development is generally within the height restrictions of the Hislop Frame. As the building design has a geometrical shape and does not include eaves, only the maximum building height of ten point five metres (10.5m) applies. The majority of the building is within this height limitation other than the elevator shaft. This is proposed at a maximum height of eleven point four metres (11.4m) above the natural ground level (or nine hundred millimetres [900mm] above the height limit). The applicant has indicated that the design of the development addresses the height variation as an architectural feature. In accordance with clause 5.11 of CPS5, a building may:

*“exceed the height prescribed for each precinct in Part 4 of in council Policy provided that :... (ii) a building may have a non-habitable tower, spire, or arch feature that exceeds the prescribed height;”*

The non-habitable tower is considered acceptable as it is appropriately articulated with horizontal fins to add visual interest; the height encroachment is considered acceptable and would not have a negative impact on the locality. Moreover, the structure is obscured by extensive building canopy at the Caltex service station and it would not be all that visible and obtrusive.

**P06/3015 - PROPOSED THREE (3) STOREY MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT CONTAINING OFFICES AND TWO (2) RESIDENTIAL UNITS ON LOT 32 (1) NORTH LAKE ROAD, ALFRED COVE (SMREC) (ATTACHMENT)****CONCLUSION**

The locality has recently had two fairly significant developments, being the Caltex service station and the mixed use development adjoining the “KFC” family restaurant. These two developments have not only improved the visual appearance of the area, it has also generated much business activities encouraging vibrancy and interactions at various levels. These are the sort of activities that the Scheme encourages and promotes. The proposed development is appropriately designed and respect the adjoining residential properties. The applicant has incorporated much of the performance based criteria into the building and provided extensive landscaping particularly to the west, and the northern aspect. This also includes a public art feature and bench seat for the use of the public.

A high quality development on this site would set a standard for the remaining properties located within the Hislop Frame. It is envisaged that the development when constructed would create other positive spinoff and provide diversity, vibrancy and offer a variety of small office suites of various configuration that will accommodate small businesses seeking small scale office tenancies in the locality.

It is recommended that the application be supported subject to appropriate conditions being imposed.

**RESOLUTION (3015)****SPECIAL MAJORITY APPROVAL**

Cr J Phillips moved, seconded Cr M J Barton

**THAT BY SPECIAL MAJORITY DECISION OF THE COUNCIL A THREE (3) STOREY MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT CONTAINING OFFICES AND TWO (2) RESIDENTIAL UNITS ON LOT 32 (1) NORTH LAKE ROAD, ALFRED COVE BE APPROVED SUBJECT TO THE FOLLOWING STANDARD AND SPECIAL CONDITIONS.**

**STANDARD CONDITIONS:****COMPLIANCE WITH STANDARD CONDITIONS:**

**RESGD1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, RESSD3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 15, 16,**

**SPECIAL CONDITIONS:**

- 1. THAT THE DEVELOPMENT SHALL NOT EXCEED A MAXIMUM PLOT RATIO OF 0.77:1 (I.E. 779 SQUARE METRES);**
- 2. THAT HAVING REGARD TO THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE VALUE OF THE INCREASE IN PLOT RATIO FOR THE PROPERTY AND THE COST OF PROVIDING THE PUBLIC BENEFITS RECEIVED IN EXCHANGE, DETAILS OF THE PUBLIC ART, NEW FOOTPATH ON NORTH LAKE ROAD AND PARK BENCHES AS A CONTRIBUTION TOWARDS COMMUNITY BENEFIT SHALL BE APPROPRIATELY VALUED TO THE SATISFACTION OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER.**

**P06/3015 - PROPOSED THREE (3) STOREY MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT CONTAINING OFFICES AND TWO (2) RESIDENTIAL UNITS ON LOT 32 (1) NORTH LAKE ROAD, ALFRED COVE (SMREC) (ATTACHMENT)**

3. THAT ALL WEST AND SOUTH FACING WINDOWS ON ALL LEVELS BEING APPROPRIATELY SCREENED AND OBSCURED TO ONE THOUSAND SIX HUNDRED AND FIFTY MILLIMETRE (1650MM) HIGH FROM THE FINISHED LEVEL TO COMPLY WITH THE PRIVACY PROVISION OF THE RESIDENTIAL DESIGN CODES;
4. THAT NO ZINCALUME AND/OR WHITE METAL MATERIALS ARE PERMITTED;
5. THAT THE CARBAYS LOCATED ALONG THE SOUTHERN BOUNDARY BEING APPROPRIATELY KERBED WITH A ONE METRE (1M) WIDE LANDSCAPING STRIP TO THE SATISFACTION OF THE MANAGER PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES (THIS INCLUDES THE PROPOSED WHEEL STOPS BEING DELETED AND REPLACED WITH APPROPRIATE KERBING);
6. THAT THE PLANTING OF TWO (2) SUITABLE VERGE TREES IN A TWO HUNDRED LITRE (200L) BAG SIZE AT THE APPLICANT'S COST TO SATISFACTION OF THE MANAGER PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES PRIOR TO OCCUPATION OF THE BUILDING;
7. THAT THE SUBMISSION OF A GLARE REFLECTIVITY STUDY BY A CONSULTING ENGINEER AND ANY GLARE ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED PRIOR TO THE ISSUE OF A BUILDING LICENCE;
8. THAT ONE (1) VEHICLE CROSSOVER OF SIX (6) METRES WIDE ONLY IS PERMITTED ON NORTH LAKE ROAD;
9. THAT THE EXISTING FOOTPATH ALONG NORTH LAKE ROAD BEING REMOVED AND REPLACED WITH A SUITABLE FOOTPATH AT THE APPLICANT'S COST. DETAILS OF THE NEW FOOTPATH TO BE SUBMITTED AND APPROVED BY THE MANAGER INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES AND FULLY CONSTRUCTED PRIOR TO OCCUPATION OF THE BUILDING;
10. THAT THE EXISTING CROSSOVER ON NORTH LAKE ROAD BEING REMOVED AND THE VERGES MADE GOOD AND FULLY LANDSCAPED AT THE APPLICANT'S COST TO THE SATISFACTION OF THE MANAGER INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES;
11. THAT THE SUBMISSION OF A COLOUR SCHEDULE BOARD DETAILING THE FINISHES AND COLOURS FOR THE MIXED USE BUILDING TO THE SATISFACTION OF MANAGER PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES PRIOR TO THE ISSUE OF A BUILDING LICENCE;

**P06/3015 - PROPOSED THREE (3) STOREY MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT CONTAINING OFFICES AND TWO (2) RESIDENTIAL UNITS ON LOT 32 (1) NORTH LAKE ROAD, ALFRED COVE (SMREC) (ATTACHMENT)**

- 12. THE NORTH BOUNDARY WALLS BEING RENDERED AND PAINTED TO A PROFESSIONAL STANDARD AND APPROPRIATE ARTICULATION OF THE WALLS BY WAY OF CURVE LINES OR OTHER ARTWORK BEING APPLIED TO THAT SURFACE AREA OF THE WALL TO ADD INTEREST AND VISUAL AMENITY TO THE SATISFACTION OF THE MANAGER PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES;**
- 13. THAT ALL EXTERNAL BUILDING PLANT, INCLUDING AIR CONDITIONER UNITS (OTHER THAN THE LIFT OVERRUN) NOT TO EXCEED THE MAXIMUM HEIGHT OF TEN POINT FIVE METRES (10.5M) FROM NATURAL GROUND LEVEL AND SHALL BE APPROPRIATELY SCREENED. DETAILS OF THE LOCATION, DESIGN AND SCREENING OF SUCH PLANT BEING SUBMITTED AND APPROVED BY THE SATISFACTION OF MANAGER PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT SERVICES PRIOR TO THE ISSUE OF THE RELEVANT BUILDING LICENCE;**
- 14. THAT ALL RUBBISH STORAGE AREAS SHALL BE RENDERED AND FINISHED TO A PROFESSIONAL STANDARD. THE BIN ENCLOSURE BEING SCREENED FROM PUBLIC VIEW AND BEING KEPT IN A TIDY AND ORDERLY MANNER AT ALL TIMES;**
- 15. THAT THE DIMENSIONS OF ALL CARPARKING BAYS, AISLE WIDTHS AND CIRCULATION AREAS COMPLYING WITH AUSTRALIAN STANDARD AS2890.1;**
- 16. THAT NO RETAINING WALLS ARE PERMITTED TO EXCEED FIVE HUNDRED MILLIMETRES (500MM) ABOVE GROUND WITHOUT THE APPROVAL OF THE COUNCIL;**
- 17. THAT THE SUBMISSION OF A CONSTRUCTION MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR THE PROPOSAL DETAILING HOW IT IS PROPOSED TO MANAGE:**
  - THE DELIVERY OF MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT TO THE SITE;**
  - THE STORAGE OF MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT ON THE SITE;**
  - THE PARKING ARRANGEMENTS FOR CONTRACTORS AND SUBCONTRACTORS (NO PARKING IS PERMITTED WITHIN THE NORTH LAKE ROAD AND HOLMAN STREET VERGE AREAS);**
  - IMPACT ON TRAFFIC MOVEMENT;**
  - OTHER MATTERS LIKELY TO IMPACT ON THE SURROUNDING RESIDENTS.**

The Mayor submitted the motion, which was declared

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

**P06/5005 – INITIATION OF AMENDMENT NO. 50 TO COMMUNITY PLANNING SCHEME NO. 5 BY REZONING WESTERN PORTION OF LOT 4049 ON CERTIFICATE OF TITLE 1942/7 (22) WINDELYA ROAD, MURDOCH FROM “REGIONAL RESERVATION – PUBLIC PURPOSES (UNIVERSITY)” TO “LIVING AREAS PRECINCT – M4 MURDOCH” WITH RESIDENTIAL DENSITY CODINGS OF “R40” AND “R60”, AND DESIGNATING NORM GODFREY RESERVE (NO. 44586) AS “LOCAL OPEN SPACE” (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

Ward	:	University
Category	:	Planning / Building Development
Application Number	:	CPS5-50
Property	:	St Ives Retirement Village – Western portion of Lot 4049 on Certificate of Title 1942/7 (22) Windelya Road, Murdoch, and Norm Godfrey Reserve (No. 44586)
Proposal	:	To rezone the western portion of Lot 4049 on Certificate of Title 1942/7 (22) Windelya Road, Murdoch from “Regional Reservation – Public Purposes (University)” to “Living Areas Precinct – M4 Murdoch” with residential density codings of “R40” and “R60”, and designate Norm Godfrey Reserve (No. 44586) as “Local Open Space”
Applicant	:	Development Planning Strategies on behalf of Murdoch University
Owner	:	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	:	Not applicable

**SCHEME PROVISIONS**

MRS Zoning	:	Regional Reservation – Public Purposes (University)
CPS 5 Zoning	:	Regional Reservation – Public Purposes (University)
R-Code	:	Proposed R40 and R60
Use Type	:	As per Community Planning Scheme No.5
Use Class	:	Existing retirement village

**P06/5005 – INITIATION OF AMENDMENT NO. 50 TO COMMUNITY PLANNING SCHEME NO. 5 BY REZONING WESTERN PORTION OF LOT 4049 ON CERTIFICATE OF TITLE 1942/7 (22) WINDELYA ROAD, MURDOCH FROM “REGIONAL RESERVATION – PUBLIC PURPOSES (UNIVERSITY)” TO “LIVING AREAS PRECINCT – M4 MURDOCH” WITH RESIDENTIAL DENSITY CODINGS OF “R40” AND “R60”, AND DESIGNATING NORM GODFREY RESERVE (NO. 44586) AS “LOCAL OPEN SPACE” (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

#### **SITE DETAILS**

Lot Area	:	226 hectares
Retention of Existing Vegetation	:	Yes, where possible
Street Tree(s)	:	Yes
Street Furniture (drainage pits etc)	:	Not applicable
Site Details	:	<a href="#">P06 5005 PROPERTY MAP.pdf</a>

[P06 5005 August 2006.pdf](#) A copy of the plans forms part of the Attachments to the Agenda, which were distributed to Members of the Council on Wednesday, 9 August 2006.

#### **DEVELOPMENT REQUIREMENTS**

Nil

#### **RELEVANT POLICIES**

Nil

#### **PUBLIC CONSULTATION**

Advertising Required?	Yes – If the Council initiates the amendment, signs shall be erected on site for a period no less than forty-two (42) days, letters of notification being sent to adjoining landowners, an advertisement be placed in Public Notices section of the local newspaper. Referral to the Environmental Protection Authority for consideration and the Western Australian Planning Commission for information is required.
-----------------------	---

#### **STATUTORY AND LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

In accordance with the Community Planning Scheme No5 and Town Planning Regulations.

**P06/5005 – INITIATION OF AMENDMENT NO. 50 TO COMMUNITY PLANNING SCHEME NO. 5 BY REZONING WESTERN PORTION OF LOT 4049 ON CERTIFICATE OF TITLE 1942/7 (22) WINDELYA ROAD, MURDOCH FROM “REGIONAL RESERVATION – PUBLIC PURPOSES (UNIVERSITY)” TO “LIVING AREAS PRECINCT – M4 MURDOCH” WITH RESIDENTIAL DENSITY CODINGS OF “R40” AND “R60”, AND DESIGNATING NORM GODFREY RESERVE (NO. 44586) AS “LOCAL OPEN SPACE” (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

## **BACKGROUND**

The City of Melville and Murdoch University have endorsed a masterplan for future development of the university site.

Murdoch considers that it is unlikely to require all of its landholdings at Murdoch for academic purposes and has determined the extent of land required for university purposes. The balance of the land is therefore available for other purposes including residential development and development that may generate funds for academic purposes such as research or technology industry.

The Masterplan is intended to guide the future development of under-utilised land on the university site in a manner which best integrates with the ongoing academic purpose of the University.

The philosophy behind the Masterplan is to consolidate existing university activities within a defined area, maximize pedestrian and public transport accessibility and promote a range of integrated development opportunities that have a strong relationship to the predominant university uses. The Masterplan takes the opportunity to identify and preserve areas of environmental and heritage significance and addresses a transport system to best service the current and future needs of the university and any other uses that may develop on the campus grounds in the future.

The Masterplan has identified three (3) precincts, the University Precinct (for core university uses), the Western Precinct (primarily residential uses) and the Eastern Precinct (primarily for research and development uses aligned with adjacent medical and hospital uses. This proposal involves the western residential precinct and reflects the structure plan which comprises an area of sixteen point seven eight (16.78) ha.

The existing retirement village development on the subject land was approved on appeal by a previous Minister for Planning on the basis that the land was not zoned appropriately in the MRS. The appeal decision stated that the University and the City of Melville should produce a land use structure plan for the university site identifying land needed for the university’s core function and that considered to be surplus to requirements and therefore having the potential for other forms of development.

**P06/5005 – INITIATION OF AMENDMENT NO. 50 TO COMMUNITY PLANNING SCHEME NO. 5 BY REZONING WESTERN PORTION OF LOT 4049 ON CERTIFICATE OF TITLE 1942/7 (22) WINDELYA ROAD, MURDOCH FROM “REGIONAL RESERVATION – PUBLIC PURPOSES (UNIVERSITY)” TO “LIVING AREAS PRECINCT – M4 MURDOCH” WITH RESIDENTIAL DENSITY CODINGS OF “R40” AND “R60”, AND DESIGNATING NORM GODFREY RESERVE (NO. 44586) AS “LOCAL OPEN SPACE” (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

Subsequently, the Minister for Planning and Infrastructure advised that the existing residential development should be given a suitable zoning under the MRS and local scheme. Recently, the WAPC embarked on Metropolitan Region Scheme Proposed Amendment No. 1110/33A – South West Districts Omnibus (No. 7), the MRS amendment was advertised between April and June this year seeking public comment.

The Omnibus amendment proposes to rezone the subject land from “Regional Reservation – Public Purposes (University)” to “Urban” zone. Consequently, the current proposed Amendment No. 50 will complement the MRS.

#### **PROPOSAL**

The proposal seeks to rezone the western portion of Lot 4049 on Certificate of Title 1942/7 (22) Windelya Road, Murdoch from “Regional Reservation – Public Purposes (University)” to “Living Areas Precinct – M4 Murdoch” with residential density codings of “R40” and “R60”, and designate Norm Godfrey Reserve (No. 44586) as “Local Open Space”

#### **COMMENT**

The majority of the land the subject of this proposal is already developed for residential purposes be it aged care or student accommodation. The balance of the subject land reflects the area identified on the University Development Strategy for future expansion of those uses, and the MRS Amendment proposal.

Surrounding development to the west and north of the University is typically low density residential development. The Community to the north backs onto South Street and looks away from the Campus. Development on the western side of Windelya Road on the other hand are slightly raised above the subject land and enjoy views across the site towards the University playing fields and Beeliar Regional Park beyond. This community was particularly vocal during the Campus Development Strategy with respect to traffic volumes and potential impacts from future development on local amenity.



**P06/5005 – INITIATION OF AMENDMENT NO. 50 TO COMMUNITY PLANNING SCHEME NO. 5 BY REZONING WESTERN PORTION OF LOT 4049 ON CERTIFICATE OF TITLE 1942/7 (22) WINDELYA ROAD, MURDOCH FROM “REGIONAL RESERVATION – PUBLIC PURPOSES (UNIVERSITY)” TO “LIVING AREAS PRECINCT – M4 MURDOCH” WITH RESIDENTIAL DENSITY CODINGS OF “R40” AND “R60”, AND DESIGNATING NORM GODFREY RESERVE (NO. 44586) AS “LOCAL OPEN SPACE” (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

To the south of the site are North Lake and the beginning of the Beeliar Regional Park, whilst to the east, the closest existing University operations are the student village and playing fields.

The residential density codings proposed for the area reflect the ultimate form of development proposed for the St Ives Retirement Village. An “R60” coding is proposed over:

- I the approved multi-storey serviced apartment building;
- II the nursing home recently considered by the City which is currently awaiting on the decision of the Western Australian Planning Commission;
- III the north-east corner of the site, where development of further multi-storey apartments form part of an urban gateway element either side of the planned new entry off South Street in the western portion of the campus.

An “R40” density coding is proposed over the balance of the property, which will in effect allow the University to develop the balance of the site for aged care grouped housing at a similar density to the majority of the village that currently exists. This form of development will also act as a transition between the existing low density residential community of Kardinya, and the increasingly urbanised core educational operations of the University.

The development requirements proposed for the “M4-Murdoch” precinct includes a six (6) storey height limitation for the R60 coded land, whilst two (2) storeys are specified for the transitional R40 coded development.

The basis for the proposed height limitations stem from a desire to minimize potential impacts on the views and general amenity of nearby residential communities, whilst allowing the University sufficient flexibility to explore opportunities to maximize development potential back within the middle of the campus where there is no resident community to impact upon.

**P06/5005 – INITIATION OF AMENDMENT NO. 50 TO COMMUNITY PLANNING SCHEME NO. 5 BY REZONING WESTERN PORTION OF LOT 4049 ON CERTIFICATE OF TITLE 1942/7 (22) WINDELYA ROAD, MURDOCH FROM “REGIONAL RESERVATION – PUBLIC PURPOSES (UNIVERSITY)” TO “LIVING AREAS PRECINCT – M4 MURDOCH” WITH RESIDENTIAL DENSITY CODINGS OF “R40” AND “R60”, AND DESIGNATING NORM GODFREY RESERVE (NO. 44586) AS “LOCAL OPEN SPACE” (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

## **CONCLUSION**

It is recommended that the City of Melville supports the proposal to amend Community Planning Scheme No. 5 by:

- (a) rezoning the western portion of Lot 4049 on Certificate of Title 1942/7 (22) Windelya Road, Murdoch from “Regional Reservation – Public Purposes (University)” to “Living Areas Precinct – M4 Murdoch” with residential density codings of “R40” and “R60”,
- (b) designating Norm Godfrey Reserve (No. 44586) as “Local Open Space”
- (c) inserting “M4-Murdoch” as a Living Area Precinct of the Scheme with the following wording:

### **“M4 – MURDOCH**

#### **Statement of Intent**

Primarily aged persons residential, including grouped and multiple dwellings accommodating independent and assisted living facilities (eg. Nursing Home), but may also include incidental non-residential uses such as home occupations, corner shops, parks, religious, recreational and educational activities, provided they are designed in a residential style and are not developed to such an intensity that they disturb the Precinct. All non-residential uses shall be advertised in accordance with Clause 7.5 provided that home occupation shall be determined in accordance with Clause 5.6.

#### **Development Requirements**

R Code	R40 & R60, in accordance with Clauses 5.1 and 5.2
Minimum Lot Area	As per R Codes
Maximum Plot Ratio (non residential)	0.4
Minimum Front Setback	As per R Codes
Minimum Side and Rear Setbacks	As per R Codes and subject to Clause 5.7

**P06/5005 – INITIATION OF AMENDMENT NO. 50 TO COMMUNITY PLANNING SCHEME NO. 5 BY REZONING WESTERN PORTION OF LOT 4049 ON CERTIFICATE OF TITLE 1942/7 (22) WINDELYA ROAD, MURDOCH FROM “REGIONAL RESERVATION – PUBLIC PURPOSES (UNIVERSITY)” TO “LIVING AREAS PRECINCT – M4 MURDOCH” WITH RESIDENTIAL DENSITY CODINGS OF “R40” AND “R60”, AND DESIGNATING NORM GODFREY RESERVE (NO. 44586) AS “LOCAL OPEN SPACE” (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

Minimum Landscaping (non residential)	33.3% of the site area and in accordance with Clause 5.9
Maximum Building height	
- R40 Coded Land	8 metres to eaves, 10.5 metres maximum, having regard to Council Policy.
- R60 Coded Land	20 metres to eaves, 22.5 metres maximum, having regard to Council Policy.
Minimum Car Parking	
- Residential	As per R-Codes
- Non-Residential	One bay per 10 square metres gross leasable area in accordance with Clause 5.8 and having regard to Council Policy.
Advertising Control	Flashing, animated, tower and roof signs are prohibited. At the discretion of Council, one non-illuminated sign per lot may be permitted to indicate business operations, goods sold on premises and/or name of the property, building, owner or occupier, not exceeding 1.0 square metre in area and in accordance with Clause 5.10. No other signs are permitted unless approved subject to advertising in accordance with Clause 7.5.”

**RESOLUTION (5005)****APPROVAL**

Cr H R Everett moved, seconded Cr D J Macphail -

**1. THAT PURSUANT TO SECTION 7 OF THE TOWN PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ACT 1928 (AS AMENDED) THE CITY OF MELVILLE COMMUNITY PLANNING SCHEME NO.5 BE AMENDED AS DETAILED BELOW:**

**A) AMEND THE SCHEME MAP BY:**

- (I) REZONING THE WESTERN PORTION OF LOT 4049 ON CERTIFICATE OF TITLE 1942/7 (22) WINDELYA ROAD, MURDOCH FROM “REGIONAL RESERVATION – PUBLIC PURPOSES (UNIVERSITY)” TO “LIVING AREAS PRECINCT” AND CREATE AN ADDITIONAL “M4 - MURDOCH” PRECINCT WITH RESIDENTIAL DENSITY CODINGS OF “R40” AND “R60” AS FOLLOW:**

**P06/5005 – INITIATION OF AMENDMENT NO. 50 TO COMMUNITY PLANNING SCHEME NO. 5 BY REZONING WESTERN PORTION OF LOT 4049 ON CERTIFICATE OF TITLE 1942/7 (22) WINDELYA ROAD, MURDOCH FROM “REGIONAL RESERVATION – PUBLIC PURPOSES (UNIVERSITY)” TO “LIVING AREAS PRECINCT – M4 MURDOCH” WITH RESIDENTIAL DENSITY CODINGS OF “R40” AND “R60”, AND DESIGNATING NORM GODFREY RESERVE (NO. 44586) AS “LOCAL OPEN SPACE” (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

**“M4 – MURDOCH**

**STATEMENT OF INTENT**

**PRIMARILY AGED PERSONS RESIDENTIAL, INCLUDING GROUPED AND MULTIPLE DWELLINGS ACCOMMODATING INDEPENDENT AND ASSISTED LIVING FACILITIES (EG. NURSING HOME), BUT MAY ALSO INCLUDE INCIDENTAL NON-RESIDENTIAL USES SUCH AS HOME OCCUPATIONS, CORNER SHOPS, PARKS, RELIGIOUS, RECREATIONAL AND EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES, PROVIDED THEY ARE DESIGNED IN A RESIDENTIAL STYLE AND ARE NOT DEVELOPED TO SUCH AN INTENSITY THAT THEY DISTURB THE PRECINCT. ALL NON-RESIDENTIAL USES SHALL BE ADVERTISED IN ACCORDANCE WITH CLAUSE 7.5 PROVIDED THAT HOME OCCUPATION SHALL BE DETERMINED IN ACCORDANCE WITH CLAUSE 5.6.**

**DEVELOPMENT REQUIREMENTS**

**R CODE R40 & R60, IN ACCORDANCE WITH CLAUSES 5.1 AND 5.2**

**MINIMUM LOT AREA AS PER R CODES**

**MAXIMUM PLOT RATIO (NON RESIDENTIAL) 0.4**

**MINIMUM FRONT SETBACK AS PER R CODES**

**MINIMUM SIDE AND REAR SETBACKS AS PER R CODES AND SUBJECT TO CLAUSE 5.7**

**MINIMUM LANDSCAPING 33.3% OF THE SITE AREA AND IN ACCORDANCE (NON RESIDENTIAL) WITH CLAUSE 5.9**

**MAXIMUM BUILDING HEIGHT**

**- R40 CODED LAND 8 METRES TO EAVES, 10.5 METRES MAXIMUM, HAVING REGARD TO COUNCIL POLICY.**

**P06/5005 – INITIATION OF AMENDMENT NO. 50 TO COMMUNITY PLANNING SCHEME NO. 5 BY REZONING WESTERN PORTION OF LOT 4049 ON CERTIFICATE OF TITLE 1942/7 (22) WINDELYA ROAD, MURDOCH FROM “REGIONAL RESERVATION – PUBLIC PURPOSES (UNIVERSITY)” TO “LIVING AREAS PRECINCT – M4 MURDOCH” WITH RESIDENTIAL DENSITY CODINGS OF “R40” AND “R60”, AND DESIGNATING NORM GODFREY RESERVE (NO. 44586) AS “LOCAL OPEN SPACE” (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

**- R60 CODED LAND 20 METRES TO EAVES, 22.5 METRES MAXIMUM, HAVING REGARD TO COUNCIL POLICY.**

**MINIMUM CAR PARKING**

**- RESIDENTIAL AS PER R-CODES**

**- NON-RESIDENTIAL**

**ONE BAY PER 10 SQUARE METRES GROSS LEASABLE AREA IN ACCORDANCE WITH CLAUSE 5.8 AND HAVING REGARD TO COUNCIL POLICY.**

**ADVERTISING CONTROL FLASHING, ANIMATED, TOWER AND ROOF SIGNS ARE PROHIBITED. AT THE DISCRETION OF COUNCIL, ONE NON-ILLUMINATED SIGN PER LOT MAY BE PERMITTED TO INDICATE BUSINESS OPERATIONS, GOODS SOLD ON PREMISES AND/OR NAME OF THE PROPERTY, BUILDING, OWNER OR OCCUPIER, NOT EXCEEDING 1.0 SQUARE METRE IN AREA AND IN ACCORDANCE WITH CLAUSE 5.10. NO OTHER SIGNS ARE PERMITTED UNLESS APPROVED SUBJECT TO ADVERTISING IN ACCORDANCE WITH CLAUSE 7.5.”**

**(II) DESIGNATING NORM GODFREY RESERVE (NO. 44586) AS “LOCAL OPEN SPACE”**

**2. THAT HER WORSHIP THE MAYOR AND THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER BE AUTHORISED TO ENDORSE THE AMENDMENT DOCUMENTATION.**

**3. THAT THE CITY OF MELVILLE FORWARDS A COPY OF THE AMENDMENT DOCUMENTATION TO:**

**A) THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AUTHORITY IN ACCORDANCE WITH SECTION 7A(1) OF THE ACT;**

**B) THE WESTERN AUSTRALIAN PLANNING COMMISSION FOR INFORMATION.**

**P06/5005 – INITIATION OF AMENDMENT NO. 50 TO COMMUNITY PLANNING SCHEME NO. 5 BY REZONING WESTERN PORTION OF LOT 4049 ON CERTIFICATE OF TITLE 1942/7 (22) WINDELYA ROAD, MURDOCH FROM “REGIONAL RESERVATION – PUBLIC PURPOSES (UNIVERSITY)” TO “LIVING AREAS PRECINCT – M4 MURDOCH” WITH RESIDENTIAL DENSITY CODINGS OF “R40” AND “R60”, AND DESIGNATING NORM GODFREY RESERVE (NO. 44586) AS “LOCAL OPEN SPACE” (REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

- 4. THAT ON RECEIPT OF ADVICE FROM THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AUTHORITY UNDER SECTION 48A OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION ACT INDICATING THAT THE AMENDMENT NEED NOT BE SUBJECT TO AN ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT, THE AMENDMENT BE ADVERTISED IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE TOWN PLANNING REGULATIONS FOR NOT LESS THAN FORTY-TWO (42) DAYS.**

The Mayor submitted the motion, which was declared

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

**P06/8008 – CANNING BRIDGE PRECINCT PARKING (AMREC)**

Ward	:	Applecross/Mt Pleasant
Category	:	Operational
Subject Index	:	Parking Control & Schemes – 4.15
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	:	Nil
Works Programme	:	2006/2007
Funding	:	Parking Facilities Reserve
Responsible Officer	:	Malcolm Jenkinson Manager Neighbourhood Amenity

**SUMMARY**

This report presents an interim response to the perceived shortage of all day parking opportunities within the Canning Bridge precinct. A strategic review of Canning Bridge, including parking considerations, is imminent and a comprehensive report that will include recommendations for permanent all day parking solutions will be presented in due course.

**BACKGROUND**

Paid parking was implemented within various areas of the Canning Bridge precinct following community feedback on the unavailability of short stay car bays due to all day parking occurring **in the then existing two (2) hour on street parking bays.**

The introduction of paid on street parking restrictions has resulted in precinct parking spilling into the adjoining residential streets, as workers attempt to avoid the costs or inconvenience of feeding the meters or moving their vehicles after the time limits expire. This has generated complaints from affected residents as well as businesses whose staff are parking in the residential streets.

This type of spill of vehicles spreading into adjoining residential streets is common with all metropolitan local authorities, and it must be managed well in order to protect the amenity of City of Melville residents. The challenge where commercial and residential elements are closely located is that a key driver of sustainability is having vibrant commercial precincts that provide employment opportunities to residents within the City of Melville.

Parking restrictions are already in place to manage the spill, but the provision of longer term parking bays is now the subject of this report. The aim for the City of Melville is to strike a balance of protecting residents amenity with ensuring economic development is not stymied by a lack of parking opportunities for employer's staff and clients.

**P06/8008 – CANNING BRIDGE PRECINCT PARKING (AMREC)**

In order to achieve this balance the City of Melville is developing a long term Precinct Plan that addresses areas such as;

- Parking;
- Transport;
- Urban Design;
- Community Facilities;
- Landscaping;
- Entrance Statements;
- Rationalisation of Council Land Holdings;
- Transit Orientated Development;
- Network City.

The Precinct Plan is expected to consider matters such as the implications of the future Canning Bridge Interchange Station and the design and composition for the new community facility of the Canning Bridge Library/Tivoli site.

The City of Melville has a number of landholdings with the Canning Bridge precinct, several of these properties are located within the commercial precinct and maybe suitable to address the lack of all day parking within the precinct whilst this study takes place.

**DETAIL**

This report seeks to address the issues of all day parking within the precinct and is detailed below under the four areas within the precinct that can assist during this interim period.

**29 Moreau Mews, Applecross**

This portion of freehold land was the site of the Melville City Playgroup Inc. In 2001 the group was relocated to the refurbished facilities at Heathcote and the site at Moreau Mews was subsequently demolished.

The site has remained vacant until now. When the Precinct Plan is concluded a determination of what is seen as the best use for the site will be made.

29 Moreau Mews is a significant landholding of the City of Melville and any future planning for the site needs to be carefully considered. Whilst the long term planning for the site has not been determined there is an opportunity to utilise the site to assist in any all day parking shortages within the precinct.

The City of Melville has a number of options for this site including the temporary conversion into a public car parking station, the lease to a private enterprise to be developed at their cost to our specifications or a lease to a private enterprise on an 'as is ' condition basis.



**P06/8008 – CANNING BRIDGE PRECINCT PARKING (AMREC)**

Detailed below is a summary of the estimated costs of construction and revenue for the site;

	Public Car park	Lease to Private Enterprise (to plan)	Lease to Private Enterprise (as is)
Construction Costs incurred by the City of Melville	-\$95,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Maintenance Costs incurred by the City of Melville over three years	-\$25,000.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
Estimated Revenue (Over 3 Years)	\$208,800.00	\$60,000.00	\$70,000.00
Net Return	\$88,800.00	\$60,000.00	\$70,000.00

# based on 70% occupancy, 34 bays, 52 weeks, 5 days per week, 9 hours (inc lunch) per day @ \$1.25 per hour.

Whilst the gain of an additional twenty-eight thousand dollars (\$28,800) might seem significant, establishing a City of Melville parking station does carry a risk related to perception. Casual and regular users of the station will become accustomed to it which may raise political pressure if the car park is later replaced by different parking options after the study is completed.

If a decision were taken to lease to a private entity the City of Melville would undertake a tender of the site on an 'as is' basis. The tender would incorporate a number of issues to address any antisocial behaviour and ensure that the only permitted use within the site is that of car parking.

The tender process would take an estimated eight (8) week process and would include a sign on site and public advertising to ensure appropriate marketing of the site. It will then be up to the successful tenderer to determine what limited improvements will be undertaken on the site and how the parking of their vehicles is managed.

An estimated thirty-six (36) bays would become available if either the City of Melville or the Private Enterprise were to construct the parking station, however these costs may be wasted if the City were to go ahead and develop or co-develop the site.

**Lot 15 Canning Beach Road, Applecross**

Lot 15 Canning Beach Road Applecross was acquired as part of the Raffles Development and is located adjacent to the Canning Bridge Library and Tivoli Theatre. The site is limited at present due to its triangular shape. Designs are well advanced to amalgamate this lot with the existing Library / Tivoli car park to increase its effective space utilisation.

The future intention for the site is for a complete redevelopment, including the Library and Theatre site however any development over the site is not intended to commence for a further two to three years. The future redevelopment is expected to provide a further increase in parking bays.

**P06/8008 – CANNING BRIDGE PRECINCT PARKING (AMREC)**

The City of Melville has a number of options to consider for this site in the interim period;

	Lease Lot 15 to Private Enterprise (as is)	Parking Station developed over both lots
Construction Costs incurred by the City of Melville	\$0.00	-\$80,000.00
Maintenance Costs incurred by the City of Melville over three years	\$0.00	-\$15,000.00
Estimated Revenue (Over 3 Years)	\$60,000.00	\$245,700.00#
Net Return	\$60,000.00	\$150,700.00

# based on 70% occupancy, 40 bays, 52 weeks, 5 days per week, 9 hours per day (incl. lunchtimes) @ \$1.25 per hour. 40 bays is 2/3rds of the estimated total number of bays being developed.

Officers support the amalgamation of the two (2) car parks into one (1) parking station. The new car park would include car parking for staff of the Library and a sufficient number of bays for free parking by Library users and community group members subject to a time limit, as agreed with the Director of Strategic Community Development.

This site is well utilised on weekends by library users, the theatre group and users of the Canning River. Any lease to a private enterprise may prevent the use by the public and therefore put additional pressure on parking in the area.

“Raffles” Public Parking Station

The Raffles Public Parking Station has a current approval for one hundred and two (102) bays for use by the public and more particularly patrons of the commercial enterprises within the development and visitors to the residential elements. The hourly rate has previously been set to discourage long term parking, leaving it available for the anticipated business and residential requirements of the Raffles development. The hourly rate is two dollars (\$2) per hour for the first three (3) hours, three dollars (\$3) per hour thereafter to a maximum of eighteen dollars (\$18) in any one day.

The City of Melville is not in a position to lease any car bays within the development over the long term as the car parking has been allocated to the commercial uses in the heritage building. Any short term leasing could only be considered up to the point the commercial operations commence at Raffles which is programmed for December 2006.

**P06/8008 – CANNING BRIDGE PRECINCT PARKING (AMREC)**

Until the commercial operations begin at the Raffles, there is an opportunity to make some bays available to the public for short and all day parking until December 2006. For this interim period, it will be recommended that the fee 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.

Although the period of availability is short it will assist in alleviating any concerns during the tender or development processes at both Moreau Mews & Lot 15 Canning Beach Road. Any such arrangements would need to be concluded prior to a certificate of occupancy being issued to the commercial development at the Raffles site.

**First Avenue All Day Parking**

Immediate changes have occurred along First Avenue to convert two (2) hour parking to all day parking along the street. The evidence from the first weeks of the paid on street parking scheme is that this is the least used road on the north side of Canning Highway. These changes have resulted in an additional twelve (12) bays being available for all day parking.

Residents within First Avenue will be offered all day permits to include First Ave, Forbes Road & Kishorn Road.

**POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

There is no Council Policy that relates to this item.

**PUBLIC CONSULTATION/COMMUNICATION**

The developments outlined in this report either do not require public consultation, as they relate to existing parking developments, or they would be subject to the normal public comment periods that exist if a tender were to be called for any private leasing.

**STATUTORY AND LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

Nil

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

Estimated construction costs for the two (2) carparks will be one hundred and seventy-five thousand dollars (\$175,000). An amount of two hundred and eighty thousand dollars (\$280,000) is available within the Trust Fund – Cash in-lieu - of Carparking being the contribution by Multiplex for their carparking shortfall of eight (8) bays for the Raffles Development.

**P06/8008 – CANNING BRIDGE PRECINCT PARKING (AMREC)****STRATEGIC & RISK IMPLICATIONS**

Current risk relating to unauthorised parking at 29 Moreau Mews is being managed by way of securing the site to prevent vehicular access by unauthorised vehicles.

No significant risks exist for a properly constructed and managed car park. This proposal is also part of an overall approach to establishing an ongoing strategic approach to the management of carparking in the Canning Bridge precinct.

**COMMENT**

The City's TravelSmart Officer has begun working with the community in the Canning Bridge precinct to identify opportunities that reduce demand for car dependent transport options in favour of walking, cycling and public transport where favourable. Particular attention is being given to the larger organisations that currently require large numbers of parking spaces and these are the organisations that can benefit the most.

These TravelSmart initiatives will complement the Councils existing actions to ensure the most efficient use of the available parking and transport infrastructure.

The recommendations contained within this report provide over one hundred and eighty (180) car bays for all day parking within the precinct. These outcomes will have a positive impact on the accessibility of bays within the precinct for workers and clients and will reduce the disruption on employer's with staff having to make routine visits to parking stations to revalidate their tickets.

It must be noted that regardless of the number of parking stations provided within the Precinct there will always be an element of society that will look to avoid paying for parking. There is already a dedicated Ranger presence in the area managing the on street parking, and the provision of off street all day parking has always been anticipated as part of that deployment.

**P06/8008 – CANNING BRIDGE PRECINCT PARKING (AMREC)**

**Officer Recommendation**

Cr D J Macphai Moved, seconded Cr M J Barton -

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 until December 2006 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 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 offstreet carparking 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 carparking trust fund balance.

Amendment 1

Cr J Phillips moved, seconded Cr H R Everett -

***That condition three (3) be amended to read as follows:***

3. ***That by Absolute Majority Decision of the Council the fee structure at the Raffles carparking 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.***

The Mayor submitted the motion, which was declared

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

**P06/8008 – CANNING BRIDGE PRECINCT PARKING (AMREC)**

**RESOLUTION (5021)**

The Mayor submitted the substantive motion, being -

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 CARPARKING 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 OFFSTREET CARPARKING 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 CARPARKING TRUST FUND BALANCE.**

Which was declared **CARRIED WITHOUT DISSENT (12/0)**

**T06/1021 – INTERSECTION OF RISELEY STREET/KEARNS CRESCENT, ARDROSS  
(REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

Ward	:	Applecross/Mt Pleasant
Category	:	Operational
Subject Index	:	BlackSpots
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	:	T05/1021
Works Programme	:	Proposed 2007/2008
Funding	:	2007/2008 Budget
Responsible Officer	:	Phil Gale Manager Infrastructure Service

**SUMMARY**

A traffic consultant was engaged to evaluate a number of intersection treatments to address the crash history of the intersection and facilitate easier pedestrian crossing of Riseley Street. The installation of traffic signals has been recommended as the preferred solution.

**BACKGROUND**

This issue was first addressed in August 2005 with a report to the Council regarding funding for various Blackspot locations within the City of Melville.

The recommended course of action for this location was to close the median to prevent right turn movements and thus the prevalence of turning movement crashes at this intersection.

The concept of closing the median was not well received with the final adopted recommendation being;

***“That Riseley Street/Kearns Crescent, Ardross - extend median through intersection proposal be recommitted for further consideration and possible redesign options, including consultation with local businesses.”***

The intervening period has now seen a report prepared by the traffic consultant, Traffic and Transport Solutions, which recommends the installation of traffic lights for this intersection

[1021 August 2006.pdf](#) A copy of the report from Traffic and Transport Solutions forms part of the Attachments to the Agenda, which was distributed to the Members of the Council on Wednesday, 9 August 2006.

**T06/1021 – INTERSECTION OF RISELEY STREET/KEARNS CRESCENT, ARDROSS  
(REC) (ATTACHMENT)****DETAIL**

For Local Authority Intersections in Melville, this intersection is sixteenth (16<sup>th</sup>) on the national programme list with six (6) casualty crashes and twelfth (12<sup>th</sup>) on the State Programme list with twenty-seven (27) crashes. This intersection has a history of fifteen (15) right-angle and right turn through crashes.

The high volume of traffic on Riseley Street and the proximity of this intersection to Canning Highway would be contributing factors to crashes at this site because of the limited gaps in traffic for vehicles to turn through and the frequent queues of traffic extending through this intersection.

The anticipated cost of this project is two hundred and forty thousand dollars (\$240,000) and has been costed to include:

- Installation of traffic signals at the intersection;
- Upgrade of the pedestrian facilities through the intersection.

The benefit-cost ratio for this project is two point four five (2.45). It is anticipated that this treatment will assist in addressing the crash history that has more than five (5) casualty crashes.

**POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

There are no policy implications with this item.

**PUBLIC CONSULTATION/COMMUNICATION**

Prior to any public consultation there needs to be an agreement with Main Roads Western Australia that they will approve the traffic signals option.

Preliminary discussions have been held with officers of Main Roads Western Australia and they are sceptical that the lights can be satisfactorily synchronised with the lights at Canning Highway.

The appropriate course of action is to submit the proposal to Main Roads Western Australia, gain approval and then consult with the business community within the precinct.



**T06/1021 – INTERSECTION OF RISELEY STREET/KEARNS CRESCENT, ARDROSS  
(REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

**STATUTORY AND LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

The Black Spot Program objective to reduce the social and economic costs of road trauma by improving road safety, relates directly to the following section of our Corporate Strategic Plan - Our City, Our Future (2005):

*Vision Two: Community Environment*

*Strategic Objective: Urban Safety*

*Deployment Objective: Road Management*

*Develop and implement a road management strategy that ensures a high level of safety on roads in the City of Melville.*

This relationship is defined in greater detail in the Road Safety Action Plan of the Design Services Business Plan that includes actions to:

- Submit funding proposals to Black Spot, Metropolitan Regional Road Group, and Perth Bicycle Network Programmes.
- Demonstrate a reduction in the total cost of crashes at Black Spot locations from 1999/2000 year.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

The amount of two hundred and forty thousand dollars (\$240,000) for the project will be on the basis of two thirds/one third contribution if approved. The City of Melville would need to contribute eighty thousand dollars (\$80,000) to this project. Funding for Blackspot projects is incorporated in the 2007/08 Capital Works Programme.

**STRATEGIC & RISK IMPLICATIONS**

This matter, by its very nature, is addressing risk issues for the community using our transport and road networks. The area has been identified through a specific programme (Blackspot) as requiring some form of intervention. This is an attempt to reduce the risk in this area.

**T06/1021 – INTERSECTION OF RISELEY STREET/KEARNS CRESCENT, ARDROSS  
(REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

**COMMENT**

There is some way to go with this project; a significant hurdle will be seeking the appropriate approvals from Main Roads Western Australia for the installation of the signals. The coordination of the traffic signals with the Canning Highway intersection is of significant concern to Main Roads Western Australia. The Traffic Consultant that we have engaged has expressed his opinion that the coordination of the systems can be accommodated with some consideration to be given to levels of service to the Kearns Crescent intersection.

One significant benefit with the installation of signals at this location is the ability to improve the pedestrian movements across Riseley Street and throughout the shopping precinct.

It is also very important that the local community be engaged in the development of solutions for this intersection to obtain the most appropriate outcomes for all stakeholders.

**Officer Recommendation**

Cr C W Robartson moved, seconded Cr D J Macphail

**That subject to Main Roads WA approval, traffic signals at the intersection of Kearns Crescent and Riseley Street, Ardross be installed.**

Amendment 1

Cr J Phillips moved, seconded Cr H R Everett

***That the Officer recommendation be amended to read as follows:***

***That subject to Main Roads WA and Public Consultation, traffic signals at the intersection of Kearns Crescent and Riseley Street, Ardross be installed.***

The Mayor submitted the motion, which was declared

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

\*\* At 7.27pm the Manager Planning & Development Services departed the Meeting.

**T06/1021 – INTERSECTION OF RISELEY STREET/KEARNS CRESCENT, ARDROSS  
(REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

Amendment 2

Cr C W Robartson moved, seconded Cr P M Phelan –

**That the Officer Recommendation be amended to read as follows:**

**The word *installed* be removed and the words *be considered as an option for the improvement of road safety at this intersection* be included.**

The Mayor submitted the motion, which was declared

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

**RESOLUTION (1021)**

**APPROVAL**

The Mayor submitted the substantive motion, being -

**THAT SUBJECT TO MAIN ROADS WA AND PUBLIC CONSULTATION, TRAFFIC SIGNALS AT THE INTERSECTION OF KEARNS CRESCENT AND RISELEY STREET, ARDROSS BE CONSIDERED AS AN OPTION FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF ROAD SAFETY AT THIS INTERSECTION.**

Which was declared **CARRIED WITHOUT DISSENT (12/0)**

**C06/8006 - CARAWATHA PRIMARY SCHOOL – USE OF BUILDINGS (REC)  
(ATTACHMENT)**

Ward	:	All
Category	:	Strategic
Subject Index	:	Carawatha
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	:	C04/7001 – Proposal to locate Coastal Business Centre at the former Carawatha Primary School C05/7000 – Melville & Carawatha Primary Schools – Acquisition Ordinary Meeting of Council – 21 March 2006 – Reports of the Chief Executive Officer – 12.2 – Melville & Carawatha Primary Schools - Acquisition
Works Programme	:	Not Applicable
Funding	:	
Responsible Officer	:	Anne McAllister Director Strategic Community Development

**SUMMARY**

The purpose of this report is to obtain Council support for a two-staged approach to the future use and development of the Carawatha Primary School site.

**BACKGROUND**

In August 2004 Council resolved that subject to the successful purchase of the Carawatha Primary School, the Coastal Business Centre and its incubator activities could occupy the site. The Chief Executive Officer was given delegated authority to negotiate the lease and formal arrangements.

In April 2005 Council resolved to purchase the Melville and Carawatha Primary School sites, however due to delays in negotiations regarding the sale, purchase was not affected until June 2006.

In the time between resolving to purchase the site and actual purchase, an expression of interest process was conducted in order to determine other possible uses for the buildings. This resulted in the receipt of five (5) expressions of interest being received.

Since being appointed, the Chief Executive Officer has expressed a desire to adopt a 'place-based' planning approach to new development opportunities. This has provided a broader strategic context for decision-making about the Carawatha site, albeit one that will take longer than originally anticipated for the resolution of use for the buildings and surrounding land.

**C06/8006 - CARAWATHA PRIMARY SCHOOL – USE OF BUILDINGS (REC)  
(ATTACHMENT)****DETAIL**

A chronology of actions commencing in 2003 following the Education Departments decision to divest itself of the Melville and Carawatha Primary Schools is useful for understanding the history of this project and informing future decisions.

Dec 2003	Public Forum (150 attendees)
Nov 2003 – Jan 2004	Community survey (630 responses)
May 2004	‘Imagine Willagee’ community meeting (8 residents)
July 2004	Business Plan for major land transaction advertised and submissions invited. Plan incorporated provision for a small business incubator and other community purposes.
August 2004	Council resolved to approve the occupation of the Carawatha Primary School by the Coastal Business Centre and its incubator activities subject to negotiations for the purchase of the site. DA to CEO to progress lease terms and financial arrangements.  Coastal Business Centre Inc advised in writing of Council decision.
Dec 2004	Workshop of Council to present the outcomes of consultations to date. Conclusions that public opinion supports purchase of POS at Melville and Willagee to reduce shortfall (1.64 hectares in Willagee) and provide community and health services and protect remnant vegetation. Potential uses included business incubator, Citizens Relief Fund, playgroup re-location from Weld Street, retention of covered areas and bitumen courts and some playground equipment, and provision for aged accommodation and health care facilities.
April 2005	Council resolves to conclude negotiations for purchase of Melville and Carawatha Primary Schools. Report indicated public open space development costs for Carawatha of five hundred thousand dollars (\$500,000) with an annual maintenance cost of fifty thousand dollars (\$50,000).
Aug – Oct 05	Expression of interest called from those organisations who had already informally registered an interest. Five (5) responses received – Coastal Business Centre Inc, Melville-Cockburn Chamber of Commerce, City of Melville Citizens Relief Fund Inc, Blue Gum Montessori School and Glowe Communication (International/Chinese School).
Oct 2005	Evaluation of EOI completed.

**C06/8006 - CARAWATHA PRIMARY SCHOOL – USE OF BUILDINGS (REC)  
(ATTACHMENT)**

October 2005	Respondents to EOI advised that recommendations would be going to Council in December. Recommendations not specified.
January 2006	Respondents to EOI advised that due to difficulties with the purchase of the site, a decision would be delayed until at least February.
March 2006	Council resolves to conclude negotiations for purchase of Melville and Carawatha Primary Schools based on new prices.
May 2006	Director Community Services designated project leader for the Carawatha site adopting a more holistic place-based approach to the future of the Carawatha site.

The land was purchased by the City of Melville in May 2006.

Re-zoning is in progress to change the site from Public Purposes – Primary School to Public Open Space including some community Centre purposes with a residential density of R40. This re-zoning allows for a business incubator and provide flexibility for other complimentary land uses to be established.

Plans for the use and development of the public open space which need to be developed and a minimal care and maintenance approach to the site is in place as an interim strategy. Anecdotal feedback indicates that the site is quickly degrading and it is highly desirable that some occupation of the site occurs as soon as possible.

**POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

Policy No: 04-003 Rentals/Leases/Management Licenses relates Community Use of Council Buildings and would provide guidance in any leasing arrangements.

**PUBLIC CONSULTATION/COMMUNICATION**

Between December 2003 and January 2004 community consultation was undertaken in relation to the purchase of the Carawatha and Melville Primary School sites. These consultations took the form of a public forum (one hundred and fifty [150] attendees) and a community survey (six hundred and thirty [630] responses). The outcomes of these consultations were presented informally to a workshop of Council in December 2004. It was reported that public opinion strongly supported the purchase of public open space on the two (2) sites to reduce shortfall (one point six four (1.64) hectares in Willagee) to provide other complimentary community and health services, and to protect remnant vegetation. Potential uses included a business incubator, City of Melville Citizen's Relief Fund, playgroup, retention of covered areas and bitumen courts and some playground equipment, and provision for aged accommodation and health care facilities.

**C06/8006 - CARAWATHA PRIMARY SCHOOL – USE OF BUILDINGS (REC)  
(ATTACHMENT)**

Between August and October 2005 expressions of interest were called from those organisations who had already formally registered an interest in the site once it was clear that Council was intending to purchase the site. Five (5) responses were received:

- Coastal Business Centre Inc.
- Melville-Cockburn Chamber of Commerce
- City of Melville Citizens' Relief Fund Inc
- Blue Gum Montessori School
- Glowe Communications for International/Chinese School

The development of a Place Plan for this area will require further community consultation in order to determine specific community outcomes.

**STATUTORY AND LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

Nil.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

A nominal budget allocation of five hundred thousand dollars (\$500,000) has been included in the current 2006-2007 budget for both Carawatha and Melville Primary Schools.

This report recommends 'in principle' support for the use of the buildings pending further consideration of a fully costed business plan.

**STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS**

The Carawatha site presents a unique opportunity to consider the broader community needs and expectations of the residents of Willagee which could have a significant positive impact on community wellbeing in the surrounding area, in particular, the possible development of the underutilised Southern Districts Seniors Citizens Club opposite the site.

The potential revitalisation of the strip shopping opposite the Carawatha site should also be considered within the broader context of the precinct and its connectivity to the Willagee Shopping Centre and Community Centre/Library to the west along Archibald Street.

Significant funding is possible through the Federal Government's Regional Partnerships Program. To achieve this, the City needs to adopt a partnership approach with other stakeholders focussing on local/regional economic development benefits with demonstrable wider community outcomes.

**C06/8006 - CARAWATHA PRIMARY SCHOOL – USE OF BUILDINGS (REC)  
(ATTACHMENT)**

In accordance with the Chief Executive Officer's desire to undertake integrated 'place-based' planning, it is recommended that a broader strategic approach should be taken for the whole site within the broader community context. However, it is acknowledged that this is a longer term solution and should not preclude any short-medium term decisions about immediate community use of the buildings in line with decisions already made by Council in order to preserve this community asset.

Development of the site around local and regional economic development addresses an identified strategic gap in the City's Strategic Plan.

**COMMENT**

Council has several decisions to make in relation to the Carawatha site:

1. Short term preservation of the building asset taking into account previous commitments to potential lessees, including immediate integration into the surrounding streetscape;
2. Long term use of the site within the broader socio-economic community context.

The Expression of Interest process resulted in the preferred solution being for the Coastal Business Centre Inc to have a head lease over the buildings for a ten (10) year period, taking responsibility for capital upgrade of the building and on-going property management of the buildings. The Coastal Business Centre Inc. would pay an annual rental fee to the City based on Policy No: 04-003, and would obtain income from sub-lessees. This solution would allocate approximately twenty-five percent (25%) provision for community use which would include the Melville-Cockburn Chamber of Commerce and the City of Melville Citizens' Emergency Relief Fund Inc, but could also include additional community organisations.

It was considered that this use of the buildings would meet the City's strategic objective of facilitating economic development and would promote strong synergies between the Coastal Business Centre Inc. and other occupiers of the buildings. It was also acknowledged that this would align with Council's original commitment to accommodate the Coastal Business Centre Inc. on the site.

This solution would provide opportunities for significant Federal Government Regional Business Partnerships Funding via the Perth Area Consultative Committee. Additional grant funding through Lotteries West would also be possible for the City of Melville Citizens' Emergency Relief Fund.

It is proposed that this solution would meet the stated needs of the Coastal Business Centre Inc. and ensures the preservation of the buildings in the short-medium term (ten [10] years). It would also present an opportunity to implement some immediate streetscaping around the Carawatha site to improve the entrance to Willagee, parking and integration with the strip shops opposite.



**C06/8006 - CARAWATHA PRIMARY SCHOOL – USE OF BUILDINGS (REC)  
(ATTACHMENT)**

It is therefore recommended that Council provides 'in principle' approval to continue to investigate leasing the Carawatha School buildings to the Coastal Business Centre Inc, as proposed, with a view to consider a detailed business case within the next three (3) months.

This approach will not negatively affect any longer term planning about the future of the whole site and the opportunities it presents for the wider community and therefore it is recommended that a Place Plan for the area (boundaries yet to be determined) should be developed over the next two (2) years.

[8006A August 2006.pdf](#)

[8006B August 2006.pdf](#)

**Officer Recommendation**

Cr P M Phelan moved, seconded Cr D J Macphail –

1. **That Council confirms its approval to locate the Coastal Business Centre Inc. In the Carawatha Primary School buildings subject to**
  - **Accommodating, as a minimum, twenty-five percent (25%) community use of the buildings to accommodate the Melville-Cockburn Chamber of Commerce and the City of Melville Citizens' Emergency Relief Fund Inc,**
  - **A business plan being prepared for Council endorsement that includes, but is not limited to the :**
    - **Proposed use and development of buildings and immediate surrounds to form the leased area;**
    - **Funding plan for the capital and operational costs associated with the use of the buildings;**
    - **Leasing and operational arrangements based on a ten (10) year lease period;**
2. **That the Director Strategic Urban Planning develop a Local Precinct plan for the area immediately adjacent to the Carawatha site, incorporating entry statements, landscaping, parking and integration with the local strip shops;**
3. **That Council adopts a Place-Based planning approach for the area in order to address long term community outcomes;**
4. **That a care and maintenance plan be implemented for the site, exclusive of the leased area, until such time that a place-based plan is developed.**

\*\* At 7.36pm Cr L M Reynolds departed the Meeting.

**C06/8006 - CARAWATHA PRIMARY SCHOOL – USE OF BUILDINGS (REC)  
(ATTACHMENT)**

Amendment 1

Cr R Aubrey moved, seconded Cr C W Robartson -

***That condition two (2) be amended to read as follows:***

- 2. That the Director Strategic Urban Planning develop a Local Precinct Plan including Financial and Land Use Options for the land not required for Public Open Space, incorporating entry statements, landscaping, parking and integration of adjoining land uses, eg local strip shops;**

The Mayor submitted the motion, which was declared

**CARRIED (11/0)**

\*\* At 7.40pm Cr L M Reynolds re-entered the Meeting.

**RESOLUTION (8006)**

**APPROVAL**

The Mayor submitted the substantive motion, Being -

- 1. THAT COUNCIL CONFIRMS IT APPROVAL TO LOCATE THE COASTAL BUSINESS CENTRE INC. IN THE CARAWATHA PRIMARY SCHOOL BUILDINGS SUBJECT TO**
  - ACCOMMODATING, AS A MINIMUM, TWENTY-FIVE PERCENT (25%) COMMUNITY USE OF THE BUILDINGS TO ACCOMMODATE THE MELVILLE-COCKBURN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE AND THE CITY OF MELVILLE CITIZENS' EMERGENCY RELIEF FUND INC,**
  - A BUSINESS PLAN BEING PREPARED FOR COUNCIL ENDORSEMENT THAT INCLUDES, BUT IS NOT LIMITED TO THE :**
    - PROPOSED USE AND DEVELOPMENT OF BUILDINGS AND IMMEDIATE SURROUNDS TO FORM THE LEASED AREA;**
    - FUNDING PLAN FOR THE CAPITAL AND OPERATIONAL COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH THE USE OF THE BUILDINGS;**
    - LEASING AND OPERATIONAL ARRANGEMENTS BASED ON A TEN (10) YEAR LEASE PERIOD;**
- 2. THAT THE DIRECTOR STRATEGIC URBAN PLANNING DEVELOP A LOCAL PRECINCT PLAN INCLUDING FINANCIAL AND LAND USE OPTIONS FOR THE LAND NOT REQUIRED FOR PUBLIC OPEN SPACE, INCORPORATING ENTRY STATEMENTS, LANDSCAPING, PARKING AND INTEGRATION OF ADJOINING LAND USES, EG LOCAL STRIP SHOPS;**
- 3. THAT COUNCIL ADOPTS A PLACE-BASED PLANNING APPROACH FOR THE AREA IN ORDER TO ADDRESS LONG TERM COMMUNITY OUTCOMES;**
- 4. THAT A CARE AND MAINTENANCE PLAN BE IMPLEMENTED FOR THE SITE, EXCLUSIVE OF THE LEASED AREA, UNTIL SUCH TIME THAT A PLACE-BASED PLAN IS DEVELOPED.**

Which was declared

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

**T06/1012 – PEDESTRIAN CROSSING SAFETY ON CANNING HIGHWAY, APPECROSS  
(REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

Ward	:	Applecross/Mt Pleasant
Category	:	Operational
Subject Index	:	Pedestrian issues
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	:	T06/1001 – Minutes of the combined City of Melville RoadWise Task Force and TravelSmart Reference Group Meeting held on 14 December 2005 (February 2006)
Works Programme	:	Not Applicable
Funding	:	Not Applicable
Responsible Officer	:	Philip Gale Manager Infrastructure Services

**SUMMARY**

At their combined meeting in December 2005, the City of Melville RoadWise Task Force and TravelSmart Reference Groups discussed the issue of pedestrian safety when crossing Canning Highway, between Sleat Road and Canning Beach Road. Subsequently, as a result of Council considering the minutes of the above meeting the following recommendation was adopted in February 2006:

*That a report on the installation of pedestrian barrier fencing on Canning Highway, between Canning Beach Road and Sleat Road, be included on the agenda for the April Community and Technical Services Committee meeting.*

That section of road is within the Canning Bridge precinct which is the continuing focus of a planning study that will include consideration of pedestrian facilities on Canning Highway. It is recommended therefore, that any decision or action on this matter be deferred until completion of that study and its recommendations are considered by Council.

**BACKGROUND**

At their combined meeting of the City of Melville RoadWise Task Force and TravelSmart Reference Group held on 14 December 2005 discussion was held about pedestrian safety when crossing Canning Highway, between Kintail Road and Sleat Road. Whilst there are traffic signals at the Canning Highway / Sleat Road intersection and a pedestrian overpass of Canning Highway, at Ogilvie Road, some pedestrians continue to cross the road at-grade in mid-block locations.

**T06/1012 – PEDESTRIAN CROSSING SAFETY ON CANNING HIGHWAY, APPECROSS  
(REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

As a result, the following motion was adopted at that meeting:

*That the RoadWise TaskForce and the TravelSmart Reference Group request the Council to make some investigation regarding the option of installing fencing along Canning Highway between Kintail Road and Sleat Road, Applecross, to form part of the submission for the Canning Bridge development.*

Subsequently, the following recommendation was adopted in February 2006 as a result of Council considering the minutes of the above meeting:

*That a report on the installation of pedestrian barrier fencing on Canning Highway, between Canning Beach Road and Sleat Road, be included on the agenda for the April Community and Technical Services Committee meeting.*

**DETAIL**

Canning Highway is a Primary Distributor road connecting the Strategic Regional Centre of Fremantle in the west to the District Centre of Victoria Park in the east. The road continues eastwards from that point as the Great Eastern Highway to the Strategic Regional Centre of Midland.

The operation of Canning Highway is managed by Main Roads Western Australia (MRWA) and in 1998/99 the volume of traffic travelling along the highway daily, east of Sleat Road, was recorded as fifty-two thousand and ninety (52,090) vehicles. The Canning Bridge Precinct is an active District Centre dissected by the highway, with the suburbs of Applecross to the north and Mount Pleasant to the south.

Originally, the focus of commercial activity along Canning Highway would have been towards the highway but as traffic volumes and its impacts have increased significantly over time that focus is increasingly being redirected to the rear of those properties and side roads where better amenity and accessibility can usually be found.

In July 1993 urban design concept plans were prepared for the City of Melville by Baranowski Rayment Landscape Architects for the section of Canning Highway from Sleat Road to the eastern side of the Canning Bridge. When those plans were considered by Council in August 1993 the following recommendations were adopted:

1. That sketch plans Nos. T93/8-7004/1 to T93/8-7004/4 inclusive be adopted as the landscape concept plan for Canning Highway between Sleat Road and Canning Bridge; and
2. That an amount of three hundred and ninety thousand, eight hundred dollars (\$390,800) for the Canning Highway Landscape Plan, between Sleat Road and Canning Bridge, be listed in the Forward Works Programme for consideration in 1994/95; and
3. That discussions between Main Roads WA, the City of South Perth and the City of Melville be instigated to determine the future of landscaping on the eastern side of Canning Bridge.

**T06/1012 – PEDESTRIAN CROSSING SAFETY ON CANNING HIGHWAY, APPECROSS  
(REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

The paving layout for that project has been installed as has some of the median planting. None of the Art Deco style street furniture, including the 'Tivoli' barrier rail fencing proposed along the length of the northern and southern verges, has been installed. The detail of that fencing included charcoal coloured pre-cast concrete bollards with a stainless steel rail between them.

[1012 August 2006.pdf](#) A copy of the concept plans for that project forms part of the Attachments to the Agenda, which was distributed to the Members of the Council on Wednesday, 9 August 2006. Note that the use of a rail, parallel and in close proximity to any traffic lane, as proposed in the 'Tivoli' barrier fencing is strongly discouraged by the road safety industry because of the danger of vehicle occupants being speared by such rails, if a vehicle hits that fencing.

The existing formal pedestrian facilities available along this section of road include:

- Pedestrian activated traffic signals at the Canning Highway / Sleat Road signalised intersection providing an at-grade crossing,
- A pedestrian overpass of Canning Highway, at Ogilvie Road and Kishorn Road, one hundred metres (170) east of Sleat Road providing a grade separated crossing, and
- A pedestrian underpass of Canning Highway, at Canning Bridge, a further four hundred and forty (440) metres east, providing a grade separated crossing.

In the five (5) year period from 1 January 2001 to 31 December 2005 there were three (3) crashes involving pedestrians along this section of Canning Highway. Fortunately, only one (1) of these crashes involved a pedestrian casualty who was hospitalised. All of these crashes occurred during the day on weekdays, with two (2) in the morning peak hour and one (1) in the middle of the afternoon. All three (3) crashes involved pedestrians crossing from the north side of the highway. Two (2) of these crashes were in the vicinity of the pedestrian overpass and one (1) crash was just east of Canning Beach Road.

Pedestrians can be regularly observed crossing at-grade in mid-block locations by using the median to cross the highway in two stages. This requires them to cross three (3) eastbound traffic lanes and two (2) westbound traffic lanes, which is not necessarily a dangerous practice for an able bodied pedestrian provided there is a suitable safe gap in the traffic flow. Regular crossing movements, particularly by high school age pedestrians, are also generated on days when rowing carnivals are held on Canning River at Apex Reserve.

Infrastructure Services officers did approach MRWA in September last year about installing a pedestrian crossing on Canning Highway, in the vicinity of Canning Beach Road, but they do not believe there are sufficient volumes of pedestrians at that location to warrant a formalised pedestrian crossing point. They have advised that they will continue to monitor pedestrian movements at that location and will possibly undertake a traffic video survey on a day an event that is expected to attract a large number of pedestrians is held in the vicinity.

**T06/1012 – PEDESTRIAN CROSSING SAFETY ON CANNING HIGHWAY, APPECROSS  
(REC) (ATTACHMENT)**

A planning study of the Canning Bridge Precinct was started last year with the objective of developing a Masterplan to guide that precinct's long-term development in an orderly fashion. That study involves a review of issues such as land use zoning, densities, plot ratios, building heights, urban design, heritage, landscape/public open space, social characteristics, traffic, parking etc.

A traffic study for the precinct was completed by WorleyParsons Services Pty Ltd and identifies the same pedestrian issues mentioned above. A Pedestrian Movements Improvements Options Study is now being done by GHD Pty Ltd to identify realistic treatments that could improve the pedestrian linkages across Canning Highway. The preliminary report was presented to the Elected Members Workshop held in June, by the Director Strategic Urban Planning. It is anticipated that by the end of the year a comprehensive planning report on the Canning Bridge Precinct will be completed.

**POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

There is no Council Policy that relates to this matter.

**PUBLIC CONSULTATION/COMMUNICATION**

Not applicable.

**STATUTORY AND LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

Not applicable.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

Not applicable.

**STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS**

Strategic planning is in progress to develop a masterplan for the long term planning of the Canning Bridge Precinct. As there are potentially both short and long term treatments that could be implemented to improve the pedestrian crossing safety of Canning Highway it is appropriate that these matters are considered in a holistic fashion as part of that overall precinct study.

**T06/1012 – PEDESTRIAN CROSSING SAFETY ON CANNING HIGHWAY, APPECROSS  
(REC) (ATTACHMENT)****COMMENT**

Clearly a lot of attention is already being focused on the need for, and standard of, pedestrian facilities in the Canning Bridge Precinct and, in particular, on Canning Highway. The provision of pedestrian fencing is only one of a number of possible treatment options that could be considered to improve pedestrian safety.

In the interests of orderly planning and resource management it is important that any decision on the need for such fencing is deferred until the current planning study is complete so that all relevant information and possible treatments can be considered. That information should include a survey(s) of pedestrian movements along and across Canning Highway to help quantify the level of pedestrian activity and identify any issues related to those movements. That information would also help support any further request to MRWA for pedestrian crossing facilities of Canning Highway.

**RESOLUTION (1012)****APPROVAL**

- 1. THE ISSUE OF PEDESTRIAN BARRIER FENCING ALONG CANNING HIGHWAY BE CONSIDERED AS PART OF THE CURRENT PLANNING STUDY FOR THE CANNING BRIDGE PRECINCT.**
- 2. THE PLANNING STUDY FOR THE CANNING BRIDGE PRECINCT INCLUDE A SURVEY OF PEDESTRIAN MOVEMENTS ON CANNING HIGHWAY TO QUANTIFY THE LEVEL OF PEDESTRIAN CROSSING ACTIVITY ON THAT ROAD AND IDENTIFY ANY ISSUES RELATED TO THOSE PEDESTRIAN MOVEMENTS.**

**C06/8005 - REPORT ON OUTCOMES OF GARDEN CITY PRECINCT PROTOCOL (REC)**

Ward	:	All
Category	:	Operational
Subject Index	:	Community Development Policy
Customer Index	:	Community and Technical Services Committee
Disclosure of any Interest	:	No Officer involved in the preparation of this report has a declarable interest in this matter.
Previous Items	:	C05/8007 – Response to Request for behaviour protocols in other parts of the City – October 2005
Works Programme	:	Not Applicable
Funding	:	Not Applicable
Responsible Officer	:	Christine Young Manager Cultural and Community Development

**SUMMARY**

This report examines the outcomes and benefits of the Garden City Precinct Protocol since its implementation in June 2005.

**BACKGROUND**

In October 2005, the Community and Technical Services Committee resolved

*“That the Garden City Behaviour Protocol be reviewed at least twelve (12) months following implementation with a report back to Council on the outcomes.”*

**DETAIL**

The Garden City Precinct Protocol has been in operation for twelve (12) months. The protocol was developed by the Melville Interagency Initiative for Youth as a way to publicly identify positive behaviour and consequences of unacceptable behaviours. The Melville Interagency Initiative for Youth consists of representatives from Garden City Shopping Centre, the Public Transport Authority, Murdoch Police Station, Melville Youth Advisory Council and the City of Melville, including representatives from Community Development and Development and Neighbourhood Amenity.

After the implementation of the protocol, City of Melville Officers and members of the Melville Interagency Initiative for Youth spent a considerable amount of time promoting the protocol. Garden City Shopping Centre distributed the brochure *Tips for Young People – What is the Garden City Precinct Protocol?* to residents of the City via a letter box drop. Every school in the City was sent a copy of the protocol, brochures to display and an offer of a copy of the brochure to be distributed to every student in the school. Three (3) high schools distributed brochures to every student. The Melville Youth Advisory Council assisted with the promotion of the protocol by providing talks to students and setting up a display in The Vault.

Copies of the protocol and brochure are available to the public at the Melville Information Desk, Melville Libraries, The Vault and Garden City Shopping Centre’s Information Desk.



**C06/8005 – REPORT ON OUTCOMES OF GARDEN CITY PRECINCT PROTOCOL (REC)**

The Melville Interagency Initiative for Youth meets every six (6) months to discuss the protocol and any issues which may arise relevant to the Garden City Precinct. The most recent meeting was held on 15 June 2006 and included a twelve (12) month evaluation of the protocol. This meeting was attended by representatives from Garden City Shopping Centre, the Public Transport Authority, City of Melville Youth Development and Community Security Staff.

**POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

Nil.

**PUBLIC CONSULTATION/COMMUNICATION**

Extensive public and agency consultation was carried out during the development of the protocol.

The Melville Interagency Initiative for Youth committee members were consulted and provided information for this report.

Members of the regional youth networking forum, Cockburn Melville Fremantle Interagency Youth Forum were invited to provide feedback on the protocol, none was received.

No public consultation has been carried out in relation to the evaluation of outcomes.

**STATUTORY AND LEGAL IMPLICATIONS**

Nil.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

Nil.

**STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS**

This item relates to

Vision 2 – *“A City with an attractive, desirable and safe community environment”*

Strategic objective 2.4 – *“A community environment where residents can live safely.”*

**C06/8005 – REPORT ON OUTCOMES OF GARDEN CITY PRECINCT PROTOCOL (REC)****COMMENT**

It is difficult to attribute either an increase or decrease in anti-social behaviours directly to the Garden City Precinct Protocol. However, the introduction of the protocol has seen a number of benefits which, although difficult to quantify, have had a positive impact on the relationships between agencies and community members.

Members of the Melville Interagency Initiative for Youth completed a survey at the last meeting, providing feedback on their use and implementation of the protocol. The Public Transport Authority, Youth Development and the Community Security Service have used the protocol to either implement consequences to unacceptable behaviour or as a promotional tool. Garden City Shopping Centre had not used the protocol as they had not identified any incidences where they could apply the protocol. Murdoch Police Station was unable to respond.

All agencies present at the June 2006 meeting include the protocol in staff handovers or are developing a process to ensure the information is known by relevant staff members. Agencies and individuals identified improved communication with other agencies, improved communication with community members and a standardised approach for all workers when implementing consequences as the benefits of the Garden City Precinct Protocol. The standardised approach included in the protocol now provides consistency when dealing with unacceptable behaviour rather than the previous range of ad hoc approaches.

Youth Development staff have anecdotally reported a decrease in anti-social behaviour occurring in and around the Vault. The protocol has been used to implement consequences for unacceptable behaviours on twelve (12) occasions by Youth Workers, all except one (1) for minor incidences.

An article in the Melville Times on 16 May 2006 reported that anti-social behaviour at Garden City Shopping Centre has decreased by eighty percent (80%) over a three (3) year period. Figures for the twelve (12) month period since the protocol's implementation were not available. The Public Transport Authority reported a decrease in the number of incidences occurring at Booragoon Bus Station in the past twelve (12) months, with the majority of recorded incidences and complaints being of a general nature and not related to anti-social behaviour.

All agencies reported that the protocol document and the *Tips for Young People* brochure were appropriate and effective in their current form. No improvements were identified or required at this time.

The next meeting of the Melville Interagency Initiative for Youth is scheduled for November 2006 where ongoing evaluation and discussion of the protocol will occur.

**RESOLUTION (8005)****APPROVAL**

**THAT THE COUNCIL CONTINUE TO SUPPORT THE USE OF THE GARDEN CITY PRECINCT PROTOCOL IN ITS CURRENT FORMAT**

**C06/5000 - 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**

Document Type	Party	Description	File Ref
Lease Agreement	Stockland Shopping Centre and City of Melville	Lease Agreement between Stockland Shopping Centre and Bull Creek Community Centre for Storage of goods store room S05	1454494
Deed of Easement	City of Melville and McLeods Barristers and Solicitors	Deed of Easement	903246
Withdrawal of Caveat	City of Melville and McLeods Barristers and Solicitors	Withdrawal of Caveat	1455695

**C06/5000 - COMMON SEAL REGISTER (REC)**

Funding Agreement	City of Melville and Dept of Families, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs	Extension of Funding Agreement – Willy Wag Tales Play Group	1460061
Scheme Amendment No 44	City of Melville and Minister of Planning and Infrastructure	Scheme Amendment No. 44	1175236
Management Licence	City of Melville and Challenger TAFE	Management Licence – Challenger TAFE (Community Buildings)	1298197

**PUBLIC CONSULTATION**

Not applicable.

**COMMENT**

Nil.

**STATUTORY ENVIRONMENT**

Section 2.5 of the Local Government Act 1995.

**POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

Nil.

**FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

Not applicable.

**STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS**

Not applicable.

**RESOLUTION (5000)**

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

**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 month of June 2006 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 August 2006.pdf](#) and [6000B August 2006.pdf](#) the Investment Statements for the month of June 2006, form part of the Attachments to the Agenda, which was distributed to the Members of the Council on Wednesday, 9 August 2006.

The Investment of Surplus Funds is undertaken in accordance with the Finance Investment Policy document for the City of Melville. [6000D August 2006.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, 9 August 2006.

Reports prepared by Grange Securities have again been included for members' information. [6000C August 2006.pdf](#) The reports form part of the Attachments to the Agenda, which was distributed to the Members of the Council on Wednesday, 9 August 2006.

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

**POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

Corporate Policy 13-PL-003.

**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 June 2006, total interest earned was three million four hundred and seventy six thousand three hundred and fifty-seven dollars (\$3,476,357) against a budget for the year of one million, nine hundred and twenty-one thousand one hundred dollars (\$1,921,100).

Reserve Fund interest earned was one million three hundred and twenty four thousand five hundred and seventy-three dollars (\$1,324,573) against a budget for the year of seven hundred and twenty-eight thousand, nine hundred dollars (\$728,900).

**STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS**

Not applicable.

**COMMENT**

Base interest rates held steady over the period, with a small increase of zero point two eight three percent (0.283%) in the rates for thirty (30) day bank bills. Longer term returns showed a higher increase, indicating the market's expectation of further rate increase to come. The performance of the City of Melville portfolio managed by Grange Securities exceeded the agreed benchmark of the UBS Bank Bill Index plus zero point three five percent (UBS plus 0.35%) by zero point six per cent (0.6%) in the month of June 2006 and by one point one seven per cent (1.17%) over the last twelve (12) months.

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

**RESOLUTION (6000)**

**THAT THE INVESTMENT STATEMENTS FOR THE MONTH OF JUNE 2006, AS DETAILED IN THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENTS BE NOTED:**

[6000A August 2006.pdf](#)

[6000B August 2006.pdf](#)

[6000C August 2006.pdf](#)

[6000D August 2006.pdf](#)

**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	:	2005/2006 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 June 2006 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 & 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**

[6001 August 2006.pdf](#) The Schedule of Accounts for the period ending 30 June 2006 including Warrant of Payments Nos. 654 to 656 were distributed to the Members of Council on Wednesday, 9 August 2006.



**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 2005/2006 Budget.

**STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS**

Not applicable.

**COMMENT**

This is a regular monthly report for Elected Members information.

**RESOLUTION (6001)**

**THAT THE SCHEDULE OF ACCOUNTS FOR THE PERIOD ENDING 30 JUNE 2006, AS APPROVED BY THE DIRECTOR CORPORATE SERVICES IN ACCORDANCE WITH DELEGATED AUTHORITY CE23, AND DETAILED IN ATTACHMENT [6001 August 2006.pdf](#) BE NOTED.**

**C06/6002 – 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 June 2006 and recommends that they be noted by Council.

**BACKGROUND**

The Financial Statements for the end of the month of June 2006 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.

**C06/6002- 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.

Copies of the complete Financial Statements for the month of June 2006 were distributed to the Deputy Presiding Member (Responsible for the Corporate and Community Portfolio) and will be available to Elected Members via the Director Corporate Services.

**DETAIL**

The following attachments form part of the Attachments to the Agenda, which was distributed to the Members of the Council on Wednesday, 9 August 2006.

<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>LINK</b>
Statement of Financial Activity	<a href="#">6002A August 2006.pdf</a>
Operating Statements by Program for the period ended 30 June 2006	<a href="#">6002B August 2006.pdf</a>
Management Report on Budget Variances by Service Unit for June 2006	<a href="#">6002D August 2006.pdf</a>
Representation of Working Capital as at June 2006	<a href="#">6002E August 2006.pdf</a>
Reconciliation of Net Working Capital as at 30 June 2006.	<a href="#">6002F August 2006.pdf</a>
Graph showing financial trend for June 2006	<a href="#">6002G August 2006.pdf</a>
Details of Budget Amendments requested during the month of June 2006	<a href="#">6002J August 2006.pdf</a>
Summary of Rates debtors for the month of June 2006	<a href="#">6002L August 2006.pdf</a>
Graph showing Rates Collections for June 2006	<a href="#">6002M August 2006.pdf</a>
Summary of Debtors aged 90 days old or greater as at 30 June 2006	<a href="#">6002N August 2006.pdf</a>

**C06/6002- FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (AMREC) (ATTACHMENT)**

**POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

Not applicable.

**PUBLIC CONSULTATION/COMMUNICATION**

Not applicable.

**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 2005/2006 Budget have been included in the budget amendment report.

**STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS**

Not applicable.

**COMMENT**

It should be noted that the attached financial statements are preliminary and do not reflect the final end of year financial position. The end of year financial statement accruals and reserve transfers and the subsequent audit are yet to be undertaken. It is expected that these tasks will have been completed by the end of October 2006.

**C06/6002- FINANCIAL STATEMENTS (AMREC) (ATTACHMENT)**

**RESOLUTION (6002)**

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

<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>LINK</b>
STATEMENT OF FINANCIAL ACTIVITY	<a href="#">6002A August 2006.pdf</a>
OPERATING STATEMENTS BY PROGRAM FOR THE PERIOD ENDED 30 JUNE 2006	<a href="#">6002B August 2006.pdf</a>
MANAGEMENT REPORT ON BUDGET VARIANCES BY SERVICE UNIT FOR JUNE 2006	<a href="#">6002D August 2006.pdf</a>
REPRESENTATION OF WORKING CAPITAL AS AT JUNE 2006	<a href="#">6002E August 2006.pdf</a>
RECONCILIATION OF NET WORKING CAPITAL AS AT 30 JUNE 2006	<a href="#">6002F August 2006.pdf</a>
GRAPH SHOWING FINANCIAL TREND FOR JUNE 2006	<a href="#">6002G August 2006.pdf</a>
SUMMARY OF RATES DEBTORS FOR THE MONTH OF JUNE 2006	<a href="#">6002L August 2006.pdf</a>
GRAPH SHOWING RATES COLLECTIONS FOR NOVEMBER AND JUNE 2006	<a href="#">6002M August 2006.pdf</a>
SUMMARY OF DEBTORS AGED 90 DAYS OLD OR GREATER AS AT 30 JUNE 2006	<a href="#">6002N August 2006.pdf</a>

2. THAT BY ABSOLUTE MAJORITY DECISION, THE BUDGET AMENDMENTS, AS LISTED IN THE BUDGET AMENDMENT REPORTS FOR JUNE 2006, AS DETAILED IN ATTACHMENT [6002J August 2006.pdf](#) BE ADOPTED

**11.1 ADOPTION**

Cr J Phillips moved, seconded Cr M J Barton -

**THAT THE REPORTS OF THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER EXCLUDING ITEMS P06/3015, P06/5005, P06/8008, T06/1021 AND C06/8006 BE RECEIVED AND THE RECOMMENDATIONS CONTAINED THEREIN BE ADOPTED**

The Mayor submitted the motion, which was declared

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

**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, the Mayor declared the Meeting closed at 7.42pm.