



# **TOWN OF CLAREMONT**

## **ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING**

### **MINUTES**

**TUESDAY 4 APRIL, 2017**

**Stephen Goode**

**CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER**

**Date:**

## **DISCLAIMER**

Would all members of the public please note that they are cautioned against taking any action as a result of a Council decision tonight until such time as they have seen a copy of the Minutes or have been advised, in writing, by the Council's Administration with regard to any particular decision.

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

| ITEM | SUBJECT                                                                                           | PAGE NO |
|------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|
| 1    | DECLARATION OF OPENING/ANNOUNCEMENT OF VISITORS.....                                              | 1       |
| 2    | RECORD OF ATTENDANCE/APOLOGIES/LEAVE OF ABSENCE .....                                             | 1       |
| 3    | DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS .....                                                                     | 1       |
| 4    | RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS PUBLIC QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE .                                           | 1       |
| 5    | PUBLIC QUESTION TIME .....                                                                        | 3       |
| 6    | PUBLIC STATEMENT TIME .....                                                                       | 4       |
| 7    | APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE .....                                                           | 4       |
| 8    | PETITIONS/DEPUTATIONS/PRESENTATIONS.....                                                          | 4       |
| 9    | CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS.....                                                 | 5       |
| 10   | ANNOUNCEMENT OF CONFIDENTIAL MATTERS FOR WHICH MEETING MAY BE CLOSED TO THE PUBLIC .....          | 5       |
| 11   | BUSINESS NOT DEALT WITH FROM A PREVIOUS MEETING .....                                             | 5       |
| 12   | REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.....                                                                        | 5       |
| 13   | REPORTS OF THE CEO.....                                                                           | 6       |
|      | 13.1 INFRASTRUCTURE .....                                                                         | 6       |
|      | 13.1.1 DAVIES ROAD PARKING AREA .....                                                             | 6       |
|      | 13.1.2 GRAYLANDS ROAD CYCLEWAY .....                                                              | 11      |
|      | 13.1.3 LAKE CLAREMONT MANAGEMENT PLAN PUBLIC CONSULTATION OUTCOMES.....                           | 18      |
| 14   | ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PRESIDING PERSON.....                                                        | 35      |
| 15   | ELECTED MEMBERS' MOTIONS OF WHICH PREVIOUS NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN.....                             | 35      |
| 16   | NEW BUSINESS OF AN URGENT NATURE APPROVED BY THE PERSON PRESIDING OR BY DECISION OF MEETING ..... | 35      |
| 17   | CONFIDENTIAL MATTERS FOR WHICH THE MEETING MAY BE CLOSED TO THE PUBLIC .....                      | 35      |
| 18   | FUTURE MEETINGS OF COUNCIL .....                                                                  | 35      |
| 19   | DECLARATION OF CLOSURE OF MEETING .....                                                           | 35      |

---



---

**TOWN OF CLAREMONT**  
**ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING**  
**4 APRIL, 2017**  
**MINUTES**

---

**1 DECLARATION OF OPENING/ANNOUNCEMENT OF VISITORS**

His Worship the Mayor, Mr Jock Barker, welcomed members of the public, staff and Councillors and declared the meeting open at 7:01PM.

**2 RECORD OF ATTENDANCE/APOLOGIES/LEAVE OF ABSENCE**

**ATTENDANCE**

**Mayor Barker**

**Cr Peter Browne**

**West Ward**

**Cr Peter Edwards**

**West Ward**

**Cr Karen Wood**

**West Ward**

**Cr Paul Kelly**

**South Ward**

**Cr Alastair Tulloch**

**East Ward**

**Cr Bruce Haynes**

**East Ward**

**Cr Kate Main**

**East Ward**

**Mr Stephen Goode (Chief Executive Officer)**

**Mr Les Crichton (Executive Manager Corporate and Governance)**

**Mr Saba Kirupanather (Executive Manager Infrastructure)**

**Ms Katie Bovell (Governance Officer)**

**Five members of the public**

**Two members of the press**

**ATTENDANCE**

Cr Goetze – Leave of Absence

Cr Mews – Leave of Absence

**3 DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS**

NIL

**4 RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS PUBLIC QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE**

**Ms Heidi Hardisty, 12A Myera Street, Swanbourne.**

**Re: Item 13.4.1, Stirling Road Car Park.**

1. Has a comprehensive parking study be conducted, including surveying the nearby parking areas at various times, to justify the increase in parking needs?

*Answer:* No separate study was undertaken recently re this proposal. The concept was developed based on the Lake Claremont Concept Plan 2010, approved by the Council, after extensive public consultation. This 2010 concept plan shows 15 bays with a possible expansion if needed. The proposed car park design allows for 15 bays (including one ACROD bay) and two motor bike bays.

2. If yes, can a copy of this report be released to the public?

*Answer:* Not applicable

3. If not, what is the justification for needing more car parking in Stirling Road Park and elsewhere in the area?

*Answer:* Answered in 1 above.

4. Has any other alternatives to building more car parks been considered? If not, why not?

*Answer:* No. The expansion of the car park was desired by the local community and approved by the Council as part of the 2010 Lake Claremont Concept Plan.

5. Given that the current car park is asphalt and can already provide wheelchair access, why isn't the car park proposed made with a permeable surface, like mulch, to give it a conservation priority and feel?

*Answer:* Mulch is not a suitable surface material for car parks as this may cause some safety issues for a regular/ high use area.

6. Will the car park be flush to the ground so that turtles and turtle hatchings can move unimpeded?

*Answer:* The car park surface with flush kerb edge will be to the ground level.

7. How many new parking bays were recently created by Scotch College?

*Answer:* 15 new bays in the carpark closest to the Stirling Road parking area, 5 additional bays north of the ELC and the Kott Terrace extension west of Stirling Road and 31 bays to the south of the ELC.

Can these be utilised by the public?

*Answer:* The car park immediately to the west of the Stirling Road car park is to be covered by a reciprocal parking agreement with the Town – this is still in the progress of preparation.

If yes, when?

*Answer:* When the easement for parking is finalised.

Have these contributed to alleviating the need for more parking in Stirling Road Park?

*Answer:* These bays have been provided to satisfy the parking requirements of the school, but provide for significant overflow of parking in times of peak demand for Lake Claremont. The extension to the Stirling Road car park is proposed to accommodate the normal activities in the morning and afternoon peak periods of park use independent to the school parking requirements. Also refer to the answer in 1 above.

8. Or is more parking needed (at this site) due to the recent expansion of Scotch College?

*Answer:* No

Will some of this parking be used for Scotch College activities?

*Answer:* The Traffic Management and Transport Plan adopted by Council in association with the development of the ELC acknowledged that 50% of the

street bays in the locality (inclusive of the existing bays at the Stirling road car park) contribute to the parking provision for the school.

9. How many trees were removed by Scotch College for the car park adjacent to this area?

*Answer:* Approved plans for the northern carpark extension do not detail any former existing trees. Plans for the area immediately adjoining the ELC indicate that eight trees would be removed; however one of those trees was saved as part of plan revisions for the southern car park.

Have any trees been required by the council to be planted in their place?

*Answer:* No

A landscaping plan was approved as part of the ELC development approval.

*Answer:* No - a basic site plan with generic hard and soft play spaces with existing tree locations.

If yes, have these been planted and if so how many and what trees? How many mature trees were removed by Scotch College to construct the Early Learning Centre and carpark attached to it?

*Answer:* There were mature trees removed from the car parking extension area to the north, however and the submitted plans did not detail these, the number and species are unknown.

10. Are any trees being removed to extend the proposed car park at Stirling Road Park?

*Answer:* One tree will be removed.

If yes, are they mature trees?

*Answer:* This tree is on a lean and not in good health.

What trees are these?

*Answer:* Corymbia ficifolia.

Will these be replaced with local native tree species such as tuarts, flooded gums, marris or jarrahs (all of which provide far more habitat for wildlife than other trees such as peppermints or exotics)?

*Answer:* Will be replaced with two or more local native trees.

## 5 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

**Mr Kevin Maitland, 4/61 Bay View Terrace, Claremont.**

**Re: Increasing nuisance Corella Issues.**

*Questions:*

1. What steps were taken to have WALGA involved and when did this start?
  2. What funding and source is backing up the culling program?
  3. What numbers have been achieved to date?
  4. Where is the culling taking place and why not where the most distress is occurring?
  5. Has any liaison taken place with other affected council's to strengthen the action?
  6. Has there been any monitoring of noise pollution as there would be for complaints about dog barking, machinery or loud party noise?
  7. When will the council arrange clean up of the health hazard on Stirling Highway immediately outside the library which is distressing business in the immediate area?
-

8. Has council tried other birth sc are devices from those listed on the internet?

*Answers:*

The Town cannot control corellas: that is simply a statement of fact. The reason is the corellas are a metro-wide problem and there is no metro-wide agreement on control measures.

Council has recognised the problem. It approved funding some years ago when the State government department tried to get agreement with all metro local governments. Unfortunately Claremont was one of only two or three that agreed to contribute which meant nothing was done. The other councils were saying it is a state government responsibility – and it is – but the government would not fund it.

Claremont Council has taken a leadership role again through WALGA to try to coordinate a metro-wide approach. WALGA is an association of councils but it has no power to levy charges or impose projects on its members. So again we have only a few councils agreeing to be involved, fortunately the WESROC councils have all been involved and some controls have happened in our area. We recognise there is a problem but there has to be a metro-wide approach to this and Claremont cannot solve the issue alone.

## **6 PUBLIC STATEMENT TIME**

NIL

## **7 APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE**

**Moved Cr Wood, seconded Cr Haynes**

**That Cr Wood be granted leave of absence for the Ordinary Council Meeting on 2 May 2017.**

**CARRIED(46/17)  
(NO DISSENT)**

**Moved Cr Kelly, seconded Cr Haynes**

**That Cr Kelly be granted leave of absence for the Ordinary Council Meeting on 18 April 2017.**

**CARRIED(47/17)  
(NO DISSENT)**

## **8 PETITIONS/DEPUTATIONS/PRESENTATIONS**

NIL



**9 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS**

**Moved Cr Edwards, seconded Cr Wood**

**That the minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of Council held on 21 March 2017 be confirmed.**

**CARRIED(48/17)  
(NO DISSENT)**

**10 ANNOUNCEMENT OF CONFIDENTIAL MATTERS FOR WHICH MEETING MAY BE CLOSED TO THE PUBLIC**

NIL

**11 BUSINESS NOT DEALT WITH FROM A PREVIOUS MEETING**

NIL

**12 REPORTS OF COMMITTEES**

NIL

## 13 REPORTS OF THE CEO

### 13.1 INFRASTRUCTURE

#### 13.1.1 DAVIES ROAD PARKING AREA

|                               |                                                                     |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>File Ref:</b>              | <b>RDS/00193</b>                                                    |
| <b>Attachments:</b>           | <a href="#">15018 Davies Rd - Alfred Rd - Parking concepts</a>      |
| <b>Responsible Officer:</b>   | <b>Saba Kirupanather</b><br><b>Executive Manager Infrastructure</b> |
| <b>Author:</b>                | <b>Marty Symmons</b><br><b>Engineering Technical Officer</b>        |
| <b>Proposed Meeting Date:</b> | <b>04 April 2017</b>                                                |

---

#### **Purpose**

To recommend no additional parking is constructed on the west side of Davies Road just south of Alfred Road.

#### **Background**

Past reports from the Lake Claremont Parkland Recreation Use Working Party discuss additional parking facilities on the west side of Davies Road south of Alfred Road for dog walkers visiting the dog exercise area.

The Lake Claremont Advisory Committee did not support this proposed parking proposal. Although previously the Committee had supported the increased parking resulting a budget provision of \$60,000 being approved by Council.

Council decision was for an officer report to be presented about this.

\$60,000 is currently allocated in the 2016-17 budget for Davies Road parking area.

#### **Discussion**

Parking on the east side of Davies Road to the south of Alfred Road is already used by dog walkers as well as other park visitors and the local residents of the street.

The Alfred Road and Davies Road intersection has a dedicated pedestrian push button phase, providing safe crossing for pedestrians.

There is no unused space to increase the quantity of parking on the east side of Davies Road with all road reserve already used for either on road or verge parking, or for a bus stop.

This limits any increase in parking on the west side of Davies Road.

To install parking on the west side of Davies Road it must either be within the existing road width or encroach into the park.

Both options were drafted to assess the impact on the park and estimate the cost of the works – refer to attachment 15018 Davies Road Parking Concepts.

Option A was the installation of bays on the west side of Davies Road within the existing road width.

This requires the realignment of the median splitter island at the intersection, the removal of some verge, and the removal of all on road parking on the east side, at an estimated cost of \$105,000. Net increase in parking was only 4 bays.

Option B was the installation of bays on the west side of Davies Road building into the verge and park.

This requires the removal and replacement of approximately 70m of footpath on a new alignment. It also requires the clearing of approximately 50m<sup>2</sup> of established bush, although all trees could be retained.

Estimated cost of these works is \$80,000 with a net increase in parking of 8 bays.



Typically the average cost for the Town to construct new parking bays is in the range of \$3,500 to \$5,500 depending on existing conditions.

At either \$26,250 a bay for option A, or \$10,000 a bay for option B, the cost of constructing bays in this location is not good value for money and should only be considered if there is significant demand to warrant the expense. The environmental cost should also be considered.

### **Past Resolutions**

Ordinary Council Meeting 16 February 2016 Resolution 19/16 and 20/16.

*THE AMENDED PRIMARY MOTION WAS PUT*

*That*

1. *Council receive this report about the consultation outcomes regarding the Lake Claremont Parkland Recreation Use Plan;*

2. Council endorse the recommendations of the Lake Claremont Parkland Recreation Use Plan (as amended by Council resolution 224/15) through modification to the Lake Claremont Parkland Concept Plan 2010 other than the recommendations relating to the dog exercise area which is to be dealt with separately;
3. Give consideration in the mid-year budget review to allocation of \$56,000 for the proposed 2015-2016 projects;
4. The necessary provision for funding be included for the listed 2016-17 and 2017-18 projects when the Town's Forward Financial Plan is reviewed;
5. Opportunities for funding partnerships and grant funding be investigated by the Administration;
6. Further consideration be given in 2018 to consider further initiatives in time for consideration during budget deliberations for 2018-19;
7. Refer to the Lake Claremont Committee for consideration and recommendation to Council -
  - a) the proposal for the dog proof fence around Lake Claremont;
  - b) the proposal to retain all fig trees as recognition of the European heritage of the precinct;

CARRIED

*For the Amended Motion: Mayor Barker and Cr Tulloch, Cr Edwards, Cr Browne, Cr Main, Cr Wood and Cr Mews.*

*Against the Amended Motion: Cr Haynes.*

8. Direct that public notice be given of the proposal to amend the Dogs in Public Places Policy LV127 by extending the existing area south to the proposed Lakeway Street parking area extension.

CARRIED  
(NO DISSENT)

Ordinary Council Meeting 15 December 2015 Resolution 224/15.

#### ALTERNATIVE MOTION

*Moved Cr Tulloch, seconded Cr Goetze*

*That*

1. *The officer recommendation not be adopted.*
2. *The recommendation from Working Party report be amended by deleting the proposal for the golf course path to be completed and rebuilt and removing the proposed dog exercise area at Cresswell Park.*
3. *Council endorse the report of the Lake Claremont Parkland Recreation Use Working Party as amended by this resolution for public advertising.*
4. *Council receive a further officer report after the public advertising and in time for consideration of projects in the mid-year budget review.*

*Reasons*

1. *The working party has considered the comments about the report and in particular the mixed views about the need for additional consultation.*

*The working party notes that its intention is that the adopted outcomes will modify the Lake Claremont Management Plan, that the Management Plan is being revised now by officers and when considered by Council will be required to be advertised for public comment.*

2. *In recommendation 2 the working party has agreed to a modification after concerns expressed about the proposal for the golf course path and the dog exercise area at Cresswell Park. If Council approves this alternative motion it is intended that the working party report be amended before it is advertised.*

**CARRIED  
(NO DISSENT)**

### **Financial and Staff Implications**

\$60,000 was allocated in the 2016-17 budget for Davies Road parking area, however was removed at the mid-year review. \$80,000 would need to be reallocated should the decision be made to construct.

### **Policy and Statutory Implications**

Footpath policy LV125

Dogs in public places LV127

Australian Standard 1428.1

Australian Standard 2890

*Aboriginal Heritage Act 1972 (WA)*

*Environmental Protection Act 1986 (WA)*

*Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (Aust)*

*Wildlife Protection Act 1950 (WA)*

Environmental Protection (Clearing of Native Vegetation) Regulations 2004 (WA)

Bush Forever and Geomorphic Wetlands Swan Coastal Plain dataset

State Planning Policy 2.8: Bushland Policy for the Perth Metropolitan Region

### **Communication / Consultation**

The report was not presented to the LCAC because it is consistent with the Committees most recent recommendation to Council. The residents of Davies Road adjacent to the park will be consulted should the decision be made to construct. The members of the Lake Claremont Advisory Committee will be informed of the Council decision.

### **Strategic Community Plan**

#### **Liveability**

*We are an accessible community, with well maintained and managed assets, and our heritage preserved for the enjoyment of the community.*

- Clean, usable, attractive, accessible streetscapes and public open spaces.
- Develop the public realm as gathering spaces for participation and enjoyment.
- Maintain and upgrade infrastructure for seamless day to day usage.

## People

*We live in an accessible and safe community that welcomes diversity, enjoys being active and has a strong sense of belonging.*

- Maintain, effectively manage and enhance the Town's community facilities in response to a growing community.
- Create opportunities for and access to social participation and inclusion in support of community health and well being.

## Environment

*We are a leader in responsibly managing the build and natural environment for the enjoyment of the community and continue to provide sustainable, leafy green parks, streets and outdoor spaces.*

- Implement sound environmental practices as reflected in the WESROC Climate Change Risk Assessment Project.

## Governance and Leadership

*We are an open and accountable local government that encourages community involvement and strives to keep its community well informed.*

- Focus on improved customer service, communication and consultation.

## Urgency

\$60,000 is currently allocated in the 2016-17 Budget for Davies Road parking area.

## Voting Requirements

Simple majority decision of Council required.

## Moved Cr Haynes, seconded Cr Edwards

**That Council does not construct any new parking on the west side of Davies Road just south of Alfred Road.**

**CARRIED(49/17)  
(NO DISSENT)**

### 13.1.2 GRAYLANDS ROAD CYCLEWAY

|                               |                                                                     |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>File Ref:</b>              | <b>RDS/00209</b>                                                    |
| <b>Attachments:</b>           | <a href="#">Graylands Rd Cycleway 16021 Rev A</a>                   |
| <b>Responsible Officer:</b>   | <b>Saba Kirupanather</b><br><b>Executive Manager Infrastructure</b> |
| <b>Author:</b>                | <b>Marty Symmons</b><br><b>Engineering Technical Officer</b>        |
| <b>Proposed Meeting Date:</b> | <b>04 April 2017</b>                                                |

---

#### **Purpose**

For Council to consider the various options and their financial implications and select the preferred cycleway types for Graylands Road to go out for public consultation.

#### **Background**

A brief background of the Graylands Road cycleway / footpath is noted in the points below:

- Graylands Road is a 6m wide local access road. Between Alfred Road and Lapsley Road it carries approximately 2800 vehicles per day (Average Weekday Traffic - AWT) and has an 85th percentile speed of 54km/h (speed at or below 85% of the vehicles travel). Speeds are lower at the northern end near Alfred Road and steadily increase to Lapsley Road as the road environment becomes more open and commercial.
- It is currently a part of the Perth Bike Network (PBN) route map. In 2011 a draft bike plan was prepared for the Town which proposed additional cycle network connectivity around the Town. A shared path (off road) was proposed for the length of Davies Road. This proposal was later changed with the preferred route being Graylands Road rather than Davies Road due to lack of verge space for a wider path on Davies Road. The intent was to provide a connection from Alfred Road to the Perth-Fremantle Principal Shared Path (PSP).
- On 1 December 2015 Council resolved to support the partial funding of a shared path on Graylands Road, subject to a Department of Transport (DoT) grant application as part of the 2017-18 draft budget.
- DoT grant funding application was unsuccessful for Graylands Road as they selected an alternate proposal by the Town instead (*Stirling Highway south – missing links Bay Road to Goldsworthy Road and Bay View Terrace to Freshwater Parade*).
- As part of the 2016-17 budget, Council added the construction of a cycleway, to be wholly funded by the Town and allocated \$165,000 to the budget for the works.
- In December 2016 a design was completed for a 2.5m wide shared path to be installed on Graylands Road from Alfred Road to Lapsley Road, connecting into continuing shared path routes to the PSP.
- In January 2017 Councillors requested a review of the Graylands Road cycleway/ shared path design.
- February 2017 on receipt of the council report reviewing the shared path design, and understanding that Graylands Road is scheduled for road

rehabilitation work as part of the 2017-18 budget, Councillors resolved to defer cycleway work to coincide with the planned road rehabilitation work and to reconsider what cycleway design options are available.

### **Discussion**

A cycleway is defined as a path or road for bicycles and not motor vehicles. There are many different types of cycleway. The most commonly used in urban environments are on-road cycle lanes, principal shared paths (PSP), and shared paths. Consistency in the design of a cycleway is desirable to provide clear guidance to road users, cyclists, and pedestrians, and to prevent confusion.

The Graylands Road cycleway will complete the connection from Alfred Road and the streets to the north to the Perth-Fremantle PSP, the Claremont train station, and the Claremont CBD. The cycleway will connect into the existing shared paths south of Lapsley Road.

As Graylands Road is due to undergo road rehabilitation works as part of the 2017-18 works programme, it is an opportunity to consolidate the works and install the cycleway infrastructure at the same time.

The benefits of this are there will be some cost savings, and only a single period of construction rather than two periods over two years lessening disruption for the residents of the street. It also provides more time for the residents to be consulted about the final preferred road design.

Major changes to streetscapes, such as the introduction of a new cycleway will warrant a period of public consultation. Due to the high cost of the different types of cycleway, and the number of options available along with the ramifications they will have on the final road and verge layout, it would be beneficial for Council to refine the number of options prior to this period of consultation.

After the cycleway types are selected concepts can be drafted showing possible new road layouts and features for consultation.

Once consultation has been conducted the feedback can be presented to Council to decide on a final design to proceed with.

Attached drawing Graylands Road Cycleway 16021 Rev A.pdf, shows 5 different cycleway treatments which could be installed on Graylands Road.

Estimated costs are for the cycleway and necessary road widening only, and not any other road works that are to be done simultaneously.

All on-verge options are shown on the Eastern verge.

This is the preferred side because:

1. On the northern end of Graylands Road the grade of the west verge makes installing a wide path difficult to achieve without creating access or stormwater runoff issues for residents, as the property levels are lower than the road levels.
  2. It is preferable for cyclists to cross over Graylands Road away from the busy Alfred Road intersection.
-



3. There are double the numbers of residents who will be affected on the western side as over half the length on the eastern side is outside the showgrounds.

#### Option 1

|               |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
|---------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Type          | 2.5m wide Shared Path                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
| Location      | On verge against the property line from Alfred Road to Second Avenue moving to the kerb from Second Avenue to south of Lapsley Road                                                                                                                                                  |
| Cost          | \$232,000                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
| Advantages    | Cheapest to construct<br>On pre-existing footpath alignment for northern section<br>No changes to Graylands Road required<br>Introduces upgraded facilities for pedestrians as well as people on bikes<br>Verge parking is retained<br>On road parking is retained                   |
| Disadvantages | Risk of conflict from vehicles reversing out of 5 houses between First Avenue and Second Avenue<br>Not a dedicated cyclist facility<br>Residents may be opposed to 2.5m wide path being installed immediately against the property line<br>Priority is for vehicles at intersections |

#### Option 2

|               |                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
|---------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Type          | 2.5m wide Shared Path                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| Location      | On verge against the kerb                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| Cost          | \$321,000                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| Advantages    | Relatively cheap to construct<br>Introduces upgraded facilities for pedestrians as well as people on bikes<br>On road parking is retained<br>Road widening only required from Alfred Road to Second Avenue |
| Disadvantages | Graylands Road requires widening from Alfred Road to Second Avenue<br>Priority is for vehicles at intersections<br>Loss of verge parking on the east verge                                                 |

Option 3

|               |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
|---------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Type          | Bicycle lanes                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
| Location      | On road                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
| Cost          | \$486,000                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| Advantages    | Cyclists have priority to continue across intersections<br>Verge parking is retained                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| Disadvantages | Graylands Road requires widening<br>Pedestrian facilities are not upgraded so existing flagstone footpath will still require upgrading to a 1.8m Claremont Cream footpath, adding to the entire project cost.<br>Removal of all on road parking<br>Novice cyclists or parents cycling with young children may not feel confident riding on-road and decide to use the footpath |

Option 4

|               |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
|---------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Type          | PSP                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
| Location      | On road                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
| Cost          | \$785,000                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
| Advantages    | Dedicated on road PSP with separation from traffic is the “Rolls Royce” treatment for cycling facilities, with no sharing with pedestrians or cars<br>Cyclists have priority to continue across intersections<br>Can accommodate very high numbers of users                                        |
| Disadvantages | Graylands Road requires widening<br>Pedestrian facilities are not upgraded so existing flagstone footpath will still require upgrading to a 1.8m Claremont Cream footpath, adding to the entire project cost.<br>Removal of all verge and road parking on east side<br>Very high cost to construct |

Option 5

|            |                                                                                                          |
|------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Type       | PSP                                                                                                      |
| Location   | On verge against the kerb                                                                                |
| Cost       | \$670,000                                                                                                |
| Advantages | Introduces upgraded facilities for pedestrians as well as people on bikes<br>On road parking is retained |

Can accommodate very high numbers of users

Disadvantages      Graylands Road requires widening  
Removal of all verge parking on east side  
Priority is for vehicles at intersections  
Very high cost to construct

Due to the cost of the PSP options and the advantages compared to the other available options, it is recommended that options 1 – 3 be taken to public consultation stage and options 4 & 5 be dropped as an option.

### Past Resolutions

Ordinary Council Meeting 1 December 2015, Resolution 213/15:

*That Council*

1. Supports grant submissions to Department of Transport for 50% funding of;

- b. One shared path project (\$250,000) in 2017-18 financial year selected from
- Graylands Road east - shared path Alfred Road to Shenton Road
  - Stirling Highway south – missing links Bay Road to Goldsworthy Road and Bay View Terrace to Freshwater Parade
  - Bindaring Parade north – shared path Osborne Parade to the Esplanade.

CARRIED

Ordinary Council Meeting 7 February 2017, Resolution 08/17:

*That the item be deferred.*

*Reason: To reconsider the possible design of the cycle path as part of the resurfacing and re kerbing of the road scheduled for 2017-18 year.*

CARRIED

### Financial and Staff Implications

\$232,000 is available in the deferred budget allocation for this item.

Option 1 \$232,000  
Option 2 \$321,000  
Option 3 \$486,000  
Option 4 \$785,000  
Option 5 \$670,000

The recommended options to go to public consultation are options 1, 2, and 3. Options 2 and 3 will require additional funding be allocated as part of the budget process.

### Policy and Statutory Implications

Bicycle Infrastructure Policy LV113  
Pavement Materials Policy LV107  
AS1428  
AS1742

Austrroads Guide to Road Design  
WALGA Shared Path Design Technical Guidelines  
Australian Road Rules 2014  
WA Road Traffic Code 2000  
Main Roads WA Policy and Standards  
Department of Transport

### **Communication / Consultation**

Consultation to commence with residents of Graylands Road on the preferred cycleway options with feedback presented to Council upon completion

### **Strategic Community Plan**

#### **Liveability**

*We are an accessible community, with well maintained and managed assets, and our heritage preserved for the enjoyment of the community.*

#### **Environment**

*Create opportunities for varied transport options that reduce carbon emissions and other impacts of a growing town*

#### **Urgency**

For consultation to be completed and reported to Council prior to finalisation of the 2017-18 budget

#### **Voting Requirements**

Simple majority decision of Council required.

#### **Officer Recommendation**

That Council

1. Selects options 1, 2 and 3 of Graylands Road Cycleway 16021 Rev A.pdf to proceed to public consultation.
2. Receives a report on completion of consultation, with resident feedback and a final design recommendation.

**ALTERNATIVE MOTION****Moved Cr Main, seconded Cr Tulloch****That Council**

- 1. Selects options 2 of Graylands Road Cycleway 16021 Rev A.pdf to proceed to public consultation, but the surface to be red asphalt and provision of sufficient funds to be included in the draft 2017-18 budget.**
- 2. Receives a report on completion of consultation, with resident feedback and a final design recommendation.**

Reason: The pathway is clearly delineated as a cycle path and not a footpath. Red asphalt is a standard surface for footpaths throughout Perth.

**CARRIED(50/17)**

For the Alternative Motion: Mayor Barker and Crs Tulloch, Haynes, Main, Wood, Browne and Kelly.

Against the Alternative Motion: Cr Edwards.

---

### 13.1.3 LAKE CLAREMONT MANAGEMENT PLAN PUBLIC CONSULTATION OUTCOMES

|                               |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>File Ref:</b>              | <b>PRK00300</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |
| <b>Attachments:</b>           | <a href="#">Lake Claremont Management Plan 2016 21 Approved draft</a><br><a href="#">Lake Claremont Management Plan Appendix 1 Approved draft</a><br><a href="#">Lake Claremont Management Plan Appendix 2 Approved draft</a><br><a href="#">Lake Claremont Management Plan Appendix 3 Approved draft</a><br><a href="#">Community Feedback from Public Consultation</a> |
| <b>Responsible Officer:</b>   | <b>Saba Kirupanather</b><br><b>Executive Manager Infrastructure</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| <b>Author:</b>                | <b>Andrew Head</b><br><b>Manager Parks and Environment</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
| <b>Proposed Meeting Date:</b> | <b>4 April 2017</b>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |

---

#### **Purpose**

For the Council to receive a report on the community public consultation and the comments received during that process.

#### **Background**

The life span of a strategic management plan, including management plans for public open spaces, is typically a period of five years.

The evolving community engagement with Lake Claremont has changed the management focus from conservation and preservation of the lake and remnant bushland to cultural, social, recreational and environmental values of a mixed-use public open space which underpins this draft of the Lake Claremont Management Plan 2016-21 (LCMP).

#### **Discussion**

At the Ordinary Council Meeting (OCM) on 18 October 2016 the Council approved the draft Lake Claremont Management Plan for public consultation during November 2016. Consultation has also been undertaken with the South West Aboriginal Land and Sea Council (SWALSC) Whadjuk Working Party, this occurred on the 15 March 2017.

The SWALSC Whadjuk Working Party meeting involved presenting the Lake Claremont Management Plan and three projects which are to be undertaken on or near Aboriginal heritage registered sites; this included the Henshaw Drain swale at Lake Claremont and another two projects on the foreshore reserve; those being Chester Road Car park and Alex Prior Drain. The two projects in the foreshore reserve will be presented to the March 2017 Foreshore Advisory Committee meeting. The members of the Whadjuk group instructed SWALSC to correspond with the

---

Town of Claremont to convey their support for the three projects and to advise that the members did not oppose the Lake Claremont Management Plan 2016-21.

Currently the Town is liaising with the Department of Aboriginal Affairs in relation to the requirement of either Regulation 10 or Section 18 approval process for the above projects. However, this is not required for the Lake Claremont Management Plan 2016-21.

Attached are the comments as received from the public consultation. A couple of items raised have already been addressed within the management plan and are included at the end of this discussion. Submissions which Council needs to consider are immediately below;

#### Sporting vs Cultural

Submission: LCMP page 3 *The following statement should be changed FROM: "...the ongoing management aim is to maintain and enhance the ecological, recreational and sporting values of the Lake Claremont environs..." TO "...the ongoing management aim is to maintain and enhance the ecological, recreational and cultural values of the Lake Claremont environs..." Point- The cultural aspect is missing and the recreational values include sport.*

Officer comment: Agree, given the outcome of previous public consultation we should remove the "Sporting" and replace with "Cultural".

#### Water Quality

Submission: LCMP page 12 *"The following statement simply is not true, as future impacts cannot be predicted: "The level of impact associated with these land uses is expected to be minimal as monitoring of water quality carried out on the water body indicate that nutrient levels, particularly those of ortho-phosphate that contribute to algae blooms, have declined or remained stable over recent time (Simpson 2013; Simpson 2014a)." This statement should be modified to read: "The level of impact associated with these land uses will continue to be monitored through the ongoing comprehensive water quality monitoring program that is currently in place"*

Officer comment: Agree, given the noted increase in phosphorous levels in the lake over this season, this could be changed within the document to say; "The level of impact associated with these land uses will continue to be regularly checked through our water quality monitoring program."

#### Greening Plan

Submission: LCMP page 10 *"The Western Suburbs Greening Plan should be added to table one as a guiding policy."*

Officer comment: Agree, This Western Suburbs Regional Organisation of Councils (WESROC) document was developed in 2002 but is still being used by all the councils in the region as a strategic greening plan. Lake Claremont is a key linkage within that plan.

Typos and updates

Submission: LCMP page 28 *“typo: ...consistent with the elements the former Lake Claremont Parkland...”*

Officer comment: Agree, need to add "of" so it reads well ...consistent with the elements of the former Lake Claremont Parkland...

Submission: LCMP page 29 *“Banksia attenuata and B. menziesii are already part of the revegetation program and have been planted extensively over the past few year (although the survival rate has been low). Please correct the following statement to reflect these facts: “Broaden the species selection for conservation and revegetation planting to include difficult to grow species, such as Banksia attenuata, Banksia menziesii...” to read “Continue the species selection.....”*

Officer comment: Agree, this needs to be changed as there has already been a concerted effort to plant a number of Banksia species, replace "broaden" with "continue".

Submission: LCMP Section 5.17 *“Access” “Signage”, etc. The environmental significance of the Lake Claremont area is important to the community. Please change the following statement (throughout the table) to reflect this view: “Recognise that the lake and its surrounds have high social and cultural values within the community” to “Recognise that the lake and its surrounds have high social, environmental and cultural values within the community”.*

Officer comment: Agree, environmental should be added to the statement within the document.

Another minor correction will be made on page 20 of the LCMP to the fifth point in section 2.9. Change from *“...facilities to cater for 10-12+ years of age...”* to *“...facilities to cater for 12+ years of age...”* to make the sentence clear.

Turtles

Submission: *“The impacts on the population of the oblong turtle, a near-threatened species, should be assessed and considered before any addition of infrastructure and ground works at Lake Claremont.”*

Officer comment: Not a lot of data on turtle activity is available for Lake Claremont. Data is being provided when carcasses are found. Minimal on ground works are proposed which may impact turtle breeding. See LCMP recommendation under section 4.5.1 *“Minimise negative impacts to native fauna, with particular attention paid to avifauna and the Chelonian colliei”*

This statement needs correcting to read- *“Minimise negative impacts to native fauna, with particular attention paid to avifauna and the Chelodina colliei”*

Local and regional significance

Submission: LCMP *“Appendix 2 – The local and regional significance of Lake Claremont is not explained (anywhere in the document). The report should note a few important facts:*

---



1. *the percentage of the remaining wetlands that occur on the Swan Coastal Plain (less than 20%)*
2. *that few wetlands are protected on the Swan Coastal Plain by being listed as a Conservation Category Wetland (and what that percentage is as the current estimate)*
3. *how many wetlands are left in the western suburbs*
4. *over 99% of the original native vegetation in Claremont has been cleared*
5. *the only remnant bushland left in Claremont is the approx. 3 hectares on the northwest side of the lake*
6. *the percentage that remains in Perth of the soil complexes that occur around the lake, etc. “*

Officer comment: Agree with points 1, 2, 3 would be good to get into the document, it would be appropriate in Appendix One, Biophysical & Wetland Values Section 1.2.

However point 4 & 5 are not entirely accurate as there is also another 4ha of remnant natural areas on the Swan River foreshore. Point 6, the percentage of soil complex types would be small and insignificant as a percentage not sure of the value in this information being calculated.

Below are the submissions received which the Town's officer believes have been adequately addressed.

#### Educational/Heritage Centre

Submission: *“Consider heritage listing for shed in the park. Unique design, setting in the trees and demonstrates history. Please don't demolish it due to safety concerns. Spend money to manage / maintain as it is, or improve structurally so it will withstand the tests of time.”*

Officer comment: The shed would not be considered a heritage building. There is also no mention in the plan of removal of this building. No further change required

Submission: *“Educational / cultural centre not to be located at shed. Needs to be at location of pool / golf course. Will need better access and parking than is available at the shed, and we don't want to remove any of the trees in vicinity of shed.”*

Officer comment: A scope will be developed first. Then in 2017-18 a proposal will be submitted to Council for approval. No further change required.

Submission: *“The (FOLC) Board welcomes the idea of creating a cultural and natural interpretative centre. However, this should not be located where the existing shed is. The shed is needed to store and clean equipment necessary for bushcare work. A more appropriate site for a cultural and natural interpretive centre would be in the pool area (which will be redeveloped soon) or the golf course club-house area so that existing facilities, such as toilets and parking, can be shared.”*

Officer comment: See section 3.3 of the LCMP as this is mentioned within the plan. Further details would be developed before making a final decision on location. Preferred location of FOLC and Lake Claremont Advisory Committee (LCAC) has been included in the plan.

### Education

Submission: *“When the old drive in site was subdivided for housing there was an assurance by ToC that environmental education would be provided as a priority for the new home owners. I don’t see that this has happened and a great potential for community involvement for those in that area has been missed. They could be participating in rubbish and weed removal of the bush in their surrounds and encouraged to be involved in planting and preventing use of shortcut paths through reveg areas which have damaged plantings and caused erosion. I am disappointed that this was not followed through with by ToC and see it as a failed promise.”*

Officer comment: Environmental education may have been discussed at workshops with the community regarding the development of Lakeway subdivision but it didn’t become a requirement of the development. Conditions on the development were around environmental design (6 star plus) and use water sensitive design with low water use plants. Issues with inappropriate access causing erosion is very limited at the site but seems to be concentrated around steeper areas of the Lakeway subdivision where the fencing is not enclosed. There are recommendations in the LCMP (Section 4.3.2) to provide educational information on signage, brochures and develop web-optimised resources. Another is to regularly review the lake banks and steeper areas for signs of erosion, and implement suitable control measures. No change to the plan required.

Submission: LCMP page 27 *“A key objective for the wetland values should be added “To promote and educate the public about the importance of the conservation status of the wetland.””*

Officer comment: See section 4.3.2 of LCMP provide educational information on signage, brochures and develop web optimised resources. See section 2.5 Signage in relation to notice boards which will assist in educating park users through bulletins and poster displays.

### Signage

Submission: *Re boards promoting ToC / FoLC activities to be placed at access points around the lake: I think that the Strickland Street access is very popular as we have a lot of pedestrians and cars coming down the street to enter the path. A lot of people from the Nedlands / northern side of Alfred Road. enter the path down Strickland Street. Consider signs at the end of the street please, otherwise all signs would be focused on eastern and southern sides.*

Officer comment: To capture most patrons the signs should be located near or at, Alfred and Davies Roads, Stirling Road and the Golf Club building. A signage plan will be developed and approved by Council showing types of signs and their proposed locations.

Submission: Section 2.5 of LCMP *“Very pleased to see upgrades to signage being actioned/considered. New bird related signage will be very good.*

*“Entry statements “ signage is vaguely referred to/not mentioned in the draft plan despite these being strongly supported by FOLC and the LCAC. These statements should welcome patrons to the park, refer to the Lakes status as a Conservation*

---

*Category Wetland, speak to the environmental and recreational values of the lake and invite users to respect those values. These 'entry statements' should incorporate the proposed notice boards informing patrons of activities current at the lake."*

Officer comment: Entry signage would form part of signage plan being developed for the site.

#### Shade

Submission: *"The existing grassed and shaded areas under trees should not be planted with undergrowth as they are used by walkers. Particularly in summer, the area is extremely hot and any shaded areas are precious to walkers and other users. If the area under the trees on the eastern boundary is planted, a limestone path under the canopy would be beneficial. More trees should be planted throughout the grassed areas to provide shade for users."*

Officer comment: The lack of shade on the parkland was previously mentioned by the community within the working party report. But planting locations need to be carefully planned to ensure it doesn't reduce usability for other activities.

Submission: *"It is also the view of the FOLC Board that some trees could be planted sparsely in the eastern wetland buffer, particularly on the western side of the shared path, to provide shade for the afternoon summer sun. These trees would not block out views."*

Officer comment: This point has been raised a couple of times during public consultation phases of this plan. Some trees could be planted close to the western side of the path to provide shade to the pedestrians without impacting views through placement and spacing. This could be reviewed by the Council at a future date. No need to change the management plan.

#### Change in Use

Submission: *It is interesting that there is an enormous emphasis at the moment on the importance of "nature play" for children, yet they are being excluded from the areas in which previous generations had available to them for such play. Instead, we build multi million dollar contrived "nature parks" (e.g. Rio Tinto in Kings Park) which end up crowded and over regulated. Perhaps we need to stop fencing off areas and telling our kids off for entering "ecologically sensitive" areas and allow them access to real nature experiences. How quickly our attitude can change, from "don't go there kids it's a tip" to "don't go there kids you might tread on a plant" in one generation.*

Officer comment: As community values of the site and environmental awareness increases people change the way they engage with the site. This is seen as a generalised comment about the change in attitude and use by people of the site.

Plan development process

Submission: *Overall the document is well organized, well written and comprehensive document that meets its objectives to guide the work at the lake over the next 5 years and beyond.*

*Despite the overall positive outcome of this report, I do have some major concerns with the review process itself, finding it inefficient and poorly managed. It will have taken approximately 3 years from the time the review process commenced until the plan is officially approved by the council. This is unacceptable for a plan with a duration of only 5 years. Please find my separate criticism on this process at the end of the document.*

Submission: *"It has been nearly 3 years from the commencement of the review process to the LCMP being released for public comment. For a 5 year management plan, this is an unacceptable amount of time. In future reviews, a time line of 6-8 months should be put into place. Any issues that cannot be dealt with during that time should be duly noted and either dealt with in the next review period or added to the plan as an addendum when the issue is resolved."*

Officer comment: Rushing an important strategic document can result in poor outcomes. By taking time to ensure all stakeholders have been consulted has resulted in the addition of facilities for children, families and other user groups.

Executive Summary

Submission: LCMP page 1 *"Executive Summary and Management Plan Overview – The beginning of both sections should begin with the vision and objective statements: "The management plan was developed to protect, enhance, and promote the cultural, environmental and recreational values of Lake Claremont and its surrounds by....." There should also be a statement in these sections that Lake Claremont is one of the Town of Claremont's most important assets. (An Executive Summary should not begin with background information about the plan being the latest iteration in a series.)*

*The addition of the Recreation Precinct to the area managed under this plan is wise and welcome so that the impacts that works may have on the conservation areas and the wildlife can be considered and assessed."*

Officer comments: Currently the vision and objective have their own heading within the table of contents under overview. LCAC has recommended them in both locations.

Sport appendix

Submission: LCMP page 12 Section 2.0, *Lake Claremont Recreation and Sport Spaces, should be move to the appendices section to have a consistent lay out for the plan.*

Officer comment: This may be a good idea for the next review. Currently there is not enough of this information to warrant a separate appendix. Once the Golf Course and Pool upgrades are complete this appendix could be developed.

Car parking

Submission: LCMP page 16. *"I do not support the current plan to put 12-14 or more new parking spaces at Stirling Rd, especially if it is hard surfaced (asphalt or cement). I have only ever supported the addition of 5 -6 rustic bays with a permeable surface like gravel. Park users should be encouraged to walk to the park. There is ample parking at the golf course. New parking will not necessarily be used by park users. The car park is already used by Scotch visitors, and this is likely to continue or even increase with new parking. Scotch College has recently removed a number of mature trees to build new car parks and the Early Learning Centre. Why isn't the replacement of these trees (in the same vicinity as they were removed) included as part of this management plan?"*

Officer Comment: At the Ordinary Council Meeting on 21 March 2017 the Council approved the Stirling Road car park design and construction.

The above issues related to Scotch College is outside the scope of this management plan.

Submission: *"The Board is opposed to additional parking on Davies Road. Dog walkers are mainly locals and walk to the lake. Davies Road is a very busy road and is not conducive to unloading dogs from cars; dog walkers can park at the golf course if no other parking is available. Green space and recently planted shrubs or trees may be removed for the addition of a few parking spaces. This parking will likely be used by a lot of different users as well as park users."*

Officer comment: A separate report will be presented to Council on 4 April 2017.

Submission: *"Expansion of the Stirling Road Car Park: The FOLC do not support the expansion of the Stirling Road Carpark as shown on the Concept Plan. We do support adding 5-6 new parking bays in a rustic, low impact way (consisting of gravel or similar permeable surface). This car park is supposed to be for park users only, but this is difficult to ensure and it is likely that it will be used by Scotch College parents as a pickup/drop off point."*

Officer comment: At the Ordinary Council Meeting on 21 March 2017 the Council approved the Stirling Road car park design and construction.

Submission: *"In recent years the Council has redeveloped Mulder Park, closed the gold course and opened up parkland around Lake Claremont. Obviously these locations are very attractive for the public and especially families to use. However, the Council has not made any additional provision for parking near either Lake Claremont or Mulder Park. Consequently, this has put additional pressure on parking at the Claremont Village shopping centre. I am aware the Council has been considering six parking spots in the park at the end of Lakeway Street. However, this does not seem enough. Maybe twenty parking spots would be more appropriate. Also, I recommend the Council provide additional parking in Mulder Park which would be safer for children getting in and out of cars to go to the new playground. In addition the Council should construct a foot path from the parking at the end of Lakeway Street to Mulder Park."*

*I would like to congratulate the Claremont Council on the work they are doing to improve the recreational facilities for residents and visitors to the area."*

Officer comment: A decision to minimise encroachment into the open space for parking has been carefully considered. The residents of Lakeway Street have objected to any additional expansion of this car park however it is a recommendation of Council to increase the parking areas by six bays using a mulched surface. A linking path to Mulder Park would assist linking and activating this area. A sports node is planned directly west of Mulder Park so this path could either run west to the lake path or north to Lakeway Street, link to the car park then head east to link to the shared path. As activation of this area occurs it is likely that both of these paths would be reviewed at a later date.

Submission: Section 2.3 of LCMP *"I don't support additional parking on Davies rd. There is sufficient parking + proposed parking at the Lakeway cul de sac which is immediately adjacent to the dog exercise area. Ample parking is available at the golf course and on Elliot rd and is just a short stroll from the dog exercise area. I don't believe that a cost/benefit analysis would support this proposal."*

Officer comment: A separate report will be presented to Council on 4 April 2017.

#### View corridors

Submission: *"The Board is cautious about the notion to create viewing corridors in the north end of the lake, especially at the expense of wildlife. We oppose the removal of wattles (Acacias) before they have died (as has recently occurred) and replacing all of them with lower vegetation in the north end of the lake, just to provide views. Acacia seeds are an important food source for birds and insects; also Variegated Fairy-wrens have returned to the areas after several decades because of these denser shrub plantings. We also note that views have been returning at this end of the lake as the vegetation has grown. The wildlife in this area should be a priority. We support removing invasive woody weeds according to a well laid out strategy."*

Officer comment: No wildlife would be harmed during the development of these view corridors. Short lived wattles may only live for another couple of years and will need to be replaced. Smaller trees are maturing which is forcing the decline of vegetation from the lower canopy; this is already creating views naturally. There is a fallen dead blue gum which would really create a view very quickly; this could also allow a bench to be installed to take advantage of the views created of the water body.

Submission: *"The Board recognises and supports the need to maintain the views of the lake on the east side. But we are strongly opposed to the proposed plant bandings in the wetland buffer which suggests taller plants should be planted near the fence line and shorter plants, less than 300mm tall, be planted nearer the lake to help give better views of the lake. This is not in keeping with the original plans to keep this area somewhat natural. There are virtually no plants that grow only to a height of 300mm. The plants will grow and naturally germinate with time, not keeping to the artificial bands drawn on a plan. It is far better to plant a mixture of low growing native herbs and shrubs that grow from 300mm to 1000 mm tall. Then there will be a nice mixture of plants with interesting features, more diversity for the wildlife and easier maintenance. Plus the views will not be blocked."*

---

Submission: Section 2.7 Lake views – *“The Town’s officer has established that views are unimpeded for 39% of the perimeter plus partial for a further 22%. Maturing of canopy and death of short lived ‘colonising’ species like Wattle will result in further improved views. I support the selective removal of exotic species to improve views. At the same time I believe the Town has an obligation to explain/educate the community (particularly those that believe the bush is too dense) about the nature of revegetation works and their positive benefits and that as the plantings mature views will re emerge will re-emerge..*

*The newly conceived concept of “plant banding” to retain views of the lake on the future wetland buffer site are unnatural and very impracticable from an implementation point of view. Further, the concept of retaining views along the east side has gone too far. A small number of trees would be beneficial from a shade perspective without limiting views.*

*The FOLC understand the importance of retaining views of the lake.”*

Officer comment: It is acknowledged that placing the height restrictions on the plantings will reduce the species available to undertake revegetation works in each band; this restricts the suitable species and reduces diversity.

From time to time species will naturally seed within the buffer areas, this will need to be managed by applying for a clearing permit for purpose should these seedling plants be identified as naturally occurring local provenance species.

#### Paths in buffer area

Submission: *“The Board is cautious when considering the addition of another limestone footpath closer to the eastern edge of the lake. The area within 50 m of a Conservation Category Wetland is designated an Environmentally Sensitive Area (ESA), and parts of the eastern wetland buffer contain the only ESAs at the lake without a formal pathway built through it. Some of this protection should remain. However, the Board is open to a short looping path leading to a bird hide or park bench, only if it has self-closing gates to prevent dog access and does not go through the entire length of the ESA on the eastern side.”*

Officer comment: The plan is to place self closing gates and have signs to exclude dogs from the buffer area. The path would help control the access to a bench which would act as a nice location to enjoy a sunset.

#### Ficus trees

Submission: *“The reference that fig trees should be recognised for their European Heritage is misleading and should be removed. The Moreton Bay Figs were planted after the rubbish dump closed in 1970. Their significance can be assessed because they are beautiful trees and are valued by the community. Their value for wildlife must be considered; a mature native tree can support up to 80 different varieties of animal species. The evaluation of these trees must also include their impact on the surface and ground water.”*

Officer comment: It is proposed that the Ficus in Stirling Road Park be assessed for heritage value using the same method used by the Heritage Council for buildings. It is unlikely that the assessment would result in local heritage registration. The Ficus

trees in the eastern buffer area will also be assessed and a separate report will be presented to LCAC and Council.

Submission: LCMP Section 1.7.1 *"The statement does not accurately reflect the alternative view.*

*The FOLC agree that the Moreton Bay Fig trees at the Southern end are worth retaining because of the shade that they create around recreational facilities. However, there are other specimens throughout the park that serve no such purpose and have detrimental environmental effects. We support previous management plans that outline a staged removal program over a significant period of years as well as allowing for "as needs" maintenance/management.*

*FOLC disagree with the notion that these trees have any "European heritage value" given their age and that they were part of landscaping for the golf course.*

*We respect the desires of the Noongar custodians and believe that the our position is a balanced compromise based on the environmental, recreational and Indigenous heritage values of the site.*

*A staged removal of the Moreton Bay Fig trees on the Eastern shore (at entrance to the peninsula) would improve views of the lake from the path, allow for the establishment of suitable native vegetation to replace and meet the objectives of the LCMP by removing a declared woody weed species from sections of the lake."*

Officer comment: Council supports the addition of Ficus Hillii to the woody weed list with a suggested removal timeline of within next five years. There will be an assessment and a separate report regarding the Moreton Bay Figs to Council via LCAC in May/ June 2017. In the meantime it is placed in the plan with timing to be advised. Council may decide not to remove.

### Dogs

Submission: LCMP Section 2.1.2 Dog walking and exercise

*I believe fencing of the dog exercise area is part of the solution to dog issues at the lake. A survey of dog walkers and registered dog owners would determine whether it was desired by the community. Fencing and provision of drinking water would increase patronage of the off lead exercise area."*

Officer comment: The area now has a drinking fountain for dogs. The hedge is becoming effective at controlling some smaller dogs however there are some park users who have requested fencing of Davies Road side as their dogs are not under effective control.

Submission: LCMP section 5.5 - *Dog management with a particular focus on education and the local fauna should be added to the table as a priority."*

Officer comment: Dog Management is in the report however the educational focus is not made explicit. This will be addressed in the sign plan for the site with a number of signs, three different designs for path stickers have been designed for implementing.

### **Past Resolutions**

Lake Claremont Advisory Committee Meeting 23 February 2017

*That Council*

- 1. supports the Lake Claremont Management Plan (LCMP) 2016-21 subject to;*
-



- a. removing 'sporting' and replace with 'cultural' in section 1.5
  - b. modifying section 1.11 on last line to read 'The level of impact associated with these land uses will continue to be monitored through the ongoing comprehensive water quality monitoring program that is currently in place, further discussion of water quality appears in Appendix 1.'
  - c. adding the Western suburbs greening plan to Table 1 on page 10 as a guiding document
  - d. changing point 2 of section 4.4.1 of LCMP so it reads 'Ensure conservation, restoration and revegetation activities are consistent with the elements of the former Lake Claremont Parkland: concept plan and 2010 Lake Claremont Management Plan'
  - e. a minor correction on page 20 of the LCMP in section 2.9. Change from '...facilities to cater for 10-12+ years of age...' to '...facilities to cater for 12+ years of age...'
  - f. rewording first point in section 4.5.1 of LCMP 'Minimise negative impacts to native fauna, with particular attention paid to avifauna and the *Chelodina colliei*'
  - g. replacing 'broaden' with 'continue' on the second recommendations of both sub headings in section 4.42 of LCMP
  - h. rewording objective under section 5.0 through to section 5.1.11 of LCMP to read "Recognise that the lake and its surrounds have high social, environmental and cultural values within the community".
  - i. modifying Appendix one, section 1.2 of LCMP to include the final paragraph "Less than 20% of the wetlands on the Swan Coastal Plain remain. In the western suburbs there are only a few protected conservation category wetlands which include Lake Monger, Perry Lakes, Herdsman Lake, Lake Gwelup and Lake Claremont."
  - j. include section 1.1, the Vision, and section 1.2, Management Plan Objectives, in the executive summary.
2. agrees that once LCMP is updated with changes above, it be submitted to the South West Aboriginal Land and Sea Council in March 2017 for aboriginal consultation and approval.

Ordinary Council Meeting 18 October 2016:

*That Council approves the release of the updated Lake Claremont Management Plan 2016-21 for public consultation subject to the following:*

1. *Acknowledges that a separate report will be presented to Council with the recommendation of LCAC regarding the Moreton Bay Figs (*Ficus macrophylla*)*
  2. *Approves the inclusion of Hills Figs (*Ficus microcarpa hillii*) in the woody weeds table 2.5.1 in Appendix 2 with a proposed removal within the next 5 years*
  3. *A comprehensive report on alternative weed control methods including but not limited to steam be presented at a Council meeting for consideration prior to finalisation of Lake Claremont Management Plan 2016-21 public consultation report.*
-

Ordinary Council Meeting 20 September 2016,

*That the item be deferred back to Administration.*

*Reason: To clarify the issues that have been presented*

1. *Balance between Lake Claremont Management Plan and the Lake Claremont Parkland Use Recreation Working Party Plan.*
2. *Plantings up to 1 metre and the view corridors.*
3. *European Heritage of Morten Bay figs.*
4. *Dog fence*
5. *Steam versus Glysohate*

Lake Claremont Advisory Committee Meeting 25 August 2016:

*That the Committee recommends that Council:*

1. *Release the Lake Claremont Management Plan 2016-21 for public consultation subject to the following;*
  - a) *Interpretive shelter to be left in plan with reference made to the proposed multiuse function room at the Aquatic Centre redevelopment being available for talks, meetings and training by use of community groups and a business plan be prepared for an environmental education centre.*
  - b) *Continue to provide views of the lake by using low plantings with an indicative height between 600mm and 1 metre height on the eastern side of the lake and other vistas be created through the removal of established non native trees which provide the Town opportunities to revegetate with endemic species in those areas to improve biodiversity and maintain long term viability of the bushland."*
  - c) *Figure 7.2 be amended by deleting Town Of Claremont ownership of Lake Way and replacing "boundary" and "shoreline."*
  - d) *Update figure 7.6 to show in particular current approved dog exercise area and Par 3 Golf Course.*
2. *The five year implementation plan (Section 5 of draft Lake Claremont Management Plan) to inform priorities of all identified actions.*
3. *Recommends the development of an appendix for land use to be created and include the Golf/Pool upgraded facilities for next management plan review in 2021.*

Lake Claremont Advisory Committee Meeting 25 February 2016:

*That the Committee recommends that Council:*

1. *Releases for community consultation the draft Lake Claremont Management Plan 2016-2021 and the three draft appendices that support the plan.*
2. *Approves engagement with Noongar representatives to confirm and/or secure (Section 18) approval for Aboriginal heritage aspects of the draft Lake Claremont Parklands Management Plan 2016-2021 and the three draft appendices that support the plan.*
4. *Refers to the Lake Claremont Advisory Committee for consideration and recommendation the scheduling of management actions determined following the community consultation and detailed in Section 5.0 of the plan.*
5. *Lake Claremont Parklands Management Plan be named Lake Claremont Management Plan.*

## Ordinary Council Meeting 16 Feb 2016:

*That*

1. *Council receive this report about the consultation outcomes regarding the Lake Claremont Parkland Recreation Use Plan;*
2. *Council endorse the recommendations of the Lake Claremont Parkland Recreation Use Plan (as amended by Council resolution 224/15) through modification to the Lake Claremont Parkland Concept Plan 2010 other than the recommendations relating to the dog exercise area which is to be dealt with separately;*
3. *Give consideration in the mid-year budget review to allocation of \$56,000 for the proposed 2015-2016 projects;*
4. *The necessary provision for funding be included for the listed 2016-17 and 2017-18 projects when the Town's Forward Financial Plan is reviewed;*
6. *Opportunities for funding partnerships and grant funding be investigated by the Administration;*
7. *Further consideration be given in 2018 to consider further initiatives in time for consideration during budget deliberations for 2018-19;*
8. *Refer to the Lake Claremont Committee for consideration and recommendation to Council –*
  - a) *the proposal for the dog proof fence around Lake Claremont;*
  - b) *the proposal to retain all fig trees as recognition of the European heritage of the precinct; and*
9. *Direct that public notice be given of the proposal to amend the Dogs in Public Places Policy LV127 by extending the existing area south to the proposed Lakeway Street parking area extension.*

## Ordinary Council Meeting 5 May 2015:

1. *Council establish a Lake Claremont Parkland Recreation Use working party to consider the use of the parkland as a recreation resource for the community.*
2. *The working party to report to Council no later than 3 September 2015.*
3. *Membership of the working party be three elected members plus the CEO or his delegate.*
4. *The working party consist of the one Councillor from each Ward and one only deputy all to be elected by Council.*

## Ordinary Council Meeting Council 1 July 2014:

*That Council:*

1. *Approves the draft brief for the consultants to review the Lake Claremont Management Plan; and*
2. *Delegates to the Chief Executive Officer to make any other amendments as needed to progress with the LCMP review.*

## Ordinary Council Meeting 18 March 2014:

*Approves \$32,500 as an unbudgeted expenditure, to review the 2010 Lake Claremont Management Plan and draft a new best practice adaptive management plan for the lake and its surrounds.*

## **Financial and Staff Implications**

Resource requirements are in accordance with existing budgetary allocation.

## **Policy and Statutory Implications**

*Aboriginal Heritage Act 1972 (WA)*

*Environmental Protection Act 1986 (WA)*

*Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (Aust)*

*Wildlife Protection Act 1950 (WA)*

*Environmental Protection (Clearing of Native Vegetation) Regulations 2004 (WA)*

Bush Forever and Geomorphic Wetlands Swan Coastal Plain dataset

State Planning Policy 2.8: Bushland Policy for the Perth Metropolitan Region

Lake Claremont Management Plan 2010

Lake Claremont Concept Plan

## **Communication / Consultation**

A copy of the Management Plan and Appendices would be placed on the Lake Claremont section of the website for public access.

## **Strategic Community Plan**

### **Liveability**

*We are an accessible community, with well maintained and managed assets, and our heritage preserved for the enjoyment of the community.*

- Clean, usable, attractive, accessible streetscapes and public open spaces.
- Develop the public realm as gathering spaces for participation and enjoyment.

### **People**

*We live in an accessible and safe community that welcomes diversity, enjoys being active and has a strong sense of belonging.*

- Improve the capacity of local community groups.

### **Environment**

*We are a leader in responsibly managing the build and natural environment for the enjoyment of the community and continue to provide sustainable, leafy green parks, streets and outdoor spaces.*

- Strive for innovative environmental design practices in new developments and redevelopments.
- Provide education and communication on leading practices to the community.
- Implement sound environmental practices as reflected in the WESROC Climate Change Risk Assessment Project.

## **Governance and Leadership**

*We are an open and accountable local government that encourages community involvement and strives to keep its community well informed.*

- Identify strategic partnerships that align with the Town's vision.
- Provide and maintain a high standard of governance, accountability, management and strategic planning.
- Focus on improved customer service, communication and consultation.

## **Urgency**

N/A

## **Voting Requirements**

Simple majority decision of Council required.

## **Moved Cr Haynes, seconded Cr Wood**

### **That Council**

- 1. Adopts the Lake Claremont Management Plan (LCMP) 2016-21 subject to;**
  - a. removing 'sporting' and replace with 'cultural' in section 1.5**
  - b. modifying section 1.11 on last line to read 'The level of impact associated with these land uses will continue to be monitored through the ongoing comprehensive water quality monitoring program that is currently in place, further discussion of water quality appears in Appendix 1.'**
  - c. adding the Western suburbs greening plan to Table 1 on page 10 as a guiding document**
  - d. changing point 2 of section 4.4.1 of LCMP so it reads 'Ensure conservation, restoration and revegetation activities are consistent with the elements of the former Lake Claremont Parkland: concept plan and 2010 Lake Claremont Management Plan'**
  - e. a minor correction on page 20 of the LCMP in section 2.9. Change from '....facilities to cater for 10-12+ years of age...' to '....facilities to cater for 12+ years of age...'**
  - f. rewording first point in section 4.5.1 of LCMP 'Minimise negative impacts to native fauna, with particular attention paid to avifauna and the Chelodina colliei'**
  - g. replacing 'broaden' with 'continue' on the second recommendations of both sub headings in section 4.42 of LCMP**

- h. rewording objective under section 5.0 through to section 5.1.11 of LCMP to read “Recognise that the lake and its surrounds have high social, environmental and cultural values within the community”.
  - i. modifying Appendix one, section 1.2 of LCMP to include the final paragraph “Less than 20% of the wetlands on the Swan Coastal Plain remain. In the western suburbs there are only a few protected conservation category wetlands which include Lake Monger, Perry Lakes, Herdsman Lake, Lake Gwelup and Lake Claremont.”
  - j. include section 1.1, the Vision, and section 1.2, Management Plan Objectives, in the executive summary.
2. Thank the South West Aboriginal Land and Sea Council for facilitating the presentation of the Lake Claremont Management Plan 2016-21 to the Whadjuk Working Party.

**CARRIED(51/17)  
(NO DISSENT)**

**14 ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PRESIDING PERSON**

Mayor Barker and Councillors Tulloch, Main, Wood and Kelly reported on their attendance at ART TRA and commended staff involved.

Councillor Kelly also reported on his attendance at the STM Fashion Parade and commended STM and the businesses involved in bringing it together.

**15 ELECTED MEMBERS' MOTIONS OF WHICH PREVIOUS NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN**

NIL

**16 NEW BUSINESS OF AN URGENT NATURE APPROVED BY THE PERSON PRESIDING OR BY DECISION OF MEETING**

NIL

**17 CONFIDENTIAL MATTERS FOR WHICH THE MEETING MAY BE CLOSED TO THE PUBLIC**

NIL

**18 FUTURE MEETINGS OF COUNCIL**

Ordinary Council Meeting, 18 April 2017, at 7:00PM.

**19 DECLARATION OF CLOSURE OF MEETING**

There being no further business, the presiding member declared the meeting closed at 7:40PM.

Confirmed this ..... day of ..... 2017.

**PRESIDING MEMBER**