



# **TOWN OF CLAREMONT**

## **ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING**

### **MINUTES**

**TUESDAY 5 SEPTEMBER, 2017**

**Liz Ledger**

**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 .	2
5	PUBLIC QUESTION TIME .....	4
6	PUBLIC STATEMENT TIME .....	8
7	APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE .....	8
8	PETITIONS/DEPUTATIONS/PRESENTATIONS .....	8
9	CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS .....	8
10	ANNOUNCEMENT OF CONFIDENTIAL MATTERS FOR WHICH MEETING MAY BE CLOSED TO THE PUBLIC .....	9
11	BUSINESS NOT DEALT WITH FROM A PREVIOUS MEETING .....	9
12	REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.....	9
13	REPORTS OF THE CEO.....	10
13.1	PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT .....	10
	13.1.1 LOTS 1, 2 AND 21 BAY VIEW TERRACE (CNR STIRLING HIGHWAY), CLAREMONT - PROPOSED REFURBISHMENT AND THIRD STOREY ADDITIONS – COMMERCIAL AND PROPOSED ILLUMINATED LED SIGN - CASH-IN-LIEU PARKING CONTRIBUTION CONDITION CLEARANCE .....	10
	13.1.2 ST LOUIS MASTERPLAN AND LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN.....	15
13.2	CORPORATE AND GOVERNANCE.....	16
	13.2.1 BUSINESS PARKING PERMITS .....	16
13.3	INFRASTRUCTURE .....	17

---

13.3.1 ASHTON AVENUE REPLACEMENT BRIDGE - FINAL  
DESIGN OF INTERSECTION SIGNAL PHASING AND  
TURNING MOVEMENTS..... 17

14 ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PRESIDING PERSON..... 22

15 ELECTED MEMBERS’ MOTIONS OF WHICH PREVIOUS NOTICE HAS  
BEEN GIVEN..... 22

16 NEW BUSINESS OF AN URGENT NATURE APPROVED BY THE  
PERSON PRESIDING OR BY DECISION OF MEETING ..... 22

17 CONFIDENTIAL MATTERS FOR WHICH THE MEETING MAY BE  
CLOSED TO THE PUBLIC ..... 22

18 FUTURE MEETINGS OF COUNCIL ..... 22

19 DECLARATION OF CLOSURE OF MEETING ..... 22

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

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

<b>Mayor Barker</b>	
<b>Cr Chris Mews</b>	<b>South Ward</b>
<b>Cr Jill Goetze</b>	<b>South Ward</b>
<b>Cr Paul Kelly</b>	<b>South Ward</b>
<b>Cr Karen Wood</b>	<b>West Ward</b>
<b>Cr Peter Browne</b>	<b>West Ward</b>
<b>Cr Peter Edwards</b>	<b>West Ward</b>
<b>Cr Bruce Haynes</b>	<b>East Ward</b>
<b>Cr Alastair Tulloch</b>	<b>East Ward</b>
<b>Cr Kate Main</b>	<b>East Ward</b>

**Ms Liz Ledger (Chief Executive Officer)**  
**Mr Les Crichton (Executive Manager Corporate and Governance)**  
**Ms Cathy Bohdan (Executive Manager People and Places)**  
**Mr David Vinicombe (Executive Manager Planning and Development)**  
**Mr Saba Kirupanather (Executive Manager Infrastructure)**  
**Ms Danielle Uniza (Senior Governance and Risk Advisor)**  
**Ms Katie Bovell**

**Three members of the public**  
**One member of the press**

**APOLOGIES**

NIL

**3 DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS**

NIL

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

**Mr Bart Benschop and Dr Hilary Snell, 4 Queenslea Drive, Claremont**  
**Re: Queenslea Drive**

**Q1.** *In accordance with AS 1428.1 - 2009 and other Federal Legislation the width of the footpath shall be 2 m. wide near schools. This means that the street trees which are about 2.5 m. from the kerb will not have the Town of Claremont required clearance from infrastructure of 1 m. Can the Town inform us how this issue is to be resolved?*

**A1.** We are not sure where you have obtained this figure that a 1m clearance is required from infrastructure. You have possibly made the assumption that because crossovers have that requirement that this carries over to other types of infrastructure, which is not the case.

**Q2.** *Will the old footpath be removed?*

**A2.** A detailed design has not been completed yet, however if the footpath is installed along the edge of the road it is likely that the footpath adjacent to the property boundaries will be removed.

**Q3.** *To have a footpath along the kerb from our property to Stirling Highway will require crossing the Parking Bay in front of our property. Can the Town confirm that the Parking Bay will be removed?*

**A3.** A detailed design has not been completed yet so we cannot confirm the alignment at this location.

**Q4.** *Is the kerb line North from the crossover at our property going to be parallel to the property boundary or is it going to be diagonally from the crossover at our property to the crossover at No.2 and will there be enough room to plant a tree?*

**A4.** A detailed design has not been completed yet so we cannot confirm the alignment at this location.

**Q5.** *The pavement of our original approved and complying crossover as well as the recently reconstructed crossover at our property are to Australian Standard AS 3996 Class 'D' for an Ultimate Test Load of 210 kN and a Maximum Wheel Load of 8000 kg to allow safe crossing by commercial trucks. Can the Town confirm that the new crossover and footpath crossing will be to this standard?*

**A5.** A detailed design has not been completed yet so we cannot confirm this. It is likely that the standard footpath design used elsewhere around the Town will be used unless there is justification for increased load ratings, such as if servicing an industrial or commercial property. This can be assessed on a case by case basis as part of the detailed design.

- Q6.** *Is the kerb line North from the crossover at our property going to be parallel to the property boundary or is it going to be diagonally from the crossover at our property to the crossover at No.2 and will there be enough room to plant a tree?*
- A6.** A detailed design has not been completed yet so we cannot confirm this. it would become cost prohibitive to replace entire crossovers for the length of the street as part of this footpath installation so it is likely that the footpath will continue through at existing grades, however this will be determined as part of the detailed design.
- Q7.** *The drain along the kerb from the roundabout to our property has an overall grade of about 0.69%. The grade directly upstream from the crossover at our property is 0%. Leaf fall from street trees is a severe problem. The grade should be some 2 % to be self cleaning.*
- A7.** The grades of the Towns roads are dictated by the existing topography and the regrading of the entire road to ensure the gutters can self clean would be cost prohibitive. Queenslea Dr is a part of the Towns street sweeping programme. It isn't required to have grades which are self cleaning.
- 7a.** *The distance of the drain is some 450 m from the roundabout to our property without a single drain pit. The crossfall upstream varies from about 2% to 3.5%. The MRWA standard is for 3%. The kerb height varies from 50 mm to 170 mm. The MRWA standard is for 150 mm. The joint between the bitumen and the kerb along the frontage of our property is damaged. Will the Town consider the sensible course of action and fix these issues at the same time as the footpath upgrade?*
- The Town is satisfied the drainage on Queenslea Dr is being managed satisfactorily. That being said, a detailed design has not been completed yet so we cannot confirm if kerb rework will be included.
- Q8.** *Storm water from the road and the verge drain onto our property being a low point. The height difference between the drain along the kerb and our property boundary at the entry at Queenslea Drive is some 600 mm. The catchment area on the road is some 1200 m<sup>2</sup> and the catchment area of the verge and footpath is some 1750 m<sup>2</sup>. In accordance with the Towns regulation, the verge and footpath shall be graded to ensure flow to the storm water drain along the kerb. Can the Town confirm:*
- 8a.** *That the new footpath will be sloped away from the boundary towards the top of the kerb to ensure drainage to the drain along the kerb?*
-

A detailed design has not been completed yet so we cannot confirm this.

- 8b.** *That the height of the crossover above the drain along the kerb as well as the kerb height between the crossover at our property and No.2 is at least 150 mm in accordance with MRWA standards?*

A detailed design has not been completed yet so we cannot confirm this.

- 8c.** *That the kerbing along the crossover is at at least 200 mm above the level of the boundary at the entry onto our property to provide a sufficient flood barrier between the road reserve and our property in compliance with the Australian recommended practice.*

A detailed design has not been completed yet so we cannot confirm this.

- 8d.** *To eliminate the need to have an additional change of grade at our property boundary, the crossover should be graded to the drain in front of our carport grate. Can the Town agree that this is acceptable?*

A detailed design has not been completed yet so we cannot confirm this.

- Q9.** *Can Bart Benschop be given an opportunity to review the construction plans and specifications before construction?*

- A9.** The design layout including path alignments and widths will be made publicly available to the residents of Queenslea Dr, so everyone can see what will be constructed. Detailed design plans will not be provided for review by the general public. Residents will not be asked to provide comment on the construction methodology or technical specifications.

## **5 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

**Ms Judy Paish, 2 Deakin Street, Swanbourne**

**Re: Infill, the Planning Study for the Swanbourne Local Centre, Swanbourne Noticeboard, Swanbourne Security Cameras and Swanbourne Station Study.**

- Q1.** *What is the Government's infill quota for the Town of Claremont? Has the Town of Claremont exceeded this quota? If so, by how much – is it by 43%?*

- A1.** The Town is progressing towards achieving its infill targets of 1300 new dwellings set by the State Government by 2050.



The Town has not exceeded this target at this point, but planning is underway to achieve the target and achieve broader planning objectives of providing for urban renewal and improvement of public and private facilities for existing and future residents of the Town.

Plans are underway for additional development at the North East Precinct (above the original estimates), along Stirling Highway (Local Development Plan approved by Council last year) and Transport Oriented Designs (TODs) for land around the railway stations. TODs are to be considered under the Draft Loch Street Station Structure Plan, Swanbourne Station (this Study) and an Activity Centre Plan for the Town Centre (to be developed this financial year).

The existing adopted studies and developments underway, being relative to the development in the North East Precinct (possibly + 270 - 370 dwellings) and Stirling Highway Local Development Plan (+1200 dwellings) identify growth opportunity for up to 1470 – 1570 dwellings in the Town (13 - 21% above the 1300 target). However, it is difficult to say how much the Town will actually exceed the WAPC target and by when. The Plans provide for the planning guidelines to facilitate development, but don't force development. The market conditions and landowner/developer aspirations will determine when development occurs over the longer period.

It is likely that over time, with the State Government's push to reduce the amount of development on the urban fringe, that targets will increase for inner city localities.

While the Plans are likely to facilitate development potential in excess of the targets, not all property will be developed immediately and it is important to ensure that all future development is sustainably designed to avoid future pressures of population growth targets impacting on the Town's heritage character and residential streetscapes. Future development options need to offer a balance between achieving future growth targets and fitting in with current local community expectations. Development undertaken now or in the coming years will exist for the long term future and it is important that the Town gets the density balance right, as development at lower densities now will limit the future capacity of the Town to achieve the targets set over the longer term.

- Q2.** *In the "Your Community, Your Say" section of the Town of Claremont website, it states that "the Town is currently preparing a Planning Study for the Swanbourne Local Centre... an important part of the study is to find out what the local community would like to see in Swanbourne..." Open House meetings about*

*the Planning Study for Swanbourne Local Centre residents were held on the 17<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> of August.*

- Why weren't notices sent to each of the local residents who are customers of the Swanbourne Shopping Centre?*
- How many people attended the Open House meeting, and filled out the online survey form?*
- How much will this survey cost?*
- Is this survey a waste of ratepayer's money, as not many of the community knew about it?*
- Why wasn't a formal public meeting held, with a Chairman, and Council Representatives, especially one from the Town of Claremont Planning Department?*
- Will a formal public meeting be held, as just mentioned, at a future date, with flyers sent to each resident?*

**A2.**

This consultation exercise is part of the first stage of consultation. When proposals are developed by the consultants, they will be formally advertised to the broader public.

- Correspondence was sent to stakeholders including local property owners (both residential and commercial properties), and business owners and operators inviting them to have their input into the study. The broader community input was sought through a number of channels including; website and social media, an article in our monthly newsletter which appeared in the Post and the Western Suburbs Weekly newspapers. Posters and flyers promoting the open house were distributed throughout the local area including Swanbourne Primary School, the church and local businesses.
- Forty people attended the two open house sessions, excluding the facilitators and Town of Claremont representatives. A total of 67 on line surveys were completed.
- The survey formed part of an overall project contract awarded to planning consultancy Game Planning Australia Pty Ltd. The cost of the survey is not separately identified.
- The number of responses received suggests a good level of community awareness regarding the survey and study. The outcomes of the survey are one of a number of indicators of community views. The survey findings, combined with other community engagement exercises provide valuable input to the planning study.
- There is a wide range of methodologies that can be employed to facilitate community engagement. The methodologies chosen for the Swanbourne planning study were considered to be fit-for-purpose and to provide most advantage for the purposes of the planning study.
- There are no intentions at this time to hold a public meeting, however when Council considers formal public

consultation on plans prepared by the planning consultant, it may consider this request.

- Q3.** *A notice about the Open House meeting for Swanbourne residents on the 17<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> of August, regarding this study, was not in the Council's public notice board at the Swanbourne shops.*
- *In the next "Town Talk" could the locations of Council's notice boards be included?*
  - *Is there one in Claremont Quarter? If so, where?*
- A3.** This matter is currently being reviewed and a final response will be provided in due course.
- This will be raised with the relevant officer of the Town.
  - This will be raised with the relevant officer of the Town.
- Q4.** *How many security cameras are in Swanbourne Village?*
- *Could Council install security cameras?*
- A4.** There are no security cameras in Swanbourne Village at present.
- Security cameras and other safety matters such as lighting will form part of the future Study recommendations and then be subject to Council budgetary considerations.
- Q5.** *On the Town's website, there is information regarding a Swanbourne Station Study to be completed by December 2017 – what is this Swanbourne Station Study?*
- A5.** The only study that is being conducted at the present time is the Swanbourne Station Study. This is in relation to the Swanbourne Station on the Town's side of the railway line.

## **6 PUBLIC STATEMENT TIME**

NIL

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

NIL

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

NIL

## **9 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS**

**Moved Cr Kelly, seconded Cr Edwards**

**That the minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of Council held on 15 August 2017 be confirmed.**

**CARRIED (134/17)  
(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 PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

*Items 13.1.1 and 13.3.1 were carried en bloc.*

#### 13.1.1 LOTS 1, 2 AND 21 BAY VIEW TERRACE (CNR STIRLING HIGHWAY), CLAREMONT - PROPOSED REFURBISHMENT AND THIRD STOREY ADDITIONS – COMMERCIAL AND PROPOSED ILLUMINATED LED SIGN - CASH-IN-LIEU PARKING CONTRIBUTION CONDITION CLEARANCE

<b>File Ref:</b>	01SAT/16/0482
<b>Attachments Public:</b>	<a href="#">Location Map</a> <a href="#">Photograph</a>
<b>Attachments Restricted:</b>	<a href="#">Approved Plans</a> <a href="#">Applicant's Solicitor's letter dated 15 August 2017</a>
<b>Responsible Officer:</b>	David Vinicombe Executive Manager Planning and Development
<b>Author:</b>	David Vinicombe Executive Manager Planning and Development
<b>Proposed Meeting Date:</b>	5 September 2017
<b>Date Prepared:</b>	25 August 2017
<b>Planning Application No.:</b>	DA 00074/2016
<b>Property Owner:</b>	Spyglass Pacific Pty Ltd
<b>Lot No.:</b>	1, 2 and 21
<b>Area of Lot:</b>	Lot 1 - 230m <sup>2</sup> , Lot 2 - 207m <sup>2</sup> and Lot 21 - 401m <sup>2</sup> – Total - 838m <sup>2</sup>
<b>Zoning:</b>	Town Centre and Unzoned
<b>Financial Implications:</b>	Cash-in-lieu funding
<b>Enabling Legislation:</b>	<i>Planning and Development Act 2005 (PDA)</i> Town Planning Scheme No. 3 (TPS3) Local Planning Policy PS205- Public Parking (PS205)

---

### Summary

- Application for Development Approval received for Lots 1, 2 and 21 Bay View Terrace (cnr Stirling Highway) was considered initially by Council on 19 July 2016. The application was referred to the Western Australian Planning Commission (WAPC) for determination by the Metropolitan West Joint Development Assessment Panel (JDAP).
  - A State Administrative Tribunal (SAT) review was lodged with regard to a number of matters inclusive of the determination of the proposed LED signage.
-

- As a result of the SAT proceedings the JDAP (on behalf of the WAPC) reviewed its former decision and conditionally approved the development inclusive of the LED signage on 2 June 2017.
- While the Town is of the view that the proposed LED signage approval cannot be developed as it is contrary to the Town's Local Law Relating to Signs where no discretion for approval is available, this matter will be subject to separate review and consideration by the SAT should an application be lodged with the Town for a Sign Permit.
- The applicant is concerned about the satisfaction of conditions relative to the proposed development and accordingly has kept the review matter with the SAT alive.
- While the conditions of development approval are the responsibility of the WAPC, the Town has been requested to provide comment on the clearance of the conditions.
- Most of the conditions are standard relative to the satisfaction of construction requirements; however condition 6 requires the payment of a cash-in-lieu parking contribution for the shortfall of three on-site parking bays to the specification of the Town.
- Cash-in-lieu for parking in the Town Centre has been a matter of concern for the Town for a number of years. Up until the gazettal of Amendment No. 123 to TPS3 and the adoption of Local Planning Policy PS205 – Public Parking (PS205), the Town was required under TPS3 to charge cash in lieu at a rate which reflected construction costs and land valuation (up to \$130,000 per bay). The Town was of the view that this contribution rate stifled development in the Town Centre and initiated a number of planning initiatives to reduce the contribution rate.
- As a result of the gazettal of Amendment No. 123 to TPS3 and adoption of PS205, the Town now considers a number of parking concessions to reduce the parking requirements and charges \$30,000 cash in-lieu for each bay not provided. Where the use is classified as a "preferred use", the contribution rate reduces to \$15,000 per bay.
- The proposed development does not comply with the definition of 'preferred use' under the terms of Local Planning Policy 205 as it relates to a new building extension, the existing building exceeds 300m<sup>2</sup> and the ground floor has (until recently) been used for consulting rooms, therefore the required cash contribution is \$90,000.

### **Purpose**

The application proposes the clearance of condition 6 of the current Development Approval for the subject site which requires payment of a cash-in-lieu contribution for the on-site shortfall of three parking bays.

## Background

The following table outlines key dates regarding this proposal:

Date	Item/Outcome
18 May 2016	Development Application received by Council
23 June 2016	Application forwarded to DoP/WAPC for recommendation to JDAP
19 July 2016	Council recommendation to WAPC
29 September 2016	JDAP approves application for WAPC (not including LED Signs)
2 June 2017	JDAP reconsiders its previous decision and approves development inclusive of LED Signs.
15 August 2017	Applicant seeks clearance of condition 6 relating to the payment of cash-in-lieu for a parking shortfall.
25 August 2017	Report prepared for Council.

## Past Resolutions

Ordinary Council Meeting 19 July 2016 (111/16)

*At its meeting held on 19 July 2016 Council resolved to advise the WAPC that should it recommend to the JDAP that Development Approval should be refused, Council would support that decision. However should the WAPC support approval of the proposed development, the Town would support this with the application of a number of conditions including requirement for the contribution of cash-in-lieu for the shortfall in the provision of car parking. The report indicated that the proposed illuminated LED signage could not be approved in accordance with the provisions of the Town's Local Law Relating to Signs.*

*CARRIED  
(NO DISSENT)*

## Heritage

The property is listed on the Town's Heritage List. As such the application was referred to the Town's Heritage Officer and was conditionally supported (with exception to the proposed illuminated LED Sign).

## Discussion

### Description

The application proposes the satisfaction of the cash-in-lieu for parking contribution by payment of \$45,000 (\$15,000 per bay – for three car parking bays).

Condition 6 of the JDAP approval for the proposed development requires:

6. *Prior to the issue of a Building Permit for the proposed development, the applicant/landowner shall make a cash-in-lieu contribution for the onsite shortfall of 3 car parking bays to the specification of the local government and satisfaction of the Western Australian Planning Commission.*

The applicant's solicitor has sought clearance of the condition based on the lower rate of \$15,000 per bay (see letter dated 15 August 2017 in Attachments – Restricted) on the basis that:



- The use of office above the ground floor is consistent with Council Policy;
- Council has an obligation to act professionally and responsibly in the exercise of its functions in progressing clearance of the conditions associated with that lawfully granted approval;
- It is expected that the payment of the cash-in-lieu for parking will be applied in a consistent manner across the Town in accordance with the Town's own local planning policy;
- The use which generates the "need" for a cash-in-lieu contribution in this case is the additional office space which has been provided above ground level on Bay View Terrace; and
- Application of the higher cash-in-lieu contribution rate should not consider whether the LED signage was supported (or not) by Council, and this is not a legitimate basis to require my client to pay the full contribution rate.

### Compliance

Payment of cash-in-lieu for the shortfall in parking is consistent with Council's recommendation to the WAPC at its meeting held 19 July 2016. As the proposed development was (at the time) primarily located in the Primary Regional Road Reservation under the MRS, a number of parking concessions were considered appropriate relative to proposals associated with Amendment No. 123 and Council Policy.

In summary the following parking assessment applies (noting that Amendment No. 123 has now been gazetted and the floor space of the third floor extension has been reduced due to setback requirements which were applied as conditions to the original Development Approval):

- The assessment identifies that 16 bays were provided on site, however as TPS3 would ordinarily require 35 bays (the status quo parking requirement) for the existing development, the new parking requirement applies to the increased parking requirements only. The proposed office floorspace is reduced to 123.8m<sup>2</sup> – this requires 4.1 bays.
  - Parking provisions introduced under Amendment No. 123 provide for Council to consider parking concessions of up to 35% for a number of aspects (5% each). These aspects include; location within 400m of Claremont Railway Station (5%), within 400m of a parking station (5%), and within 400m of a high frequency bus service (5%). Under this assessment, the parking requirement can be reduced by 15% ( $4.1 \times 0.85 = 3.485$ ) – rounded down to three bays. It is noted that other concessions provided by TPS3, such as being within the Town Centre (and providing a public benefit, complimenting the character of the area and not adversely impacting on the amenity of the locality – 5%), and conservation of heritage places, are not considered appropriate in the context of the development of the LED signage approved under the Development Approval.
  - The cash-in-lieu contribution requirement is based on Local Planning Policy PS205 – Public Parking (PS205). Policy PS205 requires the payment of \$30,000 per cash-in-lieu bay. However the parking contribution may be
-

discounted by 50% where the use is identified as a 'preferred use' under the terms of the Policy - "A 'preferred use' in the town centre may be afforded the maximum support by applying a concession for cash-in-lieu parking bays."

- 'Preferred uses' is defined under PS205 as being existing buildings containing 'Shops (small)', 'Restaurants', 'Small Bars', 'Consulting Rooms' and 'Office' (above ground level), 'Hairdressers and Barbers', and 'Beauty Salons' with a gross floor area of 300m<sup>2</sup> or less located within the town centre in Bay View Terrace, St Quentin Avenue or the associated laneways.
- The proposed development is a third floor addition to the existing building which will have a gross floor area exceeding 300m<sup>2</sup> (exist and proposed) and in which the ground floor has previously been used (currently vacant) as a consulting room.
- The proposed development does not therefore qualify as a 'preferred use' as defined in PS205 as the third floor is an addition to the existing building, the existing building exceeds 300m<sup>2</sup> and the ground floor was previously used as consulting rooms.

It is noted that the approval of a Sign Permit for illuminated LED signs under the Town's Local Law remains contentious and undetermined, however on the basis of legal advice, the Town has no discretion to approve such Sign Permit, and arguably no review rights exist in this case at the SAT. The applicant has a different view and accordingly the ultimate review by SAT of the signage application may either approve or refuse the sign.

It is also noted that as Council is not the determining authority on this matter, the WAPC through the JDAP may not support Council's view on this matter and apply the lower contribution rate of \$15,000 per bay given that the sign in itself does not attract parking.

### **Summary**

Based on the above, it is recommended that Council advise the WAPC and SAT that the Town requires the payment of \$90,000 for the cash-in-lieu contribution for three parking bays for the proposed development.

### **Voting Requirements**

Simple majority decision of Council required.

### **Moved Cr Mews, seconded Cr Kelly**

**THAT Council advise the Western Australian Planning Commission and the State Administrative Tribunal that it requires the payment of \$90,000 as a cash-in-lieu parking contribution in accordance with the provisions of Town Planning Scheme No. 3 and Council's Local Planning Policy PS205 – Public Parking, for the proposed development on Lots 1, 2 and 21 Bay View Terrace for the purpose of refurbishment and third storey additions and illuminated LED signage.**

**CARRIED (135/17)  
(NO DISSENT)**

**13.1.2 ST LOUIS MASTERPLAN AND LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN**

**File Ref:** LND/00061

**Responsible Officer:** David Vinicombe  
Executive Manager Planning and Development

**Author:** Stuart Devenish  
Planning Consultant

**Attachments Public:** [Location Map](#)  
[Photograph](#)

**Attachments Restricted:** [Applicant's Letter](#)  
[Proposed Local Development Plan](#)  
[Masterplan](#)

**Proposed Meeting Date:** 5 September 2017

---

*Item 13.1.2 was withdrawn by the CEO.*

**13.2 CORPORATE AND GOVERNANCE****13.2.1 BUSINESS PARKING PERMITS**

**File Ref:** LAW/00089

**Attachments:** [Business Case Parking Station 1A](#)  
[Business Case Parking Station 5A and 5B](#)

**Responsible Officer:** Les Crichton  
Executive Manager Corporate and Governance

**Author:** Brian Kavanagh  
Manager Statutory Services

**Proposed Meeting Date:** 5 September 2017

---

*Item 13.2.1 was withdrawn by the CEO.*

### 13.3 INFRASTRUCTURE

#### 13.3.1 ASHTON AVENUE REPLACEMENT BRIDGE - FINAL DESIGN OF INTERSECTION SIGNAL PHASING AND TURNING MOVEMENTS

<b>File Ref:</b>	<b>RDS/00304</b>
<b>Attachments:</b>	<a href="#">Draft Final - Ashton Avenue Bridge - sign and line marking.pdf</a>
<b>Responsible Officer:</b>	<b>Saba Kirupanather Executive Manager Infrastructure</b>
<b>Author:</b>	<b>Marty Symmons Engineering Technical Officer</b>
<b>Proposed Meeting Date:</b>	<b>5 September 2017</b>

---

#### **Purpose**

For Council to review the final design of the proposed modifications to the signal phasing and vehicle movements at the Guger Street, Ashton Avenue and Chancellor Street intersection.

The final design of the intersection will be subject to Main Roads WA (MRWA) approval and will provide the base intersection movements for a comprehensive traffic study of traffic movements in the locality which is required to address submissions on the proposed Draft Loch Street Structure Plan.

#### **Background**

In 2015 the existing Ashton Avenue bridge was investigated by MRWA and it was found that the structural strength of the bridge was below the acceptable loading capacity. Immediate action was taken by MRWA to install signs with load limits and prevent vehicles parking on the bridge in the traffic signal southern queuing lane. The structural strengthening works took place in December 2016 - January 2017.

In October 2016 Council resolved to accept the preliminary draft designs developed by MRWA and requested consideration be given to better pedestrian and cyclist facilities, and also that a number of vehicle movements be considered.

Different signal phasing and turning movement configurations were subsequently considered as part of the design process by MRWA. The movements considered were based on current and past usage and stakeholder feedback, including the Council's recommendations. A preferred design was selected based on these and best possible levels of service.

On 4 August 2017 MRWA completed a Road Safety Audit of the intersection design which included the proposed turning movements and signal phasing. In this audit it was determined that the two filter movements on Guger Street could not be permitted as designed due to number of historical accidents and substandard sight lines. These two movements were then removed from the design.

---

On 25 August 2017 staff from the Town met with MRWA representatives to review the newly amended design and request changes. MRWA agreed to the requested changes which included a reintroduction of one of the filter turn movements on Guger Street, and completion of the final design

### **Past Resolutions**

Ordinary Council Meeting 4 October 2016 (160/16)

#### *That Council*

1. *Accepts the proposed design parameters listed below for the preliminary draft concept design developed by Main Roads WA:*
  - a. *Two lanes in the easterly direction (one lane to turn right from Ashton Avenue to Guger Street and one lane to go straight and turn left);*
  - b. *One lane in the westerly direction from Chancellor Street to Ashton Avenue;*
  - c. *Shared path of 3 m on the north side and a path of 2m on the south side;*
  - d. *An access ramp from the Principal Shared Path between Loch Street station and Ashton Avenue, to connect to Ashton Avenue on the east side of the bridge.*
  - e. *The Town to make a decision whether to continue permanently, the temporary right turn signal from Chancellor Street to Guger Street;*
2. *Requests Main Roads WA to consider additional ramp from the PSP on the south side of the bridge to give cyclists and pedestrians to access Ashton Avenue from both sides*
3. *Requests Main Roads WA to consider the following options as well in the assessment of traffic signal configuration*
  - a. *Maintain right turn green arrow from Chancellor Street to Guger Street*
  - b. *Provide pedestrian phase for all sections*
  - c. *Provide right turn green arrow during peak times and turn off as a green filter from Guger Street to Chancellor Street and right turn ban from Guger Street to Ashton Avenue during afternoon peak times*
4. *Appreciates the Commissioner of Main Roads and Managing Director for their prompt attention in restricting the load limit and developing a concept design plan for the replacement bridge for the long term use and acceptable to all road users.*
5. *Inform the community via the Town Talk and the Town's website.*

**CARRIED**  
**(NO DISSENT)**

### **Discussion**

The MRWA preferred design for turning movements and signal phasing, based on stakeholder recommendations and optimising levels of service, was for three different phases:

---

1. Vehicles travelling in both directions on Guger Street have green signals with all movements permitted; right turns are filter only with no green arrows provided.
2. Vehicles travelling south on Ashton Avenue have green signals for all movements.
3. Vehicles travelling north on Chancellor Street have green signals for through and left turn. No right turn permitted.

When activated pedestrians get a leading green light in whichever direction they are crossing.

As part of the Road Safety Audit, crash data and sightlines were assessed. It was observed that the number of crashes which involved vehicles turning right off Guger Street in both directions were high enough to trigger the statutory requirement that the filter turns be banned. Therefore they were removed from the design.

It was observed that sight lines for vehicles turning onto Ashton Avenue from Guger Street were below standard requirements due to the crest in the road.

Sight lines for vehicles turning onto Chancellor Street were also below standard when vehicles were waiting on the other side of the intersection to turn right onto Ashton Avenue, masking the view of through moving vehicles.

The movements were then remodelled with green right turn arrows provided on Guger Street in both directions. Adding these two controlled movements lowered levels of service at the intersection to well below existing levels. The resultant congestion would not be acceptable.

The existing right turn traffic volumes were then reviewed to determine if they could be removed entirely. The movement from Guger Street onto Chancellor Street is well used, with above 90 vehicles per hour making the movement during peak times. The movement from Guger Street onto Ashton Avenue is used much less, with only 6 to 8 vehicles performing this turn during peak times.

The modelling was therefore redone with a right turn green arrow provided for turns onto Chancellor Street and right turns banned onto Ashton Avenue. This brought levels of service back to acceptable levels.

The Town's engineers then requested the following changes be considered for the final design;

- banning of the right turn from Guger Street onto Ashton Avenue removes the sight line issues for vehicles turning from Guger Street onto Chancellor Street, so this filter movement could be reintroduced.
- There were also no sight line issues for vehicles turning right from Ashton Avenue onto Guger Street when the Chancellor Street signals were green, so filter movements could be included from Ashton Avenue onto Guger Street.

Both of these changes would raise levels of service. MRWA agreed to adopt the changes pending review.

---

Final agreed configuration based on stakeholder recommendations, optimising levels of service, and meeting the requirements for road safety are now for four different phases:

1. Vehicles travelling east on Guger Street have green signals for all movements including a right turn green arrow. (short phase only)
2. Vehicles travelling in both directions on Guger Street have green signals with through left permitted in both directions. Filter right turns onto Chancellor Street are permitted. No right turns from Guger Street onto Ashton Avenue.
3. Vehicles travelling south on Ashton Avenue have green signals for all movements including a right turn arrow.
4. Vehicles travelling from both Chancellor Street and Ashton Avenue have green signals for through and left turn. Filter right turns from Ashton Avenue are permitted. No right turns from Chancellor Street onto Guger Street.

When activated, pedestrians get a leading green light in whichever direction they are crossing. MRWA will also include additional flashing amber lamps when the pedestrian crossing has been activated to increase awareness that turning vehicles are to give way to the crossing pedestrians.

### **Financial and Staff Implications**

Resource requirements are in accordance with existing budgetary allocation.

### **Policy and Statutory Implications**

Australian Standards  
Austroads Guidelines  
Main Roads WA Guidelines  
Department of Transport

### **Communication / Consultation**

N/A

### **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.

#### **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.*

---



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

### **Urgency**

MRWA is finalising the design and any comments from the Town should be provided as soon as possible.

The final agreed design for the intersection is required in order for the Town's consultants to model the future intersection movements along with road design capacities for the locality in addressing submissions raised on the Draft Loch Street Structure Plan.

### **Voting Requirements**

Simple majority decision of Council required.

### **OFFICER RECOMMENDATION**

**Moved Cr Mews, seconded Cr Kelly**

**That Council notifies Main Roads WA of its support for the proposed final movement and phasing design for the Ashton Avenue/Gugeri Street/Chancellor Street signalised intersection as detailed below:**

- 1. Vehicles travelling east on Gugeri Street have green signals for all movements including a right turn green arrow (short phase only);**
- 2. Vehicles travelling in both directions on Gugeri Street have green signals with through left permitted in both directions. Filter right turns onto Chancellor Street are permitted. No right turns from Gugeri Street onto Ashton Avenue;**
- 3. Vehicles travelling south on Ashton Avenue have green signals for all movements including a right turn arrow;**
- 4. Vehicles travelling from both Chancellor Street and Ashton Avenue have green signals for through and left turn. Filter right turns from Ashton Avenue are permitted. No right turns from Chancellor Street onto Gugeri Street.**
- 5. When any traffic signal phasing is activated, pedestrians get a leading green light in whichever direction they are crossing. MRWA will also include additional flashing amber lamps when the pedestrian crossing has been activated to increase awareness that turning vehicles are to give way to the crossing pedestrians.**

**CARRIED (135/17)  
(NO DISSENT)**

