



# **TOWN OF CLAREMONT**

## **ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING**

### **MINUTES**

**TUESDAY 5 JULY, 2016**

**Liz Ledger**

**ACTING 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 .....	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 .....	3
7	APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE .....	3
8	PETITIONS/DEPUTATIONS/PRESENTATIONS.....	3
9	CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS.....	3
10	ANNOUNCEMENT OF CONFIDENTIAL MATTERS FOR WHICH MEETING MAY BE CLOSED TO THE PUBLIC .....	3
11	BUSINESS NOT DEALT WITH FROM A PREVIOUS MEETING .....	3
12	REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.....	4
13	REPORTS OF THE CEO.....	5
13.1	PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT .....	5
	13.1.1 STIRLING HIGHWAY HOUSING STUDY.....	5
13.2	PEOPLE AND PLACES .....	25
	13.2.1 PUBLIC ART COLLECTION .....	25
13.3	CORPORATE AND GOVERNANCE.....	29
	13.3.1 MONTHLY STATEMENT OF FINANCIAL ACTIVITY FOR THE PERIOD ENDING 31 MAY 2016.....	29
13.4	INFRASTRUCTURE .....	32
	13.4.1 MEDIAN ISLAND INSTALLATION - BARNFIELD ROAD AT THE DEAN STREET INTERSECTION.....	32
	13.4.2 MODIFY THE MITFORD STREET SERVETUS STREET INTERSECTION.....	35

---

- 13.4.3 REVIEW OF CLAREMONT BIKE PLAN AND TRAVEL  
    SMART MAP ..... 36
- 14 ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PRESIDING PERSON..... 39**
- 15 ELECTED MEMBERS’ MOTIONS OF WHICH PREVIOUS NOTICE HAS  
    BEEN GIVEN..... 39**
- 16 NEW BUSINESS OF AN URGENT NATURE APPROVED BY THE  
    PERSON PRESIDING OR BY DECISION OF MEETING ..... 39**
- 17 CONFIDENTIAL MATTERS FOR WHICH THE MEETING MAY BE  
    CLOSED TO THE PUBLIC ..... 40**
  - 17.1 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER ..... 41**
    - 17.1.1 ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW OF CHIEF  
    EXECUTIVE OFFICER ..... 41
  - 17.2 CORPORATE AND GOVERNANCE..... 42**
    - 17.2.1 CLAREMONT AQUATIC CENTRE - PRINCIPAL DESIGN  
    CONSULTANT ..... 42
- 18 FUTURE MEETINGS OF COUNCIL ..... 43**
- 19 DECLARATION OF CLOSURE OF MEETING ..... 43**

---

**TOWN OF CLAREMONT**  
**ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING**  
**5 JULY, 2016**  
**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 7:00PM.

**2 RECORD OF ATTENDANCE/APOLOGIES**

**ATTENDANCE**

**Mayor Barker**

**Cr Peter Browne**

**West Ward**

**Cr Karen Wood**

**West Ward**

**Cr Peter Edwards**

**West Ward**

**Cr Paul Kelly**

**South Ward**

**Cr Chris Mews**

**South Ward**

**Cr Bruce Haynes**

**East Ward**

**Cr Kate Main**

**East Ward**

**Cr Alastair Tulloch**

**East Ward**

**Ms Liz Ledger (Acting Chief Executive Officer)**

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

**Mr David Vinicombe (Executive Manager Planning and Development)**

**Ms Maryanne Martino (Community Development Manager)**

**Ms Katie Bovell (Governance Officer)**

**Two members of the public**

**Two members of the press**

**APOLOGIES**

**Cr Jill Goetze (Leave of Absence)**

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

**3 DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS**

NIL.

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

**Ordinary Council Meeting 21 June 2016, Public Question Time**

**Mr Bart Benschop, 4 Queenslea Drive, Claremont.**

**Re: Drainage at Queenslea Drive, Claremont.**

---

*Question one:*

Why has the Town of Claremont sand bagged the premises at 4 Queenslea Drive to mitigate flooding after filling the drains on the north east side of Queenslea Drive with bitumen and changing the cross fall of the carriageway from 3% to 2%?

*Answers:*

The Town did not fill any drains with bitumen nor did it change the cross fall from 3% to 2%. The Town provided sand bags on request. The owner is responsible to stop any stormwater entering from the footpath as a condition of previous development approval.

*Question two:*

Why has the Town of Claremont modified the crossover at 4 Queenslea Drive five times when this crossover did not cause flooding?

*Answer:*

All the crossovers on the east side of Queenslea Drive were modified to ensure that storm water from the road does not enter the verge and footpath and to flow smoothly along the gutter. The Town modified the crossover at 4 Queenslea Drive a second time when it was found some vehicles had a problem entering.

*Question three:*

Why has the Town of Claremont modified the crossover at 4 Queenslea Drive so that cars cannot cross over it?

*Answer:*

When all the modification works were done along Queenslea Drive, water was ponding outside 4 and 6 Queenslea Drive. When the Town removed few millimetres of the top layer of the road surface at the kerb edge outside 4 and 6 Queenslea Drive, it removed the ponding, however created a bigger lip than acceptable at the crossover entrance at 4 Queenslea Drive. The Town is keen to correct this in line with the design provided to the owner.

*Question four:*

Why is the Town of Claremont not addressing the asbestos pollution from broken asbestos fibro cement on the footpath on the east side of Queenslea Drive?

*Answer:*

As previously advised to the owner, the pit is not under the Town's ownership or control and he needs to contact the relative service provider.

*Question five:*

Why has the Town of Claremont not addressing the drainage of asbestos polluted effluent from the Town of Claremont administered Crown Land onto the property at 4 Queenslea Drive?

*Answer:*

Please refer to answer to Question 4.

**5 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

NIL.

**6 PUBLIC STATEMENT TIME**

**Mr Mike Balfe, 15 Langsford Street, Claremont.  
Re: Item 13.1.1, Stirling Highway Housing Study.**

Mr Balfe raised his concerns with the study requesting further consultation.

**7 APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE**

**Moved Cr Haynes, seconded Cr Wood**

**That Cr Browne be granted leave of absence for the Ordinary Meeting of Council held on 2 August 2016.**

**CARRIED(98/16)  
(NO DISSENT)**

**8 PETITIONS/DEPUTATIONS/PRESENTATIONS**

NIL.

**9 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS**

**Moved Cr Mews, seconded Cr Browne**

**That the minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of Council held on 21 June 2016 be confirmed.**

**CARRIED(99/16)  
(NO DISSENT)**

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

Item 17.1.1, Annual Performance Review Of Chief Executive Officer.

Item 17.2.1, Claremont Aquatic Centre - Principal Design Consultant.

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

NIL

---

**12 REPORTS OF COMMITTEES**

NIL



## 13 REPORTS OF THE CEO

### 13.1 PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

#### 13.1.1 STIRLING HIGHWAY HOUSING STUDY

<b>File Ref:</b>	<b>LND/00089</b>
<b>Attachments – Public:</b>	<a href="#">Planning for Increased Residential Density along Stirling Highway Report</a> <a href="#">Draft Local Planning Policy – Stirling Highway – Draft Design Guidelines</a>
<b>Attachments – Restricted:</b>	<a href="#">Submissions received</a> <a href="#">Concept plans for “street wall” development of property in Eastern Highway Precinct</a>
<b>Responsible Officer:</b>	<b>David Vinicombe</b> <b>Executive Manager Planning and Development</b>
<b>Author:</b>	<b>David Vinicombe</b> <b>Executive Manager Planning and Development</b>
<b>Proposed Meeting Date:</b>	<b>5 July 2016</b>
<b>Enabling Legislation:</b>	<b><i>Planning and Development Act 2005 (PDA)</i></b> <b><i>Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015 (LPS Regs)</i></b> <b>Housing Capacity Study 2013</b> <b>Residential Design Codes (RDC)</b> <b>Town Planning Scheme No. 3 (TPS3)</b>

---

#### **Purpose**

For Council to adopt the ‘Planning for Increased Residential Density along Stirling Highway’ study (SH Study) as a Local Development Plan to guide the development of a Structure Plan / Activity Centre Plan for the town centre (and adjacent land), a TPS3 scheme amendment, Local Planning Policy and development of land along Stirling Highway.

#### **Summary**

- Council’s Housing Capacity Study (2013) recommended that the Town prepare a study into increasing residential density along Stirling Highway to address the Town’s long term obligations to meet State Government objectives for urban consolidation, while at the same time protecting the single residential streetscape and heritage characteristics of the Town.
  - The Town appointed Planning Context to prepare the SH Study in 2013.
  - The SH Study analyses the potential for increased residential density on land adjoining Stirling Highway.
  - Four development models were prepared for Council consideration as a Local Development Plan to guide the preparation of an amendment to TPS3, a Local Planning Policy and associated Structure Plan / Activity Centre Plan.
-

- The Models analysed in the SH Study include Progressive (1530 additional dwellings), Modest (1198-1339 additional dwellings), Conservative (1048-1263 additional dwellings) and Staged (1218-1322 additional dwellings).
  - It was recommended to Council on 15 March 2016 that the Staged Model be adopted for the purpose of public consultation together with “designated landmark” sites in the Western Residential Precinct. The Staged Model proposes:
    - R100 for the Eastern Highway Precinct
    - R-AC0 for the Central Town Centre Precinct
    - Retention of the current density codings (R30 and R40) and no changes for the Western Residential Precinct (with exception to the “designated landmark” sites) to preserve long term development opportunity into the next century.
  - Public consultation on the SH Study was undertaken in accordance with the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015* (LPS Regs) for a period of 28 days up until 6 May 2016.
  - Three comments of support were received in addition a letter of approval for the preparation of the Local Development Plan from the Department of Planning (DoP) on behalf of the Western Australian Planning Commission (WAPC).
  - The SH Study contains recommendations for a detailed TPS3 amendment and Local Planning Policy proposals (subject to separate consultation). These proposals are to be finalised following Council approval of the SH Study as a Local Development Plan.
  - Metropolitan Region Scheme (MRS) Amendment for Stirling Highway (Major Amendment No. 1210/41) is currently being finalised by the DoP. Once this amendment is gazetted, the Town will have 90 days in which to formally resolve to amend TPS3 to address zoning and development requirements for the land previously contained in the Primary Regional Road (PRR) reservation and included as Urban land under the MRS.
  - Recommend that Council approve the ‘Planning for Increased Residential Density along Stirling Highway’ study as a Local Development Plan, with minor modifications noting the preference for the “Staged” Model plus inclusion of the “designated landmark” site at the St Louis Estate Retirement Village site.
  - It is also recommended that upon presentation of a master plan to guide development on the St Louis Estate Retirement Village site to the satisfaction of Council, the Western Australian Planning Commission (WAPC) be requested to provide approval for the preparation of a Local Development Plan for the site which links in with the Stirling Highway Local Development Plan.
  - Finally its recommended that the approved SH Study be used as the basis to progress proposals to initiate an amendment to TPS3 and adopt local planning policies for public consultation within 90 days of MRS Amendment No. 1210/41 being gazetted.
-

## Past Resolutions

In November 2012, Council adopted the Housing Capacity Study to identify constraints and opportunities relating to the housing targets including Directions 2031 (and beyond) and the Draft Central Metropolitan Perth Sub-Regional Strategy (CMPSS).

Ordinary Council Meeting 20 November 2012, Resolution No. 221/12 includes the following pertinent extracts:

*That Council resolve as follows:*

1. *To adopt the Draft Housing Capacity Study 2012 for the Town of Claremont for inclusion in the review of the Town of Claremont's Local Planning Strategy 2010 – 2025, Clearly Claremont.*
2. *The Town of Claremont work toward implementing the 12 recommendations contained in the Housing Capacity Study 2012 as follows:*
  - 2.7 *Council lead in progressing a suitable commercial and residential zoning and density coding along Stirling Highway to ensure that in drafting a Local Scheme Amendment to reflect Metropolitan Region Scheme Amendment 1210/41, consideration be given to the introduction of a split form of R Coding such as R40/R80 and a strong set of scheme provisions, policies and design guidelines are introduced to control redevelopment and protect local heritage sites and the amenities of lower density surrounding areas.*
  - 2.8 *Council prepare an Activity Centre Structure Plan for the Claremont Town Centre which includes provisions encouraging additional residential dwellings including mixed use developments and give consideration to the creation of additional opportunities for residential development in walkable catchment of the Town Centre once formally defined.*

Council Meeting resolved on 15 March 2016, Resolution No. 37/16 as follows:

*THAT Council:*

- a) *Pursuant to Part 6 of the Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015, adopt the draft 'Planning for Increased Residential Density along Stirling Highway' study for public consultation as a proposed Local Development Plan including endorsement of the Staged Model as the preferred option plus the identified "designated landmark" site at the north western corner of Stirling Highway and Stirling Road and the St Louis Village site to guide future residential development along Stirling Highway.*
- b) *Advertise the draft 'Planning for Increased Residential Density along Stirling Highway' study for a period of 28 days.*
- c) *Require a further report being prepared for Council consideration following completion of the consultation period.*

## **Background**

The report to Council detailed the significant strategic background to the formulation of the SH Study. A brief summary is provided for the purposes of this report.

### MRS Amendment No. 1210/41

The Stirling Highway Activity Corridor Study (SHACS) is an integrated transport and land use planning study being undertaken by the Department of Planning (DoP) at the request of the Western Australian Planning Commission (WAPC) and consists of two inter-related and staged studies:

- Phase 1: A preliminary carriageway design for Stirling Highway (MRS Amendment No. 1210/41 - Rationalisation of Stirling Highway Reservation).
- Phase 2: A staged urban design and form based code study to guide built form and redevelopment opportunities in a sustainable planned manner (yet to be progressed).

MRS Amendment No. 1210/41 - Rationalisation of Stirling Highway Reservation proposed a reduction of the Primary Regional Road (PRR) reservation to approximately 40 metres in width with the balance of the land proposed to be rezoned as Urban (and Parks and Recreation for a small section between Bay View Terrace and Bernard Street).

When MRS Amendment No. 1210/41 is gazetted, land no longer affected by the PRR reservation will be zoned Urban under the MRS but will remain unzoned under TPS3 until such time as a zone (and density codings) are added by way of a scheme amendment.

The DoP has recently advised that the MRS amendment is going through its final approval procedures and is about to be gazetted.

It was considered appropriate that Council takes the initiative to develop its own set of design guidelines and other planning tools rather than await finalisation of Phase 2 of SHACS.

This report has been based on the proposed extent of the Stirling Highway reservation as shown in the MRS Amendment No. 1210/41 plans advertised for public comment, together with the remaining parcels of land which are presently zoned or reserved under TPS3. It is noted that the MRS amendment has slightly modified the proposed PRR reservation (reduced to approximately 38m), however this will not impact on the intent or the outcomes of the SH Study.

### State Government Direction

The State Government has prepared a number of strategies to promote a balance between urban growth on the fringe and consolidation within the existing urban fabric of the metropolitan area. In recent times a number of strategic directional documents have been prepared, inclusive of Directions 2031 (and Beyond), Draft Central Metropolitan Perth Sub-Regional Strategy (CMPSS), Directions 2031 (and Beyond) - 2014 Report Card and Perth & Peel @ 3.5 Million (draft). The expectation is that local government (Town of Claremont included) will take positive action to support

---

this direction and it is likely that the government will require changes to any proposals where they are not seen to be supporting these growth strategies.

Most recently, Perth & Peel @ 3.5 Million (draft) proposes that the Town to accommodate 1300 additional dwellings in the Town by 2050. This target appears to include the Directions 2031 Report Card target of 760 dwellings, but is less than the original target of 2200 contained in the Directions 2031 and Beyond / CMPSS proposals.

Discussions with the DoP officers when finalising the Housing Strategy for the Town indicated that the base (before Directions 2031 / CMPSS) calculation included 630 dwellings in the NEP. It is envisaged that with increased development yields (22-25%) at the NEP, 1000 dwellings will be accommodated within that development alone (370 dwellings more than the base 630 dwellings). It is therefore estimated that the revised future growth target for the Town of 1300, will consist of:

- 370 in the NEP
- 930 elsewhere.

#### Draft 'Planning for Increased Residential Density along Stirling Highway' Study

Details of the SH Study were reported to Council in March 2016. The following is a brief summary of that report.

- The study area includes land on both sides of Stirling Highway, within the Town of Claremont boundaries generally to a depth of the largest existing lot within each street block and following cadastral boundaries. The study area contains 146 properties and has been separated into three distinct precincts including:
  1. Western Residential Precinct (generally land on both sides of the Highway to west of Stirling Road typified by uses of a residential nature and two private school campuses, with a noticeable absence of commercial activity).
  2. Central Town Centre Precinct (generally land on both sides of the Highway between the commercial development on the west side of Stirling Road and west of Mary Street, comprising of retail, commercial and civic activity).
  3. Eastern Highway Precinct (generally land on both sides of the Highway east of Mary Street and is a mix of other commercial-type activity traditionally associated with strip highway development, with some interspersed residential activity).
- Following review of available background information (for example heritage listings, previous studies, proposed road reservations, height data, land contours, existing development) and identification of the notional study area, an on-site assessment and photography of building stock was undertaken to determine the likelihood and timing of redevelopment in the foreseeable future.
- An assessment of each property was undertaken within the study area to determine the likelihood and timing of redevelopment in the foreseeable future using a range of factors considered as either likely to encourage or be more challenging for redevelopment, and scores were applied to each category.

- 
- The suggested density coding contained in the SH Study were developed through a process that worked back from the built form to ensure a good match between the chosen R-Code and an appropriate built form for each precinct.
  - Four options were presented and analysed for the three precincts as detailed below. It is noted that total yields include an allowance of approximately 400 dwellings for the Amana (Sundowner) site, which has been the subject of a separate amendment to TPS3:
    1. Progressive Model
      - Western Residential Precinct – R80
      - Central Town Centre Precinct – R-AC0
      - Eastern Highway Precinct – R100
      - Total dwelling yield – 1,130 (plus 400 for Amana) – 1530
    2. Modest Model
      - Western Residential Precinct – R60
      - Central Town Centre Precinct – R-AC0
      - Eastern Highway Precinct – R80
      - Total dwelling yield – 939 (plus 400 for Amana) – 1339
      - Note – taking into account the reduced incentive to develop, yield may be reduced to 798 (plus 400) - 1198
    3. Conservative Model
      - Western Residential Precinct – R40
      - Central Town Centre Precinct – R-AC0
      - Eastern Highway Precinct – R60
      - Total dwelling yield – 863 (plus 400 for Amana) – 1263
      - Note – taking into account the reduced incentive to develop, yield may be reduced to 648 (plus 400) - 1048
    4. Staged Model (as per the Progressive Model for the Central Town Centre and Eastern Highway Precincts)
      - Western Residential Precinct – No change (retain R30 and R40)
      - Central Town Centre Precinct – R-AC0
      - Eastern Highway Precinct – R100
      - Total dwelling yield – 922 (plus 400 for Amana) – 1322
      - Note – taking into account the reduced incentive to develop, yield may be reduced to 818 (plus 400) - 1218

It is proposed that the R-AC zone (as referred to at times in the SH Study) be classed as R-AC0 which requires preparation of a Structure Plan (or possible Activity Centre Plan) to guide development in the Central Town Centre Precinct.

- The consultants recommend the Progressive Model as the most desirable and viable option for the following reasons:
  - *It provides sufficient incentive, flexibility and viability for landowners to initiate development.*
  - *It is more likely to result in higher quality development.*
  - *Lower densities may pose risk of seeing less redevelopment occur, or seeing interim development in a form that may be of lower quality.*

- *It more than satisfies the State Government's housing target well into the future.*
- To support the recommendation for the Progressive Model, the SH Study includes a detailed assessment of TPS provisions and makes specific recommendations for a scheme amendment and Local Planning Policy Design Guidelines (attached). In summary, the requirements outline expectations on land-use and density, plot ratio, access, parking, overshadowing, heights and setbacks, building amenity, fencing, services, heritage, and provide details for proposed scheme amendments to address these matters. In addition, Design Guidelines are recommended to address a number of these issues, plus street interface, building form, landscaping and public art and precinct specific objectives and requirements.
- The Progressive Model, proposes development requirements to create a "street wall" along both sides of the Highway with development up to four storeys high, or six storeys for key "designated landmark" corner sites, with an additional two storeys setback 3m from the "street wall" (eight storeys), except in the Town Centre where Structure Plan / Activity Centre Plan requirements will be developed to support specific Town Centre development opportunities; or where development overshadows adjacent residential property or development on the northern side of the Highway overshadows the footpath on the southern side of the Highway. Height is also proposed to be restricted to three storey "street walls" (with 3m setback additional two storeys) where development fronts commercial side streets or two storey "street walls" (with 3m setback to an additional one storey – three storeys) to residential side streets. Development will also be limited to two storeys where a site abuts a residential property not located in the study area.
- "Designated landmark" sites are defined as large prominent corner sites including Amana (Sundowner) on the corner Airlie Street as an entry point to the Town from the south; the north western corner of Stirling Highway and Stirling Road as a western entry to the town centre; Bayview Centre on the corner of Leura Avenue as the eastern entry to the town centre; and north western corner of Loch Street as the eastern entry point to the Town. It is noted that the Sundowner site has since been rezoned under TPS3 and requires no further amendment at this point.
- The pre-existing commercial nature of the Central Town Centre and Eastern Highway Precincts and ground floor (and above) commercial development will be required to be maintained with special considerations to accommodate mixed use development.
- Preliminary concept plans have been prepared as an example for a mixed use development in the Eastern Highway Precinct (see Attachment – Restricted). This (annotated) concept takes into account many of the design concepts proposed by the SH Study and the draft Design Guidelines to illustrate how the "street wall" development may be accommodated within the existing PRR reserve, and how the impact on residential property to the south may be ameliorated within the current "Highway" zone development requirements on height (max. 12m) etc.
- The SH Study is considered to be one of the most important strategic planning documents to be considered by the Town to respond to State Government

objectives whilst at the same time protecting the Town's single residential streetscapes and heritage characteristics. It is important that the Council sets clear direction on which Model to implement before finalising the scheme amendment and policy proposals.

- The SH Study assesses the advantages and disadvantages of each Model and indicated the two preferred Models are the Progressive and Staged Models, both of which provide appropriate incentives for development. It was however recommended that the Council endorse the Staged Model which focuses on increasing the density in the Central Town Centre and Eastern Highway Precincts, while retaining the Western Residential Precinct in its current form for future consideration. This option provides for the future proofing of population growth into the next century, while at the same time ensuring that an oversupply of developable land in the foreseeable future does not occur to the detriment of local amenity. A minor variation to this recommendation is the inclusion of the "designated landmark" site at the St Louis Retirement Village Estate site, which is subject to master planning to accommodate long term redevelopment.
- The Staged Model option will generate landowner/developer interest in redevelopment in the town centre and the east end of Claremont with a focus on mixed-use development to compliment the town centre.
- It is likely that the proposed scale of development may be more acceptable to the community in the Central Town Centre and Eastern Highway Precinct compared to the Western Residential Precinct as there is already a mix of uses and built forms.

### Consultation

The draft SH Study Local Development Plan Public was advertised for public comment in the Public Notices section of the Post newspaper and on the Town's website for a period of 28 in accordance with the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015* (LPS Regs) up until 6 May 2016.

Three submissions were received from planning consultants representing landowners as summarised in the submission table below. Full copies of the submissions are attached to this report.

Submission	Comments	Officer Response
1. 230 Stirling Highway (Lots 11 and 12) – Planning consultants Rowe Group on behalf of owners BGC Development Pty Ltd (Buckeridge Properties Pty Ltd)	<p>The current development on site containing 47 apartments in a three storey building is nearing the end of its economic life and requires either significant upgrades or complete redevelopment.</p> <p>The existing site is coded R40 however the development equates to R60-R100.</p> <p>Redevelopment of the site is</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>



	<p>preferred. It is considered to provide improved development outcomes for the site and local community as the existing development caters for tenant only accommodation with a very narrow demographic which does not suit the general market needs of today; redevelopment will provide for greater housing variety with a wider price point to appeal to a wider demographic including owner/occupiers and investors; and will better suit the needs of the community and reflect the built form outcomes being sought for the Eastern Highway Precinct.</p> <p>Recommends that the Study be supported as it is considered to promote and encourage redevelopment within the Eastern Highway Precinct in a manner which aligns with the current State Planning Framework and current best practice planning principles.</p> <p>Once implemented, the Study will provide for the planning framework required to guide and deliver high quality built form outcomes which complement the existing character of Stirling Highway and minimises impacts on adjacent residential dwellings.</p> <p>Supports the proposed recommendations contained in the study as indicated below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Up-coding the Eastern Highway Precinct from R40 to R100.</li> <li>• Proposed height allowing for four storey development along the Highway and six storeys behind the “street wall”.</li> <li>• Recommends the inclusion of discretionary</li> </ul>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted with acknowledgement that heights are proposed to vary to reduce the residential amenity impacts on adjacent residential development towards the rear of the site and adjoining residential development to the side.</p> <p>This will require detailed consideration as part of the proposed TPS3 amendment.</p>
--	--	--

	<p>provisions in TPS3 to allow Council to relax its usual requirements in certain circumstances.</p>	<p>Given that most of the developments proposed as a result of the Local Development Plan and TPS3 amendment will be determined by the JDAP on behalf of Council, it is likely that opportunities for discretionary considerations will be constrained.</p>
<p>2. 2 Richardson Avenue (Lot 3) – Planning consultants Harley Dykstra on behalf of owners A &amp; R Jukic</p>	<p>Commends the Town for its proactive approach in considering how it can most appropriately plan for and accommodate sensitive redevelopment to cater for projected housing demand and to meet the infill targets set by State Government.</p> <p>Also supports development of Stirling Highway as an Activity Corridor.</p> <p>Requests that the Study Area be extended to include 2 Richardson Avenue as this is consistent with orderly and proper planning and aligns with the fundamental intent of the SH Study.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>The SH Study generally aims to reduce the impact of higher densities on the adjacent residential areas by providing for the intense “street wall” along the direct Highway frontage. Where a lot extends back into the side streets, the development requirements are proposed to reduce the bulk of development to ameliorate amenity impacts on adjacent residential properties.</p> <p>It is noted that the property is partially within the line of development either side which is included in the Study Area, however existing development to the rear (Lots 62 and 63) Cliff Road is identified as having a minimal likelihood of redevelopment. In this context, inclusion of 2 Richardson Avenue may present an intrusion in to the adjoining R20 single residential area at the rear of the Highway development front contemplated in the SH Study for the Western Residential Precinct.</p> <p>These matters would suggest that the property should not be</p>

	<p>Also requests that Council pursue the Progressive Model as there are strong grounds to adopt this approach at the present time.</p> <p>The property benefits from its proximity to transport infrastructure, natural amenity and facilities as it is located within the 800m catchment of the Grant and Swanbourne railway stations, 40m of Stirling Highway, 350m from the Swan River, 450m of Christchurch</p>	<p>included, however when Council considers rezoning proposals consistent with R80 Progressive Model in the Western Residential Precinct, the inclusion of this property can be further considered and the owner will have the opportunity to make a formal submission on the amendment proposals – see further comments below on inclusion of the site into the study area.</p> <p>The Staged Model involving the deferral of proposals for the Eastern Residential Precinct was recommended for advertising of the Local Development Plan to provide a balanced approach which focuses on increasing the density in the Central Town Centre and Eastern Highway Precincts, while retaining the Western Residential Precinct in its current form for future consideration. This option provides for the future proofing of population growth into the next century, while at the same time ensuring that an oversupply of developable land in the foreseeable future does not occur to the detriment of local amenity.</p> <p>It is proposed that Council maintain this approach for the immediate future and progress the proposed TPS amendment based on the Staged Model. It is also noted that timing for progression of an amendment to include this Precinct at a higher density will depend in part on the progression of development within the other Precincts and resultant future development pressure to re-code this land.</p> <p>Noted</p>
--	---	---

	<p>and MLC and 720m from the edge of the Claremont town centre.</p> <p>Many sites in the locality have been developed above the existing R20 density coding. The property to the immediate south currently contains two storey developed with six dwellings at an equivalent R40 density. Retaining 2 Richardson Avenue at the present R20 density coding will present an anomaly if surrounding land to the north, west and east are developed at the R80 density.</p> <p>The two storey six unit development to the south means that the increased density of development at 2 Richardson Avenue would have a reduced impact on the locality and therefore be consistent with the intention of the study to protect the amenity of adjacent residential areas.</p> <p>The site is likely to be developed as a perpendicular terrace if included in the Study. This typology is outlined in the SH Study as being a small, three storey terrace of apartments. This would provide for a gradual reduction in height from six storeys on the Highway down to two storeys existing on the adjoining site to the south of 2 Richardson Avenue.</p> <p>The submission details a preliminary assessment of the site's suitability for development consistent with Attachment 2 of the SH Study and indicates that the score exceeds that for at least 20 other properties in the Western Residential Precinct – indicating its suitability for redevelopment.</p>	<p>Noted – this matter could be reviewed as a special consideration for inclusion at the time Council resolves to proceed with amendment proposals contained in the Progressive Model for the Western Residential Precinct, however at this point it is considered premature to progress this Model for the Precinct.</p> <p>Noted – as indicated above, this matter could be reviewed as a special consideration for inclusion at the time Council resolves to proceed with amendment proposals contained in the Progressive Model for the Western Residential Precinct.</p> <p>Noted – as indicated above, this matter could be reviewed as a special consideration for inclusion at the time Council resolves to proceed with amendment proposals contained in the Progressive Model for the Western Residential Precinct.</p> <p>The Western Residential Precinct contains 53 properties which have been assessed for redevelopment suitability. The purpose of this assessment is simply to establish the number of properties likely to be developed over time to inform the expected development yield and add rigor and substance to the achievable development targets within the Study Area. The assessment does not determine if a development will take place or</p>
--	---	--

	<p>In summary the property at 2 Richardson Avenue is suitable for inclusion in the Western Residential Precinct as its locational characteristics warrant a density coding greater than R20; the surrounding existing and proposed densities of development will exceed the current R20 coding and create an effective zoning anomaly; higher density redevelopment would not have an adverse impact on the Richardson Avenue streetscape; and the proposal is consistent with the intent of the SH Study and will provide for redevelopment of the site consistent with the broad principles of the Study.</p> <p>Support the promotion of the Progressive Model in preference to the Staged Model as recommended by Planning Context in the preparation of the SH Study as it provides incentives for investment and is more likely to result in better development outcomes.</p> <p>Shares Planning Context's concern that retention of existing lower densities in the short to medium term is likely to result in lesser scale development to occur in the short term that will then ultimately serve to prohibit redevelopment in the future and compromise the ability of the Study to achieve the ultimate vision and objectives for the Precinct. Considers</p>	<p>otherwise, and is not a tool to determine the desirability of redevelopment.</p> <p>Taking all of these and the above matters into consideration, it may be appropriate to consider inclusion of the property in the Study Area, but not necessarily to accommodate development at the R80 density proposed for the longer term development in the remainder of the Precinct. The impact of the R80 coding may give rise to development expectations which exceed the capacity of the site when considering the Study's intent to ameliorate the amenity impacts on the streetscape and adjoining residential development. In this context a lower density coding such as an R40 density coding could provide for a compromise development yield to offer a transition of residential density in the Precinct.</p> <p>Extensive discussions took place with Planning Context on this matter in the preparation of the SH Study. It was considered by the Town that any immediate redevelopment at the current lower density would not necessarily prevent long term redevelopment at the higher density given the higher development density is likely to significantly improved development yield and profit outcomes for owners or developers.</p> <p>The progressive roll-out of the densities proposed would not be prejudicial to the objectives of the SH Study. It is noted that a key consideration in the delivery of the SH Study outcomes is community acceptance of the recommendations contained in the SH Study and its subsequent progression through amendments to TPS3. It is considered that a strategically staged approach</p>
--	--	---

	<p>that the objective of the Staged Model to “<i>preserve long term development opportunity into the next century</i>” is prejudicial to the Study’s aims of achieving higher densities.</p> <p>Shares Planning Context’s view that the Staged Model ‘land banking’ concept is unlikely to gain the support of the WAPC as this action does not comply with State policy and may result in interim development that prejudices the longer term aim of achieving higher densities.</p> <p>Concerned over the Town’s view that the Staged Model, in preference to the progressive Model will ensure “<i>that an oversupply of developable land in the foreseeable future does not occur to the detriment of local amenity.</i>” Believe that it is essential to ensure that sufficient land is made available with appropriate development controls as soon as possible. As noted in the SH Study, there are many sites within the Study Area that are constrained or unlikely to be redeveloped in the medium term. There will also be landowners who opt out of developing at the higher densities provided. Therefore additional land should be made available for redevelopment to ensure future density targets</p>	<p>to the application of the higher densities over the longer period will improve the capacity of the SH Study objectives to be delivered.</p> <p>The Stage Model does achieve the State’s strategic planning objectives in that the potential development yield provided for under the Staged Model (in combination with other urban renewal projects in the Town) is expected to significantly exceed the targeted development yields set by the WAPC by 2050 under Perth &amp; Peel @ 3.5 Million. Inclusion of the proposals for the Western Residential Precinct is likely to provide for future development yield targets well into the next century.</p> <p>It is noted that in supporting the preparation of the Local Development Plan, the DoP on behalf of the WAPC has acknowledged the Staged Model as providing for the progressive development of higher densities along the Highway from the east to the west dependant on demand.</p> <p>As indicated above, the density targets set for the Town by the WAPC by 2050 are expected to be exceeded through proposals contained within the Staged Model for Stirling Highway and other redevelopment sites and locations within the Town.</p> <p>The deemed provisions of the LPS Regs indicate that a Local Development Plan has effect for a period of 10 years, or another lesser or greater period as prescribed by the Local Government. A future review of the SH Study may take into account these and other matters raised in the submission, the impacts of regulating the roll-out of increased densities in the Precinct and recommend the earlier progression to the R80 proposals for the Western</p>
--	--	---

	<p>are achieved.</p> <p>The submission notes the approval of the Stirling Highway MRS Amendment 1210/41 and suggests it is opportune take advantage of the significantly reduced PRR reservation to simultaneously amend TPS3 to apply zones and density codings to the land which was formerly in the PRR reserve.</p>	<p>Residential Precinct.</p> <p>The SH Study has been prepared to address and control development along Stirling Highway in expectation of the gazettal of the MRS Amendment. The strategic direction set by the Local Development Plan will form the basis of the TPS3 amendment required to be initiated within 90 days of gazettal of the MRS Amendment.</p> <p>The option for a simultaneous amendment was considered previously when Council made its submission on the MRS Amendment, however the strategic objectives for development along the Highway were not sufficiently progressed at that time to warrant a proposal for a simultaneous TPS3 amendment. These objectives will now be set in place though the final approval of the SH Study as a Local Development Plan.</p>
<p>3. 10 Albert Street (Lot 901) and 13, 15A and 15B Dean Street (Lots 123 and 1) – Planning consultants MW Urban on behalf of the owners of the St Louis Estate Retirement Village</p>	<p>Preceding the SH Study, the Town’s Housing Capacity Study highlighted the potential of the St Louis Estate site to accommodate additional housing consistent with State and local government planning objectives, given its strategic location, and hence included the following action:</p> <p><i>“Council acknowledge the intent of the St Louis Estate Retirement Village and Mont Clare Residential Aged Care Facility to develop a Master Plan for the future development of the retirement facilities in Claremont to assist in the Town of Claremont providing additional residential accommodation. Further, the Town of Claremont liaise with</i></p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Discussions in this regard were placed on hold for a considerable period while the owners considered options on whether to progress the master plans. However, these discussions have recently resumed in light of the proposals contained in the SH Study and a renewed appetite for the project on behalf of the owners. Discussions to date have related to how the master plan can be implemented once developed. Previously, this could have been implemented as a Structure Plan, however</p>

	<p><i>planning consultants for the project with the view of progressing the Master Plan development towards public consultation prior to formal consideration of the Master Plan.”</i></p> <p>With this in mind, a consultant team has been in discussion with the Town regarding progression of the master plan with the view of this being formally adopted as a Local Development Plan for the site.</p> <p>It is proposed that the future St Louis Estate master plan will incorporate the adjoining properties at 13, 15A and 15B Dean Street and be given statutory effect through the adoption of a separate Local Development Plan.</p> <p>While the broad principles of the SH Study are acknowledged and generally supported, it is believed that a separate Local Development Plan for the site is required given its unique characteristics and attributes including its 3ha site area in close proximity to the Claremont town centre; its size relative to frontages to Stirling Highway, Dean Street, Barnfield Road and Albert Street; its 370m depth extending north of the Highway; topography; and location opposite MLC and Christchurch.</p> <p>The master plan will further investigate the appropriate built form outcomes for the staged redevelopment of the site, including a range of building heights across the site consistent with the objectives of the SH Study.</p>	<p>the Local Development Plan option provided for under the LPS Regs provides opportunity for the Council and landowners to develop a plan to acknowledge the site attributes, density codings of R30/R40 and R40 and address proposals contained in the SH Study Local Development Plan.</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>It is noted that 13 Dean Street contains a heritage dwelling, which will need to be appropriately acknowledged and addressed through the preparation of a master plan and a Local Development Plan for the site.</p> <p>The specific site attributes warrant detailed attention through a master planning process to inform the preparation of a Local Development Plan. The SH Study Local Development Plan does not contemplate all the specific attributes which will apply to a detailed study of this site.</p> <p>The master plan will need to consider heights and densities under the SH Study compared to the current density codings and scheme provisions and will need to be fine-tuned to acknowledge the site attributes such as the historical and vegetative features; the size and extent of the site; the extent of density coding changes; height restrictions; and possibly different built form</p>
--	---	--



	<p>Although recommended as a “designated landmark” site, the property is not formally recognised as such in the SH Study. It is requested that this be clearly identified as such in the Local Development Plan.</p> <p>Request that the Town seeks agreement from the WAPC for the preparation of a separate Local Development Plan.</p>	<p>outcomes in the centre of the site relative to the periphery and impacts on surrounding streetscapes.</p> <p>It is noted that the current density codings of R30/R40 and R40 provide for considerable discretion in built form outcomes across the site in accordance with the R-Codes. If a Local Development Plan is supported which varies heights through the site, “special circumstances” can be established to vary the 6.6m height requirements under cl.40 of TPS3. This may allow for the progressive redevelopment of the site independent of the proposed R80 density coding which proposes to cut half way through the site at the prolongation of Kingsmill Street.</p> <p>It is recommended that the site be included as an identified “designated landmark” site which will be subject to the preparation of a master plan which informs the development of a separate Local Development Plan to identify and address specific development requirements for the site and to guide any future amendment to Town Planning Scheme No. 3 and/or Local Planning Policy.</p> <p>Once a Local Development Plan is prepared, the statutory requirements under the LPS Regs dictate a process which, if not supported by Council, may be subject to review by the SAT. As there are a number of significant master planning issues to be addressed up front it is recommended that the applicant undertake an engaged master planning process with Council to prepare a plan which informs the development of a formal Local Development Plan. The applicant has indicated a</p>
--	---	--

		<p>willingness to engage with Council on this matter and plans on presenting options to Council in the coming months.</p> <p>It is recommended that upon presentation of master plan proposals to guide development on the St Louis Estate Retirement Village site to Council's satisfaction, Council request the WAPC to provide approval for the preparation of a Local Development Plan which links in with the Stirling Highway Local Development Plan.</p>
--	--	---

### Discussion

The submissions received have raised a number of specific site issues which relate to the properties concerned. It is considered appropriate to progress the approval of the SH Study as a Local Development Plan consistent with the deemed provisions of the LPS Regs and recognise the Officer recommendations presented in the submission table above. It is noted that the SH Study is a high level strategic document to guide the preparation of future statutory provisions to regulate development in the Town. The specific proposals contained in the TPS3 amendment and policy guidelines will be extensively advertised to each owner and resident along the Highway together with adjacent landowners and residents.

### Financial and Staff Implications

The SH Study provides a strategic direction for Council to consider development of apartments on land abutting Stirling Highway. While the detailed amendment and associated Local Development Plan, Activity Centre Plan / Structure Plan and Local Planning Policies together with consideration of development applications which may result will require considerable staff resourcing, development applications will ultimately be determined by the Metropolitan West Joint Development Assessment Panel on recommendation from and behalf of Council. Once land has been developed, the final yield will assist Council's rates revenue and the development of community facilities for the betterment of all residents in the Town and the surrounding localities.

### Policy and Statutory Implications

It is appropriate that the SH Study be adopted as a Local Development Plan in order to guide the development of a Structure Plan / Activity Centre Plan for land located in and adjacent to the town centre and to form the basis for an amendment to TPS3 and associated Local Planning Policies, together with providing guidance for interim development approvals for land impacted by the PRR reservation under the MRS.

Parts 4, 5 and 6 of Schedule 2 in the new *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015* (LPS Regs) identifies procedures for the preparation and adoption of Structure Plans, Activity Centre Plans and Local Development Plans.

A Local Development Plan does not require final approval from the WAPC, however WAPC approval is required in the first instance to prepare the Local Development Plan. A Local Development Plan sets out specific and detailed guidance for future development including site and development standards. Once a Local development plan is prepared, the LPS Regs determine specific requirements and time lines for consultation and approval processes, together with setting out State Administrative Tribunal (SAT) review rights for the applicant (not including any person who makes a submission on a proposed Local Development Plan).

Activity Centre Plans are also required to be developed in accordance with *State Planning Policy 4.2 – Activity Centres for Perth and Peel (SPP4.2)*.

The Town is able to amend its current Town Planning Scheme under section 75 of the *Planning and Development Act 2005*. Scheme amendments are required to be undertaken in accordance with the LPS Regs. The LPS Regs replace the previous *Town Planning Regulations 1967*. The LPS Regs came into effect on 19 October 2015, and all procedural requirements are required to be in accordance with the new LPS Regs.

A Local Planning Policy must be adopted in accordance with Part 2 of Schedule 2 of the LPS Regs, which includes provisions that override Council's previous requirements under TPS3 cl.82.

### **Urgency**

Strategy 1.5.3 of the Town of Claremont Corporate Business Plan 2015-2019 requires the Town to undertake the Local Planning Strategy Review / Stirling Highway Study / Loch Street Station Study / Housing Capacity Study. Preparation of the SH Study was recommended by the Housing Capacity Study which was adopted by Council on 20 November 2012. Progression of the SH Study will inform the review of the Local Planning Strategy.

Schedule 2 of the LPS Regs requires Council to resolve to approve (with or without modifications) or refuse a Local Development Plan within 60 days of advertising (i.e. prior to 12 July 2016). Accordingly, Council must resolve this matter at this Council meeting.

The SH Study is closely aligned to the MRS Amendment No. 1210/41 relating to Stirling Highway. When this Amendment is gazetted, Council is required to apply specific zonings and development requirements to the land zoned Urban under the MRS by initiating a scheme amendment to TPS3 within a period of 90 days. Given the recent advice that the MRS Amendment is about to be finalised, there is now some urgency to finalise the strategic proposals contained in the draft SH Study Local Development Plan to underpin the initiation of the required scheme amendment.

### **Voting Requirements**

Simple majority decision of Council required.

**Moved Cr Wood, seconded Cr Main**

**THAT Council:**

- a) Pursuant to Part 6 of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*, approve the draft 'Planning for Increased Residential Density along Stirling Highway' study as a Local Development Plan to guide the proposed amendment to Town Planning Scheme No. 3 and associated Local Planning Policy to promote the development of land in the proximity of Stirling Highway with the following modifications:
- i) Formally name the 'Planning for Increased Residential Density along Stirling Highway' study as the 'Stirling Highway Local Development Plan'.
  - ii) Endorsement of the Staged Model as the development option until such time as the Local Development Plan is reviewed by Council.
  - iii) Include the St Louis Estate Retirement Village as an identified "designated landmark" site which is subject to the preparation of a master plan which informs the development of a separate Local Development Plan to identify and address specific development requirements for the site and to guide any future amendment to Town Planning Scheme No. 3 and/or Local Planning Policy.
  - iv) The inclusion of 2 Richardson Avenue in the Western Residential Precinct subject to formal reconsideration when the Stirling Highway Local Development Plan is reviewed to progress proposals to include the Western Residential Precinct at the R80 density.
- b) On gazettal of Metropolitan Region Scheme Amendment No. 1210/41, prepare a report to initiate an amendment to Town Planning Scheme No 3 to reflect the adopted proposals contained in the Stirling Highway Local Development Plan and detail final proposals for any associated Local Planning Policy.
- (c) Upon presentation of a master plan to guide development on the St Louis Estate Retirement Village site to the satisfaction of Council, the Western Australian Planning Commission be requested to provide approval for the preparation of a Local Development Plan for the site which links in with the Stirling Highway Local Development Plan.

**CARRIED(100/16)**

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

Against the Motion: Cr Mews.

## 13.2 PEOPLE AND PLACES

### 13.2.1 PUBLIC ART COLLECTION

<b>File Ref:</b>	<b>COM/00032</b>
<b>Attachments:</b>	<a href="#">Public Art Policy PE403</a>
<b>Responsible Officer:</b>	<b>Liz Ledger</b> <b>Executive Manager People and Places</b>
<b>Author:</b>	<b>Liz Ledger</b> <b>Executive Manager People and Places</b> <b>Maryanne Martino</b> <b>Manager Community Development</b>
<b>Proposed Meeting Date:</b>	<b>5 July 2016</b>

---

#### **Purpose**

For Council to consider the revised Public Art Collection Policy.

#### **Background**

In May 2012 Council adopted the Town's first Public Art Policy. This policy has provided direction to facilitate the integration of public art in our community, and has seen the installation of artworks in Bay View Terrace, St Quentin's Avenue, Avion Way and Number One Claremont.

The current policy states that 1% of the total project cost for any projects over \$100,000 (of new above ground and non-maintenance constructions) must be used towards public art.

This type of policy framework is used across many local governments to support civic pride and a cultural and financial investment.

The Town of Claremont is responsible for the proper management of the art collection as a valuable community asset that will provide benefits for the community such as:

- Assist in building a community identity for the Town
- Integrates works of art into the community so the community is regularly exposed to quality art
- Reflects the culture and interest of the community
- Is a valuable draw card for cultural tourism
- Provides an educative function which allows residents to enjoy a range of quality visual art, thereby enriching their lives

#### **Discussion**

The Public Art Policy is being presented to Council as there are a number of changes being made to the policy. These additions are highlighted in the table below, and then further explained.

---

Current Policy	Revised Policy
Making an annual budget allocation to a Public Art Reserve Account.	Consider an annual budget allocation to a Public Art Reserve Account, with any amount not allocated in a financial year will be placed in to a reserve fund for expenditure in future years.
Contributing 1% of the total project cost (of projects with a value greater than \$100,000) towards public art of identified, new municipal above ground and non- maintenance constructions.	Contributing 1% of the total project cost (of projects with a value greater than \$100,000) towards public art of identified, new municipal above ground and non- maintenance constructions (Percent for Art Scheme).
Maximising opportunities for external funding to contribute to identified public art projects	Maximising opportunities for external funding to contribute to identified public art projects
Ensuring that the public art planning process is integrated at the commencement of applicable Town developments and followed according to the Public Art Plan.	Ensuring that the public art planning process is integrated at the commencement of applicable Town developments and followed according to the Public Art Plan.
Private developers will be encouraged to contribute funds to be used for the development of public art within the vicinity of the (private) development.	Private developer public art solution will be dealt with in a separate planning policy.
	Include two (2) Elected Members on the Public Art Working Group.
	Provide an annual budget allocation for the ongoing maintenance of public art. This budget allocation will be based on the outcomes from the Asset Management Plan.
	Consider gifts / donations of artwork for the Collection.
	Consider an annual budget allocation to fund an annual acquisitive Art Award.

### Private Developers

The contribution of private developers towards public art in the Town will be dealt with in a separate policy to Council. This will include details on the Town's influence and role in selection, as well as addressing ongoing maintenance and costs.

### Public Art Working Group

While there has been an informal working group overseeing the selection of the Town's public artworks, the intent is to formalise this and include this within the policy. The function and the membership (as listed below) of the Working Group will remain the same.

#### Public Art Working Group Membership

- 2 x Elected Members
- Chief Executive Officer
- Executive Manager Planning & Development
- Executive Manager People & Places

### Maintenance

This has been included to provide an annual budget allocation for maintenance.

### Gifts and Donations

The revised policy includes the consideration of gifts of artworks to the collection and donations to the art reserve. Including this in the policy will allow the Town to actively pursue gifts and donations based on the needs of the Town and its Public Art Collection.

### Annual Art Award

Since the Public Art Policy was adopted in 2012, the Town has since introduced a new initiative to the Town, 'Art Award and Exhibition'. This annual project (now going into its third year) has provided a new avenue for the Town to acquire artworks through an acquisitive first prize. Through this method, the Town has acquired two artworks currently housed in the public area of Number One Claremont.

### **Past Resolutions**

Ordinary Council Meeting 1 May 2012, Resolution 62/12:

*That Council*

1. *Adopt the Public Art Policy RCM103 (attached);*
2. *Approve the preparation of a Public Art Plan which is to be presented for Council approval; and*
3. *Establish a Public Art Reserve Account the purpose of which will be to receive funding for public art through the implementation of the policy and for expenditure in accordance with a Public Art Plan.*

**CARRIED  
(NO DISSENT)**

### **Financial and Staff Implications**

Resource requirements are in accordance with existing budgetary allocation.

### **Policy and Statutory Implications**

This report refers to Public Art Policy PE403.

## **Communication / Consultation**

This policy does not require external communication or consultation.

## **Strategic Community Plan**

### **People**

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

- *Recognise and celebrate the Town's history and culture through arts and events programs.*

### **Liveability**

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

- *Develop the public realm as gathering spaces for participation and enjoyment.*

### **Urgency**

Formalising the changes to this policy prior to the 2016 Art Award & Exhibition (August 2016) would be beneficial to include the Working Group in the Award process.

### **Voting Requirements**

Simple majority decision of Council required.

### **Moved Cr Wood, seconded Cr Tulloch**

#### **That Council**

- 1. Adopt the Revised Public Art Collection Policy (attached); and**
- 2. Nominate two Councillors to the position of Public Art Working Group.**

**CARRIED(101/16)  
(NO DISSENT)**

*A nomination was received from Cr Wood to be appointed to the Public Art Working Group.*

### **Moved Cr Wood, seconded Cr Kelly**

**That Cr Wood be appointed to the Public Art Working Group.**

**CARRIED(102/16)  
(NO DISSENT)**

*Cr Wood nominated Cr Goetze be appointed to the Public Art Working Group. This nomination will be presented at the following Council meeting as Cr Goetze is currently on leave.*



### 13.3 CORPORATE AND GOVERNANCE

Items 13.3.1 to 13.4.1 were carried en bloc.

#### 13.3.1 MONTHLY STATEMENT OF FINANCIAL ACTIVITY FOR THE PERIOD ENDING 31 MAY 2016

<b>File Ref:</b>	<b>FIM/0062-02</b>
<b>Attachments:</b>	<a href="#">Statement of Financial Activity for period ending 31 May 2016</a> <a href="#">Infrastructure Assets – 2015-16 Schedule of Works</a>
<b>Responsible Officer:</b>	<b>Les Crichton</b> <b>Executive Manager Corporate and Governance</b>
<b>Author:</b>	<b>Hitesh Hans</b> <b>Finance Manager</b>
<b>Proposed Meeting Date:</b>	<b>5 July 2016</b>

---

#### **Purpose**

For Council to note the Statement of Financial Activity for the month ending 31 May 2016.

#### **Background**

The MFR is presented in accordance with the *Local Government Act 1995* and *Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996* and is made up of:

- Statement of Financial Activity.
- Infrastructure Assets 2015-16 Schedule of Works.

The comments on variances compare actual expenses and revenue against the 2015-16 Budget revised as part the mid-year budget review, adopted by Council on 16 February 2016.

#### **Discussion**

##### Summary

The closing surplus of \$4,250,743 is \$1,814,573 above the projected surplus of \$2,436,169. This variance is due to a combination of timing differences, increased revenue, timing on reserve fund transfers and identified savings.

Areas contributing to the variance are:

##### Operating revenue - \$378,437 above budget

- Fees & Charges - \$200,652 above budget due to increased fines and penalties revenue (\$140K) and aquatic centre admission and hire fees (\$65K).
  - Reimbursement - \$95,902 above budget mainly due to refund of carbon tax from WMRC (\$45K) along with increase in reimbursement of services from other council and legal expenses, worker compensation and insurance claim .
-

- Interest Earning - \$95,313 above budget due timing and higher interest income derived by better cash management and increased cash holdings.

Operating expenditure - \$453,759 below budget

- Materials and Contracts - \$627,619 due to timing differences across all business units with the more significant variances within;
  - Infrastructure - \$324K (various maintenance works (roads, drainage and footpath), street sweeping, plant operations and administration services) [timing, savings and C/F]).
  - Environmental Health and Ranger Services - \$40K of which \$12K is identified as savings and \$28K is timing related.
  - Administration & Governance – \$98K of which \$8K is identified as savings and \$90K is timing related.
  - Planning, Heritage and Building services - \$58K of which \$30K is identified as savings and \$28K is timing related.
- Employee Cost - \$221,335 under mainly due to the timing in processing of performance bonus (\$61K), training, staff recruitment & OHS (\$27K), superannuation (\$27K) and staff vacancies.
- Interest Expense – (\$156,977) is over the budget due to the WATC loan repayments processed ahead of the budget timing.
- Other expenditure – (\$253,587) over the budget mainly due to timing on allocation of overheads to capital works.

Capital expenditure – \$1,229,401 under budget

As detailed within the capital works schedules, the capital expenditure comprises;

- \$128,968 under budget on land, building, plant and equipment capital expenditure due to timing. While Note 10 of Attachment 1 provides a breakdown of these items, over expenditure of Council First upgrade is offset by Claremont way operational budget.
- \$1,072,683 under budget in infrastructure works. Attachment 2 provides further detail on the projects and variance explanation.
- \$93,035 under budget on transfers to reserves due to timing of interest income on reserve investment.

Capital income - \$215,384 under budget

- \$215,384 of variance is due to the timing of non operating grant and subsidies and disposal of assets.

While the overall variance remains large, year-end forecasting undertaken as part of the 2016-17 Budget preparation together with programmed works and associated expenditure for the remainder of the year indicate no further adjustments are required and the budgeted surplus will be achieved

**Past Resolutions**

Ordinary Council Meeting 21 June 2016, Resolution 97/16:

*That Council note the Financial Statement of Activity for the period 1 July 2015 to 30 April 2016.*

**Financial and Staff Implications**

Resource requirements are in accordance with existing budgetary allocation.

**Policy and Statutory Implications**

*Local Government Act 1995.*

*Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996.*

**Publicity**

N/A

**Strategic Community Plan****Governance and Leadership**

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

- Provide and maintain a high standard of governance, accountability, management and strategic planning.
- Maintain long term financial stability and growth.

**Urgency**

N/A

**Voting Requirements**

Simple majority decision of Council required.

**OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION**

**Moved Cr Browne, seconded Cr Edwards**

**That Council notes the Financial Statement of Activity for the period 1 July 2015 to 31 May 2016.**

**CARRIED(103/16)  
(NO DISSENT)**

## 13.4 INFRASTRUCTURE

### 13.4.1 MEDIAN ISLAND INSTALLATION - BARNFIELD ROAD AT THE DEAN STREET INTERSECTION

<b>File Ref:</b>	<b>RDS00175</b>
<b>Attachments:</b>	<a href="#">Drawing number 15004</a>
<b>Responsible Officer:</b>	<b>Saba Kirupanather</b> <b>Executive Manager Infrastructure</b>
<b>Author:</b>	<b>Marty Symmons</b> <b>Engineering Technical Officer</b>
<b>Proposed Meeting Date:</b>	<b>5 July 2016</b>

---

#### **Purpose**

For the Council to consider installing a median island on Barnfield Road across Dean Street, to prevent illegal right turn movements (mainly from Barnfield Road to Dean Street) occurring at the Barnfield Road and Dean Street intersection.

#### **Background**

The Barnfield Road and Dean Street intersection is a left-in, left-out only intersection.

An island was installed on Dean Street to prevent illegal right turn movements happening. Due to the narrow road reserve on Dean Street the design was compromised and this limited its effectiveness. There is a "No Right Turn" regulatory sign installed by Main Roads WA on the north side of Barnfield Road west of Dean Street. Also there are two signs installed at the entrance to Barnfield Road near Parry Street, "No Through Road" and "Local Traffic Only", to direct the people coming from the west to travel along Parry Street and Stirling Highway.

People regularly perform the illegal right turn movements from Barnfield Road to Dean Street.

Police have been informed of the issue and regularly monitor and infringe people performing the illegal turns. This regular enforcement has not deterred people from continuing to perform the illegal turn movements.

Residents of Barnfield Road have repeatedly contacted the Town to complain about the illegal turn movements occurring.

#### **Discussion**

The small island on Dean Street, traffic regulatory signs, and police enforcement have not been successful in preventing the ongoing illegal turning movements, so an alternate physical obstruction is required to prevent people performing these movements.

The installation of a median on Barnfield Road will prevent vehicles being able to perform the right turns. This treatment has been successful at the other intersections of Barnfield Road; Grange Street and Albert Street.

---

Constraints which require consideration at the Barnfield Road and Dean Street intersection which are not found at the Grange Street or Albert Street intersections are the access requirements of the properties on the north side of Barnfield Rd, and service truck movements from Dean Street onto Barnfield Road, which is restricted by the small corner radius.

To provide access and egress to house numbers 19, 21, and 23 Barnfield Road from both directions on Barnfield Road, the median island will need to be shorter than the optimal design length. Despite this shorter length it will still be more effective than the current treatment.

To allow for the left turn movements of service trucks from Dean Street onto Barnfield Road the west half of the median will be mountable so that trucks can track across it.

### **Past Resolutions**

There are no recent past resolutions relevant to this item.

### **Financial and Staff Implications**

There are no current resources allocated, will need to be considered as part of next budget review.

Estimated cost of construction is \$25,000.

### **Communication / Consultation**

Provide written notification of the planned works to the residents of Barnfield Road and Dean Street.

### **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.*

- Maintain and upgrade infrastructure for seamless day to day usage.
- Provide a responsible and well managed urban environment, with sustainable development outcomes.

#### **Urgency**

N/A

#### **Voting Requirements**

Simple majority decision of Council required.

**Moved Cr Browne, seconded Cr Edwards**

**That Council**

- 1. Approves the installation of the new median island on Barnfield Road across Dean Street; and**
- 2. Allocates funds for the works as part of the next budget review.**

**CARRIED(104/16)  
(NO DISSENT)**

**13.4.2 MODIFY THE MITFORD STREET SERVETUS STREET INTERSECTION**

**File Ref:** RDS/00222  
**Attachments:** [Drawing number 15001](#)  
**Responsible Officer:** Saba Kirupanather  
Executive Manager Infrastructure  
**Author:** Marty Symmons  
Engineering Technical Officer  
**Proposed Meeting Date:** 5 July 2016

---

*Item 13.4.2 was withdrawn by the CEO.*

**13.4.3 REVIEW OF CLAREMONT BIKE PLAN AND TRAVEL SMART MAP**

<b>File Ref:</b>	<b>RDS/00295</b>
<b>Attachments:</b>	<a href="#">Travel Smart Map</a>
<b>Responsible Officer:</b>	<b>Saba Kirupanather Executive Manager Infrastructure</b>
<b>Author:</b>	<b>Margaret Brophy Asset Technical Services Officer</b>
<b>Proposed Meeting Date:</b>	<b>5 July 2016</b>

---

**Purpose**

Report recommends funding to develop a Bike Plan and Western Suburbs Travel Smart Map for the Town.

**Background**

The current Bike Plan was developed in 2011 and the Department of Transport recommend that they are reviewed every 5 years.

A funding application was made in 2015 for the Department of Transport 2016-2018 Perth Bicycle Network (PBN) Grants Program and in December 2015 Council approved the allocation of \$30,000 to develop a Bike Plan subject to a \$30,000 grant being received from the Department of Transport (the total cost was \$60,000). This grant application was not successful. The Department advised the Town to apply again next year as a Western Suburbs joint submission.

The Western Suburbs Travel Smart Map (WSTSM) provides information on cycle routes and infrastructure relevant to cyclists such as drinking fountains, toilets and shops. On the reverse side it provides information about bus routes and bus stop and train station locations.

The WSTSM has been taken off the Department of Transport website as it was 10 years old and considered out of date.

**Discussion**

Despite the unsuccessful grant application it is still timely to review the cycle network within and through the Town.

With the new legislation permitting cyclists to use footpaths it is also necessary to review the footpath network as a component of cycle routes. The best cycling routes will be identified as part of the scope for the Bike Plan

Adjacent Councils have been approached to ascertain interest and to contribute financially in developing a joint bike plan and travel smart map. Cottesloe has engaged a consultant to develop their Bike Plan, Peppermint Grove has completed their cycle network and do not plan to develop a new plan. Nedlands and Mosman Park have not responded.



Once the new WSTSM is completed the hard copy pamphlets will be available for purchase and will be available digitally on the Department of Transport website. This will be linked to the Town's website too.

### **Past Resolutions**

Ordinary Council Meeting 1 December 2015, Resolution 214/15:

*That Council*

- 1. Accepts the program, together with the detailed scope of works and tasks, to prepare Claremont Bike Plan 2016-21, as described in the report; and*
- 2. Includes for consideration in the 2016-17 draft budget \$30,000 towards preparation of Claremont Bike Plan 2016-21, with the remaining \$30,000 be funded by the Department of Transport.*

### **Financial and Staff Implications**

There are no funds available in the budget, and funding could be considered as part of the end of 2015-16 review.

### **Policy and Statutory Implications**

Australian Standards, Austroads Design Guidelines, Main Roads WA design guidelines, Liveable Neighbourhoods draft 2015 and Existing Town's Bike Plan.

### **Communication / Consultation**

Consultation with all relevant stakeholders (local bike user groups, local schools, Western suburbs Councils, local businesses in Town Centre, Swanbourne, Ashton Avenue and Davies Road shopping precincts) will be an important component to develop a bike plan.

### **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.
- Maintain and upgrade infrastructure for seamless day to day usage.

#### **Environment**

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

#### **Urgency**

N/A

#### **Voting Requirements**

Simple majority decision of Council required.

---

**Moved Cr Main, seconded Cr Wood**

**That Council includes for consideration within the review of the 2015-16 year end result, provision of \$35,000 for**

- 1. Claremont Bike Plan (\$30,000)**
- 2. Western Suburbs Travel Smart Map (\$5,000).**

**AMENDMENT****Moved Cr Haynes, seconded Cr Mews**

**That point 1 be deleted.**

**LOST**

For the Amendment: Mayor Barker and Crs Haynes and Mews.

Against the Amendment: Crs Kelly, Wood, Main, Browne, Tulloch, and Edwards.

**THE PRIMARY MOTION WAS PUT****Moved Cr Browne, seconded Cr Haynes**

**That Council includes for consideration within the review of the 2015-16 year end result, provision of \$35,000 for**

- 1. Claremont Bike Plan (\$30,000)**
- 2. Western Suburbs Travel Smart Map (\$5,000).**

**CARRIED(105/16)**

For the Motion: Mayor Barker and Crs Haynes, Edwards, Tulloch, Brown, Wood, Main and Kelly.

Against the Motion: Cr Mews.

**14 ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PRESIDING PERSON**

Mayor Barker reported on attending the ALGA conference.

Cr Wood reported on attending chamber concert in memorial hall Cottesloe.

*Cr Mews left the meeting at 8:12PM.*

*Cr Mews returned the meeting at 8:14 PM*

**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****MOTION TO CLOSE DOORS**

Moved Cr Haynes, seconded Cr Wood

That in accordance with Section 5.23 (2) of the *Local Government Act 1995* the meeting is closed to members of the public with the following aspects of the Act being applicable to this matter:

(a) A matter affecting an employee or employees.

(c) A contract entered into, or which may be entered into, by the local government and which relates to a matter to be discussed at the meeting.

**CARRIED(106/16)  
(NO DISSENT)**

*Mayor Barker adjourned the meeting at 8:14PM.*

*Mayor Barker reconvened the meeting at 8:15PM.*

**ATTENDANCE**

**Mayor Barker**

**Cr Peter Browne**

**West Ward**

**Cr Karen Wood**

**West Ward**

**Cr Peter Edwards**

**West Ward**

**Cr Paul Kelly**

**South Ward**

**Cr Chris Mews**

**South Ward**

**Cr Bruce Haynes**

**East Ward**

**Cr Kate Main**

**East Ward**

**Cr Alastair Tulloch**

**East Ward**

**Ms Liz Ledger (Acting Chief Executive Officer)**

**Ms Katie Bovell (Governance Officer)**

**17.1 CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER****17.1.1 ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REVIEW OF CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER**

**File Ref:** PER/0751  
**Attachments:** [Summary and Questionnaire Results](#)  
**Responsible Officer:** Jock Barker  
Mayor  
**Author:** Jock Barker  
Mayor  
Liz Ledger  
Acting Chief Executive Officer  
**Proposed Meeting Date:** 5 July 2016

---

**Purpose**

The following item was considered in closed session.

**Moved Cr Browne, seconded Cr Main****That**

- 1. The CEO is congratulated on meeting or exceeding Council expectations for all 2015-16 Personal Objectives and that the annual performance bonus is approved for payment by Council.**
- 2. This report and attachment remains confidential in accordance with statutory requirements.**

**CARRIED(107/16)  
(NO DISSENT)**

**17.2 CORPORATE AND GOVERNANCE****17.2.1 CLAREMONT AQUATIC CENTRE - PRINCIPAL DESIGN CONSULTANT**

**File Ref:** COP/00073  
**Responsible Officer:** Les Crichton  
Executive Manager Corporate and Governance  
**Author:** Sean Badani  
Aquatic Centre Manager  
**Proposed Meeting Date:** 5 July 2016

---

**Purpose**

The following item was considered in closed session.

**MOTION TO DEFER**

**Moved Cr Tulloch, seconded Cr Edwards**

**That the item be deferred back to Administration.**

Reason:

- To identify minimum cost of assembling information required by Department of Sport and Recreation to approve grant funding.
- As Aquatic Centre is a regional facility to explore contributions from adjacent Councils.

**CARRIED(108/16)**

For the Motion to Defer: Mayor Barker and Crs Tulloch, Haynes, Edwards, Browne, and Mews.

Against the Motion to Defer: Crs Main, Kelly and Wood.

**MOTION TO OPEN DOORS**

**Moved Cr Haynes, seconded Cr Edwards**

**That the doors be opened.**

**CARRIED(109/06)  
(NO DISSENT)**

*The doors opened at 8:27PM.*

**THE MAYOR READ ALOUD THE RESOLUTIONS MADE BEHIND CLOSED DOORS.**

**18 FUTURE MEETINGS OF COUNCIL**

Ordinary Council Meeting, 5 July 2016 at 7:00PM.

**19 DECLARATION OF CLOSURE OF MEETING**

There being no further business, the presiding member declared the meeting closed at 8:32PM.

Confirmed this ... .. day of ... .. 2016.

**PRESIDING MEMBER**