


# **CITY OF COCKBURN**



## **ORDINARY COUNCIL**

## **AGENDA PAPER**

### **FOR**

**THURSDAY, 9 MARCH 2017**

# CITY OF COCKBURN

## SUMMARY OF AGENDA TO BE PRESENTED TO THE ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING TO BE HELD ON THURSDAY, 9 MARCH 2017 AT 7:00 PM

	Page
1. DECLARATION OF MEETING.....	1
2. APPOINTMENT OF PRESIDING MEMBER (IF REQUIRED) .....	1
3. DISCLAIMER (TO BE READ ALOUD BY PRESIDING MEMBER).....	1
4. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF RECEIPT OF WRITTEN DECLARATIONS OF FINANCIAL INTERESTS AND CONFLICT OF INTEREST (BY PRESIDING MEMBER).....	1
5. APOLOGIES AND LEAVE OF ABSENCE .....	1
6. WRITTEN REQUESTS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE.....	1
7. RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS PUBLIC QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE .....	2
8. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME .....	2
9. CONFIRMATION OF MEETING .....	2
9.1 (OCM 09/03/2017) - MINUTES OF THE ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING - 09/02/2017 .....	2
9.2 (OCM 09/03/2017) - MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING - 02/02/2017 .....	2
10. DEPUTATIONS .....	3
11. PETITIONS.....	3
12. BUSINESS LEFT OVER FROM THE PREVIOUS MEETING (IF ADJOURNED) .....	3
13. DECLARATION BY MEMBERS WHO HAVE NOT GIVEN DUE CONSIDERATION TO MATTERS CONTAINED IN THE BUSINESS PAPER PRESENTED BEFORE THE MEETING .....	3
14. COUNCIL MATTERS.....	3
14.1 (OCM 09/03/2017) - FINAL ADOPTION - CITY OF COCKBURN STANDING ORDERS AMENDMENT LOCAL LAW 2017 (025/001) (J NGOROYEMOTO) (ATTACH) .....	3
14.2 (OCM 09/03/2017) - MINUTES OF THE DELEGATED AUTHORITIES, POLICIES AND POSITION STATEMENTS COMMITTEE MEETING - 23 FEBRUARY 2017 (182/001; 182/002; 086/003) (B PINTO) (ATTACH).....	5
14.3 (OCM 09/03/2017) - MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL AUDIT AND STRATEGIC FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING - 23 FEBRUARY 2017 (026/007) (J NGOROYEMOTO) (ATTACH).....	8



15.	PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT DIVISION ISSUES .....	9
15.1	(OCM 09/03/2017) - DESIGN REVIEW PANEL – MEMBER APPOINTMENT (052/020) (A LEFORT) (ATTACH) .....	9
15.2	(OCM 09/03/2017) - PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO BARFIELD ROAD STRUCTURE PLAN – LOT 9000 FRANKLAND AVENUE, HAMMOND PARK – OWNER: GOLD ESTATES HOLDINGS PTY LTD – APPLICANT: ROBERTS DAY (110/166) (T VAN DER LINDE) (ATTACH) .....	16
15.3	(OCM 09/03/2017) - CONSIDER ADVERTISING OF DRAFT TREEBY DISTRICT STRUCTURE PLAN (100/141) (C CATHERWOOD) (ATTACH) .....	21
15.4	(OCM 09/03/2017) - ACQUISITION OF LAND FOR ROAD WIDENING PURPOSES - PORTION OF JANDAKOT ROAD AND SOLOMON ROAD, JANDAKOT (041/001) (K SIM) (ATTACH) .....	26
15.5	(OCM 09/03/2017) - CONSIDERATION OF ROCKINGHAM ROAD UPGRADE CONCEPT PLAN; PHOENIX ACTIVITY CENTRE PLAN AND LOCAL PLANNING POLICY (PHOENIX ACTIVITY CENTRE DESIGN GUIDELINES (FINAL ADOPTION) (110/088 & 110/043) (D DI RENZO / A TROSIC) (ATTACH).....	31
16.	FINANCE AND CORPORATE SERVICES DIVISION ISSUES .....	53
16.1	(OCM 09/03/2017) - LIST OF CREDITORS PAID - JANUARY 2017 (076/001) (N MAURICIO) (ATTACH).....	53
16.2	(OCM 09/03/2017) - STATEMENT OF FINANCIAL ACTIVITY AND ASSOCIATED REPORTS - JANUARY 2017 (071/001) (N MAURICIO) (ATTACH) .....	55
17.	ENGINEERING AND WORKS DIVISION ISSUES.....	66
17.1	(OCM 09/03/2017) - SPEARWOOD AVENUE FENCING PROPOSAL (146/002) (C SULLIVAN / A LEES) (ATTACH).....	66
17.2	(OCM 09/03/2017) - WYOLA SHIPWRECK MANAGEMENT (064/004 & 175/001) (B ROSER) (ATTACH).....	71
17.3	(OCM 09/03/2017) - TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT IN RIGBY AVENUE AND SURROUNDING AREA (047/013) (CSULLIVAN/JKIURSKI) (ATTACH) .....	80
17.4	(OCM 09/03/2017) - TENDER NO. RFT 02/2017 - PROCESSING SERVICES FOR RECYCLABLE MATERIALS (RFT 02/2017) (L DAVIESON) (ATTACH).....	85
18.	COMMUNITY SERVICES DIVISION ISSUES.....	91
18.1	(OCM 09/03/2017) - COCKBURN AQUATIC & RECREATION CENTRE - PARKING STATION LOT 125 & 126 POLETTI ROAD, COCKBURN CENTRAL (154/006) (R.AVARD) (ATTACH).....	91
18.2	(OCM 09/03/2017) - CONSULTATION WITH ABORIGINAL REFERENCE GROUP - CULTURAL ACTIVITIES ON AUSTRALIA DAY (027/009) (G BOWMAN) (ATTACH).....	94
18.3	(OCM 09/03/2017) - AUSTRALIA DAY FIREWORKS REVIEW (152/001) (M LA FRENAIS) (ATTACH) .....	100
19.	EXECUTIVE DIVISION ISSUES .....	110

20.	MOTIONS OF WHICH PREVIOUS NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN .....	110
20.1	(OCM 09/03/2017) - FORMER SOUTH FREMANTLE POWER STATION - LOT 2 ROBB ROAD AND PORTION OF LOT 3 ROBB ROAD, NORTH COOGEE – RECORDING OF URBAN ART (108/003 ) (D ARNDT).....	110
21.	NOTICES OF MOTION GIVEN AT THE MEETING FOR CONSIDERATION AT NEXT MEETING.....	113
22.	NEW BUSINESS OF AN URGENT NATURE INTRODUCED BY MEMBERS OR OFFICERS .....	113
23.	MATTERS TO BE NOTED FOR INVESTIGATION, WITHOUT DEBATE.....	113
24.	CONFIDENTIAL BUSINESS.....	113
25	(OCM 09/03/2017) - RESOLUTION OF COMPLIANCE .....	113
26.	CLOSURE OF MEETING.....	114

## **CITY OF COCKBURN**

### **AGENDA TO BE PRESENTED TO THE ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING TO BE HELD ON THURSDAY, 9 MARCH 2017 AT 7:00 PM**

---

**1. DECLARATION OF MEETING**

**2. APPOINTMENT OF PRESIDING MEMBER (If required)**

**3. DISCLAIMER (To be read aloud by Presiding Member)**

Members of the public, who attend Council Meetings, should not act immediately on anything they hear at the Meetings, without first seeking clarification of Council's position. Persons are advised to wait for written advice from the Council prior to taking action on any matter that they may have before Council.

**4. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF RECEIPT OF WRITTEN DECLARATIONS OF  
FINANCIAL INTERESTS AND CONFLICT OF INTEREST (by Presiding  
Member)**

**5. APOLOGIES AND LEAVE OF ABSENCE**

**6. WRITTEN REQUESTS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE**

**7. RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS PUBLIC QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE**

**8. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

**9. CONFIRMATION OF MEETING**

**9.1 (OCM 09/03/2017) - MINUTES OF THE ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING - 09/02/2017**

**RECOMMENDATION**

That Council confirms the Minutes of the Ordinary Council Meeting held on Thursday 9 February 2017, as a true and accurate record.

**COUNCIL DECISION**

**9.2 (OCM 09/03/2017) - MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL COUNCIL MEETING - 02/02/2017**

**RECOMMENDATION**

That Council confirms the Minutes of the Special Council Meeting held on Thursday 2 February 2017, as a true and accurate record.

**COUNCIL DECISION**

**10. DEPUTATIONS**

**11. PETITIONS**

**12. BUSINESS LEFT OVER FROM THE PREVIOUS MEETING (If adjourned)**

**13. DECLARATION BY MEMBERS WHO HAVE NOT GIVEN DUE CONSIDERATION TO MATTERS CONTAINED IN THE BUSINESS PAPER PRESENTED BEFORE THE MEETING**

**14. COUNCIL MATTERS**

**14.1 (OCM 09/03/2017) - FINAL ADOPTION - CITY OF COCKBURN STANDING ORDERS AMENDMENT LOCAL LAW 2017 (025/001) (J NGOROYEMOTO) (ATTACH)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

That Council pursuant to Section 3.12 (4) of the Local Government Act 1995 proceed to adopt the City of Cockburn Standing Orders Amendment Local Law 2017, as attached to the Agenda

**TO BE CARRIED BY AN ABSOLUTE MAJORITY OF COUNCIL**

**COUNCIL DECISION**

## **Background**

In accordance with section 3.12(3) of the Local Government Act 1995 and Council resolution of 8 December 2016, Statewide notice was given in the 'West Australian newspaper on 23 December 2016 stating that:

*The proposed amendment is to amend the City of Cockburn Standing Orders Local Law 2016 sub clauses relating to petitions and public questions, to provide clarity, and ensure that empowering enactments prevail.'*

A copy of the proposed Local Law was displayed and made available for inspection at the City of Cockburn Administration Office and at the Spearwood, Coolbellup, and Success Libraries during office hours.

Submissions about the proposed Local Law were to be made to the CEO at the City of Cockburn by 4 February 2017.

## **Submission**

N/A

## **Report**

The effect of the proposed amendment is to make the City of Cockburn Standing Orders Local Law 2016 consistent with the Local Government Act 1995, and proportionate to the exercise of power provided to local government to make laws.

It is now proposed that Council resolve to make the City of Cockburn Standing Orders Amendment Local Law 2017, and authorise two officers of the City, nominally the Mayor and the Chief Executive Officer, to affix the Common Seal of the City, thus progressing the processing of the local law and having it gazetted in the Government Gazette ultimately bringing the local law into force.

## **Strategic Plan/Policy Implications**

### **Leading & Listening**

- Deliver sustainable governance through transparent and robust policy and processes.

## **Budget/Financial Implications**

N/A

## **Legal Implications**

Section 3.12 of the Local Government Act refers.

## **Community Consultation**

Advertisement of the proposed amendments was placed in a Statewide public notice, on 23 December 2016. No submissions were received.

## **Risk Management Implications**

Failure to adopt the recommendations will leave the City of Cockburn Standing Orders Local Law with subclauses that are invalid and not authorised by the empowering enactment. This will ultimately result in the Standing Orders local Law 2016 being disallowed. In the next Parliament, there will be a newly constituted Joint Standing Committee on Delegated Legislation. The Committee may place a Notice of Motion to disallow the local law, if it deems necessary, depending on the City's response to the Committee's concerns outlined in the undertaking.

## **Attachment(s)**

Proposed City of Cockburn Standing Orders Amendment Local Law 2017.

## **Advice to Proponent(s)/Submissioners**

N/A

## **Implications of Section 3.18(3) Local Government Act, 1995**

Nil.

### **14.2 (OCM 09/03/2017) - MINUTES OF THE DELEGATED AUTHORITIES, POLICIES AND POSITION STATEMENTS COMMITTEE MEETING - 23 FEBRUARY 2017 (182/001; 182/002; 086/003) (B PINTO) (ATTACH)**

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

That Council receive the Minutes of the Delegated Authorities, Policies and Position Statements Committee Meeting held on Thursday, 23 February 2017, and adopt the recommendations contained therein.

**TO BE CARRIED BY AN ABSOLUTE MAJORITY OF COUNCIL**

## **COUNCIL DECISION**

### **Background**

The Delegated Authorities, Policies and Position Statements Committee conducted a meeting on 23 February 2017. The Minutes of the meeting are required to be presented.

### **Submission**

N/A

### **Report**

The Committee recommendations are now presented for consideration by Council and if accepted, are endorsed as the decisions of Council. Any Elected Member may withdraw any item from the Committee meeting for discussion and propose an alternative recommendation for Council's consideration. Any such items will be dealt with separately, as provided for in Council's Standing Orders. The primary focus of this meeting was to review the Policies and associated Delegated Authorities and Position Statements relative to the Engineering and Works Division. In addition, where reference was made to Town Planning Scheme No.3 in the Local Planning Policies and some Delegated Authorities, these have now been amended to reflect the change in legislation. Those DAPPS which were required to be reviewed on an as needs basis have also been included in these Minutes.

### **Strategic Plan/Policy Implications**

#### **Leading & Listening**

- Deliver sustainable governance through transparent and robust policy and processes.
- Ensure sound long term financial management and deliver value for money.
- Listen to and engage with our residents, business community and ratepayers with greater use of social media.



- Provide for community and civic infrastructure in a planned and sustainable manner, including administration, operations and waste management.

**Budget/Financial Implications**

As contained in the Minutes.

**Legal Implications**

N/A

**Community Consultation**

As contained in the Minutes.

**Risk Management Implications**

Failure to adopt the Minutes may result in inconsistent processes and lead to non-conformance with the principles of good governance, and non-compliance with the Local Government Act 1995 for delegations made under the Act.

**Attachment(s)**

Minutes of the Delegated Authorities, Policies and Position Statements Committee Meeting – 23 February 2017.

**Advice to Proponent(s)/Submissioners**

N/A

**Implications of Section 3.18(3) Local Government Act, 1995**

Nil.

**14.3 (OCM 09/03/2017) - MINUTES OF THE SPECIAL AUDIT AND STRATEGIC FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING - 23 FEBRUARY 2017 (026/007) (J NGOROYEMOTO) (ATTACH)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

That Council receive the Minutes of the Audit and Strategic Finance Committee Meeting held on Thursday, 23 February 2017, and adopt the recommendations contained therein.

**COUNCIL DECISION**

**Background**

A Special Meeting of the Audit and Strategic Finance Committee was conducted on 23 February 2017.

**Submission**

N/A

**Report**

The Special Meeting of the Audit and Strategic Finance Committee received and considered the City of Cockburn Compliance Audit Return for the period 1 January 2016 to 31 December 2016.

**Strategic Plan/Policy Implications**

**Leading & Listening**

- Deliver sustainable governance through transparent and robust policy and processes.
- Ensure sound long term financial management and deliver value for money.

**Budget/Financial Implications**

As contained in the Minutes.

**Legal Implications**

As contained in the Minutes.

**Community Consultation**

N/A

**Risk Management Implications**

Failure to adopt the recommendation will result in non-compliance with the Compliance Audit Return statutory reporting requirements to the Department of Local Government by 31 March 2017.

**Attachment(s)**

Minutes of the Special Audit and Strategic Finance Committee Meeting – 23 February 2017.

**Advice to Proponent(s)/Submissioners**

N/A

**Implications of Section 3.18(3) Local Government Act, 1995**

Nil.

**15. PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT DIVISION ISSUES****15.1 (OCM 09/03/2017) - DESIGN REVIEW PANEL – MEMBER APPOINTMENT (052/020) (A LEFORT) (ATTACH)****RECOMMENDATION**

That Council

- (1) appoints Barbara Gdowski as the Chair of the City of Cockburn Design Review Panel for a two year term concluding on 10 March 2019;
- (2) appoints Dominic Snellgrove, Chris Melsom, Peter Hobbs and David Barr as members of the City of Cockburn Design Review Panel for a two year term finishing on 9 March 2019; and
- (3) thanks and advises all unsuccessful applicants that they have not been appointed to the panel.

## COUNCIL DECISION

### Background

At its meeting held on 14 April 2016 Council made the following resolution to establish a Design Review Panel (DRP) for the City of Cockburn:

*“That Council:*

- (1) establish a Design Review Panel in accordance with Clause 11.9 of Town Planning Scheme No.3 for the purposes of providing independent expert design review advice for complex planning proposals to commence in the 2016/2017 financial year (second half);*
- (2) draft a Local Planning Policy outlining the type of development that will be referred to the Panel, a set of Design Principles that the panel will use for a basis for review and terms of reference for the panel;*
- (3) seek expressions of interest and nominations for suitably qualified membership of the City of Cockburn Design Review Panel for a period of not less than 28 days; and*
- (4) receive a further report following assessment of the expressions of interest to consider further appointment of panel members.”*

Subsequent to this resolution, a Local Planning Policy (LPP 5.16 Design Review Panel) was adopted by Council for finalisation at its meeting held on 8 September 2016 (through adoption of the August DAPPS minutes).

The DRP is established as a body with which Council may consult in assessing certain applications (as outlined in LPP 5.16) under the City of Cockburn Local Planning Scheme No.3 (LPS 3). The DRP is not established as a Committee under the *Local Government Act 1995*. Council also resolved that the DRP would be established in the second half of the 2016/2017 financial year due to the requirement for consideration through the annual budget which was adopted in June 2016.

In accordance with Council's resolution above, registrations of interest (ROI) were publicly advertised seeking suitably qualified members to join the DRP. The ROI was open for 28 days and concluded on 14

November 2016. 21 expressions of interest were received and the purpose of this report is for Council to appoint the panel members so that the DRP can commence operation.

## Submission

N/A

## Report

The Terms of Reference for the DRP are contained in Council's LPP 5.16 and state, in part, as follows:

### *(2) Panel Membership*

1. *The membership of the Panel shall comprise of up to five (5) persons, with a minimum of three (3) required to consider any matter.*
2. *Members shall be highly regarded with appropriate qualifications and substantial experience in one or more of the following areas:*
  - a) *Architecture*
  - b) *Urban design*
  - c) *Landscape Architecture*
3. *A person who is currently employed by the City of Cockburn or who is an elected member of the Cockburn Council is not eligible for appointment as a member of the Panel.*
4. *At least two panel members should demonstrate experience in the City of Cockburn or other Local Authority with similar forms of development.*
5. *All panel members shall be appointed by the Council, following a public process of expressions of interest and a Chair determined by Council.*
6. *Each nomination shall be accompanied by the names of a minimum of two professional referees. These should be independent professional peers who can specifically attest in writing as to the suitability of the candidate for membership of the Panel.*
7. *Appointment of panel members will be based on consideration of their qualifications and experience which must include demonstrated effectiveness in design review of major development proposals of the kind which the panel will be required to review as part of its role.*

8. *The term of office for panel members will be two (2) years, although Council may reappoint any member.*
9. *The Council may terminate the appointment of any member of the Panel prior to the expiry of the term of office.'*

At the closing date for submissions, nominations had been received by the following 21 design professionals:

	<b>Applicant Name</b>	<b>Qualification</b>	<b>Employer</b>
1	Simon Venturi	Architect	Noma Studio
2	Barbara Gdowski	Architect	Murdoch University
3	Alex Willis	Architect	ACW Design
4	Dominic Snellgrove	Architect	Cameron Chisholm Nicol Architects
5	Ian Dewar	Architect	Ian Dewar & Associates Architects
6	Patrick Jordan/ Nicky Croudace/ Stuart Pullybank (One submission)	Landscape Architects	Ecoscape
7	Chris Melsom	Architect Planner	HASSELL
8	Melanie Bradley	Landscape Architect Planner	Department of Planning
9	Nick Juniper	Architect	Coda Architects
10	Kym MacCormac	Architect	MacCormac Architects
11	David Barr	Architect	David Barr Architects
12	Lisa Shine	Architect & Landscape Architect	N/A
13	Peter Hobbs	Architect & Registered Builder	Peter Hobbs Architects
14	Lee-Anne Kho	Architect	Peter Hobbs Architects
15	Andrew MacLiver	Architect	A & A Macliver
16	Malcolm Mackay	Architect/Urban Designer	Mackay Urban Design
17	Tony Watson	Planner	MW Urban
18	Peter Woodward	Landscape Architect	Blackwell & Associates
19	Joe Chindarsi	Architect	Joe Chindarsi Architects
20	Michelle Blakeley	Architect	Michelle Blakely Architect Pty Ltd
21	Hans Oerlemans	Landscape Architect & Urban Designer	Place Laboratory

Based on a thorough selection process and analysis of the applicant's qualifications and experience, along with advice from the Office of Government Architect, it is recommended that Council appoint the following five members:

- Barbara Gdowski
- Dominic Snellgrove
- Chris Melsom
- Peter Hobbs
- David Barr

*Barbara Gdowski (Recommended Panel Chair)*

Barbara Gdowski is an Architect currently employed by Murdoch University as General Manager Strategy and Planning Professional Services. Prior to this role, Barbara worked as Senior Project Manager at LandCorp where she chaired the LandCorp-run Cockburn Central Town Centre Design Review Panel for approximately 8 years. Barbara was also instrumental in the development of the Cockburn Central Town Centre Design Guidelines. As such, Barbara is familiar with the City of Cockburn and has relevant experience in chairing a design review panel which will ensure success of the City of Cockburn's DRP. Barbara has demonstrated good working relationships with applicants and other panel members in order to deliver the best built form outcomes possible.

*Dominic Snellgrove*

Dominic is a highly regarded Architect with over 25 years of experience and is the Managing Director of architectural firm Cameron Chisholm Nicol (CCN). Dominic has a wealth of experience designing apartment and mixed use proposals in Cockburn Central Town Centre, Port Coogee and South Beach areas of the City as well as across Perth. Dominic is also the Chair of the Melville Design Review Panel, Deputy Chair of the Fremantle Design Advisory Committee and a member of the Subiaco Design Review Panel, so has significant experience in design review panels.

*Chris Melsom*

Chris is a qualified Architect and Planner and has extensive experience in urban design and sustainable development. Chris is a Principal Architect and Head of Planning at HASSELL where he leads the urban design sector across Western Australia and South East Asia. Chris has been engaged by LandCorp as the Estate Architect for its Shoreline development at Cockburn Coast and chairs LandCorp's Design Review Panel for the area. Chris also oversaw the

development of the Cockburn Coast Local Structure Plan and Design Guidelines for the Cockburn Coast area. Chris' architecture, planning, urban design skills and experience is expected to provide great benefit to the panel.

*Peter Hobbs*

Peter is an Architect with over 20 years of experience and is also a registered builder. Peter is Director of Peter Hobbs Architects and has worked on many projects across Western Australia. Peter is currently on the LandCorp Architectural and Urban Design Panel and Metropolitan Redevelopment Authority Design Review Services Panel providing him with relevant panel experience. Peter is also Chairman of the Urban Design Committee of the Australian Institute of Architects.

*David Barr*

David is a Fremantle based Architect and Director of David Barr Architects whose personal ambitions and focus are developing enduring architecture addressing key social issues of affordable housing and sensitively increasing density of Perth, both of which are highly relevant in the City of Cockburn. David is well regarded in the industry and in 2014 won LandCorp's Generation Y Demonstration Housing Project in White Gum Valley. David has also contributed to the Western Australian Planning Commission's Apartment Design Guide (draft) which is currently being finalised. David has undertaken a number of projects in the local area including South Beach Estate.

Conclusion

The quality of applicants who responded to the City's ROI process was extremely high and the five recommended panel members will each bring their own unique set of skills and experience to the panel. All recommended panel members are highly regarded within their industry and will contribute to the success of the panel to ensure that new development (meeting the relevant criteria outlined in LPP 5.16) contributes to the City's mission statement to make the City of Cockburn the most attractive place to live, work, visit and invest in, within the Perth Metropolitan area.

**Strategic Plan/Policy Implications**

**City Growth**

- Continue revitalisation of older urban areas to cater for population growth and take account of social changes such as changing household types



- Ensure growing high density living is balanced with the provision of open space and social spaces
- Ensure a variation in housing density and housing type is available to residents

#### **Leading & Listening**

- Deliver sustainable governance through transparent and robust policy and processes

#### **Budget/Financial Implications**

Costs associated with the operation of the DRP will be met through funds which have been allocated through the municipal budget.

#### **Legal Implications**

N/A

#### **Community Consultation**

No community consultation occurred as part of this process, although it should be noted that the EOI process involved public advertising.

#### **Risk Management Implications**

Failure to appoint members to the panel will result in non-compliance with the Terms of Reference and will ultimately result in delay to commence the DRP.

#### **Attachment(s)**

1. CV – Barbara Gdowski
2. CV – Dominic Snellgrove
3. CV – Chris Melsom
4. CV – Peter Hobbs
5. CV – David Barr

#### **Advice to Proponent(s)/Submissioners**

N/A

#### **Implications of Section 3.18(3) Local Government Act, 1995**

Nil.

**15.2 (OCM 09/03/2017) - PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO BARFIELD ROAD STRUCTURE PLAN – LOT 9000 FRANKLAND AVENUE, HAMMOND PARK – OWNER: GOLD ESTATES HOLDINGS PTY LTD – APPLICANT: ROBERTS DAY (110/166) (T VAN DER LINDE) (ATTACH)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

That Council

- (1) adopt the Schedule of Submissions prepared in respect of the proposed Structure Plan Amendment;
- (2) pursuant to *Schedule 2, Part 4, clause 20 of the deemed provisions of the Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*, recommend to the Western Australian Planning Commission the proposed amended Barfield Road Structure Plan be approved; and
- (3) advise the proponent and those persons who made a submission, of Council's decision.

**COUNCIL DECISION**

**Background**

The Structure Plan amendment applies to a portion of Lot 9000 Frankland Avenue, Hammond Park which is identified on the Location Plan at Attachment 1.

The Barfield Road Structure Plan ("Structure Plan") was adopted by Council in September 2013 and endorsed by the Western Australian Planning Commission ("Commission") in October 2014. Minor modifications to the Structure Plan were approved in October 2015.

A proposal to modify the Structure Plan pertinent to a portion of Lot 9000 Frankland Avenue, Hammond Park ("subject land") has been lodged with the City in order to increase the density code over this portion of land from R25 to R60. The current endorsed Structure Plan

and the proposed modified Structure Plan are depicted at Attachment 2.

A subdivision application over Lot 9000 Frankland Avenue was approved by the Commission on 25 July 2016 and is included at Attachment 3. The Structure Plan amendment applies to approved Lot 414 identified as a grouped housing (GH) site of 3176m<sup>2</sup> on the plan of subdivision.

The amended Structure Plan has been advertised for public comment and this report now seeks to consider the proposal for adoption, in light of the advertising process and assessment by officers.

### **Submission**

N/A

### **Report**

The subject land represents a portion of Lot 9000 Frankland Avenue and is 3176m<sup>2</sup> in size. The subject land is currently zoned 'Urban' under the Metropolitan Region Scheme ("MRS") and 'Residential R25' under the Barfield Road Structure Plan. It is also located within Development Contribution Area No. 9 (Hammond Park) ("DCA 9") and Development Contribution Area No. 13 (Community Infrastructure) ("DCA 13").

The subject land is in a locality undergoing progressive residential redevelopment following structure planning and subdivision of large rural style lots, and is identified as a grouped housing site on the approved plan of subdivision included at Attachment 3.

The subject land is located approximately 360m north of Rowley Road and 800m from the Kwinana Freeway, and thus is highly accessible via the regional road network. Hammond Park Catholic Primary School is located 300m to the north of the subject land and Hammond Park Primary School (public) is located approximately 1km north-west of the subject land. Frankland Avenue is identified as a future bus route and thus future residents at this site will have convenient access to public transport.

An area of Public Open Space (POS) of approximately 9600m<sup>2</sup> is to be located adjacent south of the subject land providing opportunities for passive and active recreation for future residents. Frankland Park reserve is also located on the opposite side of Frankland Avenue.

The subject land, identified for grouped housing development, presents a good opportunity to provide a diversity of housing products within the

Structure Plan area since the majority of housing is expected to be single detached dwellings. The subject land is also of an appropriate size to accommodate grouped dwellings at a higher density. The proposed increase in density will better capitalise on the opportunity for grouped dwelling development at this site and will allow a greater number of residents to be located adjacent to the proposed POS and in close proximity to schools and the regional road network.

Currently, the subject land has the potential to accommodate a maximum of 9 dwellings. At an R60 coding, a total of 21 dwellings are permissible at the site, subject to any site constraints. This increase in coding is considered appropriate in this location, given the site's close proximity to proposed and existing POS, the Kwinana Freeway and a number of community facilities. The proposed amendment will further extend and reinforce the current range of densities within the Structure Plan area (R25-R60).

#### *Traffic*

A Transport Impact Assessment ("TIA") was prepared in December 2013 in support of the Barfield Road Structure Plan and approved by the City of Cockburn. A Traffic Engineering Letter drawing on the conclusions presented in the TIA was lodged in support of the proposed amendment application and estimates that the increased coding of the subject land would generate an additional 77 vehicular movements per day. The proposed local road network is easily capable of accommodating this additional traffic and thus the proposed amendment will not have a negative impact on traffic.

#### *Fire Management*

A Fire Management Plan ("FMP") was prepared and approved in support of the Barfield Road Structure Plan and identifies the subject land as BAL 12.5 and 19. These requirements will not change as a result of the proposed amendment, and thus the FMP is not required to be updated. A hazard separation zone 20m in width and developed as pavement, lawn or another suitable treatment is to separate any development on the subject land from the proposed POS to the south. This has been required as a condition of the subdivision approval over the site and will be enforced at development application stage.

Community consultation was carried out for a period of 28 days from 10 January 2017 until 7 February 2017. The proposal was advertised in the newspaper, on the City's website and letters were sent to affected landowners and relevant government agencies in accordance with the Scheme requirements.

Eleven submissions were received during the advertising period all from government agencies raising no objection to the proposal. The submissions have been listed in detail within the Schedule of Submissions at Attachment 4.

In light of the planning merit of the proposed amendment, it is recommended that it be supported by Council.

### **Strategic Plan/Policy Implications**

#### **City Growth**

- Ensure planning facilitates a desirable living environment and meets growth targets
- Ensure a variation in housing density and housing type is available to residents

### **Budget/Financial Implications**

The Structure Plan fees for this proposal have been calculated in accordance with the *Planning and Development Regulations 2009*, including the cost of advertising and this has been paid by the applicant.

Subdivision and development of the subject land is also subject to the requirements of the City's Development Contribution Plan 13 (Community Infrastructure) and Development Contribution Plan 9 (Hammond Park).

### **Legal Implications**

*Planning and Development Act 2005*

City of Cockburn Town Planning Scheme No. 3

*Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*

### **Community Consultation**

Community consultation was carried out for a period of 28 days from 10 January 2017 until 7 February 2017. The proposal was advertised in the newspaper, on the City's website and letters were sent to affected landowners and relevant government agencies in accordance with the Scheme requirements.

Eleven submissions were received during the advertising period all from government agencies raising no objection to the proposal. The submissions have been listed in detail within the Schedule of Submissions at Attachment 4.

### **Risk Management Implications**

The subject land is an optimal site for medium density development higher than the current R25 coding applicable to the site due to the appropriate size and shape of the site supporting higher density, as well as its location directly adjacent to a large area of POS. An increase in coding will provide the opportunity for this site to be developed as grouped or multiple dwellings, providing housing diversity within the Structure Plan area. If the subject land is not recoded, future development will only be permitted at the R25 coding resulting in an underutilisation of land, lost opportunity for residents to live in close proximity to POS and a diversity of housing.

### **Attachment(s)**

1. Location Plan
2. Existing and Proposed Barfield Road Structure Plan
3. Approved Plan of Subdivision
4. Schedule of Submissions

### **Advice to Proponent(s)/Submissioners**

The Proponent(s) and those who lodged a submission on the proposal have been advised that this matter is to be considered at the 9 March 2017 Council Meeting.

### **Implications of Section 3.18(3) Local Government Act, 1995**

Nil.

**15.3 (OCM 09/03/2017) - CONSIDER ADVERTISING OF DRAFT TREEBY DISTRICT STRUCTURE PLAN (100/141) (C CATHERWOOD) (ATTACH)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

That Council

- (1) adopt the draft Treeby District Structure Plan for the purposes of public consultation with a view to it being a guiding document to coordinate future structure plans within the District Structure Plan area;
- (2) advertise the draft Treeby District Structure Plan for a period of 42 days, with advertising generally to follow the procedural requirements established by Schedule 2, clause 18 of the Deemed Provisions of the Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015; and
- (3) following advertising, consider the draft Treeby District Structure Plan for endorsement as a guiding document with due regard to:
  - a. Submissions received.
  - b. Further information received during the advertising period.
  - c. The status of the Western Australian Planning Commission's Draft Perth and Peel @3.5 million.

**COUNCIL DECISION**

**Background**

In November 2015, Council supported the preparation of the Banjup (now Treeby) District Structure Plan ('TDSP') and endorsed a Project Plan to prescribe how this work should be undertaken.

Since then, background work and analysis has occurred and a draft document is now presented for Council's consideration to adopt for the purposes of advertising.

**Submission**

N/A

## Report

The TDSP will guide the form of future development of the locality, with a key aim to provide opportunities to enhance the qualities of this existing neighbourhood. The TDSP is seen as an important step for the Treeby urban precinct, considering its strategic placement within the heart of the rapidly expanding south west corridor adjacent to Cockburn Central Station. At the same time, the constraints of the locality present unique challenges, which demand careful study and reflection in terms of ensuring that planning for the area is suitable to enhancing opportunities for current and future residents of Treeby.

### Planning Framework

To realise the vision of 'Directions 2031 and Beyond' and the State Planning Strategy 2050, the Western Australian Planning Commission has created a series of detailed draft planning frameworks.

The Perth and Peel@3.5million strategic suite of documents has been developed to engage the community in open discussion on expectations of what our city should look like in the future, on how we can maintain our valued lifestyle and on how we can realistically accommodate a substantially increased population over the next 35 to 40 years.

The South Metropolitan Peel Sub-regional Planning Framework is one of three frameworks prepared for the outer sub-regions of Perth and Peel, which along with the Central Sub-regional Planning Framework, establishes a long-term and integrated framework for land use and infrastructure provision.

The framework builds upon the principles of Directions 2031 and will provide guidance for:

- the preparation of amendments to the Perth Metropolitan Region Scheme, local planning schemes, local planning strategies/scheme, and district, local and activity centre structure planning; and
- the staging and sequencing of urban development to inform public investment in regional community, social and service infrastructure.


Importantly the Planning Framework, amongst other things, endeavours to develop a consolidated urban form that limits the identification of new greenfield areas to where they provide a logical extension to the urban form, and that places a greater emphasis on urban infill and increased residential density.

The following map excerpt highlights the area of Treeby which the TDSP will apply. Noting the logical extensions of the existing urban form, in what is now close proximity to transit, jobs and major activity



centres. The TDSP will provide a boundary that is comprised of land within Solomon Road, Armadale Road, Warton Road and Jandakot Road.

In the likelihood that the final boundary of urban expansion within Treeby is altered within the finalised Perth and Peel @ 3.5M the expectation is that the TDSP will adapt to the prevailing State planning framework.



### Design Principles

The TDSP responds to the WAPC's Structure Plan Framework and the key district level coordination issues the proposed development of the precinct presents. These include:

- Broad land-use arrangement, buffers and any relevant targets (e.g. density targets);
- Coordination of major infrastructure including:
  - Schools;
  - District water management;
  - District movement networks;
  - Regional & District level Open Space / Conservation areas;
  - District recreation facilities;
- Broad funding arrangements for improvements, potentially including the principles of a Development Contribution Plan (DCP).

### Conclusion

It is recommended Council adopt the TDSP for the purposes of advertising. The plan will provide a robust guideline to assist in the preparation of future local structure plans. It is recommended the TDSP is advertised for 42 days.

Following advertising, any submissions will be presented for Council's consideration and further consideration can be given to whether it is appropriate for Council to adopt the document (by resolution only). Along with submissions and additional information, Council will also need to be mindful of whether the Perth and Peel@3.5million strategic suite of documents has been adopted by the WA Planning Commission.

### **Strategic Plan/Policy Implications**

#### **City Growth**

- Ensure planning facilitates a desirable living environment and meets growth targets

#### **Moving Around**

- Reduce traffic congestion, particularly around Cockburn Central and other activity centres
- Identify gaps and take action toward extending the coverage of the cycle way, footpath and trails network

#### **Community, Lifestyle & Security**

- Provide for community facilities and infrastructure in a planned and sustainable manner.

### **Budget/Financial Implications**

N/A

### **Legal Implications**

It is proposed this plan be adopted by resolution of Council as a guiding document, but not under the Deemed Provisions of the Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015), which refers to a 'structure plan' as:

*'Structure plan means a plan for the coordination of future subdivision and zoning of an area of land'.*

The WA Planning Commission's Structure Plan Framework mentions structure plans in the generic sense as well as district and local structure plans. While it mentions that generally a district structure plan address the 'fatal flaws' of a development and provides for major structural elements, it also mentions it can provide the basis for zoning.

With the above in mind, it would be prudent to maintain Council's practice with previous district structure plans, to only adopt them by resolution of Council and not under the relevant structure planning

provisions. This acknowledges a degree of flexibility and assists with affected landowners being unlikely to consider themselves injuriously affected by the plan.

### **Community Consultation**

Once adopted as a draft, it is recommended the draft TDSP be advertised for a period of 42 days.

### **Risk Management Implications**

There is no obligation on the City to undertake district structure planning for this area. However it is considered far preferable to the alternative situation of having to coordinate separate localised structure plans with no overarching guidance.

This is particularly critical in this area for key structural features, such as school and oval locations as well as major movement connections for both vehicles and pedestrians. To have district guidance on these matters minimises the risk these key features (which often consume large parcels of land) end up located in sub-optimal locations.

As also discussed in the Legal Implications section of this report, this document should only be adopted by resolution of Council, not under the Deemed Provisions of the Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015. This reduces the risk implication for Council in terms of injurious affection claims which might otherwise arise. This is particularly important in this case given the very large area of Bush Forever status the site contains. As Council noted in its submission on the Green Growth Plan some time ago, the mechanisms for landowner compensation had not been resolved so Council must not inadvertently assume responsibility for this or 'lock in' landowners to the boundaries of that Bush Forever when it is known those landowners are proposing to review the boundary through the formal (State Government) process.

### **Attachment(s)**

Draft Treeby District Structure Plan

### **Advice to Proponent(s)/Submissioners**

The working group who provided preliminary input into the proposal have been advised that this matter is to be considered at the 9 March 2017 Ordinary Council Meeting.

## **Implications of Section 3.18(3) Local Government Act, 1995**

Nil.

### **15.4 (OCM 09/03/2017) - ACQUISITION OF LAND FOR ROAD WIDENING PURPOSES - PORTION OF JANDAKOT ROAD AND SOLOMON ROAD, JANDAKOT (041/001) (K SIM) (ATTACH)**

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

That Council purchase land required for road widening from approximately 20 properties to facilitate the upgrade of Jandakot Road between Solomon Road and Fraser Road and Solomon Road between Cutler Road and Jandakot Road to a 4-lane dual carriageway road subject to purchase prices being supported by a valuation report, prepared by a Licensed Valuer that refers to the relevant provisions of the Land Administration Act 1997, for the taking of land for a public purpose.

#### **COUNCIL DECISION**

### **Background**

At the Ordinary Council Meeting on 9 February 2017 an item was presented to Council to consider acquisition of land required for the planned upgrades of Solomon Road and Jandakot Road, Jandakot. At that meeting deputations were made by, or on behalf of, some affected landowners raising concerns in respect of the road upgrades.

The Council subsequently resolved the following:


*That Council:*

- (1) defer the item to a future Council Meeting to allow a comprehensive workshop (at a time convenient for most landowners) between the City's Officers, Elected Members and all affected land owners for all stages of the Jandakot Rd widening project (Stages 1 and 2);*

- (2) *advise Stockland WA Development Pty Ltd that the City is prepared to favourably consider a request for an extension of time for the completion date of the proposed works beyond 31 December 2017, irrespective of when the 900th residential lot is created; and*
- (3) *organise a noise impact study and acoustic report to be provided for discussion with the residents at the workshop.*

At this moment however, a number of landowners have indicated no concern with the project, and the arrangement of these landowners is such that parts of the planned upgrades could logically begin while separating the parts of the upgrades where landowners still hold concerns. Refer to Attachment 1 for details.

It is thus recommended that Council acquires the land required for the upgrading of Solomon Road and Jandakot Road where this upgrading does not involve any changes at this time to the existing Jandakot Road and Solomon Road intersection, or that section of Jandakot Road west to Berrigan Drive. This will enable the upgrade of Solomon Road and the upgrade of Jandakot Road (east of Solomon Road to Fraser Road) to occur, while giving extra time to address the concerns of residents at the intersection and west of the intersection to Berrigan Drive. Thus the works will be as follows:



Please note: Stage one is shown in green (excluding the Solomon/Jandakot Rd intersection) and Stage two in red (Jandakot Rd between Solomon and Berrigan).

## Submission

An engineering design has been completed for Solomon Road and the first stage of the Jandakot Road between Solomon Road and Fraser

Road. This engineering design has identified a number of land requirements from adjoining properties. Plans of these excisions have been passed onto a Licensed Valuer who has provided compensation reports to the City for each of the affected lots. An executive summary of the Valuation Report has been sent to each of the owners together with requests for comment and indication on whether an offer by the City based on the valuation report would be acceptable. Attachment 1 shows that all landowners have agreed except for a cluster of landowners surrounding the Solomon Road and Jandakot Road intersection. It is recommended that the planned acquisition, and thus planned works, avoid this intersection initially in order to provide time for further discussion with the affected landowners in an effort to reach agreement.

For the section of Jandakot Road west of this intersection, a number of landowners have indicated concerns however as this design is yet to occur, there is no consideration for land acquisition at this stage.

## **Report**

Jandakot Road is a 4.86 kilometre long regional distributor road that connects Berrigan Drive in the west to Warton Road in the east. The road is currently a single carriageway built to rural standard in a 20 metre wide road reserve.

The volume of traffic using Jandakot Road has increased substantially in recent years (up 85% west of Skotsch Road between 2010 and 2015), primarily due to the creation of new residential suburbs to the east of the City of Cockburn such as Harrisdale and Piara Waters. Further residential development south of Jandakot Road will add to the anticipated increase in traffic volumes. There is increasing safety and congestion issues being experienced with the road as the volume of traffic grows. The most recent traffic data available for Jandakot Road is an average weekday traffic volume of 17,335 vehicles, recorded east of Berrigan Drive in December 2016 by Main Roads WA, which exceeds the 15,000 vehicle per day traffic volume used as a flag for upgrading a road to a dual-carriageway. The City's District Traffic Study forecasts for Jandakot Road in 2031 to have a weekday traffic volume of approximately 26,000 vehicles near Berrigan Drive, and 18,000 vehicles near Warton Road.

To ensure that Jandakot Road will be able to perform its distributor road function safely and efficiently and accommodate the increasing volume of traffic, it is necessary that the road be widened to 4-lane dual carriageway. Understanding the requirement for the upgrade of these regional roads, the City and the developers of the residential development south of Jandakot Road have entered into a voluntary agreement whereby the developer will make financial contributions to

the regional roads where they adjoin the development. The City is developing plans for the widening of the remainder of Jandakot Road. It is anticipated that more road widening land will need to be purchased to complete the project between Warton Road and Berrigan Drive.

The first stage of the project is the section of Solomon road north of Cutler Road, and the portion of Jandakot Road between Solomon and Fraser Road including the merging of the new road with the existing road. 16 properties are affected by the first stage of the project.

As heard by Council at the February 2017 Council meeting, a number of concerned residents exist around the intersection of Solomon Road and Jandakot Road, and further west to Berrigan Drive. Recognising the safety imperative for works to begin as soon as possible, it is recommended that the elements of the Stage 1 upgrade, which have concerned residents surrounding, be removed from the Stage 1 works. This will enable Stage 1 work to occur initially in the green sections on the map following, with the remaining sections given time to address concerns of residents and hopefully achieve a mutually beneficial outcome. Thus the map following shows this scenario:



Please note: Stage one is shown in green (excluding the Solomon/Jandakot Rd intersection) and Stage two in red (Jandakot Rd between Solomon and Berrigan).

If Council resolves to adopt the recommendation, contracts for acquisition will be prepared by the City's lawyers as agreement is reached with individual owners. Attachment 1 shows agreements in place for the green areas of the map above.

Drawing information from the valuation reports undertaken by the Licensed Valuer, it is estimated that the total sum required for the road land acquisition is in the order of \$1.2 million.

## **Strategic Plan/Policy Implications**

### **Moving Around**

- Reduce traffic congestion, particularly around Cockburn Central and other activity centres.

## **Budget/Financial Implications**

There are no financial implications to the City. The cost of land acquisition is being funded by Stockland.

## **Legal Implications**

The Land Administration Act refers.

## **Community Consultation**

N/A

## **Risk Management Implications**

The Risk to the City if the recommendation is not followed or is deferred is that the 4-lane dual carriageway upgrade will not proceed in a timely manner. This will potentially increase safety issues along this road.

## **Attachment(s)**

Site plan of the subject area.

## **Advice to Proponent(s)/Submissioners**

The Proponent(s) and those who lodged a submission on the proposal have been advised that this matter is to be considered at the 9 February 2017 Ordinary Council Meeting.

## **Implications of Section 3.18(3) Local Government Act, 1995**

Nil.



**15.5 (OCM 09/03/2017) - CONSIDERATION OF ROCKINGHAM ROAD UPGRADE CONCEPT PLAN; PHOENIX ACTIVITY CENTRE PLAN AND LOCAL PLANNING POLICY (PHOENIX ACTIVITY CENTRE DESIGN GUIDELINES (FINAL ADOPTION) (110/088 & 110/043) (D DI RENZO / A TROSIC) (ATTACH)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

That Council

- (1) defer adoption of the Rockingham Road concept plan until such time as development is proposed by the Phoenix Shopping Centre, and note the following key points for any future proposed concept plans:
  1. In recognition of the 2016 community and landowner consultation outcomes in the northern section, any future draft concept plans for Rockingham Road include a roundabout at this location, for the purposes of undertaking further detailed investigation into its feasibility and cost.
  2. Refinements to the modified entry to Lot 16 Rockingham Road at any proposed new Lancaster Road roundabout be done in consultation with the landowner to ensure it meets their needs at that time.
  3. Review any associated modification to improve access from Phoenix Road to the car park entry behind Hungry Jacks and BP such that it is safer and more legible for cars to utilise this access point.
- (2) pursuant to Schedule 2, Part 5, clause 36 of the deemed provisions of the Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015, recommend to the Western Australian Planning Commission the proposed activity centre plan for the Phoenix Activity Centre be approved, subject to the following modifications:
  1. Modification to all references to the provision of the 'amenity space' on Rockingham Road adjacent to the new Kent Street roundabout to include provision in another location on Rockingham Road, or directly accessible to Rockingham Road, when the redevelopment of the Shopping Centre occurs.
  2. Modifications to reflect the deferral of the upgrade to Rockingham Road, stipulating that the upgrade is to occur when there is a 'Major Development' proposal (whether in the form of additional new development or redevelopment

of the existing centre) for the Phoenix Shopping Centre.

3. Deletion of Point (2) of the Staging Plan for the Phoenix Shopping Centre under Minor Development.
4. Inclusion of the following in the Staging Plan under 'Major Development' Application: "If an application is made for Major Development as defined by State Planning Policy 4.2, a functional 'public space' is to be included as part of the proposal, to be located in an area with high levels of public visibility and accessibility (i.e. adjacent to Rockingham Road). This space should be activated with retail tenancies ('shop' and/or food and beverage), provide a high level of amenity, and contribute to a more active and attractive interface with Rockingham Road".
5. Modification to Point (2) under minor expansion of floor space in the Staging Plan to state that "Utilisation of artworks required pursuant to the City's Percent for Art Local Planning Policy to enhance the appearance of the servicing area to Rockingham Road, or where the servicing area is removed or relocated, in another location on Rockingham Road".
6. Modification under "Minor expansion of floor space" in the Staging Plan to include an additional requirement as follows: "Where any significant modifications are proposed along Rockingham Road, including relocation or reconfiguration of existing uses, there are to be demonstrated improvements to the pedestrian environment; improvements to the appearance of the servicing area and Rockingham Road interface; and additional landscaping".
7. Modify the 'Development Concept Plan – Core Precinct' (Point 2) to delete the location of the amenity space on the map (text to be retained).
8. Modify the 'Development Concept Plan – Core Precinct' to reword point 5 to state "Any upgrade to Rockingham Road to investigate inclusion of new roundabout at Kent Street and Lancaster Street to slow traffic and provide turnaround points to allow rationalisation of crossovers".
9. Modify the 'Development Concept Plan – Northern Precinct' to reword references to the Rockingham Road upgrade requirements to state "Any upgrade to Rockingham Road to investigate..."

10. Updates throughout the document to all references to the upgrade to Rockingham Road project to reflect its deferral until there is a major development proposal for the Phoenix Shopping Centre.
  11. Updates to the Action Plan to reflect the above modifications.
  12. Typographical corrections where required.
- (3) advise the landowners within the activity centre plan area and those who made a submission of Council's recommendation;
  - (4) adopt the Schedule of Submissions prepared in respect to the proposed activity centre plan;
  - (5) adopt the proposed Local Planning Policy (Phoenix Activity Centre Design Guidelines) for final approval in accordance with Clause 5(1) of the Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015 subject to the following modifications:
    1. Modify clause (3) 3b to state "Demonstrate improvements to the servicing area on March Street which reduce negative impacts on residential amenity".
    2. Modify clause (3)3(c) (Phoenix Core) and (4)2(h) (Mixed Use area) to state: Ground floor non-residential frontages fronting Rockingham Road or primary pedestrian linkages are to be designed as shop fronts with no less than 70% glazing. Buildings fronting other public areas shall be glazed for a minimum of 50%. Glazing percentages are to apply from between 0.9m and 2.1m above footpath/street level.
    3. Delete clause (3)5 to remove the requirement to demonstrate capacity for future residential development.
    4. Insert a new clause under Clause (4)2. As follows: "Buildings adjacent to Rockingham Road are to be a minimum of two storeys in height, with single storey commercial buildings to be assessed on their merits against the objectives of the policy".
    5. Insert a new clause under Clause (4)2 stating "Garages facing Rockingham Road will not be supported".

6. Delete clause (4)1(l.) which refers to the establishment of an accessway easement.
  7. Modify Clause (4)2(i) and (4)3(n) to refer to commercial buildings being required to address the street in a traditional manner (currently just requires all buildings); and for design documentation of 'back-of-house' services.
  8. Reword clause (4)3(a) to state that setbacks are to comply with those for R60 residential coding, and to delete the requirement for a 12m wide access and parking easement in the front setback.
  9. Delete Appendix 1 and all references to the Appendix in the Policy.
- (6) advise submitters of Council's decision to adopt the Local Planning Policy.

## COUNCIL DECISION

### Background

At the 14 August 2014 Ordinary Council Meeting, Council endorsed the commencement of a multidisciplinary internal workgroup represented by Strategic Planning, Parks Services and Engineering Services. The purpose of this was to advance concept planning for Rockingham Road.

The work group identified key objectives and preliminary concept plan options for the revitalisation of Rockingham Road. This first step was necessary to understand the future desired form and function of the road before preparing guidelines for adjoining built form.

Following this, at the 9 June 2016 Ordinary Meeting of Council, a draft Phoenix Activity Centre Plan, Local Planning Policy Design Guidelines and draft concept plan for major upgrades to Rockingham Road were adopted for the purposes of community consultation. This was a culmination of extensive planning and engineering work in order to look

to transform the Phoenix Town Centre, with a major component of this transformation being the catalytic impact that the redevelopment of Rockingham Road would create.

The Rockingham Road concept produced by the workgroup was subsequently presented to Porter Consulting Engineers to review and develop into a feasible design that was capable of being readily implemented. This design was developed into a draft suitable for community consultation.

Following consultation during the second half of 2016, at the December 2016 Ordinary Meeting of Council, an item was presented to Council to consider adopting the design concept for Rockingham Road. A decision was deferred by Council to enable further discussion with the Phoenix Shopping Centre, and to enable the Phoenix Shopping Centre to brief Council on their proposed future Master Plan for the site. This took place in February 2017.

The purpose of this report is to now consider not only the adoption of the Rockingham Road upgrade concept, but also the associated Phoenix Activity Centre Plan and Local Planning Policy Design Guidelines.

## **Submission**

N/A

## **Report**

This report deals with Council's consideration for final adoption of the:

1. Rockingham Road upgrade concept, a \$4m road upgrade currently budgeted for Council delivery in the 16/17 financial year;
2. Phoenix Activity Centre Plan;
3. Local Planning Policy Design Guidelines for the Phoenix Town Centre.

These are overviewed following.

### **Rockingham Road Upgrade - Overview**

The Rockingham Road upgrade was identified as a key action as part of the Phoenix Central Revitalisation Strategy. This identified an upgrade to Rockingham Road in order to:

- Improve the amenity of the public realm;
- Improve connectivity for various transport modes including pedestrians and cyclists;
- Enhance bus stop facilities;

- Promote mixed use development along the western side of Rockingham Road;
- Enhance the streetscape;
- Reduce the negative impact of excessive signage along Rockingham Road;
- Reduce the negative impact of excessive car parking and crossovers along Rockingham Road.

#### Phoenix Activity Centre Plan - Overview

State Planning Policy 4.2 Activity Centres For Perth and Peel ("SPP 4.2") was gazetted in 2010, and its main purpose is to specify broad planning requirements for the planning and development of new activity centres, and the redevelopment and renewal of existing centres in Perth and Peel.

Activity centres are community focal points. They include activities such as commercial, retail, higher-density housing, entertainment, tourism, civic/community, higher education and medical services. They should be designed to be well-served by public transport, and to be highly accessible.

SPP 4.2 sets out a policy requirement for activity centre plans to be prepared for all district level centres and above.

Activity centre plans set out the spatial plan and strategy to achieve a compact, pedestrian-friendly, mixed use activity centre that will offer a range of lifestyle choices, reduce car dependency, and limit environmental impact. They are important strategic planning documents which guide land use, urban form, transport and infrastructure planning for larger activity centres. Also the City's Local Commercial and Activity Centres Strategy ("LCACS"), which was adopted by Council in 2012, set out a high level framework to guide activity centre plans and particularly focussing on the Phoenix Town Centre as an area with potential to perform better as an activity centre.

The Phoenix Shopping Centre is also likely to require refurbishing in the near future, and may also increase its floor area. For these reasons, a draft activity centre plan has been prepared for Phoenix Shopping Centre.

#### Local Planning Policy Design Guidelines - Overview

As a final and important supplementary part of the planning framework, this local planning policy seeks to set design considerations that new development, or redevelopment, need to have regard to in respect of within the Phoenix Town Centre. The Design Guidelines specifically provide that logical connection between the planned upgrade for

Rockingham Road, and how private development can optimally respond to the improved public realm, be represented by this infrastructure investment.

It recognises that such infrastructure investment will likely be a catalyst for private investment in the town centre to occur, as has been a key foundation to Council's consideration to invest in this infrastructure.

The detailed components underpinning the Rockingham Road concept plan, Activity Centre Plan, and design guidelines, thus represent an integrated approach to the future planning and delivery of improvements in the Phoenix Town Centre. These are highlighted by the key objectives of each document set out following:

#### Key Objectives - Rockingham Road Upgrade Concept Plan

1. To promote pedestrian use across and along Rockingham Road, through the provision of a safe and attractive environment;
2. To improve the amenity around bus stops and encourage the use of buses by giving priority to the bus service;
3. To create a visual identity which reassures and welcomes people to the town centre by conveying its sense of place;
4. To create safe and legible vehicle access arrangements which serves the town centre as a destination;
5. In practical terms:
  - Minimise land acquisition requirements;
  - Create maximum opportunities for landscaping to beautify the road;
  - Reduce the number of crossovers to Rockingham Road while facilitating access to businesses through a 'roundabout system';
  - Reduce traffic speeds through new 50km speed limits (subject to Main Roads), and a narrowing of the road that will slow traffic.

These informed a design concept that comprised the following key features:

- Reduction of Rockingham Road to two lanes between Coleville Crescent and Phoenix Road to slow traffic and improve safety and amenity for pedestrians and cyclists. This will allow the introduction of bike lanes and landscaping on Rockingham Road, which would not be possible within the current 4-lane configuration because of the narrow road reservation;
- Introduction of an almost continuous median strip to reduce the number of unsafe vehicle right hand turning movements, and to provide the opportunity for street trees, given this is very limited either side of the road because of the narrow road reserve; services; and powerlines;

- Replacement of the traffic signals at Lancaster Street with a new roundabout; and a new proposed roundabout at Kent Street which also includes a new relocated southern entry to the Phoenix Shopping Centre from the roundabout. These two roundabouts provide a U-turn system which allows for the introduction of the median whilst still providing good access to both sides of the road;
- Creation of an amenity space in the area to the north east of the proposed Kent Street roundabout in the area that is currently the southern entry to the Phoenix Shopping Centre. This area will provide a more attractive pedestrian entry to the shopping centre; provide a space for visitors and staff to use; critically it will provide the opportunity for an improved interface with Rockingham Road; and will help create a visual identity to the centre that will improve legibility.
- Reduction in the number of crossovers to Rockingham Road to improve safety for vehicles, and improve the pedestrian environment, given that crossovers interrupt pedestrian movement and comfort, and reduce safety for cyclists.

#### Key Objectives - Proposed Draft Phoenix Activity Centre Plan

To create a place that is:

1. Adaptable - A place that can respond to the diverse and changing needs of the community.
2. Easy to move around - A place that is easy for all users to move around, particularly pedestrians and cyclists, and that connects well to existing movement networks and key areas of interest in the surrounding area.
3. Safe and welcoming - A place where people feel safe and secure, and that encourages positive social interaction.
4. Distinctive - A place that reflects local identity and has a distinctive character.
5. Attractive - An attractive, enjoyable place where people will want to live, work, and visit.
6. Sustainable - A place that is environmentally sustainable.
7. Coordinate the key actions of:
  - a) Adoption of Design Guidelines Local Planning Policy for the Activity Centre – these design guidelines will assist in achieving coordinate development in the new Mixed Use zone on the western side of Rockingham Road.
  - b) Adoption of a vehicle access plan for the Mixed Use zone on the western side of Rockingham Road to ensure safe and legible access.
  - c) Upgrade of Rockingham Road between Coleville Crescent and Phoenix Road to slow traffic, provide opportunities for more landscaping, and to improve the pedestrian and cyclist environment.



- d) Investigation of reconfiguration of car parking in the northern end (BP site) to ensure safe traffic movement.
- e) Formulation of an Artworks and Wayfinding Strategy that identifies themes to strengthen a unique identity for the Phoenix Activity Centre and improve legibility within the centre, and within the surrounding area.
- f) Improvements to Bavich Park and Gerald Reserve to improve their appearance, and make them more attractive pedestrian connections to the Activity Centre.
- g) Monitor the performance of the activity centre by undertaking a review every two years, addressing the elements discussed within this Activity Centre Plan, relating to land use mix diversity targets, residential density targets, built form and streetscape intensity, attracting strategic employment and floor space demand requirements.

#### Key Objectives – Local Planning Policy Design Guidelines

1. To create a high quality and safe pedestrian environment along Rockingham Road in the Phoenix Activity Centre.
2. To create a new sense of place with high-quality and dynamic building and landscape design and landmark development sites.
3. To facilitate safe and convenient pedestrian and cyclist movement within the Activity Centre, resolving vehicle and pedestrian/cyclist conflict points.
4. To create attractive, active frontages that provide visual interest and contribute to pedestrian and cyclist safety and comfort.
5. To ensure that signage is not visually obtrusive, does not result in excessive visual clutter; and does not hinder passive surveillance.
6. To ensure that signage is compatible with the scale, design and visual character of the building and activity centre.
7. To provide adequate opportunities for commercial advertising to support and encourage business activity.
8. To create safe, functional and attractive car parking areas that allow for landscaping, and facilitate safe and convenient pedestrian and cyclist movement.
9. To encourage landmark development features which are integrated with buildings, and which improve legibility within the activity centre.
10. To utilise artworks to create community identity; improve inactive frontages; improve legibility; and provide functional infrastructure for pedestrians and cyclists.
11. To encourage mixed use development and a diversity of land uses.

## Overview of Community Consultation

The draft Activity Centre Plan, Local Planning Policy Design Guidelines and Concept Plan for Rockingham Road have undergone an extensive community consultation process.

In the first instance, the City undertook preliminary consultation with key affected stakeholders, writing to all adjacent landowners in May 2016 advising them of the proposed project, and inviting them to arrange a meeting with staff to explain the plans and how they may be affected. This was intended to ensure that landowners had the opportunity to meet one-on-one with staff who could explain the impact that the proposed changes would have on them.

The City met with approximately fifteen landowners/business owners and residents, and had telephone discussions with a number of other landowners at this time.

Over the past twelve months the Phoenix Working Group, comprised of community members, and on occasion affected landowners, also met discuss the plan (four meetings in total).

Subsequently the plan was adopted by Council for advertising at the 9 June 2016 OCM, and was formally advertised for 60 days, ending on 22 October 2016. This included letters to landowners in the area, letters to government agencies, and a display at the Phoenix Shopping Centre. This advertising was extended from the normal 28 days to allow the Phoenix Shopping Centre sufficient time to consider the proposal. The Shopping Centre also requested a further 14 day extension, to which it was granted.

A total of 37 formal submissions were received, with ten submissions supporting the proposed Rockingham Road upgrade and Phoenix Activity Centre Plan concept.

There were 17 objections received, with submitters primarily concerned with the reduction to one lane, perceiving it to be a downgrade that will create traffic congestion.

All submissions are included and addressed in Attachment 7.

There were four specific submissions received from businesses/landowners on Rockingham Road presenting alternative plans which will be discussed in the following section.

### Consultation with Phoenix Shopping Centre and McDonalds

The Phoenix Shopping Centre is a major stakeholder in this project, and for this reason the City has undertaken early and extensive consultation with them on the project. The following consultation has been undertaken:

- 2008 to 2016 – Several meetings to keep the Shopping Centre informed of the progress of implementation on the Phoenix Central Revitalisation Strategy;
- 10 February 2016 – the City advised the Phoenix Shopping Centre owners, Rockworth that plans were being developed for the upgrade and beautification of Rockingham Road, and that one favoured option had been prepared by David Porter Engineering after consideration of a number of alternative options;
- 23 March 2016 - they were provided with draft copies of the plan to enable them to have sufficient time to consider the implications of the plan for their own site master planning process; and
- Five meetings with representatives from the Phoenix Shopping Centre and their consultants throughout the year. City officers have also met on two occasions with representatives from McDonalds.

Fratelle Group (on behalf of the Phoenix Shopping Centre) requested an extended advertising period of 60 days (extended from the normal 28 days) at the June 2016 OCM when adoption of the draft Rockingham Road Upgrade Concept Plan and Draft Phoenix Activity Centre Plan was considered by Council.

This was requested to allow sufficient time to undertake site master planning, which would then inform their submission on the advertised documents. Council supported an extension to the advertising period of 60 days, and this was granted by the WAPC.

On 14 June 2016 the Fratelle Group, on behalf of the Shopping Centre, requested that the commencement of the advertising period for the draft Rockingham Road Upgrade Concept Plan and Draft Phoenix Activity Centre Plan be delayed until the traffic modelling was completed by the City of Cockburn. This request was granted, and advertising did not commence until the traffic modelling was available.

On 20 October 2016, at the request for the Phoenix Shopping Centre, the City granted an extension of two weeks to the advertising period which was then further extended to 8 November 2016 at their request.

During the formal advertising period the Phoenix Shopping Centre and McDonalds (located on the Phoenix Shopping Centre land) submitted an alternative plan.

This plan is not supported by the City because it includes:

1. Complete removal of the proposed amenity space, replaced by parking bays, which is considered to be a key feature of the Rockingham Road upgrade;
2. Full access to McDonalds from Rockingham Road (proposed as left-in, left out in Council's draft plan adopted for advertising) and a new internal north south connection from the southern car park to the northern car park along the Coles servicing area, which in conjunction with the other changes would result in an unattractive and cluttered area of kerbing and asphalt, with very minimal areas for landscaping;

The submissions received from the Phoenix Shopping Centre and McDonalds are included as Attachments 2 and 3.

#### Shopping Centre Consultation Post December 2016 Council Deferral

At the December 2016 Ordinary Meeting of Council the proposal was deferred to allow further discussions with the Phoenix Shopping Centre and to facilitate a Councillor Briefing by the Phoenix Shopping Centre.

The Phoenix Shopping Centre have advised that they are undertaking an asset master planning process for the centre with a view to examining more substantial refurbishment and redevelopment works. The master planning process is only just beginning, and will take time given the imperatives of tenant approvals, statutory approvals and funding considerations. It would be likely that redevelopment could occur however within the next five years.

The Shopping Centre have therefore expressed concern regarding implementing works in relation to the proposed upgrade of Rockingham Road that may need to be modified if the Shopping Centre chooses to redevelop.

In an attempt to resolve this matter City Officers met with the Shopping Centre with a view to reaching agreement on a concept plan for Rockingham Road and the interface with the Shopping Centre. Of particular focus the City sought to find an interim solution that would minimise any sacrificial works on the shopping centre land, taking into consideration the key objectives of the future master plan.

An interim solution was proposed by the City which represented a combination of the City's draft plan and that proposed by the Shopping Centre in their submission, as follows:

- Creation of an amenity space in the same location, however allowing a small amount of parking adjacent to the 'amenity space' to minimise parking losses;

- Inclusion of a new internal north south access way to connect the northern and southern car parks (as sought by the Shopping Centre in their submission)
- Retention of full access to McDonalds where aesthetic improvements to the Coles servicing area were demonstrated.

The City acknowledges that the Shopping Centre does not want to invest in works if there is substantial redevelopment of the Centre in the future; therefore this concept plan was considered to require minimal sacrificial works. This concept plan is considered to achieve the City's key objectives in the interim through:

- Provision of an amenity space for the amenity of visitors, staff and the community that provides a more attractive frontage to Rockingham Road.
- Genuine beautification of this area to Rockingham Road.
- Improvements to pedestrian amenity and connection.

However, the alternative plan has not been supported by the Phoenix Shopping Centre, and the City has been unable to reach agreement on a plan.

The City will be unable to deliver the proposed Kent Street roundabout without agreement with the Phoenix Shopping Centre, because it requires relocation and reconfiguration of the southern entry, and modifications internally to facilitate this change.

The Kent Street roundabout is a critical component of the Rockingham Road upgrade, given that in conjunction with the Lancaster Street roundabout it allows for the U-turn system that will facilitate a continuous median, and provide safe and convenient access to both side of the road.

It is therefore considered that the upgrade to Rockingham Road as proposed cannot be implemented by the City at this stage. It is therefore recommended that the project be deferred until such time as the Phoenix Shopping Centre undertakes redevelopment, which may be within the next five years. Critically however, Council has no control over whether this does or does not occur however, and thus it cannot be guaranteed to the community if or when the Rockingham Road upgrade will occur, if such is to be associated with the Shopping Centre upgrade.

#### Northern End (Lancaster Street to Phoenix Road)

Consideration has been given to the option of implementing the northern section upgrade as Stage 1, with the section between Lancaster Street and Coleville Crescent being implemented as Stage 2 in the future when the Shopping Centre redevelops.

This is considered to have very little benefit, and the scale of works in themselves would not represent an efficient use of resources. It is also noted that the construction of the Lancaster Street roundabout with two lanes to the north and four to the south would be problematic. It is therefore considered logical to defer the whole road upgrade until such time as the Shopping Centre redevelops.

The outcomes of community consultation are still discussed below, as they will be incorporated into the draft plan that will be considered in the future. Also adoption of the Activity Centre Plan and Design Guidelines is proposed in this report.

During the pre-consultation meetings, and through the formal community consultation process, concerns were expressed from landowners and business owners/operators on both sides of the road that full access should be provided otherwise there would be a loss of business from passing trade.

The City encouraged landowners and business owners to make formal submissions, and to clearly set out their concerns and suggested modifications for consideration.

On the western side of the road there is a Pharmacy, medical suites, and office uses, which currently take access from one point of Rockingham Road (full access), which allows customers to access this area travelling in either direction. The concern from landowners and businesses is that vehicles travelling south on the road will not be prepared to use the proposed Lancaster Street roundabout to U-turn and access their businesses; and that the more difficult exiting scenario will be too inconvenient for customers.

Two key submissions were received in this regard from business owners on each side of the road – one suggesting the addition of a roundabout between Lancaster Street Phoenix Road; and another suggesting introduction of additional turning lanes for each side of the road (see Attachment 7 Schedule of Submissions for plan included in the submission).

South of Lancaster Street the two proposed roundabouts provide good access to both sides of the road, thereby minimising any potential negative impact from the continuous median, and ensuring good access is provided to businesses. It is acknowledged that north of Lancaster the alternative access as proposed by the draft plan is more restrictive. Hence the roundabout proposed at the Lancaster/Rockingham intersection will be designed to allow for a future access on the western side of the roundabout (currently a Chiropractic centre) which in future could provide a service road

access right along the businesses on the western side of Rockingham Road to eliminate vehicle access and turning currently from Rockingham Road frontage. This proposal cannot happen until the redevelopment of the Chiropractic centre property but would yield major congestion and safety benefits to vehicle traffic.

One submission suggested that the intersection of Phoenix Road and Rockingham Road be modified to a two lane roundabout to facilitate easy movement to and from Lancaster Street. There is insufficient space to accommodate a roundabout at the Phoenix Road and Rockingham Road intersection. This would require very substantial land acquisitions that are not considered to be in best interests of the community, and would be cost prohibitive due to major underground and overhead utility service relocations.

The suggestion from landowners on the eastern side of the road that turning lanes be introduced (to allow full access) means that landscaping opportunities are significantly reduced, and it is questionable as to whether this outcome would achieve the key objective of beautifying the road. Providing right turn facilities would also create the risk of queuing right turn traffic obstructing the single remaining through traffic lane.

The City has therefore investigated the possibility of an additional roundabout north of Lancaster Street, aligning with the southern entrance to Lancaster House.

The City engaged Urbsol to investigate the inclusion of an additional roundabout in this location (see Attachment 4).

This report identifies that traffic will be free flowing until 2031, and that beyond this it will need to be monitored to determine whether there needs to be adjustment to the Phoenix Road/Rockingham Road traffic lights.

In recognition of the consultation outcomes in the northern section, it is recommended that Council note that any future draft concept plan for Rockingham Road include a roundabout in this location, for the purposes of undertaking further detailed investigation into its feasibility and cost.

#### Rockingham Road Community Consultation Outcomes - General Comments

A number of submissions expressed concern regarding the reduction of the road to one lane in each direction; whereby there was a perception this would cause greater congestion and driver frustration. The traffic modelling that has been undertaken demonstrates that the

proposed road upgrade will not create traffic congestion. The slower traffic speeds, and the introduction of roundabouts to break traffic, will make it easier for vehicles to exit properties on Rockingham Road and improve pedestrian safety.

Submissions were also received from residents on Kent Street raising concerns about vehicle use of this street. It is a known street which attracts speeding, due particularly to its straight run and the steepness of it especially between Sussex Street and Rockingham Road. It is recommended that traffic calming treatments be considered for the section of Kent Street between Rockingham Road and Sussex Street in the 2017/18 budget under the annual traffic management allocation.

For example the City has installed a speed hump on Gerald Street, at the northern end near Phoenix Road in order to slow vehicles down in the vicinity of the connecting side street intersection. It is recommended the City explore suitable design options for Kent Street in 2017/18.

#### Activity Centre Plan - Outcomes of Community Consultation

The submissions received during the consultation period that related to the Activity Centre Plan expressed support for the key concepts contained within the plan.

The Phoenix Shopping Centre have provided detailed comments on the Activity Centre Plan and Draft Design Guidelines, and these comments are each addressed in the Schedule of Submissions.

To summarise, objection was raised to the following key elements of the Activity Centre Plan:

- Cost responsibilities for works on the shopping centre land;
- Requirements in the Activity Centre Plan relating to minor expansion or development;
- Requirement to investigate possible residential development as part of any major redevelopment.

Some of the requirements that the Shopping Centre have objected to are considered critical to ensure the objectives of SPP 4.2 and the Activity Centre Plan are met. This particularly relates to improvements to pedestrian movement; and urban design and interface improvements, given how significant these issues are for the Shopping Centre currently.

The Shopping Centre have objected to the requirement to provide a covered walkway on the upper car parking deck where they have proposed minor or major floor space expansion, and they have requested this be funded by the City. This is not supported, and



provision of a covered walkway to improve pedestrian amenity, and support pedestrian movement which is currently poorly provided for, in the event of expansion of the shopping centre is considered justifiable given the objectives of SPP 4.2. The City is seeking to encourage people to walk to the centre through improvements to the pedestrian environment, and this particularly important given the disjointed nature of the Aldi site and the Shopping Centre itself.

Without these provisions being included it will be difficult to ensure any expansion of the Shopping Centre will result in improvements to the interface with Rockingham Road and the pedestrian environment. It is therefore considered justifiable to include these requirements in the Activity Centre Plan.

Minor applications can have an impact on an activity centre, and this is recognised in the LCACS where there are reporting requirements even for minor applications.

The following modifications to the Activity Centre Plan, as requested by the Shopping Centre, are supported:

- Deletion of reference to the requirement for investigation into residential development – given current constraints of Strata Titling Act.

Other comments made by the Shopping Centre are discussed below.

#### Impact on Activity Centre Plan of Deferral of Rockingham Road Upgrade – Recommended Modifications

The upgrade to Rockingham Road is a key component of the Activity Centre Plan. If this project is to be deferred modifications will be required to the Activity Centre Plan to reflect this, and to embed its future delivery.

This will require the addition of actions for the City of Cockburn and the Phoenix Shopping Centre, stipulating the delivery of the road upgrade as part of any major redevelopment of the Shopping Centre.

It is recommended that the Activity Centre Plan ‘Development Concept Plans’; Action Plan and Staging Plan be modified as follows:

- Modification to Point (2) under minor expansion of floor space to state that “Utilisation of artworks required pursuant to the City’s Percent for Art Local Planning Policy to enhance the appearance of the servicing area to Rockingham Road” adding “or where the servicing area is removed or relocated, in another place on Rockingham Road”. This will ensure there is flexibility for artworks to be located on Rockingham Road and contribute to an

improved interface in the even the servicing area is altered or relocated;

- Modify the 'Development Concept Plan – Core Precinct' to reword point 5 to state "Any upgrade to Rockingham Road to investigate inclusion of new roundabout at Kent Street and Lancaster Street to slow traffic and provide turnaround points to allow rationalisation of crossovers". This will ensure that this concept is re-investigated as part of any future upgrades.

It is recommended that some additional flexibility be built into the Activity Centre Plan to ensure that it is robust enough to accommodate proposals that may meet the key objectives in a different way. This includes rewording references to the amenity space on Rockingham Road, to include the space in a different location on Rockingham Road where more substantial redevelopment is proposed.

The Shopping Centre have requested the following wording:

*"If an application is made for a Major Development Application as defined by the LCACS, in a location that has high levels of public visibility and accessibility (i.e. adjacent Rockingham Road), then the application should propose the creation of a functional 'public space', and this space should be activated with retail tenancies ('shop' and/or food and beverage) and provide a high level of amenity. Where an application for Major Development is received that does not propose a 'public space', then the applicant shall provide justification as to why such a space is not proposed as part of the application. Once a 'public space' has been provided, further requirements for public space as part of future applications will be considered on an as needs basis."*

It is recommended that the following modified version be included, which tightens up the requirement to ensure the space is delivered:

*"If an application is made for Major Development as defined by the State Planning Policy 4.2, a functional 'public space' is to be included as part of the proposal, to be located in an area with high levels of public visibility and accessibility (i.e. adjacent to Rockingham Road). This space should be activated with retail tenancies ('shop' and/or food and beverage), provide a high level of amenity, and contribute to a more active and attractive interface with Rockingham Road."*

Given that it is recommended that the upgrade to Rockingham Road be deferred until there is 'major development' of the Shopping Centre, it is considered appropriate that this requirement be for 'major development' not minor development to enable its delivery to be coordinated with the upgrade works.

It is important to note that it is incremental works and modifications to the Shopping Centre, including minor expansions, additional parking decks and access ramps that have resulted in the current built form and access outcomes to Rockingham Road. These have created a sub-optimal outcome for the overall experience of visiting and moving through the town centre, which needs to be addressed at some point.

The City is concerned that this will continue to occur and there will be various minor modifications to the Shopping Centre over time without any of the key improvements to pedestrian amenity and the interface with Rockingham that are sought by the Activity Centre Plan.

Such minor works would not trigger the upgrade to Rockingham Road, and may result in a situation where the road upgrade does not occur, and the current poor interface and pedestrian environment remain unchanged, or are even further exacerbated by other changes.

To ensure this does not occur, it is recommended that an additional provision be included under 'Minor Expansion' stating:

*"Where any significant modifications are proposed along Rockingham Road, including relocation or reconfiguration of existing uses, there are to be demonstrated improvements to the pedestrian environment; improvements to the appearance of the servicing area and Rockingham Road interface; and additional landscaping."*

#### Draft Local Planning Policy – Phoenix Activity Centre Plan

Draft Design Guidelines have been prepared to provide guidance for development within the Activity Centre (Attachment 5), and were advertised for public comment with the Rockingham Road upgrade concept plan and draft Activity Centre Plan.

These guidelines include requirements for each of the precincts, and will ensure that development within the Activity Centre achieves the objectives of the Activity Centre Plan.

There are some minor discrepancies in the draft policy and it is recommended that these be corrected.

The Shopping Centre provided some comments on the draft policy, which are addressed in the Schedule of Submissions, with some modifications recommended in response. This includes modification to the requirements for glazing to achieve an active frontage whilst accommodating services etc.

With the Rockingham Road upgrade proposed to be deferred, it is also recommended that there are some modifications to the requirements for the 'Mixed Use' zone.

The Draft Policy was seeking to achieve a 12m wide accessway in the front setback that would accommodate access and 90 degree parking bays that ultimately could connect to serve as a 'slip road'. This requirement and other elements of the design guidelines were intended to provide for and encourage Mixed Use development, with ground floor commercial uses such as cafes and offices adjacent to Rockingham Road. It is noted that this did reduce the developable area of the 'Mixed Use' zoned lots, and provided an additional constraint for developers.

With the timing of the future upgrade of Rockingham Road now uncertain, it is no longer recommended that a parking and access easement (12m) be required in the front setback, as this outcome was premised on changes to the road.

As an alternative it is recommended that the Local Planning Policy require setbacks as per the applicable R60 coding to allow more flexibility for developers of these sites to locate their parking and configure their development.

However, to ensure an interesting and active frontage is still achieved to Rockingham Road, with flexibility for ground floor commercial uses, it is recommended that the following provisions be included:

- Requirement for dwellings adjacent to Rockingham Road to be a minimum of two storeys in height, with single storey commercial buildings to be assessed on their merits against the objectives of the policy;
- Garages facing Rockingham Road will not be supported.

It is recommended that the requirement for ground floor commercial uses to be included, or where not viable in the short term, to be designed to be adaptable for future commercial, be retained in the policy to ensure future adaptability.

To reflect these recommended changes it is also recommended that the following modifications be made to the Local Planning Policy:

- Delete clause (4)1(l.) which refers to the establishment of an accessway easement.
- Modify Clause (4)2(i) and (4)3(n) to refer to commercial buildings being required to address the street in a traditional manner (currently just requires all buildings); and for design documentation of 'back-of-house' services.
- Reword clause (4)3(a) to state that setbacks are to comply with those for R60 residential coding, and to delete the requirement for a 12m wide access and parking easement in the front setback.

## Conclusion

Given that agreement could not be reached with the Phoenix Shopping Centre on a concept plan it is recommended that the upgrade to Rockingham Road be deferred until such time as the Phoenix Shopping Centre undertake redevelopment. It is recommended that the Activity Centre Plan be modified to reflect this, as discussed in this report, and outlined in the Recommendation.

In relation to the Rockingham Road upgrade it is recommended that Council note the outcomes of community consultation, and specifically the outcomes in the northern end for future consideration when the plan is revisited.

It is recommended that Council adopt the Local Planning Policy Design Guidelines for final approval; subject to modifications.

## **Strategic Plan/Policy Implications**

### **City Growth**

- Ensure planning facilitates a desirable living environment and meets growth targets
- Continue revitalisation of older urban areas to cater for population growth and take account of social changes such as changing household types
- Ensure growing high density living is balanced with the provision of open space and social spaces

### **Moving Around**

- Reduce traffic congestion, particularly around Cockburn Central and other activity centres
- Identify gaps and take action toward extending the coverage of the cycle way, footpath and trails network

### **Community, Lifestyle & Security**

- Provide safe places and activities for residents and visitors to relax and socialise

### **Economic, Social & Environmental Responsibility**

- Create opportunities for community, business and industry to establish and thrive through planning, policy and community development

- Improve the appearance of streetscapes, especially with trees suitable for shade

### **Budget/Financial Implications**

The preparation of the Activity Centre Plan and Local Planning Policy has been funded through the Strategic Planning budget.

The upgrade to Rockingham Road will need to be budgeted for again in the future.

### **Legal Implications**

N/A

### **Community Consultation**

The Activity Centre Plan and Local Planning Policy Design Guidelines were advertised for a period of 60 days to relevant landowners, government agencies and community groups. This advertising period was extended from the normal 28 day period at the request of the Phoenix Shopping Centre, with the extension granted by the WAPC.

There was a display at the Phoenix Shopping Centre and notice in the newspaper to ensure people who visit the centre had the opportunity to see the proposed plans and comment.

### **Attachment(s)**

1. Draft Rockingham Road Concept Plans as adopted by Council for Community Consultation
2. Phoenix Shopping Centre Submission
3. McDonalds Submission
4. Urbsol Traffic Report – Additional roundabout
5. Draft Local Planning Policy (Phoenix Activity Centre Design Guidelines)
6. Draft Phoenix Activity Centre Plan
7. Schedule of Submissions

### **Risk Implications**

The key risk faced by the City is not being able to deliver the project due to not being able to secure an acceptable, workable outcome with the Shopping Centre. In order to address this risk, two options are provided within the report which is considered to provide equally an acceptable way for the project to move forward.

### **Advice to Proponent(s)/Submissioners**

All parties who made a submission during the public consultation period have been advised that this matter is being considered at the 9 March 2017 Ordinary Meeting of Council, and they shall also be notified in writing of Council's decision.

### **Implications of Section 3.18(3) Local Government Act, 1995**

Nil.

## **16. FINANCE AND CORPORATE SERVICES DIVISION ISSUES**

### **16.1 (OCM 09/03/2017) - LIST OF CREDITORS PAID - JANUARY 2017 (076/001) (N MAURICIO) (ATTACH)**

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

That Council adopt the List of Creditors Paid for January 2017, as attached to the Agenda.

#### **COUNCIL DECISION**

### **Background**

It is a requirement of the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996, that a List of Creditors be compiled each month and provided to Council.

### **Submission**

N/A

### **Report**

The list of accounts for January 2017 is attached to the Agenda for consideration. The list contains details of payments made by the City in relation to goods and services received by the City.

## **Strategic Plan/Policy Implications**

### **Leading & Listening**

- Deliver sustainable governance through transparent and robust policy and processes.
- Listen to and engage with our residents, business community and ratepayers with greater use of social media.

## **Budget/Financial Implications**

N/A

## **Legal Implications**

N/A

## **Community Consultation**

N/A

## **Risk Management Implications**

The list of accounts for January 2017 is attached to the Agenda for consideration. The list contains details of payments made by the City in relation to goods and services received by the City.

## **Attachment(s)**

List of Creditors Paid – January 2017.

## **Advice to Proponent(s)/Submissioners**

N/A

## **Implications of Section 3.18(3) Local Government Act, 1995**

Nil.



**16.2 (OCM 09/03/2017) - STATEMENT OF FINANCIAL ACTIVITY AND ASSOCIATED REPORTS - JANUARY 2017 (071/001) (N MAURICIO) (ATTACH)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

That Council :

- (1) adopt the Statement of Financial Activity and associated reports for January 2017, as attached to the Agenda; and
- (2) amend the 2016/17 Municipal Budget in accordance with the detailed schedule in the report as follows:

Revenue Adjustments	Increase	9,060
Expenditure Adjustments	Increase	9,060
Depreciation Expenditure Adjustments	Increase	119,763
Accumulated Depreciation Adjustments	Increase	119,763
<b>Net change to Municipal Budget Closing Funds</b>		<b>0</b>

**TO BE CARRIED BY AN ABSOLUTE MAJORITY OF COUNCIL**

**COUNCIL DECISION**

**Background**

Regulations 1996 prescribes that a local government is to prepare each month a Statement of Financial Activity.

Regulation 34(2) requires the Statement of Financial Activity to be accompanied by documents containing:–

- (a) details of the composition of the closing net current assets (less restricted and committed assets);

- (b) explanation for each material variance identified between YTD budgets and actuals; and
- (c) any other supporting information considered relevant by the local government.

Regulation 34(4)(a) prescribes that the Statement of Financial Activity and accompanying documents be presented to Council within 2 months after the end of the month to which the statement relates.

The regulations require the information reported in the statement to be shown either by nature and type, statutory program or business unit. The City chooses to report the information according to its organisational business structure, as well as by nature and type.

Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations - Regulation 34 (5) states:

- (5) *Each financial year, a local government is to adopt a percentage or value, calculated in accordance with the AAS, to be used in statements of financial activity for reporting material variances.*

This regulation requires Council to annually set a materiality threshold for the purpose of disclosing budget variances within monthly financial reporting. At its August meeting, Council adopted to continue with a materiality threshold of \$200,000 for the 2016/17 financial year.

Detailed analysis of budget variances is an ongoing exercise, with any required budget amendments submitted to Council each month in this report or included in the City's mid-year budget review as considered appropriate.

## **Submission**

N/A

## **Report**

### *Opening Funds*

The opening funds of \$9.27M (representing closing funds brought forward from 2015/16) have been audited and budget has been amended to reflect this final position.

### *Closing Funds*

The City's closing funds for January of \$58.72M were \$5.28M higher than the budget forecast. This result comprises net favourable cash flow variances across the operating and capital programs as detailed in this report.

The 2016/17 revised budget reflects an EOFY surplus of \$0.37M, unchanged from last month.

### *Operating Revenue*

Consolidated operating revenue of \$119.79M was under the YTD annual budget target by \$0.44M.

The following table shows the operating revenue budget performance by nature and type:

<b>Nature or Type Classification</b>	<b>Actual Revenue \$M</b>	<b>Revised Budget YTD \$M</b>	<b>Variance to Budget \$M</b>	<b>FY Revised Budget \$M</b>
Rates	93.34	92.71	0.63	95.70
Specified Area Rates	0.31	0.33	(0.02)	0.33
Fees & Charges	14.58	15.71	(1.12)	24.43
Service Charges	0.44	0.45	(0.01)	0.45
Operating Grants & Subsidies	7.04	7.71	(0.67)	11.03
Contributions, Donations, Reimbursements	0.65	0.39	0.25	0.67
Interest Earnings	3.42	2.93	0.49	4.77
<b>Total</b>	<b>119.79</b>	<b>120.23</b>	<b>(0.44)</b>	<b>137.38</b>

The significant variances at month end were:

- Rates – Part year rating was \$0.65M ahead of the YTD budget setting.
- Operating Grants & Contributions – were \$0.67M behind the YTD budget primarily due to the FAGS 3<sup>rd</sup> quarterly payment of \$0.95M not yet received. HACC funding was also \$0.25M behind YTD budget, whilst child care subsidies were \$0.33M ahead.
- Fees & Charges - Commercial landfill fees were \$0.65M behind the budget target, reflecting general economic conditions and activity. Commercial leasing income was \$0.27M behind budget on an YTD basis, attributable to the Cockburn Health & Community facility.
- Interest Earnings – Investment earnings from the City's financial reserves were \$0.49M ahead of budget, mainly due to additional reserve funds being held.

### *Operating Expenditure*

Reported operating expenditure (including asset depreciation) of \$74.52M was under the YTD budget by \$2.54M.

The following table shows the operating expenditure budget variance at the nature and type level. The internal recharging credits reflect the amount of internal costs capitalised against the City's assets:

<b>Nature or Type Classification</b>	<b>Actual Expenses \$M</b>	<b>Revised Budget YTD \$M</b>	<b>Variance to Budget \$M</b>	<b>FY Revised Budget \$M</b>
Employee Costs - Direct	28.07	27.61	(0.46)	49.13
Employee Costs - Indirect	0.48	0.51	0.03	1.40
Materials and Contracts	21.15	23.54	2.39	40.18
Utilities	2.58	2.64	0.06	4.67
Interest Expenses	0.39	0.48	0.09	0.93
Insurances	2.11	2.24	0.13	2.24
Other Expenses	4.88	5.75	0.87	9.03
Depreciation (non-cash)	15.54	15.88	0.34	27.42
Amortisation (non-cash)	0.64	0.69	0.05	1.19
Internal Recharging-CAPEX	(1.32)	(2.29)	(0.96)	(2.23)
<b>Total</b>	<b>74.52</b>	<b>77.06</b>	<b>2.54</b>	<b>133.97</b>

The significant variances at month end were:

- Employee Costs – the \$0.46M variance is primarily due to the inclusion of 17.5% leave loading in the calculation which was recommended by the external audit. This variance has been treated in the mid-year budget review.
- Material and Contracts - were \$2.39M under the YTD budget with the significant contributors to this result being:
  - Recreation Services under by \$0.21M
  - Facilities Maintenance under by \$0.35M
  - Plant maintenance under by \$0.20M
  - Ranger & Community Safety under by \$0.30M
  - Waste Disposal under by \$0.36M,
  - Child care subsidy payments over by \$0.35M.
- Other Expenses – Council's donation program was behind YTD budget by \$0.72M and the cash flow will be reviewed for this item next month.

Depreciation was collectively \$0.34M under YTD budget with no single asset type contributing significantly to this variance.

Internal Recharging – is showing a shortfall of \$0.96M, caused by misaligned cash flowing of internal insurance allocations. This will be rectified next month.

### *Capital Expenditure*

The City's total capital spend at the end of the month was \$57.94M, representing an under-spend of \$19.53M against the YTD budget of \$77.47M.

The following table details the budget variance by asset class:

Asset Class	YTD Actuals \$M	YTD Budget \$M	YTD Variance \$M	FY Revised Budget \$M	Commit Orders \$M
Roads Infrastructure	6.28	13.93	7.65	21.90	6.81
Drainage	0.24	0.96	0.72	1.71	0.03
Footpaths	0.32	0.83	0.51	1.18	0.08
Parks Infrastructure	5.05	6.95	1.91	10.77	1.38
Landfill Infrastructure	0.17	0.21	0.04	0.40	0.10
Freehold Land	0.27	1.33	1.07	1.79	0.00
Buildings	41.16	47.45	6.29	58.28	8.76
Furniture & Equipment	0.12	0.45	0.33	2.56	0.68
Information Technology	0.34	0.88	0.54	1.50	0.23
Plant & Machinery	4.01	4.47	0.46	8.20	2.61
<b>Total</b>	<b>57.94</b>	<b>77.47</b>	<b>19.53</b>	<b>108.30</b>	<b>20.68</b>

These results included the following significant project variances:

- Roads Infrastructure – Projects behind YTD budget were Berrigan Drive Jandakot Improvement Works (\$4.03M), Lyon & Gibbs Signalisation and Upgrade (\$0.92M), Gibbs & Liddelw Roundabout (\$0.36M), North Lake Road [Hammond to Kentucky] (\$0.34M), Beeliar Drive [Spearwood to Stock] (\$0.33M), Russell Rd [Holmes to Moylan] (\$0.32M), Mayor Rd [Rockingham to Fawcett] (\$0.31M), Phoenix & North Lake Roads Intersection (\$0.20M).
- Drainage Infrastructure – works program was collectively \$0.72M behind the YTD budget.
- Footpath Infrastructure – the footpath construction program was collectively \$0.51M behind the cash flow budget.
- Parks Infrastructure – the capital program was behind the YTD budget by \$1.91M with Beeliar Drive Landscaping (\$0.4M), CY O'Connor Improvements (\$0.39M) and Dixon Reserve Works (\$0.25M) the major contributing projects.
- Freehold Land – various land acquisition & development projects were collectively \$1.07M behind the YTD cash flow budget.

- Buildings – Projects with material underspend variances were Cockburn ARC (\$5.00M) and Community Men's Shed (\$0.42M) behind YTD budget, whilst the New Operations Centre was ahead of YTD budget (\$0.46M).
- Information Technology – was collectively \$0.54M under YTD budget due to a number of under spent software and website projects.
- Plant & Machinery – replacement program was behind YTD budget by \$0.46M (5% of the full year budget).

### *Capital Funding*

Capital funding sources are highly correlated to capital spending, the sale of assets and the rate of development within the City (developer contributions received).

Significant variances for the month included:

- Capital grants were \$6.15M behind YTD budget mainly due to timing issues for state and federal grants for the Cockburn ARC (\$3.6M), state grant for Lyon & Gibbs signalisation (\$1.0M), Roads to Recovery grant for Mayor Road [Rockingham to Fawcett] (\$0.51M) and the Lotteries Commission grant for the Community Mens Shed (\$0.48M).
- Transfers from financial reserves were \$5.94M behind the cash flow budget due to the capital program under spending for buildings and roads (timing issue).
- Proceeds from the sale of assets were \$11.39M behind the YTD budget comprising of land (\$10.97M) and plant (\$0.42M).

### *Transfers to Reserve*

Transfers to financial reserves were \$10.78M behind the YTD budget, mainly due to unrealised land sales.

### *Cash & Investments*

The closing cash and financial investment holding at month's end totalled \$143.68M, down from \$151.9M in December and \$166.6M in November. \$92.13M of this balance represents the current amount held for the City's cash/investment backed financial reserves. The balance of \$51.55M to meet operational liquidity needs.

It should be noted that funds totalling \$11.0M were transferred into the City's Trust Fund in December 2016. This followed legal advice that the City's POS cash in lieu funds (previously held within financial reserves) and refundable cash bonds and deposits should technically be held within a trust account (i.e. separate from municipal monies), as


determined by legislation and general legal principles. The legal advice was instigated by the City's external auditor due to inconsistent treatment across the local government sector for a number of years.

Details on monies held within the Trust Fund are now included in a separate section at the end of this report.

### *Investment Performance, Ratings and Maturity*

The City's investment portfolio made a weighted annualised return of 2.83% for the month, slightly decreased from 2.84% last month and from 2.86% the month before. However, this still compares quite favourably against the UBS Bank Bill Index (2.15%) and has been achieved through careful management of the City's cash flow requirements. The cash rate was most recently reduced 25bp to 1.50% at the August meeting of the Reserve Bank of Australia and this reduction has impacted the investment rates achievable for new deposits since then.

However, the City's interest revenue to January was ahead of the YTD budget target by \$0.49M. This was primarily due to the retention of a larger investment pool (as capital outflows have been somewhat delayed) and a conservative budget setting, factoring in more rate cuts.



*Figure 1: COC Portfolio Returns vs. Benchmarks*

The majority of investments were held in term deposit (TD) products placed with highly rated APRA (Australian Prudential Regulation Authority) regulated Australian and foreign owned banks. These were invested for terms ranging from three to twelve months. All investments comply with the Council's Investment Policy other than those made under previous statutory provisions and grandfathered by the new ones.

The City's TD investments fall within the following Standard and Poor's short term risk rating categories. The A-1+ investment holding decreased marginally from 41% to 40% during the month. The amount invested with A-2 banks was 54%, comfortably below the policy limit of 60%:




Figure 2: Council Investment Ratings Mix

The current investment strategy seeks to secure the highest possible rate on offer (up to 12 months for term deposits), subject to cash flow planning and investment policy requirements. Value is currently being provided within 3-12 month investment terms and particularly by A-2 banks.

The City's TD investment portfolio currently has an average duration of 149 days or 4.9 months (slightly down from 157 days the previous month) with the maturity profile graphically depicted below:




Figure 3: Council Investment Maturity Profile

#### *Investment in Fossil Fuel Free Banks*



At month end, the City held 59% (\$82.7M) of its TD investment portfolio with banks deemed as free from funding fossil fuel related industries. This was up slightly from 58% the previous month.

### *Budget Revisions*

Budget amendments identified during the month and requiring Council adoption are as per the following schedule:

PROJECT/ACTIVITY LIST	USE OF FUNDING + / (-)		FUNDING SOURCES (+) / (-)		
	EXP \$	TF to RESERVE \$	TF FROM RESERVE \$	REVENUE \$	MUNI \$
Skateboarding coaching clinics (Healthway sponsorship)	8,000			(8,000)	
HACC office chair (funded from grant surplus)	1,060			(1,060)	
Depreciation - Buildings	(711,301)				
Depreciation - Parks Equip	828,456				
Depreciation - Marina	2,608				
Accumulated Depreciation	(119,763)				
<b>Totals</b>	<b>9,060</b>			<b>(9,060)</b>	

The depreciation adjustments are related to reconciling and adjusting asset types handed over with the Port Coogee Marina in July 2017.

### *Description of Graphs & Charts*

There is a bar graph tracking Business Unit operating expenditure against budget. This provides a quick view of how the different units are tracking and the comparative size of their budgets.

The Capital Expenditure graph tracks the YTD capital spends against the budget. It also includes an additional trend line for the total of YTD actual expenditure and committed orders. This gives a better indication of how the capital budget is being exhausted, rather than just purely actual cost alone.

A liquidity graph shows the level of Council's net current position (adjusted for restricted assets) and trends this against previous years. This gives a good indication of Council's capacity to meet its financial commitments over the course of the year. Council's overall cash and investments position is provided in a line graph with a comparison against the YTD budget and the previous year's position at the same time.

Pie charts included show the break-up of actual operating income and expenditure by nature and type and the make-up of Council's current assets and liabilities (comprising the net current position).

### *Trust Fund*

At month end, the City held \$11.03M within its trust fund. \$5.84M was related to POS cash in lieu and another \$5.19M in various cash bonds and refundable deposits.

A summary of the POS cash in lieu held follows:

<b>Suburb</b>	<b>\$</b>
Aubin Grove	845,930
Atwell	172,320
Beeliar	2,259,820
Cockburn Central	161,832
Coolbellup	167,369
Coogee	378,850
Hamilton Hill	565,254
Hammond Park	29,936
Jandakot	258,119
Bibra Lake	124,374
Munster	604,164
South Lake	56,023
Yangebup	221,286
<b>Total</b>	<b>5,845,276</b>

The POS funds are regularly reviewed by the Strategic Planning and Parks Departments. Parks last spent funds on POS in 2014/15 totalling \$0.49m. The allocation of POS to public open space projects is strictly controlled and must be approved by the WAPC before funds can be expended. Funds can only be spent on new infrastructure and land acquisitions. It is expected a report will be presented to Council seeking approval to spend some of the funds in the 2017/18 financial year.

### **Strategic Plan/Policy Implications**

#### **Leading & Listening**

- Deliver sustainable governance through transparent and robust policy and processes.
- Ensure sound long term financial management and deliver value for money.

### **Budget/Financial Implications**

No change to the budget surplus of \$368,929 with only self-funded expenditure and non-cash depreciation included in the recommendation.

### **Legal Implications**

N/A

### **Community Consultation**

N/A

### **Risk Management Implications**

Council's budget for revenue, expenditure and closing financial position will be misrepresented if the recommendation amending the City's budget is not adopted.

### **Attachment(s)**

Statement of Financial Activity and associated reports – January 2017

### **Advice to Proponent(s)/Submissioners**

N/A

### **Implications of Section 3.18(3) Local Government Act, 1995**

Nil.

## 17. ENGINEERING AND WORKS DIVISION ISSUES

### 17.1 (OCM 09/03/2017) - SPEARWOOD AVENUE FENCING PROPOSAL (146/002) (C SULLIVAN / A LEES) (ATTACH)

#### RECOMMENDATION

That Council

- (1) note the results of the further consultation carried out and receipt of petition;
- (2) continue with the landscaping to this section of Spearwood Ave in accordance with the Friendship Way landscape design and review the effectiveness of the natural screening on maturity of the almond trees; and
- (3) advise the petitioners and property owners of Council's decision.

#### COUNCIL DECISION

#### Background

At the February 2016 Ordinary Council Meeting a matter to be noted for investigation without debate on the beautification of Spearwood Avenue was presented with the following alternative recommendation:

*"That Council:*

- (1) continue with the Friendship Way Landscaping Program;*
- (2) consider placing funds in the 2016/17 Municipal Budget based on a detailed cost estimate to be provided by City Officers for the colorbond fencing or concrete panels option with or without the removal of existing fences; and*
- (3) authorises City officers to consult with affected property owners on the colorbond fencing option prior to the completion of the 2016/17 budget."*

The consultation was duly carried out and a budget item included in the 2016/17 capital works program of \$200,000. At the OCM of September 2016, Council resolved to:

- (1) *note the results of the consultation;*
- (2) *the existing budget allocation CW5790 be changed by renaming the project from Spearwood Avenue Fencing Replacement to Spearwood Avenue Street Beautification Program to ensure a planting regime that provides an effect screen to the fencing types along that section of Spearwood Avenue;*
- (3) *continue the landscaping of Spearwood Avenue in accordance with the Sister City project and the project outlined at Point 2 above; and*
- (4) *advise all property owners and residents in writing of Council's decision.*

Following the Council's recommendation, work began on the planting regime in particular the proposed bore for reticulation along the verges and in the adjacent park areas.

Community representatives requested a site meeting be conducted with property owners of Spearwood Avenue who had expressed dissatisfaction with the Council decision. The meeting was conducted on 1<sup>st</sup> December 2016 attended by the Mayor, Ward Councillors and City officers.

Property owners were unhappy with the inclusion of residents who were not property owners in the survey and also presented a number of responses that had not been lodged with the City prior to the closure of the consultation due to various reasons.

A petition was also submitted to the City at the meeting requesting Council to replace the existing asbestos fencing as a higher priority to continuing the planting strategy of the Friendship Way Landscaping Program. Some residents also requested consideration of a screen wall or barrier along the verges that would provide the visual improvement without the replacement of the existing asbestos fencing.

Residents also objected to any proposal involving removal of existing pedestrian or vehicle access gates to Spearwood Avenue.

### **Submission**

The petition and outstanding consultation responses are included as Attachment 1.

## Report

If the additional responses received at the site meeting are included in the survey and only the property owners comments are evaluated the following results are realised.

Survey	Properties	Yes	No	No Response
Original	29	13	3	13
Revised	29	19	3	7

The results show an additional six (6) properties have provided a response compared to the original survey. These additional responses, received through the petition, demonstrate a 65% return across the property owners in the affirmative. The property owners who advocated in the negative remain consistent and the seven (7) owners who didn't respond are ostensibly property investors. Although the results are not a clear mandate to precede with the replacement of the fences it demonstrates the heightened interest in improving the appearance along this stretch of Spearwood Ave at Council's cost.

Based on the revised survey results, including the petition, the following options are proposed for consideration, as discussed and presented previously:

### 1. Replace the fences along Spearwood Ave

The option to remove the existing fibro fence and replace with colour bond fence has a number of constraints which will require further investigation prior to execution. In accordance with the Dividing Fences Act 1961, the City and each individual property owner will need to enter into a legal agreement to override the provisions of the Act. The agreement will need to outline the City's responsibilities pertaining to the removal and replacement of the fences and mitigation of future for claims for damages and maintenance. Property owners will be required to agree to the City's conditions and facilitate all future maintenance and replacement requirements at their cost. The agreement will also need to consider future ownership particularly as these properties are developed in order to mitigate the City risk.

In order for this option to be executed in its entirety, consultation with the owners who didn't respond and the three (3) negative respondents will need to be undertaken. Whilst it is envisaged these owners will invariably accept the decision of Council, it would be prudent to receive confirmation of their acceptance. Should this not transpire the City will need to reconsider its position as a contiguous fence may not be possible, thereby detracting from the current project scope. Furthermore, the City

will need to comprehend the cost implications of executing individual legal agreements with each property owner and whether any contribution from the adjoining land owners is applicable.

It has been estimated that the fencing replacement will be in the order of \$105,000 however the legal costs have yet to be determined and will require detailed analysis before a firm budget is realised. As there is no funding within this year's program, Council would need to consider this option when workshops are held for the 2017/18 capital works program.

## 2. Friendship Way Landscaping Proposal

As outlined in the September 2016 OCM report, landscaping works along this section of Spearwood Ave are being delivered in accordance with the design for the Peace section of the Friendship Way project. The landscape to this section has seen the planting of ornamental almond trees. It is envisaged the spacing of the almond tree at maturity will provide a natural screen to the fencing along this section of Spearwood Av, thereby mitigating the need to replace private residential fences. Following construction of the bore at Peace Park, an irrigation network will be installed to support the growth of the almond trees and the future planting of groundcovers in this section.

Funding for this option is current provided within the Parks capital works program.

## 3. Investigate a screen wall directly abutting the existing fence line

Although the landscaping proposal to this section of Spearwood Av will provide a natural screen on maturity of the almond trees, there is an opportunity to explore the construction of a screen fence to mitigate the requirement of option 1. This option would enhance the landscaping treatment and through a rigorous design process enable the incorporation of the horticultural heritage as raised by members of the Phoenix Design Guidelines Working Group.

This option will need require further analysis with designs being reviewed by the working group and adjoining property owners in order to achieve an agreed outcome. As this option is currently not listed within the Parks and Environment 2016/17 Business Plan and no funding allocation provided, it would be prudent to list this for consideration in the 2017/18 CW program.

The three options outlined above all viable projects, subject to Council's decision to meet the needs of the community expectations. However the replacement option will set a precedent that could have far reaching implications for the City to manage in the future and require a huge investment in officer's time to engage with each property owner to execute legal agreements.

Furthermore it would be prudent to hold off on the construction of a screen wall until the completion of the landscape works and the almond trees have matured. Based on the analysis, officers recommend the continuation of the landscaping to this section of Spearwood Ave in accordance with the Friendship Way landscape design and review the effectiveness of the natural screening on maturity of the almond trees.

### **Strategic Plan/Policy Implications**

#### **City Growth**

- Continue revitalisation of older urban areas to cater for population growth and take account of social changes such as changing household types.

#### **Economic, Social & Environmental Responsibility**

- Sustainably manage our environment by protecting, managing and enhancing our unique natural resources and minimising risks to human health.
- Improve the appearance of streetscapes, especially with trees suitable for shade.

### **Budget/Financial Implications**

There is no financial implication if Council adopt the recommendation. The City has a budget allocation of \$200,000 to complete these works in the current financial year.

### **Legal Implications**

Should Council choose to replace the existing fences with colour bond fencing a legal agreement would need to be signed by all property owners for maintenance of the fence into the future by the property owners and future property owners as well as Council waiving the requirements of the Dividing Fences Act 1961.

### **Community Consultation**

Further consultation with property owners carried out as noted above.



### **Risk Management Implications**

Replacing residential fencing will set a precedent for future fencing requests by individuals or community groups adjacent to Public Access Ways, Public Open Space or land owned by the City and also has the potential for backlash by community representatives.

In addition, replacing fence panels has a number of significant risks including the process for the removal and disposal of asbestos fencing, preventing access to properties during the project period, damage to private infrastructure and unknown costs to alleviate differential lot levels and damage to the existing landscape.

### **Attachment(s)**

1. Petition and Outstanding Consultation Responses
2. Spearwood Ave property owners

### **Advice to Proponent(s)/Submissioners**

The Proponent(s) and those who lodged a submission on the proposal have been advised that this matter is to be considered at the 9 March 2017 Ordinary Council Meeting.

### **Implications of Section 3.18(3) Local Government Act, 1995**

Nil.

## **17.2 (OCM 09/03/2017) - WYOLA SHIPWRECK MANAGEMENT (064/004 & 175/001) (B ROSER) (ATTACH)**

### **RECOMMENDATION**

That Council

- (1) retain the Wyola Shipwreck and barge in their present locations;
- (2) approve the adoption of a long term management programme for the site; and
- (3) include funds for consideration in the 17/18 Operational Budget for the purpose of long term management and maintenance of the site.

**COUNCIL DECISION****Background**

C Y O'Connor beach is popular for horse training, swimming and walking with additional recreational features such as the nearby Port Coogee Marina and dive trail. It is a very popular beach and will continue to grow in its utilisation by a broad spectrum of the community.

The beach also accommodates the Wyola shipwreck and barge remains, partially buried in the sand approximately mid-way along the beach. The site provides a point of interest along the beach, however, given the beach's increasing popularity, the wreck and barge presents a challenge to the City in managing the longer term safety of beachgoers.

At the July 2016 Grants and Donations Committee a proposal was presented to hold a horse race along the beach to re-enact an 1833 horse race, believed to be the first official horse race held in WA.

At a Special Meeting on 25 August, 2016, Council considered the grant request and resolved:

*"That Council:*

- 1. Supports the staging of a family fun day and commemorative plaque unveiling for beach horse racing to be organised and managed by Amalfi Publishing;*
- 2. Supports the placement of a plaque at CY O'Connor Reserve;*
- 3. Approves funding of \$7,000 from the Community Grants Scheme to Amalfi Publishing provided that the terms and conditions within the City's Events Application process for the event are adhered to."*

It was noted by City staff at the time that the proposed race would require the removal of the Wyola shipwreck and this removal would require a degree of community consultation, a decision by Council and liaison with a variety of State Government Departments.

The City has now completed the community consultation and received advice back from relevant State Government Departments. As per the report below, it is recommended that the wreck and barge remain in situ and be managed as coastal features for the benefit of current and future generations. A copy of the public consultation results is included as Attachment 1 for reference.

## **Submission**

N/A

## **Report**

### History

Between the mid-1850's to well into the 20<sup>th</sup> Century the beach formed part of a large industrial zone which featured Robb Jetty, Fremantle Smelting Works, Newmarket Hotel, large expanses of paddocks, a quarantine area and an explosives magazine. The area also contained a power station, bacon factory, limekiln, orchards, vegetable gardens, dairy farms, drying sheds, tanneries and an extensive railway system.

From the 1830's the beach was known for the exercising and training of horses, an activity that has continued to the present day. The South Beach Horse Exercise Area is listed on the Register of Heritage Places.

The Wyola was built in 1912 by Messrs J. T. Eltringham and Co. in South Shields, England and served under the Swan River Shipping Company. The Wyola was a 306-gross-ton single crew steam tug, measuring 125 feet (38.1 metres) in length, 24 foot six inch (7.5 metres) in beam and 13 feet six inch (4.1 metres) in draught. Once built, it departed for Fremantle to be part of the Swan River Shipping Company.

The Wyola was integral for the functioning of Fremantle Harbour when in operation, performing services such as towing vessels and assisting stranded boats.

In 1965, after many years of service, both abroad and within WA, a routine survey of the Wyola indicated that extensive repairs would be necessary to keep the vessel in service after 1969. Delays in the building of a new tug extended the commission of the Wyola to 1970. On January 27, 1970 ownership of the Wyola passed to Goldfield Metal Traders for scrapping and registry of the Wyola was officially cancelled on September 25, 1970.

Goldfield Metal Traders took the tug to Robb Jetty, where they moored a barge alongside to cut the vessel down. It is unclear as to why the

work was not completed; however, the tug was predominantly left on the beach where it still remains to this day.

Robb Jetty was demolished in 1975 and the Abattoir eventually closed in 1994.

Information surrounding the barge is limited; however, it has a length of 20.5 metres and beam of 9.5 metres and is believed to have been used in scrapping the Wyola in 1970 whereby it was brought ashore, becoming derelict and catching fire. The remaining timbers became buried next to the Wyola wreck.

### Current state

The Wyola Shipwreck and Barge are heavily corroded and are still located on C Y O'Connor Beach. Sections of both remain in the sand and the extent of protrusion from the beach depends upon the prevailing wind and tide movements. The keel of the Wyola hull lies beneath the sand.

This section of beach is used daily by trainers exercising horses, dog walkers and other beach users with the wreck and barge having long been an attraction to tourists, photographers, marine archaeologists and locals.

There have been limited complaints and incidents reported to the City regarding the danger the shipwreck and barge remains poses to beach users, including horses and riders. These complaints are limited when considered against the number of people who experience the wreck site daily.

The City of Cockburn has previously cut away exposed sections of the Wyola that have appeared on the beach and near the beach access path from 2012 onwards. Since then, a plaque has been installed and the City has completed extensive consultation about the safety of the wreck on the beach.

To gain further understanding of the size, depth and condition of the wreck, staff engaged Local GeoTechnics, a geotechnical consultant to identify and confirm the size and scale of the shipwreck below the sand and confirm the depth of the shipwreck and its alignment.

Local GeoTechnics used a combination of field work (including Ground Penetrating Radar) and desk top review (incorporating Landgate aerial imagery) to complete their assessment. A copy of the report is included as Attachment 2 for reference.

The report revealed the bow of the shipwreck is at the sea side and stern is at the shore side. The depth of the shipwreck varies from 1.0m (from the bow end to the middle beam), approximately 1.8m at the middle part and approximately 2.0m to 2.5m at the stern end (shore side). The depth of the bottom of the shipwreck may vary as the depth was measured from the existing surface level which has been changing continuously due to sand filling or erosion by tidal wave occurring at the site.

The upraised portion of side shell of the shipwreck was found to be rusted and damaged. The middle beam was also found rusted and decayed. Solid steel/iron was felt at the bottom of the shipwreck.

### Heritage considerations

In August 2013 during the advertising of the annual update of the Local Government Inventory (LGI) the WA Maritime Museum nominated the Wyola Barge and Wreck for inclusion on the City's LGI as a separate place.

The heritage value of the Wyola Barge and Wreck were subsequently considered, which included input from the City's heritage consultant, Eddie Marcus. It was determined that they have the following heritage significance (Statement of Significance):

- *Wyola Wreck and Barge (remains)* have historical significance as a tangible and visible reminder of the maritime history associated with Cockburn Sound.
- The *Wyola* is associated with both World Wars and had a long and important association with the Fremantle Harbour shipping industry, through its involvement in long-distance towing, salvage and rescue.
- The remains of the hull of the *Wyola* form a landmark on C. Y. O'Connor Beach, and have aesthetic and interpretive significance.
- *Wyola Wreck and Barge (remains)* have social value as a publicly accessible landmark, contributing to the community's sense of place.
- The timber barge has social and historic significance for its association with shipbreaking activities and Cockburn's maritime industrial heritage.

The proposal to include the Wyola Wreck and Barge on the LGI and Heritage list was adopted by Council at 10 April 2014 OCM.

The City's Local Government Inventory awarded the Wyola tug and barge a heritage rating of B, classifying it as "considerable significance". Category B places should be protected through appropriate management. There is a presumption against removal.

The Wyola and timber barge are not protected by the State Maritime Archaeology Act 1973 as they were wrecked post-1900, however, it is clear the sites have historical significance to the heritage and maritime history of the Fremantle and Cockburn region. There also does not appear to be protection under the Commonwealth Historic Shipwrecks Act 1976.

Referring to the WA Maritime Museum's Shipwreck Databases the Wyola wreck is noted as being inspected by the museum in 2004 and has been listed as "not protected State". Given this scenario, the WA Maritime Museum would prefer the City retain the wreck at its current location, but also appreciates the wreck may be presenting certain safety risks for the City.

There are other buried wrecks north of Port Coogee that form key features of the Coogee Maritime Trail. These include the James (1830), the Diana (1878) bookended by the also visible Omeo (1905) shipwreck, however, it is rare that shipwrecks are visible to the general public, and the Wyola is a landmark in the seascape at C Y O'Connor Beach. It is also part of a maritime precinct incorporating the wreck of the timber barge, the remains of Robb Jetty dive site offshore, C Y O'Connor statue, and adjacent cattle run interpretation for the old abattoir/meatworks.

There is potential to better interpret the historical values of the wreck and also include it as part of a foreshore walking/ cycling wreck/heritage trail that would extend from Fremantle to Woodman Point.

Overall, the wreck and barge are classified as very important to the heritage of the locality, conservation of the place is highly desirable and any alterations or extensions should be sympathetic to the heritage values of the place.

## Site Management Considerations



The City has regularly completed minor works to improve the safety of the immediate area of the wreck site. This has included re-aligning the beach access footpath and grinding away of some of the wreck structure. This has temporarily improved the overall safety of the immediate area for beach users but unfortunately, there is little doubt the exposed remnants of the shipwreck present a hazard with a risk of injury to users of the beach (e.g. pedestrians and horse riders accessing the beach).

The level of risk to beachgoers appears to vary with the amount of wreck exposure due to changing tidal and weather conditions leading to either erosion or accretion of sand at the location. Such risk, though, if managed appropriately, is considered acceptable especially when compared to the array of other risks that a coastal location presents.

It is proposed the shipwreck and barge remain in-situ with City staff to explore long term management options, which may include regular excavation and partial or full removal of protruding steel from the body of the ship on the beach to ensure beachgoers and horse rider's safety.

With the above in mind, the longer term management of the site will include:

- Immediate excavation of the shipwreck from approximately 2.0m to the landward side of the bow. Remove the upper section of the hull to ensure a minimum depth of approximately 1.0m clearance below the sand along the beach.

- Complete monthly inspections of the wreck to identify hazardous protrusions from the beach. These are to be removed once identified.
- Complete monthly inspections of the signage at the wreck site and beach access paths to ensure beach users are well informed.

### **Strategic Plan/Policy Implications**

#### **Community, Lifestyle & Security**

- Provide for community facilities and infrastructure in a planned and sustainable manner
- Provide safe places and activities for residents and visitors to relax and socialise

#### **Leading & Listening**

- Listen to and engage with our residents, business community and ratepayers with greater use of social media

### **Budget/Financial Implications**

It is proposed to include an operational works budget for consideration in the 2017/18 financial year of \$20,000 to cover the ongoing inspections and initial excavation and removal of portions of the wreck.

### **Legal Implications**

N/A

### **Community Consultation**

The community consultation was based on:

- Maintaining safety for beach users;
- Ensuring safety for participants in a proposed family fun day with horse races in 2017;
- Providing direction to City staff about dealing with the wreckage.

As the first stage of consultation, the City interviewed some key local stakeholders to flesh out the issues and received feedback from some maritime archaeologists around Australia and the WA Museum.

As the second stage of consultation, the City invited residents across the City to voice their concerns and sentiments via an online survey on Comment on Cockburn (153 responses) and via Facebook (53 responses).



The invitation to comment was publicised through electronic newsletters and a newspaper advertisement.

The outcome was:

Stakeholders	In favour of <u>retaining wreck</u> on the beach	In favour of <u>removing wreck</u> from the beach	Neutral
<b>Residents</b>			
Facebook (n=53)	92%	8%	-
Survey (n=153)	65%	31%	4%
<b>Key stakeholder groups</b>			
WA Museum (n=1)	✓		
Maritime archaeologists (n=2)	✓		
Coogee Beach Progress Association (n=1)		✓	
Horse trainers (n=2)		✓	
Council landscape architect (n=1)	✓		
Cockburn historical society (n=1)		✓	
Aboriginal Reference Group		No action in dunes	
Journalist/publisher (n=1)		✓	
South Beach Community Group (n=1)			✓

In summary, the majority of respondents (68%) who participated in the community consultation process wish to see the wreck and barge retained on the beach. Only 28% are in favour of removal of the wreck.

This reflects the heritage values represented by the place and also the desires of the community which overwhelmingly supports retention of the wreck and barge.

A copy of the full consultation report is available at  
<http://comment.cockburn.wa.gov.au/>

### Risk Management Implications

There is little doubt the exposed remnants of the shipwreck present a hazard with a risk of injury to users of the beach (e.g. pedestrians and horse riders accessing the beach). Failure to adopt the recommendation may result in an increase of public safety risk at the wreck site. Placing this in context, there are numerous other hazards associated with the beach environment and through careful management coupled with appropriate public behavior, such hazards can be managed.

Additionally, given that an extensive community consultation process has been undertaken, the community would expect that where a clear

majority of respondents seek a certain course of action that Council would decide accordingly unless a clear reason for an alternative decision was provided. By not adopting the recommendation the City may suffer reputational damage if it was not seen to be listening and responding appropriately to its community.

By adopting the decision and managing the site, this important coastal feature can be retained for the future.

#### **Attachment(s)**

- 1 Public Consultation report Wyola Wreck
- 2 Geo-Technical report Wyola Wreck

#### **Advice to Proponent(s)/Submissioners**

Those involved in the community engagement have been advised that this matter is to be considered at the 9 March 2017 Council Meeting.

#### **Implications of Section 3.18(3) Local Government Act, 1995**

Nil.

### **17.3 (OCM 09/03/2017) - TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT IN RIGBY AVENUE AND SURROUNDING AREA (047/013) (CSULLIVAN/JKIURSKI) (ATTACH)**

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

That Council

- (1) authorise City officers to investigate the specific intersections and parking concerns noted in the report and submit a further report on proposed traffic management measures in the area to a future Council Meeting;
- (2) notify the WA Police of resident concerns about speeding in the area and request additional Police surveillance, along with variable message boards; and
- (3) include an allocation of \$100,000 for consideration in the proposed 2017/18 budget to begin to address the higher priority projects identified in this report.

## COUNCIL DECISION

### Background

Concerns have been raised regarding traffic and pedestrian safety for some years on Rigby Avenue, Spearwood and also relating to the traffic generation and movements in the Packham North District Structure Plan area. A number of requests to close or partially close Rigby Avenue at the western end have not been supported by the City.

During 2015 and 2016, City officers carried out a number of speed/volume counts on Rigby Avenue which indicated that while the number of heavy vehicles had increased due to land development activity in the area, the average weekday volume and 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed did not indicate that any form of intervention was required. A copy of these assessments and commentary are included as Attachment 1 for reference.

### Submission

N/A

### Report

Following a number of concerns expressed to Elected Members, City officers invited the residents of Rigby Avenue and the surrounding area to a public meeting held at the City Administration Centre on 13 December 2016 to allow a general discussion of opinions from residents on traffic and safety issues in their local area. The meeting was attended by the Mayor and Ward Councillors and conducted by City officers.

A number of submissions were made by residents who were unable to attend the meeting and a copy of these is included as Attachment 3 for reference. A copy of the City officer's presentation is included as Attachment 4 for reference also.

The summary of points raised is shown below:

- General concern about speeding and illegal parking over the study area, particularly enforcement of 50 kmh zones, more

signage required (eg Entrance Road, Pallett Road, Mell Road, Rigby Avenue, Pennlake Road);

- A request for a roundabout at the Mell Road/Hamilton Road intersection;
- Pennlake Road/Gerovich Road intersection control, visibility and pavement marking issues;
- Rigby Avenue/Rockingham Road intersection capacity and the safety of turning movements;
- Dangerous turning movements at the Rigby Avenue/Mell Road intersection;
- Parking congestion in the vicinity of multi-unit developments and reserves such as Watson Reserve;
- The need to upgrade pedestrian and cycling pathways to improve safety and connectivity;
- Excessive traffic volumes in the Rigby/Bramston/Mell/Gerovich area;
- Pavement markings are worn in places and need repainting;
- A centre line is required to better guide traffic (e.g. Pennlake Drive);
- Traffic movements at the King St/Hamilton Rd roundabout;
- Right turns out of Orsulich Loop need Stop sign control;
- A footpath is required along the north side of Rigby Avenue;
- Mell Road/Pennlake roundabout safety at pedestrian crossings, particularly for the aged care facility;
- Traffic problems at the northern end of Mell Road in regards to blind spots from the rail line to 83 Mell Road
- Maintenance of verge trees/vegetation in the area is required to address sight line issues and provide unobstructed passage for path users.

City officers have assessed the points raised and identified a number of actions with priorities to address these concerns as shown in the table below.

#	Action	Description / Justification	Priority	Responsibility
1	Install a parking restriction signage along Rigby Av	"No Parking" signage will be installed along Rigby Av to improve safety and traffic movement through the area.	High	City of Cockburn
2	Install 50km signage along Entrance Road, Pallett Road, Mell Road, Rigby Avenue, and Pennlake Road	Work with MRWA to provide additional 50km signage to remind drivers about speed environment within the area	Medium	City of Cockburn / MRWA
3	Investigation and completion of a preliminary design for roundabout at the Mell Road/Hamilton Road intersection.	Identify opportunity for roundabout installation at intersection of Mell Road/Hamilton Road, which will provide a better traffic flow.	High	City of Cockburn
4	Investigation and completion of a preliminary design for roundabout at Rigby Avenue/Rockingham Road intersection.	Identify opportunity for roundabout installation at intersection of Rigby Avenue/Rockingham Road, which will increase intersection capacity and provide a better traffic flow.	High	City of Cockburn
5	Investigation of the visibility and pavement marking at intersection of Pennlake Road/Gerovich Road	Work with MRWA to renew pavement marking	High	City of Cockburn / MRWA
6	Investigation for reconstruction of Rigby Avenue/Mell Road intersection	Identify opportunity for reconstruction of Rigby Avenue/Mell Road intersection to improve turning movements and safety within area.	High	City of Cockburn
7	Investigation for reconstruction of King St/Hamilton Rd roundabout	Identify opportunity for reconstruction of King St/Hamilton Rd intersection to improve turning movements and safety within area.	High	City of Cockburn
8	Investigation for reconstruction of Mell Road/Pennlake Rd roundabout	Identify opportunity for reconstruction of Mell Road/Pennlake Rd intersection to improve pedestrian crossing.	Medium	City of Cockburn
9	Improve pedestrian safety and footpath network efficiency	Identify opportunity for footpath and cycling pathways construction to improve safety and connectivity within area.	Medium	City of Cockburn
10	Investigation of parking issues in the vicinity of new developments and construction sites	Parking issues in the vicinity of new developments and construction sites will be considered during development of a Citywide Parking Strategy.	Medium	City of Cockburn
11	Traffic Count investigation	Complete new traffic count within area on 2018 to define is there any variations to the current traffic volume and speeding behaviour	Medium	City of Cockburn

## Strategic Plan/Policy Implications

### Moving Around

- Reduce traffic congestion, particularly around Cockburn Central and other activity centres

- Identify gaps and take action toward extending the coverage of the cycle way, footpath and trails network
- Improve connectivity of transport infrastructure

### **Community, Lifestyle & Security**

- Provide residents with a range of high quality, accessible programs and services
- Provide for community facilities and infrastructure in a planned and sustainable manner

### **Leading & Listening**

- Deliver sustainable governance through transparent and robust policy and processes
- Provide for community and civic infrastructure in a planned and sustainable manner, including administration, operations and waste management

### **Budget/Financial Implications**

While there are no impacts on the Council budget for the current financial year, a budget allocation of \$100,000 is proposed for Council's consideration in the 2017/18 capital works budget for the detail design and consultation of the actions identified, in their order of priority.

### **Legal Implications**

N/A

### **Community Consultation**

A public meeting was conducted at the City Administration Centre on the evening of 13 December 2016. A copy of the public notification of the meeting is included as Attachment 2 for reference. A total of 1,690 letters to residents were sent out for the study area. The area was bounded by Rockingham Road to the east, Hamilton Road to the west, the freight railway line to the north and Troode Road to the south.

### **Risk Management Implications**

Should Council not support the recommendation, the risk to public safety at the locations identified in the report will remain and will not be mitigated. The level of risk of accidents or near misses at these locations would remain as substantial, with the consequential damage to the City's reputation and potential liability claims.

**Attachment(s)**

1. Results of Traffic Counts on Rigby Avenue in 2015 and 2016.
2. Notification of Public Meeting on 13 December 2016.
3. Submissions received for the Public Meeting
4. City Officers Presentation 13 December 2016

**Advice to Proponent(s)/Submissioners**

The attendees of the public meeting and those who lodged a submission have been advised that this matter is to be considered at the March 2017 Ordinary Council Meeting and will be advised of Council's decision.

**Implications of Section 3.18(3) Local Government Act, 1995**

Nil.

**17.4 (OCM 09/03/2017) - TENDER NO. RFT 02/2017 - PROCESSING SERVICES FOR RECYCLABLE MATERIALS (RFT 02/2017) (L DAVIESON) (ATTACH)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

That Council accept the tender submitted by Suez Recycling & Recovery Pty Ltd, for Tender No. RFT 02/2017 – Processing Services for Recyclable Materials. The estimated sum of the service is \$1,222,728 (GST exclusive) including a transport calculation over the three (3) year period of the Contract.

**COUNCIL DECISION****Background**

The City provides a weekly 240 litre MGB Recycling collection service for residential and commercial properties throughout the Local Government District. This material is currently processed at the South Metropolitan Regional Council (SMRC) in Canning Vale. The City has

issued its intention to withdraw from the SMRC Project Participant's Agreement on 30 June 2017. As a consequence, the City will require an alternate, competent processor for the co-mingled recyclables collected from the yellow top bin.

The City collects approximately 13,000 tonnes of Recyclable Materials annually. Weekly tonnages of Recyclable Materials will vary dependant on presentation rates and seasonal fluctuations. This Tender seeks the services of a suitable contractor to receive and process this co-mingled material. Recyclable Materials will be delivered to the designated Materials Recovery Facility (MRF) as specified by the Contract.

- The Contractor shall receive the Recyclable Material delivered by the Principal;
- The Contractor will process the Recyclable Materials and separate them into individual Recyclates, suitable for sale to the market;
- The Contractor will market and sell the sorted Recyclates;
- The Contractor will dispose of residual waste at a suitably licensed disposal facility; and
- The Contractor will provide comprehensive reports detailing Recyclable Materials received, residual waste and Recyclates sold to the satisfaction of the requirements of the Department of Environment Regulation's Annual Compulsory Waste Census and the Principal.

The successful Tenderer will be deemed the Principals' Contractor for these services and any similar or additional services that may be required during the entirety of the proposed Contract.

The Contract will be for an initial period of three (3) years and will commence on 1 July 2017. There will be Principal instigated options to extend the Contract period by an additional twelve (12) month period and for up to twelve (12) months after that to a maximum period of five (5) years.

Tender No. RFT 02/2017 – Processing Services for Recyclable Materials was advertised on Saturday 4 February 2017 in the Local Government Tenders section of "The West Australian newspaper. It was also displayed on the City's E-Tendering website between the 4 and 21 February 2017.



## Submission

Tenders closed at 2:00 p.m. (AWST) on Tuesday 21 February 2017 and four (4) tender submissions were received from:

1. Suez Recycling and Recovery Pty Ltd.
2. South Metropolitan Regional Council
3. Cleanaway Pty Ltd
4. Aurigen Group Ltd

## Report

### Compliance Criteria

The following criteria were used to determine whether the submissions received were compliant:

	Compliance Criteria
(a)	Compliance with the Conditions of Tendering ( <b>Part 1</b> ) of this Request.
(b)	Compliance with the Specification ( <b>Part 2</b> ) contained in the Request.
(c)	Completion and submission of Form of Tender – <b>Clause 3.1</b> .
(d)	Compliance with Licence Requirements and completion of <b>Clause 3.6</b> .
(e)	Compliance with Financial Position requirements and completion of <b>Section 3.2.6</b> .
(f)	Compliance with Insurance requirements and completion of <b>Section 3.2.7</b> .
(g)	Compliance with Qualitative Criteria requirements and completion of <b>Section 3.3.2</b> .
(h)	Compliance with Fixed Price requirements and completion of <b>Section 3.4.2</b> .
(i)	Compliance with and completion of the Price Schedule <u>in the format provided in <b>Part 4</b></u> .
(g)	Compliance with ACCC Requirements and completion of <b>Appendix A</b> .
(h)	Acknowledgement of any Addenda issued.

### Compliant Tenderers

All four (4) Tenderers were deemed compliant and were evaluated.

Evaluation Criteria

Evaluation Criteria	Weighting Percentage
Demonstrated Experience	15%
Key Personnel Skills and Experience	10%
Operational Performance	40%
Sustainability	5%
Tendered Price	30%
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>100%</b>

Evaluation Panel

The tender submissions were evaluated by:

1. Lyall Davieson – Waste Manager
2. Mickey Danilov – Waste Collection Coordinator
3. Chantelle D'ascenzo – Rates and Revenue Manager

Scoring Table - Combined Totals

Tenderer's Name	Percentage Score		
	Non-Cost Evaluation	Cost Evaluation	Total
	70%	30%	100%
<b>Suez Recycling &amp; Recovery Pty Ltd</b> **	<b>51.30%</b>	<b>30.00%</b>	<b>81.30%</b>
Cleanaway Pty Ltd	47.23%	11.01%	58.24%
Aurigen Group Ltd	41.97%	15.47%	57.44%
South Metropolitan Regional Council	41.00%	13.65%	54.65%

**\*\* Recommended Submission**

Evaluation Criteria AssessmentDemonstrated Experience

Cleanaway and Suez demonstrated significant experience in the operation of Materials Recovery Facilities (MRF) for the processing of comingled recyclables, detailing dozens of local governments to which they deliver this service.

### Key Personal Skills and Experience

All tenderers proved they had sufficient key personal skills and experience to operate a successful MRF.

### Operational Performance

All Tenderers had adequate capacity to accept the City's recyclables as of 1 July 2017. The SMRC, Cleanaway and Suez offered the most sophisticated comingled recyclable MRFs.

### Sustainability

Cleanaway, Suez and Aurigen obtained moderate scores in this section with their commitments to social enterprise and indigenous employment.

### Summation

All tenders are considered to have the capacity to meet the City's requirements as detailed in the Specifications as well as comply with the General and Special Conditions of Contract as stated in the tender document.

The estimated sum listed is a calculated figure used for comparative purposes and not the total cost of the service. This figure represents the tonnage rate of processing recyclables together with costs associated with the hours involved in delivering the product to the respective Material Recovery Facilities for each of the four (4) tenderers. An assumption was used to calculate only movements from the City's Operation Centre to the Suez MRF, for the purpose of comparing tenders. The estimated sum listed does not reflect the actual truck movements on their daily runs.

Suez provided the best score against the selection criteria when assessing the tonnage rate, the travel distance to the MRF and the high compaction level above which a penalty would be imposed. Suez provided a very competitive price per tonne and offers a professional service; consequently, their tender should be supported.

## **Strategic Plan/Policy Implications**

### **Economic, Social & Environmental Responsibility**

- Sustainably manage our environment by protecting, managing and enhancing our unique natural resources and minimising risks to human health

- Improve water efficiency, energy efficiency and waste management within the City's buildings and facilities and more broadly in our community

### **Leading & Listening**

- Deliver sustainable governance through transparent and robust policy and processes.

### **Budget/Financial Implications**

In the past decade, the City has budgeted around \$1million each year for OP 9556 "Entry Fee for Recyclables" at the SMRC. In the 2017-18 budget, Waste Services will be proposing a significantly reduced budget for OP9556 for the processing of recyclables at the Suez Bibra Lake MRF. This is a saving of approximately \$3-3.5m subject to increase in tonnages over the three year initial contract period.

Due to the location of the Suez MRF, it is estimated that the six recycle trucks will travel about 170,000kms less per year than their current journey to the SMRC in Canning Vale. This will result in significant savings in plant and labour costs associated with OP 9553 "Collection of Recycling Bins".

### **Legal Implications**

Section 3.57 of the Local Government Act 1995 and Part 4 of the Local Government (Functions and General) Regulations 1996 refers.

### **Community Consultation**

N/A

### **Risk Management Implications**

The City and the SMRC have allocated significant resources to educating the community on how to correctly use their waste and recycling bins. There are some in the community that believe we do not actually recycle the contents of the yellow top bin. If there was no tender in place identifying an alternative processor of comingled recyclables post our withdrawal from the SMRC, this product could be landfilled. This would be a substantial risk to the City's communication strategy, its investment in waste education and our sustainability reputation.

**Attachment(s)**

The following Confidential Attachments are provided under a separate cover:

1. Compliance Evaluation
2. Consolidated Evaluation Panel Score Sheet; and
3. Tendered Prices

**Advice to Proponent(s)/Submissioners**

Those who lodged a tender submission have been advised that this matter is to be considered at the 9/3/2017 Council Meeting.

**Implications of Section 3.18(3) Local Government Act, 1995**

Nil.

**18. COMMUNITY SERVICES DIVISION ISSUES**

**18.1 (OCM 09/03/2017) - COCKBURN AQUATIC & RECREATION CENTRE - PARKING STATION LOT 125 & 126 POLETTI ROAD, COCKBURN CENTRAL (154/006) (R.AVARD) (ATTACH)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

That Council :

- (1) pursuant to Section 3.12 of the Local Government Act 1995 proceed to make a Local Law to amend the City of Cockburn Parking and Parking Facilities Local law 2007, as shown on the attachment to the agenda and advertise the proposed amendment for a minimum of six (6) weeks; and
- (2) pursuant to clause 9 (1) of the City of Cockburn Parking Facilities Local Law 2007 establish parking stations on Lots 126 and 125 Beeliar Drive, Cockburn Central, as Parking Station 3, as attached to the agenda.

**COUNCIL DECISION**

## **Background**

Included in the development of the Cockburn ARC facility are approximately 470 car parking bays located under the power lines on Lots 125 and 126 Poletti Road, Cockburn Central.

## **Submission**

N/A

## **Report**

There have been significant parking issues in the Cockburn Central area and within the Cockburn Gateways site generally in part due to the number of vehicles that park in the area to access the Cockburn Central train station. It is quite likely over time that there will be people parking in the Cockburn ARC car park and making their way to the Cockburn Central train station. The result of this will be that there will be cars parked in the Cockburn ARC car park for extended periods limiting parking for patrons of the Cockburn ARC. The creation of a parking station will allow the City to impose restrictions on the time people park in this car park without authorisation. Within the lease agreement the Fremantle Football Club (FFC) can have up to 120 car parking bays allocated to them for their staff. It is proposed that the City impose a 3 hour time limit on public parking on Lots 125 and 126 Poletti Road, Cockburn Central with permits for FFC and City staff for non-restricted parking periods.

This is in addition to the approximately 60 secure car parking bays the FFC have on the west side of the building for its players and executive.

There are a further 30 secure car parking bays on the east side of the building that is available for City staff and also to serve as the access for rubbish trucks.

Should parking become a problem with non-Cockburn ARC patrons the City will place on future budgets for consideration funds to install electronic parking monitoring devices.

## **Purpose**

To amend the City of Cockburn Parking and Parking Facilities Local Law 2007 to establish a new parking station to serve the Cockburn ARC facility on lots 125 and 126 Poletti Road, Cockburn Central.

## **Effect**

To effectively control the parking for the Cockburn ARC to allow parking availability for patrons of the Cockburn ARC complex.

## **Strategic Plan/Policy Implications**

### **Moving Around**

- Reduce traffic congestion, particularly around Cockburn Central and other activity centres.

### **Community, Lifestyle & Security**

- Provide for community facilities and infrastructure in a planned and sustainable manner.

## **Budget/Financial Implications**

Minor signage and advertising will be required which can be funded from current budget allocations.

## **Legal Implications**

Amendment to the Local Laws is in accordance with section 3.12 of the Local Government Act 1995.

## **Community Consultation**

Section 3.12 stipulates the procedure for the advertising for public comment for a minimum of 6 weeks and subsequent Council consideration for the amendments to the local law to come into effect.

## **Risk Management Implications**

The financial success of the Cockburn ARC is heavily dependent on patrons having ready access to parking. If they cannot find parking nearby they may well not attend the complex. The establishment of a parking station will give the City the legal means to ensure compliance to parking regulations in the carpark.

## **Attachment(s)**

1. Draft proposed City of Cockburn Parking and parking Facilities Local Law amendments 2017.
2. Map of proposed parking station areas.

## **Advice to Proponent(s)/Submissioners**

N/A

## **Implications of Section 3.18(3) Local Government Act, 1995**

Nil.

**18.2 (OCM 09/03/2017) - CONSULTATION WITH ABORIGINAL REFERENCE GROUP - CULTURAL ACTIVITIES ON AUSTRALIA DAY (027/009) (G BOWMAN) (ATTACH)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

That Council:

- (1) receive the Aboriginal Reference Group Consultation Report;
- (2) allocate \$6,000 from the 2016/17 Grants and Donations Budget for an extended Aboriginal Reference Group and Aboriginal Community consultation process regarding the nature and type of cultural activities for future Australia Day events;
- (3) allocate \$2,000 from the 2016/17 Grants and Donations Budget for additional Nyungar cultural activities at the Australia Day Citizenship Ceremony in 2018;
- (4) approve the appropriate use of Nyungar language in the Acknowledgement of Country at Council Meetings and public events; and
- (5) require that the Reconciliation Action Plan (RAP) Review process consider the extended consultation findings and other recommendations contained in the Aboriginal Reference Group Consultation Report.

**COUNCIL DECISION**

**Background**

At the Ordinary Council Meeting on 8 September 2016 Council resolved to:

- (1) *retain the current allocation of sponsorship funds of \$25,000 for Indian Ocean Sky Show in the 2016/2017 Grants and Donations Budget;*
- (2) *produce an internal/external report on how it can hold an Australian Day fireworks display from 2018 onwards, with the said report being presented to Council prior to March 2017;*



- (3) *fund the report from the CEO's contingency fund should the CEO decide to outsource the report*
- (4) *liaise with the Mayor and Deputy Mayor over the report's terms of reference should the CEO outsource the report; and*
- (5) *require consultation with the Aboriginal Reference Group to determine the desirability of Council allocating an amount from the 2016/2017 Grants and Donations Budget, for Aboriginal Cultural considerations and healing activities relating to Australia Day.*

Note: Sub-recommendation (2) above is subject to a separate report prepared by the City's Corporate Communications Unit.

### **Submission**

N/A

### **Report**

The Aboriginal Reference Group (ARG) was advised of the Council decision and an initial consultation was held with the Aboriginal Reference Group in November 2016 which confirmed the need for a culturally appropriate consultation workshop process with the Aboriginal Reference Group.

Consequently Mr Oral McGuire from the Gundi Corporation was appointed by the City as a consultant to assist with a consultation workshop with the City of Cockburn's Aboriginal Reference Group. Mr McGuire was requested to ensure that the consultation was undertaken in a culturally appropriate manner and in accordance with the Council decision.

The consultation workshop was completed on 17 January 2017 and the ARG members who could not attend on the day replied by email correspondence. The key questions raised were:

1. Are ARG members in agreement for Aboriginal cultural activities to take place on January 26, and is there anything in addition that they would like to see there, or in future years? (Eg. could be cultural or healing activities, if agreed to).
2. Is it appropriate to conduct cultural and/or healing activities on 26 January, and if yes, then what would/should the Grants and Donations fund be used for (up to \$25,000)?

These questions were presented as discussion points and people responded verbally in the consultation meeting and in writing through email correspondence. A summary of these views and comments are outlined below, with the full Consultant's report attached to the Agenda.

Australia Day represents many things to the modern Australian citizen of 2017. There is the historical perspective of British Australia, the multicultural perspective of modern Australia, the citizenship celebration of our newest arrivals and from an Aboriginal perspective the sometimes *forgotten* perspective of the First Peoples of Australia. It was from this perspective (forgotten/not represented) that ARG members wanted change to occur.

People generally felt supportive of the fact that it was too late to make changes to the arrangements for the 2017 event with Aboriginal artists having been booked months prior to the event. However, they were clear about making changes to the way the City of Cockburn engaged with the Aboriginal community about Australia Day events post 2017.

All members did not see the Australia Day event/date as a celebration, unless it was in the context of 'survival' (of Aboriginal peoples and their cultures). All members also expressed concerns about how community perspectives were represented by those Aboriginal community members who participated in events and activities. For example, cultural and healing activities that were conducted as part of the overall breakfast event, could be misconstrued by Non- Indigenous Australians as endorsements of or for the 'celebrations' of the day/date. All members felt there needed to be a stronger statement made by Council of the acknowledgment and respect for Indigenous Australians' perspectives on this specific date and what it actually represented for Indigenous peoples – ie. the beginning of Aboriginal people's traumatic history. This statement could also serve to clarify the conflicting views between celebrating arrival and celebrating survival.

ARG members stated various concerns around the cultural activities of the Australia Day celebrations. Primarily, that the participation of Aboriginal people was not for the purpose of celebrating the date, but more about stating the struggles endured, the healing still required and the resilience and strength of Australia's First Peoples. As a part of the planning process it was clearly stated that a slower, more comprehensive consultation and engagement process (carried out over the 12 months prior to the date) be committed to by Council as a means of demonstrating Council's compassion, understanding and commitment to its Indigenous community. The ARG committed to provide the guidance and support to Council as part of this strategy. All members were committed to working openly and collaboratively with the City and Council over the next calendar year.

From this consultation with the ARG the following key activities and recommendations have been made by the Aboriginal Reference Group for Council consideration.

List of Activities & recommendations:

*That the Council consider:*

- Undertaking a comprehensive consultation process with the ARG and the broader Aboriginal Community about cultural activities being held on Australia Day (over the next 12 months) to 'slow the process down' in order to get a better outcome through proper engagement.
- Increasing the participation of Nyungar people in the Citizenship ceremony held on Australia Day – by having additional Nyungar engagement at the ceremony, including additional information in the welcome to country about the meaning of the 26 January, a smoking ceremony, and other culturally appropriate activities.
- A Council statement of commitment to be read by the Mayor at the Australia Day Citizenship Ceremony and the Australia Day Breakfast and potentially at ALL ceremonies (words to be consistent with RAP and previous levels of commitment from Council) – eg. 'Speaker' to use the phrase "Kaya, Wanju Wadjuk Budjar" somewhere in the statement, which means in English "Hello, Welcome to Wadjuk Land".
- Conducting a series of pro-active and interactive workshops with Aboriginal Reference Group members and key staff in the City around Nyungar protocols/procedures concerning sacred knowledge/sites.
- Committing to dealing with sacred and knowledge sites matters in an appropriate and sensitive and respectful way – where Nyungar and Aboriginal people are thoroughly consulted and engaged.
- Advocating to the Commonwealth Government for a change of the Australia Day date.
- Supporting the development of Nyungar Language teaching, preservation and revitalization in consultation with the ARG and Kwoberup Elders.
- Expanding the 'Bush Babies' Community Art project (see below) as a means of promoting survival and resilience.

- Recognising and acknowledging Men's (eg. Hunting) and Women's (eg. Birthing) areas more prominently through interpretive signage
- The proactive use of appropriate language – 'ancient culture & customs', 'Nyungar culture alive and thriving, still standing strong'. With Language to represent current situation more appropriately – present not past tense.

In order to be culturally appropriate and respectful regarding this sensitive topic it is recommended that the Council support the recommendation from the ARG for an extended consultation period which will require additional funding to appoint a consultant to engage with the Aboriginal Community in a culturally appropriate manner. The additional consultancy is estimated to cost \$6000. This recommended extended and broader consultation would include developing further understanding of the considerations listed in the consultancy report and described above.

It is recommended that the Council support the recommendation from the ARG to include additional cultural activities to the Australia Day Citizenship Ceremony in 2018 which will require additional funds of \$2,000. This will provide new citizens with a much deeper understanding of Aboriginal culture and perspectives.

The City is already undertaking the Bush Babies community art project and exhibition managed by Local Aboriginal Artist Sharyn Egan that shows the portraits and stories of Nyungar Elders who were born in the bush and the midwives who delivered them. The exhibition will be located in the Cockburn Seniors Centre from April to May 2017 and there is also an intergenerational schools program attached to this project.

It is suggested that other recommendations including the use of Nyungar language in the Acknowledgement of Country at public events and Council Meetings be approved as this is an important reconciliation gesture.

It is recommended that the activities and recommendations listed in the ARG consultancy report be incorporated and considered in the review process for the Reconciliation Action Plan which is currently being undertaken. The draft Reconciliation Action Plan will be developed in consultation with the ARG, the Reconciliation Action Plan Committee, and Reconciliation Australia and it is intended to be ready for Council consideration in October 2017.

## **Strategic Plan/Policy Implications**

### **Economic, Social & Environmental Responsibility**

- Continue to recognise and celebrate the significance of cultural, social and built heritage including local indigenous and multicultural groups.

### **Leading & Listening**

- Listen to and engage with our residents, business community and ratepayers with greater use of social media.

### **Budget/Financial Implications**

The recommended extended consultation is estimated to cost \$6,000 of Municipal funds which will be required for a consultant to carry out further consultation work with the ARG and extended consultation and the broader Aboriginal Community to determine the detailed nature of other cultural activities for future Australia Day Events including the Citizenship Ceremony.

It is recommended that \$2,000 be allocated from the Grants and Donations Budget for expanded Nyungar cultural activities at the 2018 Citizenship Ceremony including an extended Welcome to Country, a Smoking Ceremony and culturally appropriate decorations.

The cost of the other recommended activities will need to be researched and considered as part of the Reconciliation Action Plan review for future financial years.

### **Legal Implications**

N/A

### **Community Consultation**

Consultation with 15 of the Aboriginal Reference Group Community Members was carried out in January 2017 in accordance with the Council Decision. The consultation findings are contained in the main report and in the attachment to the Agenda.

### **Risk Management Implications**

If the recommendations are not considered and adopted by Council there is an increased risk of reputational damage with the Aboriginal Reference Group.

If the recommendations are adopted there is a lower risk of reputation damage with the Aboriginal Reference Group.

**Attachment(s)**

Aboriginal Reference Group – Consultation Report.

**Advice to Proponent(s)/Submissioners**

N/A

**Implications of Section 3.18(3) Local Government Act, 1995**

Nil.

**18.3 (OCM 09/03/2017) - AUSTRALIA DAY FIREWORKS REVIEW  
(152/001) (M LA FRENAIS) (ATTACH)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

That Council: :

- (1) receive the “Project 3” consultant report; and
- (2) declines to undertake the delivery of a fireworks event on Australia Day in future years, in accordance with the content of the report.

**COUNCIL DECISION**

**Background**

The resolution from the Ordinary Council Meeting of 8 September 2016 states that Council:

- (1) *retain the current allocation of sponsorship funds of \$25,000 for Indian Ocean Sky Show in the 2016/2017 Grants and Donations Budget;*
- (2) *produce an internal/external report on how it can hold an Australian Day fireworks display from 2018 onwards, with*

*the said report being presented to Council prior to March 2017;*

- (3) fund the report from the CEO's contingency fund should the CEO decide to outsource the report,*
- (4) liaise with the Mayor and Deputy Mayor over the report's terms of reference should the CEO outsource the report; and*
- (5) require consultation with the Aboriginal Reference Group to determine the desirability of Council allocating an amount from the 2016/2017 Grants and Donations Budget, for Aboriginal Cultural considerations and healing activities relating to Australia Day.*

Since 2012, the City of Cockburn sponsored the City of Fremantle's Indian Ocean Fireworks. This agreement ceased in 2016, two years earlier than the scheduled expiry. The City of Fremantle indicated that it no longer wished to run a fireworks event on Australia day due to cultural reasons and that it wished to create a culturally inclusive event 'One Day' on 28 January 2017. This event went ahead and was deemed a success by the City of Fremantle with an estimated 15,000 people attending. The Fremantle Business Improvement District also held a fireworks display in Fremantle fishing boat harbour on Australia Day with an estimated 10,000 spectators attending the event.

### **Submission**

N/A

### **Report**

Through a consultancy brief process, Project 3 was appointed to provide the report on how the City of Cockburn could hold an Australia Day fireworks event. Their findings provided the following recommendations/observations:

- 1. The only viable location for a display of the size and nature that is articulated would be off Coogee Beach. The fireworks could be launched from a barge approximately 350m offshore to mitigate environmental and bushfire risks.
- 2. This location would provide for the largest spectator viewing areas while also highlighting the picturesque coastal environment to the public. Attendance numbers would be anticipated as approximately 10,000 – 15,000 dependent on the level of promotion.

3. It is unlikely that any firework display in this area would attract the crowd numbers that Fremantle received in previous years (around 50,000, as there is no town centre infrastructure to support the event or encourage numbers. There are limited businesses in the area and the Fishing Boat Harbour businesses have indicated that they may continue to run an event in Fremantle
4. There is a risk that a new evening event may impact on the success of the City of Cockburn's Australia Day morning event and dilute crowds between the two events, rather than increasing overall crowds. The morning event (budget \$67K) is popular and attracted the largest ever crowd (estimated 7,000 people) in January 2017. See attached results from the independent survey conducted on 26 January 2017 at the event and also with an opportunity to respond online.

Key recommendations should the event proceed:

- Detailed consultation with the Aboriginal Reference Group and Aboriginal Elders is undertaken prior to any decision.
- Coogee Beach, with fireworks launched off shore, is the recommended location based on consultation, feedback and risk mitigation.

### Cost

The cost of undertaking a fireworks event on Australia Day is \$294,250 including GST which includes public transport and an external event company to organise/deliver the event. Note that the Event Team would not have the capacity to run the fireworks event. The Event and Cultural Coordinator would still need to be present to oversee the event.

There is no projected budget allocated in the 2017/18 financial year for this event, costing estimates as follows:



<b>Expenditure</b>	<b>Cost</b>
<u>Administration</u>	
Event Management fee including insurance	\$72,500
Admin	\$2,500
Approvals	\$1,750
Volunteers	\$1,500
VIP's	\$1,000
<u>Marketing</u>	
Advertising	\$21,000
Design & Collateral	\$7,000
Publicity	\$4,500
<u>Operations</u>	
Security, public transport, traffic management	\$69,000
Equipment	\$14,500
Labour	\$14,000
Production including fireworks	\$80,000
<u>Contingency</u>	\$5,000
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$294,250</b>

Please note a further budget breakdown can be found in the attached Consultant's report.

#### Sponsorship

A number of potential key partners were approached for an initial opinion on the likelihood of sponsoring an Australia Day Fireworks event. The following feedback was gained:

#### Healthway – Shane Pavlinovich, Arts Program Manager

Healthway don't normally support community fireworks events as they don't tend to offer the opportunity to promote their health messages effectively. Exceptions to this rule would be if a community or Council were putting on additional community and family activities in the day and period leading up to the fireworks.

One example of where they do sponsor the community Australia Day fireworks is in The City of Albany. This is because they offer a number

of activities throughout the day before the fireworks which attracts thousands of people and allows Healthway to promote their messages in a more conducive atmosphere and environment.

#### Lotterywest – Lucy Renolds, Grants Manager

Lotterywest highlighted that it likes to support community entertainment events and therefore although they do strongly support the Skyworks event in Perth they would also consider supporting other local community fireworks events in addition. However the level of funding would most likely be significantly less than that of Skyworks, closer to approximately \$20,000. No funding is guaranteed and would be assessed on its merits and opportunity at the time of submission.

#### Cockburn Gateway – Andrew Wilkinson, Marketing Manager

Cockburn Gateway advised that this is something they would have to discuss with the owners of the property and highlighted that he wasn't sure it would be something that they would support due to the media attention that Fremantle received from this. He also said that he thought that given the Centre would be closed at the time of the fireworks it would not be seen as a viable opportunity to drive customers.

There did seem to be interest in the other activities that the City were putting on at the Australia Day morning event and suggested that this was more in line with the events that they would support as it would provide them with an opportunity to encourage people into their Centre.

#### Suppliers

Initial discussions with a number of suppliers indicated that Australia Day is one of the busiest days of the year for them. Given this it is unlikely that any in-kind support could be offered particularly given the scope of the requirements.

#### Media Partners

Should the decision to proceed with a fireworks event be made, more detailed discussions could be initiated with media partners and it is likely that some level of support would be provided. They were hesitant to engage in meaningful discussions until a decision to proceed was taken.

#### Environment

Fireworks are well known to have a negative impact on the environment with significant debris and waste generated in the firing

process. This debris is a consideration for both ocean and land based wildlife. Chemical residue can also have an ongoing impact and it is difficult to clearly assess associated impact until after the event.

There are also prevailing weather conditions and increased fuel loads that raise the risk of bushfires at that time of year which will impact on the preferred launch locations. Significant concern is raised in relation to this from both internal and external departments and agencies.

Any outdoor event is subject to environmental conditions at the time. This increases the risk also of cancellation or impact to patron safety depending on weather conditions, with either extreme heat or storm conditions a risk.

### Bushfires

If the fireworks were discharged from a barge on the ocean and if the barge was located at reasonable distance from Coogee Beach, there would be no objection from Department of Fire and Emergency Services (DFES).

However, their support is subject to these conditions.

1. All activities proposed will need to comply in full with *Regulation 39E – Bushfires Act 1954*.
2. Strict adherence to the *Dept. of Mines and Petroleum Code of Practice Safe use of Outdoor fireworks in Western Australia - Part 6.1 – Weather Conditions*.

What the latter means is; should the local wind conditions meet or exceed 50km/h just before or during the event, the event must be immediately deferred or cancelled, irrelevant of the location of the barge.

### Traffic Management

With such a significant number of people attending an event like this the management of traffic and parking issues will be critically important. The City's Engineering Services recommends encouraging people to consider alternative transport modes eg. local residents walking to the event and the provision of public transport. Despite this it is expected there would still be a significant volume of vehicle traffic attracted to it.

A traffic and parking management plan would need to be prepared and would need to be approved by Engineering Services and Main Roads WA. As people would be encouraged to view the fireworks from a number of vantage points along the coast it would make the parking/traffic management more complex and costly. Management of

these issues on the day would be quite resource intensive and could not be accommodated in-house. It would be necessary to engage a traffic management contractor. While there is traffic management for the morning event, it would not be sufficient for an evening event and would need to be increased.

The City's Engineering Services advises that management of on-street parking on local roads would potentially be the most difficult aspect to manage because of limited in-house resources and the likely need to manage parking over a long period of the day. The responsibility of managing on-street parking is not something that the City can delegate.

### Public Transport

The only viable temporary public transport services that could be implemented are increased bus services. Dedicated free public transport could be implemented from either Fremantle or Cockburn Central train stations.

The suggested drop off locations would be clearly identified and signposted points along Cockburn Road. The directional flow of drop offs and pick-ups would suggest a south to north direction to reduce the amount of patrons crossing Cockburn Road. Bus stop locations would need to consider patron queue safety which will require increased lighting to safely implement as well as marshals to assist.

Free public transport networks are well established and often expected at major public events. They can be effective in transporting large numbers of patrons quickly and clearing the area however they are expensive to implement.

Encouraging other forms of transport such as walking or bike riding would also be advised to reduce the impact on the road network as well as improve the environmental impact. It is recommended that secure and accessible bike parking be provided and promoted.

### Community Economic Benefit

While the Coogee Beach Reserve location offers the optimum viewing and maximizes any potential attendance capacity, it will offer relatively little economic benefit to the area. There are limited businesses that would be in a position to benefit from the increased foot traffic and trade potential. Businesses within the Port Coogee marina and the Coogee Beach café may experience increased trade, if they are in a position to open at the time.

The Coogee Beach Surf Life Saving Club would be the most likely business to benefit from the event being held. The Australia Day morning event would already encourage traffic to the venue; however the addition of a fireworks event would lengthen the potential time of increased foot traffic.

If the attendance projection is not significantly increased over and above the current attendance at the morning event then it is unlikely that any significant increase in localized economic benefit would be seen.

There is a greater opportunity for increased economic benefit to the area if the event was to be held within the Cockburn Central precinct. However this timing again will not benefit all businesses given that it is a public holiday and the event would see the greatest attendance in the evening.

Restaurants and related businesses would be the most likely to benefit from the event through increased attendance in the area. Any event company contracted to run the event would be required to consult with and advise businesses on maximising opportunities.

#### Current Australia Day Event

It is anticipated that should the current Australia Day morning event continue that an outside event contractor would be required to successfully plan and implement the evening event. It is likely that an outside contractor would be needed regardless to accommodate the increased complexity of aspects such as traffic and crowd management for such an event.

Additional resource may be needed to safely implement the normal resident support and services offered by the local authority for such an event, particularly in year one of introduction.

Australia Day is one of the busiest days of the year in the event industry and suppliers and contractors will be stretched across the State. This not only increases costs compared to other times of the year but would also require an early decision to ensure that competent and experienced contractors were available and equipment and infrastructure bookings were confirmed well in advance.

#### Aboriginal Cultural Considerations

Council's resolution of 8 September 2016 also stated that Council is required to consult with the Aboriginal Reference Group and wider Aboriginal community to determine the desirability of Council allocating an amount from the 2016/2017 Grants and Donations Budget, for

Aboriginal Cultural considerations and healing activities relating to Australia Day.

An initial Consultation was held with the Aboriginal Reference Group in November 2016, with a workshop held in January 2017. It was decided that a separate report be provided to Council regarding Aboriginal considerations.

### Conclusion

Further to the Project 3 Consultant's Report, the City does not recommend running a fireworks display for the following reasons:

- Officers believe that the cost to host a 20 minute firework display could be better spent.
- The negative environmental impact is not compatible with the City of Cockburn's commitment to sustainability.
- There would be minimal economic benefit.
- The Fremantle Business Improvement District has said it will continue to host a fireworks display in Fremantle fishing boat harbour. It is open for Council to consider contributing to this event, if it is established that it would provide a benefit for Cockburn residents.
- The City already has its own unique and successful (92.2% satisfied) Australia Day event which captures people coming to the beach in the morning. 46.3% of attendees prefer the current event timing (morning) while 16.1% said they would be interested in an evening fireworks event. (See independent market research report attached).

A concept is being developed for Council to consider a more unique coastal event (not Australia Day) with laser shows and cultural components. This would be held over a weekend if approved.

### **Strategic Plan/Policy Implications**

#### **Moving Around**

- Advocate for improvements to public transport, especially bus transport.

#### **Community, Lifestyle & Security**

- Provide residents with a range of high quality, accessible programs and services.
- Provide safe places and activities for residents and visitors to relax and socialise.

**Economic, Social & Environmental Responsibility**

- Sustainably manage our environment by protecting, managing and enhancing our unique natural resources and minimising risks to human health.

**Budget/Financial Implications**

The cost of undertaking a fireworks event on Australia Day managed by an external event company, which would be necessary, is \$294,250.

**Legal Implications**

The City would need to draw up a legal agreement in regard to the operation of a fireworks display, if supported by Council.

**Community Consultation**

N/A

**Risk Management Implications**

If the City proceeded with the fireworks event there is an increased risk of reputational damage due to the increased risk of negative environmental and wildlife impacts and Aboriginal cultural concerns about the date of the event.

**Attachment(s)**

1. Project 3 Australia Day Fireworks Review – Consultant Report.
2. Perth Market Research Australia Day 2017 Survey Report (Extract)

**Advice to Proponent(s)/Submissioners**

N/A

**Implications of Section 3.18(3) Local Government Act, 1995**

Nil.

**19. EXECUTIVE DIVISION ISSUES**

**20. MOTIONS OF WHICH PREVIOUS NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN**

**20.1 (OCM 09/03/2017) - FORMER SOUTH FREMANTLE POWER STATION - LOT 2 ROBB ROAD AND PORTION OF LOT 3 ROBB ROAD, NORTH COOGEE – RECORDING OF URBAN ART (108/003 ) (D ARNDT)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

That Council request that Synergy commission a formal photographic record of the urban art within the former South Fremantle Power Station.

**COUNCIL DECISION**

**Background**

Cr Pratt has submitted the following Notice of Motion for the forthcoming Council meeting:

*“That the art in the old power station should be photographed/documented prior to any future development”*

This report deals with that notice of motion.

**Submission**

N/A

**Report**

The former South Fremantle Power Station was constructed in two stages, between 1947 and 1951, and housed the first major power generating equipment in the State. It was decommissioned in 1985, stripped of most of the equipment, and has remained vacant since that



time. Since it's decommissioning, the Power Station's structural components have fallen into varying levels of dilapidation.

The current owner of the building is Synergy (formerly Verve Energy), who have secured the site to prevent public access. Despite being fenced and clearly signposted with do not enter signs. Individuals regularly cut holes in the fence and enter the site without authorisation. Synergy has removed the main staircases in the building in an effort to deter people exploring the upper floors and the site is regularly patrolled by security. However because of its size and the remote nature of the building it has become popular with graffiti artists who have covered the building's walls, catwalks and pillars in street art.

At the November 2014 Ordinary Meeting of Council considered a Master Plan for the former South Fremantle Power Station (submitted by LandCorp on behalf of Synergy) to support the lifting of Urban Deferment under the Metropolitan Region Scheme.

The Masterplan acknowledges the existence of the urban art within the building stating:

*Since its closure, urban art has been informally applied onto the walls of the Power Station. This art demonstrates that a period of abandonment and neglect has been a significant part of the history and evolution of the building over the past 25 years. Retention of the building will enable opportunities to retain some of the high quality urban art.; and*

*it will be possible to retain some of the existing urban art (graffiti) and existing columns and walls in their current form to reflect the post industrial style and texture into the development*

Part of the recommendations contained with the Masterplan, include the following requirements

- *Acknowledge the significance of high quality urban art, which has been informally applied on the walls of the Power Station since its closure.*

Recent discussions with LandCorp have indicated that they are currently negotiating the transfer of the buildings and land from Synergy to LandCorp however the redevelopment of the site is still a number of years away in the current economic climate.

It is therefore recommended that in the interim the City requests that Synergy commission a formal photographic record of the urban art within the former South Fremantle Power Station.

### **Strategic Plan/Policy Implications**

#### **Economic, Social & Environmental Responsibility**

- Continue to recognise and celebrate the significance of cultural, social and built heritage including local indigenous and multicultural groups

### **Budget/Financial Implications**

N/A

### **Legal Implications**

N/A

### **Community Consultation**

N/A

### **Risk Management Implications**

There are no risks to the City should a photographic record not be made of the urban art within the building. There will however be cultural loss should no record of the urban artwork be made.

### **Attachment(s)**

N/A

### **Advice to Proponent(s)/Submissioners**

N/A

### **Implications of Section 3.18(3) Local Government Act, 1995**

Nil.

21. **NOTICES OF MOTION GIVEN AT THE MEETING FOR CONSIDERATION AT NEXT MEETING**
22. **NEW BUSINESS OF AN URGENT NATURE INTRODUCED BY MEMBERS OR OFFICERS**
23. **MATTERS TO BE NOTED FOR INVESTIGATION, WITHOUT DEBATE**
24. **CONFIDENTIAL BUSINESS**
25. **(OCM 09/03/2017) - RESOLUTION OF COMPLIANCE**

**RECOMMENDATION**

That Council is satisfied that resolutions carried at this Meeting and applicable to items concerning Council provided services and facilities, are:-

- (1) integrated and co-ordinated, so far as practicable, with any provided by the Commonwealth, the State or any public body;
- (2) not duplicated, to an extent Council considers inappropriate, services or facilities as provided by the Commonwealth, the State or any other body or person, whether public or private; and
- (3) managed efficiently and effectively.

**COUNCIL DECISION**

**26. CLOSURE OF MEETING**

Meeting closed at: \_\_\_\_\_

LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1995

*City of Cockburn*

STANDING ORDERS AMENDMENT LOCAL LAW 2017

Under the powers conferred by the *Local Government Act 1995* and all other powers enabling it, the Council of the City of Cockburn resolved on 9 March 2017 to make the following local law.

**1. Citation**

This local law may be cited as the *City of Cockburn Standing Orders Amendment Local Law 2016*.

**2. Commencement**

This local law comes into operation 14 days after the day of its publication in the *Government Gazette*.

**3. Principal Local Law amended**

This local law amends the *City of Cockburn Standing Orders Local Law 2016* as published in the *Government Gazette* on 22 September 2016.

**4. Part 4 amended**

- (1) In clause 4.4 (3)(1), after the words ‘no bad language’ delete the words “argument or expression of opinion”.
- (2) In clause 4.6(1) after the words ‘by a member’ delete the words “who shall acquaint himself or herself with the contents thereof and ascertain that it does not contain language disrespectful to the local government”.

---


Dated:.....

The Common Seal of the City of Cockburn was affixed under the authority of a resolution of Council in the presence of –

Logan K Howlett, Mayor

Stephen Cain, Chief Executive Officer

# CITY OF COCKBURN



## DELEGATED AUTHORITIES, POLICIES & POSITION STATEMENTS COMMITTEE

### MINUTES

#### FOR

**THURSDAY, 23 FEBRUARY 2017**

These Minutes are subject to Confirmation

Presiding Member's Signature

\_\_\_\_\_

Date: 25 May 2017

# CITY OF COCKBURN

## SUMMARY OF MINUTES OF THE DELEGATED AUTHORITIES, POLICIES & POSITION STATEMENTS COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON THURSDAY, 23 FEBRUARY 2017 AT 6:00

---

	Page
1. DECLARATION OF MEETING.....	1
2. APPOINTMENT OF PRESIDING MEMBER (IF REQUIRED) .....	1
3. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF RECEIPT OF WRITTEN DECLARATIONS OF FINANCIAL INTERESTS AND CONFLICT OF INTEREST (BY PRESIDING MEMBER).....	2
4 (DAPPS 23/02/2017) - APOLOGIES & LEAVE OF ABSENCE.....	2
5. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES.....	2
5.1 (MINUTE NO 392) (DAPPS 23/02/2017) - MINUTES OF THE DELEGATED AUTHORITIES, POLICIES AND POSITION STATEMENTS COMMITTEE MEETING - 24/11/2016 .....	2
6. DEPUTATIONS .....	2
7. PETITIONS.....	2
8. BUSINESS LEFT OVER FROM THE PREVIOUS MEETING (IF ADJOURNED) .....	2
9 (DAPPS 23/02/2017) - DECLARATION OF COUNCILLORS WHO HAVE NOT GIVEN DUE CONSIDERATION TO MATTERS IN THE BUSINESS PAPER.....	3
10. COUNCIL MATTERS.....	3
11. PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT DIVISION ISSUES .....	3
11.1 (MINUTE NO 393) (DAPPS 23/02/2017) - ADOPTION OF PROPOSED LOCAL PLANNING POLICY LPP 3.7 'SIGNS AND ADVERTISING' (182/001) (C DA COSTA) (ATTACH).....	3
11.2 (MINUTE NO 394) (DAPPS 23/02/2017) - PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO LOCAL PLANNING POLICY LPP 4.6 'COCKBURN COAST DESIGN GUIDELINES FOR ROB JETTY AND EMPLACEMENT PRECINCTS' (182/001) (A LEFORT) (ATTACH).....	6
11.3 (MINUTE NO 395) (DAPPS 23/02/2017) - PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO LOCAL PLANNING POLICY 5.15 'ACCESS STREET - ROAD RESERVE & PAVEMENT STANDARDS' (182/001, 110/161) (T VAN DER LINDE) (ATTACH).....	9
11.4 (MINUTE NO 396) (DAPPS 23/02/2017) - REVIEW AND MINOR MODIFICATIONS TO LOCAL PLANNING POLICIES (182/001) (C DA COSTA) (ATTACH) .....	14
11.5 (MINUTE NO 397) (DAPPS 23/02/2017) - PROPOSED NEW LOCAL PLANNING POLICY LPP 5.18 'SUBDIVISION AND DEVELOPMENT STREET TREES' (104/001, 182/001) (G LILLEY) (ATTACH).....	22

12.	FINANCE & CORPORATE SERVICES DIVISION ISSUES .....	26
13.	ENGINEERING & WORKS DIVISION ISSUES.....	27
13.1	<u>(MINUTE NO 398)</u> (DAPPS 23/02/2017) - PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO AEW1 'STREET VERGE IMPROVEMENTS' (182/001) (C DUNN) (ATTACH) .....	27
13.2	<u>(MINUTE NO 399)</u> (DAPPS 23/02/2017) - PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO POLICY AEW5 'LANDOWNER BIODIVERSITY GRANT PROGRAM' AND ASSOCIATED DELEGATED AUTHORITY (182/001) (A HARRIS) (ATTACH) .....	30
13.3	<u>(MINUTE NO 400)</u> (DAPPS 23/02/2017) - REVIEW OF ENGINEERING & WORKS SERVICES(EWS) POLICIES, POSITION STATEMENTS AND DELEGATED AUTHORITIES (182/001, 182/002, 086/003) (A LEES/ J KIURSKI) (ATTACH) .....	32
13.4	<u>(MINUTE NO 401)</u> (DAPPS 23/02/2017) - PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO POSITION STATEMENT PSEW12 'STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS AND COST OF CROSSOVERS' (182/002) (J KIURSKI) (ATTACH) .....	38
14.	COMMUNITY SERVICES DIVISION ISSUES.....	44
14.1	<u>(MINUTE NO 402)</u> (DAPPS 23/02/2017) - PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO POLICY SC35 'GRANTS, DONATIONS & SPONSORSHIPS - COMMUNITY ORGANISATIONS & INDIVIDUALS' AND DELEGATED AUTHORITY ACS2 'APPLICATIONS FOR GRANT AND INDIVIDUAL SPONSORSHIP FUNDED PROJECTS' (086/003, 086/001) (M BOLLAND) (ATTACH).....	44
14.2	<u>(MINUTE NO 403)</u> (DAPPS 23/02/2017) - PROPOSED NEW POLICY ACS15 'COUNCIL SPONSORED COMMUNITY COMPETITIONS' (182/001) (S SEYMOUR-EYLES) (ATTACH) .....	48
15.	EXECUTIVE DIVISION ISSUES .....	52
16.	MOTIONS OF WHICH PREVIOUS NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN.....	52
17.	NOTICES OF MOTION GIVEN AT THE MEETING FOR CONSIDERATION AT NEXT MEETING.....	52
18.	NEW BUSINESS OF AN URGENT NATURE INTRODUCED BY DECISION OF MEETING BY COUNCILLORS OR OFFICERS .....	52
19.	MATTERS TO BE NOTED FOR INVESTIGATION, WITHOUT DEBATE.....	53
20.	CONFIDENTIAL BUSINESS.....	53
21	(DAPPS 23/02/2017) - CLOSURE OF MEETING.....	53





## CITY OF COCKBURN

### MINUTES OF THE DELEGATED AUTHORITIES, POLICIES AND POSITION STATEMENTS COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON THURSDAY, 23 FEBRUARY 2017 AT 6:00

---

#### PRESENT:

Mrs C Reeve-Fowkes	-	Deputy Mayor (Presiding Member)
Mr L. Howlett	-	Mayor
Mr S. Portelli	-	Councillor
Mr B. Houwen	-	Councillor
Mr P. Eva	-	Councillor

#### IN ATTENDANCE:

Mr S. Cain	-	Chief Executive Officer
Mr D. Green	-	Director, Governance & Community Services
Mr S. Downing	-	Director, Finance & Corporate Services
Mr D. Arndt	-	Director, Planning & Development Services
Mr C. Sullivan	-	Director, Engineering & Works
Ms M. Tobin	-	Executive Manager, Strategy & Civic Support
Mr J Ngoroyemoto	-	Governance & Risk Co-ordinator
Mrs B. Pinto	-	Executive Assistant to Directors - Finance. & Corporate Services/Governance & Community Services

#### 1. DECLARATION OF MEETING

The Presiding Member declared the meeting open at 6.02 pm.

She acknowledged the Noongar people who are the Traditional Custodians of this Land. She paid respect to the Elders, both past and present, of the Noongar Nation and extended that respect to other Indigenous Australians who may be present.

#### 2. APPOINTMENT OF PRESIDING MEMBER (If required)

Nil.



**3. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF RECEIPT OF WRITTEN DECLARATIONS OF FINANCIAL INTERESTS AND CONFLICT OF INTEREST (BY PRESIDING MEMBER)**

Nil

**4 (DAPPS 23/02/2017) - APOLOGIES & LEAVE OF ABSENCE**

Clr Lyndsey Sweetman	-	Apology
Clr Kevin Allen	-	Apology
Clr Stephen Pratt	-	Apology

**5. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES**

**5.1 (MINUTE NO 392) (DAPPS 23/02/2017) - MINUTES OF THE DELEGATED AUTHORITIES, POLICIES AND POSITION STATEMENTS COMMITTEE MEETING - 24/11/2016**

**RECOMMENDATION**

That Committee confirms the Minutes of the Delegated Authorities, Policies and Position Statements Committee Meeting held on Thursday, 24 November 2016, as a true and accurate record.

**COMMITTEE DECISION**

MOVED Clr S Portelli SECONDED Clr P Eva that the recommendation be adopted.

**CARRIED 5/0**

**6. DEPUTATIONS**

Nil

**7. PETITIONS**

Nil

**8. BUSINESS LEFT OVER FROM THE PREVIOUS MEETING (IF ADJOURNED)**

Nil



**9 (DAPPS 23/02/2017) - DECLARATION OF COUNCILLORS WHO HAVE NOT GIVEN DUE CONSIDERATION TO MATTERS IN THE BUSINESS PAPER**

AT THIS POINT IN THE MEETING, THE TIME BEING 6.05 PM THE FOLLOWING ITEMS WERE CARRIED BY 'EN BLOC' RESOLUTION OF COMMITTEE

11.1	13.2	14.1
11.3	13.4	14.2
11.4		
11.5		

**10. COUNCIL MATTERS**

Nil

**11. PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT DIVISION ISSUES**

**11.1 (MINUTE NO 393) (DAPPS 23/02/2017) - ADOPTION OF PROPOSED LOCAL PLANNING POLICY LPP 3.7 'SIGNS AND ADVERTISING' (182/001) (C DA COSTA) (ATTACH)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

That Council adopt the proposed Local Planning Policy LPP 3.7 'Signs and Advertising' for finalisation in accordance with Clause 4 of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*, as shown in the attachment to the Agenda.

**COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION**

MOVED Cllr S Portelli SECONDED Cllr P Eva that the recommendation be adopted.

**CARRIED 5/0**

**COUNCIL DECISION**

## Background

A new Local Planning Policy 'Signs and Advertising' was adopted by Council for the purposes of advertising in accordance with Clause 4 (1) of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015* at its meeting held on 08 December 2016.

The policy was subsequently advertised and no comments were received during the advertising period.

The Local Planning Policy LPP 3.7 'Signs and Advertising' provides guidance for decision making in relation to signs and advertising in the City of Cockburn.

## Submission

N/A

## Report

The purpose of this policy is to provide guidance for applicants, Council and the community in the assessment and determination of applications for various types of signs and advertising within the City.

The policy intends to replace the existing policy provisions with the enclosed draft new LPP. A brief summary of the changes are outlined below:

- Wording changes to exclude unnecessary provisions
- Clarification and modification to specific sign provisions (height, depth, width)
- Rearrangement of existing provisions
- Inclusion of new images
- Inclusion of new sign types
- Overall reformatting to improve readability.

Some additional changes were made post the advertising period, which can be seen in the track changes of the attached draft LPP 3.7 and relate to:

- Numbering the signs from 1 to 19
- Clarifying Variable Message Signs (Sign No. 17)
- Correcting the reference to Awning Sign (Below) and Projecting sign (Sign No. 4)
- Minor administrative corrections.



## **Strategic Plan/Policy Implications**

### **City Growth**

- Ensure planning facilitates a desirable living environment and meets growth targets

### **Economic, Social & Environmental Responsibility**

- Create opportunities for community, business and industry to establish and thrive through planning, policy and community development

### **Leading & Listening**

- Deliver sustainable governance through transparent and robust policy and processes

## **Budget/Financial Implications**

N/A

## **Legal Implications**

N/A

## **Community Consultation**

Consultation was undertaken in accordance with the requirements of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015* and no submissions were received.

## **Risk Management Implications**

If the subject draft policy is not adopted, it could result in an inconsistent approach to decision making with regards to dealing with signs and advertisements, which is undesirable and could damage the brand and/or reputation of the City.

## **Attachment(s)**

1. Existing Local Planning Policy LPP 3.7 'Signs and Advertising' (Superseded)
2. Proposed amended Local Planning Policy LPP 3.7 'Signs and Advertising'.

## **Advice to Proponent(s)/Submissioners**

N/A.



**Implications of Section 3.18(3) Local Government Act, 1995**

Nil.

**11.2 (MINUTE NO 394) (DAPPS 23/02/2017) - PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO LOCAL PLANNING POLICY LPP 4.6 'COCKBURN COAST DESIGN GUIDELINES FOR ROB JETTY AND EMPLACEMENT PRECINCTS' (182/001) (A LEFORT) (ATTACH)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

That Council adopt proposed amendments to Local Planning Policy LPP 4.6 'Cockburn Coast Design Guidelines for Rob Jetty and Emplacement Precincts' for the purposes of advertising in accordance with Clause 5 of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015* for a period of 21 days, as shown in the attachments to the Agenda.

**COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION**

MOVED Deputy Mayor C Reeve-Fowkes SECONDED Cllr S Portelli that adopt modifications to Local Planning Policy LPP 4.6 'Cockburn Coast Design Guidelines for Robb Jetty and Emplacement Precincts' for the purposes of advertising in accordance with Clause (4) (1) of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015* for a period of 21 days except for the following:

- (a) amending all references to wall setbacks to public open space in the Activity Centre, Mixed Use – Cockburn Road and High Density Residential Built Form Typologies to a minimum of 4m (as per the current policy), not 3m as proposed.

as shown in the attachment to the Minutes.

**CARRIED 5/0**

**COUNCIL DECISION**

**Reason for Decision**

The proposed amendments to the Local Planning Policy relating to the reduction in setbacks to areas of public open space were proposed to provide greater flexibility for the R40 single residential lots. The proposed amendments however as currently worded facilitate the



changes to the public open space setback applying to all housing typologies not just single dwellings. The alternative seeks to address that by excluding the setback relaxation for all other housing typologies.

## Background

Council first adopted Local Planning Policy LPP 4.6 Cockburn Coast Design Guidelines for Rob Jetty and Emplacement precincts on 9 May 2013, approximately three years prior to Landcorp's first land releases in the area which have occurred more recently. Since the design guidelines have been implemented, it is recognised by Landcorp and the City that the document requires a number of modifications to avoid ambiguity and ultimately deliver better outcomes.

Landcorp and the City have drafted a number of modifications which range from simple administrative to more detailed changes which will be discussed below.

## Submission

N/A

## Report

The non-administrative changes to the policy include:

- Clarification of setback requirements for buildings particularly relating to balconies;
- Reduction of setbacks to public open space from 4m to 3m;
- Clarification of building heights to avoid confusion in the interpretation of the building heights plans (figure 14);
- Fencing requirements relocated to a new section in each typology;
- Clarification that the Mixed Use – Cockburn Road Typology includes both Mixed Use and Mixed Business zones;
- Clarification of open space provisions for grouped dwellings and single houses;
- Introduction of a requirement for communal open space for multiple dwelling developments which is consistent with the State Government's draft Apartment Design Guide.

The above modifications to the policy are considered relatively minor and are being recommended in collaboration with Landcorp to provide more clarity and consistency across the various planning documents applicable to the area.





It is envisaged however that further modifications to the design guidelines may be warranted once the State Government's Apartment Design Guide is finalised to provide greater consistency between apartment development in this area and in other areas around Western Australia.

### **Strategic Plan/Policy Implications**

#### **City Growth**

- Ensure planning facilitates a desirable living environment and meets growth targets
- Continue revitalisation of older urban areas to cater for population growth and take account of social changes such as changing household types
- Ensure growing high density living is balanced with the provision of open space and social spaces
- Ensure a variation in housing density and housing type is available to residents
- Maintain service levels across all programs and areas

#### **Leading & Listening**

- Deliver sustainable governance through transparent and robust policy and processes

### **Budget/Financial Implications**

Costs involved in advertising the modifications shall be met by Council's municipal funds.

### **Legal Implications**

N/A

### **Community Consultation**

In accordance with the Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations, the proposed modifications to the policy shall be advertised for a period of no less than 21 days.

### **Risk Management Implications**

Should Council not support the proposed modifications there is a minor risk that there could be inconsistency between those interpreting the



design guidelines which is undesirable and could cause minor damage the City's reputation.

### **Attachment(s)**

Proposed amended Local Planning Policy LPP 4.6 'Cockburn Coast Design Guidelines for Rob Jetty and Emplacement Precincts'.

### **Advice to Proponent(s)/Submissioners**

N/A

### **Implications of Section 3.18(3) Local Government Act, 1995**

Nil.

## **11.3 (MINUTE NO 395) (DAPPS 23/02/2017) - PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO LOCAL PLANNING POLICY 5.15 'ACCESS STREET - ROAD RESERVE & PAVEMENT STANDARDS' (182/001, 110/161) (T VAN DER LINDE) (ATTACH)**

### **RECOMMENDATION**

That Council adopt proposed amendments to Local Planning Policy 5.15 'Access Street – Road Reserve and Pavement Standards' for finalisation in accordance with Clause 5(1) of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*, as shown in the attachment to the Agenda.

### **COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION**

MOVED Cllr S Portelli SECONDED Cllr P Eva that the recommendation be adopted.

**CARRIED 5/0**

### **COUNCIL DECISION**

### **Background**

The draft amended Local Planning Policy 5.15 'Access Street – Road Reserve & Pavement Standards' ("the Policy") was adopted by Council for the purposes of advertising in accordance with Clause 5(1) of the



*Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015* at its meeting held on 24 November 2016.

The amended policy was subsequently advertised for 21 days. No submissions were received during the advertising period.

The purpose of this report is to adopt the amended Policy for finalisation.

### **Submission**

N/A

### **Report**

The Policy acknowledges Liveable Neighbourhoods as the City's primary policy guidance in regards to integrated movement and street design, but also provides the ability for the City to require variations to Liveable Neighbourhoods if this results in a more optimal movement network.

This Policy amendment aims to provide further guidance on optimal design of the movement network where it relates to laneways. Laneways are to be designed in a way that ensures unobstructed sight lines along laneways for residents, visitors and the City's refuse collection trucks whilst also allowing ease of navigation by all vehicles. This amendment seeks to specifically respond to the issue of substandard laneway designs, and to ensure such does not occur within the City of Cockburn.

### **Waste Collection**

There have been a number of instances within the City where right angle or bent laneways have been developed which has caused increased risk and difficulties for the City's refuse trucks. Refuse truck drivers cannot see the laneway exit when entering these laneways and often encounter private vehicles parked around the first corner or bend of the laneway, obstructing the carriageway, and resulting in the truck being required to reverse back out. This is a hazardous manoeuvre and has resulted in damage to property in the past. An example of a laneway which is likely to create potential safety risks is provided below (Figure 1).





*Figure 1 The bend in the laneway does not allow refuse truck drivers to see obstructions within the laneway before entering*

A straight laneway is the safest option for the City's refuse trucks and the only design that allows drivers to see if there are any obstructions within the laneway before entering. It is unlikely that refuse trucks will need to reverse out of these laneways due to unforeseen obstruction, minimising risk of collision and damage to property. Thus, the City's position is that laneways should only be a straight, short connection between two public roads.

### Passive Surveillance

Right angle bends or curves obstruct sight lines down the length of laneways and thus limit passive surveillance of these laneways from the public road. Though Liveable Neighbourhoods (LN) allows 'T' or bent laneways (noting LN does not consider waste management), this is generally only desirable where a studio is positioned at the laneway intersection or at the bend in the laneway to increase passive surveillance in both directions. However, this is rarely put into practice and often dwellings gaining vehicle access from laneways do not have any habitable rooms or windows fronting the laneway. An example of this is provided below (Figure 2). Thus, opportunities for passive surveillance of the laneway in either direction from the intersection or bend within the laneway are diminished. This results in the potential for laneways to be subject to vandalism and crime as they are hidden from the public eye.





*Figure 2 The bend in the laneway obstructs sight lines from the public road down the length of the laneway, and the laneway is dominated by garages providing no opportunities for passive surveillance from the dwellings*

Concerns regarding passive surveillance also apply to straight laneways located between two public roads where the laneway is dominated by garages. In these situations, it is important that lots facing the entry and exit points of laneways on the opposite side of the public road are centred to the laneway as illustrated in Figure 3 below. This allows a direct line of sight from the habitable rooms of the dwelling down the length of the laneway, providing opportunities for passive surveillance. Thus, proposed lot layouts and street block orientation should be appropriately designed to ensure sight lines are achieved from habitable rooms down the length of laneways, rather than boundary fences or garages occupying this space.



*Figure 3 A dwelling has been centred to the laneway to allow direct line of sight from a habitable room down the length of the laneway*

Therefore, the proposed amendment to the Policy seeks to eliminate the development of unsafe laneways that are difficult to manoeuvre in



order to benefit both the City, in terms of waste collection services, and residents, by reducing risk of damage to property and increasing passive surveillance of laneways.

## **Strategic Plan/Policy Implications**

### **City Growth**

- Ensure planning facilitates a desirable living environment and meets growth targets
- Maintain service levels across all programs and areas

### **Moving Around**

- Improve connectivity of transport infrastructure

### **Community, Lifestyle & Security**

- Provide for community facilities and infrastructure in a planned and sustainable manner

### **Economic, Social & Environmental Responsibility**

- Improve water efficiency, energy efficiency and waste management within the City's buildings and facilities and more broadly in our community

### **Leading & Listening**

- Provide for community and civic infrastructure in a planned and sustainable manner, including administration, operations and waste management

## **Budget/Financial Implications**

N/A

## **Legal Implications**

N/A

## **Community Consultation**

Consultation was undertaken for 28 days from 20 December 2016 until 17 January 2017 in accordance with the requirements of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*. No submissions were received.

## **Risk Management Implications**

Not supporting the amendment to the Policy may result in the continuous development of unsafe laneways that do not allow for the



safe and efficient movement of refuse trucks, or sufficient passive surveillance from neighbouring dwellings.

**Attachment(s)**

Proposed amended Local Planning Policy 5.15 – ‘Access Street – Road Reserve and Pavement Standards’.

**Advice to Proponent(s)/Submissioners**

N/A

**Implications of Section 3.18(3) Local Government Act, 1995**

Nil.

**11.4 (MINUTE NO 396) (DAPPS 23/02/2017) - REVIEW AND MINOR MODIFICATIONS TO LOCAL PLANNING POLICIES (182/001) (C DA COSTA) (ATTACH)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

That Council adopt proposed amendments to the Local Planning Policies, in accordance with Clause 5(2) of the Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015, as outlined in the report, as shown in the attachments to the Agenda.

**COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION**


MOVED Cllr S Portelli SECONDED Cllr P Eva that the recommendation be adopted.

**CARRIED 5/0**

**COUNCIL DECISION**

**Background**

The local planning policies, the subject of this report, require minor modifications. The modifications are administrative to align with the changes referencing ‘Town Planning Scheme’ to ‘Local Planning Scheme’ as per the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*.



Other changes are minor in nature, and serve to clarify certain elements of the policies. A table depicting the changes to each policy is clarified in the 'Report' section.

### Submission

N/A

### Report

The local planning policies proposed to be amended are reflected in the table below. All references to the Delegated Authority in the Delegations are also changed from 'Town Planning Scheme No. 3' to 'Local Planning Scheme No. 3'.

Ref No.	Local Planning Policy	Delegated Authority Reference	Change Summary
LPP 1.1	Residential Design Codes Alternative Deemed to Comply Provisions	OLPD33	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Changing reference to Town Planning Scheme No. 3 to Local Planning Scheme No. 3 (LPS 3) as referenced in LPS 3 gazetted on 26 August 2016 and updated 24 October 2016.</li> <li>Clarifying the provisions for the outbuilding boundary walls.</li> </ul>
LPP 1.2	Residential Design Guidelines	OLPD33	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Changing reference to Town Planning Scheme No. 3 to LPS 3 as referenced in LPS 3 gazetted on 26 August 2016 and updated 24 October 2016.</li> <li>Clarifying the requirements for walls on the boundary abutting Public Access Ways (PAW), Right of Ways (ROW), Public Open Space (POS), and any other reservations.</li> </ul>
LPP 1.4	Aged or Dependent Persons' Dwellings	OLPD33	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarifying 5 (a)(b) in relation to high frequency bus routes.</li> </ul>
LPP 1.5	Single Bedroom Dwellings	OLPD33	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Changing reference to Town Planning Scheme No. 3 to LPS 3 as referenced in LPS 3 gazetted on 26 August 2016 and updated 24 October</li> </ul>




Ref No.	Local Planning Policy	Delegated Authority Reference	Change Summary
			2016.
LPP 1.6	Lodging Houses	OLPD33	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Changing reference to Town Planning Scheme No. 3 to LPS 3 as referenced in LPS 3 gazetted on 26 August 2016 and updated 24 October 2016.</li> </ul>
LPP 1.7	Coogee Residential Height requirements	OLPD33	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Changing reference to 'pitch' roof to 'pitched' roof under 1(iii) of the Policy.</li> </ul>
LPP 1.8	Flagpoles and Camera Poles	OLPD33	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Changing reference to Town Planning Scheme No. 3 to LPS 3 as referenced in LPS 3 gazetted on 26 August 2016 and updated 24 October 2016.</li> </ul>
LPP 1.9	Domestic Satellite Dishes	OLPD33	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Changing reference to Town Planning Scheme No. 3 to LPS 3 as referenced in LPS 3 gazetted on 26 August 2016 and updated 24 October 2016.</li> </ul>
LPP 1.15	Tourist Accommodation	OLPD33	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Changing reference to Town Planning Scheme No. 3 to LPS 3 as referenced in LPS 3 gazetted on 26 August 2016 and updated 24 October 2016.</li> <li>Clarifying references to 'Park Home Residential Parks'.</li> </ul>
LPP 1.16	Singe House Standards for Medium Density Housing Density in the Development Zone	OLPD33	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Changing reference to Town Planning Scheme No. 3 to LPS 3 as referenced in LPS 3 gazetted on 26 August 2016 and updated 24 October 2016.</li> </ul>
LPP 2.1	Rural Subdivision	OLPD33	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Changing reference to Town Planning Scheme No. 3 to LPS 3 as referenced in LPS 3 gazetted on 26 August 2016 and updated 24 October 2016.</li> </ul>
LPP 2.2	Subdivision in Jandakot and Banjup North of Armadale	OLPD33	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Changing reference to Town Planning Scheme No. 3 to LPS 3 as referenced in LPS 3 gazetted on 26 August 2016</li> </ul>



Ref No.	Local Planning Policy	Delegated Authority Reference	Change Summary
	Road		and updated 24 October 2016.
LPP 2.3	The Keeping of Horses & Other Animals in the Resource Zone	OLPD33	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Changing reference to Town Planning Scheme No. 3 to LPS 3 as referenced in LPS 3 gazetted on 26 August 2016 and updated 24 October 2016.</li> </ul>
LPP 2.4	Outbuildings	OLPD33	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Changing reference to Town Planning Scheme No. 3 to LPS 3 as referenced in LPS 3 gazetted on 26 August 2016 and updated 24 October 2016.</li> </ul>
LPP 2.5	Relocation of Building Envelopes	OLPD33	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Changing reference to Town Planning Scheme No. 3 to LPS 3 as referenced in LPS 3 gazetted on 26 August 2016 and updated 24 October 2016.</li> </ul>
LPP 3.1	Child Care Premises	OLPD33	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Changing reference to Town Planning Scheme No. 3 to LPS 3 as referenced in LPS 3 gazetted on 26 August 2016 and updated 24 October 2016.</li> <li>Changing the title from 'Child Care Centres' to 'Child Care Premises' to align with the use class and use class definition under LPS 3.</li> <li>Clarifying requirements under the Building Code.</li> <li>Clarifying requirements under the State Planning Policy 3.7 and associated Guidelines for vulnerable land uses.</li> </ul>
LPP 3.2	Educational Establishments	OLPD33	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Changing reference to Town Planning Scheme No. 3 to LPS 3 as referenced in LPS 3 gazetted on 26 August 2016 and updated 24 October 2016.</li> </ul>
LPP 3.3	Health Studios	OLPD33	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Changing reference to Town Planning Scheme No. 3 to LPS 3 as referenced in LPS 3 gazetted on 26 August 2016 and updated 24 October 2016.</li> </ul>

Ref No.	Local Planning Policy	Delegated Authority Reference	Change Summary
LPP 3.4	Service Stations	OLPD33	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Changing reference to Town Planning Scheme No. 3 to LPS 3 as referenced in LPS 3 gazetted on 26 August 2016 and updated 24 October 2016.</li> <li>Changing the title from 'Service Stations and Petrol Filling Stations' to 'Service Stations' to align with the use class and use class definition under LPS 3 and the deletion of 'Petrol Filling Station' under LPS 3.</li> <li>Removal of reference to Petrol Filling Stations throughout the Policy.</li> </ul>
LPP 3.6	Licensed Premises (Liquor)	OLPD33	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Changing reference to Town Planning Scheme No. 3 to LPS 3 as referenced in LPS 3 gazetted on 26 August 2016 and updated 24 October 2016.</li> </ul>
LPP 3.8	Industrial Subdivision	OLPD33	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Changing reference to Town Planning Scheme No. 3 to LPS 3 as referenced in LPS 3 gazetted on 26 August 2016 and updated 24 October 2016.</li> </ul>
LPP 3.9	Industrial development	OLPD33	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Changing reference to Town Planning Scheme No. 3 to LPS 3 as referenced in LPS 3 gazetted on 26 August 2016 and updated 24 October 2016.</li> <li>Update reference to AS2890.1 (as amended) in Part 4 – Vehicle Access &amp; Parking of this Policy.</li> </ul>
LPP 3.10	Discretion to Modify Development Standards – Non Residential Development	OLPD33	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Changing reference to Town Planning Scheme No. 3 to LPS 3 as referenced in LPS 3 gazetted on 26 August 2016 and updated 24 October 2016.</li> </ul>
LPP 4.1	Phoenix Business Park Design	OLPD33	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Changing reference to Town Planning Scheme No. 3 to LPS 3 as referenced in LPS 3</li> </ul>



Ref No.	Local Planning Policy	Delegated Authority Reference	Change Summary
	Guidelines		gazetted on 26 August 2016 and updated 24 October 2016.
LPP 4.3	Cockburn Central North (Muriel Court) Structure Plan – Design Guidelines	OLPD33	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Changing reference to Town Planning Scheme No. 3 to LPS 3 as referenced in LPS 3 gazetted on 26 August 2016 and updated 24 October 2016.</li> </ul>
LPP 4.4	Heritage Conservation Design Guidelines	OLPD33/AP D 55	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Changing reference to Town Planning Scheme No. 3 to LPS 3 as referenced in LPS 3 gazetted on 26 August 2016 and updated 24 October 2016.</li> </ul>
LPP 4.5	Naval Base Holiday Park Heritage Area	OLPD33	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Changing reference to Town Planning Scheme No. 3 to LPS 3 as referenced in LPS 3 gazetted on 26 August 2016 and updated 24 October 2016.</li> </ul>
LPP 4.6	Cockburn Coast Design Guidelines for Robb Jetty and Emplacement Precincts	OLPD33	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Changing reference to Town Planning Scheme No. 3 to LPS 3 as referenced in LPS 3 gazetted on 26 August 2016 and updated 24 October 2016.</li> </ul>
LPP 5.5	Local Development Plans	OLPD33	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Changing reference to Town Planning Scheme No. 3 to LPS 3 as referenced in LPS 3 gazetted on 26 August 2016 and updated 24 October 2016.</li> </ul>
LPP 5.7	Uniform Fencing	OLPD33	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Changing reference to Town Planning Scheme No. 3 to LPS 3 as referenced in LPS 3 gazetted on 26 August 2016 and updated 24 October 2016.</li> <li>Minor formatting changes to the text.</li> </ul>
LPP 5.8	Sea Containers	OLPD33	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Changing reference to Town Planning Scheme No. 3 to LPS 3 as referenced in LPS 3 gazetted on 26 August 2016 and updated 24 October 2016.</li> </ul>

Ref No.	Local Planning Policy	Delegated Authority Reference	Change Summary
LPP 5.13	Percent for Art	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Changing reference to Town Planning Scheme No. 3 to LPS 3 as referenced in LPS 3 gazetted on 26 August 2016 and updated 24 October 2016.</li> <li>Clarification on estimated cost of development for the purpose of art contribution to be calculated exclusive of GST.</li> </ul>
LPP 5.14	Cockburn Coast Percent for Art		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Changing reference to Town Planning Scheme No. 3 to LPS 3 as referenced in LPS 3 gazetted on 26 August 2016 and updated 24 October 2016.</li> <li>Clarification on estimated cost of development for the purpose of art contribution to be calculated exclusive of GST.</li> </ul>
LPP 5.16	Design Review Panel	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Changing reference to Town Planning Scheme No. 3 to LPS 3 as referenced in LPS 3 gazetted on 26 August 2016 and updated 24 October 2016.</li> </ul>
LPP 5.17	Cockburn Central Percent for Art	N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Changing reference to Town Planning Scheme No. 3 to LPS 3 as referenced in LPS 3 gazetted on 26 August 2016 and updated 24 October 2016.</li> <li>Clarification on estimated cost of development for the purpose of art contribution to be calculated exclusive of GST.</li> </ul>

Where reference is made to Town Planning Scheme No.3 in certain Policies in the above mentioned table, (which is not attached to this report), the amendment to reference the new legislation to Local Planning Scheme No.3 will be undertaken administratively.



## **Strategic Plan/Policy Implications**

### **City Growth**

- Continue revitalisation of older urban areas to cater for population growth and take account of social changes such as changing household types.
- Ensure a variation in housing density and housing type is available to residents.

### **Community, Lifestyle & Security**

- Provide for community facilities and infrastructure in a planned and sustainable manner.

## **Budget/Financial Implications**

N/A

## **Legal Implications**

N/A

## **Community Consultation**

N/A

## **Risk Management Implications**

If the subject changes to the policies are not adopted and therefore not progressed, some inconsistencies would occur in relation to existing practices. This practice needs to be formalised in a policy for consistency and reliability.

## **Attachment(s)**

1. LPP 1.1 'Residential Design Codes Alternative Deemed to Comply Provisions'
2. LPP 1.2 'Residential Design Guidelines'
3. LPP 1.4 'Aged or Dependent Persons' Dwellings'
4. LPP 1.7 'Coogee Residential Height requirements'
5. LPP 1.15 'Tourist Accommodation'
6. LPP 3.1 'Child Care Premises'
7. LPP 3.4 'Service Stations'
8. LPP 3.9 'Industrial Development'
9. LPP 5.7 'Uniform Fencing'
10. LPP 5.13 'Percent for Art'
11. LPP 5.14 'Cockburn Coast Percent for Art'
12. LPP 5.17 'Cockburn Central Percent for Art'



**Advice to Proponent(s)/Submissioners**

N/A

**Implications of Section 3.18(3) Local Government Act, 1995**

Nil.

**11.5 (MINUTE NO 397) (DAPPS 23/02/2017) - PROPOSED NEW LOCAL PLANNING POLICY LPP 5.18 'SUBDIVISION AND DEVELOPMENT STREET TREES' (104/001, 182/001) (G LILLEY) (ATTACH)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

That Council adopt proposed new Local Planning Policy LPP 5.18 'Subdivision and Development Street Trees', in accordance with Clause 5(1) of the Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015, as shown in the attachment to the Agenda.

**COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION**

MOVED Cllr S Portelli SECONDED Cllr P Eva that the recommendation be adopted.

**CARRIED 5/0**

**COUNCIL DECISION**

**Background**

The draft Local Planning Policy – 'Subdivision and Development Street Tree Policy' ("the Policy") was first adopted by Council for the purposes of advertising in accordance with Clause 5(1) of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015* at its meeting held on 8 December 2016. This followed consideration by the Committee of Council on 24 November 2016.

The purpose of the Policy is to provide a framework to ensure that the numbers of street trees are increased through a coordinated approach to involving:



- retaining and protecting street trees through the development process;
- selecting suitable tree/s that are planted as part of subdivision and development works;
- maintenance of the street tree.

The Policy will help to ensure the improvement of the appearance of the City's streetscapes and deliver upon Council's vision to "ensure that the Cockburn of the future will be the most attractive place to live, work, visit and invest in, within the Perth metropolitan area."

The Policy was subsequently advertised for 21 days. Eight (8) submissions were received during the advertising period, of which none raised any objections to the Policy.

### **Submission**

N/A

### **Report**

The purpose of this report is for Council to consider adopting the Policy for final approval as shown in Attachment 1. The Policy has been prepared to ensure that the City's 35,000 plus street trees are increased as the City recognises the importance of these trees in contributing to the health and well-being of our communities.

The Policy seeks to:

1. *Preserve the City's Urban Forest through street tree protection and maintenance programs;*
2. *Increase the number of street trees on verges through proactive planting programs;*
3. *Improve the appearance of streetscapes, especially with trees suitable for shade;*
4. *Increase public awareness of the benefits of street tree/s.*

### **Policy Provisions**

The policy applies to land which is zoned Residential, Regional Centre, District Centre, Local Centre, Mixed Business, Mixed Use, Industry and Light and Service Industry. It recognises that within these zones, there is typically subdivision and/or development taking place, either together or separately. To address the scenarios of subdivision and development being an appropriate trigger to secure street trees, the policy sets out the following provisions of how street trees will be secured:





1. Street tree planting as part of subdivision works

Once an applicant, subdivider, developer or landowner receives a subdivision application approval which involves civil works, the Policy will require them to submit engineering/civil works drawings to indicate the provision of street trees to be planted on both sides of all streets within the subdivision area.

Street trees will be provided at the following rates:

- the rate of one tree per lot, or in the case of lots less than a 10m width, at a rate to be determined by the City;
- must comprise of a species to the satisfaction of the City and which will mature to a sufficient size and canopy; and
- be located such as to provide sufficient shading of the street verge area to the satisfaction of the City.

An applicant then has the choice to satisfy their street tree planting obligations by choosing one of the following options:

Option 1 (preferred) - Applicant provides contribution payment to City of Cockburn who then takes responsibility


In this option, an applicant can choose to pay the City \$600 per street tree. This payment must be made prior to the practical completion certification of the civil works. In receiving this contribution, the City will purchase, install and maintain all street trees within the subdivision for three years. Installation will occur at the most optimal time in the opinion of the City, taking in to account development rates on each lot.

Option 2 - Applicant takes responsibility and plants the trees prior to clearance of the subdivision

The applicant is required to install and manage the street trees for a three year period post installation, performing sound Arboricultural maintenance practices that promote good form and shape with a well-defined canopy, to the satisfaction of the City. Street trees which are not adequately maintained in the opinion of the City will be required to be removed, replaced and maintained for a further three years. Details of maintenance must be set out in the Street Tree Management Plan.

Option 3 - Applicant takes responsibility and plants the trees after clearance and after each lot is developed.

The key difference with this option and Option 2 is that to achieve clearance of the subdivision, a bond equal to \$600 per street tree must be provided to the City. The City will return this in one amount once all street trees have been planted and maintained consistent with the Street Tree Management Plan.



The above processes as they pertain to subdivision are similar to development also. Key differences will however be

- in residential zoned areas one street tree per lot will be required.
- in all other zoned areas the street tree rate will be determined based on the width of the lot, and taking in to account relevant issues like vehicle access.

### Strategic Community Plan 2016-2026

The Policy is aligned to the specific objective to “improve the appearance of streetscapes, especially with trees suitable for shade.” Council’s objective will be measured and become achieved through the provision of new street trees, associated with subdivision and/or development within the City.

Furthermore, the policy also reflects community feedback which lists streetscape appearances as a high community priority in Cockburn.

### Conclusion

The Policy will assist in the delivery of the Council’s vision to “ensure that the Cockburn of the future will be the most attractive place to live, work, visit and invest in, within the Perth metropolitan area.”

It is therefore recommended that Council adopt the Subdivision and Development Street Tree Policy as included at Attachment 1.

## **Strategic Policy Implications**

### **City Growth**

- Ensure planning facilitates a desirable living environment and meets growth targets

### **Community, Lifestyle & Security**

- Provide for community facilities and infrastructure in a planned and sustainable manner
- Provide safe places and activities for residents and visitors to relax and socialise

### **Economic, Social & Environmental Responsibility**

- Sustainably manage our environment by protecting, managing and enhancing our unique natural resources and minimising risks to human health
- Improve the appearance of streetscapes, especially with trees suitable for shade



### **Budget/Financial Implications**

Either an applicant provides and maintains the street trees for a three year period, or they pay a contribution to the City of \$600 per tree to do this which covers the City's costs during the maintenance period.

The annual budget for street tree maintenance will need to be reviewed every year as more street trees come off maintenance and become City assets..

### **Legal Implications**

N/A

### **Community Consultation**

The Policy was advertised for public comment from 20 December 2016 until 17 January 2017. A total of eight (8) submissions were made, all of which supported the Policy.

### **Risk Management Implications**

Not supporting the policy will result in unclear guidance for subdividers and developers, and inconsistent approaches taken to the provision of street trees. This will likely result in the lack of provision of street trees as messages being sent to the community about the values of trees within Cockburn.

### **Attachment(s)**

1. Proposed new Local Planning Policy LPP 5.18 'Subdivision and Development Street Tree'
2. Schedule of Submissions

### **Advice to Proponent(s)/Submissioners**

N/A

### **Implications of Section 3.18(3) Local Government Act, 1995**

Nil.

## **12. FINANCE & CORPORATE SERVICES DIVISION ISSUES**

Nil



### 13. ENGINEERING & WORKS DIVISION ISSUES

#### 13.1 **(MINUTE NO 398) (DAPPS 23/02/2017) - PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO AEW1 'STREET VERGE IMPROVEMENTS' (182/001) (C DUNN) (ATTACH)**

##### **RECOMMENDATION**

That Council adopt the proposed amendments to AEW1 'Street Verge Improvements', as shown in the attachment the Agenda.

##### **COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION**

MOVED Cllr S Portelli SECONDED Cllr B Houwen that the recommendation be adopted.

**CARRIED 5/0**

##### **COUNCIL DECISION**

### **Background**

In 1997 Council adopted a Street Verge Improvements policy recognising that the appearance of street verges is important to owners / occupiers, because of the potentially significant aesthetic impact of verges on their dwellings and properties.

The City has a duty of care to ensure that verges are safe and secure for the public. This policy maintains the community's safety and provides advice and guidance on the constraints and opportunities residents should take note of when improving the City's street verges.

This policy has recently undergone review by an external consultant offering recommendations for the City to meet the minimum water wise criteria as endorsed by the Water Corporation.

### **Submission**

N/A

### **Report**

The main amendments that are proposed are:

1. *Including in the policy PURPOSE: to encourage biodiversity and strengthen ecological corridors*
  - Rationale for amendment: to specify and clarify for residents outcomes linked to the purpose of promoting the principles of environmental sustainability
2. *Expansion of the 'Permitted Verge Improvements – Shrubs and Plants' section to include reference to other City resources in relation to water wise plants.*
  - Rationale for amendment: providing Council, staff and community with reference to environmentally sustainable verge improvements, specifically native plants as recommended under external consultant review of this policy.
3. *Expansion of the 'Permitted Verge Improvements – Shrubs and Plants' section to preference no/low-water use landscape, encouraging drip irrigation, the need to be aware of allocated water days and noting the possibility for residents to seek exemption from water restrictions.*
  - Rationale for amendment: to promote to Council, staff and community best practice in water wise irrigation as recommended under external consultant review of this policy.
4. *Insertion of a new section – Edible Gardens*
  - Rationale for this new section has been brought about by a number of residents querying the utilisation of the verge area to grow vegetables for personal and community use. The section outlines the conditions to insure the City's risks are minimised.
5. *Further expansion of the 'Mulch' section to note the preference for mulch varieties that use minimal amounts of water.*
  - Rationale for amendment: to promote to Council, staff and community best practice in water wise mulch application as recommended under external consultant review of this policy.
6. *Revision of the Synthetic Turf section to mitigate the impacts of heat and storm water runoff.*
  - Rationale for the amendment is to ensure a trees canopy will extend over the synthetic turf area mitigating the build-up heat in the soil and surrounding environment whilst increasing the density of street trees throughout the City. The conditions outlined place the onus on the applicant to ensure the synthetic turf is maintained to an acceptable level and not used as a carpark
7. *Further expansion of the 'Paving' section to include permission to pave up to 25% (not set at 25%) of the verge surface area excluding the crossover as determined by the City in cases where it*



*has been deemed that paving to the entire verge for parking is not supported.*

- Rationale for amendment: to limit cases where trees roots become severed and verges left in an untidy state for the installation of a small area of paving.

8. *Several formatting amendments throughout policy.*

- Rationale for amendment: For ease of reading and practicality of layout resulting from specific policy amendments.

## **Strategic Plan/Policy Implications**

### **Economic, Social & Environmental Responsibility**

- Sustainably manage our environment by protecting, managing and enhancing our unique natural resources and minimising risks to human health
- Improve water efficiency, energy efficiency and waste management within the City's buildings and facilities and more broadly in our community

### **Budget/Financial Implications**

N/A

### **Legal Implications**

N/A

### **Community Consultation**

N/A

### **Risk Management Implications**

Failure to adopt this policy may result in situations where non-compliant verges create a safety risk to the community which may leave the City liable for any injury or damages claims.

### **Attachment(s)**

1. Proposed amended Policy AEW1 'Street Verge Improvement'
2. JBA City of Cockburn Verge Policy Review & Recommendations

### **Advice to Proponent(s)/Submissioners**

N/A



**Implications of Section 3.18(3) Local Government Act, 1995**

Nil.

**13.2 (MINUTE NO 399) (DAPPS 23/02/2017) - PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO POLICY AEW5 'LANDOWNER BIODIVERSITY GRANT PROGRAM' AND ASSOCIATED DELEGATED AUTHORITY (182/001) (A HARRIS) (ATTACH)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

That Council adopt:

- (1) the proposed amendments to Policy AEW5 'Landowner Biodiversity Conservation Grant Program', as shown in the attachments to the Agenda;
- (2) associated Delegated Authority with no changes, as shown in the attachments to the Agenda; and
- (3) update the Delegated Authority Register accordingly.

**TO BE CARRIED BY AN ABSOLUTE MAJORITY OF COUNCIL**

**COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION**

MOVED Clr S Portelli SECONDED Clr P Eva that the recommendation be adopted.

**CARRIED 5/0**

**TO BE CARRIED BY AN ABSOLUTE MAJORITY OF COUNCIL**

**COUNCIL DECISION**

**Background**

As a consequence of urbanisation, local bushland has become fragmented and is increasingly under threat from a variety of causes that contribute to its degradation.

Privately owned bushland is therefore an important resource, forming part of wildlife corridors and bushland linkages for the migration of birds



and animals. It plays a vital role in maintaining both the diversity of species at the individual plant level as well as diversity within the gene pool.

Given the importance of bushland, the City established the Landowner Biodiversity Conservation Grant Program to provide assist to landowners to manage their bushland.

### **Submission**

N/A

### **Report**

The City of Cockburn Landowner Biodiversity Conservation Program has been running for more than 12 years. During this time numerous landowners have applied and received funding. However because there have been no restrictions on how many times a landowner can apply for funding many landowners have applied each year. Restricting access to the grant program will allow funds to be distributed to other landowners and encourage previous funding recipients to become less reliant on grant funding to maintain their bushland.

The proposed amendment will result in the policy outline reflecting the following:

- Landowners are now only eligible for funding under the *Landowner Biodiversity Conservation Grant Program* for a maximum of three years. Landowners will not become eligible to apply for funding again until after an additional period of three years has elapsed.

### **Strategic Plan/Policy Implications**

#### **Economic, Social & Environmental Responsibility**

- Sustainably manage our environment by protecting, managing and enhancing our unique natural resources and minimising risks to human health

#### **Budget/Financial Implications**

Currently Council allocates \$35,000 to the Landowner Biodiversity Grant Program. Funding is expected to remain the same however it is expected that a larger range of landowners will be able to access the funding.

#### **Legal Implications**

N/A





**Community Consultation**

N/A

**Risk Management Implications**

There are minimal risks associated with the proposed policy changes as its principles purpose is to ensure a greater distribution of funds through the communities rural precincts.

**Attachment(s)**

1. Proposed amendments to Policy AEW5 'Landowner Biodiversity Conservation Grant Program'
2. Delegated Authority AEW5 "Landowner Biodiversity Conservation Grant Program'

**Advice to Proponent(s)/Submissioners**

N/A

**Implications of Section 3.18(3) Local Government Act, 1995**

Nil.

**13.3 (MINUTE NO 400) (DAPPS 23/02/2017) - REVIEW OF ENGINEERING & WORKS SERVICES(EWS) POLICIES, POSITION STATEMENTS AND DELEGATED AUTHORITIES (182/001, 182/002, 086/003) (A LEES/ J KIURSKI) (ATTACH)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

That Council adopt:

- (1) Policies AEW2 – AEW12, SEW1 – SEW6 and associated Delegated Authorities, Position Statements PSEW2 – PSEW20, as shown in report;
- (2) Position Statement PSES15 'Removal and Pruning of Trees' and Policy AEW3 'Street Lighting', as shown in the attachments to the Agenda; and
- (3) update the Delegated Authority Register accordingly.

**TO BE CARRIED BY AN ABSOLUTE MAJORITY OF COUNCIL**



**COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION**

MOVED Mayor L Howlett SECONDED Cllr B Houwen that the recommendation be adopted subject to amending Position Statement PSEW15 'Removal and Pruning of Trees', under sub-heading 'Pruning of Trees' as follows:

- (1) amend reference to Australian Standard AS 4373 to 2007 instead of 1996; and
- (2) include sub-clause (6) to read as follows:
  - (6) Minor trimming of a branch on the undercroft of a verge tree is permissible for pedestrian safety or as a result of damage but any other pruning must be carried out by City Officers or contractors employed by the City as excessive pruning may result in permanent damage to the health of a tree which may result in future replacement cost to the City.

as shown in the attachment to the Minutes.

**CARRIED 5/0**

**TO BE CARRIED BY AN ABSOLUTE MAJORITY OF COUNCIL**

**COUNCIL DECISION****Reason for Decision**

The Australian Standard AS 4373-2007 which covers pruning of trees and has been the basis of the City's tree maintenance does not define the difference between major and minor pruning but rather describes the correct method of pruning and the technique involved. City officers are aware that informal pruning of verge trees is often carried out without the knowledge of or reference to the City officers and hence results in a risk to the maintenance of healthy verge tree assets. The proposed amendment to PSEW15 allows for minor trimming only of individual branches on the undercroft of a tree due to an immediate safety danger to pedestrians or as a result of damage to the tree. It must be emphasised that indiscriminate or excessive tree pruning must not be allowed as this could result in substantial future costs to the City in tree replacement if the health of verge trees is affected by untrained persons pruning these trees.

## Background

Pursuant to Council Policy SC47, Council is to review its Delegated Authorities, Policies and Position Statements (DAPPS) at least every two years.

The documents subject to specific review at this Committee Meeting are the Engineering & Works Services (EWS) Unit.

## Submission

N/A

## Report

The previous overall review of these documents was undertaken in August 2015, and adopted by Council in September 2015. Therefore, in accordance with Council Policy SC47, the review of these documents is timely.

Relevant City Officers have undertaken a review of the documents and have found that most remain current and any recommended amendments are mostly cosmetic, to reflect current nomenclature, or changed format to maintain currency of the information contained within the documents. Where significant changes have been made to any documents, these have considered separately in this Agenda.


The table below identifies the documents reviewed and highlights any amendments proposed. Note references to Position Statements are prefixed with "PSEW", while Policies and Delegated Authorities are identified as "AEW" and "SEW".

No.	Proposed Amendment	Reason for Amendment
<b><u>Policies</u></b>		
AEW1 – Street Verge Improvements	Subject of separate report	
AEW2 – Kerbside House Numbering	No Change	No Change
AEW3 – Street Lighting	Under the heading Policy point (6) - remove \$6,500 and replace with \$9,000	Western Power installation cost increase
AEW4 - Installation of Playground/Recreation Equipment on Reserves	No Change	No Change
AEW5 - Landowner	Subject of separate	



No.	Proposed Amendment	Reason for Amendment
Biodiversity Conservation Grant program	report	
AEW6 – Promotional Street Banners	No Change	No Change
AEW7 – Establishment of Community Gardens	No Change	No Change
AEW8 – Temporary Road Closures	No Change	No Change
AEW9 - Internally Illuminated Directional Signs	No Change	No Change
AEW10 - Submission and Comment on Environmental Approvals and Matters	No Change	No Change
AEW11 – Open Space Lighting	No Change	No Change
AEW12 - AEW10 – Installation of Private Memorial Plaques in Public Open Space	No Change	No Change
SEW1 - Maintenance of Verges and Public Open Space (POS) Following Residential Subdivision	No Change	No Change
SEW2 – Street & Public Area Lighting	No Change	No Change
SEW3 – Traffic Management Investigation		
SEW4 – Bushland Conservation	No Change	No Change
SEW5 – Native Fauna Protection	No Change	No Change
SEW6 – Wetland Conservation	No Change	No Change
<b><u>Delegations</u></b>		
AEW1 – Street Verge Improvements	No Change	No Change
AEW2 – Kerbside House Numbers	No Change	No Change
AEW3 – Street Lighting	No Change	No Change
AEW4 – Installation of Playground/Recreation Equipment on Reserves	No Change	No Change
AEW6 – Promotional Street Banners	No Change	No Change
AEW8 – Submission and Comment on Environmental Approvals	No Change	No Change

No.	Proposed Amendment	Reason for Amendment
and Matters		
AEW9 – Internally Illuminated Directional Signs	No Change	No Change
AEW10 – Installation of Private Memorial Plaques in Public Open Space	No Change	No Change
SEW1 – Maintenance of Verges and Public Open Space (POS) Following Residential Subdivision	No Change	No Change
SEW2 – Street & Public Area Lighting	No Change	No Change
SEW3 – Traffic Management Investigations	No Change	No Change
SEW4 – Bushland Conservation	No Change	No Change
<b><u>Position Statements</u></b>		
PSEW2 – Advertising on Litter Bins & Bus Stop Seats	No Change	No Change
PSEW3 – Conditions for Contractors Opening up Road Works	No Change	No Change
PSEW5 – Construction of Footpaths	No Change	No Change
PSEW7 – Street Name Plates	No Change	No Change
PSEW10 – Graffiti & Vandalism Response – Council Property	No Change	No Change
PSEW11 – Subdivision Construction Standards	No Change	No Change
PSEW12 – Standard Specifications and Cost of Crossovers & requests for Related Private works	Subject of separate report	
PSEW14 – Portable Signs in Streets, Ways and Reserves	No Change	No Change
PSEW15 – Removal & Pruning of Trees	Under sub heading Pruning of Trees inserted "without the approval of the City"	Ensures offices can advise residents that they cannot prune the City's trees.
PSEW16 – Unkempt Verge	No Change	No Change



No.	Proposed Amendment	Reason for Amendment
mowing		
PSEW17 – Outdoor Sport Lighting on Recreation Reserves	No Change	No Change
PSEW18 – Trees on Privately Owned Land	No Change	No Change
PSEW19 – Shade to playgrounds on Recreation Reserves	No Change	No Change
PSEW20 – Graffiti Response – Non – City Owned Property	No Change	No Change
PSEW21 – Trailer Passes	No Change	No Change
PSEW22 – Streetscape Bonds	No Change	No Change
PSEW23 – 50 KM/H Speed Limit Reminder Signs	No Change	No Change

### Strategic Plan/Policy Implications

#### Leading & Listening

- Deliver sustainable governance through transparent and robust policy and processes

#### Budget/Financial Implications

While the individual allowance has increased from \$6,500 to \$9,000 to represent current Western Power costs, it is not intended to increase the total annual budget allocation to this item.

#### Legal Implications

N/A

#### Community Consultation

N/A

#### Risk Management Implications

Failure to adopt the recommendations from the policies review will result in a non-compliance risk in accordance with the Local Government Act 1995 policies review provisions, and failure to uphold principles of good governance. Ultimately this will lead to policies, delegations, and position statement documents that are outdated and do not align to the current practices and processes.



**Attachment(s)**

1. Proposed amended Position Statement PSEW15 'Removal & Pruning of Trees'
2. Proposed amended Policy AEW5 'Landowner Biodiversity Conservation Grant Program'

**Advice to Proponent(s)/Submissioners**

N/A

**Implications of Section 3.18(3) Local Government Act, 1995**

Nil.

**13.4 (MINUTE NO 401) (DAPPS 23/02/2017) - PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO POSITION STATEMENT PSEW12 'STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS AND COST OF CROSSOVERS' (182/002) (J KIURSKI) (ATTACH)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

That Council adopt proposed amendments to Position Statement PSEW12 'Standard Specifications and Cost of Crossovers', as shown in the attachment to the Agenda.

**COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION**

MOVED Cllr S Portelli SECONDED Cllr P Eva that the recommendation be adopted.

**CARRIED 5/0**

**COUNCIL DECISION**

**Background**

At the DAPPS Council Meeting of 25 February 2016, Council endorsed the City's standard specifications and cost of crossovers, and associated plans and specifications. City Position Statement PSEW12 Standard Specifications and Cost of Crossovers is a commitment by the City to ensuring that the crossing places constructed within the City are complied with the relevant standards and regulatory requirements.



Where a crossing facility is the first crossing to a property, Council accept part of the cost of the crossover constructed to the City's Crossover Specification. On January 2017 the City's Crossover Specification was updated to meet the terms from Western Australia Local Government Association (WLGA) Crossover Guidelines.

A review of the Position Statement PSEW12 has been conducted in line with WALGA Guidelines and Principles of the City's Integrated Transport Plan, to ensure that pedestrians and cyclists in crossover areas have priority over vehicles.

### **Submission**

N/A

### **Report**

The Position Statement PSEW12 states that the purpose of Crossover Specification is:

*To develop a standard set of specifications for crossing places constructed within the City of Cockburn public road reserves.*

The City currently has reviewed the Crossover Specification based on WALGA's Guidelines and Liveable Neighbourhoods and the Western Australian Planning Commission (WAPC) operational policy.

A review of the Position Statement PSEW12 highlights the following minor gaps which can be easily modified to ensure compliance with WALGA's guidelines. These include:

### **Vehicle Crossover Specification and Forms**

The crossover specification section has been included in the policy to clearly define the City's requirements for constructing a new crossover and explain eligibility to obtain the City's contribution to the crossover construction.

According the WALGA's guidelines the crossovers are defined to be 'Road-Related Areas'. Pedestrians and cyclists in these areas have priority over vehicles. For this reason the City's specification has been adopted that the pedestrian infrastructure be provided in a continuous manner across all residential driveways, maintaining path cross-fall and material in preference to the crossover construction.

The construction – general information – footpath section of the crossover specification has been changed to meet WALGA's





guidelines and WAPC's operational policy Liveable Neighbourhoods requirements. An extract of the conditions within the Crossover Specification is provided below:

*The crossover is to be constructed without removing the footpath, footpaths are to remain as part of the connective network providing pedestrians and bicycle users safe passage. Should an existing footpath be present at the site of a proposed crossover the path should be assessed to ensure it complies with Australia Standards (AS 1428.1), is constructed to the appropriate standard to support vehicular traffic, and is in good repair. Should the existing footpath not conform to the required standards it shall be required to be rebuilt at a cost to the property owner as part of the crossover works.*

The construction – general information – asphalt crossover, of the crossover specification has been added to the Crossover Specification to meet requirements from residents, which live in the rural areas. This is due to there being no kerb or proper drainage system available at those locations. An extract of the conditions within the Crossover Specification is provided below:

*Asphalt crossovers are gradually being phased out in the built up areas of the City of Cockburn in preference of either concrete or brick paving. This is due to rising maintenance costs and the rising cost of the asphalt (uneconomical).*

*The City will only consider an asphalt crossover in the rural areas if required. This is due to there being no kerb or proper drainage system available at those locations.*

*If you live in the built-up area and desired an asphalt crossover, you will need to apply to the City (in writing) explaining why it is required to be constructed in asphalt.*

The construction – general information – location has been changed to avoid a conflict with existing traffic, City's infrastructure such as pram ramps, side entry pits and drainage structures, and also the external agencies utilities, and light pole. The changes of the crossover location within the Crossover Specification are provided below:

*Crossovers shall be located a minimum of 1.0m from side boundary unless otherwise approved, refer to drawings DWG2478.*

*A crossover located in proximity to a mature street tree must first been assessed and approved by the City of Cockburn's Parks Department prior to construction.*



*Crossovers in cul-de-sac shall be located as shown on drawing DWG2478.*

The construction – general information – width requirements and section of alternative materials have been changed to meet WALGA's Guidelines and Liveable Neighbourhoods and WAPC operational policy requirements. The changes of the crossover location within the Crossover Specification are provided below:

#### *Width Requirements*

##### *Residential Crossovers:*

- *From 3 metres to 6 metres for residential properties, not including the wings.*
- *A minimum of 3 metres to a maximum 6 metres at the property boundary line.*
- *A minimum of 5 metres to a maximum of 8 metres at the road edge. Unless otherwise approved by the Engineering Service Unit.*

##### *Commercial and Industrial Crossovers:*

- *From 3 metres to 9 metres for Commercial and Industrial developments, not including the wings.*
- *A minimum of 3 metres to a maximum 9 metres at the property boundary line.*
- *A minimum of 5 metres to a maximum of 11 metres at the road edge. Unless otherwise approved by the Engineering Service Unit.*
- *Refer to City's Policy APD57*

#### *Alternative Materials – Residential Properties*

*The City supports the use of permeable and porous materials, subject to the approval from the City prior to construction. The materials must be trafficable and maintained by the property owner accessing the crossover.*

*The crossover must not be a safety or tripping hazard to road users, bike riders and pedestrians.*

The construction – vehicle crossover drawings has been changed to meet WALGA's guidelines. Drawings No. 2478B03 sheets No. 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5 have been updated to the Drawings No. 2478B03 sheets No. 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5, with all sheets as Revision 'A'.



## Proposed Amendments

Amendment No. 1 - Under heading position, (1), (b) delete below paragraphs:

1. *STANDARD CROSSING - that a standard crossing be defined as one which is 3.0m wide and 6.0m long.*
2. *MAXIMUM & MINIMUM SIZES - that as far as possible the maximum and minimum sizes of crossovers are to be:- from 3.0m to 6.0m for Residences; and from 3.0m to 9.0m for Commercial and Industrial developments.*
3. *REQUIREMENTS OF CROSSTOVERS - that the provision of crossovers be mandatory on all developments fronting a bituminised roadway.*
4. *VARIATION IN SIZES - that should an applicant require a crossover wider than normally accepted by Council, the Director - Engineering & Works be empowered to approve the additional width subject to consideration being given to location, drainage implications and general aesthetic appeal from other landowners' viewpoints.*

Reason for amendment – Updated Crossover Specification, which provides more comprehensive explanation for crossover construction, has been inserted on the Page No. 3.

Amendment No. 2 – Insert a new heading CROSSTOVER SPECIFICATION after heading POSITION and insert an updated Vehicle Crossover Specification and Forms text.

Reason for amendment – An inclusion of the Crossover Specification provides clarity for the officers completing the crossover application assessment and mitigates any negotiations to the required standards.

## Strategic Plan/Policy Implications

### City Growth

- Ensure planning facilitates a desirable living environment and meets growth targets

### Moving Around

- Identify gaps and take action toward extending the coverage of the cycle way, footpath and trails network



**Leading & Listening**

- Deliver sustainable governance through transparent and robust policy and processes

**Budget/Financial Implications**

N/A

**Legal Implications**

N/A

**Community Consultation**

N/A

**Risk Management Implications**

The management of crossover construction and the City contribution to construction through PSEW12 provides a defined framework for Council officers when requests for crossover construction applications are received and any alterations that may expose the Council to a potential loss of existing City infrastructure such as footpaths, pram ramps or drainage infrastructure.

**Attachment(s)**

Proposed amended Position Statement PSEW12 'Standard Specifications and Cost of Crossovers'

**Advice to Proponent(s)/Submissioners**

N/A

**Implications of Section 3.18(3) Local Government Act, 1995**

Nil.



#### 14. COMMUNITY SERVICES DIVISION ISSUES

- 14.1 **(MINUTE NO 402)** (DAPPS 23/02/2017) - PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO POLICY SC35 'GRANTS, DONATIONS & SPONSORSHIPS - COMMUNITY ORGANISATIONS & INDIVIDUALS' AND DELEGATED AUTHORITY ACS2 'APPLICATIONS FOR GRANT AND INDIVIDUAL SPONSORSHIP FUNDED PROJECTS' (086/003, 086/001) (M BOLLAND) (ATTACH)

##### **RECOMMENDATION**

That Council adopt:

- (1) proposed amendments to Policy SC35 'Grants, Donations & Sponsorships – Community Organisations & Individuals', as shown in the report and attachments to the Agenda;
- (2) proposed amendments to Delegated Authority ACS2 'Applications for Grant and Individual Sponsorship Funded Projects', as shown in the report and attachments to the Agenda; and
- (3) update the Delegated Authority Register accordingly.

**TO BE CARRIED BY AN ABSOLUTE MAJORITY OF COUNCIL**

##### **COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION**

MOVED Cllr S Portelli SECONDED Cllr P Eva that the recommendation be adopted.


**CARRIED 5/0**

**TO BE CARRIED BY AN ABSOLUTE MAJORITY OF COUNCIL**

##### **COUNCIL DECISION**

#### **Background**

Each year, Council allocates up to 2% of the rates income to a range of grants, donations, sponsorships and subsidies. Council established the Grants and Donations Committee to recommend on the level and nature of grants, donations and sponsorships provided to individuals,



groups and organisations. To ensure that these funds are distributed in a rational way, eligibility, selection and evaluation criteria are required for the assessment and prioritisation of applications to be funded.

At its meeting of 21 July 2016, the Grants and Donations Committee made the following recommendations:

*That Council:*

- (1) *Approve the proposed plan for reviewing the selected grants programs, guidelines, application forms and processes as outlined in the report;*
- (2) *Approve an allocation up to \$10,000 in 2016/17 for a subscription to the SmartyGrants online grants management system; and*
- (3) *Remove the Sustainable Events Grants Program and annual allocation and replace with a \$15,000 allocation in 2016/17 for a Small Events Sponsorship and Grants Program to be developed and delivered in collaboration with Community Development.*

which were duly adopted by Council on 11 August 2016.

At the following Grants and Donations Committee Meeting on 25 October 2016, the Committee recommended:

*That Council:*

- (1) *Receive the report on the Review of Grants Programs and adopt the recommendations contained therein; and*
- (2) *Adopt the proposed Small Events Sponsorship Program, as detailed in the report, to begin in early 2017.*


which were duly adopted by Council on 10 November 2016.

### **Submission**

N/A

### **Report**

Following the review of the grants programs by the Grants and Donations Committee and adoption of the recommendations by Council, Delegated Authority ACS2 'Applications for Grant and Individual Sponsorship Funded Projects' and Policy SC35 'Grants, Donations & Sponsorships – Community Organisations & Individuals' must be updated to reflect the agreed changes to the programs.



The main changes include the deletion of the Sustainable Events Grants program and the adoption of the Small Events Sponsorship Program and associated criteria.

The Small Events Sponsorship program is intended to encourage small scale neighbourhood events across Cockburn with applications open all year round providing flexibility to groups to gain funding. It is not intended to replace the current Community Grant and Sponsorship programs currently available in two rounds per year, but provide supplementary funding available all year round for smaller events such as movie nights, pop up cafés, Christmas carols, food swaps and fetes to be run by organisations and in consultation with the City's Community Development team.

Initially, it is proposed that Small Events Sponsorship would be to a maximum limit of \$2,000 per application. An allocation of \$15,000 has been approved for this funding program to commence in early 2017.

The proposal for this program was presented at the CCDG meeting on 14 September 2016, and feedback was also sought during the grants feedback survey. Results from the survey concluded:

- 90% of respondents feel there is a need for this type of program, and 79% would be more likely to host a small-scale community event in Cockburn if this program was available, with a broad and innovative range of event suggestions.
- Key costs to be covered were running costs, equipment and venue hire, food, marketing and promotion, entertainment and supplier costs.

General feedback suggested that more flexible timeframes for this program will make it easier for their organisations to make an application, especially when 62% of respondents have advised that they most often seek funding for community events.

There are also a few minor suggested amendments to provide clarity to officers assessing applications and administering grant funds and to ensure the related Delegated Authority and Policy are aligned and reflect current practices and processes.

### **Strategic Plan/Policy Implications**

#### **Community, Lifestyle & Security**

- Provide residents with a range of high quality, accessible programs and services



**Economic, Social & Environmental Responsibility**

- Create opportunities for community, business and industry to establish and thrive through planning, policy and community development

**Leading & Listening**

- Deliver sustainable governance through transparent and robust policy and processes

**Budget/Financial Implications**

For 2016/17 the Grants and Donations budget is \$1,300,000, for which the following allocations have been made for the programs that are the subject of this Delegated Authority and Policy:

- \$100,000 for Community Grants
- \$20,000 for Cultural Grants
- \$200,000 for Donations
- \$100,000 for Sponsorship (Group and Individual)
- \$15,000 for Small Events Sponsorship

**Legal Implications**

N/A

**Community Consultation**

The Grants and Research Officer presented information about the review of the City's grants programs and the Small Events Sponsorship program proposal to the Cockburn Community Development Group (CCDG) at their meeting on 14 September 2016. The members of this group (who are representatives of the residents associations) completed a grants feedback survey during this meeting.

An online version of the survey was sent via email to applicants from these grants programs from the last three years, and shared via the Cockburn Community Portal facebook page. The survey was open for two weeks and received 45 responses. A copy of the survey and summary of results from the community was provided to the Grants and Donations Committee at its meeting on 25 October 2016.

**Risk Management Implications**

The Council allocates a significant amount of money to support individuals, groups and organisations through a range of funding programs. There are clear guidelines and criteria established to ensure that Council's intent for the allocation of funds are met.





The reputation of the City of Cockburn could be seriously compromised should funds allocated to individuals, groups or organisations not meet the criteria and guidelines or if the funds were not used for the purposes they were provided. Adherence to these requirements is essential.

Failure to adopt the proposed amendments based on the recommendations from the review will mean the delegation and policy documents are outdated and do not align to the current practices and processes.

**Attachment(s)**

1. Proposed amended Policy SC35 'Grants, Donations & Sponsorships – Community Organisations & Individuals'.
2. Proposed amended Delegated Authority ACS2 'Applications for Grant and Individual Sponsorship Funded Projects'.

**Advice to Proponent(s)/Submissioners**

N/A

**Implications of Section 3.18(3) Local Government Act, 1995**

Nil

**14.2 (MINUTE NO 403) (DAPPS 23/02/2017) - PROPOSED NEW POLICY ACS15 'COUNCIL SPONSORED COMMUNITY COMPETITIONS' (182/001) (S SEYMOUR-EYLES) (ATTACH)**

**RECOMMENDATION**

That Council adopt proposed new Policy ACS15 'Council Sponsored Community Competitions', as shown in the attachment to the Agenda.

**COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION**

MOVED Clr S Portelli SECONDED Clr P Eva that the recommendation be adopted.

**CARRIED 5/0**

**COUNCIL DECISION**



## Background

The City runs external and internal competitions for education and engagement purposes.

There are different types of competitions including skills or merit based competitions, some with token prizes, some with larger prizes. There are competitions judged by panels and there are raffles and other prize draws.

These are run across a number of different service units including Libraries, Recreation Services, Travelsmart, Environmental Services, Corporate Communications and Cockburn ARC.

Staff require guidance on terms and conditions to ensure consistency and good governance. The terms and conditions need to articulate whether or not staff, Elected Members and their close families may enter competitions. This policy addresses these matters.

The policy was developed in consultation with Youth Services, Seniors Services, Community Development, Family Services, relevant Engineering staff, Libraries, Cockburn ARC and Health Promotion.

## Submission

N/A

## Report

### Terms and Conditions

Staff must write terms and conditions for their competitions. This does not apply to prize draws or raffles drawn on the same day and which are sold in public. The Gaming and Wagering Commission Act 1987 has some minimum requirements around terms and conditions for other competitions. The City has other requirements that should be included, such as whether or not the competition will be limited to residents of Cockburn. This is for clarity, consistency and good governance. The Policy states that the following terms and conditions must be included.

- a. whether the competition is limited to residents of the City of Cockburn according to the service. In general competitions should be limited to City of Cockburn residents and ratepayers, but if a service has a customer base beyond the City of Cockburn, they may limit entry to competitions to members or customers.



- b. how and where to enter;
- c. who to contact for queries;
- d. what the prizes are;
- e. when and where the competition will be judged;
- f. how it will be judged or the prize drawn;
- g. where the winners names will be published and when and how winners will be notified;
- h. what happens if the City is unable to contact the winner;
- i. that the judges' decision is final;
- j. who to contact for questions.
- k. The terms and conditions will also advise whether or not staff, Elected Members and their family are allowed to enter the competition.
- l. A disclaimer to not use the information the entrant provides for anything other than the competition. Otherwise the competition needs to clearly state what their contact details will be used for.

If the terms and conditions are not written on the competition documentation, it must be clear where to find them.

#### Staff, Elected Members and close family

For the purpose of this Policy, close family is defined as spouse/partner, children and grandchildren of staff or Elected Members.

The families of Elected Members and many staff live in the City of Cockburn.

In September 2016, 40.25% of employees including casual employees, equating to 336 people, lived in the City of Cockburn. Many of their children, grandchildren and partners are highly engaged with City services and events such as Libraries, Youth Centre, Environmental Service programs and the free community events the City runs.

Many children of staff and Elected Members are highly engaged with the Cockburn community and use multiple services such as the Library Services and Youth Services.

The aim of this Policy is to strike a sensible balance between ensuring there is no possibility of favouritism being perceived for City of Cockburn staff, Elected Members, or their close families when they enter a competition, thereby creating a negative perception. Equally, the aim is not to penalise City of Cockburn staff, Elected Members, or their close families by not allowing them to participate in community competitions where there is none or little possibility of any favouritism and where the prizes are not of high value.



The Policy defines when Elected Members, staff and their close families may or may not enter a competition, based on these principles above.

It is recommended that Elected Members and City of Cockburn staff and their close family may not enter any high profile competitions or competitions with a prize greater than \$100. This includes 'Battle of the Bands' and 'Cockburn's Got Talent'.

There are recommended exceptions, such as the Bibra Lake Fun Run where the prize money is \$300 for first place adult and \$150 for first place child. The City encourages its staff and the community to be healthy. Risk of favouritism is negligible as it is a first past the post competition and timing is undertaken by a third party company.

#### What do other Councils do?

The City of Armadale does not allow staff, Councillors or any of their extended families to enter competitions. They sometimes run a separate (smaller prized) competition for staff and Councillors and their families, to encourage them to participate.

One larger Council north of the river declined to be named but advised that staff and Elected Members are excluded from winning City-held competitions.

The City of Fremantle destination promotion department does not permit employees, or their families (and any employees of businesses associated with the competition or prize) to enter competitions.

### **Strategic Plan/Policy Implications**

#### **Leading & Listening**

- Deliver sustainable governance through transparent and robust policy and processes

#### **Budget/Financial Implications**

N/A

#### **Legal Implications**

The Gaming and Wagering Commission Act 1987 has some minimum requirements around terms and conditions for other competitions.

#### **Community Consultation**

N/A



### **Risk Management Implications**

If Council does not adopt a policy on competitions, there is no guidance to staff or Elected Members on whether or not they should or should not be able to enter City run competitions. Resultant poor decisions by staff, Elected Members or their families could damage the reputation of the City, the Elected Member, the staff member and/or possibly their family.

If Council does adopt the Policy, it provides guidance on the matter and can be reviewed each year.

### **Attachment(s)**

Proposed new Policy ACS15 'Council Sponsored Community Competitions'.

### **Advice to Proponent(s)/Submissioners**

N/A

### **Implications of Section 3.18(3) Local Government Act, 1995**

Nil.

## **15. EXECUTIVE DIVISION ISSUES**

Nil

## **16. MOTIONS OF WHICH PREVIOUS NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN**

Nil

## **17. NOTICES OF MOTION GIVEN AT THE MEETING FOR CONSIDERATION AT NEXT MEETING**

Nil

## **18. NEW BUSINESS OF AN URGENT NATURE INTRODUCED BY DECISION OF MEETING BY COUNCILLORS OR OFFICERS**

Nil



**19. MATTERS TO BE NOTED FOR INVESTIGATION, WITHOUT DEBATE**

Nil

**20. CONFIDENTIAL BUSINESS**

Nil

**21 (DAPPS 23/02/2017) - CLOSURE OF MEETING**

6:19 pm.



<b>POL</b>	<b>COCKBURN COAST DESIGN GUIDELINES FOR ROBB JETTY AND EMPLACEMENT PRECINCTS</b>	<b>LPP 4.6</b>
------------	--	----------------

<b>POLICY CODE:</b>	LPP 4.6
<b>DIRECTORATE:</b>	Planning & Development
<b>BUSINESS UNIT:</b>	Planning and Development
<b>SERVICE UNIT:</b>	Statutory Planning
<b>RESPONSIBLE OFFICER:</b>	Manager, Statutory Planning
<b>FILE NO.:</b>	182/001
<b>DATE FIRST ADOPTED:</b>	9 May 2013
<b>DATE LAST REVIEWED:</b>	<del>10 December 2015</del>
<b>ATTACHMENTS:</b>	Yes
<b>DELEGATED AUTHORITY REF.:</b>	OLPD33
<b>VERSION NO.</b>	5

<b>Dates of Amendments / Reviews:</b>		
DAPPS Meeting:	22 August 2013	2 June 2015
	26 February 2015	26 November 2015
OCM:	9 May 2013	12 March 2015
	12 September 2013	11 June 2015

## **BACKGROUND:**

The Cockburn Coast Design Guidelines for the Robb Jetty and Emplacement Precinct have been prepared to guide the development and urban form (including subdivision) of Robb Jetty Local Structure Plan and Emplacement Local Structure Plan (LSP) areas.

## **PURPOSE:**


The Design Guidelines will guide the creation of a quality development that ensures the design principles of the Robb Jetty and Emplacement LSP's are achieved.

## **POLICY:**

Appendix 1 contains the Cockburn Coast Design Guidelines for the Robb Jetty and Emplacement Precinct.

Development applications will be assessed under the Design Guidelines in conjunction with the Residential Design Codes of Western Australian (R-Codes), the approved structure plan and any other relevant local planning policy.







## SECTION

Background	5
I _____ Introduction	5
II _____ Vision for Cockburn Coast	5
III _____ Context	7
IV _____ Approach	8
V _____ Objectives	8
VI _____ Purpose	8
VII _____ Design Guideline Policy Area	8
VIII _____ Relationship to Relevant Planning Documents	9
IX _____ Relationship to the Robb Jetty LSP and Emplacement LSP	9
X _____ Guideline Framework	10
XI _____ Discretion	10
XII _____ Definitions	10
Activity Centre – Main Street Typology	14
Building Setbacks	15
Building Articulation	16
Building Levels	16
Awnings	18
Building Height	18
Building Materials	18
Open Space	18
Landmark Sites	19
Fencing	19
Mixed Use – Cockburn Road Typology	21
Building Setbacks	21
Building Articulation	22
Building Levels	23
Awnings	23
Building Height	23
Building Materials	24
Open Space	24
Landmark Sites	24
Fencing	24
High Density Residential Typology	26
Building Setbacks	27
Building Articulation	27
Building Levels	28
Building Height	28
Building Materials	28
Open Space	29
Fencing	29
Landscaping	29
Medium Density Residential Typology	31
Building Setbacks	33
Building Articulation	33
Roof Form	34
Building Levels	34
Building Height	34
Building Materials	36
Open Space	36
Fencing	36
Landscaping	36
2.1 _____ Built Form Requirements	38
2.1.1 Building Height	38
2.1.2 Facades	39
2.1.3 Room Form	40
2.1.4 Lighting	40
2.1.5 Acoustics and Vibration	41
2.1.6 Active Edges and Street Relationship	41
2.1.7 Heritage Considerations	42
2.2 _____ Service Infrastructure and Access	43
2.2.1 _____ Internal Access	43

2.2.2	Parking	43
2.2.3	Parking Location and Access	43
2.2.4	Sleeved Parking	43
2.2.5	End of Trip Facilities	44
2.2.6	Site Services	45
2.3	Sustainability Requirements	45
2.3.1	Sustainable Travel	45
2.4	Laneways	46
2.4.1	Residential and Commercial Laneways	46
2.5	Communal Open Space	45

---

## Background

### I Introduction

The Cockburn Coast Design Guidelines for the Robb Jetty and Emplacement precincts (henceforth referred to as the Design Guidelines) have been prepared to guide the development and urban form (including subdivision) of *Robb Jetty Local Structure Plan* (Robb Jetty LSP) and *Emplacement Local Structure Plan* (Emplacement LSP) areas. The design guidelines are focused on the creation of a quality development that ensures the design principles of the Robb Jetty and Emplacement LSP's are achieved.

5

The design guidelines will bring to fruition a lively and sustainable urban centre set amongst dense residential development. The design guidelines introduce standards for development to create the intended character and amenity within the Robb Jetty LSP and Emplacement LSP areas. Although some of the criteria are mandatory, the general approach is to provide a series of broad principles for development to follow while allowing flexibility in design outcomes over the project life span.

The design guidelines are a performance orientated assessment tool. Each design element is expressed as a design objective and one or more assessment criteria. Where a stated assessment criterion is proposed to be varied, development must demonstrate that it meets the related design objective. In this way a performance approach to design and assessment is facilitated.

The design guidelines are divided into two main sections:

#### ***Typology Specific Guidelines***

A series of built form typologies are established in defined areas where specific guideline provisions apply that may expand on or vary the general provisions.

#### ***General Provisions***

Contain the design guideline general provisions which are applicable to all development.

### II Vision for Cockburn Coast

Capitalising on a rare opportunity, these design guidelines set out to inform the development of an exciting mixed use community that celebrates the best of the Western Australian coastal lifestyle.

Cockburn Coast will be different from its neighbouring suburbs; it will be a place that offers choice and variety of living, recreation and working opportunities. Core to the success of the redevelopment is a well connected Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) system which is intended to link the development to its surrounding areas. As well as connecting the design guideline area to its surrounds, this system will provide an internal system of movement which encourages more sustainable personal transportation choices.

The City of Cockburn's *Cockburn Coast District Structure Plan* (DSP) and *Cockburn Coast District Structure Plan Part 2* (DSP2) nominates three local structure plan areas being Robb Jetty, Emplacement and Power Station. Each of these areas is distinct in character and function. These design guidelines introduce standards for development to create the intended character and amenity within the Robb Jetty and Emplacement LSP areas following a detailed local structure planning process.

### ***Robb Jetty LSP Area***

The Robb Jetty LSP area forms the north-western portion of the site and stretches from Rollinson Road in the north, to the Parkland Corridor in the south and Cockburn Road in the east. The area stretches west of Robb Road but excludes the beach.

The Robb Jetty LSP area will contain elements of mixed use development along significant road links including Cockburn Road but is otherwise set aside for medium to high density residential development. The area will also house supporting community facilities in the form of the two storey urban primary school and the area's key active playing field. A coastal character is proposed to complement the adjacent foreshore and areas of open space contained within it.

The BRT public transport alignment is set to pass through the heart of the area and be well connected to Fremantle and the rapidly emerging Cockburn Central. A variety of small but connected public spaces will offer a range of experiences from the quiet to the communal, the sheltered to the open and the organic to the formal.

### ***Emplacement LSP Area***

The Emplacement LSP area forms the north-east portion of the project area and stretches from the northern boundary of the master plan area, to the middle parkland corridor to the south, to Cockburn Coast Drive in the east, and Cockburn Road in the west.

The distinct character of the Emplacement LSP area is a product of its elevated topography and this landform influences how it shall be treated. Development will be responsive to the topography and shall aim to retain as much of the existing natural character of the site as possible. The Emplacement LSP area will be predominantly mixed use in its north, residential in its south, and contain the east-west linear parks, providing strong connections from Beeliar Park and through Robb Jetty LSP area to the coastal foreshore.

The Emplacement LSP area will be the new highpoint, a manufactured horizon line that offers the opportunity for a new architectural topography and an integrated landscape of nature and built form.




Figure 01\_Cockburn Coast Local Structure Plan areas

### III Context

The design guidelines complete a complex process of strategic planning to capitalise on the opportunity for redeveloping Cockburn Coast identified in the Western Australian Planning Commission's strategic planning document '*Directions 2031 and Beyond*'. The adoption of the DSP and later DSP2 2012 served to solidify the recognition of the Cockburn Coast's potential and identifies a number of key drivers and opportunities that underpin the vision and intent of the DSP and DSP2. Following an amendment (Amendment 89) to the City of Cockburn Town Planning Scheme No. 3 (The Scheme), which aligns the City of Cockburn's (the City) planning framework with that as proposed in the DSP and DSP2, local structure plans were produced for the Robb Jetty LSP and Emplacement LSP areas which establishes a development agenda and expands on the foundations of the DSP and DSP2.

These design guidelines bring to fruition a vision established and carried forward through a number of strategic planning documents and processes.

## IV Approach

The DSP established a vision which remains relevant to the ongoing planning of Cockburn Coast:

***“To create a vibrant, landmark destination that is connected, integrated, diverse and accessible.”***

The vision seeks to create a place that offers new and exciting living, employment and recreation opportunities, whilst providing an appropriate level of compatibility and support for adjoining residents and existing enterprises in the area. These design guidelines are set to establish this vision by creating a sustainable community that celebrates the area’s past as well as taking on creative ideas, innovation and development. Cockburn Coast will be an easily accessible place, with an integrated transit system offering contemporary lively cafes, restaurants, shops, residential and commercial areas, tourism, cultural and recreation activities.

Integral to the vision of Cockburn Coast is the intention to establish a new benchmark for sustainable urban development. This means creating a place where people not only want to live and work today, but also in the future. Sustainable communities cater to the different needs of all its residents; they are safe and inclusive and offer equality of opportunity, they are sensitive to their environment and contribute to a high quality of life.

## V Objectives

The development of Cockburn Coast is guided by a number of key objectives or drivers which will bring to fruition the vision of a sustainable landmark destination. These objectives have influenced the preparation of the design guidelines and underpin their purpose, being to:

- create a hierarchy of coastal nodes providing for the needs of local residents and visitors alike;
- create physical and emotional links between the urban environment and the coast allowing the coastal experience to translate into the urban setting;
- provide attractive, pedestrian-oriented streets and public spaces that create an environment for positive community engagement and business exchange;
- enable buildings and public realm to engage with pedestrians and facilitate a comfortable and safe urban environment;
- allow for activation at ground level by retail and hospitality uses in key streets identified by the Local Structure Plans;
- optimise residential development potential whilst maintaining the intended character of the Cockburn Coast;
- minimise the impact of car parking on the pedestrian experience and quality of the public realm;
- create a sustainable environment that allows for the implementation of green infrastructure; and
- promote the use of sustainable modes of transport and a health way of living through active engagement with the urban environment.

## VI Purpose

These design guidelines have been prepared to guide development within the Robb Jetty LSP and Emplacement LSP areas under the Scheme. Implementation of the guidelines will ensure the realisation of Cockburn Coast as an urban environment providing both local and district centre activity centres.

## VII Design Guideline Policy Area

These design guidelines apply to the area of land within the Robb Jetty LSP and Emplacement LSP, henceforth referred to as the policy area. The policy area is bound by:



- Rollinson Road to the north;
- South Fremantle Power Station and the Western Power Switchyard to the south;
- Beeliar Regional Park to the east; and
- The foreshore reserve to the west.

9



Figure 02\_Design Guidelines Policy Area

## VIII Relationship to Relevant Planning Documents

The design guidelines are adopted under the provisions of section 4 of the Planning and Development Regulations 2015 Procedures for Making Local Planning Policy. The provisions of these design guidelines vary the requirements of the State Planning Policy 3.1 Residential Design Codes (R-Codes). Where these design guidelines are silent the provisions of the R-Codes and relevant local planning policies apply. It should be noted that the plot ratio deemed to comply provisions of the R-Codes are varied and plot ratio will not form part of the assessment criteria for proposals in these precincts.

These design guidelines should be read in conjunction with the Scheme, the Robb Jetty LSP, the Emplacement LSP, [any relevant Local Development Plan \(LDP\)](#) and the R-Codes. In determining any application for development approval, the City will utilise these design guidelines in conjunction with the Scheme, [any relevant LDP](#) and policies.

## IX Relationship to the Robb Jetty LSP and Emplacement LSP

The Robb Jetty LSP and Emplacement LSP set out a number of development objectives relating to the DSP2 redevelopment area. In particular they establish land use, movement, activity, urban form and resource enhancement development standards to ensure Cockburn Coast operates as an effective urban environment.

These design guidelines build upon both LSPs and provide more detailed guidance on development standards in the form of an adopted local planning policy.

## **X Guideline Framework**

10

The detailed design guidelines contained in the General Provisions section are set out with the following framework:

### *Design Objective:*

Statements outlining the design philosophy and intent of the assessment criteria. It is mandatory for development to meet the design objective.

### *Assessment Criteria:*

Standards that sets out the specific criteria to satisfy an associated design objective. Compliance with the applicable assessment criteria will achieve the design objective. However individual criteria are not mandatory and alternative solutions for complying with the design objective will be considered on a performance basis subject to supporting evidence.

The typology specific section of the design guidelines contains character statements. The character statements guide both the design objective and assessment criteria and as such, all development shall be consistent with the relevant character statement.

## **XI Discretion**

An important provision within the design guidelines is the opportunity for the applicant or owner to meet the design objective through an alternative solution.

| The City may approve a development application or Local Development Plan where the applicant or owner has departed from the recommended assessment criteria. Variations may be considered where, in the City's opinion, the applicant or owner has demonstrated that the alternative solution is consistent with the Robb Jetty LSP or Emplacement LSP where relevant and meets the design objective. Variations will be considered where a proposal does not include an affordable housing component, but will be considered more favourably where it does.

Where a development proposal is determined to be inconsistent with a design objective in a manner that may impact on the public realm or adjoining properties then the proposal may be refused or referred to Council for determination.

Where the applicant or owner has provided a sufficient affordable housing component, a relaxation of the assessment criteria may be considered where the alternative solution is consistent with the relevant LSP and meets the design objective. These design guidelines provides further guidance on those criteria considered suitable for variation.

Each application for development approval will be assessed on an individual basis and the approval of an alternative solution will not set a precedent for other developments.

## **XII Definitions**

*Noise Sensitive Premises (as defined in the Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations 1997) includes premises occupied solely or mainly for residential or accommodation purposes, and premises used for the purpose of a hospital, sanatorium, educational establishment, public worship, aged care or child care.*

*Commercial Laneway includes any laneway within the mixed use or activity centre typology areas as set out by these design guidelines.*



All definitions included in the R-Codes are applicable to land affected by these Design Guidelines.

### **XIII Development Process**

11

Owners, developers and/or agents are encouraged to arrange pre-application meetings with the City's Planning Department prior to lodgement of a formal development application. Once a development application is lodged, it will be assessed by the City to verify it meets all applicable design objectives and assessment criteria.



Activity Centre – Main Street Typology



Mixed Use – Cockburn Road Typology



High Density Residential Typology



Medium Density Residential Typology



## 1. TYPOLOGY SPECIFIC GUIDELINES

The policy area is divided into a number of built form typologies each with their own distinct character and function. There are also a number of landmark and gateway sites identified by the built form typology location plan. These sites are to be developed with a diverse and active facade to facilitate way finding and reflect the natural hierarchy and land use of the area.

### *Activity Centre - Main Street Typology*

Development in this area addresses and activates the identified pedestrian oriented “main” street whilst a high quality public realm creates a comfortable place in which locals meet and conduct business. This area provides a key link between the ocean and urban environment as well as providing for the retail and local service needs of the local community.

### *Mixed Use - Cockburn Road Typology*

A range of retail and commercial functions complemented by residential development are to be accommodated within this mixed use area. The presence of Cockburn Road informs the scale and built form of development and necessitates the promotion of an active ground floor.

### *High Density Residential Typology*

The most intensely developed residential typology to afford the greatest access to the proposed bus rapid transit system. High density residential development is to create a new skyline in Cockburn Coast.

### *Medium Density Residential Typology*

Providing a mix of housing opportunities near the Activity Centre, this typology will feature soft landscape public realm and contemporary urban development ranging from terrace housing to medium scale apartment style buildings.



Figure 03\_Built Form Typologies

## Activity Centre – Main Street Typology

14

The activity centre typology is primarily a place for local residents and businesses, a walkable village that is intimate in scale and 'soft' in character. The beach comes to the main street and a variety of small but connected public spaces offer a range of experiences from the quiet to the communal. Buildings and land use will facilitate the creation of a central shopping and activity zone resulting in a walkable community hub.

The Main Street provides a convenient and inviting local shopping experience intended to be serviced by a rapid bus transit system. Street trading and active retail is concentrated in the western portion of the area creating a vibrant community hub. A diverse and contiguous streetscape will be developed with civic, business and retail services ensuring a suitable business mix. The oval and park within the activity centre typology represents the traditional village green and is therefore the focus of active recreation at Cockburn Coast. It is a place to be shared harmoniously by many for diverse purposes.

The built form is encouraged to take advantage of the abundant natural assets and create a comfortable outdoor environment that encourages social interactions in a relaxed and personal environment. Future built form should embody the feeling of seamless transition, from indoor to outdoor, from formal to informal, from exposed to protected. Respectful of nature, built form should reflect the natural characteristic of the vegetation and landscape.

Buildings generally of 5 to 8 storeys in height will promote a pedestrian friendly place through podium style built form and a focus on ground floor activation. Development embodies a warm architectural finish through the use of natural materials, whilst street awnings, wide footpaths and soft landscaped edges create a sense of intimacy and shelter pedestrians.

Opportunities for laneway development enhance and celebrate the distinctive environment by reflecting the neighbourhood character whilst allowing for it to be developed as a secondary small street. Laneways containing commercial uses will be characterised by small scale tenancies, evolving over time to provide an intimate and unique experience.



Figure 04\_Activity Centre built form typology

## Building Setbacks

### Design Objective

- I. Building setbacks create tightly framed streetscapes and public open spaces
- II. Building setbacks help create highly urban streetscapes

### Assessment Criteria

- i. Building setbacks are to be in accordance with the following table

Setbacks for	Primary Setback (minimum maximum)	Street and (minimum)	Side Secondary Setback (minimum)	Rear Setback (minimum)	Public Open Space (minimum)
Levels 1-5	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	4.0 metres to wall and 2.0 metres to balconies (cantilevered/Light weight only)
Levels 6+	5.0 metres to wall and 2.0 metres to balconies (cantilevered/light weight only)	3.0 metres to wall and 2.0 metres to balconies (cantilevered/light weight only)	3.0 metres		5.0 metres to wall and 2.0 metres to balconies (cantilevered/light weight only)

\* Where there is a commercial laneway the minimum setback above 3 storeys should be a distance equivalent to the width of lane unless a variation to the assessment criteria outlined in clause 2.4.1(ii)c of the general provisions is granted



Table 01\_ Building Setbacks for Activity Centre

- ii. ~~Buildings shall be setback 4.0 metres from any boundary adjoining public parkland. This~~ The public open space setback area shall include space for landscaping and if necessary an outdoor living area. Where additional outdoor living area is to be provided, the additional outdoor living area shall be absorbed into the building space (i.e. building shall cantilever over the outdoor living area)
- iii. Projections are permitted within the 4.0 metre setback to public parkland to maximum of 2 metres into the setback area
- iv. Balconies will be supported within the nil setback on levels 1-5 where a substantial facade is provided to ensure a continuous built form
- ~~iv-v. Balconies for Levels 6+ proposed to be setback between 2-5 metres shall be lightweight/cantilevered only~~

16

## Building Articulation

### Design Objective

- I. To ensure that building facades add positively to the public realm and its interest. Building articulation will encourage interaction with the street and passive surveillance of adjacent spaces
- II. To promote a pedestrian scale of buildings at street level
- III. The building design shall demonstrate an appropriate level of articulation to avoid building bulk appearing excessive
- IV. Building articulation will express a vibrant and modern design aesthetic

### Assessment Criteria

- i. Permanent blank walls are not permitted to any street frontage. Major openings are required to provide for surveillance and interaction with the public realm
- ii. For commercial street level frontages a minimum of 80% of the frontage shall be glazed. For the street frontage for all upper floors a minimum of 40% of the frontage shall be glazed
- iii. Mixed use buildings should provide separate entries for non-residential and residential uses for legibility of pedestrian access
- iv. The facade detail may be simplified on loading areas, parapet walls and walls to 'back of house' areas
- v. Corner buildings are to address both frontages through the provision of:
  - a) distinct roof form at corners;
  - b) variation in materials and colours; and
  - c) varied balcony treatments.

## Building Levels

### Design Objective

- I. To ensure development maintains a positive relationship with the street such that pedestrian movement, sight lines and streetscape character are maximised
- II. To allow for the safe use of ceiling fans for cooling

### Assessment Criteria

- i. Floor to floor heights on the ground floor should be 4.5 metres to allow for commercial use
- ii. All other floors shall maintain a 3.1 metre floor to floor height for residential use and a 3.6 metre floor to floor height for commercial use
- iii. The ground floor should be flush with the adjacent footpath at the boundary
- iv. All development is to achieve a minimum finished floor level of +3.8AHD to ensure development takes into account coastal erosion and accretion patterns. Non habitable

rooms and the provision of basement parking are exempt from the finished floor level stated above

## Awnings

### Design Objective

- I. To encourage a pedestrian scale of development
- II. To provide shelter from environmental conditions
- III. To encourage a seamless flow of the use and function of a building from internal to external
- IV. To maintain a safe separation between passing traffic and awnings

18

### Assessment Criteria

- i. Awnings over footpaths are to be provided for no less than 80% of the primary and secondary street frontage. This requirement does not apply to laneways
- ii. The vertical clearance of awnings shall be consistent and generally 3.2 metres from pavement level
- iii. Awnings shall project 3.5 metres from the building line except where this results in a setback between to the awning and the outer edge of the road pavement of less than 0.6 metres
- iv. Adjoining awnings are to form continuous coverage over the footpath
- v. Awnings are to be provided with non-structural veranda posts along the Robb Jetty Main street. In this respect awnings are to be suspended by cantilevered construction and not use load bearing posts

## Building Height

### Design Objective

- I. Building heights help create a compact urban built environment
- II. Consistent building heights create a recognisable urban character
- III. Building heights mean the Activity Centre Typology area is highly visible from a distance
- IV. Building heights do not visually overwhelm the streetscape
- V. Building heights avoids continual overshadowing of the streetscape

### Assessment Criteria

- i. Building heights shall be in accordance with the Building Height Plan (Figure 14)
- ii. Development shall be a minimum of three storeys [and six storeys \(depending on site\)](#)

## Building Materials

### Design Objective

- I. To encourage a style of development that is consistent with the coastal location
- II. To provide for a consistency in the standard of finish and materials throughout Cockburn Coast.
- III. To foster a sense of place through an identifiable character and style of development

### Assessment Criteria

- i. Extensive use of concrete tilt panels is discouraged. Where concrete tilt panels are used, they shall be integrally coloured (colour tinted concrete)
- ii. Moulded textures imprinted in the external surfaces of any concrete panels are encouraged
- iii. Painted finishes and rendered textures over concrete panels are not permitted
- iv. The use of natural materials such as stone, timber and other such natural products is encouraged in both interior and exterior finishes

## Open Space

### Design Objective

- I. To ensure that development provides an attractive and engaging interface with the public open space
- II. To maximise the potential for passive surveillance



### Assessment Criteria

- i. Where an area of public open space is provided the surrounding development must address the open space by maximising passive surveillance from habitable rooms; buildings must front onto the open space through placement of doors, windows and balconies to create a safe and comfortable pedestrian environment

~~ii. The interface between private lots and the public open space may be fenced to a maximum height of 1.2 metres from natural ground level, but must be visually permeable above a height of 1.0 metres above natural ground level~~

### Landmark Sites

#### Design Objective

- I. To encourage a sense of place and identity
- II. To increase the legibility of place
- III. To demarcate the natural hierarchy of an area by identifying those places which are of significance

### Assessment Criteria

- i. Sites in key locations have been nominated as landmark sites as shown in Figure 04  
Built Form Typologies shall:
  - a) Promote prominent architectural form on corner elements to provide a reference point in the built form and landscape;
  - b) Encourage additional height elements where appropriate to create a point of difference with the balance of the development area and demarcate points of entry and prominence; and
  - c) Variations to setback requirements will be considered in order to create prominent feature elements.

### Fencing

#### Design Objective

- I. To ensure that fencing does not detract from the function and appearance of the streetscape

### Assessment Criteria

- i. Fencing is not permitted forward of the building line adjacent to the primary or secondary street frontage  
—The interface between private lots and the public open space may be fenced to a maximum height of 1.2 metres from natural ground level, but must be visually permeable above a height of 1.0 metres above natural ground level

~~ii.~~



Figure 05\_Typical cross section for activity centre development

Mixed Use – Cockburn Road Typology

Cockburn Road is the main arterial road through Cockburn Coast and the policy area. Cockburn Road will be the focus of a mixed use form of development allowing for commercial, residential and retail uses. An active ground floor through retail and commercial uses will be encouraged with primarily residential development occupying the upper levels. The impact of the busy Cockburn Road will be softened by landscaping and an active footpath. Alfresco dining opportunities will be encouraged and facilitated by the built forms and land uses. [The Mixed Use – Cockburn Road Typology as shown in Figure 06 below, applies to both Mixed Use and Mixed Business zones as shown on the approved Robb Jetty Local Structure Plan.](#)



Figure 06\_Mixed Use built form typology

Building Setbacks

Design Objective

- I. Building setbacks promote tightly framed streetscapes and public open spaces
- II. Building setbacks help create highly urban streetscapes

Assessment Criteria

- i. Building setbacks are to be in accordance with the following table

Setback	Primary Street (minimum and maximum)	Secondary (minimum)	Laneway (minimum)	Public Open Space (minimum)
Levels 1-3	Nil	Nil	Nil	4.0 metres to wall and 2.0 metres to balconies (cantilevered/light

				weight only)
Levels 4+	5.0 metres to wall and 2.0 metres to balconies (cantilevered/light weight only)	3.0 metres to wall and 2.0 metres to balconies (cantilevered/light weight only)	3.0 metres	5.0 metres to wall and 2.0 metres to balconies (cantilevered/light weight only)

\* Where there is a commercial laneway the minimum setback above 3 storeys should be a distance equivalent to the width of lane unless a variation to the assessment criteria outlined in clause 2.4.1(ii)c of the general provisions is granted

Table 02\_ Building Setbacks for Mixed Use development

Setbacks for	Street Setback (minimum and maximum)	Side Setback (minimum)	Rear Setback (minimum)
Levels 1-3	Nil	Nil	Nil
Levels 4+	5.0 metres to wall and 2.0 metres to balconies	3.0 metres	3.0 metres

~~\* Where there is a commercial laneway the minimum setback above 3 storeys should be a distance equivalent to the width of lane unless a variation to the assessment criteria outlined in clause 2.4.1(ii)c of the general provisions is granted~~

~~Table 02\_ Building Setbacks for Mixed Use development~~

- ii. Buildings shall be setback 4.0 metres from any boundary adjoining public parkland. This setback area shall include space for landscaping and if necessary an outdoor living area. Where additional outdoor living area is to be provided, the additional outdoor living area shall be absorbed into the building space (i.e building shall cantilever over the outdoor living area)
- iii. Projections are permitted within the 4.0 metre setback to public parkland to maximum of 2.0 metres into the setback area
- iv. Balconies will be supported within the nil setback on levels 1-5 where a substantial facade is provided to ensure a continuous built form

## Building Articulation

### Design Objective

- I. To ensure that building facades add positively to the public realm and its interest. Building articulation will encourage interaction with the street and passive surveillance of adjacent spaces
- II. To promote a pedestrian scale of buildings at street level
- III. The building design shall demonstrate an appropriate level of articulation to avoid building bulk appearing excessive
- IV. Building articulation will express a vibrant and modern design aesthetic

### Assessment Criteria

- i. Permanent blank walls are not permitted to any street frontage. Major openings are required to provide for surveillance and interaction with the public realm
- ii. For commercial street level frontages a minimum of 80% of the frontage shall be glazed. For the street frontage for all upper floors a minimum of 40% of the frontage shall be glazed
- iii. Mixed use buildings should provide separate entries for non-residential and residential uses for legibility of pedestrian access

- iv. The facade detail may be simplified on loading areas, parapet walls and walls to 'back of house' areas
- v. Corner buildings are to address both frontages through the provision of:
  - a) distinct roof form at corners;
  - b) variation in materials and colours; and
  - c) varied balcony treatments.

## **Building Levels**

### **Design Objective**

- I. To ensure development maintains a positive relationship with the street such that pedestrian movement, sight lines and streetscape character are maximised
- II. To allow for the safe use of ceiling fans for cooling

### **Assessment Criteria**

- i. Floor to floor heights on the ground floor should be 4.5 metres to allow for commercial use of the ground floor
- ii. All other floors shall maintain a 3.1 metre floor to floor height for residential use and a 3.6 metre floor to floor height for commercial use
- iii. The ground floor should be flush with the adjacent footpath at the boundary
- iv. All development is to achieve a minimum finished floor level of +3.8AHD to ensure development takes into account coastal erosion and accretion patterns. Non habitable rooms and the provision of basement parking are exempt from the finished floor level stated above

## **Awnings**

### **Design Objective**

- I. To encourage a human scale of development
- II. To provide shelter from environmental conditions
- III. To encourage a seamless flow of the use and function of a building from internal to external
- IV. To maintain a safe separation between passing traffic and awnings

### **Assessment Criteria**

- i. Awnings over footpaths are to be provided for no less than 80% of the primary and secondary street frontages. This requirement does not apply to laneways
- ii. The vertical clearance of awnings shall be consistent and generally 3.2 metres from pavement level
- iii. Awnings shall project 3.5 metres from the building line except where this resulting in a setback between to the awning and the outer edge of the road pavement of less than 0.6 metres
- iv. Adjoining awnings are to form continuous coverage over the footpath
- v. Any veranda post provided to an awning shall be non-structural. In this respect awnings are to be suspended by cantilevered construction and not use load bearing posts

## **Building Height**

### **Design Objective**

- I. Building heights help create a compact urban built environment
- II. Consistent building heights create a recognisable urban character
- III. Building heights do not visually overwhelm the streetscape
- IV. Building heights avoids continual overshadowing of the streetscape

### **Assessment Criteria**

- i. Building shall be in accordance with the Building Height Plan (Figure 14)
- ii. Development shall be a minimum of three storeys

## Building Materials

### Design Objective

- I. To encourage a style of development that is consistent with the coastal location
- II. To provide for a consistency in the standard of finish and materials throughout Cockburn Coast
- III. To foster a sense of place through an identifiable character and style of development

24

### Assessment Criteria

- i. Extensive use of concrete tilt panels is discouraged. Where concrete tilt panels are used, they shall be integrally coloured (colour tinted concrete)
- ii. Moulded textures imprinted in the external surfaces of any concrete panels are encouraged
- iii. Painted finishes and rendered textures over concrete panels are not permitted
- iv. The use of natural materials such as stone, timber and other such natural products is encouraged in both interior and exterior finishes

## Open Space

### Design Objective

- I. To ensure that development provides an attractive and engaging interface with the public open space
- II. To maximise the potential for passive surveillance

### Assessment Criteria

- i. Where an area of public open space is provided the surrounding development must address the open space by maximising passive surveillance from habitable rooms; buildings must front onto the open space through placement of doors, windows and balconies to create a safe and comfortable pedestrian environment
- ~~ii.i. The interface between residential development and the public open space may be fenced to a maximum height of 1.2 metres from natural ground level, but must be visually permeable above a height of 1.0 metres above natural ground level~~

## Landmark Sites

### Design Objective

- I. To encourage a sense of place and identity
- II. To increase the legibility of place
- III. To demarcate the natural hierarchy of an area by identifying those places which are of significance

### Assessment Criteria

- i. Sites in key locations have been nominated as landmark sites as shown in Figure 06 Built Form Typologies. Development on Landmark Sites shall:
  - a) Promote prominent architectural form on corner elements to provide a reference point in the built form and landscape;
  - b) Encourage additional height elements where appropriate to create a point of difference with the balance of the development area and demarcate points of entry and prominence; and
  - c) Variations to setback requirements will be considered in order to create prominent feature elements.

## Fencing

### Design Objective



- I. To ensure that fencing does not detract from the function and appearance of the streetscape

#### Assessment Criteria

- i. Fencing is not permitted forward of the building line to the primary and secondary street frontages
- ii. The interface between residential development and the public open space may be fenced to a maximum height of 1.2 metres from natural ground level, but must be visually permeable above a height of 1.0 metres above natural ground level

25




Figure 07\_Typical cross section for mixed use development



Mixed use development will encompass active street edges that create a comfortable pedestrian environment

## High Density Residential Typology

High density housing opportunities along the Emplacement escarpment and within the Robb Jetty LSP area will create a new skyline for the Cockburn Coast. A manufactured horizon line of apartment buildings six to eight storeys in height will offer the opportunity for a new architectural topography and an integrated landscape of nature and built form. Residents will enjoy the expansive views but also the sense of containment and grounding in the environment. Facades and balconies shade and veil occupants whilst the ground level public realm is internalised and places focus on the residential communities' common interest.

Landscaped front setbacks and tree lined verges will combine to create a soft and comfortable urban setting for apartment buildings. Pocket parks and integrated greenery with built form create a calming natural feel throughout the area despite the intensity of development, acting as a backyard space and providing a link to the coast.




Figure 8\_High Density built form typology



## Building Setbacks

### Design Objective

- I. Building setbacks frame streetscapes and public open spaces
- II. Building setbacks accommodate landscaping which slightly widen and softens the streetscape

27

### Assessment Criteria

- i. Building setbacks are to be in accordance with the following table

Setbacks for	Street Setback (minimum and maximum)	Side Setback (minimum)	Rear Setback (minimum)
Levels 1-3	3.0 metres	Nil	Nil
Levels 4+	5.0 metres to wall Balconies may project into the front setback area.	3.0 metres	3.0 metres

Setback	Primary Street (minimum)	Secondary (minimum)	Laneway (minimum)	Public Open Space (minimum)
Levels 1-3	3.0 metres	Nil	Nil	4.0 metres to wall and 2.0 metres to balconies (cantilevered/light weight only)
Levels 4+	5.0 metres to wall and 2.0 metres to balconies (cantilevered/light weight only)	3.0 metres to wall and 2.0 metres to balconies (cantilevered/light weight only)	3.0 metres	5.0 metres to wall and 2.0 metres to balconies (cantilevered/light weight only)

Table 03\_ Building Setbacks for high density residential development

- ii. Buildings shall be setback 4.0 metres from any boundary adjoining public parkland. This setback area shall include space for landscaping and if necessary an outdoor living area. Where additional outdoor living area is to be provided, the additional outdoor living area shall be absorbed into the building space (i.e. building shall cantilever over the outdoor living area)
- iii. Projections are permitted within the 4.0 metre setback to public parkland to maximum of 2.0 metres into the setback area

## Building Articulation

### Design Objective

- I. To ensure that building facades add positively to the public realm and its interest. Building articulation will encourage interaction with the street and passive surveillance of adjacent spaces
- II. To promote a pedestrian scale of buildings at street level
- III. The building design shall demonstrate an appropriate level of articulation to avoid building bulk appearing excessive

#### IV. Building articulation will express a vibrant and modern design aesthetic

##### Assessment Criteria

- i. Permanent blank walls are not permitted to any street frontage. Major openings are required to provide for surveillance and interaction with the public realm
- ii. The facade detail may be simplified on loading areas, parapet walls and walls to 'back of house' areas
- iii. Built form is to address parks, pedestrian access ways and in particular laneways by providing windows, balconies and suitable facade articulation facing these areas. These elevations are to match the design quality of the dwellings primary street elevation
- iv. Corner buildings are to address both frontages through the provision of:
  - a. distinct roof form at corners;
  - b. variation in materials and colours; and
  - c. varied balcony treatments

28

## Building Levels

### Design Objective

- I. To ensure development maintains a positive relationship with the street such that pedestrian movement, sight lines and streetscape character are maximised
- II. To allow for the safe use of ceiling fans for cooling

### Assessment Criteria

- i. All development shall maintain a minimum floor to floor height of 3.1 metres
- ii. All development is to achieve a minimum finished floor level of +3.8AHD to ensure development takes into account coastal erosion and accretion patterns. Non habitable rooms and the provision of basement parking are exempt from the finished floor level stated above
- iii. Where residential dwellings are proposed on the ground floor adjacent to a street or public open space, a grade separation from 0.5 metres to 1.2 metres between the finished floor level of the ground floor and the adjacent street or public open space is encouraged in order to create a visual distinction between the public and private space

## Building Height

### Design Objective

- I. Building heights will respond to the pedestrian scale, urban character, intended dwelling density, land use mix as well as the natural topography of the area
- II. The built form of an area shall provide a pedestrian scaled street interface with taller upper floors setback from the street alignment
- III. The built form shall minimise overshadowing to adjacent streets and public spaces

### Assessment Criteria

- i. Development shall be in accordance with the Building Height Plan (Figure 14)
- ii. Development shall be a minimum of three storeys

## Building Materials

### Design Objective

- I. To encourage a style of development that is consistent with the coastal location
- II. To provide for a consistency in the standard of finish and materials throughout Cockburn Coast
- III. To foster a sense of place through an identifiable character and style of development

### Assessment Criteria

- i. Extensive use of concrete tilt panels is discouraged. Where concrete tilt panels are used, they shall be integrally coloured (colour tinted concrete)
- ii. Moulded textures imprinted in the external surfaces of any concrete panels are encouraged
- iii. Painted finishes and rendered textures over concrete panels are not permitted
- iv. The use of natural materials such as stone, timber and other such natural products is encouraged in both interior and exterior finishes

29

## Open Space

### Design Objective

- I. To ensure that development provides an appropriate interface with the public open space
- II. To maximise the potential for passive surveillance

### Assessment Criteria

- i. Where an area of public open space is provided the surrounding development must address the open space by maximising passive surveillance from habitable rooms; buildings must front onto the open space through placement of doors, windows and balconies to create a safe and comfortable pedestrian environment

## Fencing

### Design Objective

- I. To ensure that the provision of fencing does not detract from the function and appearance of the streetscape

### Assessment Criteria

- i. The interface between private lots and the public open space may be fenced to a maximum height of 1.2 metres from natural ground level, but must be visually permeable above a height of 1.0 metre above natural ground level
- ii. Fencing shall generally not be permitted in the primary or secondary street setback areas

## Landscaping

### Design Objective

- I. To ensure an attractive streetscape environment
- II. To aid the sustainability of a building through the provision of permeable surface

### Assessment Criteria

- i. The front setback area shall include provision for elements of soft landscaping
- ii. In ground landscaping is preferred over shallow landscaping above basements
- iii. Paving that is contiguous with foot paths and other paving in the public realm shall be of the same style and materials, matching exactly wherever possible




Figure 9\_Typical cross section of high density residential adjoining road



Figure 10\_Typical cross section of high density residential directly adjoining public open space



Figure 11\_Typical cross section for high density residential development



High density Residential Development showing the use of natural materials in the facade and a provision of high quality building articulation in keeping with the objectives of these design guidelines

### Medium Density Residential Typology

The Robb Jetty area provides an important medium density housing area. Leafy streets and small softly landscaped front setbacks will combine to create a comfortable urban setting for contemporary apartment buildings. Future built form will embody a seamless transition from indoor to outdoor, from formal to informal, from exposed to protected. Built form will be respectful of nature and reflect the natural characteristics of the vegetation and landscape within Cockburn Coast.





Figure 12\_Medium Density built form typology

|

## Building Setbacks

### Design Objective

- I. Building setbacks create intimate streetscapes
- II. Building setbacks accommodate landscaping which slightly widen and softens the streetscape

33

### Assessment Criteria

- i. Building setbacks are to be in accordance with the following table

Setbacks for	Street Setback (minimum and maximum)	Side Setback (minimum)	Rear Setback (minimum)
Levels 1-3	2.0 metres	Nil  3.0 metres	Nil  3.0 metres
Levels 4+	5.0 metres to wall and 2.0 metres to balconies		

Setback	Primary Street (minimum)	Secondary (minimum)	Laneway (minimum)	Public Open Space (minimum)
Levels 1-3	2.0 metres	1.5 metres	Nil	3.0 metres to wall and 2.0 metres to balconies (cantilevered/light weight only)
Levels 4+	5.0 metres to wall and 2.0 metres to balconies (cantilevered/light weight only)	3.0 metres to wall and 2.0 metres to balconies (cantilevered/light weight only)	3.0 metres	5.0 metres to wall and 2.0 metres to balconies (cantilevered/light weight only)

Table 04\_ Building Setbacks for medium density residential development

- ii. Buildings shall be setback 4.3.0 metres from any boundary adjoining public parkland. This setback area shall include space for landscaping and if necessary an outdoor living area. Where additional outdoor living area is to be provided, the additional outdoor living area shall be absorbed into the building space (i.e. building shall cantilever over the outdoor living area)
- iii. Projections are permitted within the 4.3.0 metre setback to public parkland to maximum of 2.0 metres into the setback area

## Building Articulation

### Design Objective

- I. To ensure that building facades add positively to the public realm and its interest. Building articulation will encourage interaction with the street and passive surveillance of adjacent spaces
- II. To promote a pedestrian scale of buildings at street level

- III. The building design shall demonstrate an appropriate level of articulation to avoid building bulk appearing excessive
- IV. Building articulation will express a vibrant and modern design aesthetic

#### Assessment Criteria

- i. The facade detail may be simplified on loading areas, parapet walls and walls to 'back of house' areas
- ii. Built form is to address parks, pedestrian access ways and in particular laneways by providing windows, balconies and suitable facade articulation facing these areas. These elevations are to match the design quality of the dwellings primary street elevation
- iii. Balconies are encouraged but shall not run continuously along the facade. Separate individual balconies are appropriate
- iii-iv. The primary frontage shall provide pedestrian access to the major entry (front door) of the building(s)
- iv-v. Corner buildings are to address both frontages through the provision of:
  - a. distinct roof form at corners;
  - b. variation in materials and colours; and
  - c. varied balcony treatments.

### Roof Form

#### Design Objective

- I. The roof form should be designed as a contemporary and integrated architectural structure as befits this unique metropolitan coastal location

#### Assessment Criteria

- i. Use of skillion roofs and modern materials is actively promoted
- ii. Use of pitched roofs and dark tiles is discouraged
- iii. Lighting or similar features may be used to accentuate the roofscape and provide a positive architectural feature at night
- iv. Flat roofs are acceptable where concealed behind a building parapet.

### Building Levels

#### Design Objective

- I. To ensure development maintains a positive relationship with the street such that pedestrian movement, sight lines and streetscape character are maximised
- II. To allow for the safe use of ceiling fans for cooling

#### Assessment Criteria

- i. All development shall maintain a minimum floor to floor height of 3.1 metres
- ii. All development is to achieve a minimum finished floor level of +3.8AHD to ensure development takes into account coastal erosion and accretion patterns. Non habitable rooms and the provision of basement parking are exempt from the finished floor level stated above
- iii. Where residential dwellings are proposed on the ground floor adjacent to a street or public open space, a grade separation from 0.5 metres to 1.2 metres between the finished floor level of the ground floor and the adjacent street or public open space is encouraged in order to create a visual distinction between the public and private space

### Building Height

#### Design Objective

- I. Building heights will respond to the pedestrian scale, urban character, intended dwelling density, land use mix as well as the natural topography of the area
- II. The built form of an area shall provide a pedestrian scaled street interface with taller upper floors setback from the street alignment



III. The built form shall minimise overshadowing to adjacent streets and public spaces

Assessment Criteria

- i. Building shall be in accordance with the Building Height Plan (Figure 14)
- ii. Development shall be a minimum of three storeys, with the exception of Lots 235-239 and 247-259 where the minimum height is two storeys as shown in a relevant Local Development Plan. For the purposes of assessing the number of storeys, a loft can be considered as a third storey, provided the building design gives the appearance of three storeys from the primary street frontage
- ii.iii. Single storey development shall not be supported

35

## Building Materials

### Design Objective

- I. To encourage a style of development that is consistent with the coastal location
- II. To provide for a consistency in the standard of finish and materials throughout Cockburn Coast
- III. To foster a sense of place through an identifiable character and style of development

36

### Assessment Criteria

- i. Extensive use of concrete tilt panels is discouraged. Where concrete tilt panels are used, they shall be integrally coloured (colour tinted concrete)
- ii. Moulded textures imprinted in the external surfaces of any concrete panels should also be applied
- iii. Painted finishes and rendered textures over concrete panels are not permitted
- iv. Warm exterior finishes are encouraged through the use of natural materials such as stone, timber, and other such natural products

## Open Space

### Design Objective

- I. To ensure that development provides an appropriate interface with the public open space
- II. To maximise the potential for passive surveillance

### Assessment Criteria

- i. Where an area of public open space is provided the surrounding development must address the open space by maximising passive surveillance from habitable rooms; buildings must front onto the open space through placement of doors, windows and balconies to create a safe and comfortable relationship to the public open space

## Fencing

### Design Objective

- I. To ensure that fencing does not detract from the function and appearance of the streetscape

### Assessment Criteria

- i. The interface between private lots and the public open space may be fenced to a maximum height of 1.2 metres from natural ground level, but must be visually permeable above a height of 1 [metre](#) above natural ground level

## Landscaping

### Design Objective

- I. To ensure an attractive streetscape environment
- II. To aid the sustainability of a building through the provision of permeable surface

### Assessment Criteria

- i. The front setback area shall include provision for elements of soft landscaping
- ii. In ground landscaping is preferred over shallow landscaping above basements, particularly in front setback areas which provides the opportunity for tree planting



Figure 13\_Typical cross section for medium density built form typology

## 2. GENERAL PROVISIONS

### 2.1 Built Form Requirements

38

Built form should provide a pedestrian scale and define streets and public spaces whilst contributing towards creating an urban presence. The built form will contribute towards the intended streetscape character and typology. Taking cues from the natural assets of the site building height responds to site topography, maximising views to the ocean particularly for residential development.

For private open space, visual privacy, storage for grouped and multiple dwellings requirements refers to the relevant section of the R-Codes. For private open space for single houses refer to the relevant Local Development Plan (LDP) or if not specified in the LDP refer to the City of Cockburn's Local Planning Policy LPP 1.16 Single House Standards for Medium Density Housing in the Development Zone. Other elements not listed in the relevant LDP or LPP 1.16 shall be assessed as per the Residential Design Codes.

#### 2.1.1 Building Height

##### Design Objective

- I. Building heights will respond to the pedestrian scale and urban character of Cockburn Coast, intended dwelling density and land use mix as well as the natural topography
- II. The built form of an area shall provide a pedestrian scaled street interface with taller upper floors setback from the street alignment
- III. The built form shall minimise overshadowing to adjacent streets and public spaces

##### Assessment Criteria

- i. Heights to be in accordance with the typology specific built form requirements and the Building Height Plan below in Figure 14
- ii. The proposed Primary School may be approved with a minimum of two storeys




Figure 14\_Building Height Plan



## 2.1.2 Facades


### Design Objective

- I. Building facades add significantly to the public realm and its interest. A vibrant and modern design aesthetic for Cockburn Coast will require the provision of visually engaging building exteriors which encourage interaction with the street and passive surveillance of adjacent spaces

39

### Assessment Criteria

- i. Fenestration, entrances, balconies and awnings shall be provided in a manner that creates visual cohesiveness, interest and interaction with the public realm
- ii. An exposed parapet or boundary wall must have the same standard of finish as the primary facade. Detailing for permanently exposed blank walls shall include texture, patterns or suitable alternatives to the finish of the wall to address the objective
- iii. External ducting, air conditioners, plants, pipes, lift over-runs, service doors and similar building services must be screened from public view or adjacent property and incorporated into the building at the initial design stage
- iv. Ground floor lobbies shall be clearly delineated, well lit and safe to access
- v. Facade design shall address crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED) principles



Buildings shall provide a break up of bulk and scale through articulated facades



Building facades are to be finished with fine grain architectural elements

### 2.1.3 ~~Room~~Roof Form

#### Design Objective

- I. The roof form as seen from the street or adjoining sites should be designed to make a contemporary and positive architectural contribution to the streetscape and skyline. Where appropriate the roof form can be designed to enhance the architecture and contribute to creating local landmarks through the use of integrated architectural form and detailing

40

#### Assessment Criteria

- i. Roof designs must conceal roof plant and equipment including lift over run structures from view from the public realm and street level
- ii. Lighting or similar features may be used to accentuate the roofscape to provide a feature at night
- iii. Flat roofs are acceptable where concealed behind a building parapet
- iii-iv. Flat roof areas that are accessible, concealed behind a building parapet and provide a minimum dimension of 2.4m may be used as an outdoor living area or communal open space, however shall not count towards the private open space area requirement.


### 2.1.4 Lighting

#### Design Objective

- I. To ensure perceived and actual safety for all users of the area is achieved by providing lighting around public spaces that allows for a high degree of visibility of pedestrians at all times

#### Assessment Criteria

- i. Lighting to be integrated into built form to highlight architectural features
- ii. Ensure inset spaces, access, egress and signage is well lit
- iii. Lighting is to be incorporated into building awnings over the footpath and building entrances



Innovative lighting built into the facade of a building can contribute to an activated and interesting facade



### 2.1.5 Acoustics and Vibration

#### Design Objective

- I. To facilitate a sustainable mixed use environment where a variety of land uses can co-exist
- II. To ensure appropriate noise intrusion and noise emission mitigation measures are incorporated into building design and construction and where necessary, building refurbishment

#### Assessment Criteria

- i. Design of Noise sensitive premises must be give consideration to the following:
  - a) the identification of existing/potential environmental noise sources;
  - b) development orientation and layout taking into account the location of existing/potential environmental noise sources;
  - c) the location of bedrooms away from noise sources;
  - d) the location of balconies and windows away from noise sources;
  - e) the use of built form (blade walls, etc) to screen noise sources; and
  - f) the use of building design elements (balcony balustrades, decorative screens, etc) to provide some reduction in noise impact on windows.
- ii. Notifications are required to be applied to the created land title and any subsequent strata titles of any noise sensitive premises pursuant to section 70A of the *Transfer of Land Act 1893*, together with section 165 of the *Planning and Development Act 2005* to inform prospective land owners and residents of the likelihood of higher noise levels associated within the inner city environment
- iii. An acoustic and vibration (as deemed required in the local structure plan) report and associated plans are required detailing compliance with the above design objectives and assessment criteria for noise sensitive and commercial developments. The report is to be prepared by a qualified and experienced acoustic consultant and submitted as part of a DA and should address the requirements of State Planning Policy 5.4 Road and Rail Transport Noise and Freight Considerations in Land Use Planning (and associated guidelines), [the City of Cockburn's Local Planning Policy LPP 1.12 Noise Attenuation](#) and Quiet House Design Principles

### 2.1.6 Active Edges and Street Relationship

#### Design Objective

- I. The activation of streets and other publicly accessible spaces are fundamental to providing an attractive and safe pedestrian environment throughout Cockburn Coast
- II. All development must be designed to activate streets and laneways. This can be achieved by utilising major openings to residential and commercial land uses, alfresco dining areas, pedestrian shelters and legible building entries to create a vibrant, diverse and safe environment

#### Assessment Criteria

- i. Passive surveillance of communal areas and public spaces ~~are to~~ [shall](#) be integrated into building design, providing for overlooking of the street, public space ~~or and~~ communal open space
- ii. Pedestrian entrances are to be highly visible
- iii. Ground floor non-residential frontages should be designed as shop fronts with no less than 80% of the shop front glazed with clear glass
- iv. Car park entries are to be located appropriately to avoid disruption of the pedestrian experience

- v. Inactive ground floor uses are to be avoided within the Activity Centre and Mixed Use areas particularly on the Robb Jetty Main Street and surrounding the identified landmark development sites

42

### 2.1.7 Heritage Considerations

#### Design Objective

- I. Development of site adjacent to a heritage place shall be respectful of the recognised cultural heritage significance; and should not adversely affect the heritage significance

#### Assessment Criteria

- i. New buildings adjacent to a Heritage Place should conform with the provisions of the City's Heritage Conservation Guidelines policy to ensure that they respect the heritage significance of the place
- ii. Any new work adjacent to a significant tree should not affect the appearance or health of the tree



Ground floor commercial land uses will provide active street edges



## **2.2.7 2.2 Service Infrastructure and Access**

Service infrastructure and access arrangements are an important part of allowing development to function effectively. However, these elements can often create unsightly urban environments and therefore appropriate treatment and coordination of these elements is required to make them an integral part of new development

43

### **2.2.1 Internal Access**

#### Design Objective

- I. Internal access within street blocks to perform as one coordinated and efficient movement network

#### Assessment Criteria

- i. Internal access ways servicing development to be designed to facilitate adjoining development and where logical allow for reciprocal access arrangements

### **2.2.2 Parking**

#### Design Objective

- I. Development will encourage and support alternative modes of transport to the car by limiting and screening the provision of car parking on site

#### Assessment Criteria

- i. Vehicle crossovers for non-residential development are required to be built underneath the building or provide design elements above the crossover to reduce the street impact and pedestrian environment
- ii. Reciprocal use of commercial car parking bays for uses within a comprehensive development with different peak usage requirements (such as restaurants and offices) may be considered
- iii. Residential parking is to be provided in accordance with the [relevant Local Structure Plan City of Cockburn Town Planning Scheme No.3 and the Residential Design Codes of Western Australia.](#)

### **2.2.3 Parking Location and Access**

#### Design Objective

- I. The number of vehicle crossovers into a development is to be minimised to create a pedestrian friendly environment
- II. Parking is to be located so as minimise the visual impact on the public realm

#### Assessment Criteria

- i. All on site car parking facilities are to be concealed from public view to ensure car parking does not dominate streetscapes or create conflict with pedestrian and vehicle movement
- ii. Car parking entry is to be subservient to pedestrian entries and shall address street spaces, building returns and recesses
- iii. Where terrace style or single residential lots are proposed vehicle access must be provided at the rear of the dwellings
- iv. Car parking is to be concealed from public view by habitable frontages, or high quality landscaping along minor/secondary streets
- v. Parking facilities should not be visible from public open space
- vi. Where garage doors service only one dwelling they should be no wider than 6 metres

### **2.2.4 Sleeved Parking**

#### Design Objective

- I. To screen multi storey car parks from the public realm and to provide active frontages to the street

#### Assessment Criteria

- i. All multi storey car parking structures should be sleeved by development to ensure car parking is screened from view of the public realm
- ii. Sleeve above ground car parking structures with other uses, such as offices, residential and retail
- iii. Where it is not possible for car parking structure to be screened any car parking structures that contain three or more levels must be appropriately designed and screened from adjacent or nearby buildings and the street through the use of innovative wall detailing, decorative screening, patterning and vegetation

44

### 2.2.5 End of Trip Facilities

#### Design Objective

- I. To encourage the use of bicycles, walking and other alternative means of transport to reduce the use of private motor vehicles and contribute to public health

#### Assessment Criteria

- i. Provision of adequate bicycle and change room facilities. Secure lockers, bicycle storage and showers shall be provided within buildings
- ii. Developments are to be provided with end of trip facilities in accordance with the following table

<b>Commercial</b>	1 Secure bicycle storage per 150m <sup>2</sup> of Net Lettable Area (NLA); and
Accessible showers	There must be a minimum of two female and two male showers, located in separate changing rooms, for the first 10 bicycle parking bays. Additional shower facilities to be provided at a rate of one male and one female shower for every 10 bicycle parking bays or part thereof.
Changing facilities	Including secure lockers at 1.5 for each bicycle parking bay.
Visitor Bicycle Storage	A minimum of 1 space per 750m <sup>2</sup> of NLA. Located and signed near the main public entrance to the building.
<b>Residential</b>	Bicycle parking facilities for multiple dwellings, short stay accommodation and serviced apartments shall be provided at a minimum of 1 bay per unit.

Table 05\_ End of trip facility provision rates



End of trip facilities



Use of screening can minimise the impact of parking structures

## 2.2.6 Site Services

### Design Objective

- I. Services and related elements required for the function of the building shall be appropriately screened or integrated into the building design

### Assessment Criteria

- i. Air-conditioning units must not be visible from the streets and laneways
- ii. Service pipes and wired services are to be concealed from public view
- iii. All meters to be contained within development lots to the requirements of the appropriate authorities
- iv. Provide secure and accessible facilities for mail delivery
- v. Commercial utility and waste storage areas are to be screened or located behind buildings and not visible from public view and residential apartments
- vi. Fire booster cabinets and associated infrastructure are to be discretely designed into development and must not dominate any frontage

## 2.3.72.2.7 Sustainability Requirements

Integral to the sustainability of the development will be the provision of affordable housing and facilities to encourage alternative modes of transport to the private car. This will promote a healthy lifestyle that encourages people to actively engage with the urban environment and create a robust and diverse community

### 2.3.1 Sustainable Travel

#### Design Objective

- I. To reduce greenhouse gases through the reduction of motorised transport to and from Cockburn Coast and encourage residents and site visitors to improve their physical health through walking, cycling or other physically active forms of transport either solely or in combination with public transport

#### Assessment Criteria

- i. Demonstrate that pedestrians and cyclists have been prioritised within the development
- ii. Surface finishes of all driveways and pathways to be safe and comfortable for pedestrians and cyclists
- iii. Grade changes between private and public spaces to be complementary and accessible

### 2.4.1 Residential and Commercial Laneways

#### Design Objective

46

- I. To create unique and attractive built form and character along laneways through sensitive and innovative design
- II. To encourage activity and interaction between public laneways and adjacent private uses at the ground level
- III. To reinforce the primary function of laneways as key service and vehicle access spaces within the development
- IV. Encourage development to provide highly articulated and well detailed facades that create visual interest, particularly at the lower levels
- V. Encourage development to orientate windows and balconies to overlook lane ways

#### Assessment Criteria

##### i. Residential Laneways

- a) For lots with a laneway frontage of 8 metres or greater, pedestrian access to the laneway from the lot should be provided
- b) Buildings are to provide an elevation to the laneway that is articulated and similarly detailed to the front facade

##### ii. Commercial Laneways

- a) Laneways within the activity centre and mixed used zones are encouraged to be activated at ground floor level, but shall not be done so to the detriment to the activation of the primary or streetscape facade of the building
- b) Buildings shall maintain a nil setback to the laneway for the first three storeys
- c) The minimum setback above 3 storeys should be a distance equivalent to the width of the lane, unless it can be demonstrated that a lesser setback protects the quality of the pedestrian space at ground level including:
  - a. by maintaining or providing greater access to sunlight;
  - b. by maintaining or providing greater wind protection; and
  - c. by avoiding a sense of enclosed space.
- d) Buildings are to provide an elevation to the laneway that is articulated and similarly detailed to the front facade
- e) Development should contain a door which addresses the laneway or is accessed via its own pedestrian access gate



Activated laneways encourage vitality and interaction between public laneways and adjacent private uses

## 2.5 Communal Open Space

### Design Objective

- I. To provide an adequate area of quality communal open space for multiple dwelling developments which will enhance residential amenity and provide opportunities for soft landscape areas.

47

### Assessment Criteria

- i. Communal open space is provided for multiple dwellings at the following rates:
  - a) Up to 10 dwellings – no requirement
  - b) 11 to 20 dwellings – 10% of site area
  - c) 21-30 dwellings – 15% of site area
  - d) 31+ dwellings – 20% of site area
- ii. Developments achieve a minimum of 50% direct sunlight to the principal usable part of the primary communal open space for a minimum of two hours between 9am and 3pm on 21 June (mid winter)

<b>POS</b>	<b>REMOVAL &amp; PRUNING OF TREES</b>	<b>PSEW15</b>
------------	---------------------------------------	---------------

<b>POSITION STATEMENT CODE:</b>	PSEW15
<b>DIRECTORATE:</b>	Engineering & Works
<b>BUSINESS UNIT:</b>	Parks Department
<b>SERVICE UNIT:</b>	Parks Maintenance Services
<b>RESPONSIBLE OFFICER:</b>	Manager, Parks & Environment
<b>FILE NO.:</b>	182/002
<b>DATE FIRST ADOPTED:</b>	20 May 2003
<b>DATE LAST REVIEWED:</b>	10 December 2015
<b>ATTACHMENTS:</b>	N/A
<b>VERSION NO.</b>	3

<b>Dates of Amendments / Reviews:</b>	
DAPPS Meeting:	27 August 2015 26 November 2015
OCM:	11 December 2014 10 September 2015

## BACKGROUND:

Trees are regarded as highly desirable and integral to the urban landscape, providing a range of social, environmental and economic advantages. As such they are considered to be an integral part of the total public landscape amenity affecting and benefiting all residents within the locality, individually and collectively.

From time to time requests are received from residents for the removal or pruning of trees.

## PURPOSE:

To provide clear direction to the City's officers when requests are received for the removal or pruning of trees growing on land under the direct care, control and management of the City.

## POSITION:

*Removal of Trees on Land under the direct care, control and management of the City*

(1) Trees shall **not** be removed unless they are:

1. Dead;
2. In a state of decline to the point that survival is unlikely;
3. Structurally unsound, to the point of constituting imminent danger to persons or property;
4. Damaging or likely to damage property, where alternatives to prevent damage are not possible;



<b>POS</b>	<b>REMOVAL &amp; PRUNING OF TREES</b>	<b>PSEW15</b>
------------	---------------------------------------	---------------

5. Part of a tree replacement program; or
6. Obstructing a Council approved works program, such as road and drainage works.
7. Adversely impacting on home owners by way of tree root invasion that is damaging their homes, driveways, letter boxes, fences or other assets on their property.

(2) Any cost of removing the tree to be borne by the City.

(3) wherever practicable, a new tree be planted that does not have invasive root systems.

### *Loss of Amenity*

Trees growing on land under the direct care, control and management of the City, that are considered to be unduly interfering with the amenity available to adjacent residents in the use of their land, may be removed or pruned at the discretion of the Council.

In such circumstances, trees shall not be removed unless:

1. A request in writing for removal of the tree has been received from the adjacent property owner by the City's Officers, clearly stating the reasons for requesting removal;
2. An Officer's report detailing the request and associated issues has been presented to the Council for its consideration, including any consultation undertaken; and
3. The Council has formally resolved to authorise removal of the tree.

Where the Council has resolved to authorise removal of a tree at the request of an adjacent property owner:

1. Removal shall be at full cost to the property owner who made the request for removal;
2. The tree shall be dismantled to the ground, removed from the site and the stump shall be ground out;
3. The tree shall be removed by a suitable contractor engaged by the City for the purpose;
4. The tree shall not be removed until the City has received payment for the full cost of removal; and
5. The City at the Council's cost shall plant a replacement tree suitable for the location, within six months of removing the original tree.

### *Planning, Building, and Other Approvals*

Where a planning, building or other approval has been granted by the City, that necessitates removal of a tree growing on land under the direct care, control and management of the City:

POS	REMOVAL & PRUNING OF TREES	PSEW15
-----	----------------------------	--------

1. Removal shall be at full cost to the property owner who made the request for removal;
2. The tree shall be dismantled to the ground, removed from the site and the stump shall be ground out;
3. The tree shall be removed by a suitable contractor engaged by the City for the purpose; and
4. The City at the Council's cost shall plant a replacement tree suitable for the location and as near as practical to the original location, within six months of removing the original tree.

### *Pruning of Trees*


Generally, trees shall be allowed to develop their natural canopy and shall not be pruned without the approval of the City;

Where pruning is essential, pruning shall only be carried out in accordance with Australian Standard AS 4373 – ~~1996~~2007, *Pruning of Amenity Trees*, and for the express purposes of:

1. Providing clearance for pedestrian movement;
2. Improving the safety, structure and health of the tree;
3. Maintaining clearances for utility services, eg powerlines;
4. Improving vehicle driver's line of sight along vehicle carriageways; and
5. Preventing branches encroaching into neighbouring property from public property.
6. Minor trimming of a branch on the undercroft of a verge tree is permissible for pedestrian safety or as a result of damage but any other pruning must be carried out by City officers or contractors employed by the City as excessive pruning may result in permanent damage to the health of a tree which may result in future replacement cost to the City.



# CITY OF COCKBURN



## SPECIAL AUDIT & STRATEGIC FINANCE COMMITTEE

### MINUTES

#### FOR

**THURSDAY, 23 FEBRUARY 2017**

These Minutes are subject to Confirmation

Presiding Member's Signature

\_\_\_\_\_

Date: 20 July 2017



# CITY OF COCKBURN

## SUMMARY OF MINUTES OF SPECIAL AUDIT AND STRETEGIC FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON THURSDAY, 23 FEBRUARY 2017 AT 6:30 PM

---

---

### Page

1.	DECLARATION OF MEETING.....	1
2.	APPOINTMENT OF PRESIDING MEMBER (IF REQUIRED) .....	1
3.	DISCLAIMER (READ ALOUD BY PRESIDING MEMBER) .....	2
4.	ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF RECEIPT OF WRITTEN DECLARATION.....	2
5	(SASFC 23/02/2017) - APOLOGIES & LEAVE OF ABSENCE.....	2
6.	PUBLIC QUESTION TIME .....	2
7.	DEPUTATIONS .....	2
8.	PETITIONS .....	2
9.	DECLARATION OF COUNCILLORS WHO HAVE NOT GIVEN DUE CONSIDERATION TO MATTERS IN THE BUSINESS PAPER .....	2
10	(SASFC 23/02/2017) - PURPOSE OF MEETING.....	2
11.	COUNCIL MATTERS.....	3
11.1	(MINUTE NO 184) (SASFC 23/02/2017) - LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMPLIANCE AUDIT RETURN 2016 (087/005) (J NGOROYEMOTO) (ATTACH) .....	3
12	(SASFC 23/02/2017) - CLOSURE OF MEETING.....	5



# CITY OF COCKBURN

## MINUTES OF SPECIAL AUDIT & STRATEGIC FINANCE COMMITTEE MEETING HELD ON THURSDAY, 23 FEBRUARY 2017 AT 6:30

---

### PRESENT:

#### ELECTED MEMBERS

Mr S Portelli	-	Councillor (Presiding Member)
Mr L Howlett	-	Mayor
Mrs C Reeve-Fowkes	-	Deputy Mayor
Mr B Houwen	-	Councillor
Mrs C Terblanche	-	Councillor

#### IN ATTENDANCE

Mr S. Cain	-	Chief Executive Officer
Mr D. Green	-	Director, Administration & Community Services
Mr S. Downing	-	Director, Finance & Corporate Services
Mr C. Sullivan	-	Director, Engineering & Works
Mr J. Ngoroyemoto	-	Governance & Risk Management Co-ordinator
Mrs B. Pinto	-	EA to Directors – Fin. & Corp. Services & Admin. & Comm. Services


### 1. DECLARATION OF MEETING

The Presiding Member declared the meeting open at 6.30 pm.

He acknowledged the Noongar people who are the Traditional Custodians of this Land. He also paid respect to the Elders, both past and present, of the Noongar Nation and extend that respect to other Indigenous Australians who may be present.

### 2. APPOINTMENT OF PRESIDING MEMBER (If required)

Nil.



**3. DISCLAIMER (Read aloud by Presiding Member)**

Members of the public, who attend Council Meetings, should not act immediately on anything they hear at the Meetings, without first seeking clarification of Council's position. Persons are advised to wait for written advice from the Council prior to taking action on any matter that they may have before Council.

**4. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF RECEIPT OF WRITTEN DECLARATION**

Nil

**5 (SASFC 23/02/2017) - APOLOGIES & LEAVE OF ABSENCE**

Clr Kevin Allen - Apology

**6. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

Nil

**7. DEPUTATIONS**

Nil

**8. PETITIONS**

Nil

**9. DECLARATION OF COUNCILLORS WHO HAVE NOT GIVEN DUE CONSIDERATION TO MATTERS IN THE BUSINESS PAPER**

Nil

**10 (SASFC 23/02/2017) - PURPOSE OF MEETING**

The purpose of the meeting is to consider the Compliance Audit Return (CAR) for the period 1 January 2016 to 31 December 2016, in time for it to be adopted by Council and forwarded to the Department of Local Government by the statutory timeframe of 31 March 2017, as required by Regulation 14 and 15 of the Local Government (Audit) Regulations 1996 (as amended).



## 11. COUNCIL MATTERS

### 11.1 **(MINUTE NO 184) (SASFC 23/02/2017) - LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMPLIANCE AUDIT RETURN 2016 (087/005) (J NGOROYEMOTO) (ATTACH)**

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

That Council adopt the Local Government Compliance Audit Return for the period 1 January 2016 to 31 December 2016, as attached to the Agenda.

#### **COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION**

MOVED Deputy Mayor C Reeve-Fowkes SECONDED Cllr C Terblanche that the recommendation be adopted.

**CARRIED 5/0**

#### **COUNCIL DECISION**

#### **Background**

Since 2000, completion of the Local Government Compliance Audit Return has been mandatory for all local governments in this State in accordance with Regulations 14 and 15 of the Local Government (Audit) Regulations 1996.

#### **Submission**

N/A

#### **Report**

The Annual Compliance Audit Return is to be presented to, and reviewed by, a meeting of the Audit and Strategic Finance Committee in accordance with Regulation 14(3A) of the Local Government (Audit) Regulations 1996 and the result of that review be reported to a meeting of Council for adoption.

Following adoption by Council, a certified copy of the Return, signed by the Mayor and Chief Executive Officer, along with a copy of the relevant section of the Council Minutes, is submitted to the Director General, Department of Local Government and Regional Development



in accordance with Regulations 14 and 15 of the Local Government (Audit) Regulations 1996, by 31 March. The Return indicates a conformity rating of 99% for the year.

The 1% non-compliance was due to one Elected Member failing to complete the Annual Return by 31 August 2016. This was due to technological difficulties with our new compliance system. This was rectified and the Annual return was lodged on 8 September 2016 and notified to the Corruption and Crime Commission by the Chief Executive Officer.

### **Strategic Plan/Policy Implications**

#### **Leading & Listening**

- A responsive, accountable and sustainable organisation.
- A culture of risk management and compliance with relevant legislation, policy and guidelines

### **Budget/Financial Implications**

N/A

### **Legal Implications**

Regulations 14 and 15 of the Local Government (Audit) Regulations 1996 refer.

### **Community Consultation**

N/A

### **Risk Management Implications**

Failure to adopt the recommendation will result in non-compliance with the Compliance Audit Return statutory reporting requirements to the Department of Local Government by 31 March 2017.

### **Attachment(s)**

City of Cockburn Compliance Audit Return 2016.

### **Advice to Proponent(s)/Submissioners**

N/A

### **Implications of Section 3.18(3) Local Government Act, 1995**

Nil.





**12 (SASFC 23/02/2017) - CLOSURE OF MEETING**

6.41pm.



## CURRICULUM VITAE

**Name:** Barbara Suzanne Gdowski  
**Date of Birth:**  
**Country of Birth:**  
**Citizenship:**  
**Contact:**

**Work ph.** 9360 2710

### QUALIFICATIONS

Bachelor of Architecture (Hons)  
 1985, University of Western Australia

### AFFILIATIONS

Member of WA Institute of Architects Urban Design Committee  
 Member of State Design Review Panel (Convention Centre Masterplan project)  
 Judge 2015 Architecture Awards

### SUMMARY OF EXPERIENCE

- |                    |  |
|--------------------|--|
| <b>Current</b>     | <b>General Manager Strategy and Planning</b><br><b>Property and Commercial Services Murdoch University</b><br>As the GM of this directorate, Barbara is responsible for 11 staff, with teams that include strategic asset management, process, procedures and policies for University asset portfolio, Design and Sustainability (including design review process chaired by Geoffrey London), strategic project assessment, budget establishment, business case and approval process, project procurement, place-management and activation, development and management of Strategic Masterplan for South Street Campus, revitalisation and refurbishment of existing buildings as required.   |
| <b>2004 – 2015</b> | <b>Senior Development Manager (SDM)</b><br><b>LandCorp</b><br>LandCorp Senior Development Managers are all round property experts who are experienced in evaluating and delivering projects whilst expertly managing the intricate relationships and partnerships which surround significant projects, including master plan implementation. Responsibilities include all aspects of Project Management. Barbara has a specific role in linking the Design and Sustainability Unit with operations and has been the SDM for a number of Icon, award winning projects, including Cockburn Central (all aspects of project delivery, including project initiation, planning, full project team management, civil works construction, lot sales, Design Guideline administration with an extensive Design review process as Chair, full place-management implementation plan, including space and event management). Barbara is also involved with the Knutsford Redevelopment precinct, Leighton and the Cottesloe Deaf School (with Business Development-high level business case). Barbara has also sat in the role of Business Manager for the metropolitan Activities Centre team. |
| <b>1996 -2004</b>  | <b>Project Manager</b><br><b>Woodsome Management Pty Ltd</b><br>General duties pertaining to all aspects of project management in respect of major projects; including procurement, budget monitoring and administration, project team management, stakeholder liaison, project governance and project documentation.  |
| <b>1991 – 1994</b> | <b>Architect and Project Manager</b><br><b>Independent Consultancy</b><br>Experience involving all aspects of small practice including design (residential and commercial), supervision, construction and office management, including being a home owner builder.   |
| <b>1985 – 1991</b> | <b>Architect</b><br><b>Forbes and Fitzhardinge, Architects and Planners</b><br>Involved in all aspects of the architectural process from design through to contract administration. Areas of expertise included client liaison, project team coordination, tourism/sustainability and communications.  |

## PROJECT SUMMARIES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

**2015 – present** Murdoch University Strategic Masterplan: Development of a Masterplan to guide development for 223Ha University landholdings for the short, medium and long term outlook.

**2015 – present** Murdoch University Library Refurbishment Masterplan: Full analysis of existing library functionality with resultant strategic plan to deliver student centric spaces with the Library taking the place at the centre of student life.

**2015 – present** Murdoch Hub Student Centre: Delivery of new student \$24m Ref and ancillary centre on Bush Court to deliver a location for students to socialise, share meals, study and interact.

**2015 – present** Mandurah Campus Masterplan: Development framework to guide refurbishment, activation, improved student experience, improved integrated landscaping and public art proposal and addition food and beverage options, including refurbished Alfresco area.

**2010 - 2015** Design and project management. Development of the Project Design Review process for all LandCorp projects, Design Guidelines (author of the Cockburn Central Activity Centre DGs) across the organisation, Design reviews for specific projects (Kunnunarra strategic land supply, Karatha and Woodside 220 dwelling masterplan, Swanbourne Highschool Mirvac Fini Joint Venture, Leighton, Perry Lakes and Cockburn Central), design tenders (author) and evaluation panel member. Her stakeholders include a close liaison with the Office of the Government Architect and Barbara is well versed in governance and procurement processes for all sized projects.

**2006 - 2015** Knutsford redevelopment area. (Fremantle). This project will seek to innovatively plan for social and demographic changes of the forthcoming baby boomer phenomenon. Promoting whole of life intergenerational planning, it will aim to do this primarily within the context of the emerging medium density market. This project includes a series of further subprojects including the City of Fremantle Depot and Museum sites. LandCorp hopes to partner with the City to deliver a benchmark, demonstration project focusing on precinct scale sustainable infrastructure with design excellence for an integrated urban design approach. The White Gum Valley project includes the innovative 'GenY' project. Via a design competition, this project will deliver a new approach to housing, where compact living with 3 small dwellings within the appearance of an average suburban home is delivered.

**2004 – 2015** Cockburn Central Regional Central. New Regional Centre for rapidly expanding south west corridor to ultimately serve a population of approximately 190,000 people within a 10km radius. Planning has been a complex process with implications for all levels of government, the private sector and the community. Project objectives are based on sustainability, design excellence, an enhanced public realm and place-management to ensure that a new village is created which can grow sustainably into a vibrant town centre. Senior Development Manager (nearing completion)

**1996 – 2004** Alkimos Eglinton Structure Plan. Liaison Project Manager for 2660 Ha study area in the north west corridor of Perth requiring an integrated master planned carbon neutral solution for improved regional planning outcome. (suburbs under construction)

**2000 – 2004** Alkimos Lot 101 Joint Venture. As a result of the above collaboration a development agreement between the Water Corporation, LandCorp and Eglinton Estates Pty Ltd was established to progress the first phase of the project adjacent the Alkimos regional beach. (Underway)

**1998 – 2004** Yanchep Lot 101. 100ha study area located south of Yanchep. Structure Plan required for development of a coastal residential node, focusing on greater sustainability. (Underway)

**1998 – 2003** Paruna Eco Sanctuary, Avon Valley. Proposal for an Australian Wildlife Conservancy Bushcamp in the Avon Valley. The project concept focused on extensive sustainability initiatives within a masterplanned approach.

**2000 -** Mornington Bushcamp – Kimberley. Proposal for Australian Wildlife Conservancy Bushcamp at Mornington Station. The project concept was an eco friendly approach to accommodation based on semi permanent safari tents and fixed ensuites. Woodsome Management project managed the project which is now built.

**1991 - 1993** X2 Heritage Award – City of Fremantle for owner, Architect and Builder of 39 / 41 Attfield Street Fremantle. 1991. (Completed) and for 26 / 28 Gold Street, South Fremantle. 1993 (Completed)

**1990 – 1991** Relocate to Singapore to establish satellite office for Forbes & Fitzhardinge Architects (2 person resident office). Involved with all aspects of administering a satellite office, responsible for 3 major master plan projects.

**1989 – 1991** Batamindo Executive Village. Singapore / Indonesia \$250million master planned resort, residential, commercial development. Design team member.

**1989 – 1990** Bintan Resort master plan. Indonesian 10,000ha regional master plan for resort, infrastructure, regional, district and local centres, villages, residential commercial and resort development. Design team member. (Implemented)

**1989** Western Australian Tourism Commission. Responsible for the production of 'Successful Tourism Design' brochure. A publication distributed through the Western Australian Tourism Commission to Local Authorities, government agencies and developers.

**1989**                843 – 845 Hay Street Perth. (No 1 His Majesty's Lane). Project Architect responsible for the design, design development, documentation, construction and site inspection of this retail / commercial development in Hay Street, Perth CBD (Completed).

**1989**                "Architecture in the Wild" – National Conference (Tasmania) examining the successful amalgamation between architecture, master planning, tourism, sustainability and environment.

**1986 – 1987**        Regular visits to Singapore on various projects. Other projects, as team member include Central Park tower, Augusta Hotel master plan, Hamelin Bay master plan, Denham Sunfish Lodge.

Barbara brings to any project well developed skills in the areas of organisation, communication and teamwork. A great generalist, Barbara approaches most problems as design opportunities. She has enormous initiative, working well in teams and as a leader. She displays values of reliability, loyalty, responsibility and passionate commitment to all matters associated with Design and Sustainability.

Barbara brings to any team an intimate knowledge of urban and building design, planning and project management. She has well developed expertise in written, visual and oral communications, being well practised in the preparation and delivery of Executive, Board and Ministerial papers along with fully developed Business Cases. Barbara is easy going, friendly, well liked and respected by her colleagues and associates.

Despite significant experience with large master plans and projects, Barbara is pragmatic and practical, being an avid DIY home renovator and manager of several investment properties. She is well versed in the common problem solving, maintenance and management aspects of all sized projects.

Barbara's core interest is to contribute in a truly meaningful way to improving the quality of the built environment so as to reduce the pressure on the natural environment and to contribute positively to the built environment. She is devoted to design excellence and sustainability in all its forms.

#### **FAMILY AND INTERESTS.**

Barbara is married with two young adult children. Her interests include travel, literature, movies, bushwalking and Contemporary dance. She is a member of the Board of Management for STEPS Youth Dance Company, a nationally recognised professional contemporary dance company for youth. In her capacity as a member of the Board of Management, she was involved in the strategic overview and organisation of high end transformative contemporary dance works at the State Theatre of Western Australia.

#### **REFEREES**

<b>Professor Geoffrey Warn</b>	– Government Architect Western Australia – 0408 903 384
<b>Professor Geoffrey London</b>	– Government Architect Victoria – 0409 333 580
<b>Anna Evangelisti</b>	– Design Manager – LandCorp – 0428 210 100
<b>Tasio Cokis</b>	– Director Woodsome Management – 0413 944 009



CAMERON  
CHISHOLM  
NICOL

9 November 2016

Andrew Lefort  
Manager Statutory Planning  
City of Cockburn  
by email  
[alefort@cockburn.wa.gov.au](mailto:alefort@cockburn.wa.gov.au)

Dear Andrew

Re: EOI Design Review Panel-City of Cockburn

Please find attached a copy of my CV in support of my application to join the City of Cockburn Design Review Panel.

I understand the Panel's role will be to provide the City with independent and professional advice on design quality in relation to particular planning applications or relevant strategic planning proposals.

I am an architect with over 25 years of local and international experience, and am currently the Managing Director of Cameron Chisholm Nicol.

My CV outlines my key qualifications and experience in the areas of: town and city centre planning and development; heritage and urban conservation; energy efficient building design and sustainable development; public space planning and development; and inner-city design and development.

I am currently overseeing the design and delivery of over 2,000 apartments throughout the Perth metro area and have detailed experience working within the City of Cockburn at Cockburn Central, Port Coogee and South Beach. Cameron Chisholm Nicol's projects Helm at Port Coogee and Mika at South Beach (both by Match) were recognised with a Commendation and an Architecture Award respectively by the Australian Institute of Architects (WA Chapter) in 2015 and 2016.

At Cameron Chisholm Nicol I have recently worked on the master planning and architecture for City Gardens, a mixed-use commercial, retail and residential development in Booragoon that will become the gateway to the Melville City Centre. The project will create an activated urban form for the precinct on under-utilised land currently occupied by a carpark.

In my role as Cameron Chisholm Nicol Design Director on Perth Arena I was involved in the design and delivery of a significant piece of urban and civic infrastructure. The project, undertaken in joint venture with ARM, is a complex exercise in city centre and public space planning and is an important catalyst for urban regeneration in an under-utilised part of Perth City.

Cameron Chisholm  
& Nicol (WA) Pty Ltd  
Level 3, Sheffield House  
713 Hay Street  
Perth WA 6000  
GPO Box D185  
Perth WA 6840  
T +61 (0)8 9322 1566  
F +61 (0)8 9481 0854  
E [ccn@ccnwa.com.au](mailto:ccn@ccnwa.com.au)  
W [ccnwa.com.au](http://ccnwa.com.au)  
ACN 053 861 948



I am currently the Chair of the City of Melville Design Review Panel, Deputy Chair of the Fremantle Design Advisory Committee and a member of the Subiaco Design Review Panel. I am also an Alternate Member of the JDAP.

During 2014 - 2015 I participated in a number of Department of Planning practitioner working groups for the 'Planning Reform for Better Design' project (Design Guide for Multi-Residential Development). I provided advice to the Department of Planning on apartment design issues. The launch of the DesignWA 'Draft Apartment Design Guidelines' document was hosted at a Cameron Chisholm Nicol project, The Pocket at Claremont on the Park (by Georgiou). The Pocket has been cited as an exemplar of best practice multi-residential design, and is illustrated in the Draft document along with other Cameron Chisholm Nicol projects Kingston at Cockburn Central (by Fraser Properties), and Ocean Edge at Port Coogee (by TRG Properties).

The following people have agreed to be my referees:

Professor Geoffrey London  
Professor of Architecture, University of Western Australia  
Telephone +61 8 6488 2588  
[glondon@cyllene.uwa.edu.au](mailto:glondon@cyllene.uwa.edu.au)

Geoff Warn  
Government Architect, Department of Treasury & Finance  
Telephone +61 8 9328 4474  
[geoff.warn@finance.wa.gov.au](mailto:geoff.warn@finance.wa.gov.au)

Peter Prendergast  
Manager Statutory Planning, City of Melville  
Telephone +61 8 9364 0666  
[perter.prendergast@melville.wa.gov.au](mailto:perter.prendergast@melville.wa.gov.au)

Cathy Bonus  
Director – Development Services, City of Subiaco  
Telephone +61 8 9237 9222  
[kathyb@subiaco.wa.gov.au](mailto:kathyb@subiaco.wa.gov.au)

Professor Peter Newman  
Professor of Sustainability, Curtin University  
Telephone +618 9266 9032  
[p.newman@curtin.edu.au](mailto:p.newman@curtin.edu.au)

Should you have any further queries regarding this submission please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely

Dominic Snellgrove  
BA (Hons), AA Dipl, RAlA  
Managing Director  
Cameron Chisholm & Nicol (WA) Pty Ltd

by email

**Dominic Snellgrove** Managing Director / BA (Hons), AA Dipl, RIBA**Professional Qualifications**

2005-13	Green Star Accredited Professional, GBCA
2005	Green Building Council Member
2004	Registered Architect WA
1998	Registered Architect NSW
1994	Registered Architect UK
1990	Architectural Association, London AA Dipl. RIBA Pt II
1986	Kingston University, Surrey UK BA (Hons) Architecture RIBA, Part II

**Professional Experience**

2011-	Managing Director, Cameron Chisholm Nicol, Perth WA
2004-	Director, Cameron Chisholm Nicol, Perth WA
1997-03	Senior Architect, Lendlease Design, Sydney NSW
1997	Director, TSA Architects, Sydney
1994-97	Architect, Foggo Associates, London
1991-94	Architect, Professor O.M. Ungers and Partner, Berlin
1987-88	Graduate of Architecture, Wickham & Associates, London

**University Tutoring and Lecturing**

2009-	Curtin University Department of Architecture - Guest Tutor
2004-08	UWA Architecture Faculty - Studio Coordinator
1999-03	UNSW Faculty of the Built Environment - Lecturer/Tutor in years 2, 3 and 5
2002	UTS - Guest Lecturer

**Committee Memberships**

2016 -	MRA Design Review Services Panel
2016 -	Property Council WA Diversity and Women in Property Committee
2016 -	City of Melville Design Review Panel - Chair
2015 -16	Department of Planning practitioner working group for <i>Planning Reform for Better Design</i> project (Design Guide for Multi-Residential Development)
2015 -	City Of Melville Canning Bridge Activity Centre Design Review Panel - Chair
2013 -	Property Council WA Residential Committee

*continued overleaf*

Dominic Snellgrove is the Managing Director of Cameron Chisholm Nicol, an award-winning, multi-disciplinary architectural practice working across sectors including residential, commercial office, education, health and well-being, sport and entertainment, hospitality and leisure, retail, adaptive re-use, and sustainable design.

Dominic studied architecture in London at the Architectural Association and practiced in Berlin, London and Sydney prior to moving to Perth in 2004. Whilst in Europe Dominic gained extensive experience in residential, retail and commercial projects including major redevelopment projects in the former East Berlin, and significant environmental projects in the commercial office sector in the UK for various institutional and public property companies.

In Sydney Dominic worked as a senior architect for Lendlease Design on residential, retail, commercial, entertainment, master plan and mixed-use projects. These include: the high-rise commercial office tower Aurora Place and residential tower Macquarie Apartments by The Renzo Piano Building Workshop in association with Lendlease Design; retail projects in Queensland and New South Wales, including Sunshine Plaza and MacArthur Square; and a 1,300 seat performance space at Fox Studios in Sydney.

Whilst at Lendlease, Dominic was the concept and design architect for '30 The Bond', the former Lendlease Head Office in Sydney. This role enabled him to explore and develop his interest in sustainable design, adaptive re-use and the evolution of the modern workplace. Dominic introduced significant environmental initiatives to enhance indoor environment quality and energy conservation. As a result '30 The Bond' was the first 5 Star ABGR rated office building in Australia, and the first 5 Star Green-Star-As-Built rated office building. Incorporating chilled beam cooling technology and mixed mode ventilation, amongst other energy efficient strategies, '30 The Bond' was awarded 'Building of the Decade' for the 2000s by the RIBA NSW Bulletin.

Since joining Cameron Chisholm Nicol as a director in early 2004, Dominic has consulted with a number of WA government departments including; Building Management and Works (BMW); Department of Housing and Works (DHW); LandCorp; the Department of Planning and Infrastructure (DPI); the City of Fremantle; the City of Subiaco; and the Department of Culture and Arts. Dominic has also consulted to local and national clients including Mirvac, TRG Properties, Georgiou, Match, Perron Group, Fraser Properties, Stockland, GE Finance, Lend Lease, Cape Bouvard and Westbridge.

Dominic was the Cameron Chisholm Nicol project and design director for the Perth Arena, a joint-venture collaboration with Melbourne-based architects ARM. Perth Arena has been recognised with numerous industry awards including the George Temple Poole Award (WA's highest state award) and the Sir Zelman Cowen Award (the highest national award for public architecture). He is currently overseeing the design and delivery of over 2,000 apartments in and around the Perth metro area.

Dominic has most recently worked on the master planning and architecture for City Gardens, a mixed-use commercial, retail and residential development in Booragoon that will become the gateway to the Melville City Centre. The project will create



**Committee Memberships** *continued*

2012 -	Joint Development Assessment Panels Member (JDAPs) - Alternate Specialist Member
2012 -	City of Subiaco Design Advisory Committee
2010 -	City of Fremantle Design Advisory Committee - Deputy Chair
2004 -13	Property Council WA Residential Development Committee
2009 -11	GBCA WA State Leadership Group
1999 -03	RAIA NSW Sustainable Development Committee
1999 -03	RAIA NSW Education Committee

an activated urban ground plane and street edge in an under-utilised part of the city currently occupied by an on-grade car park. The development's scale, rhythm and texture responds to the city centre's desired urban character as defined in the Melville City Centre Activity Centre Structure Plan.


Since 2010 Dominic has sat on the Fremantle Design Advisory Committee and he is currently the Deputy Chair. He has advised the City of Fremantle on city centre planning, heritage and conservation, sustainable design and design quality in the built environment.

In 2012 Dominic was appointed to the City of Subiaco Design Review Panel where he is advising on matters of town and city planning, heritage and urban conservation, energy efficient and sustainable development and public space planning.

In 2015 Dominic was appointed Chair of the City of Melville Canning Bridge Design Review Panel and in 2016 he was appointed to the MRA Design Review Services Panel.

Dominic has been an active member of the Green Building Council of Australia since 2003 and a guest speaker at the Green Cities International Conference. He has participated in design jury service for both the RAIA WA state design awards and the Fremantle Kings Square design competition. He has been an Alternate Specialist Member of the Joint Development Assessment Panels (JDAPs) since 2012.

Clockwise from top / **Kingston**, Cockburn Central / **Helm**, Port Coogee / **Mika**, South Coogee





HASELL Limited  
ABN 24 007 711 435

Mr Andrew Lefort  
Manager Statutory Planning  
City of Cockburn

8 November 2016

By Email: [alefort@cockburn.wa.gov.au](mailto:alefort@cockburn.wa.gov.au)

Dear Andrew

**Expression of Interest\_ Design Review Panel**

I wish to express my interest in membership of the City of Cockburn Design Review Panel. The Panel plays an important role in assessing proposals and providing advice in relation to significant development applications within the City of Cockburn.

Please find attached a Statement addressing the selection criteria and Resume, which includes the names and contact details of referees.

Should you require any further prior information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Regards



Chris Melsom  
MAIA FPIA  
Principal

Mobile 0408 025 933  
Email [cmelsom@hassellstudio.com](mailto:cmelsom@hassellstudio.com)

---

# Expression of Interest

---

## ***A recognised architecture, landscape architecture or urban design tertiary qualification***

Chris is qualified and registered as both an Architect and Town Planner in Western Australia.

- \_ Bachelor of Architecture, (Hons), Curtin University 1986
- \_ Bachelor of Arts, Urban and Regional Planning (Hons) Curtin University 1993

Further studies have included Urban Design, Project Management, Business Leadership and Project Discounted Cash-Flow Modelling.

---

## ***Demonstrated experience and expertise in one or more of the areas of: urban and regional planning, urban design, energy efficient building design and sustainable development***

As an architect and planner, Chris brings extensive experience in, and knowledge of urban and regional planning, urban design and sustainable development. This includes a detailed knowledge of the Western Australian Planning system, urban design processes and the creation of sustainable urban places.

Chris's role with HASSELL has been to work with clients to lead, advise on and undertake complex, large scale commercial and mixed use projects from context analysis and strategic planning through site planning, concept design to business cases and approvals.

Within the City of Cockburn, projects such as the Cockburn Coast Redevelopment Project, South Fremantle Power Station Master Plan and the current Power Station Business Case each demonstrate a high level experience in urban planning and urban design and a commitment to sustainable building and precinct scale design. LandCorp has retained Chris as Estate Architect to work with proponents to meet the design standards initially developed by Chris and his team for the stage 1 'Shoreline' development.

Chris brings a detailed knowledge of development processes and stakeholder requirements, such as cultural heritage, development feasibility, urban design and infrastructure provision. In particular, successful project delivery requires an understanding of design and how to develop a contemporary, sustainable, architectural design response within a local, state and in this case, international heritage context.

Other recent projects have included master plan review for the Midland Railway Workshops, the Belmont Park Raceway redevelopment master plan, concept plan and Detailed Area Plan; the Riverside Precinct Master Plan, East Perth; the 'Greater Curtin' Stage 1 Business Case; the Connect Joondalup Site Master Plan for the Department of Housing and the Fremantle East End Urban Design Study.

The above roles have been recognised through numerous peer awards received for design and planning.

---

## ***Relevant skills and experience to provide independent expert advice;***

Chris's skills and experience in providing expert advice in design review, development assessment and impact assessment are highly relevant to the role as a member of the City of Cockburn Design Advisory Panel.

Experience in the above has included roles such as:

- \_ Chairing stakeholder workshops for drafting of the recently released draft SPP 7 Design WA for multi-unit apartment sites, precincts and communities (DoP)
- \_ Undertaking and managing development control
- \_ Facilitating stakeholder and community work groups in developing project vision, objectives, success criteria and preferred design strategies
- \_ Assessment of competitive design and tender bids for large scale projects (LandCorp, East Perth Redevelopment Authority)
- \_ Development related competitive bid preparation including master planning, urban design, tender presentation, site analysis, concept development and visualisation
- \_ 'Vision keeper' roles for the Metropolitan Redevelopment Authority and LandCorp
- \_ Judge in Awards for Excellence programmes including UDIA (three years including one year as Chair), AIA, PIA and the Australian Civic Design Awards Committee.

The provision of 'independent expert advice' is often a key role in the services sought by large scale developer clients, from site selection, development orientation and design through to negotiating the development approvals process. Chris has provided advice as an expert witness in appeals, assessment and procurement processes, by private sector clients, LandCorp and in 2016, the City of Cockburn.

The approach taken by the development sector to achieve commercial and development objectives, as well as the role of local authorities to achieve outcomes which are of benefit to their context, the local community, the objectives of the Council and the sustainability of the resultant urban environment are inherently understood.

---

***Skills and experience in design and design review of major development of the kind and scale which the DRP will be required to review (as contained in Local Planning Policy 5.16);***

As Principal of a leading international design practice, Chris has been responsible for the planning, design and delivery of large scale places and spaces. As project leader, he has steered the key design outcomes for projects such as the Springs, Rivervale, the Riverside Precinct, East Perth, Cockburn Coast North Coogee, the South Fremantle Power Station, North Coogee, the Midland Railway Workshops, Midland and the Elmina City Centre, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.

In those projects, Chris has acted as design director and team leader with roles that have varied from urban planning and project feasibility through to 'hands-on' detailed design.

With a background that includes planning roles in State and Local Government, Chris can demonstrate significant skills and experience in design and design review of significant, complex and sensitive urban projects.

A key practice role within HASSELL is that of design review, where all projects are subjected to multi-disciplinary review at each stage of design. This is considered essential for large scale projects that will be subject to the scrutiny of clients, users, stakeholders and peers. The process has required the development of skills in the design review process and the ability to understand the impact of review on design outcomes.

In recent years, Chris has participated in this process alongside clients and co-consultants on projects such as the new Perth Stadium (under construction), the New Western Australian Museum (design development), one40 William (completed), Brookfield Place (completed) and Fiona Stanley Hospital (completed) – as well as a range of smaller, mixed use projects.

More recently, Chris has also presented a number of large scale projects to the office of the Government Architect for review and stakeholder feedback. These have included the Perth Convention and Exhibition Centre (2016), the Perth Parliamentary Precinct Master Plan and the Royal Perth Hospital Precinct Master Plan.

A key part of earlier roles with the East Perth and Subiaco Redevelopment Authorities was to assess development proposals for projects such as the Chinese Consulate Officers in East Perth, master plan proposals for the redevelopment of the WACA and Gloucester Park grounds in East Perth and high density, mixed use development sites in Northbridge and Adelaide Terrace, Perth.

---

***Eligibility for membership to the relevant professional association.***

Chris maintains membership of professional associations in Architecture, Planning and Urban Design, including:

- \_ Member of the Australian Institute of Architects (AIA)
- \_ Member of the Urban Design Committee AIA
- \_ Fellow of the Planning Institute of Australia (PIA)
- \_ WA Division Committee Member of PIA
- \_ Co-convenor of the PIA Urban Design Committee
- \_ Chair, Australian Urban Design Research Centre Professional Practice Advisory Committee
- \_ Member of UDIA
- \_ Member of the Property Council of Australia
- \_ Member of the Committee for Economic Development Australia

---

# Chris Melsom

## Resume



Chris Melsom  
Principal

E: cmelsom@hassellstudio.com  
M: 0408 025 933

Level 1 Commonwealth Bank Building  
242 Murray Street  
Perth WA 6000  
Australia

# HASSELL

---

### Introduction

Chris is a Principal and Head of Planning across HASSELL. Chris leads the urban design sector across Western Australia and South East Asia. He is a registered Architect and Certified Practicing Planner with 30 years experience across local government, state government and private practice in Australia and overseas.

Chris' key interest is the promotion of design excellence and collaboration across the planning and design professions. He holds a range of positions in professional institutes, committees, associations and awards programs which focus on education and practice in urban design.

Chris has specialist skills in urban renewal, urban design, project and strategic planning; and team co-ordination with particular strength in master planning and urban design of major urban redevelopment projects. His past roles have included that of Executive Director with the East Perth and Subiaco Redevelopment Authorities.

Chris has served as a judge in the Planning Institute of Australia Awards for Planning Excellence for several years running as Head Judge for the 2011 UDIA Awards for Excellence. He has held positions in a number of institutes, committees, associations and awards programs.


---

### Qualifications

- \_ Bachelor of Architecture (Hons), Curtin University
- \_ Bachelor of Arts (Hons) Urban and Regional Planning, Curtin University
- \_ Registered Architect (Western Australia)
- \_ Certified Practicing Planner



WaterBank, East Perth



Brookfield Place, St Georges Tce, Perth

South Fremantle Power Station Master Plan and Business Case



## Professional experience

### 2008 – Current

Principal, HASSELL  
Head of Urban Design, Western Australia and South East Asia,  
Head of Discipline, Planning.

HASSELL is an international, multi-disciplinary practice employing approximately 1,000 people in architecture, landscape architecture, interior design, planning and urban design in studios across Australia, China, the United Kingdom and Singapore.

As Principal, Chris has responsibilities across the business consistent with being a partner of a major international design practice.

In the urban design sector, Chris provides clients with knowledge leadership, skills and experience across a wide range of urban scale projects, from the shaping of whole cities to the creation of exceptional places on single infill sites.

With projects currently set across WA, Malaysia, Singapore, Indonesia, Victoria and South Australia, his roles include business leadership, client and team management, leading projects and in the hands-on roles of urban design, (architectural) concept design, urban planning, business feasibility and strategic planning.

Within the City of Cockburn, Chris has had a long term role working for LandCorp on the Cockburn Coast redevelopment project from prior to its inception in 2008.

This has included master planning, structure planning, concept design, urban design and strategy and development related advice. Chris has also led the South Fremantle Power Station (redevelopment) master plan, is currently engaged as the Cockburn Coast Estate Architect and Project Principal for the South Fremantle Power Station Business Case.

### 2004 – 2008

Senior Associate, HASSELL  
Head of Discipline, Planning,

Chris joined HASSELL in November 2004 to establish the planning and urban design arm of the business in Western Australia with a focus on urban renewal, urban infill, mixed use development and urban design projects.

### 2001 – 2004

Executive Director, Place Delivery  
East Perth Redevelopment Authority and Subiaco Redevelopment Authority.

### 1997 – 2001

Manager, Planning, East Perth  
Redevelopment Authority

### 1994 – 1997

Director, Urban Design and Landscape  
Architecture Consultant, Tract (WA) Pty  
Ltd

### 1990 – 1994

Urban Design Architect, City of Perth

### 1988

Graduate Architect, Barton Willmore  
Partnership, London Ltd

### 1987

Graduate Architect. Architectural  
Assistant to the City Architect, City of  
Fremantle

### 1985

Student Architect, Considine & Griffiths  
Architects

### 1984

Student Architect: Theo Mathews  
Architect, Margaret River



Elmina West\_ Township Master Plan and Urban Design Guide, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia



Cockburn Coast Redevelopment Master Plan, District Structure plan (II), Design Guidelines, Estate Architect, Cockburn, Australia



one40willam, Perth, Australia

## Professional Affiliations

### Australian institute of Architects

- \_ AIA Member 1989 – Current),
- \_ AIA Urban Design Committee member (Current)

### Planning Institute of Australia (WA Division):

- \_ PIA Member (1994 – Current)
- \_ PIA Fellow (Elevated to Fellow in 2015)
- \_ WA Division Committee Member (Current, 2008-2013)
- \_ Urban Design Committee (Forum) Co-Convenor (Current)
- \_ Urban Design Committee (Forum) Member (2012 – Current)
- \_ PIA Mentorship Programme: Mentor
- \_ Consultant Planners Committee Chair (2011 - 2013)
- \_ Vice President (2006)
- \_ Awards judge (2008).

### Australian Association of Planning Consultants AAPC

- \_ Member 2005 – 2008;
- \_ Chair 2009 – 2011

### Urban Development Institute of Australia

- \_ Member (2008 – current)
- \_ Awards judge (2009 – 2012)
- \_ Built Form Committee (2012)

### Property Council of Australia

- \_ Member (2011 – 2012)

### Committee for Economic Development Australia (CEDA)

- \_ Member (2009 – current)

## Project Experience

- \_ Belmont Park Redevelopment Master Plan Review, Golden Group
- \_ Greater Curtin Student Housing Design briefing, Curtin University
- \_ Greater Curtin Stage 1 Business Case, Curtin University
- \_ Belmont Park Precinct D Detailed Area Plan, Golden Group
- \_ Cockburn Coast Redevelopment, LandCorp
- \_ South Fremantle Power Station Master Plan, LandCorp
- \_ South Fremantle Power Station Redevelopment Business Case, LandCorp
- \_ Connect Joondalup Master Plan, Housing Authority
- \_ Glenithorne Precinct Master Plan, University of Adelaide
- \_ Connect Joondalup Local Planning Policy, Housing Authority
- \_ Universal Access Design Guidelines, Curtin University
- \_ Campus Link Strategy, University of Western Australia
- \_ Elmina Township Master Plan, Design Guidelines, Sime Darby, Malaysia
- \_ Rottnest Island Landscape Master plan, Rottnest Island Authority
- \_ Rottnest Island Marina Concept Plan, Rottnest Island Authority
- \_ Rottnest Island Hotel Redevelopment Concept plan, Sandalfords
- \_ Al Wakra Waterfront and Down Town Master Plan, Qatar. Surbana
- \_ Stirling City Structure Planning and ongoing studies, Stirling Alliance
- \_ Fiona Stanley Hospital, Dep't Health
- \_ Gold Coast University Hospital, QLD,
- \_ Oakajee Port and Rail, WA, Australia
- \_ Rendezvous Observation City Hotel, Scarborough, WA, Australia
- \_ Perth Cultural Centre Urban Renewal Strategy, WA, Australia
- \_ Waterbank Precinct Mixed-Use Master Plan and Design Guidelines, WA, Australia
- \_ Waterbank site development Master Plan Competitive Tender, WA, Australia
- \_ Hope Valley Wattleup Redevelopment Project, WA, Australia
- \_ Review of Hope Valley Wattleup Redevelopment Act, WA, Australia
- \_ LandCorp Joint Venture Proposal Assessments, WA, Australia





Fiona Stanley Hospital\_ Precinct master plan

---

#### Referees

**Peter Lee**

Director HASSELL  
plee@hassellstudio.com  
M: 0419 912 992  
T: +61 8 6477 6000

**Amanda Shipton**

Project Manager, Complex Projects.  
Housing Authority WA.  
Amanda.Shipton@housing.wa.gov.au  
M: 0433 528 570  
T: (08) 6318-8375

**Phillip Griffiths**

President, Australian Institute of  
Architects (WA).  
Director, Griffiths Architects  
mail@griffithsarchitects.com.au  
T: +61 8 9381 1666

CITY OF COCKBURN

# DESIGN REVIEW PANEL



**PETER HOBBS ARCHITECTS**  
ARCHITECTURE | CONSTRUCTION | URBAN DESIGN







# CONTENTS

## CITY OF COCKBURN

### 1. ABOUT PHA

### 2. QUALIFICATIONS

RELEVANT SKILLS AND EXPERIENCE WITHIN OUR STUDIO TO PROVIDE INDEPENDENT EXPERT ADVICE AS WELL AS EXPERIENCE IN DESIGN REVIEW OF A SCALE REQUIRED BY DRP AS CONTAINED IN LOCATL PLANNING POLICY 5.16

- PETER HOBBS (INCLUDING MEMBERSHIP TO THE RELEVANT PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION)
- LEE-ANNE KHO

### 3. DEMONSTRATED EXPERIENCE

PROJECT PROFILES - URBAN AND REGIONAL PLANNING, URBAN DESIGN, ENERGY EFFICIENT BUILDING DESIGN & SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT.



IMAGE: PARK ROAD APARTMENTS BY PHA

# 1. ABOUT PHA

CITY OF COCKBURN

Peter Hobbs Architects (PHA) is a boutique architectural studio whose team works across a wide range of projects from single and multi-residential, retail and urban design studies.

PHA's business model is to provide a direct and dedicated service to their clients- every project is attended to by all senior members of the teams, ensuring maximum experience is afforded.

Our key team brings complimentary skills that combine into an efficient unit. Our service includes:

- detailed briefing,
- identification of best practice through research,
- innovation and value adding through design,
- thorough Design Development,
- rigorous Contract Documentation, and
- firm but fair Contract Administration

Peter Hobbs has been a practicing Architect in Western Australia for the last twenty years, during which time he has amassed a wealth of planning, architectural, urban design and construction experience, and has been awarded by his peers with several state RAIA Architecture Awards.

Peter's experience spans all parts of any given project, from the initial briefing and feasibility stage, to the final Construction certification. His keen interest in social issues, and the way that urban design can inform social and economic outcomes has led to major contributions to significant urban renewal projects.

As a registered builder, Peter also brings a sense of practicality and achievability to all his projects.

PETER HOBBS ARCHITECTS





IMAGE: RNO HOPETOWN - COURTESY OF JOY ARCHITECTS

CITY OF COCKBURN

PETER HOBBS ARCHITECTS



# PETER HOBBS

## ARCHITECT & REGISTERED BUILDER. PHA DIRECTOR

In 2009, Peter created Peter Hobbs Architect with a focus on medium density housing, mixed use planning, retail and urban design projects.

Peter also contributes to the local profession, and is currently the Chairman of the AIA Urban Design Committee and is a Chapter Councillor for the WA Chapter of the AIA. Peter also sits on the Education advisory panel of The Australian Urban Design Research Centre (AUDRC) that is responsible for setting the curriculum of the Masters of Urban Design.

2009-	Established Peter Hobbs Architect
2009-	Established Imagin Construction Pty Ltd
2007-2009	Director - JCY Architects & Urban Designers
2001 - 2007	Associate Director - JCY Architects & Urban Designers
1995 - 2001	Project Architect - JCY Architects & Urban Designers
1994 - 95	Brian Klopper Architects
1993 - 94	G2 Architects, Paris, France
1992	Babel Architects, Paris, France
1986 - 92	Brian Klopper Architects
1985	Bachelor of Architecture- UWA



## AWARDS

MARGARET RIVER EDUCATION CAMPUS, MARGARET RIVER - RAIA (WA Chapter) Award of Merit - Public/Institutional Category 2005- Project Director -Project Architect, Design Architect

182 ST GEORGES TERRACE, PERTH - RAIA (WA Chapter) Award of Merit - Commercial Category 2002 Project Director-Project Architect, Design Architect

ANSETT CUSTOMER CONTACT CENTRE, JOONDALUP - RAIA (WA Chapter) Commendation - Commercial Category 2001 Project Architect, Design Architect

COOLBELLUP NEW LIVING - UDIA Awards for Excellence - Urban Renewal Projects Project Architect, Design Architect - MBA Excellence in Construction Awards - Certificate in Commendation

HOWARD PARK WINERY, COWARAMUP - RAIA (WA Chapter) - Commendation - Commercial Category 2000 Project Architect, Design Architect

## PROJECTS

### PHA Projects

- Railway Pde Apartments (2014) - \$10million
- The Lane Apartments (2014) - \$12million
- Activity Centre Study- Dept of Planning
- McMasters Apartments (2013) - \$3million
- Joondalup Performing Arts Feasibility Study (2012) - \$60million
- Port Hedland Entertainment Study (2012) - \$50million
- Lot 359 Apartments- Landorp - \$6.5million
- Park Street Apartments (2012) - \$3.5 million
- Challenge Rd Residence (2011) - \$1million
- Landcorp Density study (2011)
- Rockpools Bar and Grill (2010) - \$8.5million
- Burke Drive Residence(2009) - \$4.5 million
- Joondalup Performaning Arts Centre - DALE PAGE REFEREE

### JCY Projects

As Director of JCY, Peter amassed the significant portfolio of projects.

### Education Projects

- Margaret River Education Campus( 2006) - \$11million
- Pundulmurra College(1996) - \$1million
- CY O'Connor College of TAFE Moora (2002) - \$2million
- Kununurra TAFE (2000) - \$500 00
- 

### Residential

- Frasers Riverside (2006) - \$300million
- Pier Street Housing(2005) - \$8million
- RNO Eco Village (2006)- \$15million
- GEO, Mixed Use Development, Mt Hawthorn (2003) - \$3million
- Cambridge Street Apartments (2002) - \$2.5million
- San Marco Quays, Mandurah (2002) - \$4million

# PETER HOBBS

PROJECTS

PHA Projects

- Railway Pde Apartments (2014) - \$10million
- The Lane Apartments (2014) - \$12million
- Activity Centre Study- Dept of Planning
- McMasters Apartments (2013) - \$3million
- Joondalup Performing Arts Feasibility Study (2012) - \$60million
- Port Hedland Entertainment Study (2012) - \$50million
- Lot 359 Apartments- Landorp - \$6.5million
- Park Street Apartments (2012) - \$3.5 million
- Challenge Rd Residence (2011) - \$1million
- Landcorp Density study (2011)
- Rockpools Bar and Grill (2010) - \$8.5million
- Burke Drive Residence(2009) - \$4.5 million

JCY Projects

As Director of JCY, Peter amassed the significant portfolio of projects.

Education Projects

- Margaret River Education Campus( 2006) - \$11million
- Pundulmurra College(1996) - \$1million
- CY O'Connor College of TAFE Moora (2002) - \$2million
- Kununurra TAFE (2000) - \$500 00



IMAGE:EAST PERTH POWER STATION - COURTESY OF JCY ARCHITECTS

Residential

- Frasers Riverside (2006) - \$300million
- Pier Street Housing(2005) - \$8million
- RNO Eco Village (2006)- \$15million
- GEO, Mixed Use Development, Mt Hawthorn (2003) - \$3million
- Cambridge Street Apartments (2002) - \$2.5million
- San Marco Quays, Mandurah (2002) - \$4million

Urban Design & Masterplanning Projects

- East Perth Power Station Masterplan & Design Guidelines (2008) - \$200million
- Leederville Town Centre Strategy, Station Precinct, Town of Vincent (2006) - \$100million
- Leederville Town Centre Strategy, Carr Street, Town of Vincent (2007)
- Built Form Guidelines, Leederville Masterplan (2007)
- West Perth Regeneration Masterplan (2007)
- Frasers Mandurah, Coodanup (2006)
- Eaton Town Centre Plan(2006)
- Pretty Pool Masterplan + Design Guidelines, Port Hedland(2005)
- Leederville Masterplan(2005)
- Albany Foreshore Study (2002)
- Bunbury Outer Harbour Redevelopment (2004)
- Metrobus Depot/WAPS Study, East Perth (2004)
- East Perth Redevelopment Authority Underground Railway Project (2000)
- East Perth Transit Orientated Development Study (2000)
- South Beach Development (1999)
- Gateway Masterplan - EPRA (2001)
- Coolbellup New Living (2000)
- Murdoch Drive Masterplan (1998)
- Stirling Civic Precinct Masterplan
- Alkimos Eglinton Masterplan (1995)
- Subiaco Station Precinct (1995)
- Coolbellup Suburb Refurbishment (2000) - \$100million
- Apollo Quays, Mandurah (1998) - \$6million
- The Palladio, East Perth (1997) - \$2million
- Richmond Iceworks, Fremantle(1997) - \$2million



PHOTO;182 ST GEORGES TCE PERTH - COURTESY JCY



PETER HOBBS

Commercial Projects

- Ansett Customer Contact Centre (2001) \$4million
- 182 St Georges Tce (2003) \$11million
- Lamp & Riseborough Winery(2003) \$2million
- Millbrook Winery (2005) \$4million
- Howard Park Winery (1998) \$2million
  
- Panels and Juries
- Landcorp Architects Panel 2013- present
- MRA Elizabeth Quay Jury 2016
- MRA Design Review Services panel



IMAGE:MAD FISH WINERY - COURTESY OF JCY ARCHITECTS

PETER HOBBS ARCHITECTS

REFEREES

- Barbara Gdowski**
- General Manager (Strategy & Planning) | Property, Development and Commercial Services Office  
Murdoch University  
T: +618 9360 2710 | E: B.Gdowski@murdoch.edu.au
- Dale Page**
- Director of Planning and Development - City of Joondalup  
T:9400 4445 email | E: dale.page@joondalup.wa.gov.au  
JOONDALUP PERFORMING ARTS CENTRE - REFEREE 2012

- Kate Hislop**
- MArch/LArch Honours Coordinator/Senior Lecturer  
T:61864887813 | E: Kate.Hislop@uwa.edu.au



IMAGE:MAD FISH WINERY - COURTESY OF JCY ARCHITECTS

PETER HOBBS ARCHITECTS

PETER HOBBS

Peter is the current Chair of the Australian Institute of Architects Urban Design committee, and is the chief spokesman for the institute as regards current urban design and planning issues. Peter has contributed to numerous design reviews, and has participated in several design advisory committees including:

AUSTRALIAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS  
Chapter Councillor 2012-present

Chairman of Urban Design Committee  
Peter convenes monthly forums with key stakeholders from the planning, development and urban design community.

LANDCORP ARCHITECTURAL AND URBAN DESIGN PANEL (2013-present)

Peter undertook reviews on the followings:  
The Springs Apartment development.  
The Springs Hotel Mixed use development  
Cockburn Central Apartment development  
Cockburn Central Sport and Recreation Facility  
White Gum Valley Masterplan

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING

Density by Design. (2014)  
Peter was on the professional steering panel that assisted the DoP compile its Density by Design handbook, that has become a tool for local authorities and planners.

Multiple Residential Codes (2015-)

Peter has represented the AIA as a key stakeholder for the latest revision of the Multiple Residential Codes

AUDRC

Education Sub-committee  
Peter sits on the Education Sub-Committee that provides professional advice as to the curriculum for the Masters in Urban Design

UWA (2013-)

Peter is regular juror for the 5th honours program.

COMMITTEE FOR DESIGN EXCELLENCE (2013-present)

Peter has represented the AIA as a foundation member on the Committee of Design Excellence. The CDE is a joint initiative of the Office of Government Architect, MRA, Landcorp, AIA, AILA, DoP and the City of Perth who collaborate to ensure design excellence is pursued through every facet of project briefing, visioning and procurement.

MRA-LOTS 2 and 3 Elizabeth Quay

Peter recently participated as a juror for MRA's Competitive Design Process, which was an integral part of the sale of Lots 2 and 3 Elizabeth Quay.

The competition format borrowed heavily from the City of Sydney's competitive design process, but was modified through input from the Committee for Design Excellence.

This process is a watershed for Perth, with four Architectural practices participating in a paid competition that married the aspiration of MRA's vision for EQ with the developers' brief- providing innovative and iconic solutions to this key site. It represents a real leap of faith by the development proponents to allow an independent jury to assess and recommend the direction of such a large investment, and it was essential that the jury were skilled both architecturally and commercially.

The design review process will be seen to have added enormous value to the final outcome for this iconic site.

A preliminary jury assessment at week 3 of a 7week program ensured design teams stayed on course with MRA's vision and design guidelines while meeting the developers' commercial requirement. Fatal flaws were identified, and the design teams were then able to fully develop their schemes in the knowledge that they were on the right track. Similarly, in cases where the design teams breached design guidelines, the jury was able to give feed back to the MRA as to whether these non-conformances were actually positive or negative.

At the completion of the completion, the 5 member jury assessed 4 highly competent and sophisticated schemes, and were able to carefully analyse each design against the brief, the design guidelines and first principle urban design considerations. The ensuing presentations and jury interrogation provided the developer detailed information regarding costs, structural considerations, place making, planning efficiencies and urban design consideration.

While the first competition of its type, and still subject to final confirmation, all proponents of the process have heralded the competitive design process a success.

This process will become a standard feature of Perth's major projects.

METROPOLITAN REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY

Design Review services panel - 2016 +



DESIGN REVIEW PANEL

LEE-ANNE KHO

B. APP. SCI (ARCH)

Lee-Anne has been part of the practice since 2014. Throughout her long Architectural career she has been involved in a number of important projects including the NBL Vision Keeping, NBL Celebration Place Masterplan, Port Coogee Town Architect, East Perth Power Station, Bennett Street Affordable Housing for Foundation Housing.

Her experience spans a number of areas with a grounding in Architectural design, urban design and project coordination.

She is currently project manager for the ALDI Store roll-out in WA.

PRACTICE, QUALIFICATIONS & EDUCATION

- 2014 - Peter Hobbs Architects
- 2004 - 2014 JCY Architects & Urban Designers
- 1995 - 2000 JCY Architects & Urban Designers
- 1991 - 1995 Philip Cox Etherington Coulter and Jones, Architects & Planners
- 1989 Bachelor of Architecture, Curtin University of Technology
- 1989 - 1991 Dryka, Szyjan & Cheng Architects
- 1989 Hocking, Patman & Antill, Architects & Town Planners
- 1988 Artra Design
- 1987 Dryka, Szyjan & Cheng Architects

PROJECTS

Residential Projects

- Lee Shore Development
- Bennett Street Lodging
- Lot 2001 Secret Harbour
- Meve at Beelier
- Millbrook Kitchen
- Millbrook Chalets
- RNO Accommodation Village in Hopetoun
- Campbell Street, West Perth



IMAGE:BENNETT ST- COURTESY OF JCY ARCHITECTS



CITY OF COCKBURN

PROJECTS

- City of Canning Admin & Civic Building • 262 Marine Parade, Swanbourne
- BHPB Housing, Port Hedland
- Gammell Residence

CULTURAL PLANNING STUDIES

- New Performing Arts Centre, Perth - Site - PAUL JONES REFEREE
- Evaluation Study
- Rechabites Hall
- Subiaco Theatre - PAUL JONES REFEREE
- WA Gallery Workshop

MASTERPLANN & FEASIBILITY STUDIES

- 167 Westralia Plaza - Fitout Guidelines
- AMTC Masterplan
- Albany Foreshore Study
- Cottesloe Hotel
- East Perth Power Station
- Flat Bush, Auckland
- Forrest - Minderoo
- Leederville Masterplan
- Mariner Tavern - Geraldton
- Marlston Hill Masterplan, Bunbury
- NBL Vision Keeping & Sub-Division Works
- NBL Celebration Place Masterplan
- Perth Framework/Greenspine Study
- Port Coogee, Town Architect
- Pretty Pool, Port Hedland
- Rottnest Feasibility Study, Land-Corp
- Secret Harbour Seaside Village Masterplan
- South Beach Lots 483 & 484
- Western Foreshore

REFEREES

Paul Jones  
Director of PJ Architecture  
T:04199 321 33 | E: pj@pjarchitecture.com.au

Ian Hart  
Director of Jones, Coulter, Young  
T: 9481 1477 | E: ian.hart@jcy.net

IMAGE:PORT COOGEE- COURTESY OF JCY ARCHITECTS





# HOBBS' BOAT SHED



STATUS: COMPLETE

LOCATION: PEPPERMINT GROVE

TYPE: HERITAGE AND CONSERVATION

CLIENT: HOBBS & JOHNSTON FAMILIES, STATE HERITAGE OFFICE

HOBBS SHED

In 2014 PHA designed and documented a restoration of Hobbs Shed in Freshwater bay. This boat shed was designed by and constructed in 1905 for Sir JJ Talbot Hobbs at the bottom of Keane Street in Peppermint Grove. It has been part of the visual and social history of the area for over 100 years. The boat sheds are some of the few remaining examples of this building type on the Swan River, and accordingly were placed on the State Register of Heritage Places in 2011.

## 3.DEMONSTRATED EXPERIENCE



The restoration project received a state Heritage Council Grant, and was nominated for a State Heritage Award.

The project demonstrated an understanding of the care required to deal with sensitive heritage issues, and displayed PHAs commitment to the local Freshwater Bay-Claremont-Peppermint Grove area.

# JOONDALUP CULTURAL



**STATUS: CONCEPT**

**LOCATION: JOONDALUP**

**TYPE: PERFORMING ARTS & CULTURAL FACILITY CONCEPT**

**CLIENT: CITY OF JOONDALUP**

Peter Hobbs Architects (PHA) and Pracsys and were commissioned to undertake a feasibility study & business case for a new \$80 million arts hub based in central Joondalup (JPAC). The study was broken into six broad sections:

#### Precedence Study

A desk top survey or best practice national and international regional arts centers. This identified a number of alternative build form options, ranging from a disbursed model, a stand-alone theatre and a multi-valent arts hub.

**PETER HOBBS ARCHITECTS**



#### Community Consultation

A detailed survey of all arts and community organizations, including existing facilities, with a view to identifying and quantifying future demand and usage patterns.

#### Enquiry by Design

PHA prepared a number of schematic designs for the various option configurations, that were then costed as a way of creating a business case.

#### Business Case

Pracsys developed a detailed business case that charted usage hours, ticket sales and volumes, recurring costs, revenue streams form venue hire. Based on this business case a brief was finalized

#### Brief

PHA wrote a detailed brief that became the the basis a future design completion for the project. In addition, some artists renders of the future project where created as part of a funding application to various state and federal government agencies.

Recently, a design completion was held, and the City of Joondalup are in the process of finalizing funding.

**PETER HOBBS ARCHITECTS**



# PORT HEADLAND



**STATUS: COMPLETE**

**LOCATION: PORT HEADLAND**

**TYPE: ENTERTAINMENT CENTRE**

**CLIENT: SHIRE OF PORT HEADLAND**

At the height of the 2012 iron ore boom in Port Hedland, the population of Port Hedland grew by almost 100% in less than 5 years, as the shire actively encouraged new employees to move to the town and break the FIFO trend. This population growth put enormous pressure on many aspects of town life, in particular, social and recreational infrastructure.

Pracsys and Peter Hobbs Architects (PHA) were engaged to undertake a detailed study of existing entertainment facilities, and their capacity. They also undertook detailed public consultation, including targeted interviews of many community and employment clubs and groups, and identified a number of events and activities that were considered base line activities.

**PETER HOBBS ARCHITECTS**

# ENTERTAINMENT CENTRE



Once need and demand were established, PHA produced nominal building briefs and designs that were then costed for the purpose of a business case. A number of key initiatives were presented to Council, which included

- Multi-purpose external performance Space
- MP Arts Space- a combined café, gallery, conference and studio in residency
- Upgrade to the existing Matt Dann Theatre
- New Cinema complex
- Bowling Alley
- Mobile Theatre

The recommendations and facilities management of this study culminated in the North by North West Festival, which has now become an annual event & these recommendations were adopted by council. The recent down turn in Port Hedland has reduced the urgency for some of these upgrades.

In 2013/4, PHA were commissioned to design and document and upgrade of the Matt Dann Theatre, which was successfully completed in 2014.

**PETER HOBBS ARCHITECTS**

# LEEDERVILLE - MASTERPLAN



**STATUS: ONGOING**

**LOCATION: LEEDERVILLE. WA.**

**VALUE: MASTERPLANNING**

**CLIENT: TOWN OF VINCENT**

Leederville is one of the most cosmopolitan and vibrant parts of the Town of Vincent and is highly valued by the community.

The Leederville Masterplan creates a blueprint for the future development of the Leederville business area focusing on the environmental, economic and social needs of the community.

The Masterplan was undertaken with the assistance of economists Pracsys, retail consultants Tactics4 and Colliers, to ensure that the built form proposal would work in a commercial sense.

The Leederville Masterplan recognises the importance of increasing density in Transit Orientated Development areas, but recognised the conflicts and resistance to change from local stakeholders. The mitigation strategy for this was to provide a constant Consultation process, and ensure

The Leederville study also proved the importance of preparing detailed building plans for the proposed development, especially when the structure plan appears to be suggesting a very prescriptive built form outcome. Providing flexibility within the Design controls help achieve the highest sales rate for the land, which needs to be carefully considered in relation to other requirements such as development mix and sustainability objectives.

Following the approval of the Leederville Master Plan, the Town of Vincent commissioned Peter Hobbs (JCY) to prepare The Leederville Town Centre Design Guidelines, that were adopted as Policy in 2009.

The Guidelines create a number of Precincts within the Town Centre that each had specific commercial and built form characteristics, and created specific requirements for these areas. In addition, generic guidelines that applied to the entire Town Centre were created, that dealt with higher order issues including Sustainability and Architectural expression.

The Guidelines were prepared with a detailed 3D model of the entire Town Centre, and through the creation of this model, mapped out appropriate streetscape setbacks, and where possible, located areas where building of greater height (up to 18 storeys) would be appropriate. In this sense, Built Form has been used as the fundamental development control. This approach has been used in conjunction with density controls, that allow incentivization of Affordable Housing and Environmental performance.

The Guidelines carefully addressed the issues of heritage and scale within Leederville, and identified how streetscape or existing low rise shop fronts could be used as podiums to larger bulk set back from the street edge.

The Guidelines begins by stating an over-arching Vision for each precinct, which were then synthesised into a series of Aims, and were followed by some direct rules and requirements. This approach, allows scope to vary development specifics, as long as the Vision and Aims are maintained.

A key innovation of the Design Guidelines is the introduction of sliding densities, that encourages the amalgamation of privately owned land into lot sizes more appropriate for medium density



# MARGARET RIVER -



IMAGE: MARGARET RIVER ED CAMPUS - COURTESY OF JCY ARCHITECTS

**STATUS: COMPLETED 2004**

**LOCATION: MARGARET RIVER**

**VALUE: \$9MILLION**

**CLIENT: DEPARTMENT OF TRAINING AND WORKPLACE DEVELOPMENT, CURTIN UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY, EDITH COWAN UNIVERSITY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND MARGARET RIVER SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL**

The aesthetics of the buildings are drawn from the traditional shed construction of the wine industry. Added to the palette of corrugated iron is the use of a rich timber building veneer and coloured glass which are both common in the south-west region.

**PETER HOBBS ARCHITECTS**

## EDUCATION CAMPUS



The campus is co-located with the High School so as to achieve significant educational and economic benefits for the community as no private land has been required for the its establishment. With its broad-based education programme and existing viticulture and other agricultural facilities as well as its large land area, central position, accessibility and exposure, all participants are well placed to benefit from and contribute to the successful development and operation of the campus.

The campus provides a world class training venue for practical and theoretical elements of wine grape growing, cellar operations, cellar door sales and wine tourism industries. The sophisticated research and tasting facilities coupled with a working winery for hands-on experience makes this the premier provider of wine industry training for the cultivation, manufacture and bottling, as well as the promotion of wine sales at the cellar door. In addition the campus also delivers courses in Access & Participation, Aged Care, Childcare, Commercial Cookery, Conservation & Land Management, Disability Work, Horticulture, Teacher Assistance, Hospitality, Information Technology, Office Administration, Small Business Management, Tourism and Visual Art.

**PETER HOBBS ARCHITECTS**




# EAST PERTH - POWER STATION



**STATUS: ONGOING**  
**LOCATION: EAST PERTH. WA.**  
**VALUE: MASTERPLANNING**  
**CLIENT: EPRA**

The East Perth Power Station has stood derelict for some 40 years, a fine example of early 20th century industrial architecture, now decommissioned and replaced with modern day remote generation. Under the direction of EPRA, Peter Hobbs lead a multifaceted design team including Urbis, Pracsys, TBB, RBB, Syrinx and SKM to master plan the 10 hectare site and provide a re-development strategy for the Power Station Building, that would justify the expenditure required to save this precious heritage.

**PETER HOBBS ARCHITECTS**



A key aspect of the study was to understand the costs of some significant infrastructure changes required to free up development of the site, and to understand the economics of how to amortize these costs against future development. This was achieved by producing detailed hypothetical development solutions, and to test these plans as a way of generating land values. Concurrently with this, various development scenarios were presented to community focus groups. In this manner, the site was optimized in terms of return, while ensuring local acceptance of the plan. Detailed planning was also undertaken to match built form, parking requirements and landscape opportunities. Similarly, setbacks, cross-overs and active edges were identified in the EPPS Master plan, to be then captured within the Guidelines.

The plan, based on TOD principles, enshrined best practice environmental design, and provide some 1300 new dwellings. It successfully provided direction for the preservation of an important heritage building that will become an important regional community asset.

**PETER HOBBS ARCHITECTS**

# PARK ROAD - APARTMENTS



**STATUS: COMPLETE**  
**LOCATION: CRAWLEY. WA.**  
**VALUE: \$4 MILLION**  
**CLIENT: ARGYLE HOLDINGS**

Park rd apartments are located at 18 Park Rd in Crawley in close proximity to the Hampden Rd cafe strip, the University of Western Australia and Trinity College. The development is elevated three storeys above ground level and includes a basement carpark below. The development comprises of eight two storey one bed loft style apartments and four ground floor two bedroom apartments for a total of twelve apartments.

The ground floor is landscaped along the access path and to the front and rear of the property. There are visitor bays available to guests from both Park Rd and the rear laneway. The bin store area is located and accessed via the rear laneway to remove unsightly bins from the street frontage.

**PETER HOBBS ARCHITECTS**

The two bedroom apartments located on the ground floor are constructed in cavity brick construction with insulation for thermal comfort. These apartments have a generous western courtyard which is sunny during the day and pleasantly shaded by the neighbouring property in the afternoon and early evening. The masterbedroom and the living room are connected to the courtyard by large sliding doors creating an attractive outlook and natural ventilation whilst maintaining privacy. The dining areas on the eastern side are bathed in morning sunlight and have a leafy outlook to a garden bed off the access path.

The upstairs loft apartments are separated from the ground floor apartments by a concrete slab, cavity brick construction provides acoustic separation between each loft apartment. These loft apartments are uniquely constructed internally of a two storey timber structure specially engineered to fire regulations. The lower floor of the apartment contains the master bedroom with the bathroom/laundry separated by an under stair study. A balcony, which connects the bathroom, study and bedroom allows light and ventilation to penetrate into these spaces. The upper floor of the loft apartment is accessed by a timber stair. The loft contains a compact, highly functional kitchen, with integrated appliances, stone bench tops and glass splashbacks. The living and dining space features a raking ceiling opening up to a generous decked courtyard. The courtyard is fully tanked below and is open to the sky above. The courtyard has a timber screen which allows the breeze whilst restricting overlooking and creating privacy for the resident. The front and rear loft apartments have a beautiful outlook from the courtyard with solid balustrading to provide privacy.

Externally the upper floors are clad in shadowclad timber, painted dark charcoal and this is offset with with a splash of bright colour on the fascia and balustrade capping, with soffit and balcony linings painted white. The sharp raking roofline and aluminium windows create an impressive sculptural architectural piece sitting on a podium of rendered brickwork below.



**PETER HOBBS ARCHITECTS**



# THE LANE - APARTMENTS



**STATUS: IN PROGRESS**  
**LOCATION: BEKENHAM**  
**VALUE: \$11 MILLION**  
**CLIENT: FINI DEVELOPMENTS**

The Lane apartments are located at No's 5 and 7 Central Terrace in Beckenham, only 300m from the Beckenham train station and within 2km of the Carousel shopping centre and the Cannington shopping district.

The fifty four unit development is generously divided into four apartment blocks nestled into a leafy spacious landscaped site. Covered car parking is provided via secured access driveways along the side boundaries connecting Central Terrace and the new Gemma Lane. Secured access to the apartments from the car park creates a safe environment for the residents. Visitors arrive via Central Terrace through a lusciously landscaped, paved laneway containing parallel parking

**PETER HOBBS ARCHITECTS**



along the lane and a bank of visitor bays opposite a roundabout featuring a mature flowering tree. Adjacent to this feature is a grassy square surrounded by fruiting trees for the pleasure of the residents. Generous bike storage facilities are available to residents and visitors. These located at both street entrances and a locked bike storage facility is available to residents adjacent to the green space.

The apartments are designed to provide affordable living options to the community and have been finished internally with modest finishes such as laminate cabinetry and stone bench tops, pleasant laminate flooring to living areas and carpet to bedrooms. Apartments are available in one and two bedroom types, some allowing for a study and some with a second bathroom. All units are unique, providing opportunity for a broad range of occupants.

**PETER HOBBS ARCHITECTS**



# COOLBELLUP - APARTMENTS



**STATUS: IN PROGRESS**  
**LOCATION: COOLBELLUP**  
**VALUE: \$5 MILLION**  
**CLIENT: JAXON**

22 Storybook Way is a proposed 28 unit apartment development in Landcorp's new sub-division- The Assembly, in Coolbellup.

Coolbellup has enjoyed a renaissance since the early 2000's, when Homeswest's New Living program began the transformation of Coolbellup from a predominantly social housing neighbourhood to a now vibrant and diverse community.

With excellent proximity to Murdoch University, St John of Gods Hospital, the recently completed Fiona Stanley Medical precinct, and connected to multiple public transport routes, 22 Storybook Way will add to the diverse offer of housing stock in the community, and will appeal to a multi-generational demographic, from first home owners and starter families to down sizers, from students to young professionals working in the area.

The site is elevated, with the street elevation facing north. Site analysis indicates that 22 Storybook will occupy a prominent position in the landscape- accordingly, careful attention has been paid to ensuring the building presents consistently from all quarters. Equally, due to the site's elevation, 22 Storybook will enjoy commanding views to both the south, west and east.

The building typology is a lifted three storey, contemporary apartment block, connected around with a circulation of open walkways. The planning is a quadrangle arranged around a central courtyard with a luscious central garden, mature trees and communal herb planters.

The development is build close to the street, with an articulated street elevation with pop up balcony elements that creates a town house sense of scale.

**PETER HOBBS ARCHITECTS**

The entrance to the development is highlighted with a vertical bar of brilliantly coloured glazed bricks, letter boxes and planting,

Front fences are light weight steel and back planted with hedging, to create a semi private zone between the ground floor apartments and the street, creating usable alfresco areas while providing surveillance of the street.

The building's materiality is a composition of 4 basic elements. The ground floor is treated in a rusticated red brick, while the upper two floor are in a crisply white rendered masonry. Balconies are treated as pop up structures, with the exterior treatment in a metal cladding, and the interior in a warm toned CFC cladding. Fixed shading devices to windows will add highlights and splashes of colour.

Parking and vehicle circulation is arranged around the western and southern boundaries of the site, with fabric shade structures providing protection for vehicles.

The apartment mix includes the usual proportion of 1 and two bedroom apartments mandated by the R codes, but includes 5 three bedroom apartments, indicating a commitment to a more diverse apartment market catering for a wider demographic that includes young families with a number of children. This is made viable with the number of parks and local retail offer within walking distance of the site.

22 Storybook Way represents a new maturity in the emerging apartment market in the middle ring of Perth's metropolitan area, and represents Jaxon Properties commitment to his sector.

**PETER HOBBS ARCHITECTS**

DAVID BARR ARCHITECT

ABWA: 2093  
32 Cliff Street, Fremantle, 6160

DAVID BARR ARCHITECT

**PERSONAL DETAILS**

Name	David Lytton Lindsay Barr
Address	
Phone	0438 895 119
Email	<a href="mailto:david@davidbarrarchitect.com.au">david@davidbarrarchitect.com.au</a>

**PROFESSIONAL SUMMARY**

I established David Barr Architect in 2011, a design practice that provides the foundation for my personal ambitions and focus, of developing enduring architecture addressing key social issues of affordable housing and sensitively increasing density of Perth. This passion grew from two defining factors, firstly from a resistance to the urban sprawl that plagues the infant City of Perth and Fremantle and secondly the affordability conundrum that faces all future generations contemplating home ownership. My experience spans a broad range of scales from small \$100,000.00 bespoke commissions to large \$18,000,000.00 sustainable developments, augmenting upon the lineage of works, each providing opportunities of testing, researching and realising conceptual ideas. The body of work is spread across of number of fields from education of architectural design studios at tertiary level exploring propositions for future housing developments, commissioned works responding current industry directions, architectural competitions, and consultancy testing future policies at local and state level.

**EDUCATION**

2001	Bachelor of Applied Science at Curtin University School of Technology
2003	Bachelor of Architecture (First Class Honours) at Curtin University School of Technology

**WORK HISTORY:**

## Registered Architect

2003 - 2007	Iredale Pedersen Hook Architects
2007	3 months residency with Flores Prats Arquitectes in Barcelona, Spain
2007 - 2010	CODA studio
2011 - ongoing	David Barr Architect (Cast Collective Pty Ltd trading as David Barr Architect)

## Teaching Experience

2004	Design Communication 201 with Emma Williamson – Tutor - Curtin University
2004	Architectural Design 201 with Rosanna Blacket – Tutor - Curtin University
2003	Architectural Design 302 with Simon Pandal – Tutor - Curtin University
2007	Architectural Design 301 with Andrea Quagliola - Tutor - UWA
2009	Architectural Design 201 – Lecturer - Curtin University
2011	Architectural Design 301 'Multiple Dwellings' with Jonathan Lake - Tutor – Curtin University
2012	Architectural Design Praxis 651 – 'Modular Affordable Housing' Lecturer - Curtin University
2013	Architectural Design 4a Complex Buildings with Andrea Quagliola – Studio Coordinator - UWA
2013	Integrated Design Studio 1 – IDFS2000 with Emiliano Roia – Studio Coordinator - UWA
2014	Architectural Design 4a Complex Buildings with Andrea Quagliola – Studio Coordinator - UWA
2015	Architectural Design Complex Buildings 'Suburban Topographies' – Studio Coordinator - UWA

**PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS:**

1999 - ongoing	Architect member of Royal Australian Institute of Architecture
1999	Golden Key Member
2005 - 2009	Merge (Formerly known as Young Architects Committee)
2007 - ongoing	Architects Board of Western Australia Architect Reg. 2093
2011 - ongoing	Architects Board of Western Australia Corporate Reg. 2558

**AWARDS | COMPETITIONS**

2001	Wood Bagot Scholarship (Bachelor of Applied Science)
2001	Golden Key Member
2001	Executive Dean's Award Division of Humanities Group Award – 'Voyage' (Turkey Study Tour)
2002	Inducted into Vice Chancellor's list – Bachelor of Architecture
2003	First Class Honours Bachelor of Architecture
2003	RAIA Spowers Architects (WA) Graduation Prize in Architecture
2004	Youth in Architecture Award (sponsored by Office of Children and Youth and RAIA)
2012	AIA Architecture Award: Small Project Architecture: Westbury Crescent Residence
2012	AIA Mondulce Lighting Awards: The Creative and Innovative Use of Lighting in Architecture: Westbury Crescent Residence

2013	Finalist 'Houses' National Publication – New Houses under 200sqm
2014	Finalist 'Houses' National Publication – Alterations and Additions over 200sqm
2014	AIA Architecture Commendation: New Residence: Beach Road
2014	Finalist for Kings Square National Competition (Short-listed 6)
2014	LandCorp – Generation Y Winner for Demonstration Housing Project in White Gum Valley
2016	AIA Architecture Award: Alterations and Additions: Claremont Residence
2016	AIA Architecture Awards: Mika: Multiple Residential Development
2016	LandCorp – Shoreline Affordable Housing Project – (Short-listed 7 – ongoing)

**PUBLICATIONS:**

2004 - 2005	Monument Magazine No.64 Dec 2004/Jan 2005 'New Generation' 40 recent design graduates pg 71
2005	Artrage Festival Guide 3 Over 4 Under 'Onsite' pg 18
2013	The Architect – Summer January Issue 1 – Westbury Crescent Residence
2013	'A New Suburbia' Thames and Hudson by Stuart Harrison
2014	The Architect – Affordable Medium Density Housing Solutions

**REFEREES:**

Referee:	Anna Evangelisti
Company:	LandCorp
Position:	Design Manager
Mob:	0419 000 486
Email:	<a href="mailto:anna.evangelisti@landcorp.com.au">anna.evangelisti@landcorp.com.au</a>
Reference Project:	Gen Y Demonstration Housing Project
Referee:	Carmel Van Ruth
Company:	Office of Government Architect
Position:	Senior Architectural Officer
Mob:	(08) 6551 1935
Email:	<a href="mailto:carmelvanruth@finance.wa.gov.au">carmelvanruth@finance.wa.gov.au</a>
Reference Project:	Apartment Design WA / Planning Reform for Better Design (PRBD)
Referee:	Nicholas Temov
Company:	Planning Commission
Position:	Senior Planning Officer
Mob:	(08) 6551 9316
Email:	<a href="mailto:Nicholas.Temov@planning.wa.gov.au">Nicholas.Temov@planning.wa.gov.au</a>
Reference Project:	Apartment Design WA / Planning Reform for Better Design (PRBD)
Referee:	Warren Phillips
Company:	LandCorp
Position:	Senior Development Manager
Mob:	0478 585 880
Email:	<a href="mailto:Warren.Phillips@landcorp.com.au">Warren.Phillips@landcorp.com.au</a>
Reference Project:	WGV Lot 1 Development Proposition / Gen Y Demonstration Housing Project

## DEMONSTRATED EXPERIENCE

## 2016

**PRBD**

Client:  
Address:  
Role / Stages:  
Building Type / Description:

Value:

**STATE PLANNING COMMISSION: APARTMENT DESIGN WA (DRAFT)**

Planning Commission  
N/A  
Architectural Consultant for Part 4 – Designing the Building  
David Barr Architect was engaged as part of a large professional consultancy team and took the lead role of the Part 4, 'Designing the Building' of the draft Apartment Design Guide. Further to our involvement in Part 4, we were commissioned to undertake key diagramming and graphic content for the document to clearly demonstrate the design criteria and guidance principles.  
N/A

**MINDARIE**

Client:  
Address:  
Role / Stages:  
Building Type / Description:

Value:

**MINDARIE 5 LEVEL MULTIPLE RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT**

M-Group  
284 South Terrace, South Fremantle  
David Barr Architect in association with Old Field Knott Architects / Design Architect  
Multiple residential development 50 apartments over four levels. As lead architectural design consultant we were commissioned to provide a unique apartment product in a challenging economic apartment climate that harnessed excellent design outcomes.  
\$19,000,000

**SUBURBAN ORCHARD**

Client:  
Address:  
Role / Stages:  
Building Type / Description:

Value:

**WGV MULTIPLE RESIDENTIAL SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT**

M-Group  
LOT 1 White Gum Valley Development, LandCorp  
Concept Design  
David Barr Architect approached the M-Group as a consortium for a competition for a sustainable multiple residential development located in LandCorp's WGV precinct development. The scheme proposed, a entirely timber framed structure (90% reduction in embodied energy) adopting the principles of 'One Planet Living' addressing, communal, sustainable and environmental initiatives.  
\$5,000,000


**MARKET STREET**

Client:  
Address:  
Role / Stages:  
Building Type / Description:

Value:

**FREMANTLE PUBLIC PLAZA & STREET ACTIVATION / HERITAGE UPGRADE**

City of Fremantle  
Market Street Fremantle  
Invited Competition  
David Barr Architect was invited to provide conceptual ideas for the activation and revitalisation of Market Street coupled with responding to the compliance upgrades to the Heritage Listed Evan Davies Building, urban activation to an area struggling with trade and high turnover of commercial properties.  
\$350,000



## 2015

**SOUTH TERRACE**

Client:  
Address:  
Role / Stages:  
Building Type / Description:

Value:

**MIXED USED AFFORDABLE INFILL URBAN DEVELOPMENT**

M-Group  
284 South Terrace, South Fremantle  
David Barr Architect in association with Cameron Chisholm Nicol / Design Architect  
Mixed used development containing 5 commercial tenancies and 20 apartments over three levels located in the heart of South Fremantle. The project sensitively engages with heritage buildings adjacent, providing a strong active edge to the street as well as responding to the adjacent scale of the suburban edge.  
\$7,300,000




**FREMANTLE HOUSING DIVERSITY II**

Client:  
Address:  
Role / Stages:  
Building Type / Description:

Value:

**LOCAL PLANNING PROVISIONS FOR SUSTAINABLE INFILL DEVELOPMENT**

City of Fremantle / AUDRC (Sharne Bruere & Dr Anthony Duckworth-Smith)  
N/A  
Local Policy Testing  
The commission required rigorous testing and exploration of a proposed local scheme amendment that sought to promote moderately-sized infill housing in suburban areas in the City of Fremantle.  
N/A

**2014****GEN Y DEMONSTRATION HOUSING**

Client:  
Address:  
Role / Stages:  
Building Type / Description:

Value:

**MULTIPLE RESIDENTIAL ENERGY EFFICIENT & SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT**

LandCorp  
Lot 7 Hope Street, White Gum Valley  
Lead Consultant / Full Service Commission  
The project was won through an architectural competition responding to social, economical and sustainable initiatives. Our innovative proposal demonstrates six adults living comfortably on a shared 250sqm suburban site with flexibility in the planning for future alterations and augmentations. The house achieves a Gold Medal reduce carbon footprint of 97% life cycle assessment of embodied energy of materials and energy consumption. The house also incorporates 'One Planet Living' principles responding to the precinct development guidelines.  
\$650,000


**MIKA APARTMENTS**

Client:  
Address:  
Role / Stages:  
Building Type / Description:

Value:

**MULTIPLE RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT**

M-Group  
22 Heirisson Way, North Coogee  
David Barr Architect in association with Cameron Chisholm Nicol / Design Architect  
A multiple residential development consisting of 38 apartments with a diverse mix of one and two bed options designed on an old industrial site recently converted to a residential precinct south of Fremantle. Situated amongst two storey houses the project responds to bulk and scale, climate, context and activating the streets edge on all three frontages.  
\$10,000,000

**SUBLIME**

Client:  
Address:  
Role / Stages:  
Building Type / Description:

Value:

**MIXED USE INFILL DEVELOPMENT**

M-Group  
Lot 217 No. 14 Lime Street, North Fremantle  
David Barr Architect in association with Old Field Knott Design Architect / Facade Design  
Our engagement was to redesign the previously proposed street elevation providing an appropriate solution for the local context.  
N/A

**RECREATION DRIVE**

Client:  
Address:  
Role / Stages:  
Building Type / Description:

Value:

**AFFORDABLE MIXED USE INFILL DEVELOPMENT**

De Petra Trust  
Lot 65, No. 7 Recreation Drive, Hamilton Hill  
Concept Design (only)  
The commission was to design a moderately scaled multiple residential development containing 18 low cost affordable apartments within the City of Cockburn. A suburban lot that would typically host 8 grouped dwellings was transformed to increase density, whilst maintaining amenity to the occupants and surrounding neighbours.  
\$4,500,000



## Design Review Panel Registrations of Interest

	<b>Applicant Name</b>	<b>Qualification</b>	<b>Employer</b>
1	Simon Venturi	Architect	Noma Studio
2	Barbara Gdowski	Architect	Murdoch University
3	Alex Willis	Architect	ACW Design
4	Dominic Snellgrove	Architect	Cameron Chisholm Nicol Architects
5	Ian Dewar	Architect	Ian Dewar & Associates Architects
6	Patrick Jordan/ Nicky Croudace/ Stuart Pullybank (One submission)	Landscape Architects	Ecoscope
7	Chris Melsom	Architect Planner	HASSELL
8	Melanie Bradley	Landscape Architect Planner	Department of Planning
9	Nick Juniper	Architect	Coda Architects
10	Kym MacCormac	Architect	MacCormac Architects
11	David Barr	Architect	David Barr Architects
12	Lisa Shine	Architect & Landscape Architect	N/A
13	Peter Hobbs	Architect & Registered Builder	Peter Hobbs Architects
14	Lee-Anne Kho	Architect	Peter Hobbs Architects
15	Andrew MacLiver	Architect	A & A MacLiver
16	Malcolm Mackay	Architect/Urban Designer	Mackay Urban Design
17	Tony Watson	Planner	MW Urban
18	Peter Woodward	Landscape Architect	Blackwell & Associates
19	Joe Chindarsi	Architect	Joe Chindarsi Architects
20	Michelle Blakeley	Architect	Michelle Blakely Architect Pty Ltd
21	Hans Oerlemans	Landscape Architect & Urban Designer	Place Laboratory





**City of Cockburn**  
G.I.S Services Department

**Location Plan – Lot 9000 Frankland Avenue, Hammond Park**

PRINTED ON:  
24/01/2017

SCALE = 1:7431

DISCLAIMER - The City of Cockburn provides the information contained herein and bears no responsibility or liability whatsoever for any errors, faults, defects or omissions of information contained in this document.







ENDORSED LOCAL STRUCTURE PLAN

MODIFIED LOCAL STRUCTURE PLAN

**LEGEND**

**STRUCTURE PLAN BOUNDARY**

**ZONES**

- RESIDENTIAL
- LOCAL CENTRE

**RESERVES**

- PARKS AND RECREATION
- PUBLIC PURPOSE

**OTHER ELEMENTS THAT INFORM THE LSP**

- R25 RESIDENTIAL DENSITY CODE
- PROPOSED BUS ROUTE
- PLANNING CONTROL AREA No. 95
- LAND WITHIN FLAMEZONE NOT CAPABLE OF BEING DEVELOPED UNTIL ADJOINING BUSH FIRE HAZARD REMOVED
- DEVELOPMENT SUBJECT TO DWELLING CONSTRUCTION UNDER AS3959-2009

**MODIFICATION**

**1** CHANGE FROM R25 TO R60



robertsday.com.au planning.design.place

SIZE A3  
1:4000  
0 metres 40 80 120 160 200



**AERIAL PHOTOGRAPHY**  
SOURCE: NA  
YYMMDD: NA

**CADAstral INFORMATION**  
SOURCE: McMULLEN NOLAN  
YYMMDD: 140501  
DWG REF: 96236  
PROJECTION: PCG 94

D	MODIFIED BOUNDARY	160906	RF	ER
C	UPDATED DESIGN	160823	RF	ER
B	REMOVED LOT	151015	RF	ER
A	PLAN BASE RD1 034B	150716	RF	ER
REV	DESCRIPTION	YYMMDD	DRAWN	APPR'D

EXISTING AND MODIFIED LOCAL STRUCTURE PLAN COMPARISON  
**Lots 13-14, 18 & 47-51 Hammond park**  
City of Cockburn

REF NO. **RIC HAM** DRAW NO. **RD1 045** REV. **D**




## LEGEND

- SUBJECT LAND
- EXISTING LOT BOUNDARY
- PROPOSED LOT BOUNDARY
- EXISTING CONTOURS

Lot Breakdown	
Area Range	No. Lots
319 - 449	18
3000 - 3500	1

Existing No. Lots	4
Single Residential Lots	18
Group Housing	1
Balance Lot	3



**RD** great places.

robertsday.com.au  
planning.design.place

CADASTRAL INFORMATION  
SOURCE: RICHARD NOBLE  
YYMADO: 150929  
DWG REF: 96326-010-P  
PROJECTION: PCG94

SIZE A3

1:1000

D LOT 415  
C REALIGN GH ROAD  
B ALTER GH + ADD 286  
A SUBDIVISION PLAN  
REV DESCRIPTION

160315 ED ER  
160301 ED ER  
160229 ED ER  
160211 RF ER/KV  
YYMADO DRAWN APPRD

PLAN OF SUBDIVISION  
Lots 286, 9000, 9001 & 9002 Barfield Road  
City of Cockburn

REF NO.  
RIC HAM

DRAW NO.  
RD1 300

REV.  
D

DISCLAIMER: ISSUED FOR DESIGN INTENT ONLY. ALL AREAS AND DIMENSIONS ARE SUBJECT TO DETAIL DESIGN AND SURVEY

File No. 110/166

**SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS**  
**PROPOSED STRUCTURE PLAN AMENDMENT – LOT 9000 FRANKLAND AVENUE, HAMMOND PARK**

NO.	NAME/ADDRESS	SUBMISSION	RECOMMENDATION
1	Department of Environment Regulation Locked Bag 33 Cloisters Square PERTH WA 6850	DER has no comment on this matter in reference to regulatory responsibilities under the <i>Environmental Protection Act 1986</i> and the <i>Contaminated Sites Act 2003</i> .	Noted.
2	Main Roads WA PO Box 6202 EAST PERTH WA 6892	Main Roads has no objection to the proposed amendment to the Barfield Road structure plan.	Noted.
3	Department of Parks and Wildlife Locked Bag 104 Bentley Delivery Centre WA 6983	The Department of Parks and Wildlife has no comments on the application. It is considered that the proposal and any potential environmental impacts will be appropriately addressed through the existing planning framework.	Noted.
4	WA Gas Networks (ATCO Australia) PO Box 3006 SUCCESS WA 6964	<p>ATCO Gas has gas mains (DN63PE 1.5PEHP 350kPa) and associated infrastructure predominantly within the road reserve of Corsia Crescent in the immediate vicinity of the area to which the Amendment for the purpose of Rezoning would apply. ATCO Gas have service lines within the Lots that also provide domestic gas supplies.</p> <p>ATCO Gas do not have any objections to the proposed Amendment being approved to facilitate future rezoning of the nominated area within Lot 9000 from R25 to R60.</p> <p>Please see the attached Figure for your record.</p>	Noted.
5	Western Power GPO Box L921 PERTH WA 6842	<p>A Danger Zone, Registered Easement, Restriction Zone or Minimum approach distance represent areas of high risk when building or working near the Western Power network. Before commencing any work it is essential that you complete a Dial Before You Dig enquiry to obtain the location and voltage of the Western Power network.</p> <p>Areas of high risk include;            Danger Zone - Defined by regulation 3.64 of the Occupational Safety</p>	Noted. The applicant has been made aware of these requirements via this attachment to the Council Report.



NO.	NAME/ADDRESS	SUBMISSION	RECOMMENDATION
		<p>and Health Regulations 1996 . Registered Easement - Western Power easements are registered on the Certificate of Title for the property. Easements and conditions are available from Landgate (<a href="http://www.landgate.wa.gov.au">www.landgate.wa.gov.au</a>) .</p> <p>Restriction Zone - These are applied in the absence of a registered easement and are calculated in line with the Australian Standard for overhead line design (AS/NZS 7000:2010) . Minimum approach distance - These are applied to underground cables and can be found in the Working safely around the Western Power network handbook that is available on the Western Power website (<a href="http://www.westernpower.com.au/safety-working-near-electricity">www.westernpower.com.au/safety-working-near-electricity</a> )</p> <p>It is recommended that persons planning to build or undertake works in high risk areas near transmission or communication assets (including those listed above) act in a safe manner at all times and in accordance with all applicable legal and safety requirements (including the 'duty of care' under the laws of negligence, Worksafe requirements and guidelines, Australian Standards and Western Power policies and procedures).</p> <p>Western Power provides services that may assist persons planning to build or work within high risk areas near transmission or communication assets (refer to your Dial Before You Dig enquiry for location and voltage). These services can be found by visiting the Transmission and communication assets section of the Western Power website (<a href="http://www.westernpower.com.au/safety-working-near-electricity.html">http://www.westernpower.com.au/safety-working-near-electricity.html</a> ).</p>	
6	Department of Water PO Box 332 MANDURAH WA 6210	<p><b>LWMS</b> <b>Urban Water Management</b></p> <p>Consistent with <i>Better Urban Water Management</i> (BUWM) (WAPC, 2008) and policy measures outlined in <i>State Planning Policy 2.9, Water Resources</i>, the proposed Local Structure Plan should be supported by a Local Water Management Strategy (LWMS) consistent with the approved <i>Barfield Road Various Lots District Water Management Strategy</i> prior to final approval of the Structure Plan.</p> <p>The LWMS should demonstrate how the subject area will address water use and management. It should contain a level of information that demonstrates the site constraints and the level of risk to the water</p>	Noted.

NO.	NAME/ADDRESS	SUBMISSION	RECOMMENDATION
		<p>resources.</p> <p>The DoW reviewed the supporting documents, <i>Barfield Road Local Water Management Strategy</i> (LWMS) (Emerge Associates, June 2013) and the <i>Barfield Road Local Structure Plan LWMS Addendum</i> (Emerge, 2014) and both were deemed satisfactory to the DoW. Given the minor nature of the proposed amendment the DoW has no objections to the proposed Structure Plan proceeding.</p>	
7	Water Corporation PO Box 100 LEEDERVILLE WA 6902	<p>The Water Corporation offers the following comments in regard to this proposal.</p> <p><b><u>Water and Wastewater</u></b></p> <p>Reticulated water and sewerage is currently available throughout the subject area.</p> <p>The proposed changes to the Structure Plan do not appear to impact on the Water Corporation's ability to serve the area of increased density.</p> <p><b><u>General Comments</u></b></p> <p>The principle followed by the Water Corporation for the funding of subdivision or development is one of user pays. The developer is expected to provide all water and sewerage reticulation if required. A contribution for Water, Sewerage and Drainage headworks may also be required. In addition the developer may be required to fund new works or the upgrading of existing works and protection of all works. Any temporary works needed are required to be fully funded by the developer. The Water Corporation may also require land being ceded free of cost for works.</p> <p>Please provide the above comments to the land owner, developer and/or their representative.</p>	Noted. This information has been forwarded on to the applicant.
8	Telstra Locked Bag 2525 PERTH WA 6001	<p>Thank you for the above advice. At present, Telstra Corporation Limited has no objection. This area is NBNCo .</p> <p><b><u>Latest Telecommunications Policy</u></b></p> <p>The Federal Government has deemed developers are now responsible for telecommunications infrastructure on all developments, i.e.</p>	Noted.

NO.	NAME/ADDRESS	SUBMISSION	RECOMMENDATION
		conduits, pits and the cost of the cable installation by Telstra or other carrier. Telstra can provide a quote for the pit and pipe and/or cable. This is explained on the Telstra Smart Community website below. The owner/developer will have to submit an application <u>before construction is due to start</u> to Telstra (less than 100 lots or living units) or NBN Co. (for greater than 100 lots or living units in a 3 year period).	
9	Department of Transport GPO Box C102 PERTH WA 6839	The DoT has liaised with its transport Portfolio stakeholders and notes that Main Roads have provided the City with a separate response.  Please be advised that The DoT has no comments for this planning stage.	Noted.
10	Department of Health PO Box 8172 PERTH BC WA 6849	Thank you for your letter, dated 9 January 2017, requesting comment from the Department of Health (DOH) on the above proposal.  The development is required to connect to scheme water and reticulated sewerage as required by the Government Sewerage Policy - Perth Metropolitan Region.  The City of Cockburn should also use this opportunity to minimise potential negative impacts of the increased density development such as noise, odour, light and other lifestyle activities and consider incorporation of additional sound proofing / insulation, double glazing on windows, or design aspects related to location of air conditioning units and other appropriate building/construction measures.  DOH has a document on 'Evidence supporting the creation of environments that encourage healthy active living' which may assist you with planning elements related to this activity centre plan. A copy is attached or may be downloaded from: <a href="http://www.public.health.wa.gov.au/cproot/6111/2/140924_wahealth_evidence_statement_be_health.pdf">http://www.public.health.wa.gov.au/cproot/6111/2/140924_wahealth_evidence_statement_be_health.pdf</a>	Noted. These concerns will be looked at in closer detail at Development Application via assessment under the R-Codes and at Building Permit stage.
11	Department of Fire and Emergency Services 20 Southport Street WEST LEEDERVILLE WA 6007	This email is to confirm receipt of the above referral (your reference 110/166 dated 9 January 2017) by DFES Advisory Services.  In this regard, Advisory Services will review the proposed amendment and provide a written response by 7 February as requested.	No further correspondence was received and so it is assumed there is no objection to the proposal.



# TREEBY DISTRICT STRUCTURE PLAN

February 2017

## PART ONE - IMPLEMENTATION

STRUCTURE  
PLAN TREEBY  
DISTRICT



## TREEBY DISTRICT STRUCTURE PLAN

### PART ONE - IMPLEMENTATION

Prepared by:



PO Box 796  
Subiaco WA 6904  
t: 9382 1233  
f: 9382 1127  
[www.cleplan.com.au](http://www.cleplan.com.au)

2310Rep137C  
February 2017

### 1.0 STRUCTURE PLAN AREA

This District Structure Plan applies to the area shown within the boundary on Plan A – Treeby (Banjup) District Structure Plan.

### 2.0 STRUCTURE PLAN CONTENT

This structure plan comprises:

- Part One – Implementation Section
- Part Two – Explanatory Section
- Appendices – Technical Reports.

Part One of the District Structure Plan comprises the structure plan map and planning provisions. Part Two of the District Structure Plan is the Explanatory Section which can be used to interpret and implement the requirements of Part One.

### 3.0 OPERATION

The District Structure Plan is a strategic planning document intended to guide and coordinate more detailed planning (including preparation of Local Structure Plans) for individual sites within the District Structure Plan area. The structure plan comes into effect on the date Council resolves it will become a guiding document for more detailed structure planning. Endorsement by the Western Australian Planning Commission (WAPC) under the provisions of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) 2015 Schedule 2 – Deemed provisions* is not proposed although the District Structure Plan has been prepared with reference to WAPC policies and consultation with the Department of Planning.

### 4.0 REZONING, LOCAL STRUCTURE PLAN, SUBDIVISION AND DEVELOPMENT REQUIREMENTS

The land use arrangements, district level infrastructure and movement network illustrated in the District Structure Planning will inform the City's response to requests for rezoning and more detailed Local Structure Plans within the structure plan area. The layout illustrated within Plan A represents a high level structural response to key issues which may be subject to refinement at more detailed stages of planning.

Local Structure Plans prepared within the District Structure Plan area should:

- Generally conform with the layout illustrated within the District Structure Plan;
- Be accompanied by:
  - A Local Water Management Strategy consistent with any approved District Water Management Strategy;
  - An Environmental Assessment Report;
  - A Bushfire Hazard Assessment;
  - A Transport Noise Assessment; and
  - Other submission requirements consistent with the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) 2015 Schedule 2 – Deemed provisions*.

Subdivision and development will be determined in accordance with the applicable zoning, planning scheme provisions and, where applicable, approved Local Structure Plans and Local Development Plans.


## **5.0 ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

All urban development within the District Structure Plan area is subject to Development Contribution Plan No. 13.

In addition, urban development sites abutting Jandakot Road shall be required to provide for the widening and upgrade of any directly abutting portion of Jandakot Road to a 2 lane divided urban standard road, with provision (widening and earthworks) for ultimate upgrade to a 4 lane divided urban standard road. These works and associated widening required shall be agreed via legal agreement entered into with the City of Cockburn prior to approval of a Local Structure Plan for the site if deemed necessary.



This plan has no formal approval status and has been prepared by CLE to demonstrate one potential land use scenario for the land which could be investigated further by the Client. Implementation in any form would be subject to the receipt of all appropriate approvals. The plan may be changed without notice and should not be relied upon. This plan remains the property of CLE.







# TREEBY DISTRICT STRUCTURE PLAN

February 2017

## PART TWO - EXPLANATORY SECTION

STRUCTURE  
PLAN TREEBY  
DISTRICT

*This page has been left blank intentionally*

TREEBY DISTRICT STRUCTURE PLAN  
PART TWO - EXPLANATORY SECTION

Prepared by:



PO Box 796  
Subiaco WA 6904  
t: 9382 1233  
f: 9382 1127  
[www.cleplan.com.au](http://www.cleplan.com.au)

2310Rep118C  
February 2017



*This page has been left blank intentionally*

**DEVELOPER**

---

Perron Developments Pty Ltd

**PROJECT TEAM**

---

Town Planning - CLE Town Planning + Design

Environmental - 360 Environmental

Hydrology - JDA Consultant Hydrologists

Civil Engineering - Wood & Grieve Engineers

Traffic - Transcore

*This page has been left blank intentionally*

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1.0 PLANNING BACKGROUND</b>	<b>2.5 Heritage</b>
1.1 Introduction and Purpose	<b>2.6 Context Analysis and Opportunities and Constraints</b>
<b>1.2 Land Description</b>	<b>3.0 DISTRICT STRUCTURE PLAN</b>
1.2.1 Location	<b>3.1 Land Use</b>
1.2.2 Area and land use	3.1.1 Residential Densities and Yield Projections
1.2.3 Legal Description and Ownership	3.1.2 Non-Residential Land Uses/Facilities
<b>1.3 Planning Framework</b>	<b>3.2 Public Open Space and Recreation</b>
1.3.1 Zoning and Reservations	<b>3.3 Education Facilities</b>
1.3.2 Planning Strategies and Sub-Regional Structure Plan	<b>3.4 Employment</b>
1.3.3 Planning Policies	<b>3.5 Movement Networks</b>
1.3.4 Other Approvals and Decisions	3.5.1 Ultimate Road Network
<b>2.0 EXISTING ENVIRONMENT: SITE CONDITIONS AND CONSTRAINTS</b>	3.5.2 Pedestrian and Cycle Network
<b>2.1 Biodiversity and Natural Area Assets</b>	3.5.3 Public Transport
2.1.1 Remnant Vegetation	<b>3.6 Water Management</b>
2.1.2 Conservation Significant Flora	<b>3.7 Service Infrastructure</b>
2.1.3 Conservation Significant Fauna	3.7.1 Sewer
<b>2.2 Landform and Soils</b>	3.7.2 Water Supply
2.2.1 Acid Sulphate Soils	3.7.3 Power
<b>2.3 Groundwater and Surface Water</b>	3.7.4 Telecommunications
<b>2.4 Bushfire Hazard</b>	3.7.5 Gas
	<b>4.0 IMPLEMENTATION</b>

*This page has been left blank intentionally*

## FIGURES

- Figure 1: Site Plan
- Figure 2: Location Plan
- Figure 3: Ownership Plan
- Figure 4: Metropolitan Region Scheme Plan
- Figure 5: Local Planning Scheme Plan
- Figure 6: Draft South Metropolitan Peel Sub Regional Framework
- Figure 7: Draft South Metropolitan Peel Sub Regional Framework Urban Staging
- Figure 8: Underground Water Pollution Control Areas
- Figure 9: Opportunities and Constraints Plan
- Figure 10: Banjup Quarry (Calleya) Local Structure Plan
- Figure 11: Proposed Road Hierarchy (Interim)
- Figure 12: Proposed Road Hierarchy (Armada Road Deviation)
- Figure 13: Proposed Pedestrian and Cyclist Network
- Figure 14: Potential Future Bus Routes (PTA)

## TABLES

- Table 1: Primary Potential Development Sites
- Table 2: Land Ownership
- Table 3: MRS Zoning (Summary)
- Table 4: Local Scheme Zoning (Summary)
- Table 5: Land Use Schedule (Summary)

## APPENDICES

- Appendix 1: Environmental Assessment Report
- Appendix 2: Transport Assessment
- Appendix 3: District Water Management Strategy
- Appendix 4: Engineering Infrastructure Report



TREEBY DISTRICT STRUCTURE PLAN  
PART TWO - EXPLANATORY SECTION





## **1.0 PLANNING BACKGROUND**

### **1.1 Introduction and Purpose**

This District Structure Plan, hereinafter referred to as the Treeby District Structure Plan (TDSP) has been prepared at the request of the City of Cockburn in consultation with key stakeholders including relevant government agencies and major landholders. It is a strategic document to guide the City's decision making: it has not been prepared under Part 4 of Schedule 2 of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015* and endorsement by the Western Australian Planning Commission is not proposed to be sought.

The TDSP applies to the area generally bounded by Jandakot Road to the north, Warton Road to the east, Armadale Road to the south and Solomon Road to the west. This area totals around 460ha (refer Figure 1 – Site Plan).

The primary objective of the TDSP is to provide a high level strategic spatial planning framework to coordinate the development of land and provision of district level services within the Banjup Urban Precinct. The TDSP identifies the basic physical arrangement of urban areas, the primary road network, neighbourhoods, schools, district open space, commercial centres, public transportation and other major infrastructure. The TDSP consolidates background information and provides broad direction to inform the preparation of Local Structure Plans as part of the more detailed planning process to follow.

The coordination of planning for the Banjup Urban Precinct (now defined as the Treeby DSP area) presents a valuable opportunity for the State to achieve many of its planning and land use objectives for Perth, and consolidation of urban development in the southern metropolitan corridor.


The lodgement of the TDSP aligns with the Project Plan released by the City of Cockburn in September 2015. The Project Plan provides a guide for the preparation of the TDSP which covers the following –

- Broad land-use arrangement, buffers and any relevant targets (eg. density targets);
- Coordination of major infrastructure including:
  - Schools;
  - District Water Management;
  - District Movement Networks;
  - Regional & District level Open Space / Conversation Areas;
  - District recreation facilities.
- Broad funding arrangements for improvements, potentially including the principles of a Development Contribution Plan (DCP).

The TDSP addresses and acknowledges all of the objectives of the City's Project Plan.

TREEBY DISTRICT STRUCTURE PLAN  
PART TWO - EXPLANATORY SECTION

This plan has been prepared for general information purposes only and uses potentially uncontrolled data from external sources. CLE does not guarantee the accuracy of this plan and it should not be used for any detailed site design. This plan remains the property of CLE.



## 1.2 Land Description

The following section provides a brief overview of the TDSP area, and examines its context with respect to location, land use and ownership.

### 1.2.1 Location

The TDSP applies to the area generally bounded by Jandakot Road to the north, Warton Road to the east, Armadale Road to the south and Solomon Road to the west within the City of Cockburn. It is located approximately 19km south of the Perth CBD, 1km east of Cockburn Central Railway Station and Activity Centre, and 13km west of the Armadale Shopping Centre (refer Figure 2 - Location Plan).

### 1.2.2 Area and land use

The TDSP covers an area of approximately 460ha. Existing land use within the TDSP includes residential, extractive industry, rural residential, rural and open space / conservation. This includes:

- 118.48ha of Regional Open Space reserved for Parks and Recreation owned by the State;
- The Calleya (Banjup Quarry) residential development estate which consists of around 145ha of land in the western portion of the TDSP, currently under development by Stockland;
- The currently vacant Lot 1 (west) Armadale Road, to the southwest of the Calleya development (8.09ha);

- Fourteen (14) Resource zoned existing rural residential homesites accessed via Skotsch Road totalling 29.83ha; and
- Four (4) consolidated vacant sites previously used for quarrying activities and now identified for development:

**Table 1: Primary Potential Development Sites**

Lot Details	Landowner	Area(ha)
Lot 1 (east) Ghostgum Avenue	Department of Housing	20.35
Lot 2 Armadale Road	Ronci, Palmerino	3.15
Lot 4 Armadale Road	Midland Brick Co Pty Ltd - under contract to Perron Developments P/L	58.77
Lot 131 Jandakot Road	Limebrook Holdings Pty Ltd. - subject to a JV arrangement with Perron Developments P/L	64.75



TREEBY DISTRICT STRUCTURE PLAN  
PART TWO - EXPLANATORY SECTION

This plan has been prepared for general information purposes only and uses potentially uncontrolled data from external sources. CLE does not guarantee the accuracy of this plan and it should not be used for any detailed site design. This plan remains the property of CLE.





### 1.2.3 Legal Description and Ownership


The following table provides a summary of the land ownership within the TDSP, excluding created single residential lots within Calleya. A Land Ownership Plan is provided at Figure 3.

**Table 2: Land Ownership**

Lot Number	Owner	Certificate Of Title	Area(ha)
1 (west)	Armada Road Pty Ltd	1209-240	8.09
1 (east)	Housing Authority	2887-742	20.35
2	Ronci, Palmerino	1250-966	3.15
4	Midland Brick Co Pty Ltd	333-129A	58.77
131	Limebrook Holdings Pty Ltd	1524-135	64.75
62-75	Various Skotsch Road private landowners		29.83
500	Dougan, Kiara Helen & Law-David, Daniel John	1663-61	1.19
139	State of WA	LR3144-998	5.30
140	State of WA	LR3096-571	42.56
467	State of WA	LR3081-261	40.31
468	State of WA	LR3024-166	2.59
614	State of WA	LR3032-307	7.68
820	WA Planning Commission (State of WA)	2710-373	20.05
9012	Stockland WA Development Pty Ltd	2867-287	7.43
9021	Stockland WA Development Pty Ltd	2898-453	41.26
9016	Stockland WA Development Pty Ltd	2898-982	41.56

TREEBY DISTRICT STRUCTURE PLAN  
PART TWO - EXPLANATORY SECTION

This plan has been prepared for general information purposes only and uses potentially uncontrolled data from external sources. CLE does not guarantee the accuracy of this plan and it should not be used for any detailed site design. This plan remains the property of CLE.



- Legend**
- Scheme boundary
  - Reserved lands**
    - Parks and recreation
    - Restricted public access
    - Railways
    - Port installations
    - State forests
    - Civic and cultural
    - Waterways
    - Public purposes - denoted as follows:
      - H Hospital
      - HS High school
      - TS Technical school
      - CP Car park
      - U University
      - CG Commonwealth Government
      - SEC State Energy Commission
      - SU Special uses
      - WSD Water Authority of WA
      - P Prison
  - Reserved roads**
    - Primary regional roads
    - Other regional roads
  - Zones**
    - Urban
    - Urban deferred
    - Central city area
    - Industrial
    - Special industrial
    - Rural
    - Rural - water protection
    - Private recreation
  - Notice of delegation**
    - (Site No) Bush forever area
  - Redevelopment schemes**
    - Redevelopment scheme/act area
  - Special control areas**
    - Water catchments
    - Environmental conditions

LEGEND

Treeby District Structure Plan Area



Source: WAPC\_MRS\_Map24\_25000\_Forestdale\_17.06.2016  
2310-127-01 (07.07.2016), NTS



METROPOLITAN REGION SCHEME PLAN

Figure 4



### 1.3 Planning Framework

#### 1.3.1 Zoning and Reservations

##### 1.3.1.1 Metropolitan Region Scheme

The TDSP area is subject to various zonings and reservations under the Metropolitan Region Scheme (MRS) including 'Urban', 'Rural', 'Rural-Water Protection', 'Parks and Recreation'. A 'Bush Forever' overlay associated with Bush Forever site 390 applies to many parts of the area containing remnant vegetation. The Parks and Recreation reserves are also subject to a Water Catchment Special Control Area. The table below provides details of the MRS zoning for key lots. A Metropolitan Region Scheme (MRS) zoning plan is also provided at Figure 4.

**Table 3: MRS Zoning (Summary)**

Lot Details	Metropolitan Region Scheme Zone / Reserve
Lots 1 (West), 9012, 9014, 9016, Lots 1 (east)	Urban
Lots 139, 140, 467, 468, 614, 820	Parks and Recreation, Water Catchment SCA, Bush Forever overlay
2, 500, 800 and Lots 62-78 Skotsch Road.	Rural – Water Protection.
Lot 4, 131	Rural – Water Protection, Bush Forever overlay (portions).

Lots 9012, 9014 and 9016 within the western portion of the TDSP are zoned 'Urban' under the MRS and are covered by the Banjup Quarry (Calleya) Local Structure Plan, facilitating urban development of this area. An MRS Amendment to rezone Lot 1 (east) to Urban has recently been gazetted, paving the way for a similar process and outcome for this site. A request to rezone Lots 2 and 4 to 'Urban' was also lodged with the WAPC in April 2014, however this request has been held pending further progression of the Perth and Peel @ 3.5 Million (planning) Frameworks currently being finalised.

The 98ha of Parks and Recreation reserve on the eastern portion of the area, and the centrally located 20ha reserve east of Fraser Road south (now Ghostgum Avenue) are covered by the MRS Bush Forever overlay associated with Bush Forever site 390. Site 390 also extends over portions of Lots 4 and 131 which are currently zoned as Rural Water-Protection. These areas of Bush Forever will be subject to review and refinement through the rezoning and local structure planning process. In total 172ha of land within the TDSP is currently shown as Bush Forever within the MRS.


Small slivers of Primary Regional Roads reserve apply along the southern boundary of the DSP area providing for widening of Armadale Road.

The 'Rural - water protection' zone over the balance of the area reflects its historic use and the presence of the Jandakot water mound.



TREEBY DISTRICT STRUCTURE PLAN  
PART TWO - EXPLANATORY SECTION

This plan has been prepared for general information purposes only and uses potentially uncontrolled data from external sources. CLE does not guarantee the accuracy of this plan and it should not be used for any detailed site design. This plan remains the property of CLE.



LEGEND

REGION SCHEME RESERVES (MRS)

Orange	Civic and cultural	Yellow	Public purposes
Blue	Other regional roads	CP	Public purposes - car park
Green	Parks and recreation	CD	Public purposes - Commonwealth Government
Red	Parks and recreation restricted	HS	Public purposes - high school
Grey	Port installations	H	Public purposes - hospital
Red	Primary regional roads	P	Public purposes - prison
Grey	Railways	GU	Public purposes - special uses
Yellow	Stille forests	SEC	Public purposes - State Energy Commission
Blue	Waterways	TS	Public purposes - technical school
Blue	Water catchments	U	Public purposes - university
		WSD	Public purposes - Water Authority of WA

LOCAL SCHEME RESERVES

(see scheme text for additional information)

Blue	Lakes and drainage	GS	Public purposes - Gas pipeline
Blue	Local road	DP	Public purposes - Oil pipeline
Green	Parks and recreation	P	Public purposes - Police station
C	Public purposes - Civic	K	Public purposes - Pre-school
AG	Public purposes - Dept of	PS	Public purposes - Primary school
FS	Public purposes - Fire station	WC	Public purposes - Water Corporation
		WP	Public purposes - Western Power

LOCAL SCHEME ZONES

(see scheme text for additional information)

Yellow	Development	Mixed use	Mixed use
Blue	District centre	Regional centre	Regional centre
Blue	Industry	Residential	Residential
Blue	Light and service industry	Resource	Resource
Blue	Local centre	Rural	Rural
Blue	Mixed business	Rural living	Rural living
		Special use	Special use

OTHER CATEGORIES

(see scheme text for additional information)

Black dashed line	Scheme boundary
Red dashed line	Local Government boundary
Black solid line	Hope Valley - Watteup Redevelopment Area
Black solid line	R20 R Codes
Black solid line	A1 Additional uses
Black solid line	X1 Restricted uses
Black solid line	SU1 Special use area
Blue solid line	Peel-Harvey coastal plain catchment area
Blue dashed line	Building envelope
Blue dashed line	BVA Bushfire vulnerability areas
Blue dashed line	DA1 Development area
Blue dashed line	Development contribution area
Blue dashed line	JA Jandakot airport
Blue dashed line	Heritage place
Blue dashed line	No zone
Blue dashed line	Waterbodies



### 1.3.1.2 Local Planning Scheme

The City of Cockburn Town Planning Scheme No. 3 (TPS 3) zoning applicable to the TDSP area is shown at Figure 5 (Local Scheme Zoning). Table 4 below also provides summary details of the local planning schemes zones applicable to key lots within the TDSP.

**Table 4: Local Scheme Zoning (Summary)**

Lot Details	Local Planning Scheme Zone
Lots 1 (west), 9012, 9014, 9016	Development
Lots 139, 140, 467, 468, 614, 820	Parks and Recreation
Lots 1 (east), 2, 131, 500, 800, 4 and 62-78 Skotsch Road	Resource

The Development zone, generally reflecting areas zoned Urban under the MRS, provides for adoption and application of local structure plans to guide subsequent subdivision and development (as is occurring over the Calleya estate). The Resource zone reflects the water protection provisions of the current MRS zoning applicable over non reserved sites and caters for larger lot (Rural Residential style) development. This would require amendment (following MRS rezoning) to facilitate urban development.

### City of Cockburn Development Contribution Plan No. 13

Schedule 12 of TPS3 specifies infrastructure and community items that are required to be funded through development contribution plans. The TDSP is within Development Contribution Area No. 13 (DCP 13). DCP 13 includes regional, sub-regional and local infrastructure items that have been determined as necessary to support the community within its boundaries, with allocation of a proportion of the cost of these items levied upon new lots created in the area.

*This page has been left blank intentionally*

### 1.3.2 Planning Strategies and Sub-Regional Structure Plan

#### 1.3.2.1 State Planning Strategy 2050

The State Planning Strategy (SPS) provides the basis for the long-term State and regional land use planning within Western Australia. It sets out the key principles, strategies and actions relating to the environment, community, economy, infrastructure and regional development which should guide the creation of State Planning Policy, Regional Strategies/ Frameworks and all future planning decisions.

The SPS identifies planning considerations and approaches that directly relate to the formulation of Cockburn Central Activity Centre Plan and set the agenda for more compact urban development in close proximity to public transport nodes as well as regeneration projects throughout Perth, those being:

- Place based approaches – That plan for the local economy, enhance and protect the identity of places, and provide for diverse, accessible and liveable communities.
- Affordable living – Identifying opportunities for housing diversity, infill development opportunities in appropriate locations and sustainable developments.
- Health and wellbeing – Identifying opportunities for the built environment to encourage the wellbeing of communities such as through the design of environments, streets and open spaces that people want to be active within.
- Land availability – Providing diverse and affordable housing outcomes.

Expansion of the Cockburn Central catchment to accommodate additional masterplanned communities on disused ex-quarry sites directly aligns with many of the objectives of the Strategy.

#### 1.3.2.2 Directions 2031 and Beyond: Metropolitan Planning Beyond the Horizon

‘Directions 2031 and Beyond’ provides a high level spatial framework and strategic plan for the metropolitan Perth and Peel region. It has a 20 year horizon within which time it anticipates how the projected growth and development of Perth can be best accommodated. Amongst other things, it anticipates the need for an additional 328,000 dwellings to accommodate the growing population, with half of these sought as infill development to limit the expanding urban footprint, service extension and vegetation clearing on the fringes of the city.


Directions 2031 seeks a 50% improvement on current infill residential development trends of 30 and 35%; and has set a target of 47 per cent or 154,000 of the required 328,000 dwellings as infill development. This translates to 11,100 as part of infill / redevelopment opportunities within the City of Cockburn.

Directions 2031 also promotes a 50 per cent increase in the current average residential density 10 dwellings per gross urban zoned hectare; and, has set a target of 15 dwellings per gross urban zoned hectare of land in new development areas. This translates to 18,280 new dwellings as part of Greenfield development opportunities within the City of Cockburn.



TREEBY DISTRICT STRUCTURE PLAN  
PART TWO - EXPLANATORY SECTION

This plan has been prepared for general information purposes only and uses potentially uncontrolled data from external sources. CLE does not guarantee the accuracy of this plan and it should not be used for any detailed site design. This plan remains the property of CLE.



Directions 2031 and Beyond: Metropolitan Planning Beyond the Horizon was adopted by the WAPC in August 2010 and is the current spatial planning framework document for Perth and Peel, guiding the planning vision and direction to 2031 and beyond.

The reuse of ex-quarry sites within Banjup within an established residential area in close proximity to existing infrastructure, transport and services aligns strongly with the strategy.

#### 1.3.2.3 Draft Perth and Peel @ 3.5 Million

Draft Perth and Peel @ 3.5 million seeks to build on and extend Directions 2031 in providing an overarching strategic planning framework for the metropolitan Perth and Peel regions, considering an increased population projection of 3.5 million by 2050. The documents include Central, North-West, and North-East and South Metropolitan Peel subregional frameworks (discussed below) which provide spatial guidance on where development should occur over the next 35 to 40 years. The document continues to promote more efficient use (and reuse) of land and infrastructure, and maintains a target of 47% of new lots by infill. It anticipates the need for 800,000 new dwellings to accommodate an additional 1.5 million people within the region by 2050, of which 380,000 are sought in strategic infill positions. Additional residential development within the DSP area would contribute to these targets, whilst protection of significant remnant vegetation and wetland areas responds to environmental objectives.

#### 1.3.2.4 Draft South Metropolitan Peel Sub Regional Framework

The Draft South Metropolitan Peel Sub Regional Framework (the Framework) is one of three frameworks prepared for the outer sub regions of Perth and Peel, which along with the Central

Sub-Regional Planning Framework established a long term integrated framework for land use and infrastructure provision as a component of the Perth and Peel @ 3.5 Million strategy.

The framework identified the need to accommodate more than 1.26 million people in the south metropolitan region by 2050 and identifies both the locations within which new development is to occur, and an indication of anticipated staging and sequencing of urbanisation to inform public investment in regional, community, service and service infrastructure.

The Planning Framework endeavours to facilitate the more consolidated urban form promoted by Directions 2031 and Perth and Peel @ 3.5 Million by limiting the identification of new Greenfield areas to where they provide a logical extension to the urban form, and placing a greater emphasis on urban infill and increased residential density.

The Framework satisfies the density objectives of Draft Perth and Peel @ 3.5 with a target of 30,119 dwellings to be provided in the City of Cockburn, of which 14,678 dwellings are to be via infill development opportunities and 15,441 via Greenfield development. This mix of infill and Greenfield development will contribute an estimated additional population of 66,957 people in the City of Cockburn.

The Framework identifies the larger site areas unaffected by Bush Forever site 390 within the BDSP as Urban and Urban Investigation area (refer Figure 6), with the staging and sequencing of land development being in the short term (2015 - 2021) and medium term (2015 - 2031) (refer Figure 7). The TDSP is consistent with this, albeit seeking a minor refinement to the basic boundaries illustrated in the Framework on the basis of the more detailed site analysis undertaken as part of the DSP exercise.




# TREEBY DISTRICT STRUCTURE PLAN PART TWO - EXPLANATORY SECTION

This plan has been prepared for general information purposes only and uses potentially uncontrolled data from external sources. CLE does not guarantee the accuracy of this plan and it should not be used for any detailed site design. This plan remains the property of CLE.

## Legend


### Staging

-  Short Term (2015-2021)
-  Short-Medium Term (2015-2031)
-  Medium Term (2022-2031)
-  Medium-Long Term (2022+)
-  Long Term (Beyond 2031)

-  Subject to the finalisation of Kwinana Industrial (including Air Quality) Buffer

### LEGEND

-  Treeby District Structure Plan Area



DRAFT SOUTH METROPOLITAN PEEL SUB-REGIONAL FRAMEWORK  
- URBAN STAGING





#### 1.3.2.5 City of Cockburn Planning Strategy

The City of Cockburn's Local Planning Strategy sets out long term planning direction and provides the rationale for the zones and other provisions of the City of Cockburn Town Planning Scheme No.3. The Local Planning Strategy outlines the general aims and intentions for future long-term growth and change within the City of Cockburn. The Strategy includes a comprehensive list of strategies and actions to guide the development of regional and local communities, with the following particularly relevant to the TDSP:

##### *Transport*

- Maximise development near public transport routes
- Minimise trip lengths in order to maximise local convenience and minimise the environmental impacts of private car users.
- Encourage cycling by defining and implementing cycle networks and promoting the provision of end-of-trip facilities.

##### *Open Space*


- Maintain the amount of local open space per capita
- Improve the quality, amenity and accessibility of local and regional open space.

#### Heritage

- Enhance local identity and character by preserving buildings and places with historic, architectural, scientific or scenic value. (and by deduction, encouraging development in those locations without such attributes).

The TDSP either directly contributes to these directions, or provides a framework by which they can be pursued in more detailed planning processes to follow.

This plan has been prepared for general information purposes only and uses potentially uncontrolled data from external sources. CLE does not guarantee the accuracy of this plan and it should not be used for any detailed site design. This plan remains the property of CLE.





### 1.3.3 Planning Policies

#### 1.3.3.1 SPP 2.3 Jandakot Groundwater Protection

The Jandakot Groundwater Protection policy aims to prevent, control and manage development and land use changes in the Jandakot Groundwater Protection Policy Area to limit impacts on groundwater. It works in concert with the Jandakot Underground Pollution Control Area (UWPCA) (declared under the *Sewerage and Drainage Act 1909*), and seeks to give statutory effect to, and implement the *Jandakot Land Use and Water Strategy*, and the *Jandakot Groundwater Protection Area Drinking Water Source Protection Review*. These documents allocate management priority designations 1-3 to land within the Policy Area and, amongst other things, outline the framework for assessing development within its boundaries. Priority 1 (risk prevention) applies to state owned Parks and Recreation Reserves, Priority 2 (risk minimisation) to privately owned rural areas and Priority 3 (risk management) to urban areas – refer Figure 8 Underground Water Pollution Control Areas.

Further urbanisation within the DSP area will require recategorisation of some existing Priority 2 areas to Priority 3. A revision to SPP 2.3 advertised for public comment outlines the circumstances under which this will be contemplated, as follows:

- Large land holdings that were previously cleared and disturbed;
- Land directly adjacent to already developed areas;
- Land identified as appropriate for more intensive development through strategic planning instruments such as regional or sub-regional structure plans;

- Where appropriate risk mitigation measures are available; and
- Where net long term public benefit is demonstrated.


Recent advice from the Department of Water has indicated that should the WAPC determine through a strategic planning process (i.e. South Metropolitan Peel Sub Regional Planning Framework) that development in this location is warranted taking into account social, environmental and economic factors, the Department will re-classify rezoned areas to P3, which is compatible with urban development.

#### 1.3.3.2 SPP 2.8 Bushland Policy for the Perth Metropolitan Region

SPP 2.8 – *Bushland Policy for the Perth Metropolitan Region* seeks to provide a policy and implementation framework to ensure bushland protection and management in the Perth region. It identifies bushland areas, and specifies the policy approach to their management based on categorisation. Bush Forever site 390 within the DSP area (illustrated on Figure 4 – Metropolitan Region Scheme plan) is classified as ‘BFA – Urban, industrial or resource development’ under SPP 2.8, essentially on the basis of its status under private ownership and its prior land use. The Policy consequently requires consideration of impacts on the bushland in the future planning of the site, and promotes negotiation of the conservation of all or part of the site as part of the process. The proposed retention and management of the majority (95%) of the Bush Forever site proposed by the DSP achieves alignment with the key precepts of the policy. More detailed negotiation on the areas to be retained versus removed, and any applicable off-sets package will occur through the rezoning and local structure planning stages.



TREEBY DISTRICT STRUCTURE PLAN  
PART TWO - EXPLANATORY SECTION





#### 1.3.3.3 SPP 4.2 Activity centres for Perth and Peel

SPP 4.2 Activity Centres for Perth and Peel identifies the broad requirements for the planning and development of new activity centres and the renewal of existing centres in Perth and Peel. A primary objective of the policy is to increase the density and diversity of housing within and around activity centres to the improve land use efficiency, residential amenity and access to services, housing variety and centre vitality. The Cockburn Central Secondary Centre is located approximately 1km west of the DSP boundary. Development of the DSP area will increase the population catchment east of the activity centre, contributing the Policy objectives. Provision for smaller more local services within the DSP area is also accommodated within the TDSP, consistent with the recommendations of the policy.

#### 1.3.3.4 SPP 5.3 Jandakot Airport Vicinity

SPP 5.3 Jandakot Airport Vicinity applies to land in the vicinity of Jandakot airport, which is, or may in the future, be affected by aircraft noise. The objectives of the policy are to:

- Protect Jandakot Airport from encroachment by incompatible land use and development, so as to provide for its ongoing, safe and efficient operation; and
- Minimize the impact of airport operations on existing and future communities with particular reference to aircraft noise.

The Policy describes two areas to which the policy applies. Firstly a Core Area defined by the 20ANEF contour and a Frame Area defined by the area between the 20ANEF contour and Roe Highway, Ranford Road, Warton Road, Armadale Road and Kwinana Freeway.

The TDSP is wholly located outside the 20ANEF contour, with the policy consequently containing no constraints to development within it. Notwithstanding, the City expects that memorials be placed on all new residential lots within the policy area identifying the existing of the airport and associated noise to ensure understanding of this by future lot purchasers.

The location of the TDSP area in relation to the airport and 20ANEF contour is illustrated in the Opportunities and Constraints Plan provided at Figure 9.

*This page has been left blank intentionally*



1.3.3.5 SPP 5.4 - Road and Rail Transport Noise and Freight Considerations in Land Use Planning

SPP 5.4 addresses how amenity impacts, specifically transport noise, associated with high volume roads, rail lines and freight routes should be addressed through the planning system. The policy provisions are applicable to development along both Armadale Road and Jandakot Road because of the expectation that traffic volumes along these roads will exceed 20,000 vehicles per day within 20 years. Armadale Road is also designated a primary freight route which also triggers application of the policy. The policy seeks to ensure that transport noise impacts on sensitive land uses (including residential development) is kept within targets for both night and day time, through the appropriate design of development. This will require assessment of anticipated transport noise reaching sensitive land uses and submission of mitigation measures to achieve the noise targets specified by the Policy as a component of local structure planning for each development site abutting either road. Typical mitigation measures include use of noise walls or bunds to screen noise reaching development sites, and application of 'Quiet House Design' requirements on dwellings requiring this to meet the specified threshold. It is understood from discussions with the City of Cockburn that conflicts can occur between the construction standards application for Quiet House Design Package B and BAL19+ construction standards and therefore it is preferable to avoid an overlap between these where possible.

In addition to SPP 5.4, consideration should be given to other potential noise sources (including the Jandakot airport and nearby

land uses including the Jandakot Pistol Club) in the local structure planning of the area to ensure that noise impacts experienced within residential areas are reduced and that conflicts between the new residences and existing operations are minimised through appropriate separation, treatment and / notification on title.


1.3.3.6 SPP 2.4 Basic Raw Materials

This policy sets out matters which are required to be taken into account when considering zoning, subdivision and development applications for extractive industries or on land identified as containing a strategic resource. The key objectives of this policy are to:

- Identify the location and extent of known basic raw material resources;
- Protect Priority Resource Locations, Key Extraction Areas and Extraction Areas from being developed for incompatible land uses which could limit future exploitation;
- Ensure that the use and development of land for the extraction of basic raw materials does not adversely affect the environment or amenity in the locality of the operation during or after extraction; and
- Provide a consistent planning approval process for extractive industry proposals including the early consideration of sequential land uses.

TREEBY DISTRICT STRUCTURE PLAN  
PART TWO - EXPLANATORY SECTION

This plan has been prepared for general information purposes only and uses potentially uncontrolled data from external sources. CLE does not guarantee the accuracy of this plan and it should not be used for any detailed site design. This plan remains the property of CLE.



The DSP features several sites previously used for extractive industry (primarily sand quarrying) including Calleya, Lots 1 (east), 4, 131, and 140. A live mining tenement also exists over portion of Lots 140, 139, 468 and 467 however it is uncertain whether further clearing will be permitted within this reserve to enable extraction of the remaining sand resource. Redevelopment and / or rehabilitation of sites following the completion of resource extraction as proposed within the DSP consistent with the policy. Maintenance of a temporary buffer to the live tenement and associated weighbridge in the west of the DSP area may be required along the eastern boundary of lots 2 and 4 should further mining be approved within tenement however the impacted area is small and will only be a consideration for a limited period pending completion of sand extraction. Similarly a buffer to approved sand extraction on Lot 130 north of Jandakot Road may impact on the northern portion of Lot 131 but is expected to be shortlived and can therefore be easily addressed through staging, in the event that it has not concluded at the point that development of this site commences.

#### 1.3.3.7 Local Planning Policies

In addition to the state and regional planning policies in operation, the City has a number of local planning policies relevant to the planning of the DSP area. These include (but are not limited to):

- LPP 1.12 Noise Attenuation
- LPP 5.1 Public Open Space
- LPP 5.2 Incorporating Natural Areas in Public Open Space

- LPP 5.3 Control Measures for Protecting Water Resources in Receiving Environments
- LPP 5.4 Location of High Voltage Overhead Power Lines and Microwave Towers
- LPP 5.6 Vehicle Access
- LPP 5.7 Uniform Fencing
- LPP 5.15 Access Street – Road Reserve & Pavement Standards

These do not pose a conflict with the DSP but will require consideration in the more detailed design and implementation planning processes to follow.

#### 1.3.4 Other Approvals and Decisions

##### 1.3.4.1 Banjup Quarry Local Structure Plan

Lots 9012, 9014, 9015 and the newly created residential lots west of Fraser Road south (now Ghostgum Avenue) form part of the 144ha Banjup Quarry structure plan area, being developed by Stockland as the Calleya Estate. The area was rezoned from 'Rural-Water Protection' to 'Urban' under MRS Amendment 1221/41 in November 2012 following which it was rezoned for development under the City's Local Planning Scheme.

The Banjup Quarry Local Structure Plan was formally adopted by the City of Cockburn in May 2013, and endorsed by the Western Australian Planning Commission (WAPC) (subject to conditions) on the 22<sup>nd</sup> October 2013. An amended version of the Plan approved in 2015.

The LSP provided for a 1.46ha Neighbourhood Activity Centre (NAC) incorporating a Mixed Use and Commercial (Shop/Retail) development, Public Purpose site (Primary School with co-located community land uses) and can support in excess of 2000 dwellings at 15 dwellings per gross hectare, with 1990 dwellings representing the estimate stated in current version of the LSP.

The first subdivision application (WAPC 148012) was approved by the WAPC on the 22<sup>nd</sup> October 2013, comprising 460 residential lots within the southern precinct of the LSP area, much of which has now been developed.

A second subdivision application (WAPC 149633) was approved by the WAPC on 8 August 2014, comprising approximately 1300 lots in the northern precinct (north of the Western Power easement) and inclusive of Primary School, Civic, Local Centre and Light Industry zoned sites.

Staged development of the estate is anticipated to continue over coming 5-7 years (dependent of rate of sales) to completion.

#### 1.3.4.2 MRS Amendment 1289/57 – Lot 1 (east) Armadale Road to 'Urban'

Amendment 1289/57 to the Metropolitan Region Scheme rezoned Lot 1 (east) Ghostgum Avenue / Armadale Road from Rural to Urban and reserved the abutting Lot 820 to the north for Parks and Recreation. This was gazetted on 20 May 2016. Rezoning under the local planning scheme and formal submission of a local structure plan will be required prior to development of this site for urban (residential) purposes.

In considering the Amendment, the EPA noted the existence of flora and vegetation on Lot 1 requiring consideration in the structure planning and subdivision of the site. It recommended that fringing remnant vegetation be retained and that textual provisions be included in the Planning Scheme to this effect. The EPA also suggested that the interface with Bush Forever site 390 to the north be suitably treated to minimise adverse impacts from development, and that the protection afforded to the population of *Calandenia huegelii* on-site under both the *Environmental Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* and the *Wildlife Conservation Act 1950* as an endangered species be noted, and that protection be incorporated into subsequent site planning processes. It is noted that while the EPA are suggesting additional scheme provisions, this amendment is yet to be formally considered by the WAPC and the Minister for Planning. The City of Cockburn has not supported the inclusion of specific scheme text as requested, as the matters can be appropriately dealt with via the structure planning process.



## 2.0 EXISTING ENVIRONMENT: SITE CONDITIONS AND CONSTRAINTS

An Environmental Assessment Report (EAR) has been prepared by 360 Environmental, refer Appendix 1. The report identifies key environmental issues relevant to the TDSP, provides the key findings of environmental assessments that relate to the TDSP, and recommends appropriate management responses to facilitate and guide future development and local structure planning within the TDSP. The EAR concludes that none of the key environmental issues identified on the site pose a significant constraint to implementation of the TDSP and that the overall environmental outcomes achieved are positive.

### 2.1 Biodiversity and Natural Area Assets

#### 2.1.1 Remnant Vegetation

Much of the DSP area has been cleared as a result of previous land uses and mining activities. The majority of vegetation remaining falls within Bush Forever Site 390. In accordance with State Planning Policy 2.8 (SPP 2.8), the Bush Forever Site 390 falls under the 'Bush Forever Area (BFA) – Urban, Industrial and Resource Development' site implementation category. SPP 2.8 recognises that regionally significant bushland in this category is constrained by existing commitments, approvals and policies. Therefore, development proposals should seek to achieve a reasonable balance between conservation and development or resource extraction through a negotiated outcome which has regard for the specific conservation values involved.

A total of 176ha of open space incorporating environmental values (including 94% of the portion of Bush Forever site 390 within the DSP area) is proposed for retention under the DSP. An area of approximately 10.5ha of Bush Forever within Lot 131 is proposed for residential development. Of this area, 4.2ha (40%) comprises of vegetation that is mapped as 'Completely Degraded' or previously cleared as a result of past sand quarrying activities and poorly rehabilitated. Further assessment of this component of the plan will occur through the subsequent rezoning and local structure planning processes, in accordance with SPP 2.8 which specifies the impact assessment process to be followed. Offsets for the removal of the better quality vegetation may be required and will be negotiated through the statutory approval process.

#### 2.1.2 Conservation Significant Flora

*Caladenia huegelii*, a conservation significant flora species (better known as a spider orchid), has been identified within the TDSP. *Caladenia huegelii* is classified as Threatened in accordance with the *Wildlife Conservation Act 1950* (WC Act) and *Environmental Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* (EPBC Act). The population of *Caladenia huegelii* is mainly known to occur within Bush Forever 390 and all *Caladenia huegelii* within Bush Forever 390 are proposed to be retained. Two isolated occurrences located outside the Bush Forever area within Lot 4 will be proposed for relocation.

### 2.1.3 Conservation Significant Fauna

The TDSP has been assessed as containing suitable habitat for conservation significant fauna including the Carnaby's, Baudin's and Forest Red-tailed Black Cockatoos. Retention of the majority of existing remnant vegetation within the structure plan area limits impact on these species.

The proposal to develop Lot 4 of the TDSP has been referred to the Federal Department of Environment under the *EPBC Act 1999*. The referral attracted a "not a controlled action" level of assessment, meaning that it is considered not to significantly impact on matters of national environmental significance including listed black cockatoos.

## **2.2 Landform and Soils**

The Department of Agriculture and Food Western Australia (DAFWA) has mapped the entire site as forming part of the Bassendean System (DAFWA 2012). The Bassendean System is described as occurring on the Swan Coastal Plain from Busselton to Jurien and consists of sand dunes and sand plains with pale deep sand, semi-wet and wet soil.

### 2.2.1 Acid Sulphate Soils

Acid Sulphate Soil (ASS) mapping undertaken by the DER indicates that the site is within an area mapped as being of "moderate to low risk of ASS". Areas mapped as being of "high moderate risk of ASS" occurs approximately 50m south of the site. Further assessment and management of this will form a routine

component of the detailed planning and development phases in the event of disturbing activities such as earthworking being proposed within this area.

## **2.3 Groundwater and Surface Water**

The TDSP falls within the Jandakot Underground Water Pollution Control Area (JUWPCA). The western portion of the TDSP (the Calleya Estate) was originally classified as Priority 2 (P2) area. The Department of Water (DoW) endorsed the area to be reclassified to Priority 3 (P3) for urban development following its rezoning as it was concluded that the drinking water resource risk could be adequately managed through application of best practice water management, and the WAPC had determined that the benefits of urbanisation in this location warrant this. A similar position has been taken in relation to Lot 1 (east) during the rezoning process for this site. The balance of the privately owned TDSP area is classified as P2 with the eastern (reserved) portion of the site classified as Priority 1 (P1) under the JUWPCA. Rezoning and urbanisation within the Priority 2 area will necessitate demonstration of adequate risk management and public benefit against the criteria listed in the revised SPP 2.3, and through District and Local Water Management Strategies. This issue is further addressed within the Strategic District Water Management Strategy prepared for the precinct, discussed in section 3.6 below.

Surface water is present within several excavated depressions across the mined portions of the DSP area which will require recontouring and / or management as part of redevelopment.



The mapped Resource Enhancement wetland within Lot 131 is proposed for retention within a public reserve, and will be subject to an appropriate management strategy.

## 2.4 Bushfire Hazard

SPP 3.7 Planning in Bushfire Prone Areas seeks to apply risk-based land use planning and development controls to ensure that bushfire hazards are considered in planning decisions, to preserve life and reduce the impact of bushfire on property and infrastructure. The Policy is to be read in conjunction with the Deemed provisions of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Scheme) Amendment Regulation 2015*, the supporting *Guidelines for Planning in Bushfire Prone Areas*, and *Australian Standard 3959: Construction of Buildings in Bushfire Prone Areas*.

Areas of the DSP are mapped as Bushfire Prone and so will require detailed Bushfire Hazard Assessment and application of Bushfire Management Plans to address bushfire risk. Likely measures include provision of hazard separation through the placement of roads and / or managed local open space abutting areas of retained vegetation, and application of BAL construction standard requirements to lots in closest proximity to areas of retained vegetation. This approach has been successfully applied within Calleya. Detailed assessment will be required as a routine component of the preparation of local structure plans.

## 2.5 Heritage

The Department of Aboriginal Affairs (DAA) Aboriginal Heritage Information System (AHIS) indicates the location of three 'Other Heritage Places' and no 'Registered Sites' with the TDSP. The three 'Other Heritage Places' are defined below –

- Banjup Calsil – Place ID. 3301 associated with artefacts/scatter. The status of the place is 'Stored Data/Not a Site', which means it has been assessed as not meeting Section 5 of the *Aboriginal Heritage Act 1972*.
- Readymix Sandpit 1 – Place ID. 4108 associated with artefacts/scatter. The status of the place is 'Lodged Site', which means it has not been determined whether or not it meets Section 5 of the *Aboriginal Heritage Act 1972*.
- Camp Site – Place ID. 18752 associated with artefacts/scatter. The status of the place is 'Lodged Site', which means it has not been determined whether or not it meets Section 5 of the *Aboriginal Heritage Act 1972*.

The location of these places is shown in Figure 12 of the Environmental Assessment Report. The latter two places are located within Calleya and in the very south-west corner of the DSP area (potentially outside its actual boundaries), respectively. The Calsil site impacts a substantial portion of the regional reserve in the east of the DSP area and portion of Lots 2, 4 and the Skotsch Road estate.

The closest 'Registered Site' is Kraemer Reserve (Place ID. 21811), which is approximately 1.1km to the south of the Study Area. The site is registered due to its mythological significance.

Obligations precluding interference with registered sites without prior clearance, and disturbance of any artefacts discovered exist under the Aboriginal Heritage Act which will need to be observed in any development within the DSP.

## **2.6 Context Analysis and Opportunities and Constraints**

An Opportunities and Constraints Plan has been prepared illustrating the context and the site and its key opportunities and constraints (refer Figure 9). This illustrates the strategic location of the site from an urban infill potential and the availability of goods, services, transport and urban infrastructure already in place. It also identifies a number of constraints to which the DSP and subsequent local structure plans must respond. Items illustrated on the plan include:

- The area's exceptional access to employment opportunities, retail and services, both within the immediate area, and accessible via the Perth-Mandurah Rail Line nearby;
- Its proximity to the Cockburn Central railway station providing direct access to the Perth CBD, Mandurah, and other stops along the line (including Murdoch providing a regional hospital and university facility);
- The surrounding road network and cycle network;
- Existing cadastral boundaries, illustrating areas in consolidated ownership versus those previously developed;
- Existing planning for the Calleya Estate;
- Areas of regional reserve, and Bush Forever sites;

- Surveyed Declared Rare Flora (surveyed locations subject to confirmation);
- Areas cleared for sand mining versus areas of remnant vegetation;
- Mapped wetland areas;
- The location of ground water extraction bores;
- The boundaries of the Jandakot Airport and associated ANEAF noise contours;
- The absence of buffers associated with kennel zones to the north east affecting the area;
- Mapped sand resources;
- The 330kv powerline easement running east west through the DSP area;
- Walking and cycling catchments to Cockburn Central railway station and activity centre.

The TDSP provides a design response to these considerations as detailed in section 3.0 below.

### **3.0 DISTRICT STRUCTURE PLAN**

The District Structure Plan has been drafted to respond to the key opportunities and constraints presented by the precinct and provide a broad framework for future land use planning and infrastructure provision. It seeks to optimise the reuse of consolidated sites which have previously been cleared for sand mining given the strategic location of the precinct, whilst preserving areas of significance, and recognising existing uses and approvals. It provides for:

- The continued development of the Banjup Quarry / Calleya estate in accordance with the approved Local Structure Plan;
- The development of Lot 1 (west) Armadale Road for either Service Commercial and/or Residential purposes, in accordance with an approved Local Structure Plan (to be prepared);
- The development of Lot 1 (east), 4, 2 and 131 for urban residential purposes in accordance with approved Local Structure Plans (to be prepared following or concurrent with rezoning);
- The retention of Lot 500 and the Skotsch Road precinct for Rural Residential purposes;
- Retention of Lots 467, 139, 468, 140, 614 and 820 for Regional Open Space;
- Retention of additional areas (totalling 58 ha to create a total of approximately 177ha) of open space incorporating environmental values and vegetation retention;
- Restriction of access from Armadale Road to approved access points into Lot 1 (west) (Left in Left out), Ghostgum Avenue / Calleya (full movement but ultimately subject to restriction to Left in Left out) and Lots 2 and 4 (full movement at extension of Liddelow Road). Potential for an additional Left in Left out into Lot 4 to relieve pressure on the full movement intersections has also been recommended by Transcore to improve traffic flow and load share however the impact of this intersection on the function of Armadale Road has been flagged by MRWA as of concern and so it is subject to further investigation and approval during the local structure planning phase;
- Extension of internal north south road linkages through Calleya (as approved) and through Lots 4 and 131 to Fraser Road to provide for through connection between Armadale Road and Jandakot Road;
- Extension of internal east-west linkages to facilitate internal movement within the DSP area, and access to local services and amenities;
- Upgrade of Jandakot Road to a two lane divided urban road with ultimate provision for upgrading to a four lane road;
- Provision of two centrally located Primary Schools (within Calleya and Lot 4);
- Provision of a Neighbourhood (within Calleya) and a Local (within Lot 4) Activity Centre to cater for provision of local services to supplement those available within Cockburn Central and the broader district.

Development in accordance with the DSP is estimated to yield approximately 3500-3800 dwellings (including the 1990-2350 estimated to be created/potentially created within the approved Calleya area). In the event that portion or all of Lot 1 (west) is developed for Residential instead of Service Commercial purposes, this might yield a further 100 commercial lots (approximately) or a higher number of retirement dwellings.

### 3.1 Land Use

The Structure Plan provides a general indication of land use designation and arrangements. However, refinements to the details of boundary alignment and layout may occur as part of the more detailed site planning occurs.

The basic land use areas indicated on the DSP are as follows:

**Table 5 – Land Use Schedule (Plan 2310-122D-01)**

	Sub Total (ha)	Total (ha)
Total DSP Area		458ha
<b>Non Residential Land Uses</b>		
Mixed Business (assume 100% Urban-zoned portion of Lot 1 west)	7.03	
Neighbourhood & Local Centres	4.57	
Primary School & Community Purpose	8.20	
Non Residential Land Use Total		19.61
Rural Residential		31.02
<b>Open Space with Conservation Values</b>		
Existing Parks & Recreation Reserve	118.48	
Additional Open Space incorporating Conservation Values	58.75	
Open Space with Conservation Values Sub Total		177.23
<b>Gross Residential Area</b>		230.30

*\* All areas approximate only.*

*\* Areas of open space credited under WAPC policy (including potential areas with conservation value) to be determined through Local Structure Plan and subdivision processes.*

### 3.1.1 Residential Densities and Yield Projections

The Calleya LSP estimates a total residential lot yield of 1,990 with ultimate planned potential up to 2,350 to provide an upper range catering for growth over time. These yields are provided via a range of residential densities including 'traditional' R20/25 single residential lots with a proportion of smaller R30, R40 and a smaller component of R60 lots within strategic locations.

Extension of these principles and the Perth and Peel @ 3.5 Million target of 15 dwellings per hectare to Lots 1 (east), Lots 4 and 2 and the portion of Lot 131 identified for urban investigation will generate approximately 1,500 additional lots. Lot 1 (West) might provide a further 100 lots (approximately) if fully developed for traditional residential purposes.

Density allocation within development sites should follow the principles of Liveable Neighbourhoods (as illustrated at Calleya) with a base providing for traditional single residential lots with higher density lots concentrated around local amenities, open space and transport routes. Further detail on density codings will be provided through local structure plans prepared for each site.

### 3.1.2 Non-Residential Land Uses/Facilities

The site is exceptionally well located in relation to access to employment opportunities, retail and services. Cockburn Central, a strategic metropolitan centre, is located within 1.5km-3km from the DSP whilst the rail line provides direct connection to the Perth CBD 20km to the north. Jandakot Business Park and other district business and industrial areas nearby provide further opportunities.


To supplement these, the DSP provides for a Neighbourhood Centre within Calleya and a small Local Centre within Lot 4 to provide for a range of daily needs within walking distance of most urban areas of the DSP. Uses accommodated within these centres might include a deli, cafe, medical services, childcare and / or local offices, depending on market demand. The Neighbourhood Centre might also incorporate a small supermarket and specialty shops.

The Calleya Neighbourhood Centre incorporates provision for a community centre to be developed in conjunction with the local school and active recreation facilities, consolidating this as a focus for community interaction. Collocation of the school with the local centre is also proposed on Lot 4 to facilitate multi-purpose trip, manage traffic and access, and provide a concentration of activity within a central point within the precinct. The shared use oval abutting the Lot 4 primary school has also be notionally sized to accommodate a senior sized oval, should there be unmet demand for this (as has been the case elsewhere within the region).

Lot 1 (west) abuts service commercial (showroom type) development to the west, and residential to the east and north. As such, this site has the opportunity to accommodate either land use or a combination of the two (subject to appropriate planning and interface treatment). Any residential component would be required to integrate with Calleya, and access provision has been incorporated in the Calleya LSP to facilitate this. The City has indicated that non residential uses would be expected to restrict access and egress to Armadale Road (and / or integration with development to the west if this can be negotiated). The details



This plan has been prepared for general information purposes only and uses potentially uncontrolled data from external sources. CLE does not guarantee the accuracy of this plan and it should not be used for any detailed site design. This plan remains the property of CLE.





of land use mix, access and layout for this site will be determined through the subsequent LSP. Given its location, either land use option integrates with the DSP, and its size limits the impact on either land use scenario on the overall outcome.

### **3.2 Public Open Space and Recreation**

The DSP illustrates the existing network of state owned regional reserves supplemented by additional areas (approximately 58ha) of open space incorporating environmental values. These areas incorporate the majority of Bush Forever site 390 and an area of contiguous conservation within Lot 9012. These areas, ultimately forming part of a district parkland, total 177ha. Whilst much of this area is proposed for retention for environmental reasons, it includes parts with an existing or potential recreation function, including cleared areas previously subject to sandmining. There is also the opportunity to integrate the park with the 330kv Western Power Easement running east-west through the precinct to provide not only a 'green linkage' through the area, but also a potential recreation linkage. Preparation of a masterplan over the park could assist in achieving a well thought out and integrated management arrangement which maximises both conservation, recreational and aesthetic benefits, and creates a focus for the district.

Two active recreation areas are identified on the DSP to provide for playing fields abutting schools. The precise sizing and location of these will be subject to detailed planning in conjunction with the City, but both cater for multiple sporting uses including potential senior sized football oval. The City has indicated the need for clubrooms (change rooms, toilets and the like) to service these.


Local open space areas are not illustrated on the DSP (being a detailed design item) however provision for these will be required in addition to those areas identified on the DSP in accordance with Liveable Neighbourhoods policy. These will need to be placed to ensure accessibility to local residents, and provision of a range of functions accommodating different recreational and social needs. Management considerations will also inform detailed open space planning and treatment in the detailed design processes to follow.

### **3.3 Education Facilities**

Provision for two primary school sites, one within Calleya and one in the east of the DSP within Lot 4 is made within the DSP to accommodate projected population. This rate of provision is consistent with Liveable Neighbourhoods and the advice of the Department of Education based on the estimated lot yield. The eastern (Lot 4) school site is shown at 4ha at the request of the Department of Education catering for the higher end of the yield range and some incremental growth. The Department of Education has advised that no high school is required for the site with demand to be met by existing and planned high schools within the locality including Lakelands, Atwell and Harrisdale.

Tertiary education facilities are provided at a range of locations accessible from the DSP area including at Murdoch, Bentley, Crawley, Armadale, Mandurah, Fremantle, Perth CBD and within private facilities within nearby business parks.

This plan has been prepared for general information purposes only and uses potentially uncontrolled data from external sources. CLE does not guarantee the accuracy of this plan and it should not be used for any detailed site design. This plan remains the property of CLE.





### 3.4 Employment

The DSP area has excellent access to a range of employment opportunities provided at:

- Cockburn Central (1.5-3km from DSP);
- Jandakot Business Park (2.5km from DSP);
- Perth CBD (20km from DSP on train line);
- Canning Vale industrial area (6km from DSP);
- Armadale centre (10km from DSP); and
- Bentley Business Park (15km from DSP).

Employment opportunities within the DSP will include those available at the two local primary schools, within the Neighbourhood and Local centres, within the community facility, and within home based businesses.

### 3.5 Movement Networks

The Precinct is bounded by an established (and largely higher order) road network, with the local network being extended through the Calleya development providing for internal movement. Extension of this to integrate with additional development sites, and optimise access to services and amenities is relatively simple, though access to Armadale Road and Jandakot Road is restricted due to projected volumes, existing access points and topography, making interconnection of the internal network particularly critical. Transcore traffic engineers have provided input into the preparation of the DSP and prepared the appended Transport Assessment (refer Appendix 2) confirming the suitability of the structure proposed in the DSP. The following section outlines the key elements of the Transport Assessment including details of

the existing and proposed road networks and road hierarchy classifications. The section also provides an overview of public transport, cyclist and pedestrian network provision within the TDSP area.


#### 3.5.1 Ultimate Road Network

The proposed road network for Banjup provides sufficient and logical connectivity through Primary Regional, Integrator and Neighbourhood Connector Roads, compatible with sub-regional planning outcomes including the existing and potential future network changes. The proposed internal road network (shown in Figure 11) of the TDSP reflects local structure planning within the Calleya Estate and facilitates good traffic circulation throughout the balance of the TDSP, and appropriate connectivity to the surrounding regional roads including Armadale Road and Jandakot Road. A revision of this to reflect longer term upgrading plans for Armadale Road is shown in Figure 12.

The Transport Assessment notes that:

- Armadale Road is a Primary Distributor and is proposed to be upgraded to dual carriageway in the vicinity of the DSP in the short-medium term, and 6 lanes in the long term, at which point the projected traffic volume is expected to be over 50,000vpd. The proposed internal road network includes three connections with Armadale Road, including:
  - One full movement intersection (at Liddelow Road);
  - The existing Ghostgum Avenue intersection (ultimately requiring modification to Left in Left out upon construction of the Armadale Road deviation); and
  - A Left in Left out intersection to Lot 1 (west)

This plan has been prepared for general information purposes only and uses potentially uncontrolled data from external sources. CLE does not guarantee the accuracy of this plan and it should not be used for any detailed site design. This plan remains the property of CLE.





A further Left in Left out only intersection was proposed between Liddelow Road and Ghostgum Avenue to improve connectivity and permeability of the DSP areas and to relieve pressure on the 4-way intersection/s, however this will only proceed if MRWA concern with it can be resolved.


- Jandakot Road forms the northern boundary of the DSP area and is classified as an Integrator A road requiring dual carriageway standard with a predicted traffic volume of 20,000-30,000vpd. The ultimate road design will include two traffic lanes in both directions and a 6m median. This upgrade will require land resumption to accommodate the widening. The internal road network includes four connections to Jandakot Road including roundabout intersections at Solomon Road, the north-south Neighbourhood Connector A road through Calleya, and Fraser Road, and a priority T-intersection at Skotsch Road.
- Warton Road is a north-south District Distributor A road of dual carriageway standard, connecting Jandakot Road with Armadale Road along the eastern boundary of the DSP area. The Jandakot Road intersection is currently controlled with a roundabout whilst the Armadale Road intersection is signalised. Warton Road experiences traffic volumes of approximately 18,600 vpd.
- Solomon Road is a north-south Integrator B road, running between Armadale Road and Jandakot Road on the western edge of the DSP area. It will carry a projected traffic volume of approximately 12,000vpd. Two priority controlled T-intersections are proposed to connect the DSP area with Solomon Road, at Dollier Road and the east-west Calleya Estate Neighbourhood Connector A road.

- A Planning Control Area has been issued by the WAPC for the future upgrade and deviation of Armadale Road west of the DSP area. The upgrade would involve modification to the alignment of Armadale Road including trenching portions of the road to improve through movement capacity and reduce traffic congestion in and around the Cockburn Central activity centre and Station precinct. Regardless of whether these additions to the regional road network eventuate, this proposal can connect into the current network configuration.
- The DSP proposes a permeable network of north-south and east-west Neighbourhood Connector roads providing good access to the Calleya Neighbourhood Centre, two primary schools and residential areas. The roads provide efficient connectivity to the surrounding arterial road network of Armadale Road, Jandakot Road and Solomon Road.

Neighbourhood Connectors within the eastern portion of the DSP area (Calleya Estate) are classified as Neighbourhood Connector A roads, and have been established as part of Local Structure Plan associated with this site. The eastern portion of the TDSP area includes a north-south Neighbourhood Connector A road through lots 4 and 131, providing a connection between Jandakot Road, Armadale Road and linking into the Calleya Estate. The proposed east-west road between lots 4 and 1 (east), and the Left in Left out access point to Armadale Road are classified as Neighbourhood Connector B roads.

Traffic volumes on Neighbourhood Connector roads are predicted to be less than 5,000vpd; therefore no restrictions to direct lot access are required for lots within the DSP area.

This plan has been prepared for general information purposes only and uses potentially uncontrolled data from external sources. CLE does not guarantee the accuracy of this plan and it should not be used for any detailed site design. This plan remains the property of CLE.





### 3.5.2 Pedestrian and Cycle Network

The TDSP proposes a pedestrian and cycle network that will provide excellent accessibility and permeability for residents within the DSP area, connecting the area to neighbouring precincts and strategic locations. On average, the walking / cycling distance between the DSP area and the Cockburn Central Station/ Activity Centre will be 2 to 3km. The DSP includes a network of shared paths and footpaths on all Neighbourhood Connector A roads and the east -west neighbourhood Connector B road proposed through lots 4 and 1 (east) refer Figure 13. Shared or dedicated cycle and foot paths are also proposed on the existing arterial road network, including Armadale Road, Solomon Road and Jandakot Road, and potentially through the parkland and Western Power easement running east-west through the site (subject to open space masterplan).

### 3.5.3 Public Transport

Public transport provision for the Banjup DSP area is anticipated to include the following:

- Continuation of route 518 along Armadale Road between Murdoch and Piara Waters;
- A proposed route through the Calleya Estate between Jandakot Road and Armadale Road servicing the Calleya Neighbourhood Centre and primary school. This route is likely to ultimately connect Banjup with the Cockburn and Murdoch Stations. The precise route is currently under review given MRWA plans restrict access from Armadale

Road, with several options being considered.

- A possible supplementary bus service between the Calleya Neighbourhood Centre and the eastern residential area and primary school, providing access to Cockburn Central (refer Figure 14). The WAPC Transport Assessment Guidelines for Developments (2006) suggest that it is desirable for at least 90% of dwellings to be within 400m of a bus route. The provision of the secondary bus route in the east of the DSP area would satisfy this objective.
- Possible future bus rapid transit route between Armadale and Cockburn Central on Armadale Road, proposed as part of the Public Transport Plan for Perth in 2031.

Access to the Cockburn Central Railway Station can be enhanced through extension of an east-west cycle / pedestrian link through the DSP area and connection to Dollier and Solomon Roads to the station.

## **3.6 Water Management**

The TDSP is located within the Jandakot Underground Water Pollution Control Area (UWPCA) and incorporates Priority 1 and 2 areas. This makes consideration of groundwater impacts a critical consideration in any land use planning for the future of the site, and one which has been very carefully assessed in the formulation of this proposal. A Strategic District Water Management Strategy has been prepared by JDA Hydrologists for the TDSP (refer Appendix 3) to provide direction on appropriate management of water and groundwater, in particular, to inform more detailed site strategies required to support individual rezoning and local structure plan proposals.

The SDWMS investigations conclude that the extensive work undertaken in relation to site conditions, hydrogeology and groundwater management for the Calleya and Lot 4 rezoning proposals is pertinent to abutting sites (which exhibit similar attributes), with the conclusion that groundwater impacts can be appropriately managed through best practice management practices similarly extended.

Initiatives recommended to be applied to limit potential groundwater impact associated with urban development, include:

- Extension of deep sewer to all lots;
- Application of water sensitive urban design principles including at-source stormwater infiltration, rain gardens and water harvesting;
- Appropriate road design and treatments to minimise the risk of high speed car collision (which may result in oil or petrol spillage);
- Provision of lot types which maximise land use efficiency and reduce excessive garden area (and hence fertiliser and pesticide use);
- Encouragement of home purchasers to use native plants for landscaping (which will also reduce fertiliser and pesticide use);
- Use of promotional information to land purchasers aimed at raising awareness of water issues; and,
- An on-going monitoring programme.

Exclusion of higher risk land uses (such as service stations) is also proposed.

The analysis concludes that reclassification of the land within the TDSP from a P2 to P3 water protection zone classification (with retention of P1 or P2 in areas of retained bushland), can be supported against the criteria listed within the revised SPP 2.3, subject to implementation of appropriate Local Water Management Strategies and Urban Water Management Plans consistent with the direction set within the SDWMS.

### **3.7 Service Infrastructure**

Wood and Grieve Engineers have reviewed service capability within the area and prepared the appended Engineering Infrastructure Report for TDSP, refer Appendix 4. This concludes that the DSP area can be serviced by the construction, upgrade and / or extension of regional service infrastructure to the site, with details as follows.

#### 3.7.1 Sewer

Water Corporation has commenced conceptual wastewater supply planning for the DSP area. Approval of MRS amendments within the DSP area will trigger review of the Water Corporation formal sewer planning scheme and detailed network design.

Wastewater disposal will be achieved via a network of gravity fed reticulation sewers, gravitating to two Waste Water Pumping Stations (WWPS). One station has been constructed within the Calleya Estate which discharges to existing infrastructure west of the DSP area. The balance of the DSP area discharges to a

proposed type 40 WWPS within Lot 4, which will discharge to the existing Calleya estate WWPS.

A site of approximately 1000m<sup>2</sup> is required centrally within lot 4 to accommodate an additional pumping station, which will be determined through local structure planning. Design of local structure plan development concepts will have a layout sympathetic to the landform and will provide direct links through the development to the WWPS to minimise sewer length and depth.

#### 3.7.2 Water Supply

The Water Corporation has commenced conceptual water supply planning for the DSP area, as an extension to the Thompson Lake Gravity Supply Scheme. This indicates provision of a water main extension from the existing DN760 main crossing Liddelow Road south of Armadale Road. Provision of a potable water supply to individual lots would be achieved through the construction of a network of smaller DN100 to DN250 pipes throughout the internal road network.

Approval of the MRS amendment will provide the catalyst for more detailed planning for water supply over the site.

#### 3.7.3 Power

Power supply can be achieved via expansion and/ or upgrade to the existing Western Power network in the Vicinity of the DSP area. 22kv power lines are currently installed within the Armadale Road and Jandakot Road reserves and high voltage underground

power has been installed within the Calleya estate.

It is anticipated that the existing Armadale Road and Jandakot Road overhead power lines will be replaced with underground cables as part of the development. An underground network will be provided throughout the DSP area providing low voltage connections to each lot.

#### 3.7.4 Telecommunications

National Broadband Network (NBN) has been installed within the Calleya estate. It is expected that this would be extended through the DSP area (in a common trench with underground power) as a component of urban development, and would be progressively constructed with fibre distribution hubs located throughout the site as required.

#### 3.7.5 Gas

The DSP can be serviced by ATCO Gas's DN300 high-pressure steel gas main located in the Armadale Road reserve. It is anticipated that ATCO Gas will service the development with reticulation of natural gas within a common trench with water reticulation. A pressure reducing valve will also be required to reduce operating pressures to that suitable for residential reticulation.

*This page has been left blank intentionally*

#### **4.0 IMPLEMENTATION**

The TDSP provides a broad overarching framework to coordinate more detailed local structure planning required of individual development sites following their rezoning. It also outlines the basic principles upon which such rezonings may be based.


Implementation of the TDSP will primarily occur through the rezoning of identified development sites under the MRS and TPS3, and subsequent local structure planning which would refine and build upon the basic structure and principles outlined in this document. It is anticipated that individual LSPs would be required for Lots 1 (west), 1 (east), 4, 2 and 131 with Lots 4 and 2 expected to combine. These LSPs would provide more detailed analysis and justification for the layouts proposed in accordance with the WAPC's Structure Planning Framework.

Preparation of an overarching Masterplan for the interconnected regional open space area may also be desirable and could form a component of an offset package for removal of a portion of remnant vegetation in the north of Lot 131. Individual open space management plans are routinely required as a condition of subdivision approval for individual sites however the Masterplan would provide a framework for a more integrated and strategic approach to management, given the scale of the open space area and the multiple functions and conditions it currently contains.


The sites are already subject to Development Contribution Plan No. 13 which provides for per lot contributions towards regional, district and local community infrastructure. Rezoning

of additional sites within the TDSP area would trigger a review of the DCP to factor in the additional lots over which DCP items costs would be allocated. Inclusion of limited additional items (namely an additional district recreational facilities required to support the active open space shown on Lot 4) into a new DCP or through private arrangement may be appropriate, and upgrading obligations associated with the portion of Jandakot Road abutting urban areas will also require agreement.










LEGEND

- PROPOSED PAVEMENT
- EXISTING PAVEMENT
- EXISTING PATH
- PROPOSED RETAINING WALL
- PROPOSED 15m CYCLE LANE
- PROPOSED PATHS
- PROPOSED MEDIAN/ISLANDS
- PROPOSED BUS EMBAYMENTS
- PROPOSED LANDSCAPING



SCALE 1:1000

PROJECT: <div>ROCKINGHAM ROAD SPEARWOOD</div>		<table><tr><td>C</td><td>29-2-2016</td><td>SECTION REVISED FROM PHOENIX TO LANCASTER. EASTERN SIDE REVISED TO MAINTAIN EX KERB</td><td>MJV</td></tr><tr><td>B</td><td>11-12-2015</td><td>COUNCIL COMMENTS RECEIVED 26-11-15. DRAWINGS REVISED AS REQUESTED.</td><td>MJV</td></tr><tr><td>A</td><td>30-9-2015</td><td>PRELIMINARY ISSUE FOR COMMENT</td><td>MJV</td></tr><tr><td>NO.</td><td>DATE</td><td>REVISION</td><td>BY</td></tr></table>	C	29-2-2016	SECTION REVISED FROM PHOENIX TO LANCASTER. EASTERN SIDE REVISED TO MAINTAIN EX KERB	MJV	B	11-12-2015	COUNCIL COMMENTS RECEIVED 26-11-15. DRAWINGS REVISED AS REQUESTED.	MJV	A	30-9-2015	PRELIMINARY ISSUE FOR COMMENT	MJV	NO.	DATE	REVISION	BY	<div>COPYRIGHT</div> <div>COPYRIGHT IN THIS DRAWING IS THE PROPERTY OF THE CONSULTANT. THE CLIENT HAS LICENSE TO USE THIS DRAWING FOR THE PROJECT ONLY. THE USER SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR "SITE CHECKING" ALL DIMENSIONS BEFORE COMMENCEMENT OF WORK. LAD DRAWING DO NOT MANUALLY ALTER</div> <div>ONLY PLANS WITH NUMERICAL REVISION (REV '1' OR HIGHER) AND SIGNED AS APPROVED SHALL BE USED FOR CONSTRUCTION</div> <div><div><div><div></div><div></div></div><div>Porter</div><div>Consulting Engineers</div></div><div>Level 2 Kishore Court 50 Kishore Road Mt Pleasant 6153 WA PO Box 1036 Canning Bridge 6153 WA Tel (08) 9315 9955 Fax (08) 9315 9959 Email: office@portereeng.com.au www.portereeng.com.au</div><div><small>750960 Pty Ltd ACN 678 071 NAB as trustee for The Consulting Engineering Unit Trust trading as Porter Consulting Engineers ABN 78 626 296 205</small></div></div>	CLIENT: <div>CITY OF COCKBURN</div>	<div>DRAWING: PROPOSAL 5 OVERALL LAYOUT PLAN</div> <div><table><tr><td>SCALE: 1:1000</td><td>DRAWING No:</td><td>REV No:</td><td>ORIGINAL DRAWING SIZE:</td></tr><tr><td>DATE: FEB 2016</td><td>15-07-111/100</td><td>C</td><td>A1</td></tr><tr><td>DESIGN: ELW</td><td colspan="3">FILE NAME: S:\ACTIVE PROJECTS\15-07-111\ACAD\15111-100.dwg</td></tr><tr><td>DRAWN: MJV</td><td colspan="3"></td></tr><tr><td>CHECK:</td><td>APP'D:</td><td colspan="2"></td></tr></table></div> <div><table><tr><td>STATUS:</td><td>FOR APPROVAL</td></tr></table></div>	SCALE: 1:1000	DRAWING No:	REV No:	ORIGINAL DRAWING SIZE:	DATE: FEB 2016	15-07-111/100	C	A1	DESIGN: ELW	FILE NAME: S:\ACTIVE PROJECTS\15-07-111\ACAD\15111-100.dwg			DRAWN: MJV				CHECK:	APP'D:			STATUS:	FOR APPROVAL
C	29-2-2016	SECTION REVISED FROM PHOENIX TO LANCASTER. EASTERN SIDE REVISED TO MAINTAIN EX KERB	MJV																																								
B	11-12-2015	COUNCIL COMMENTS RECEIVED 26-11-15. DRAWINGS REVISED AS REQUESTED.	MJV																																								
A	30-9-2015	PRELIMINARY ISSUE FOR COMMENT	MJV																																								
NO.	DATE	REVISION	BY																																								
SCALE: 1:1000	DRAWING No:	REV No:	ORIGINAL DRAWING SIZE:																																								
DATE: FEB 2016	15-07-111/100	C	A1																																								
DESIGN: ELW	FILE NAME: S:\ACTIVE PROJECTS\15-07-111\ACAD\15111-100.dwg																																										
DRAWN: MJV																																											
CHECK:	APP'D:																																										
STATUS:	FOR APPROVAL																																										



Our Ref: 716-600

8 November 2016

Chief Executive Officer  
City of Cockburn  
PO Box 1215  
Bibra Lake 6965

Attention: Andrew Trosic – Manager Strategic Planning

Dear Andrew,

**SUBMISSION ON THE DRAFT PHOENIX ACTIVITY CENTRE DOCUMENTATION**

TPG + Place Match on behalf of Rockworth Capital Partners (Rockworth) is pleased to make this submission in relation to the draft Phoenix Activity Centre documentation. Thank you for granting Rockworth an extension of time in which to prepare this considered submission.

As you are aware, Rockworth Capital Partners own the Phoenix Shopping Centre which is located on approximately 5.8 hectares of land within the Phoenix Activity Centre and are therefore a major stakeholder in relation to the advertised documents.

Rockworth recognises the initiative of the City to prepare the Activity Centre Structure Plan, Design Guidelines and concept for the upgrade of Rockingham Road and acknowledges the effort and resources that the Council has invested to date to progress the draft framework.

As a major stakeholder, Rockworth appreciates the opportunity to review and inform the preparation of the draft documentation, with a view to ensuring that mutually beneficial outcomes are agreed to with the City and that alignment is achieved between Rockworth's long-term intentions for the centre and the draft planning framework.

Please find below our submission on the advertised documents.

**Rockingham Road Concept**

While Rockworth has no objection to the initiative to redesign Rockingham Road between Phoenix Road and Coleville Crescent, Rockworth would like to emphasise the need to coordinate access and egress points with the Phoenix Shopping Centre to ensure that access arrangements adequately service current tenant requirements, tie in with longer term development opportunities for the centre and maximise customer accessibility and patronage.

Rockworth have reviewed the proposed Rockingham Road redesign concepts and request that a number of modifications be made to the concept design to ensure better integration with the Phoenix shopping centre.

PERTH OFFICE  
Level 7, 182 St Georges Tce  
PERTH WA 6000

PO Box 7375 Cloisters Square  
PERTH WA 6850

Tel +61 8 9289 8300  
Fax +61 8 9321 4786

[www.tpgwa.com.au](http://www.tpgwa.com.au)  
[planning@tpgwa.com.au](mailto:planning@tpgwa.com.au)

The requested modifications to the City's proposed redesign concept relates to the section of road between Kent Street and the current ramp entry to the Phoenix shopping centre. Please refer to the proposed alternative concept which forms part of this submission at Attachment A.

The proposed modifications as illustrated in the plan are detailed below and supported by relevant justification.

## 1. Provision for a right hand turn movement and slip lane from Rockingham Road into the McDonalds entry.

The McDonalds tenancy is one of the most constrained tenancies within Western Australia and any additional restrictions imposed on customer access to and from this tenancy will have a significant and detrimental impact on the viability of the tenancy.

The redesign concept as proposed by the City would restrict customer access travelling from the south to enter the car parking area adjacent to the back end of the Coles tenancy immediately north of the proposed Kent Street roundabout. This is far from ideal for a fast food tenancy, as customers expect access to be provided immediately adjacent to the fast food outlet to ensure convenience and to limit opportunities for traffic conflict. Direct line of sight from the point of decision to turn into the centre and the fast food tenancy is also critical to maximise customer patronage. Customer sales will be directly and negatively effected as a result of restricting right hand vehicle access into the McDonalds tenancy.

It is proposed to provide for a right hand turn movement and slip lane from Rockingham Road into the existing McDonalds entry to ensure customers continue to have direct and convenient access to the McDonalds outlet. Shawmac have designed and reviewed this proposed access arrangement from a traffic point of view and have deemed it a safe and functional arrangement, as follows:

- The slip lane is of sufficient length to allow for stacking of vehicles turning right into the centre.
- The road will be a low speed environment and therefore this arrangement will function at an acceptable level and will not limit traffic flow or result in vehicle conflict.
- The slip lane would still provide a landscaped median strip to ensure that the City's beautification objectives are still achieved. Any loss of landscaping within the median strip as a result, will be offset by additional landscaping proposed on Rockworth's land, as detailed further in our submission below.

Please refer to the Shawmac traffic report at Attachment B.

## 2. Proposed modifications to the ramp entry and arrangements.

Rockworth propose to undertake modifications to the existing ramp entry on the northern side of the Shopping Centre to facilitate better connectivity between the south western car parking areas located adjacent to Rockingham Road and the expansive carparking located in the north eastern part of the Centre.

It is proposed to close the southern-most ramp which currently provides access down from the upper level loading bay towards Rockingham Road. Loading vehicles using this loading bay would still be catered for by retention of the existing exit lane ramp as indicated on the concept at Attachment A.

The revised ramp configuration would also facilitate access for vehicles using the south-western car parking area to turn right and enter the undercroft carpark which links to the more expansive north-eastern car parking area.

These modifications to the ramp access would not impact on the ability to tie in with the modified Rockingham Road arrangement as proposed within the City's redesign concept.



The Shopping Centre will also require an internal connection between the southern and northern carpark areas as a result of the extra vehicle load being placed on the southern carparking area as a result of the introduction of the southern roundabout entry on Rockingham Road.

### 3. Clarification of Responsibilities

Rockworth would like to take the opportunity to clarify expectations regarding financial responsibilities for the works associated with the upgrade of Rockingham Road. Specifically, it is expected that the City will be responsible for the following:

1. All costs associated with acquiring the portion of Rockworth's land required for the road reservation associated with the creation of the southern roundabout proposed at the intersection of Kent Street and Rockingham Road. This is to include the following:
  - a. the payment to Rockworth for an amount representing an agreed value of the land to be determined through a valuation sought by the Valuer General's office; and
  - b. the City is to cover all administrative fees associated with lodging an application for subdivision to excise the parcel of land and all transfer fees to incorporate the required portion of land within the Rockingham Road reserve.
2. All costs associated with the design and construction of all roadworks within the road reserve, including the construction of the requested right hand slip lane and access arrangement to service the McDonalds tenancy;
3. All costs associated with the tie in works associated with the construction of the southern roundabout, including the associated island and access treatments that form part of the advertised design and which are located on Rockworth's land. The extent of these works are further defined on the plan contained at Attachment A. We believe that it is reasonable for the City to cover the cost for the design and construction of the defined tie in works given that these works are critical to the design and functionality of the proposed roundabout and are required in order for the design to meet the applicable Australian Standards;
4. It is expected that the City will make good any damage to existing infrastructure and landscaping contained on Rockworth's land as a result of undertaking the construction works. With respect to this, Rockworth intend to retain a portion of the car parking in proximity to the proposed southern roundabout as detailed on the plan contained at Attachment A, and it is expected that the City will seek to retain and protect this car parking area in undertaking the construction works;
5. All costs associated with the provision of signage and way finding to ensure customers to the Phoenix shopping centre are appropriately informed of and directed to the proposed new entries to the shopping centre. This is to specifically include signage and way finding to direct customers to the new main entry via Lancaster Street, the new southern entry treatment via the proposed roundabout and the revised access arrangements to the McDonald's tenancy.

These expectations are further defined on the plan contained at Attachment A.

Rockworth would also like to highlight that the proposed roadworks will cause inconvenience to both the tenants and users of the road, including customers to the centre. The roadworks are likely to result in considerable loss of income for the Centre, and this loss further supports the position that the City should be responsible for all costs associated with the design and construction of Rockingham Road, including the tie in works as defined above.

#### 4. Rockworth Commitments

Rockworth are committed to undertaking initial improvements to its frontage to Rockingham Road in order to provide a temporary improvement to its Rockingham Road frontage, ahead of more substantial works to be undertaken at a later date.

These proposed works seek to improve pedestrian connectivity from Rockingham Road into the centre, provide facade improvements to existing blank walls, address lighting and safety concerns and to provide landscaping adjacent to the Rockingham Road reserve to contribute to the volume of street tree planting to contribute to the boulevard treatment to Rockingham Road. Specifically, Rockworth propose to undertake the following treatments:

1. Creation of an improved pedestrian access spine to the southern entry to the centre via a new covered walkway. This access would provide a link between the proposed bus embayments on Rockingham Road and the Centre itself and would include new pedestrian crossing through the car park access.
2. Provision of additional landscaping beds on the southern and northern side of the proposed southern roundabout located outside of the proposed road reserve associated with the roundabout. The intent of this additional landscaping would be to accommodate suitable landscaping to be selected in consultation with the City to tie in with the boulevard landscape theme proposed along this section of Rockingham Road.
3. Undertake facade improvements to the corner of the existing Coles supermarket to provide a better address to the southern entry and roundabout.
4. Provide improved lighting to the car park area between the Coles tenancy and Rockingham Road.
5. Demolish the existing screen wall to the Coles loading area to open up this part of the site to the proposed bus embayments on Rockingham Road.
6. Installation of other additional pedestrian crossing points within the existing southern car park to improve pedestrian safety and connectivity with the Centre.

#### 5. Master Planning Process

Rockworth are currently undertaking an asset master planning process for the Phoenix Shopping Centre, with a view to examining more substantial refurbishment and redevelopment works. This master planning process is commercial in confidence at this point in time, as negotiations with major tenants is still taking place.

However, key principles of the master plan are detailed in Attachment C and outlined below:

1. Creation of a new food and beverage precinct to be focussed around a public community gathering space, which is to be accessible 24 hours a day. This community gathering space will maximise the centres connection with Rockingham Road and will be activated by new food and beverage tenancies.
2. Reconfigure the internal parking access to connect the southern and northern car parking areas, to alleviate parking stress on the southern car parking area.
3. Improve public accessibility into the centre from Rockingham Road and also from Coleville Crescent via a new open air pedestrian street environment.
4. Improve façade treatments of built form facing Rockingham Road to create a more fine grained retail environment.
5. Improved service area to March Street.
6. Creation of an architectural feature at the intersection of Rockingham Road and Coleville Crescent.
7. Improved pedestrian linkages and customer experience throughout the centre.
8. Additional landscaping to soften the edges of the centre and key public spaces.

The principles are high level in nature and consistent with the intent of the draft Structure Plan. The master planning process will provide greater resolution to these desired outcomes and will be presented to relevant stakeholders including the Council at a point in time when agreements have been reached with tenants and internal stakeholders.

Please refer to Master Plan Principles Plan at Attachment C.

## 6. Additional Comments

Rockworth would also like to emphasise the following with respect to the future roadworks adjacent to the Phoenix shopping centre.

- (a) Loss of car parking bays within the Phoenix Shopping Centre.

The proposed roundabout at the intersection of Kent Street and Rockingham Road would result in the loss of approximately 35 bays within the southern car park. These bays are subject to control zones within existing lease arrangements and are allocated to specific tenancies. The resultant loss of these bays would need to be offset in another location as part of the existing tenancy agreement. As illustrated on the concept provided at Attachment A, there is the potential to reconfigure the car parking area to achieve 14 car parking bays to partly offset the loss of bays. However Rockworth request that the City of Cockburn compensate Rockworth for the cost of reconfiguring the car parking bays, as the cost associated with this will be as a direct result of the City proposing the construction of the Kent Street roundabout and is not as a result of any specific requirement of the Centre.

- (b) Covered walkway for northern upper deck

Rockworth are also of the view that costs associated with the construction of item 1(a) referred to in the staging plan, being the requirement to construct a covered walkway on the north-south pedestrian path of the northern upper car parking deck, should be borne by the City of Cockburn and not Rockworth.

## **Draft Phoenix Activity Centre Structure Plan**

We have undertaken a thorough review of the draft Phoenix Activity Centre Structure Plan and provide the following comments for consideration by the City.

### 1. Proposed entry reconfiguration

It is requested that the draft Structure Plan documentation be modified to accommodate the proposed alternative access arrangements previously outlined in our submission. Specifically, the Development Concept Plan relating to the Core Precinct should be modified to include the following:

- Provision of four way vehicular access at the crossover located immediately south of the existing McDonald's tenancy, including provision for a slip lane on the north bound carriageway on Rockingham Road.
- Modification to the existing ramp entry to facilitate better accessibility between the existing south-western car parking area and the car parking located in the north-eastern section of the Phoenix Shopping Centre.

### 2. Location of gathering space within the Core Precinct

The proposed Structure Plan designates a new community gathering space and pedestrian connection within the 'Core Precinct'. We have given careful consideration to the proposed location of this community space, and while it is a sound principle for the Centre to provide a community focal space, we consider that the draft Structure Plan proposes it in a problematic location, for reasons outlined below:

1. The community space would be located between the proposed Kent Street roundabout and the car parking deck associated with Coles (the southern carpark). The proposed location would therefore have a low level of amenity as a result of being exposed to a significant amount of vehicle movement.



2. The proposed location of the community space adjacent to the roundabout and primary entry to the shopping centre also represents a safety concern, particularly for children, as there is potential for human activity to inadvertently conflict with adjacent vehicular traffic.
3. The proposed location would be exposed to prevailing south-westerly winds and harsh afternoon sun. There is limited opportunity to mitigate these factors due to its location adjacent to Rockingham Road. The space will therefore not be a pleasant space to linger, particularly in summer.
4. The proposed location is not associated with any active uses within the Centre. It is located adjacent to an existing car parking area and would be overlooked by the back of house area of the Coles tenancy. In order for such a space to be inviting and successful, it should be located adjacent to active retail tenancies, such as food and beverage outlets.
5. The location would compromise the ability to provide car parking to offset the loss of 35 car parking bays within the southern car park as a result of the proposed Kent Street roundabout.
6. It is also considered that the proposed creation of a public space should be linked with a major floor space expansion of the centre (i.e. proposed building >10,000m<sup>2</sup> or extensions >5,000m<sup>2</sup>) and not a minor expansion. The reason for this is that any minor redevelopment is not likely to have the potential to yield significant change to the public realm in order to create a functional public space with a high level of activation and amenity.

As an alternative, we propose that the Structure Plan provide greater flexibility relating to the location of a community gathering space with the opportunity for creating a successful public space associated with an application for major floorspace expansion within the centre. It is suggested that a provision in the Structure Plan be included to provide flexibility relating to the location of a new community space, associated within any substantial redevelopment.

It is requested that the following modifications be made to the draft Structure Plan documentation:

- i. That the specific location of the community gathering space be deleted from the Development Concept Plan for the Core Precinct (item 2) and replaced with a generic notation on the plan which refers to the requirement to create a new community space associated within any future retail redevelopment adjacent to Rockingham Road.
- ii. With respect to the development requirements and staging table located under the heading 'Staging Plan', delete requirement 2 in relation to 'Minor expansion to the floor space'.
- iii. Insert a new requirement in relation to 'Major floor space expansion', as follows:
  - a. *"If an application is made for a Major Development Application as defined by the LCACS, in a location that has high levels of public visibility and accessibility (i.e. adjacent Rockingham Road), then the application should propose the creation of a functional 'public space', and this space should be activated with retail tenancies ('shop' and/or food and beverage) and provide a high level of amenity. Where an application for Major Development is received that does not propose a 'public space', then the applicant shall provide justification as to why such a space is not proposed as part of the application. Once a 'public space' has been provided, further requirements for public space as part of future applications will be considered on an as needs basis."*
- iv. Delete dot point 1 of Action no. 3 under the 'Action Plan' as it requires the community gathering space to be provided in a specific location and would not result in a good outcome for reasons already outlined in our submission.

### 3. Improved way finding signage as part of entry reconfiguration

As a result of the entry reconfigurations into the Phoenix Shopping Centre as proposed by the City, it will be necessary to establish way finding signage to direct customers to the new entry points. It is requested that this requirement be articulated within the Structure Plan report, as follows:

1. A notation be included on the Proposed Concept Plan for Rockingham Road stating that new signage will be installed to improve way finding for new entry arrangements into the Shopping Centre from Rockingham Road.

2. Item 7 of the Action Plan be extended to specifically refer to the requirement to provide signage to direct customers to the new entries associated with the Phoenix Shopping Centre.

#### 4. Reduced car parking rates

It is requested that the draft Structure Plan be modified to include a section providing guidance on the application of reduced car parking ratios for the Centre. State Planning Policy 4.2 – Activity Centres Policy for Perth and Peel (SPP 4.2) states that for activity centres, upper limits should be prescribed for car parking provision, due to opportunities for reciprocal parking, availability of on-street parking and the need for land efficiency.

SPP 4.2 prescribes a guide of between 1 bay per 20 to 25 square metres of shop floorspace for activity centres.

On this basis, we request that the Structure Plan prescribe an upper limit of car parking of 1 bay per 25 square metres of shop floorspace, acknowledging the current oversupply of car parking within the Centre.

### Draft Phoenix Activity Centre Design Guidelines

We have reviewed the draft Phoenix Activity Centre Design Guidelines and provide comment as summarised in the following table.

Extract of Policy Provision	Comment
<b>(1) General policy objectives</b>	No specific comment.
<b>(2) General Provisions</b> 1. Signage	This section should include an additional provision which encourages a coordinated approach to signage, including consolidated pylon signage and wall panel signage incorporated into the design of future buildings.
<b>(3) Phoenix Core Precinct</b> <b>1. Movement</b> 2. Development Applications are to be accompanied by a Pedestrian and Cyclist Movement Plan...	The provision is silent on the trigger for requiring a Pedestrian and Cyclist Movement Plan. It is considered an onerous requirement for minor applications which will have limited or no ability to modify movement and accessibility within the public realm. It is suggested that this provision be amended to relate specifically to development applications proposing Major Floorspace Expansion.
<b>(3) Phoenix Core Precinct</b> <b>1. Movement</b> 3. All development applications for the Phoenix Shopping Centre site that propose expansion of floorspace, or extensions or modifications to car parking areas or vehicle access ramps, must address the following matters...	This provision should be amended to clarify that the matters are only required to be addressed where applicable to the specific development application.
<b>(3) Phoenix Core Precinct</b> <b>1. Movement</b> 3. b. Demonstrate improvements to the servicing areas on March Street including:	This policy provision is incomplete as it does not specify what improvements are required to be undertaken.
<b>(3) Phoenix Core Precinct</b> <b>3. Built Form</b> c) Ground floor non-residential frontages are to be designed as shop fronts with no less than 70% of the shop front glazed with clear glass to facilitate passive surveillance and ensure an interesting pedestrian environment.	In our experience, a requirement to provide 70% glazing is not able to be achieved when taking into account structural requirements of buildings, the need to externally locate some services and other factors.  It is suggested that this provision be reworded as follows:

	<p><i>"c) Ground floor non-residential frontages fronting Rockingham Road or primary pedestrian linkages are to be designed as shop fronts with no less than 70% glazing. Buildings fronting other public areas shall be glazed for a minimum of 50%. Glazing percentages are to apply from between 0.9m and 2.1m above footpath/street level."</i></p>
<p><b>(3) Phoenix Core Precinct</b>  <b>5. Capacity for future residential</b>  a) Major redevelopment or expansion of the shopping centre must demonstrate a capacity for future residential above retail on the shopping centre site.</p>	<p>The construction of residential apartments above the existing shopping centre is currently constrained by the <i>Strata Titles Act 1985</i>. While there is a reform proposed to the Act, it is ultimately unclear if and when this reform will be gazetted, and in what ultimate form.</p> <p>With this uncertainty, it is requested that this requirement be removed from the current draft policy, with an opportunity to revisit the policy to include such a requirement if and when the reform to the <i>Strata Titles Act 1985</i> occurs.</p>

On behalf of Rockworth Capital Partners, we thank you for the opportunity to make a submission in relation to the draft Phoenix Activity Centre policy framework and concept for the redesign of Rockingham Road. We trust that the City will give due consideration to the comments that we have provided in this submission and proceed to incorporate our requested modifications into the draft framework. We would welcome the opportunity to meet with the City to discuss our submission in further detail and also welcome the opportunity to continue to work with the City to improve the functionality and amenity of the Phoenix Activity Centre on an ongoing basis.

Please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned on (08) 9289 8300 should you wish to discuss our submission.

Yours sincerely  
**TPG + PLACEMATCH**




Mike Davis  
Associate

# **ATTACHMENT A**

## **PROPOSED ALTERNATIVE CONCEPT FOR SECTION OF ROCKINGHAM ROAD**







NORTH

NEW LANDSCAPING

NEW PAVING

NEW ROAD / PARKING BAYS

COVERED WALKWAY (FIXED TO EXISTING BUILDING & PATH)

PAINT WALL

DEMOLISH EXISTING RAMP

EXTENT OF WORKS BY COCKBURN (NOTE: COLOURED WORKS WITHIN BDY BY COCKBURN)

NOTE: LAYOUT IS CONCEPTUAL ONLY, SUBJECT TO COMMERCIAL DISCUSSIONS WITH CITY OF COCKBURN





CAR PARK PUBLIC ACCESS



FEATURE CLADDING PAINT ONLY



FEATURE CLADDING PAINT AND MATERIAL



GREEN / LIVING WALL



NTS



# **ATTACHMENT B**

## **SHAWMAC TRAFFIC REPORT**



## Technical Note.

Subject: **Impact of proposed reconfiguration of Rockingham Road on Phoenix Shopping Centre, Spearwood.**

Date: 10<sup>th</sup> June 2016

Author: Ed Wilks

Client: Fratelle Group

---

### Introduction

Shawmac was commissioned by Fratelle Group to assess the possible impacts on the access to Phoenix Shopping Centre due to proposed modifications to Rockingham Road. The shopping centre is located on Rockingham Road in Spearwood, City of Cockburn as shown in **Figure 1**.




Figure 1: Location of Phoenix Shopping Centre

The City of Cockburn has prepared a concept plan showing proposed changes to Rockingham Road for discussion with affected property owners and in due course, release for public comment. Copies of relevant drawings are included in **Annexure A**. The objective of the Council is to discourage heavy vehicle traffic along this section of Rockingham Road and create a more pedestrian friendly location with a town centre appearance. While the objective is commendable, the owners of Phoenix Shopping centre are concerned that the proposed changes will limit current permissible vehicle movements which may have an unintended detrimental effect on the access to the shopping centre and result in a drop in patronage.

### Current Shopping Centre Layout

The current layout of the shopping centre and access points is shown in **Figure 2**.



Shopping Centre Access Points

Figure 2: Layout of Phoenix Shopping Centre

Photographs of Rockingham Road and the entrances to Phoenix Shopping Centre off Rockingham Road are shown in **Figures 3, 4 and 5**.



Figure 3: Entrance 1 to Phoenix Shopping Centre, looking north on Rockingham Road



Figure 4: Entrance 2 to Phoenix Shopping Centre, looking north on Rockingham Road





Figure 5: Entrance to McDonalds, looking north on Rockingham Road

### Proposed Modifications to Rockingham Road

A copy of the concept plan is included in **Annexure A**.

The main aspects of the proposed reconfiguration are:

- Reconfiguration to occur between Lancaster Street and Kent Street.
- Reduction of Rockingham Road to one lane in each direction.
- Introduction of medians along the majority of the road length between Lancaster Street and Kent Street.
- Construction of roundabouts at Lancaster Street and Kent Street to “book end” the town centre section of road.
- Restriction of right turn movements across the oncoming lane.
- Realignment of southern shopping centre access on Rockingham Road with roundabout at Kent Street.

### Regional Context

The City of Cockburn has commissioned a traffic study to assess the impacts of the proposed reconfiguration of Rockingham Road on the surrounding road network, however the regional impact of the proposed changes is addressed briefly in this report to inform readers of the potential impacts of the work. The section of Rockingham Road subject to the proposed reconfiguration and the location of Phoenix Shopping Centre are shown in a regional context in **Figure 6**.




Figure 6: Location of Shopping Centre and proposed works in a Regional Context

Roads are classified according to a road hierarchy, based on their geometric configuration, as shown in the legend in Figure 5. The vehicle capacity of each classification increases from Access Roads up to Primary Distributors. The hierarchy in Figure 5 is from Main Roads Western Australia. The Western Australian Planning Commission uses a similar hierarchy, but with slightly different terminology.

Rockingham Road is a Distributor B category Road. The proposed reconfiguration of Rockingham Road will tend to divert heavy vehicles currently using Rockingham Road between Phoenix Road and Spearwood Avenue to use: (refer Figure 5)

1. Cockburn Road and then east / west on Spearwood Avenue, or
2. Phoenix Road and Stock Road.

Light vehicles may tend to use:

3. Hamilton Road, or
4. Gerald Street



The reduction of Rockingham Road from two lanes in each direction to one lane in each direction and the introduction of two roundabouts, will slow traffic between Phoenix Road and Coleville Crescent, discouraging heavy vehicles from using Rockingham Road. It is unlikely that heavy vehicles diverted to alternative routes would have stopped at the shopping centre. However, while the new road environment may be beneficial to people travelling specifically to the shopping centre, other light vehicle users may tend to try and by-pass the location using alternative routes such as Hamilton Road and Gerald Street. Some of these light vehicle users may have resulted in patrons to the shopping centre from impulse shopping decisions. This bypass traffic also has the potential to increase traffic and noise on residential streets such as Hamilton Road and Gerald Street.

### **Potential impacts on Phoenix Shopping Centre**

The following issues have been identified as potentially having a major impact on the access and patronage to the shopping centre:

- Closure of north bound right turn movement into entrance 2 on Rockingham Road will discourage patrons.
- Closure of north bound right turn movement into McDonalds will discourage customers who will continue on to other fast food outlets.
- Establishment of major entrance into shopping centre off roundabout at Kent Street will attract patrons to the southern carpark which is the smaller of the two main carparks. The lower level of the southern carpark currently regularly experiences congestion and the northern and southern carparks do not have an internal link. If customers are unable to find parking they have to go back onto Rockingham Road and go to the northern carpark, however if they are frustrated with the congestion in the southern carpark they may leave and shop elsewhere.
- The proposed reconfiguration of Rockingham Road includes the provision of a bus bay to accommodate two busses on the south bound lane opposite the loading bay. The reduction of Rockingham Road to one lane in each direction, could result in a back up of traffic south bound in the event that more than two buses try to access the bus bay at the same time. If Rockingham Road becomes too congested and time consuming, people will use alternative routes and shopping venues.

### **Traffic Survey**

A traffic count of vehicle movements in and out of the various entrances to Phoenix Shopping Centre was carried out to identify current customer habits. The counts were carried out on a Thursday between 3pm and 7pm and a Saturday between 10am and 2 pm. These are generally recognised as the two busiest periods during the week for shopping centres. The peak hour for the Thursday was between 3.30pm and 4.30pm. The peak hour for Saturday was from 10.45m to 11.45am. The survey data is included in **Annexure B**.



### Carpark Entrance Utilisation

The number of vehicles using the various entrances to the shopping centre was counted with results summarised graphically in **Figure 7** and **Figure 8**.




Figure 7: Distribution of Vehicle Movements – Thursday Peak Hour




Figure 8: Distribution of Vehicle Movements – Saturday Peak Hour

The vehicle movements at Entrance 6 are not entering the shopping centre carpark. They are just McDonalds customers. However the counts were included with the five shopping centre access points to get a perspective of the number of McDonalds customers in relation to the Shopping Centre customers. (Some of the McDonald's

customers may well have visited the shopping centre before or after McDonalds, however those trips would be included with the count for whichever shopping centre carpark entrance they used.)

The comparison of the six shopping centre access points (ie. excluding McDonalds) is shown in **Table 1**.

<b>Thursday</b>	Peak Hour Movement Summary below:						
Location	1	2	3	4	5	7	Total
%	21%	39%	18%	3%	6%	12%	100%
Movements	237	442	202	39	71	137	1128

<b>Saturday</b>	Peak Hour Movement Summary below:						
Location	1	2	3	4	5	7	Total
%	21%	30%	23%	4%	8%	14%	100%
Movements	276	380	294	49	104	185	1288

Table 1: Peak hour vehicle movements at entrances to Phoenix Shopping Centre.

The total vehicle movements for all entrances for the Thursday and Saturday peak hours are of similar magnitude.

Entrances 1 and 2 on Rockingham Road account for 60% of total customer trips during the Thursday peak hour and 51% of total customer trips during the Saturday peak hour. ie. On average about 55% of customers enter and exit the shopping centre on Rockingham Road.

Entrance 2, near Kent Street is more popular than entrance 1 (with the gantry sign.) During Thursday peak hour, approximately double the number of customers used entrance 2 as opposed to entrance 1, while during the Saturday peak hour is was 50% more using entrance 2 as opposed to entrance 1. This could partly be due to the internal layout of the shopping centre (ie. Possibly more frequented shops near entrance 2) however from the external traffic aspect it could possibly be attributable to the signage at the entrances. Entrance 2 has a large free standing pylon sign which is visible from a distance on Rockingham Road, whereas entrance 1 has a gantry sign that is parallel to Rockingham Road and only visible from fairly close proximity.

### Travel direction of customer trips

The breakdown of left and right turn movements in and out of Entrances 1 and 2 is shown in **Tables 2 and 3**.

Thursday Entrance 1					
TOTAL	3-7pm				
Right in	Left in	TOTAL in	Left Out	Right Out	Total Out
167	215	382	261	107	368
44%	56%	100%	71%	29%	100%
PEAK HOUR 3:30-4:30					
Right in	Left in	TOTAL in	Left Out	Right Out	Total Out
60	67	127	89	21	110
47%	53%	100%	81%	19%	100%
Saturday Entrance 1					
TOTAL	10am-2pm				
Right in	Left in	TOTAL in	Left Out	Right Out	Total Out
246	292	538	267	97	364
46%	54%	100%	73%	27%	100%
PEAK HOUR 3:30-4:30					
Right in	Left in	TOTAL in	Left Out	Right Out	Total Out
76	97	173	90	39	129
44%	56%	100%	70%	30%	100%

Table 2: Turning movements – Entrance 1 Rockingham Road, Gantry

For entrance 1, the south bound left in movement is around 55% while the north bound right in movement is around 45% for both Thursday and Saturday peak hour. However the exit movement has around 70% left out (south bound) movements as opposed to only 30% right out (north bound) on Thursday, while the Saturday split is 80/20 left vs right. This would indicate that customer origins are fairly equally distributed between north and south, however when leaving the shopping centre it would be easier to turn left out, rather than cross the south bound lane to turn right, north bound. North bound customers that turn left would find an alternative route to head north.

Thursday Entrance 2					
TOTAL 3-7pm					
Right in	Left in	TOTAL in	Left Out	Right Out	Total Out
388	380	768	406	295	701
51%	49%	100%	58%	42%	100%
PEAK HOUR 3:30-4:30					
Right in	Left in	TOTAL in	Left Out	Right Out	Total Out
128	120	248	129	107	236
52%	48%	100%	55%	45%	100%
Saturday Entrance 2					
TOTAL 10am-2pm					
Right in	Left in	TOTAL in	Left Out	Right Out	Total Out
403	327	730	304	302	606
55%	45%	100%	50%	50%	100%
PEAK HOUR 10:45-11:45					
Right in	Left in	TOTAL in	Left Out	Right Out	Total Out
116	101	217	81	82	163
53%	47%	100%	50%	50%	100%

Table 3: Turning movements – Entrance 2 Rockingham Road, Sign

The directional split for entrance 2 is slightly different to that of entrance 1, with left and right turn movements for both inbound and outbound traffic all being close to 50/50. This would indicate that it is easier for drivers to turn right out of entrance 2 as opposed to entrance 1. This would be attributable to the road marking at the two entrances. See **Figure 9** and **Figure 10**. There is a right turn lane on the northbound carriageway opposite entrance 2, which would generally provide easy access to the north bound lanes with vehicles being able to turn and then merge into the northbound lane. Whereas opposite entrance 1 there is a holding bay in the centre of the road which, although it would facilitate right turn movements, vehicles would have to wait for a gap in the traffic to enter the northbound lanes.





Figure 9: Roadmarking Rockingham Road – Entrance 2



Figure 10: Roadmarking Rockingham Road – Entrance 1

## McDonalds Entrance

Thursday Entrance 6 McDonalds						
TOTAL		5-7pm				
Right in	Left in	TOTAL in	Left Out	Right Out	Total Out	
60	59	119	63	43	106	
50%	50%	100%	59%	41%	100%	
PEAK HOUR		5:45-6:45				
Right in	Left in	TOTAL in	Left Out	Right Out	Total Out	
34	30	64	31	24	55	
53%	47%	100%	56%	44%	100%	
Saturday Entrance 2 McDonalds						
TOTAL		12-2pm				
Right in	Left in	TOTAL in	Left Out	Right Out	Total Out	
58	79	137	97	40	137	
42%	58%	100%	71%	29%	100%	
PEAK HOUR		10:45-11:45				
Right in	Left in	TOTAL in	Left Out	Right Out	Total Out	
26	51	77	51	22	73	
34%	66%	100%	70%	30%	100%	

The inbound turning movements for the McDonalds entrance (entrance 6) are evenly distributed left in / right in during the Thursday count period, however for the exit movement there is a slight left out preference. Possibly some of the vehicles heading north from McDonalds are leaving via the shopping centre entrance 1. Left out and right out are therefore also probably fairly evenly balanced on the Thursday. However the Saturday traffic survey showed a distinct preference to both left in and left out as opposed to the right turn movements. This is probably due to the heavier traffic on a Saturday morning making a right turn movement across the south bound lane more difficult and also a build up of traffic in the northbound right turn lane due to traffic entering the shopping centre at entrance 1, making the right out turn movement difficult.

## Conclusions / Recommendations

### 1. Impact on Patronage

A summary of the vehicle movements using the entrances on Rockingham Road observed during the traffic survey is shown in **Figure 11**.




Figure 11: Summary of vehicle movements using entrances on Rockingham Road

## 1.1 Shopping Centre

The right turn movements at entrance 2 will be accommodated by the proposed roundabout at Kent Street, however the road reconfiguration will prevent right turn movements at entrance 1, which will become a Left In – Left Out access.

The Institute of Traffic Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Handbook provides typical rates for the percentage of shopping centre patrons that result from passer by traffic (as opposed to shoppers that make a specific trip to the shopping centre – destination specific trips.) For a shopping centre the typical rate is 34%.

Between 10am and 2pm on Saturday, the total number of right turn movements into entrance 1 was 246 vehicles. If 34% of these are from passer by traffic, that equates to 84 vehicles which would be affected by the closure of the right turn access. It is assumed that the destination specific customers would be familiar with the access to the shopping centre and use an alternative entrance.

The total inbound traffic at entrances 1 to 5 during the Saturday observation period was 2108. Consequently  $(84/2108) \times 100 = 4\%$  of all customers arriving by car would be affected by the right turn movement closure.

### Recommendation

Upgrade signage as detailed in Recommendation 2 below.

## 1.2 McDonalds

The ITE trip generation rate for passer by traffic for a fast food outlet is 50%.

Between 10am and 2pm on Saturday, the total number of right turn movements into entrance 6 (McDonalds) was 58 vehicles. If 50% of these are from passer by traffic, that equates to 29 vehicles which would be affected by the closure of the right turn access. The total inbound traffic at entrance 6 (the only access to McDonalds) during the Saturday observation period was 137. Consequently  $(29/137) \times 100 = 21\%$  of McDonalds customers would be affected by the closure of the right turn in movement from Rockingham Road. It is quite likely that the vast majority of these potential customers would not do a u-turn at the Lancaster Street roundabout and return to the McDonalds left in entrance, which would have a significant impact on the McDonalds turnover.

### Recommendation

Right turn movements into McDonalds are around 30 vehicles per hour during peak hour. I.e. Only one every two minutes. The southern entrance to McDonalds is combined with the heavy vehicle exit from the loading bay which permits right turn out movements. I.e. There will be an opening in the median for heavy vehicles at this point. It is recommended that a right turn bay be provided in the median for access to McDonalds for light vehicles. See **Figure 12**. Heavy vehicle movements will be minimal and with only 30 vph making use of the right turn bay, the expected operation of the access is regarded as acceptable.




Figure 12: Proposed right turn bay for access to McDonalds

## 2. Shopping centre access on Rockingham Road.

Slightly more than 50% of all shopping centre customers make use of the two entrances on Rockingham Road as opposed to the other three entrances. The number of customers approaching the centre from north and south on Rockingham Road appears to be evenly distributed.

The detrimental impact of the proposed road modifications is that a greater number of customers will be attracted to the new entrance to the southern carpark to be located at the roundabout at Kent Street. However this carpark has less capacity than the northern carpark and will lead to customer dissatisfaction when they are caught in a congested carpark - especially if they then have to exit the carpark and enter the shopping centre at an alternative entrance.

### Recommendations:

1. Downgrade the scope of the entrance statement at entrance 2 off the roundabout.
2. Upgrade signage within the lower level of the southern carpark to ensure patrons are informed of the ramp access to the upper level parking (which is currently under utilised compared to the lower level.)





3. Move the large free standing pylon sign from entrance 2 to entrance 1 to ensure that south bound customers are drawn to entrance 1 (which currently has the gantry sign.)
4. Provide clear and prominent signage to customers northbound on Rockingham Road that they can access the centre from the roundabout at Lancaster Street, via Lancaster Street and Burgandy Crescent.
5. Upgrade the entrance off Burgandy Crescent to create a significant entrance statement / showpiece to Phoenix Shopping Centre.
6. Investigate provision of an internal link between the southern and northern car parks. There are two options:
  - i. The lane way on the eastern side of the shopping centre. However this has been subject to noise related complaints from adjacent residents and is subject to an order from the City to be closed.
  - ii. Provision of a link on the western side of the shopping centre, past the loading dock and front of McDonalds.


The provision of a right turn movement out of Coleville Crescent into Rockingham Road would facilitate the movement of patrons from the southern to the northern carparks, however due to the sight distance limitations at the intersection (southwards from Coleville Crescent due to the crest in Rockingham Road) a median protected right turn lane within Rockingham Road would need to be provided. This is not possible with the close proximity of the Kent Street roundabout. This further supports the requirement for an internal link between the southern and northern carparks.






## **Annexure A**

### **Reconfiguration of Rockingham Road – Phoenix Road to Coleville Street – Concept Plans**




REFER TO MATCHLINE BELOW FOR CONTINUATION



REFER TO MATCHLINE ABOVE FOR CONTINUATION

#### LEGEND



- PROPOSED PAVEMENT
- EXISTING PAVEMENT
- EXISTING PATH
- PROPOSED RETAINING WALL
- PROPOSED 15m CYCLE LANE
- PROPOSED PATHS
- PROPOSED MEDIAN/ISLANDS
- PROPOSED BUS EMBAYMENTS
- PROPOSED LANDSCAPING



SCALE 1:1000


PROJECT: <b>ROCKINGHAM ROAD SPEARWOOD</b>		COPYRIGHT COPYRIGHT IN THIS DRAWING IS THE PROPERTY OF THE CONSULTANT. THE CLIENT HAS LICENSE TO USE THIS DRAWING FOR THE PROJECT ONLY. THE USER SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR "SITE CHECKING" ALL DIMENSIONS BEFORE COMMENCEMENT OF WORK. LAD DRAWING DO NOT MANUALLY ALTER. ONLY PLANS WITH NUMERICAL REVISION BEY "1" OR HIGHER AND SIGNED AS APPROVED SHALL BE USED FOR CONSTRUCTION.		CLIENT: <b>CITY OF COCKBURN</b>		DRAWING: <b>PROPOSAL 5 OVERALL LAYOUT PLAN</b>		SCALE: 1:1000 DATE: FEB 2016 DESIGN: ELW DRAWN: MJV CHECK:		DRAWING No: <b>15-07-111/100</b>		REV No: <b>C A1</b>		ORIGINAL DRAWING SIZE: <b>A1</b>	
STATUS: <b>FOR APPROVAL</b>		FILE NAME: S:\ACTIVE PROJECTS\15-07-111\ACAD\15111-100.dwg		APPD:											





LEGEND




- PROPOSED PAVEMENT
- EXISTING PAVEMENT
- EXISTING PATH
- PROPOSED RETAINING WALL
- PROPOSED 1.5m CYCLE LANE
- PROPOSED PATHS
- PROPOSED MEDIAN/ISLANDS
- PROPOSED BUS EMBAYMENTS
- PROPOSED LANDSCAPING





SCALE 1:500

PROJECT: <b>ROCKINGHAM ROAD SPEARWOOD</b>		COPYRIGHT COPYRIGHT IN THIS DRAWING IS THE PROPERTY OF THE CONSULTANT. THE CLIENT HAS LICENSE TO USE THIS DRAWING FOR THE PROJECT ONLY. THE USER SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR "SITE CHECKING" ALL DIMENSIONS BEFORE COMMENCEMENT OF WORK. LAD DRAWING DO NOT MANUALLY ALTER. ONLY PLANS WITH NUMERICAL REVISION (REV 'Y' OR HIGHER) AND SIGNED AS APPROVED SHALL BE USED FOR CONSTRUCTION.		CLIENT: <b>CITY OF COCKBURN</b>		DRAWING: <b>PROPOSAL 5 CONCEPT LAYOUT SHEET 1 OF 5</b>		STATUS: <b>FOR APPROVAL</b>	
26-2-2016 11-12-2015 30-9-2015		ORIGINAL KERB LINE REMAINS ON EASTERN SIDE BETWEEN LANCASTER & PHOENIX RD. COUNCIL COMMENTS RECEIVED 26-11-15. DRAWINGS REVISED AS REQUESTED. PRELIMINARY ISSUE FOR COMMENT.		Level 2 Kishore Court 50 Kishore Road M5 Pleasant 6153 WA PO Box 1036 Canning Bridge 6153 WA Tel (08) 9315 9955 Fax (08) 9315 9959 Email office@portereeng.com.au www.portereeng.com.au		SCALE 1:500 DATE FEB 2016 DESIGN ELW DRAWN MJV CHECK APPD		DRAWING No. <b>15-07-111/400</b> FILE NAME S:\ACTIVE PROJECTS\15-07-111\ACAD\15111-400-40A.dwg	
NO. DATE		REVISION		REV No.		ORIGINAL DRAWING SIZE		C A1	






- LEGEND
- PROPOSED PAVEMENT
  - EXISTING PAVEMENT
  - EXISTING PATH
  - PROPOSED RETAINING WALL
  - PROPOSED 1.5m CYCLE LANE
  - PROPOSED PATHS
  - PROPOSED MEDIAN/ISLANDS
  - PROPOSED BUS EMBAYMENTS
  - PROPOSED LANDSCAPING




PROJECT:		ROCKINGHAM ROAD SPEARWOOD				COPYRIGHT		 Level 2 Kishara Court 58 Kishara Road M1 Pleasant 453 WA PO Box 936 Canning Bridge 6153 WA Tel (08) 9315 9955 Fax (08) 9315 9959 Email: office@portereng.com.au www.portereng.com.au		CLIENT:		DRAWING: <b>PROPOSAL 5</b> <b>CONCEPT LAYOUT SHEET 2 OF 5</b>		SCALE: 1:500		DRAWING No.		REV No		ORIGINAL DRAWING SIZE	
						COPYRIGHT IN THIS DRAWING IS THE PROPERTY OF THE CONSULTANT. THE CLIENT HAS LICENSE TO USE THIS DRAWING FOR THE PROJECT ONLY. THE USER SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR "SITE CHECKING" ALL DIMENSIONS BEFORE COMMENCEMENT OF WORK. CAD DRAWING DO NOT MANUALLY ALTER		<b>CITY OF COCKBURN</b>				DATE: FEB 2016		<b>15-07-111/401</b>		<b>D</b>		<b>A1</b>			
						ONLY PLANS WITH NUMERICAL REVISION (REV 'Y' OR HIGHER) AND SIGNED AS APPROVED SHALL BE USED FOR CONSTRUCTION						DESIGN: ELW									
												DRAWN: MJV		FILE NAME: S:\ACTIVE PROJECTS\15-07-111\ACAD\157111-400-404.dwg							
												STATUS: <b>FOR APPROVAL</b>									
												CHECK:		APPD:							








- LEGEND**
- PROPOSED PAVEMENT
  - EXISTING PAVEMENT
  - EXISTING PATH
  - PROPOSED RETAINING WALL
  - PROPOSED 1.5m CYCLE LANE
  - PROPOSED PATHS
  - PROPOSED MEDIAN/ISLANDS
  - PROPOSED BUS EMBAYMENTS
  - PROPOSED LANDSCAPING




LAND REQUIREMENT DETAIL 3  
1:500




SCALE 1:500

PROJECT:		ROCKINGHAM ROAD SPEARWOOD				COPYRIGHT		 <div>Level 2 Kishorn Court 50 Kishorn Road MF Pleasant 6153 WA  PO Box 1036 Canning Bridge 6153 WA  Tel (08) 9315 9955 Fax (08) 9315 9959 Email: office@portereng.com.au www.portereng.com.au</div>		CLIENT:	CITY OF COCKBURN		DRAWING:	PROPOSAL 5 CONCEPT LAYOUT SHEET 3 OF 5				SCALE:	1:500	DRAWING No.		REV No.	ORIGINAL DRAWING SIZE	
D	26-2-2016	ORIGINAL KERB LINE REMAINS BETWEEN LANCASTER & PHOENIX RD. LAND REQUIREMENT DETAILS				MJV	COPYRIGHT IN THIS DRAWING IS THE PROPERTY OF THE CONSULTANT. THE CLIENT HAS LICENSE TO USE THIS DRAWING FOR THE PROJECT ONLY. THE USER SHALL BE RESPONSIBLE FOR "SITE CHECKING" ALL DIMENSIONS BEFORE COMMENCEMENT OF WORK. LAD DRAWING DO NOT MANUALLY ALTER				DATE	FEB 2016		15-07-111/402		D	A1							
C	11-12-2015	COUNCIL COMMENTS RECEIVED 26-11-15. DRAWINGS REVISED AS REQUESTED.				MJV	ONLY PLANS WITH NUMERICAL REVISION (REV '1' OR HIGHER) AND SIGNED AS APPROVED SHALL BE USED FOR CONSTRUCTION.				DESIGN	ELW												
B	12-11-2015	DETAIL AND AREA OF LAND ACQUISITION ADDED				MJV					DRAWN	MJV		FILE NAME: S:\ACTIVE PROJECTS\15-07-111\ACAD\151111-400-404.dwg										
A	30-9-2015	PRELIMINARY ISSUE FOR COMMENT				MJV					CHECK	APPD												
No		DATE		REVISION		BY		TUSOM Pty Ltd ACN 070 071 768 is the provider for The Consulting Engineering Unit. Trust trading as Porter Consulting Engineers. ABN 78 636 296 305		STATUS:		FOR APPROVAL												





- LEGEND
- PROPOSED PAVEMENT
  - EXISTING PAVEMENT
  - EXISTING PATH
  - PROPOSED RETAINING WALL
  - PROPOSED 1.5m CYCLE LANE
  - PROPOSED PATHS
  - PROPOSED MEDIAN/ISLANDS
  - PROPOSED BUS EMBAYMENTS
  - PROPOSED LANDSCAPING



SCALE 1:500

PROJECT:  <b>ROCKINGHAM ROAD SPEARWOOD</b>				COPYRIGHT		<div><div><div><div></div><div></div></div><div><b>Porter</b></div><div>Consulting Engineers</div></div><div>Level 2 Kishore Court 50 Kishore Road Mt Pleasant 6153 WA  PO Box 1036 Canning Bridge 6153 WA  Tel (08) 9315 9955 Fax (08) 9315 9959 Email office@portereng.com.au www.portereng.com.au</div><div>750960 Pty Ltd ACN 678 071 NAB as trustee for The Consulting Engineering Unit Trust trading as Porter Consulting Engineers ABN 78 626 296 205</div></div>	CLIENT:  <b>CITY OF COCKBURN</b>	DRAWING:  <b>PROPOSAL 5 CONCEPT LAYOUT SHEET 4 OF 5</b>	STATUS:  <b>FOR APPROVAL</b>	<div><div>SCALE</div><div>DATE</div><div>DESIGN</div><div>DRAWN</div><div>CHECK</div></div> <div><div>1:500</div><div>FEB 2016</div><div>ELW</div><div>MJV</div><div></div></div> <div><div>FILE NAME</div><div>APP'D</div></div> <div><div>S:\ACTIVE PROJECTS\15-07-111\ACAD\157111-404.dwg</div><div></div></div>	DRAWING No.  <b>15-07-111/403</b>	REV No.  <b>C</b>	ORIGINAL DRAWING SIZE: <b>A1</b>
	<div><div>C</div><div>B</div><div>A</div></div>	<div><div>26-2-2016</div><div>11-12-2015</div><div>30-9-2015</div></div>	<div><div>FOOTPATH WORKS REMOVED FROM PROJECT</div><div>COUNCIL COMMENTS RECEIVED 26-11-15, DRAWINGS REVISED AS REQUESTED</div><div>PRELIMINARY ISSUE FOR COMMENT</div></div>	<div><div>MJV</div><div>MJV</div><div>MJV</div></div>	<div><div>ONLY PLANS WITH NUMERICAL REVISION (REV '1' OR HIGHER) AND SIGNED AS APPROVED SHALL BE USED FOR CONSTRUCTION</div></div>								
No	DATE	REVISION		BY									





## **Annexure B**

### **Traffic Survey Data**

Phoenix Shopping Centre  
Thursday

	In							Out							TOTAL							TOTAL	Hour TOTAL
Time	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	TOTAL	Hour TOTAL
3:00-3:15	34	54	25	9	5	15	10	26	41	34	4	6	13	12	60	95	59	13	11	28	22	288	1213
3:15-3:30	38	51	30	5	6	11	12	24	51	15	9	10	12	19	62	102	45	14	16	23	31	293	1225
3:30-3:45	30	51	33	3	7	12	13	33	40	17	5	13	13	24	63	91	50	8	19	25	38	294	1244
3:45-4:00	29	72	28	4	7	17	15	25	49	37	6	11	17	21	54	121	65	10	18	34	36	338	1243
4:00-4:15	32	61	23	9	6	15	13	21	53	23	2	10	13	19	53	114	46	11	16	28	32	300	1204
4:15-4:30	36	69	20	4	6	17	13	31	47	21	6	10	12	20	67	116	41	10	17	29	32	312	1197
4:30-4:45	24	46	22	6	6	15	12	29	61	26	6	9	13	18	53	107	48	12	15	28	30	293	1169
4:45-5:00	25	53	15	3	7	17	15	20	50	34	10	13	13	24	45	103	49	13	20	30	39	299	1114
5:00-5:15	27	57	21	2	7	15	14	26	46	28	5	11	13	21	53	103	49	7	18	28	35	293	1072
5:15-5:30	27	49	22	2	7	11	15	21	33	45	3	13	12	24	48	82	67	5	20	23	39	284	990
5:30-5:45	16	40	18	4	6	12	12	28	42	15	5	9	13	18	44	82	33	9	15	25	30	238	916
5:45-6:00	20	48	13	4	6	17	13	17	43	22	7	10	17	20	37	91	35	11	17	34	32	257	877
6:00-6:15	10	33	10	2	6	15	13	20	38	20	2	10	13	19	30	71	30	4	16	28	32	211	805
6:15-6:30	11	33	8	1	7	17	15	16	39	16	3	11	12	21	27	72	24	4	18	29	36	210	
6:30-6:45	11	32	7	1	7	15	13	10	36	14	3	13	13	24	21	68	21	4	19	28	38	199	
6:45-7:00	12	19	5	3	6	17	12	21	32	15	1	10	13	19	33	51	20	4	16	30	31	185	
TOTAL	382	768	300	62	106	238	206	368	701	382	77	167	212	325	750	1469	682	139	273	450	531	4294	
%	19%	37%	15%	3%	5%	12%	10%	16%	31%	17%	3%	7%	9%	15%	17%	34%	16%	3%	6%	10%	12%	100%	

Excluding  
McDonalds

PEAK TOTAL	127	253	104	20	27		53	110	189	98	19	44		84	237	442	202	39	71		137	1128
%	22%	43%	18%	3%	5%		9%	20%	35%	18%	3%	8%		16%	21%	39%	18%	3%	6%		12%	100%

Phoenix Shopping Centre  
Saturday


Time	In							Out							TOTAL							TOTAL	Hour TOTAL
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
10:00-10:15	20	40	32	6	2	13	4	14	37	29	4	2	13	3	34	77	61	10	3.96	26	7.04	219	1101
10:15-10:30	38	47	33	5	4	13	6	23	40	21	2	3	13	5	61	87	54	7	6.48	26	11.52	253	1239
10:30-10:45	45	41	33	5	5	13	8	29	40	40	4	5	13	9	74	81	73	9	9.72	26	17.28	290	1339
10:45-11:00	41	55	37	6	9	13	15	23	27	48	5	17	13	30	64	82	85	11	25.56	26	45.44	339	1396
11:00-11:15	41	55	49	7	11	13	19	15	54	40	9	11	13	20	56	109	89	16	21.96	26	39.04	357	1384
11:15-11:30	54	48	35	9	12	13	22	19	37	48	8	13	13	22	73	85	83	17	24.84	26	44.16	353	1365
11:30-11:45	42	59	14	2	13	15	23	41	45	23	3	19	15	33	83	104	37	5	31.68	30	56.32	347	1347
11:45-12:00	44	45	31	4	10	15	17	34	35	40	5	12	15	20	78	80	71	9	21.24	30	37.76	327	1295
12:00-12:15	33	43	25	3	10	17	19	35	36	44	5	19	15	34	68	79	69	8	29.52	32	52.48	338	1238
12:15-12:30	36	45	23	2	8	26	15	33	35	43	2	18	17	32	69	80	66	4	26.28	43	46.72	335	1160
12:30-12:45	29	45	21	4	7	19	12	23	42	25	4	14	24	26	52	87	46	8	21.24	43	37.76	295	1092
12:45-13:00	23	38	27	3	5	13	8	14	47	30	3	17	13	29	37	85	57	6	21.24	26	37.76	270	1021
13:00-13:15	23	45	11	2	7	19	13	14	34	33	2	14	19	24	37	79	44	4	20.88	38	37.12	260	990
13:15-13:30	28	48	18	3	10	18	17	13	32	27	3	12	16	22	41	80	45	6	21.96	34	39.04	267	
13:30-13:45	19	32	8	3	9	10	16	23	28	19	3	12	22	20	42	60	27	6	20.52	32	36.48	224	
13:45-14:00	22	44	17	4	8	15	14	11	37	23	4	10	11	19	33	81	40	8	18.36	26	32.64	239	
TOTAL	538	730	414	68	129	245	229	364	606	533	66	197	245	349	902	1336	947	134	325	490	579	4713	
%	23%	31%	18%	3%	5%	10%	10%	15%	26%	23%	3%	8%	10%	15%	19%	28%	20%	3%	7%	10%	12%	100%	

Excluding  
McDonalds

PEAK TOTAL	178	217	135	24	45		79	98	163	159	25	59		106	276	380	294	49	104		185	1288
PEAK %	26%	32%	20%	4%	7%		12%	16%	27%	26%	4%	10%		17%	21%	30%	23%	4%	8%		14%	100%

# ATTACHMENT C

## MASTER PLAN PRINCIPLES PLAN



**LEGEND**

- Existing Decked Carpark Structure
- Retail, Commercial, Entertainment Uses
- Architectural Feature Element
- Community Gathering Space  
(associated with Major Redevelopment - tenant focus on food and beverage)
- Pedestrian Linkage
- Public Access Point
- Fine Grained Edge Treatment  
(horizontal rhythm of facade articulated to respond to neighbouring single dwellings)
- Landscaped Edge Treatment
- Roundabout - EXISTING
- Roundabout - PROPOSED
- Open Air Pedestrian Street Environment
- Potential F&B Precinct
- Reconfigured Internal Parking Access  
(to link southern and northern carpark areas)
- Improved Service Area
- Improved Pedestrian Entry to Centre

# Principles Plan

## Phoenix Shopping Centre, Spearwood

DRAFT



Project Manager: MD Date: 8 November 2016  
Drawn: OP Scale: NTS @ A3  
Checked: KS Drawing No. 716-600 CP-1 A



8 November 2016



**McDonald's Australia Limited**  
ABN 43 008 496 928  
18 Lyall Street  
Ascot WA 6104  
Phone: (08) 9475 5999

Chief Executive Officer  
City of Cockburn  
PO Box 1215  
BIBRA LAKE WA 6965

Attention: Andrew Trosic, Manager Strategic Planning Services

Dear Sir,

**MCDONALD'S SPEARWOOD  
SUBMISSION ON ROCKINGHAM ROAD UPGRADE PROPOSAL**

McDonald's Australia Ltd and Mr Terry Creasey are the proprietors of the McDonald's Restaurant at Lot 63 (254) Rockingham Road, Spearwood.

We thank the City of Cockburn for the opportunity to review and provide comment on the Rockingham Road upgrade concept, and meeting with ourselves and the project team on 25 August 2016 to discuss our initial concerns and the alternative access proposal.

In principle, we support the City's initiative to activate Rockingham Road and improve the pedestrian environment, however the proposed works as they are currently designed will significantly adversely impact our business operations, access for customers and will create traffic conflicts.

We **object** to the current proposal, as presented, as there will be significant adverse safety issues caused to our customers by the adjacent loading dock access point. Furthermore, the proposed access arrangements will cause a substantial detrimental impact on our business through the removal of the right turn access into our site for northbound traffic on Rockingham Road.

Based on our business modelling, the removal of the right turn access into our site for northbound traffic on Rockingham Road will reduce revenue by at least 30%. This represents a substantial impact to the business operations and as a consequence it will affect the ability for both Terry Creasey and McDonald's Australia to reinvest in the restaurant to provide improved services and facilities to the community in the future.



Importantly, a loss of revenue of this scale will also significantly impact the ability to not only employ additional staff at the store but also to retain the existing numbers. Such an impact on revenue will also affect the ability for the store to continue the level of community support in the local area as well as the ability to support any new initiatives into the future.


McDonald's remains committed to providing local employment and community sponsorship opportunities, however the proposed access arrangements puts in serious jeopardy the level of employment and community sponsorship that they store can support.

We have worked closely with the owners of the Phoenix Shopping Centre to prepare an alternative access proposal that maintains satisfactory access to the site. Refer Appendix 1. The alternative access proposal maintains the right turn access into our site for northbound traffic and provides satisfactory access to the both the restaurant and shopping centre, whilst achieving the City's objectives to improve the streetscape through additional landscaping, pedestrian safety and renewal of the shopping centre frontage.

We request the City **modify** the Rockingham Road upgrade concept to include the access arrangements presented in the alternative access proposal. We thank the City's officers for engaging with us and look forward to achieving a mutually acceptable solution.

Should you have any queries or require further clarification in regard to the above matter, please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned.

Yours sincerely,


A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Ray Pardo', written over a horizontal line.

---

Ray Pardo  
Development Manager WA

## APPENDIX 1

### Alternative Access Proposal



- NEW LANDSCAPING
- NEW PAVING
- NEW ROAD / PARKING BAYS
- COVERED WALKWAY (FIXED TO EXISTING BUILDING & PATH)

- PAINT WALL
- DEMOLISH EXISTING RAMP
- EXTENT OF WORKS BY COCKBURN (NOTE: COLOURED WORKS WITHIN BDY BY COCKBURN)

NOTE: LAYOUT IS CONCEPTUAL ONLY,  
SUBJECT TO COMMERCIAL DISCUSSIONS  
WITH CITY OF COCKBURN





CAR PARK PUBLIC ACCESS




FEATURE CLADDING PAINT ONLY



FEATURE CLADDING PAINT AND MATERIAL



GREEN / LIVING WALL



NTS

Ref: jap001 Rockingham Rd Addendum 1

Mr John McDonald  
City of Cockburn  
Coleville Crescent  
SPEARWOOD WA 6163

18 November 2016

Dear John

### **Rockingham Road Traffic Investigation – Addendum 1**

This letter presents an addendum to the Urbsol report “Rockingham Road Streetscaping Project, Traffic Engineering Study” of August 2016 (Urbsol 2016). This addendum has been prepared due to a number of suggested modifications to the proposed streetscaping plan received by the City of Cockburn (the City) during its advertising period. As advised by the City, these modifications included the following:

- Inclusion of an additional roundabout on Rockingham Road between Phoenix Road and Lancaster Street, which will provide access to properties on the east and west sides of Rockingham Road (and removal of the initially proposed left in/out to the property on the west side of Rockingham Road).
- Inclusion of a right turn into the crossover near the southern side of McDonalds.

As a result of the proposed access adjustments, the following tasks were undertaken:

- Redistribution of traffic currently utilising the various access points to reflect the proposed arrangement (AM and PM peaks). Note that this now includes the McDonalds driveway, which was not previously included.
- Review the SIDRA analysis for the various access points and intersections (same as those assessed previously, plus the McDonalds driveway). This was undertaken for 2016 and 2031 AM and PM peak traffic periods for both base case and project cases.

The results of the revised traffic analysis are documented in the following sections.

### **Traffic Assessment**

#### ***Traffic Redistribution***

The assumptions around the redistribution of traffic that were documented in Table 2 of the Urbsol 2016 report were revised to reflect the latest suggested modifications to the project. The revised assumptions are documented in Table 1.

**Table 1 Traffic Redistribution Assumptions**

Intersection/Access	Impacted Movement	Anticipated Route
<b>Phoenix Road Intersection</b>	No change	N/A
<b>BP Access</b>	Right turn in & out removed	Northbound entering traffic to turn right into Liquorland driveway (roundabout) and travel through carpark. Northbound exiting traffic to exit via Liquorland driveway.
<b>777 Access</b>	No change – access relocated only (new roundabout)	All entering and exiting traffic transferred to new roundabout.
<b>Liquorland Access</b>	No change (new roundabout)	All entering and exiting traffic to use new roundabout.
<b>Lancaster Street Intersection</b>	No change	N/A
<b>Cash Converters Access</b>	Right turn in & out removed	Northbound entering traffic to U-turn at Lancaster St and turn left into access. Northbound exiting traffic to exit left onto Rockingham Rd and U-turn at Kent St.
<b>Video Ezy Access</b>	Right turn in & out removed	As per Cash Converters Access.
<b>NAB Access</b>	Right turn in & out removed	As per Cash Converters Access.
<b>Shopping Centre Access</b>	Right turn in & out removed	Northbound entering and exiting traffic transferred to new 4 <sup>th</sup> leg at Kent St.
<b>McDonalds Access</b>	No change	N/A
<b>Coles Access/Kent Street</b>	Current access closed and relocated as 4 <sup>th</sup> leg at Kent St	To accommodate northbound entering and exiting traffic from Shopping Centre Access (above).
<b>Coleville Crescent Intersection</b>	No change	N/A

The resultant network traffic flows are shown on the stick diagrams included in Appendix A.

### ***Traffic Adjustment***

The adjustments to traffic volumes were undertaken in accordance with the same methodology as documented in the Urbsol 2016 report. These adjustments reflected:

- the downgrade of Rockingham Road from two to one through lanes in each direction were undertaken, and
- traffic growth to 2031

The resultant 2016 network traffic flows are shown on the stick diagrams included in Appendix B.

The resultant 2031 network traffic flows are shown on the stick diagrams included in Appendix C.



### **Traffic Operational Analysis**

Following the traffic redistribution and adjustment processes, capacity analysis was conducted at the nominated key intersections and access points using SIDRA Intersection. The following locations were assessed:

- Phoenix Road
- BP Access
- 777 Access/Liquorland Access
- Lancaster Street
- Cash Converters Access
- Video Ezy Access
- NAB Access
- Shopping Centre Access
- McDonalds Access
- Coles Access/Kent Street
- Coleville Crescent

Level of Service definitions used in these assessments are those from SIDRA and are shown in Figure 1.

Level of Service	Control delay per vehicle in seconds (d)		
	Signals	"SIDRA Roundabout LOS" method (1)	Sign Control
<b>A</b>	$d \leq 10$	$d \leq 10$	$d \leq 10$
<b>B</b>	$10 < d \leq 20$	$10 < d \leq 20$	$10 < d \leq 15$
<b>C</b>	$20 < d \leq 35$	$20 < d \leq 35$	$15 < d \leq 25$
<b>D</b>	$35 < d \leq 55$	$35 < d \leq 50$	$25 < d \leq 35$
<b>E</b>	$55 < d \leq 80$	$50 < d \leq 70$	$35 < d \leq 50$
<b>F</b>	$80 < d$	$70 < d$	$50 < d$

Source: SIDRA Intersection 7.0 User Guide

### **Figure 1 Level of Service Definitions**

Table 2 provides a summary of the SIDRA analysis for the key intersections and access points for each the 2016 and 2031 peak periods with Rockingham Road capacity downgraded.

**Table 2 Results of Traffic Operational Analysis**

Intersection/Access	2016 AM		2016 PM		2031 AM		2031 PM	
	Average Delay (s)	LoS	Average Delay (s)	Average Delay (s)	Average Delay (s)	Average Delay (s)	Average Delay (s)	Average Delay (s)
Phoenix Rd	25	C	25	C	26	C	27	C
BP	<1	A	<1	A	<1	A	<1	A
777 / Liquorland	6	A	6	A	6	A	6	A
Lancaster St	5	A	6	A	5	A	7	A
Cash Converters	<1	A	<1	A	<1	A	<1	A
Video Ezy	<1	A	<1	A	<1	A	<1	A
NAB	<1	A	<1	A	<1	A	<1	A
Shop Access	<1	A	1	A	<1	A	1	A
McDonalds Access	2	A	2	A	2	A	2	A
Coles/Kent St	7	A	8	A	7	A	10	A
Coleville Cr	<1	A	<1	A	<1	A	<1	A

The results of the SIDRA analysis indicate very little change from the results documented in the Urbsol 2016 report, therefore similar conclusions as previously documented remain appropriate.

The analysis indicates that the proposed roundabout on Rockingham Road at the 777 and Liquorland driveways is expected to operate well with average delays of around 6s and levels of service A for all scenarios analysed. Nominal figures for through traffic from east to west and reverse were included in the analysis. An examination of the results indicates 95<sup>th</sup> percentile queues of up to around 30m on the Rockingham Road southern approach. This is within the approximate 70m available storage between this intersection and Lancaster Road. Similarly the results indicates 95<sup>th</sup> percentile queues of up to around 45m on the Rockingham northern approach to Lancaster Road intersection. Again this is within the approximate 70m available storage.

It should be noted however that the expected queue lengths on the Rockingham Road south approach to the Phoenix Road intersection were estimated at around 90m in 2016 and 100m in 2031. There is approximately 110m storage available between this intersection and the roundabout at 777/Liquorland. Queues should be monitored to minimise potential negative impacts of one intersection's operations impacting the other. There appears to be sufficient capacity at the Rockingham Road/Phoenix Road intersection to adjust signal timing if required to minimise such impacts.

For other access points assessed, the SIDRA analysis indicates that they will operate with minimal delays and good levels of service for all scenarios analysed.

Similarly to the previous analysis, it should be noted that traffic redistribution was not undertaken for the residential properties on the western side of Rockingham Road (southern section). The traffic generated by these properties is minimal compared to the other local land uses and the analysis indicates that there will be sufficient capacity at key intersections and access points should additional traffic movements be generated as a result of access restrictions on these properties.

Yours faithfully




Jason Petsos  
Principal  
jpetsos@urbsol.com.au  
mob: 0418 943 738

## **Appendix A – Redistributed 2016 Traffic Volumes**

2016 AM Peak Redistributed Volumes


Austraffic  
Calculated  
New turns, uncertain use







## **Appendix B – Adjusted 2016 Traffic Volumes (Rockingham Road Capacity Downgraded)**








## **Appendix C – Adjusted 2031 Traffic Volumes (Rockingham Road Capacity Downgraded)**



2031 PM Peak Redistributed Volumes - Downgraded





<b>POL</b>	<b>PHOENIX ACTIVITY CENTRE DESIGN GUIDELINES</b>	<b>LPP XX</b>
------------	--	---------------

<b>POLICY CODE:</b>	LPP XX
<b>DIRECTORATE:</b>	Planning and Development
<b>BUSINESS UNIT:</b>	Planning and Development
<b>SERVICE UNIT:</b>	Strategic Planning Services
<b>RESPONSIBLE OFFICER:</b>	Manager, Strategic Planning
<b>FILE NO.:</b>	104/001
<b>DATE FIRST ADOPTED:</b>	
<b>DATE LAST REVIEWED:</b>	
<b>ATTACHMENTS:</b>	
<b>DELEGATED AUTHORITY REF.:</b>	
<b>VERSION NO.</b>	

<b>Dates of Amendments / Reviews:</b>	
DAPPS Meeting:	
OCM:	

## BACKGROUND:

The Phoenix Revitalisation Strategy identified a vision for the Phoenix Activity Centre to evolve into a town centre, and the Phoenix Activity Centre Structure Plan provides further guidance for development.

These Design Guidelines set out development control policy measures to achieve the key objectives of the Revitalisation Strategy and the Activity Centre Structure Plan.

## PURPOSE:

The purpose of this Policy is to set out design guidelines for the Phoenix Activity Centre, which is divided into three precincts as follows:

1. Phoenix Core Precinct
2. Mixed Use Precinct
3. Northern Precinct

This Policy should be read in conjunction with the Phoenix Activity Centre Structure Plan.

## POLICY:

### Definitions:

**Active Frontage** means street frontages where there is an active visual engagement between people in the street and those on the ground floors of buildings.

**Amenity** means all those factors which combine to form the character of an area and includes the present and likely future amenity. An area of high amenity could be described as a comfortable and pleasant immediate environment, located within agreeable surroundings.

**Articulation** means the breaking up of a building façade into individual elements to provide a modulated effect aimed at enhancing individual building identity, variety and interest through the use of such elements as window projections, balconies, awnings, minor recesses and/or projections of walls or parts of walls.

**Built Form** means the configuration of the aggregate form of all buildings, structures, etc., which make up the physical environment of a locality.

**Bulk** means the size, or mass, of a building within its built form context.

**Character** means the essential combination of the public and private domains. Every property, public place or piece of infrastructure and the way it is used by the public, makes a contribution, whether large or small. It is the cumulative impact of all these contributions that establishes neighbourhood character.

**Context** means the specific character, quality, physical, historic and social context of a building's setting and may, according to circumstances, be a group of buildings, a part of a street, whole street, part of a town or the whole town.

**Legibility** means a street and movement system designed to provide a clear sense of direction and connection, giving definite signals regarding the spatial layout and geography of an area.

**Public Realm** means areas of a town which belong to the community as a whole. This refers to spaces that are physically accessible to the public, and those aspects of other spaces that are visible from physically accessible spaces. It incorporates features such as streets, parks, squares, community buildings and the street facades of other buildings.

**Scale** means the size of a building and its relationship with its surrounding buildings or landscape.

**Streetscape** means the total visual impression gained from any one location within a street including the natural and man-made elements and is made up of the appearance of and the relationships between buildings in terms of design, scale, materials, colours, finishes, signs, external furniture, paving materials for roads, footpaths and landscaping.

**Passive Surveillance** means the presence of passers-by or the ability of people to be seen in public spaces from surrounding windows, decks, balconies or the like. "eyes on the street" provided by local people going about their daily activities.

POL	PHOENIX ACTIVITY CENTRE DESIGN GUIDELINES	LPP XX
-----	---	--------

### **(1) General policy objectives**

- a) To create a high quality and safe pedestrian environment along Rockingham Road in the Phoenix Activity Centre.
- b) To create a new sense of place with high-quality and dynamic building and landscape design and landmark development sites.
- c) To create an activity centre with a readily identifiable character.
- d) To facilitate safe and convenient pedestrian and cyclist movement within the Activity Centre, resolving vehicle and pedestrian/cyclist conflict points.
- e) To create an Activity Centre that is highly legible.
- f) To create attractive, active frontages that provide visual interest and contribute to pedestrian and cyclist safety and comfort.
- g) To ensure that signage is not visually obtrusive, does not result in excessive visual clutter; and does not hinder passive surveillance.
- h) To ensure that signage is compatible with the scale, design and visual character of the building and activity centre.
- i) To provide adequate opportunities for commercial advertising to support and encourage business activity.
- j) To encourage an increase in pedestrian and cycling trips by maximising the convenience, safety and appeal of these modes of travel.
- k) To create safe, functional and attractive car parking areas that allow for landscaping, and facilitate safe and convenient pedestrian and cyclist movement.
- l) To encourage landmark development features which are integrated with buildings, and which improve legibility within the activity centre.
- m) To utilise artworks to create community identity; improve inactive frontages; improve legibility; and provide functional infrastructure for pedestrians and cyclists.
- n) To promote the integration of wayfinding with urban design, landscaping, architectural design and public art.
- o) To encourage mixed use development and a diversity of land uses.

<b>POL</b>	<b>PHOENIX ACTIVITY CENTRE DESIGN GUIDELINES</b>	<b>LPP XX</b>
------------	--	---------------

## **(2) General Provisions**

### **1. Signage**

- a) Development should include clearly identifiable entry point(s) for customers/pedestrians in the building design, rather than relying on signage.

### **2. Lighting**

- a) Development should make provision for the location of external lighting, to include the lighting of commercial building facades for public safety purposes and to add variety, interest and character to the development at night.
- b) Lighting should be even and consistent to avoid shadows and glare, and should be provided to increase safety and security along important pedestrian pathways.

## **(3) Phoenix Core Precinct**

### **1. Movement**

- 2. Development Applications are to be accompanied by a Pedestrian and Cyclist Movement Plan demonstrating how pedestrian and cyclist connectivity can be accommodated safely and conveniently, addressing the following:
  - a. Demonstrate improvements to legibility, permeability and pedestrian safety along and connecting with Rockingham Road.
  - b. Inclusion of separate pedestrian path(s) on the vehicle access ramp from Rockingham Road to secure safe pedestrian movement, where the ramp is retained as part of a redevelopment proposal, or a proposal for expansion of the floorspace.
  - c. Demonstrate how car parking areas include safe and convenient pedestrian routes to key destinations, both from car parking bays, bus stops, and from the wider pedestrian network. This may require a decrease in the number of parking spaces to allow for improved accessibility and/or improved landscaping.
  - d. Provision of high quality, safe, secure and accessible end-of-trip facilities for cyclists.
- 3. All development applications for the Phoenix Shopping Centre site that propose expansion of floorspace, or extensions or modifications to car parking areas or vehicle access ramps, must address the following matters:

<b>POL</b>	<b>PHOENIX ACTIVITY CENTRE DESIGN GUIDELINES</b>	<b>LPP XX</b>
------------	--	---------------

- Demonstrate improvements to the servicing area on Rockingham Road.
- Minimising the width and impact of vehicle crossovers on the pedestrian environment if possible, given that they serve to disconnect the pedestrian environment, reduce pedestrian comfort and increase potential conflict between vehicles and cyclists and pedestrians.
- Improving the inactive frontage.
- Improving the interface with the bus stop.
- a. Improve pedestrian connectivity through the Phoenix Shopping Centre site, and to the main entries of the shopping centre.
- b. Demonstrate improvements to the servicing areas on March Street, including:

### **3. Built Form**

- a) Proposed buildings or extensions/major modifications to buildings are to address street frontages (and internal roads) and maximise opportunities for passive surveillance of streets, car parking areas, and areas used by pedestrians and cyclists.
- b) Proposed buildings or extensions/major modifications to buildings are to be appropriately detailed at ground level so that they create an attractive, safe and interesting environment for occupants and pedestrians alike.
- c) Ground floor non-residential frontages are to be designed as shop fronts with no less than 70% of the shop front glazed with clear glass to facilitate passive surveillance and ensure an interesting pedestrian environment.
- d) Where an active frontage cannot be achieved, for example servicing/loading areas, it should be demonstrated how the frontage has been designed to contribute to a high quality, safe and attractive street environment by:
  - Minimising the length and height of blank walls, and
  - Articulating blank walls through the creative application of complementary materials, avoiding large continuous masses of the same finish; and/or the provision of appropriately integrated structural features, lighting, street furniture, artworks, or display windows where possible.
- e. Vehicle ingress and egress, loading facilities and building services should be designed so that they do not detract from a high quality, safe and attractive public realm.



<b>POL</b>	<b>PHOENIX ACTIVITY CENTRE DESIGN GUIDELINES</b>	<b>LPP XX</b>
------------	--	---------------

- e) Wherever possible development should use built form to signify entry points rather than relying on signage elements (including 'signage' structures) to serve as a landmark to the shopping centre, and/or to signify the location of entrances to the shopping centre.
- f) Wherever possible the opportunity to "sleeve" large scale retail and/or to introduce outwards-facing uses to avoid blank walls is strongly encouraged. Buildings at ground level should contain activities that positively contribute (either passively or actively) to the public domain.
- g) Ensure where appropriate that development complements and corresponds to neighbouring or abutting built form through consideration of form, detail and application of materials.

#### **4. Visual Impact**

- a) Development must demonstrate the visual impact of development from the surrounding area, particularly from the residential area to the east of the activity centre.
- b) Buildings and structures should present well from all angles as some may be visible from a considerable distance.
- c) Development should demonstrate that consideration has been given to the vista and pedestrian connectivity from Orleans Street, including ensuring the following is achieved:
  - a. The establishment of safe and attractive pedestrian connectivity;
  - b. ensuring development is not obtrusive when viewed from Orleans Street

#### **5. Capacity for future residential**

- a) Major redevelopment or expansion of the shopping centre must demonstrate a capacity for future residential above retail on the shopping centre site.

#### **6. Signage**

- a) All development applications should be accompanied by information regarding the location and scale of signage.
- b) Signage should be:
  - Be contained within the boundary of the lot
  - Be easy to read and provide a clear message
  - Only advertise goods and services that relate to the business on which the sign is located

<b>POL</b>	<b>PHOENIX ACTIVITY CENTRE DESIGN GUIDELINES</b>	<b>LPP XX</b>
------------	--	---------------

- c) Signage is to be an integrated part of the building/site, and should be compatible with the scale, design and visual character of the building/site, and should not result in visual clutter.
- d) Signage is not to cover a large proportion of the shopfront window, or prevent passive surveillance.
- e) Signage and signage structure should not be used in isolation to signify entry points to development.

## **7. Landscaping**

- a) Development proposals should include the retention of existing landscaping on March Street to provide a buffer with the residential development on the eastern side of the road.

DRAFT

POL	PHOENIX ACTIVITY CENTRE DESIGN GUIDELINES	LPP XX
-----	---	--------

#### **(4) Mixed Use Precinct**

##### **1. Objectives**

- a) To create a vibrant mixed use environment that facilitates a diversity of uses.
- b) Promote a diversity of housing types within the activity centre structure plan area.
- c) To encourage rationalisation of signage to reduce visual clutter and enhance the streetscape.
- d) To encourage mixed use development whereby non-residential uses can be accommodated at the ground floor.
- e) To ensure residential amenity and security is protected in mixed use environments.
- f) To protect the residential amenity of dwellings on adjacent 'Residential' zoned land.
- g) To ensure high quality built form in the 'Mixed Use' zone that provides interest to the street, and promotes passive surveillance.
- h) To ensure new development in the 'Mixed Use' zone achieves visual cohesiveness.
- i) To ensure buildings are robust and adaptable to allow for future use changes so that the mixed use area can evolve over time to meet the needs of businesses and the community.
- j) To ensure that buildings give additional prominence to street corners by using landmark features which will create visual interest in the streetscape and assist with legibility.
- k) To ensure buildings contribute positively to the public realm by creating visual interest, facilitating passive surveillance of streets and spaces used by the public, and contributing to pedestrian comfort.
- l) To ensure safe vehicle access and egress to Rockingham Road, and improve pedestrian safety and comfort by:
  - Rationalising vehicle crossovers to Rockingham Road generally;
  - Establishing a new shared accessway with car parking parallel to Rockingham Road for the 'Mixed Use' zone to rationalise crossovers to Rockingham Road and ensure ease of access for businesses and dwellings.

<b>POL</b>	<b>PHOENIX ACTIVITY CENTRE DESIGN GUIDELINES</b>	<b>LPP XX</b>
------------	--	---------------

- m) To improve the pedestrian amenity of Rockingham Road through the introduction of a landscaping strip.

## **2. General Built Form Provisions**

- a) Development should incorporate non-residential ground floor uses that promote activity and informal surveillance of the street and have facades that add interest and vitality to the public realm.
- b) Where commercial uses are not considered viable in the short term, ground floor tenancies should be designed to be adaptable for future commercial uses, including incorporating a minimum ground floor tenancy height of 3.9 metres above the finished ground floor level. In this respect a maximum building height of 10m will be accepted to accommodate this requirement.
- c) Where the ground floor is designed accordingly the plot ratio of the ground floor will be in addition to that of the residential development, calculated in accordance with the Residential Design Codes.
- d) To ensure that building facades are architecturally interesting the upper levels of buildings should be articulated to break-up long sections of plain facades. This should include at least three of the following features:
- Major openings;
  - Different colours, materials or textures;
  - Indentations and extrusions which break the building into individual elements;
  - Protruding balconies;
  - Awnings over windows.
- e) All building levels should be clearly defined through the use of colours, materials and detailing.
- f) The upper level(s) of buildings should be designed to promote informal surveillance of the street through the use of balconies and/or large windows.
- g) Upper floor windows of buildings should be largely unobscured to promote passive surveillance.
- h) Ground floor non-residential frontages are to be designed as shop fronts, with no less than 70% of the shop front glazed with clear glass (and unobscured by signage or stickers) to facilitate passive surveillance.
- i) Buildings should address the street in a traditional manner with windows facing the street and clearly defined entry points that are visible from the street. To achieve this entry points should generally include at least two of the following features:

<b>POL</b>	<b>PHOENIX ACTIVITY CENTRE DESIGN GUIDELINES</b>	<b>LPP XX</b>
------------	--	---------------

- a. Appropriately scaled signage above the entry door;
  - b. Indentation of the entry point, with recessed entrances truncated at an angle to the pedestrian route of no less than 60 degrees;
  - c. Highlighting the entry point through the use of different materials.
- j) Buildings should be designed so that services do not project above the specified maximum height of the building, and should be screened from view. To ensure adaptability of buildings this should include consideration of larger servicing unit requirements for other uses (such as restaurants) so that these can be accommodated should the building undergo a future change of use.
- k) To articulate street corners to provide visual interest and assist with legibility, new buildings located on corner sites should include:
- Architectural roof features that protrude above the normal roof line;
  - Increased parapet heights with additional detail, colour and textures; and/or
  - An increased number of storeys at the street corner.
- l) New buildings with parapets should include indentations; additional modulation, and/or variation in parapet heights and designs so as to provide additional interest to the street.
- m) In mixed use developments commercial uses should be separated from residential uses by being located on separate floors of a building to ensure the amenity and security of residents and commercial tenants.
- n) Development applications are to be accompanied by design and documentation of 'back-of-house' services, including ducting and vents. To ensure the robustness and adaptability of buildings this should consider a general and basic overview of potential 'back-of-house' services for food businesses (such as ducting and vents allowing for the mechanical ventilation of kitchen areas, and 'grease traps').

### **3. Parking and Movement**

- a) Where new building(s) are proposed within the 'Phoenix Mixed Use Development and Access Precinct' they are required to be setback in accordance with the 'Phoenix Mixed Use Access Plan' (Appendix 1), which requires:
- Establishment of a new 12m wide access and parking easement in the front setback, setback 2m from the road reserve, with one crossover to Rockingham Road where access from the access easement is not yet available.
  - Contrasting asphalt colour between the aisle and parking bays.



<b>POL</b>	<b>PHOENIX ACTIVITY CENTRE DESIGN GUIDELINES</b>	<b>LPP XX</b>
------------	--	---------------

- 90 degree parking adjacent to the road.
  - The access and parking easement being setback 2m from the road reserve to establish a 2m wide landscaping strip.
- b) At-grade car parking areas should be landscaped with suitable trees at the rate of one tree per 6 bays. The chosen trees should provide shade, improve amenity and assist in visual screening from above. The car park should also be appropriately lit for after-dark use.
  - c) Any new multi-storey car parks should incorporate interactive street frontages, such as shops or other uses that promote activity, where possible. These can be 'sleeved' along the street frontages of the car park structure.
  - d) Where car parking levels (including undercroft levels) are visible from a street or public space, high quality architectural detailing shall be incorporated into the façade of all floors.
  - e) Development proposals should include only one vehicle crossover, to be placed where there is no street tree.
  - f) Wherever possible the finished level of buildings/tenancies should match that of the adjacent footpath so that continuous access is provided from the pedestrian footpath into each commercial tenancy and a consistent streetscape is achieved on Rockingham Road.
  - g) Services should be located away from the street and towards the rear of the site to minimise impact on the pedestrian environment.
  - h) Safe and comfortable pedestrian access shall be provided from the parking area to the entry point of the proposed development and to all street frontages.
  - i) For developments that include parking at the rear of the building pedestrian access between the street and car parking area is to be provided.

#### **4. Servicing**

- a) Bin and service enclosures are to be screened and located away from visually prominent parts of the site. Wherever possible services should be designed to visually integrate into buildings, rather than be a separate element.
- b) Development will need to conform to the City's Local Planning Policy related to Waste Management Plans in Multiple Unit development.

#### **5. Change of use proposals for dwellings**

<b>POL</b>	<b>PHOENIX ACTIVITY CENTRE DESIGN GUIDELINES</b>	<b>LPP XX</b>
------------	--	---------------

a) Where the existing dwelling or building is the subject of a change of use proposal (to be accommodated within an existing dwelling/building), the following provisions will apply:

- Only one vehicle crossover is to be utilised, with any existing additional crossovers to be removed unless safe access and egress cannot be accommodated otherwise.
- Existing large crossovers are to be reduced in size.
- Car parking areas are to be designed so that vehicles can exit onto Rockingham Road in forward gear.

## **6. Landscaping**

- a) A comprehensive landscaping plan is required for the front setback area and verge, demonstrating an appropriate and attractive mix of hard paving and in-ground planting, provided that the plantings maintain an openness to the building to ensure a visible and safe entrance, and create no potential entrapment areas.
- b) Water-sensitive design planting principles will be encouraged.
- c) Opportunities should be taken to include simple pedestrian amenities such as seats and shade/shelter.

**(5) Northern Precinct****1. Objectives**

- a) To ensure buildings contribute positively to the public realm by creating visual interest, facilitating passive surveillance of streets and spaces used by the public, and contributing to pedestrian comfort.
- b) To facilitate safe, comfortable pedestrian and cyclist movement, particularly in a north south direction through the activity centre.
- c) To improve legibility for pedestrians throughout the precinct.
- d) To ensure safe and legible vehicle access and egress throughout the precinct, particularly onto Rockingham and Phoenix Road.

**2. General Built Form Provisions**

- a) New buildings or proposed modifications to existing buildings should include clearly identifiable pedestrian entry point(s).

**3. Parking and Movement**

- a) Development must demonstrate how safe and convenient pedestrian movement from the street footpaths and car parking areas to building entry points are facilitated.


**4. Signage**

- a) All applications for development are to be accompanied by a plan showing location and details of any proposed signage.

**5. Landscaping**

- b) Development proposals should include landscaping plans that provide detail of plant species and maintenance.



Appendix 1 - Phoenix Mixed Use Development Access Plan





## City of Cockburn

# Phoenix Activity Centre Structure Plan DRAFT



## Endorsement

Endorsement page example This structure plan is prepared under the provisions of the City/Shire/Town of [NAME] Local Planning Scheme [NUMBER].

IT IS CERTIFIED THAT THIS STRUCTURE PLAN WAS APPROVED BY RESOLUTION OF THE WESTERN AUSTRALIAN PLANNING COMMISSION ON:

[DATE]

Signed for and on behalf of the Western Australian Planning Commission:

---

an officer of the Commission duly authorised by the Commission pursuant to section 16 of the Planning and Development Act 2005 for that purpose, in the presence of:

---

Witness

---

Date

---

Date of Expiry



## PART ONE

### IMPLEMENTATION

#### Structure Plan Area

The Activity Centre Structure Plan boundary was defined in the City of Cockburn Local Commercial and Activity Centre Strategy. This was based on the guidance set out in SPP 4.2, which outlines that the extent of each activity centre should be identified by a boundary in the activity centre structure plan for the purposes of estimating the growth potential and land use mix of the activity centre; and managing the interface between centre-scaled development and adjacent land.

The Phoenix activity centre structure plan boundary is illustrated in Figure 1 and is consistent with that set out in

the LCACS. It encompasses a 400m walkable catchment that includes the 'District Centre' zoned land, the 'Mixed Use' zoned land on the western side of Rockingham Road, some adjacent residential zoned lots, and the City's administration site. This area enables comprehensive consideration of land use and movement in the activity centre.

#### Operation Date

This Activity Centre Structure Plan came into operation on the date it was approved by the Western Australian Planning Commission ("WAPC") \_\_\_\_\_.



**Figure 1. Phoenix Activity Centre Structure Plan area (extract from Local Commercial and Activity Centre Strategy**

re Structure Plan – November 2015





## DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT PLAN – CORE PRECINCT

Development in the Core Precinct should have due regard to the following desired key outcomes:

1. Proposed new shopping centre entry from Rockingham Road/Kent Street, and closure of existing entry immediately to the north.
2. New community gathering space and pedestrian connection, to provide an active frontage and presence to Rockingham Road; and an identifiable entry to the centre, consideration to be given to inclusion of the following elements:
  - Seating for pedestrians
  - Landscaping
  - Children's play equipment
  - Artworks
3. Pedestrian connection improvements – provision of improvements to the pedestrian link including consideration of new surface treatment to clearly delineate the path; weather protection and safe separation for vehicles.
4. Pedestrian connection improvements to the pedestrian link including consideration of new surface treatment to clearly delineate the path; weather protection and safe separation for vehicles, in addition to the possible inclusion of trees along the north-south link on the upper deck of parking.
5. Proposed new roundabouts at Rockingham Road/Kent Street and Rockingham Road/Lancaster Street to slow traffic and provide turnaround points to allow rationalisation of crossovers.
6. New common easement for vehicle access and parking to 'Mixed Use' zone.
7. Improvements to servicing area.



Potential Landmark Sites (if redevelopment occurs)

Potential Public Art locations

## IDEAS AND EXAMPLES FOR THE CORE PRECINCT



Figure 1. Ideas for 'public space'



Figure 2. Ideas to enhance pedestrian access




Figure 3. Ideas for Rockingham Road upgrade to enhance provision for pedestrians



Figure 4. Ideas for Mixed Use development





## DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT PLAN – NORTHERN PRECINCT

Development in the Northern Precinct should have due regard to the following key desired outcomes:

1. New roundabout at Rockingham Road and Lancaster Street to slow traffic and provide turnaround opportunities that allow rationalisation of crossovers to Rockingham to improve pedestrian movement on Rockingham Road.
2. Upgrades to Rockingham Road, including possible terraced landscaping.
3. Improvements to 'dead space' in the south eastern corner of the precinct with removal of under used parking bays, inclusion of a safe pedestrian north-south pathway, and appropriate landscaping.
4. Improve vehicle access through this pinch-point.
5. Requirement for the footpath to connect to parking areas, requiring deletion of parking bay(s) to improve pedestrian movement.
6. Investigate reconfiguration of parking bays to be tandem to prevent cars queuing at the petrol bowlers causing obstruction.



Potential Landmark Sites



Potential Public Art locations

## CONCEPTS AND IDEAS



Figure 1. Ideas for median landscaping Rockingham Road




Figure 2. Provision for pedestrians in new development




Figure 3. Ideas for landmark buildings



Figure 4. Terraced Landscaping





#### DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT PLAN – CIVIC PRECINCT

A Master Plan will be required to determine the future of this site, and this should include investigation of the following key elements:

1. Retention of a 'civic presence'
2. Identification of mature trees and vegetation to be retained.
3. Adaptive reuse of the existing administration building
4. Creation of a new 'community space'
5. Residential development with an appropriate interface with surrounding development.

#### CIVIC PRECINCT IDEAS



Figure 1. Retention of key stands of vegetation in POS areas.





## Staging Plan

The following development triggers and requirements have been identified for the Phoenix Activity Centre:

Development requirements and staging		
	PROPOSAL	REQUIREMENTS
SHOPPING CENTRE	Minor expansion to the floor space (Minor Development Application as defined by LCACS)	<p>The following should be provided as part of an application to commence development:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Demonstrated improvements to the pedestrian environment, including: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Inclusion of a covered walkable on the north south pedestrian path of the northern upper deck of car parking.</li> <li>b) Improvements to the pavement of this path to more clearly delineate the pedestrian path.</li> <li>c) Investigation of insertion of openings in the upper car park deck to provide more light to the ground floor parking area, and to facilitate the possibility of tree planting.</li> <li>a) Utilisation of artworks required pursuant to the City's Percent for Art Local Planning Policy to enhance the appearance of the servicing area to Rockingham Road.</li> </ol> </li> <li>(2) If a new entrance is created to the shopping centre from Kent Street – the creation of a 'public space' to the north of this area that includes landscaping, seating, lighting and artworks to enhance the blank southern façade if an active façade is not proposed in this area.</li> </ol>
	Major floor space expansion (Major Development Application as defined by LCACS)	<p>In addition to the above requirements, the following should be provided as part of an application to commence development:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Improvements/redesign of the March Street servicing area to improve safety and residential amenity.</li> </ol>
	Major expansion that exceeds identified floor space range (Table 1)	<p>Prior to consideration of proposals for major development which exceeds the shop-retail floorspace area identified in Table 1, the City of Cockburn will require the preparation of a Retail Sustainability Assessment, in accordance with State Planning Policy 4.2 – Activity Centres for Perth and Peel.</p> <p>Where the City and the WAPC determine that the proposal substantially changes the intent or form of the Structure Plan, an amendment to the Structure Plan will be required prior to consideration of the proposal.</p>

<b>NORTHERN END</b>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Demonstrated connectivity from building entrances to footpaths.</li> <li>b) Artworks provided as required by Percent for Art Local Planning Policy to provide pedestrian amenity.</li> </ul>
<b>2 Lancaster Street, Spearwood (corner of Rockingham Road and Lancaster Street)</b>	<b>Major expansion</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>c) Improvements to 'dead space' in the south eastern corner of the precinct with removal of under used parking bays, inclusion of a safe pedestrian north-south pathway, and appropriate landscaping.</li> <li>d) Improve vehicle access through this pinch-point.</li> <li>e) Requirement for the footpath to connect to parking areas, requiring deletion of parking bay(s) to improve pedestrian movement.</li> <li>f) Landmark feature and/or public art on corner of Lancaster Street and Rockingham Road.</li> </ul>
<b>MIXED USE PRECINCT</b>	Redevelopment of sites, or substantial modifications and expansion to existing dwellings	Provision of an accessway in front setback for vehicle access, parking and landscaping, consistent with Design Guidelines.
<b>ADMINISTRATION SITE</b>	<b>Any major development</b>	Preparation of a Master Plan for the Administration site.

**TABLE 1: RETAIL AND SHOP FLOOR SPACE**

	2011	2016	2020	2026
<b>SHP</b>	15,864-26,440	18,890-31,483	21,231-35,385	22,508-37,513
<b>RET</b>	54,89	68-113	80-133	85-142



## Percent for Artworks Strategy

Public art can play an important role in establishing a unique sense of place, and can help define the character of an area.

The vision for the Phoenix Activity Centre Structure Plan is to create a place that is:

***DISTINCTIVE*** – A place that reflects local identity and has a distinctive character

Public art is encouraged throughout the Phoenix Activity Centre to achieve the following:

- a) Create visual interest and ‘activate’ adjacent spaces, particularly to enhance the pedestrian and cyclist environment.
- b) Improve legibility throughout the activity centre.
- c) Provide functional infrastructure for pedestrians and cyclists where possible (such as bicycle parking, seating, shade devices, lighting, drink fountains).
- d) Be meaningful for the local community, contributing to local identity within the Activity Centre.
- e) Serve as landmarks for the activity centre where identified in this Policy.
- f) Address safety, maintenance and conservation issues.

Public art/artworks provided by developers or Council are to be generally in accordance with the following requirements, in addition to the requirements of Local Planning Policy APD80 ‘Percent for Art’ where applicable:

### KEY THEMES:

Public art can play an important role in establishing a unique sense of place, and can help define the character of an area.

The Cockburn Coast area is subject to a Placemaking and Public Art Strategy; the Packham North District Structure Plan area has artworks that reflect history relating to Watsonia Factory and Woodlands Homestead.

The Spearwood area shares much common history and themes with the Cockburn Coast area, and this Artworks Strategy seeks to identify some more specific and unique themes for the Spearwood area to strengthen community identity.

The following local themes have been identified for the Phoenix Activity Centre for further exploration and reflection through public art. These themes recount the past, and have relevance to the future:

### A Place of Diversity

*The original settlers of Spearwood came from England, Ireland, Denmark, and Germany; and after 1912 from Croatia, Italy and Portugal.*

*They had diverse backgrounds and occupations – many came via the Goldfields, or from the Eastern States seeking new work opportunities. The one thing they all had in common was that they were resourceful, adaptable, hardworking, and optimistic about the future.*

*They were settlers whose diverse occupations and backgrounds added further to the energy and enthusiasm which characterised the growing community in Spearwood.*

*They moved to Spearwood in search of opportunities for affordable, productive land and employment. They were attracted by its proximity to Fremantle and because of employment opportunities in the nearby area – reasons that today still attract people to the area.*

### A Place with Strong Community Spirit

*The original settlement in Spearwood was closer than that previously seen in the areas further south, or in Bibra Lake, Jandakot, and Hamilton Hill. For residents this meant there were opportunities to meet more frequently, and to work together to gain the facilities they needed for their families. It also meant there was a need for cooperation from neighbours in the growing of produce. A strong sense of community was therefore borne out of living in close proximity.*

*Historically Spearwood did not have a 'town centre', rather a number of places were used to host events – churches, schools, private residences such as those of Mrs Straughair or William Watson.*

*At the outbreak of World War I there were 40 Spearwood residents who enlisted, which was a significant proportion of the district's population. In addition, every member of the community participated in the war effort by fundraising.*

*While the area has always had a strong relationship with Fremantle, it seems there has always been a desire to ensure that as the area grows it does not become part of Fremantle.*

*A strong sense of community spirit still exists in the area today, with many long term residents; an active residents' association; and a long running soccer club dating back to 1929, the Cockburn City Soccer Club (originally the Spearwood Rovers).*

### A History of Agriculture and Market Gardening

*Spearwood is well-known for its history of market gardening, and the area was one of Perth's first major market gardening, providing a variety of produce for Western Australia, including fruit, vegetables, grapes, including the prize winning Globe onion.*

*The area was known for events such as the Spearwood Show, Spearwood Agricultural Association who ceded the Council administration land.*

### Precinct 1: Phoenix Core Artworks Requirements

The following are identified as priority locations for artworks in the Phoenix Core, and artworks in these locations are encouraged:

1. The area on Rockingham Road adjacent to the Coles servicing area and bus stop.
2. The corner of Coleville Crescent and Rockingham Road.

#### 1. Rockingham Road adjacent to the Coles servicing area

Artworks are encouraged in this area to enhance the servicing area of Rockingham Road in the following way:

- Artwork which functions to screen the servicing area and enhance the blank façade to Rockingham Road, which may include a vertical garden element, mural or LED lighting.
- Artwork that also serves to enhance the amenity of pedestrians and patrons of the bus stop.
- Landmark artwork that improve legibility.



**Figure 3. Example of facade mural artwork**




**Figure 2. Example of facade treatment to servicing vents**

### Precinct 2: Northern Precinct Artworks Requirements

Where required by APD80 'Percent for Art', the following artworks are encouraged in the northern commercial end:

1. Artworks which serve to enhance pedestrian/cyclist amenity such as bicycle parking or canopy shading.
2. Artworks that are integrated into the building entry to assist in providing clearly identifiable pedestrian entry point(s).
3. Artworks that assist with legibility through the precinct and in connection to adjacent areas, particularly for pedestrians.
4. Landmark artworks only on the corner of Rockingham Road and Phoenix Road which function as an appropriate 'entry statement' to the activity centre in line with the identified theme(s).

5. Artworks on the corner of Lancaster Street and Rockingham Road to function as a landmark for this precinct and Lancaster Street itself in line with the identified themes.



**Figure 4. Example of pedestrian path treatment**



**Figure 5. Example of surface treatment to assist with wayfinding**

### **Precinct 3: Mixed Use Area**

Where required by APD80 'Percent for Art', the following artworks are encouraged in the Mixed Use Area:

1. Integrated artworks that enhance visual interest for pedestrians, and contribute to the 'finer grain' detail and scale of development.
2. Functional artworks where these can be safely accommodated and where it complements the built form, such as bicycle parking, seating, planter beds.
3. Landmark artworks only on the corner of Rockingham Road and Phoenix Road which function as an appropriate 'entry statement' to the activity centre in line with the identified theme(s).



**Figure 6. Functional artworks - bicycle rack**



**Figure 7. Lighting as artworks**

## Action Plan

Action No.	ACTION	Responsible Agency	Responsible City of Cockburn Service Unit	Priority
1	<b>Adoption of Design Guidelines Local Planning Policy for the Activity Centre</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Adoption of Design Guidelines for the 'Mixed Use' zone providing guidance for mixed use development to encourage commercial uses, including offices, at ground floor.</li> <li>Adoption of Design Guidelines which require new development in the Activity Centre to address streets and public spaces.</li> <li>Preparation of Design Guidelines that require landmark built form in the Activity Centre to add visual interest and improve legibility and amenity.</li> </ul>	City of Cockburn	Strategic Planning	High
2.	<b>Adoption of a vehicle access plan for the Mixed Use zone to ensure safe and legible access.</b>	City of Cockburn	Strategic Planning	High
3.	<b>Upgrade of Rockingham Road between Coleville Crescent and Phoenix Road</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Investigation into the creation of a new entry to the Phoenix Shopping Centre from a new Kent Street/Rockingham Road roundabout, to include a new 'public space' and pedestrian entry.</li> <li>Investigate inclusion of cycle lanes on Rockingham Road as part of the proposed improvements to improve north south connection.</li> <li>Investigate improvements to the amenity at bus stops on Rockingham Road.</li> </ul>	City of Cockburn	Strategic Planning, Engineering Services, Parks services and Phoenix Shopping Centre	High
4.	<b>Investigation of reconfiguration of car parking in the northern end (BP site) to determine whether existing bays adjacent to the access should be parallel.</b>	City of Cockburn	Strategic Planning and Engineering Services	Low
5.	<b>Formulation of a Public Art and Wayfinding Strategy that identifies themes to strengthen a unique identity for the Phoenix Activity Centre and improve legibility.</b>		Strategic Planning	Medium



6.	<i>Improvements to Bavich Park and Gerald Reserve to improve their appearance, and make them more attractive pedestrian connections to the Activity Centre.</i>	<i>City of Cockburn</i>	<i>Parks Services</i>	<i>Medium</i>
7.	<i>Preparation of a Signage Strategy for Rockingham Road.</i>	<i>City of Cockburn</i>	<i>Strategic Planning and Statutory Planning</i>	<i>High</i>
8.	<p><i>Preparation of a Master Plan for the City of Cockburn Administration Site to include investigation of the following key elements:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Retention of a ‘civic presence’</i></li> <li><i>Identification of mature trees and vegetation to be retained.</i></li> <li><i>Adaptive reuse of the existing administration building</i></li> <li><i>Creation of a new ‘community space’</i></li> <li><i>Residential development with an appropriate interface with surrounding development.</i></li> </ul>	<i>City of Cockburn</i>	<i>Strategic Planning and External consultants</i>	<i>High</i>
9.	<p><i>Monitor the performance of the activity centre by undertaking a review every two years, addressing the elements discussed within this Structure Plan relating to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Land use mix diversity targets;</i></li> <li><i>Residential density targets;</i></li> <li><i>Built form and streetscape intensity;</i></li> <li><i>Measuring against the LCACS metrics.</i></li> </ul>	<i>City of Cockburn</i>	<i>Strategic Planning</i>	<i>Ongoing</i>

## PART TWO - EXPLANATORY

# 1. INTRODUCTION

## NEED FOR AN ACTIVITY CENTRE STRUCTURE PLAN

Activity centres are community focal points. They are hubs that attract people for a variety of activities such as shopping, working studying and living. They include uses such as commercial, retail, higher-density housing, entertainment, tourism, civic/community, higher education and medical services.

State Planning Policy 4.2 Activity Centres For Perth and Peel ("SPP 4.2") was gazetted in 2010, and its main purpose is to specify broad planning requirements for the planning and development of new activity centres, and the redevelopment and renewal of existing centres in Perth and Peel.

The Spearwood Activity Centre (also referred to as the 'Phoenix Centre') has been designated within SPP 4.2 as a 'District Centre'. It is the City of Cockburn's second largest centre with 28,000m<sup>2</sup> of retail floor space, and many other associated commercial uses. This centre is the only district level centre within the City of Cockburn, with Cockburn Gateway being the City's regional centre.

SPP 4.2 sets out a policy requirement for activity centre structure plans to be prepared for all district level centres and above. Activity centre structure plans set out the spatial plan and strategy to achieve a compact, pedestrian-friendly, mixed use activity centre that will offer a range of lifestyle choices, reduce car dependency, and limit environmental impact. They are important strategic planning documents which guide land use, urban form, transport and infrastructure planning for larger activity centres.

The City of Cockburn's Local Commercial and Activity Centres Strategy ("LCACS") was adopted by Council in 2012 and sets out the strategic vision and broad framework to

guide the planning and development of the City's activity centres over the next 15 years. The LCACS sets out that that its successful implementation will require early, targeted activity centre structure planning for major commercial activity centres likely to experience significant future growth in the short-medium term. It sets out the requirement for activity centre structure plans to be prepared for district and larger centres, which includes the Phoenix District Centre.

There has already been a considerable amount of strategic planning work completed for the Phoenix District Centre. The Phoenix Revitalisation Strategy was adopted by Council for the Phoenix Centre in 2009. In line with the recommendations of the Revitalisation Strategy, there has been an increase to the residential densities within the 800m catchment around the centre, rezoning of a new 'Mixed Use' area, and numerous improvements to the public realm.

The Phoenix Shopping Centre is likely to undergo refurbishment and possible expansion in the future. The new 'Mixed Use' zoning in the activity centre is likely to generate new land uses and development proposals. The Activity Centre Structure Plan is needed to guide this development. The Revitalisation Strategy has identified the need for improvements to movement and connectivity in the area – the activity centre structure plan further addresses these issues.

The Activity Centre Structure Plan examines the key opportunities and constraints of the area, and identifies key actions to support maturation of the activity centre. It also measures the impact these actions are predicted to have on the criteria, or metrics set out for the centre in the LCACS.


## Defining the Activity Centre Boundary

SPP 4.2 outlines that the extent of each activity centre should be identified by a boundary in the activity centre structure plan for the purposes of estimating the growth potential and land use mix of the activity centre; and managing the interface between centre-scaled development and adjacent land.

SPP 4.2 provides some guidance on defining activity centre boundaries. This includes consideration of factors such as existing zonings; topographical features; major infrastructure; walkable catchments; and use of rear boundaries as an interface for land use change.

The City's activity centres were defined in the LCACS, based on the guidance provided in SPP 4.2. The Phoenix Activity Centre Structure Plan boundary is illustrated in Figure 1 and is consistent with that set out in the LCACS.

It encompasses a 400m walkable catchment that includes the 'District Centre' zoned land, the 'Mixed Use' zoned land on the western side of Rockingham Road, some adjacent residential zoned lots, and the City's administration site. This area enables comprehensive consideration of land use and movement in the activity centre.



**Figure 8. Activity Centre Structure Plan area**

## Vision for the Activity Centre

The Phoenix Revitalisation Strategy and Activity Centre Plan set out key principles that were developed during the preparation and visioning phases of the project which included extensive community input.

These principles have been further refined and consolidated to create a vision for the Activity Centre, which is to create a place that is:



**ADAPTABLE** – A place that can respond to the diverse and changing needs of the community



**EASY TO MOVE AROUND** – A place that is easy for all users to move around, particularly pedestrians and cyclists, and that connects well to existing movement networks and key areas of interest in the surrounding area



**SAFE AND WELCOMING** – A place where people feel safe and secure, and that encourages positive social interaction



**DISTINCTIVE** – A place that reflects local identity and has a distinctive character



## 2. CENTRE CONTEXT **Catchment Area**


The Phoenix Activity Centre catchment area encompasses the suburbs of Spearwood and Hamilton Hill. Given the offering of the Activity Centre the catchment is primarily confined to the surrounding suburbs. Demand analysis suggests that the centre is trading well indicating that the centre has a well justified economic purpose.

Cockburn Gateways; Booragoon Garden City Shopping Centre and Kardinya Park District Centre are within close proximity to the centre. The offering of Kardinya Park is similar, but given the distance between the centres, approximately 7km, and the more local catchment of a district centre, it is not considered to directly compete with the centre. However the growth of the larger centres, Booragoon (12km) and Cockburn Central (11km) does impact on the catchment of the Phoenix Activity Centre, as the growth of these centres is also seeing a substantial growth in their catchment.

The future activity Centres of Port Coogee and Cockburn Coast are also within close proximity to the centre, but are expected to have a different offering to that of the Phoenix Activity Centre, with more of a focus on entertainment and other retail.

### **Neighbouring Attractors**

The Activity Centre is within close proximity to a number of natural attractions, including Manning Park and the coast. Strengthening connections from the Activity Centre to these attractions is considered important to increase pedestrian and cyclist movement through the area, and to build a unique community identity for the Spearwood area



**Figure 9. Centre catchments surrounding the Phoenix Activity Centre**

## PLANNING CONTEXT

### State Planning Policy 4.2

State Planning Policy 4.2 Activity Centres (“SPP 4.2”) aims to:

- improve the integration of activity centres with public transport;
- lower transport energy use and associated carbon emissions;
- ensure centres contain a range of activities to promote community benefits; and
- promote the economic benefits of business clusters.

The Phoenix Activity Centre has been designated within SPP 4.2 as a District Centre. SPP 4.2 describes the role of a District Centre as follows:

*“District centres have a greater focus on servicing the daily and weekly needs of residents. Their relatively smaller scale catchment enables them to have a greater local community focus and provide services, facilities and job opportunities that reflect the particular needs of their catchments.”*

This description is in alignment with the current activities of the Phoenix Activity Centre, with the City’s administration office providing for a greater diversity of employment than would otherwise be anticipated. The current floor space of the Phoenix Activity Centre is 33,000m<sup>2</sup>, comprised of

20,000m<sup>2</sup> of shop floor space and 5,000m<sup>2</sup> of office floor space.

### 3.2.2 Directions 2031

*Directions 2031* is the latest spatial planning framework for Perth and Peel and outlines the planning vision that will guide the planning of Perth and Peel to 2031 and beyond.

The Strategy aims to provide for different lifestyle choices, vibrant nodes for economic and social activity and a more sustainable urban transport network. *Directions 2031* recognises that the role and function of centres will vary depending on their catchment, but should generally:

- provide services, employment and activities that are appropriate for and accessible to the communities they support;
- be integrated with, and encourage the efficient operation of the transport network, with particular emphasis on promoting public transport, walking and cycling, and reducing the number and length of trips;
- be designed based on transit oriented development principles;
- provide opportunities as places to live through higher density housing and the development of social and cultural networks;
- encourage the agglomeration of economic activity and cultivation of business synergies; and support the development of a local identity and sense of place.

## Local Planning Context

### Local Commercial Centre and Activity Centre Strategy

The City of Cockburn’s Local Commercial and Activity Centres Strategy (“LCACS”) represents a new strategic direction for the planning and development of activity centres within the City. It is an important planning document for implementing the new direction for the planning of activity centres in Perth and Peel set by the policy context outlined in *Directions 2031*, and State Planning Policy No. 4.2 – Activity Centres for Perth and Peel. These two documents reflect a growing recognition within the State Government and the planning profession of the complex issues relating to sustainability and planning for the urban environment.

The LCACS sets the strategic vision and broad framework to guide the planning and development of the City’s activity centres and to help guide planning for the City’s strategic employment centres over the next 15 years. The LCACS provides:

- a set of guiding principles derived from an analysis of the objectives of *Directions 2031* and SPP4.2 within the unique context of the City;
- a framework for implementing the principles within the City’s strategic and statutory planning processes;

- an action plan which sets out the key tasks which will aid the implementation of the LCACS; and
- a number of background studies which provide reliable base information on which the City and other stakeholders can base their planning and decision making.

One of the major areas of influence for the LCACS is the guidance of the assessment of structure plans, activity centre structure plans, detailed area plans (DAPs) and development applications within activity centres. There are three distinct levels of planning approval that need to be considered in the implementation of the LCACS. These are:

- Structure planning (district and local);
- Activity centre structure planning (or detailed area planning); and Development applications.

The LCACS assessment areas outlined in Section 4.2 are put to work in the City's decision making when considering proposals at these three planning approval stages. Reporting, justification and assessment of proposals against each assessment area at these three levels must ensure the implementation of the LCACS.

The LCACS included the assessment of each activity centre against criteria or 'metrics'. The Activity Centre Structure Plan identifies how the proposed actions are likely to improve the scores for each of these metrics, and will allow progress to be measured.

### *Phoenix Central Revitalisation Strategy and Activity Centre Plan (2009)*

The Phoenix Central Revitalisation Strategy was adopted by Council in 2009 and provides a strategic framework for improvements to the Phoenix town centre and the surrounding 800m catchment which encompasses parts of the suburbs of Spearwood and Hamilton Hill.

The study area of the Revitalisation Strategy covers the area that correlates approximately to the 800m walkable catchment from the Phoenix town centre, including approximately 4,300 residential properties in the surrounding area.

The aim of the Revitalisation Strategy was to develop the centre according to the principles outlined in the now superseded Network City, replaced by Directions 2031, the Western Australian Planning Commission's high level spatial framework and strategic plan that establishes a vision for future growth of the metropolitan Perth and Peel region.

Preparation of the Revitalisation Strategy included a comprehensive community consultation program, which began in October 2007 with a community visioning phase.

The Revitalisation Strategy provided a comprehensive plan for the Phoenix centre and includes the following key features:

- An increase in residential densities to improve urban land efficiency and housing choice, and create a more sustainable urban environment.
- Improvements to the movement network to improve pedestrian amenity and reduce transport energy demand and private vehicle use.
- Enhancements to local parks and community facilities to improve their visual appearance and usage.

Key recommendations of the Revitalisation Strategy that have been implemented include:

- Increasing residential densities from R20 to R40 in the 400m walkable catchment of the Phoenix Town Centre, around local centres, and along major public transport routes.
- Increasing residential densities within close proximity to the centre to R60.
- Increasing the residential density from R20 to R30 within the 400m to 800m walkable catchment.
- Increasing residential densities to R30/R40 surrounding parks to encourage passive surveillance and active frontages.
- Proposed R160 residential development on the City's administration site in conjunction with the development of the Community Hub.
- Rezoning of the western side of Rockingham Road to a new 'Mixed Use' zone.

One of the key recommendations of the Revitalisation Strategy was improvements to



Rockingham Road, which are currently being explored.

### **City of Cockburn Town Planning Scheme No. 3**

The Structure Plan area is subject to City of Cockburn Town Planning Scheme No. 3. The Phoenix Shopping Centre and adjacent land to the north (south of Phoenix Road), are zoned 'District Centre' (RAC-3).

Pursuant to the Scheme, a residential coding of 'R60' would normally apply to the 'District Centre' zone, however, an 'RAC-3' coding has been introduced to further encourage residential development and mixed use development.

On the western side of Rockingham Road the land is zoned 'Mixed Use' with a residential coding of 'R60'. The surrounding residential area is zoned 'Residential R40' within an approximately 400m walkable catchment from the activity centre. Beyond this area, within the 800m walkable catchment of the activity centre outside the Structure Plan area, the residential coding is predominately 'R30'.

These zonings were recommendations of the Revitalisation Strategy. Much of the 'Mixed Use' zoned area was previously zoned 'Residential R40', and the residential area within the 800m walkable catchment was zoned 'Residential R20'.



**Figure 10. Extract from Town Planning Scheme No. 3 – Phoenix Activity Centre**

### **City of Cockburn Housing Affordability and Diversity Strategy**

The City of Cockburn Housing Affordability and Diversity Strategy was adopted in 2014. The following key findings are relevant to the Activity Centre Structure Plan:

*Housing stock mismatch:* The City's current housing stock does not match the projected smaller households, and will not provide an adequate range of housing choices for future

households. A greater number of smaller dwellings will be required to meet the needs of smaller households.

*Need for a compact urban form:* The Perth Metropolitan Region is still characterised by predominately low density residential codings that have resulted in a housing stock of large detached dwellings, and many dwellings that in general do not have high levels of accessibility. Providing dwellings with good access to services and public transport is particularly important for young people and people with disabilities, who are high users of public transport.

*Declining housing affordability:* The number of Australian households in housing stress has increased dramatically since 2003, and this is a trend that is likely to continue into the future. Households susceptible to housing stress are low income renters, low income households with children, older people renting, and people with disabilities.

*Cost of living impacts for low income households:* All households are impacted on by increasing costs of living, however low income households are the most affected. Housing affordability is a particular issue for family households who have a variety of living expenses that make them more susceptible to financial hardship, in addition to having high housing costs through the requirement in many cases for larger dwellings that have higher rental costs.

*Need for adaptable housing:* In the City of Cockburn there is an ageing population, and 18 per cent of people have a disability. For many of these people their home may not suit their needs either now or in the future, because the number of private and public dwellings that have been built to incorporate universal design elements is very low. Inaccessible housing leads to social disadvantage and has negative effects for social integration and participation. Modifications to dwellings to improve accessibility, such as installation of ramps, are often expensive and unsatisfactory. These costs place increased financial pressure on such households, and moving to find a better house design suited to their specific needs is often not a viable option due to the high 'sunk costs' in the current accommodation.

*Demand for aged care facilities:* The ageing population, particularly the increase in people over 70 years of age, will see an increased demand for aged care facilities for those whose care needs can no longer be met within their own homes.

The demand for low and high care facilities, in addition to respite care will continue to increase across the Perth metropolitan area. In particular there will be a demand for affordable aged care.

## Local Context

### Demographic Profile

The suburbs of Spearwood and Hamilton Hill, which form part of the 800m catchment of the

Activity Centre, are forecast to experience a sharp increase in dwelling growth to 2030 when it will level out.

The household forecasts indicate that this catchment will have the highest proportion of lone person households, approximately 30 per cent. The 800m catchment is characterised by small households, with approximately half of the area having household sizes of less than 1.5 people.

'Couples with dependents' were the dominant household type in 2011, however by 2031 there will almost be the same percentage of 'lone person households' and 'couples without children'.

Currently the housing stock in Hamilton Hill and Spearwood is predominately 3+ bedrooms (74 per cent and 83 per cent respectively). These dwellings do not match the forecast households in the area, and there is a greater need for smaller dwelling types to meet the demand of smaller households.

Currently the area in the northern end of the Activity Centre, where older style apartments are located, accommodate a large percentage of lone person households, indicating the importance of smaller dwellings to meet this need. 20 per cent of occupants of this area do not have a car, and 6.4 percent of residents walked to work, suggesting that they likely work in the Activity Centre.

The Activity Centre is best placed to deliver more additional smaller dwellings that will be required to meet the needs of the future community.

The community within the 800m catchment is characterised by the largest proportion of people in the City of Cockburn born overseas and from non-English speaking backgrounds.

### Defining Characteristics

The Phoenix Activity Centre encompasses 9.5ha of 'District Centre' zoned land that accommodates the Phoenix Shopping Centre, residential apartments and other office and retail uses. It also includes 'Residential' zoned land in the surrounding area, ranging in coding from R30 to R80. On the western side of Rockingham Road is the 'Mixed Use' (R60) zone that is currently characterised predominately by single residential dwellings, with some businesses operating from modified former dwellings.

For the purposes of the Activity Centre Structure Plan the Phoenix Activity Centre can be divided into five precincts:

1. Phoenix Core Area
2. Northern Commercial End
3. Mixed Use zone
4. Civic Precinct
5. Residential Area

### Phoenix Core Area

The Phoenix Core Area includes the Phoenix Shopping Centre, which is an enclosed shopping mall. It also includes a three storey residential apartment building containing 21 apartments, and



a fast food outlet. These uses are interrelated due to their siting and shared vehicle and pedestrian access.

The Phoenix Shopping Centre was originally constructed in the early 1970s, with its primary frontage to Coleville Crescent, and at-grade car parking on the western and southern sides. In these early stages Burgandy Crescent and March Street were connected on the northern side. Adjacent development on Rockingham Road comprised residential dwellings and a service station.

In the late 1970s the centre expanded on the northern and western side, including a new car parking area on the northern side that severed the connection between Burgandy Crescent and March Street. This parking area was subsequently covered with deck parking with the upper deck originally accessible only from Burgandy Court to the north.

However, by 2000 the service station on Rockingham Road was replaced with a MacDonald's restaurant and immediately to the north a ramp from Rockingham Road was added, providing access to the upper parking deck, in addition to the access to the lower level. This created a constrained access arrangement in this area that remains today.

Until the 1990s there were residential dwellings on Rockingham Road in this precinct (immediately to the north of the shopping centre), with the

exception of a bank on the corner of Rockingham Road and Lancaster Street.

This area was subsequently the subject of a 'development concept plan' prepared by Council to coordinate integrated commercial development and car parking. This development plan was adopted by Council in 1990. This 'development concept plan' identified the location of vehicle crossovers and siting of the built form setback from the road with car parking in the front setback.

The commercial development seen today occurred between 1995 and 2003 in accordance with a 'development concept plan'.

Pre-2005 the south west corner (Rockingham Road and Coleville Crescent) of the shopping centre was an open carpark, which enabled views towards this key southern entrance to the shopping centre. In 2006 this area had another level of car parking added, with a roof over a portion of the upper storey, completed in 2007. This decked car parking area has obscured a prominent part of the shopping centre.

The incremental development of the shopping centre and adjacent commercial area, particularly the car parking areas, has created a number of key issues including:

- Restricted permeability for pedestrians and cyclists in a north south direction, and from Rockingham Road.

- Poor exposure for the shopping centre to Rockingham Road, and reliance on signage as a landmark.
- Poor exposure for commercial development that is set back from Rockingham Road resulting in reliance on signage.

### Northern Commercial End

The northern commercial end precinct is defined as the area north of Lancaster Street and south of Phoenix Road within the Activity Centre. This area is zoned 'District Centre' and includes internal private streets, and numerous landholdings in separate ownership, with various easements over the car parking areas. The land uses in this area include a number of take-away restaurants, shops, a service station, a gym, dental surgery and a number of small shops. A number of these premises have had a variety of different land uses and businesses in the last few years.

This area was developed in its current form later than the Phoenix core area. In the early 1970s the land between Lancaster Street and Phoenix Road was the site of the Phoenix Hotel. This was constructed around the same time as the three residential apartment buildings to the east.

The existing Hungry Jacks restaurant was constructed to the north of the Hotel with no direct frontage to Rockingham Road. At the same time the 'Lancaster House' commercial office building was constructed on the new lot, which still remains.

In the late 1990s the Phoenix Hotel was demolished and replaced with the current service station and other commercial buildings which were created and subdivided/strata-titled incrementally around 'Lancaster House' and the Hungry Jacks restaurant and associated easements.

The incremental development and subdivision/strata titling of this site has created the following key issues:

- Fragmented landownership which restricts options for future development or redevelopment.
- Complex easement arrangements for car parking and access which restrict access options.
- Disjointed car parking areas.
- Lack of cohesion in the built form.
- Inadequate consideration of pedestrian and cyclist movement throughout the precinct.

### **Mixed Use Precinct**

Rockingham Road is a key component of the activity centre, and the adjacent land uses.

The western side of the Rockingham Road opposite the Phoenix Shopping Centre is zoned 'Mixed Use', and is predominately residential properties and a number of dwellings converted to businesses.

Redevelopment of these lots has the potential to appear ad-hoc given fragmented landownership.

Therefore Design Guidelines are required to ensure coordinated and cohesive development occurs.

The northern section of the 'Mixed Use' zone is characterised by medical uses such as physiotherapy, pathology and pharmacy, in addition to other office uses. Car parking is located in the front setback. This section of Rockingham Road is unlikely to see substantial redevelopment given the age of the buildings, less than ten years old, however 'change of use' proposals are likely over time.

### **Civic Precinct**

The City of Cockburn administration centre, Seniors Centre and Spearwood library are located to the south of the Phoenix Shopping Centre. The site contains stands of mature trees and vegetation, and has a recreation function, containing BBQs and exercise equipment.

### **Residential Precinct**

The surrounding area is zoned 'Residential' with codings of R40, R60 and R80, recoded in 2010 as an outcome of the Revitalisation Strategy. Typically lots in the area are 700m<sup>2</sup> in area, and prior to rezoning they were typical single residential dwellings, although there are some older style grouped and multiple dwellings in the area. A proportion of single residential lots that have been recoded have been redeveloped with grouped or multiple dwellings.

### 3. MOVEMENT

#### Public transport infrastructure

The Activity Centre is well-served by public transport, with high-frequency bus routes operating on Rockingham Road.

However, the two bus stops along Rockingham Road within the activity centre have poor amenity due to:

- Lack of sun protection resulting from the orientation of the bus shelter.
- Closeness to the road due to the narrowness of the road reserve - when there are large numbers of people waiting at the bus stop during peak periods, the footpath becomes partially obstructed.
- Proximity to a key Phoenix Shopping Centre servicing area.

Safe, high quality bus stops are important because they create a positive perception of public transport, and can promote the attractiveness of this travel mode over others.

Attractive, efficient and convenient public transport access can reduce private car dependency by encouraging use of public transport. This can also lead to a more efficient use of land within an activity centre to the benefit of businesses and the community. The quality of the public transport infrastructure plays an important role in the attractiveness of this travel mode over others.

It is therefore recommended that opportunities for improvements to the amenity of the bus stops be investigated by the City of Cockburn as part of the proposed upgrade of Rockingham Road.

#### Pedestrian and cyclist movement and amenity

##### *Regional Cycle Network*

Connections to activity centres are important for the promotion of cycling for short local trips that are often made by car but can be easily replaced by cycling.

The activity centre is not well served by the existing Shared Use Path or PBN networks. The City of Cockburn Bicycle Network and Footpath Plan (2010) identified the need to provide a new north/south connection through the City providing access to Fremantle and retail/commercial activities along Rockingham Road. The proposed improvements to Rockingham Road include cycle lanes on Rockingham Road to improve north south connection.

There are a number of key local destinations within close proximity to the activity centre that could benefit from improved connectivity, including:

- Manning Park/Azalea Ley Museum
- Port Coogee

It is considered that adoption of a wayfinding strategy for the Activity Centre would assist in promoting cyclist movements between these attractions which are within easy cycling distance.

## Local Cycle and Pedestrian Movement

The walk network within the Activity Centre is restricted to the larger grained road network, however most centre access is designed for vehicles within car parking environments. This means that there are a number of conflict points for pedestrians and vehicles.

The car parks throughout the activity centre do not have good provision for pedestrians. In the Core Precinct, the upper deck on the northern side of the shopping centre lacks shade, and at the lower level there is no pedestrian path provided for. It is proposed that improvements to the pedestrian environment of the centre be a requirement of any expansion of the shopping centre to address this issue.

This includes improvements to the pedestrian link on the vehicle ramp to Rockingham Road and Burgundy Court, including consideration of new surface treatment to delineate the path; weather protection and safe separation from vehicles.

The frequency, width and design of vehicle crossovers have a significant impact on pedestrian comfort. The footpaths on both sides of Rockingham Road (particularly on the eastern side adjacent to the Phoenix shopping centre) are frequently interrupted by wide vehicle crossovers. This has a significant negative impact on pedestrian amenity by disrupting and slowing pedestrian movement, and increasing the potential for pedestrian/cyclist and vehicle conflict.

The footpaths along Rockingham Road are also narrow and mostly directly abutting the kerb given the narrowness of the road reserve.

The majority of vehicle accidents involving pedestrians occur mid-block, rather than at intersections, and this highlights the need for safe pedestrian crossings mid-block (Worley Parsons 2010). Rockingham Road through the activity centre was identified for a 'mid-block crossing review' in the City of Cockburn Bicycle Network and Footpath Plan (2010).

Pedestrian movement from the southern end of the Structure Plan area to the northern end is frequently taken through the shopping centre, likely to be as a result of the unpleasant pedestrian environment along Rockingham Road, and the lack of other options. This means that pedestrian movement is restricted afterhours when the Phoenix Shopping Centre is closed.

The proposed improvements to Rockingham Road include rationalisation of crossovers and a reduction in size of crossovers where appropriate. These measures will greatly assist in improving pedestrian movement on Rockingham Road, and will make this a more attractive pedestrian route.

Critically the shopping centre area lacks a clear entry point for pedestrians. The proposed improvements to Rockingham Road include a new proposed entry to the centre from Kent Street, via a new roundabout. This will provide an important opportunity to create an attractive pedestrian entry to the centre where the existing southern vehicle entrance is currently.



**Figure 11. Shopping centre vehicle access - Rockingham Road**



**Figure 12. Existing connecting path on northern side of upper deck parking - opportunity for improvement to pedestrian amenity.**

Pedestrian movement in the northern end of the site is not well catered for. Pedestrian movement from Lancaster Street to the Northern Precinct is within the car park environment, and the topography of this area makes pedestrian movement even more unsafe due to poor visibility for pedestrians and vehicles (Figure 16). This area has poorly used parking bays on the eastern side and an uneven boundary that creates 'deadspace' in the south eastern corner of the Northern Precinct (Figure 13)

The opportunity exists to create a separate north south pedestrian pathway in this area on the eastern side, with the 'deadspace' area landscaped to improve pedestrian comfort and safety. This is a proposed requirement of any development of this land in the Northern Commercial Precinct.

Overall the activity centre lacks active frontages which are important for creating an interesting pedestrian environment which will attract walking. Design Guidelines have been prepared setting out the requirement for new development to include active frontages to address this issue.

Key adjoining streets for pedestrian connections to the centre are Kent Street, Lancaster Street, March Street and Glendower way. These streets lack street trees and continuous footpaths, which negatively impact the pedestrian experience.

The finer details of street footpath network lack connectivity which has a negative impact on pedestrian comfort and safety. In particular there are instances where street footpaths do not connect to commercial



**Figure 13. Northern Precinct - area of poor north south pedestrian connectivity and underutilised car parking**

landholdings. Redevelopment of these sites should require these connections to be established in a way



**Figure 16. Ramp from Rockingham Road**

that ensures convenient pedestrian movement is established and maintained.

Throughout the activity centre there is a lack of amenities for pedestrians and cyclists, such as seating and water fountains. A number of key pedestrian routes to the activity centre are long streets, such as Kent Street, which could benefit from some seating along the way to break up the journey and encourage walking. This would



**Figure 15. Northern Precinct - area of poor north south pedestrian connectivity, and 'deadspace area'**

**Figure 14. Pathways that do not connect in the Northern Precinct**





particularly benefit older people, and people with disabilities.

## Vehicle movement and access

Vehicular connectivity throughout the 'District Centre' zoned area of the activity centre lacks legibility and permeability. This includes movement from the Core Precinct to the Northern Precinct.

In and around the Phoenix Shopping Centre site traffic movement is constrained by ground level changes (and resultant retaining walls), deck parking arrangements, and complicated vehicular entrances. Traffic movement from Rockingham Road around the MacDonald's Restaurant has a complicated vehicular entrance which creates the potential for conflict and confusion.

In many instances legibility for vehicles is heavily reliant on signage, particularly the entrance from Rockingham Road to the upper deck of car parking (Figure 17).



**Figure 17. Rockingham Road vehicle entrance to upper deck parking - relies on signage**

A key recommendation of the Phoenix Revitalisation Strategy was the upgrade of Rockingham Road, and the City is progressing plans for an upgrade with the objective of slowing traffic, improving the pedestrian environment, enhancing the streetscape, improving legibility and signalling entry to the Activity Centre.

A key component of the proposed Rockingham Road upgrade is the possible introduction of a new roundabout at the intersection of Kent Street and Rockingham Road. This would provide a new direct entry from Rockingham Road to the Phoenix Shopping Centre south of the existing southern entry. This would provide the opportunity to create a new highly visible entrance to the centre, allowing the current entrance to be closed. This will create an area to the south of the shopping centre, adjacent to the new entrance, which can be used to create a pedestrian entry and amenity space with landscaping.

This will provide the centre with an attractive and distinctive new entry for pedestrians and vehicles, whilst also providing an entry statement for the Activity Centre.



**Figure 19. View of Rockingham Road Southern entrance to become new 'public space' and pedestrian entry**



**Figure 18. Southern entrance from Rockingham Road, currently relies on signage, proposed relocation south**

In the Northern Precinct vehicle access from Rockingham Road (northern entrance) can experience queuing from the servicing station blocking traffic. The Development Approval for the service station required the parking bays to the north of the entrance to be parallel, however the bays are perpendicular, reducing the width of this access. At times this results in queuing from the service station blocking the narrow access.

The perpendicular bays were allowed in the scenario where this access did not connect to the rest of the precinct. Therefore given that connectivity has been established it is considered appropriate to investigate whether these parking bays should be redesigned to be parallel, providing greater access width for this entry,



**Figure 20. Northern end parking bays for re-consideration, orange line showing where access was intended to be blocked**

The Mixed Use precinct currently comprises small lots in fragmented landownership, therefore there are multiple crossovers to Rockingham Road. To achieve cohesive development and coordinated vehicle access it is proposed that in addition to Design Guidelines for the area, a vehicle access plan be prepared to ultimately create a vehicle access easement, almost a service road, in the front setback for access and parking. Ultimately this would facilitate rationalisation of crossovers and coordinated access point.

## Servicing

The Phoenix Shopping Centre has a number of servicing areas on the north, east and western sides, with the two main servicing areas located on Rockingham Road, and March Street (Figures 22 and 21).


The Coles servicing area is particularly important given its prominent location on Rockingham Road between two main entrances to the shopping centre, and adjacent to a key bus stop. The following issues are noted for this servicing area:

- Includes and currently requires two wide crossovers which break pedestrian movement along Rockingham Road in this section
- Results in a blank, inactive facade to Rockingham Road
- Includes a level change down from the road
- Located adjacent to a well-used bus stop

With the exception of a complete redevelopment of the centre, this servicing area is likely to remain in this location given that it is the servicing area of a major retail tenancy



**Figure 22. Rockingham Road (Coles) servicing area**



**Figure 21. March Street servicing area**

that would likely remain a key component of the centre as part of any expansion or refurbishment. It is therefore

possible that expansion or refurbishment of the centre may not include any specific modifications to this servicing area, yet such improvements are considered critical to address the above issues and achieve the following:

- Improve pedestrian movement along this section of Rockingham Road which is critical given it is used to access the bus stop and main entrance to the centre.
- Provide a more active frontage to improve pedestrian amenity.

It is therefore proposed that any expansion of the centre demonstrate how improvements to pedestrian amenity have been addressed in this area.

It is considered that any artworks required pursuant to the City's Percent for Art Policy be provided in this area to improve pedestrian amenity. This is reflected in the Phoenix Percent for Artworks Strategy.

The March Street servicing area (Woolworths and Big W) has been the subject of ongoing complaints from residents on March Street expressing concerns regarding reversing servicing vehicles. Any major expansion to the shopping centre will be required to explore the potential for improvements to this area to address safe vehicle movements and the interface with residential development.

## Movement Actions

1. *Investigation into the creation of a new entry to the Phoenix Shopping Centre from a new Kent Street/Rockingham Road roundabout, to include a new 'public space' and pedestrian entry.*
2. *Requirement for any expansion of the centre to demonstrate how pedestrian connectivity and amenity has been addressed, including:*
  - *Improvements to the pedestrian link from the centre to Burgandy Court and Rockingham Road, including consideration of new surface treatment to clearly delineate the path; weather protection and safe separation for vehicles, in addition to the possible inclusion of trees along the north-south link on the upper deck of parking.*
3. *Improvements to pedestrian amenity along Rockingham Road adjacent to the Rockingham Road shopping centre servicing area which is critical given it is used to access the bus stop and main entrance to the centre.*
  - *Provide a more active frontage to improve pedestrian amenity.*
  - *To improve legibility to the centre.*
4. *Artworks required pursuant to the City's Percent for Art Policy be provided in the vicinity of the*
5. *Adoption of Design Guidelines and a vehicle access plan for the Mixed Use zone to ensure safe and legible access.*
6. *Investigation of reconfiguration of car parking in the northern end (BP site) to determine whether existing bays adjacent to the access should be parallel.*
7. *Preparation of a wayfinding strategy for the Activity Centre to assist in promoting cyclist movements between nearby attractions and within the centre.*
8. *Investigate inclusion of cycle lanes on Rockingham Road as part of the proposed improvements to improve north south connection.*
9. *Requirement for any development of 2 Lancaster Street to include a separate north-south pedestrian pathway from Lancaster Street (on the eastern side) with the 'deadspace' area landscaped to improve pedestrian comfort and safety.*

*Rockingham Road shopping centre servicing area area to improve pedestrian amenity (Phoenix Percent for Artworks Strategy)*

## LCACS Scores and Outcomes

*The Phoenix Activity Centre currently achieves an overall accessibility score of 7, which is below the benchmark score of 8 for a District Centre.*

*It is anticipated that implementation of the Activity Centre Structure Plan actions and improvements to the walkability within the centre and to the centre; and to the cycle network will result in an improved score of 8 which is considered within the desired level for a district centre.*





## 4. ACTIVITY

### Dwellings

The Phoenix activity centre is located in an established suburban area, and historically the urban form has consisted predominantly of low density single dwellings.

The activity centre has some higher density housing in the four three-storey apartment buildings constructed in the late 1960s/early 1970s when the Phoenix Shopping Centre was built. In total these buildings contribute to the diversity of dwellings, and provide some of the most affordable, smaller housing options within the Activity Centre and the City of Cockburn:

- 75 Phoenix Road - 48 apartments (three storey building 1 and two bedroom apartments)
- 83 Phoenix and 15 Glendower Way – 51 apartments (two bedroom apartments)
- 3 Burgandy Court in the Phoenix Shopping Centre precinct (21 two bedroom/one bathroom dwellings at 67m<sup>2</sup>).



**Figure 23. Glendower Way, Spearwood – 24 single bedroom apartments**

The Phoenix Revitalisation Strategy identified residential zoning changes for the 800m walkable catchment to the centre as follows:

- Increasing residential densities within close proximity to the centre to R60.
- Increasing residential densities from R20 to R40 in the 400m walkable catchment of the Phoenix Town Centre, around local centres, and along major public transport routes.
- Increasing the residential density from R20 to R30 within the 400m to 800m walkable catchment.
- Increasing residential densities to R30/R40 surrounding public open space to encourage passive surveillance and active frontages.

These residential coding changes were gazetted in 2010, and subsequently there has been significant infill development occurring. This has taken the form of:

- ‘Battleaxe’ subdivisions with retention of an existing dwelling (typically located at the front of the dwelling, although in some cases at the rear), and the addition of another dwelling (typically one or two) to the rear.
- Demolition of an original dwelling for redevelopment of the site (typically with three grouped dwellings).
- Demolition of an original dwelling for redevelopment of the site with multiple dwellings.

These residential codings will facilitate an additional 325 dwelling units within the Activity Centre. Along Rockingham Road a new ‘Mixed Use’ zone will potentially facilitate an additional 79 dwelling units. The majority of these dwellings will be smaller dwellings particularly in the ‘Mixed Use’ zone, where they will be predominately ‘shop-top’ housing. This will assist in improving housing diversity and in meeting the needs of the growing number of smaller households.



### Phoenix Activity Centre Projected Infill Development

Residential zoned land	
R40	+ 120 du
R60	+ 37 du
R80	+17 du
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>+ 325 du</b>
Mixed Use zoned land (total area 1.48 ha)	+79 du
<b>ADDITIONAL DWELLINGS FOR ACTIVITY CENTRE</b>	<b>411 du</b>

Phoenix District Centre				
Walkable Catchment:	400 m			
Gross Area:	38.59 ha			
Residential Density				
	Targets		Shortfall	
	Minimum	Desirable	Minimum	Desirable
Existing				
9.1 dwellings/ha	20 dwellings/ha	30 dwellings/ha		
353 dwellings	770 dwellings	1,155 dwellings	417 dwellings	803 dwellings

The 400m catchment includes 106 residential properties which are typically sized between 700sqm and 900sqm, in individual ownership.

It is considered unlikely that higher residential codings than those currently designated (between R30 and R80) would be likely to result in a substantial increase in ultimate dwelling numbers. The development of multiple dwellings typically occurs on larger lots, with lots larger than 1,000sqm in the Spearwood area being the most attractive for redevelopment of multiple dwellings. Smaller lots (regardless of the coding) have typically been developed to accommodate between two and four grouped dwellings.

Therefore the estimated additional 411 dwelling units in the 'Residential' and 'Mixed Use' zoned portions of the activity centre is likely to be the largest increased possible without undertaking compulsory acquisitions to consolidate land parcels and undertake development at a larger scale.

Under the current residential codings the minimum targets set out in SPP 4.2 will almost be achieved (417 dwellings).

It is therefore considered at this stage that the current residential codings are appropriate in the context of the activity centre.


However, to maximise upper floor residential dwellings which would increase dwelling numbers, particularly the number of smaller, affordable dwellings, Design Guidelines have been prepared for the Mixed Use zone.

## LCACS Outcomes and Goals

*Analysis of the walkable catchment indicates that the current residential density is 9.1 dwellings per gross hectare.*

*This translates to an overall intensity score of 1.75, which is below the average score of 2.25 and below the best of type score for a District Centre.*

*The new 'Mixed Use' zoning and higher residential coding for the shopping centre site (R-AC3) will facilitate greater opportunities for housing in the activity centre. It is anticipated that a score of 2.50 could be achievable with the addition of residential dwellings under the current zonings.*



## Land Uses and Diversity

It is important for activity centres to have an appropriate mix of uses to encourage vibrant, safe and diverse centres. For this to occur diverse and complementary land uses are required, rather than a centre dominated by typical retail uses.

The Phoenix activity centre does perform well in relation to the 'Mix of Uses' threshold (Tables 3 SPP 4.2) with a surplus of 3,237m<sup>2</sup> floorspace that is non-retail. This indicates that there is a good balance between retail and other floor space in the centre which is an important component of diversity.

It is noted that the activity centre does not perform well in the 'diversity index' which measures the diversity or richness of different uses. There is the potential for increases in floor area of 'entertainment', 'office', and 'health uses'. The addition of residential floor space will also improve the diversity index. Such uses can be accommodated in the new 'Mixed Use' zone, and within the existing 'District Centre' zone.

The proposed upgrade of Rockingham Road will slow traffic and make the road more pedestrian friendly, and this will encourage new uses in the 'Mixed Use' zone. Ultimately these ground floor tenancies will be attractive as restaurants and cafes. Design Guidelines for this area will require robust ground floor that can be converted to commercial if that is not viable in the short term.

## LCACS Outcomes and Goals

*Currently the Phoenix Activity Centre has an overall diversity score of 4.25, which is below the average score of 4.75 and below the best type of score for a District Centre.*

*Of primary importance is the balance of retail and non-retail floorspace, which rates well. It is considered that the poor score for the 'diversity index' will improve as the centre sees more residential and office uses, however at this stage it is difficult to estimate to what extent this will improve the score.*

*It is also noted that this score in itself does not accurately reflect diversity of land uses that will be important for the vitality of the centre. For example, an increase in uses such as cafes and restaurants will be important for afterhours activation, and to provide local destinations that will encourage walking and cycling to the centre.*

## Employment


The Phoenix Activity Centre currently accommodates 1,065 employment opportunities, which equates to an employment density of 100 jobs per hectare. Approximately 12% of the jobs are knowledge intensive or export orientated (KIEO).

Employment can be divided into two categories - population driven activity and knowledge-intensive employment. Population driven employment will exist to a large extent with the introduction of a population

(eg. retail centres, basic producer services, hospitals and institutional centre).

Knowledge-intensive employment refers to high-quality knowledge-intensive jobs where the application or creation of knowledge opens up global markets for local outputs (eg. legal and financial services, technology research and development). In general there is a lack of knowledge-intensive employment outside the Perth Central Area, which has resulted in a disparity of employment in other centres, and low employment self-sufficiency.

An immature population driven centre services only the basic consumer needs of its catchment, and is characterised by low concentrations of KICS and strategic employment.



**Figure 24. Target for Phoenix Centre - Diverse population drive centre**

The target maturity level for a centre must be considered in the context of the Activity Centre. Not all centres are required to reach the highest level of maturity. LCACS has outlined that secondary centres and below, maturation beyond a diverse population drive level is unnecessary and can be undesirable as it can detract from growth and maturation of higher order centres. Therefore the Phoenix Activity Centre should focus on maturity as a diverse population driven centre.

This entails a continuing role for the Activity Centre in meeting both the basic and higher level consumer needs of the community.

For a diverse population driven centre the KICS target is 7%, and Phoenix currently achieves 12% KICS. However there is no maximum desirable level which means that there is opportunity for a higher level to be achieved.

Continued diversification through the delivery of knowledge intensive consumer services (eg. healthcare, education) will be required to improve the employment performance.

It is therefore important to ensure that the land use planning facilitates these types of uses.

Phoenix has the 6.63 ha of land required to meet the employment target of 1,393 jobs by 2031 (a 369 shortfall).

LCACS identifies the anticipated market potential of Office Business activity – this anticipates a significant

increase in KICS office uses for the Phoenix Activity Centre (eg. accountants, real estate agents etc.). This will strengthen the centre's move from a population driven centre to a diverse population driven centre.

The 'mixed use' zoning on Rockingham Road will provide the opportunity for office space at ground level, in addition to the potential for medical centres, consulting rooms and other such uses. It is therefore anticipated that redevelopment of the 'mixed use' zone will result in the creation of floor space that will contribute to an increase in KICS employment.

In the interim, existing dwellings in the 'Mixed Use' zone can be converted to businesses, such as offices or consulting rooms. This will cater for small scale and home-based businesses and live-work housing, creating employment opportunities, and live work

Based on this assessment no further commercial zoning changes, or expansion to the commercial zoning is considered required to improve employment performance.

However, there are actions that could encourage mixed use development in the 'Mixed Use' zone. This includes design guidelines to provide greater certainty around expectations for this area.

The Design Guidelines also require an adaptable ground floor that can accommodate future commercial development even if it is not viable in the short term. This will ensure the potential for commercial development in the area is retained.

## Economic Activation

The Activity Centre is anchored by Phoenix Shopping Centre, which is an enclosed mall, and is supported by the City of Cockburn Administration building.

Demand analysis undertaken as part of the LCACS confirms that the centre has a well justified economic purpose.

However, the LCACS analysis identified that the activity centre underperforms in the following key areas:

- Purpose of Place – 'Vision/Plan'
- Exposure - 'Activated frontages' and 'Permeability'

### Purpose of place

*Purpose:* The centre rated 'good' for purpose, and is deemed to have a well-justified economic purpose, however it is considered there is potential for this to be 'very good' with the introduction the mixed use zone, and higher densities in the town centre providing for a greater mix of dwelling types.

*Vision/Plan:* The centre rated poorly for its lack of a vision/plan for the centre. The adoption of an activity centre structure plan will improve this score to 'very good', providing a vision and direction for future development for the centre.

### **Exposure**

*Activated frontages:* Some nodes within the centre do not address the surrounding street network at all. The adoption of design guidelines will ensure that future development addresses streets and public spaces.

*Permeability:* The shopping centre, like all mall based centres is selectively permeable, and while the mall itself is relatively easy to move through there are poor physical and visual connections between many buildings and streets, poor connections to the surrounding environment and the permeability of the centre is severely constrained outside of retail trading hours.

Improving permeability throughout the Activity Centre is a key objective of the Structure Plan, but substantial improvements will be reliant on redevelopment of the shopping centre given that this restricts movement through the centre after hours. However, improvements to legibility and physical and visual connections are considered possible through improvements to Rockingham Road, and the introduction of a wayfinding strategy.



## ACTIVITY ACTIONS

### Employment and Economic Activation Actions

1. **Adoption of Design Guidelines for the 'Mixed Use' zone providing guidance for mixed use development to encourage commercial uses, including offices, at ground floor.**
2. **Inclusion of a requirement in the Mixed Use Design Guidelines for the ground floor to be adaptable to accommodate commercial development even when it may not be viable in the short term.**
1. **Adoption of the Activity Centre Structure Plan to strengthen the 'vision/plan' for the centre.**
2. **Adoption of Design Guidelines which require new development in the Activity Centre to address streets and public spaces.**
3. **Adoption of a Wayfinding Strategy for the Activity Centre and surrounding area to improve legibility.**

### LCACS Outcomes and Goals - Economic Activation

Currently the Phoenix Activity Centre achieves an overall 'Economic Activation' score of 4.00, which equates to a below target performance level.

It is anticipated that a score of 6.8 is achievable with the introduction of the new 'Mixed Use' zone and higher residential zonings for the activity centre; and with the implementation of the actions of this Activity Centre Structure Plan to improve the purpose, activated frontages and permeability.

The adoption of an activity centre structure plan will also improve this score for 'vision/plan' to 'very good', providing a vision and direction for future development for the centre.

It is considered that a score above the projected 6.8 would only be achievable upon substantial redevelopment of the Phoenix Shopping Centre whereby permeability and activated frontages can be more significantly improved.

### LCACS Outcomes and Goals - Employment

Currently the Phoenix Activity Centre achieves an overall employment score of 3.5, which is above the average score of 3.25 and below the best of type score for a District Centre.

The additional commercial zoning changes, including a new 'Mixed Use' zone on Rockingham Road and the adoption of design guidelines for this area to ensure adaptable development will ensure the creation of additional employment opportunities, resulting in an improvement to this score over time.



## Retail

While encouraging diversity of land use is a principal aim of the Activity Centre Structure Plan, retailing is still a critical component of the Activity Centre.

Like the Phoenix Activity Centre, the majority of the district centres in the Perth metropolitan area are anchored by an enclosed shopping centre. Therefore, given the important role and large proportion of land within the activity centre that is attributed to the Phoenix shopping centre, it is vital to examine shopping centre and retailing trends, particularly at the district centre scale. This will assist in understanding how these trends may influence the future shape and role of the activity centre.

Traditionally district centre shopping centres were modelled as smaller versions of the larger centres. They offered a discount department store, a supermarket (or two), and a number of specialty retail stores and food options. They provided a convenient, one stop destination for a range of goods and services, even though this was at a smaller scale with fewer options than the larger centres.

However, the larger centres have become larger, and they are continuing to expand. In the Perth metropolitan area significant expansions are proposed for a number of strategic metropolitan centres and secondary centres.

There are a number of emerging trends in relation to larger scale Australian shopping centres, including an increase in the presence of international retailers,

seeking high profile locations and larger floor plates; increase in food and beverage retailing and dining in response to an increased consumer interest in food; wider range of health and beauty services; increased focus on lifestyle and entertainment; and facilities/services to complement online shopping.

The expansion and refurbishment of these larger centres, coupled with the above trends, is likely to widen the gap between district centres and the larger centres. The difference between district centres and the larger centres is becoming more pronounced both in terms of size, function, the experience offered, and the range of goods and services available. The expansion and refurbishment of the larger centres also means they offer contemporary building design and interiors which will always make them attractive destinations for shoppers.

These larger centres also have increasing catchments, whereby customers are prepared to travel further because of the range of goods and services, and the quality of the experience offered.

At the opposite end of the scale, smaller neighbourhood centres (that generally offer one supermarket and a small range of specialty stores) are able to offer high levels of convenience for shoppers.

This means that district scale shopping centres will need to find their niche role in between the larger and smaller centres.

*At their smaller scale, District Centres have the potential to offer:*

- *Convenience with greater variety than neighbourhood centres.*
- *A wide range of locally tailored services*
- *Community gathering/event function*

For district centres there are a number of emerging trends that are likely to change the tenancy mix and physical form of shopping centres.

In the past retailers sought a presence in most shopping centres, however this trend is shifting and retailers are taking a more strategic approach to where they locate. Most of these retailers offer online stores with free or low cost delivery and returns, reducing the risk for buyers.

The increase in online shopping is impacting on centres and resulting in a reduction in the number of chain outlet stores (particularly apparel) in smaller centres, and an increase in services that cannot be purchased online, such as health and beauty services.

There are 19 district centres in the Perth metropolitan area, and across all these centres the following key trends are observed:

- Decrease in apparel retail outlets with the exception of centres with a large catchment, remote from larger centres (eg, Baldivis District Centre).
- Increase in proportion of tenancies occupied by:
  - Food, beverage and dining options, including specialty food and beverages

- Health services such as gyms/health studios, massage therapy, dentists and pharmacies
- Beauty services such as nail parlours, and hairdressers
- Medical and related services – doctors' surgeries, dentists, optometrists etc.
- Services such as travel agents, dry cleaners, clothing alterations
- Office uses– accountants, real estate agents, banks
- Discounts variety stores
- Emerging uses such as child care centres

These trends are further evidenced by the recent redevelopment/renovation of a number of district centres in Perth, where the following are observed:

***Increase in food and dining options*** - Chain and independent cafes locating in the centres, in addition to specific food and beverage outlets (eg, frozen yoghurt). For example, Bassendean Centre has only one clothing boutique, and one gift shop, yet it has seven dine in café/restaurants.

***Externally accessible dining*** – For example, at Riverton Forum the façade near the main entrance has an alfresco area that provides a more attractive, active frontage for the centre and clearly signifies the main entrance. This also serves to attract people to the centre for easily accessible food/coffee options that otherwise would have been within the centre primarily serving customers already at the centre.

***Increase in services*** - For example, the greatest proportion of tenancies in Bassendean Centre are dedicated to services such as beauty services, travel agents, optometrist, chemist, gym and yoga studio.

***Improved amenities*** - High quality parents' facilities, children's playgrounds and mobility aids are becoming more important to attract people to centres, and to encourage them to stay longer.

District shopping centres are typically anchored by one or two major supermarkets which serve to draw shoppers for daily and weekly grocery needs. Therefore trends in grocery shopping are of particular significance for centres of this size.

The key trend for grocery shopping in Australia is that shoppers are visiting more frequently, with the weekly shop becoming less common. This means that the convenience of accessing the supermarket becomes important. In response, new supermarket layouts reflect greater convenience for more frequent shopping.

On the basis of these trends, it is therefore likely that the future role of district shopping centres will focus on:

- Services that complement online shopping, such as online pickup points; temporary displays (linking to online stores);
- Greater range of quality food and dining options, including those that are externally accessible to the centre;



Figure 25. Play area at Baldvis Shopping Centre



Figure 26. Alfresco Dining Terrace at Riverton Forum

- 'Pop up' stores (eg. displaying goods from an online store for a period of time for promotional purposes);
- Serving and connecting with the local community;
- Functioning as a community meeting place;

- Medical, health, fitness and beauty services, including more specialised services;
- Office uses;
- High quality facilities such as children's play areas and parent's rooms.

These trends impact on the planning for the activity centre. Many of these trends have the potential to positively influence the activity centre because they provide a greater diversity of uses (including services to meet the needs of the local community), and more 'externalised' design features such as cafes and non-retail uses that are externally accessible and therefore provide active frontages and visual interest. Greater convenience and accessibility also encourages walking to the centre.

District Centre Shopping Centre Trends	
Trend	Implications for the Structure Plan
<i>Facilities to complement online shopping (eg. online grocery pickup points)</i>	Provides the opportunity to activate blank frontages with new entrances for goods collection.
<i>Greater focus on food and dining options, particularly externally accessible.</i>	Provides an opportunity to activate blank frontages, signify entrance points, attract people to the centre, improve pedestrian amenity, increase walking to the centre; and activate the activity centre after hours.
<i>'Pop up' stores (eg. Temporarily displaying goods from an online store)</i>	Provides the ongoing opportunity to take up vacancies in smaller tenancies throughout the centre, and to provide space for local online businesses as required.
<i>Focus on serving and connecting with the local community.</i>	Provides the opportunity to create a community gathering point and to support local character and identity.  Flexible public and private spaces that are capable of hosting community events, markets etc.  Inclusion of facilities and playgrounds
<i>A diversity of uses</i>	Provides a greater mix of uses to serve the local community, and creates the opportunity for afterhours activation.
<i>Functioning as a community meeting place</i>	Use of car parking areas as spaces for 'pop up' events such as markets, outdoor cinema etc.

## 5. URBAN FORM

### Key nodes, landmarks and view lines

The Rockingham Road streetscape comprises residential dwellings at a lower level on the western side, and the Phoenix shopping centre on the eastern side. The Phoenix shopping centre is heavily reliant on signage as a 'landmark', and to signify the vehicle entrances to the shopping centre.

The view from Rockingham Road facing north is characterised by:

- Lack of legibility
- Low visual amenity
- Duplication of signage

The view from Rockingham Road looking south:

- Shopping centre blends into the skyline
- 'Landmark structure' is a sign
- Limited sense of place
- Lack of landscaping on western side of Rockingham Road

The view of the Northern Entrance is:


- Reliant on signage to signify shopping centre entrance
- No facade/ identifiable features facing the street
- Complicated vehicular entrance



**Figure 27. Rockingham Road looking south**



**Figure 28. Rockingham Road. Southern Entrance**



**Figure 29. Ramp entrance - Rockingham Road**



The view of the southern entrance (Rockingham Road):

- Reliant on Signage to signify the entrance
- No facade facing the street/ poor visual connection to exterior of the site

## Landmarks

### Natural Landmarks



**Figure 31. View of the Ridgeline from Rockingham Road**

The Manning Lake Reserve ridgeline is a distinguishing natural feature in Spearwood that is highly valued by the local community.

The ridgeline is a visual asset that provides a distinctive setting for the Spearwood area and contributes strongly to the local character. The ridgeline is prominent from Rockingham Road, and in particular views from Kent Street and Phoenix Road.

### Public Art

On Spearwood Avenue, within the 800m catchment of the Activity Centre there are themed artworks and plantings that form part of 'Friendship Way'. Friendship Way is located on Spearwood Avenue from Cockburn Road in North Coogee to Beeliar Drive in Yangebup. It is split into five sections, each commemorating an important connection the City has established - with the traditional owners of the land, with its sister cities and with the principles of global peace.

Between Hamilton Road and Rockingham Road in Spearwood (Section 2) the theme is world peace; and between Doolette Street and Discovery Drive the theme is Aboriginal Australia. This includes public art and plantings in the theme, and these provide attractive and meaningful landmarks along Spearwood Avenue.

The Activity Centre itself however lacks landmarks, and lacks a sense of arrival and distinctive sense of



**Figure 30. Public Art on Spearwood Avenue**

place. Public art in the activity centre would provide an opportunity to create this sense of place, and to reflect a unique character for the activity centre. In particular it is considered that artworks denoting entry to the activity centre would assist in defining the role of the centre as a 'town centre'.

Identification of key themes for artworks and wayfinding will provide the opportunity to create a unique sense of place for the Phoenix Activity Centre.

A Percent for Artworks Strategy has therefore been prepared identifying key themes and locations for artworks required to the City of Cockburn Percent for Art Local Planning Policy. This will ensure that artworks contribute to enhance of local identity and enhance the activity centre.

It is also recommended that a Public Art and Wayfinding Strategy be prepared for the public realm.

### Building Landmarks

The Activity Centre in general lacks building landmarks, with very little variation in building height and form. There is a strong reliance on signage.

In appropriate locations new development should emphasise street corners, provide greater visual interest and signify entrance to the town centre. These requirements are set out in Design Guidelines to be adopted as a Local Planning Policy pursuant to the Scheme. Such features also assist with wayfinding and improve legibility.

## Street interface

The design and placement of the shopping centre presents visual and functionality issues. Key to this issue is the internal nature of the Phoenix shopping centre with entrances located away from surrounding roads. Whilst not unusual in a shopping centre complex, the entrances do not face the street fronts, creating issues of legibility and reducing pedestrian connectivity and limiting the sense of place. This is an issue that has arisen due to the original frontage of the shopping centre addressing Coleville Crescent, rather than Rockingham Road. Incremental expansion of the centre, particularly the decked parking areas, has therefore closed off opportunities for frontages to the street.

The built form along Rockingham Road does not signify entry into the town centre, given that it is either primarily setback from the street, or is interfaced with inactive frontages.

Integration of the site as it presents to Rockingham Road would improve the connection of the Shopping Centre to its surrounds and potentially improve the centre's functionality and viability as well as improving the general neighbourhood.

The proposed new Kent Street shopping centre entrance and public space provides the opportunity for greater connectivity and an improved presence to Rockingham Road that can be achieved without substantial redevelopment of the shopping centre (Figure 34).

For the 'Mixed Use' zone on Rockingham Road, the proposed Design Guidelines will require active frontages at ground floor level, and articulated upper floors to ensure visual interest.



Figure 33. View looking north on Rockingham Road



Figure 34. Inactive frontage to March Street



Figure 32. March Street shopping centre interface




Figure 35. Proposed 'public space' north of the proposed new entrance

## Signage

### Rockingham Road

A 'strip' of confusing and conflicting signs has developed along Rockingham Road through the activity centre. The facades of buildings are often obscured from view from the road, and the desire to increase signage is a common outcome of commercial development that is setback from the road.

The current signage is also designed for cars rather than pedestrians.

In the north western commercial end there is individual freestanding signage for each tenancy

Uncoordinated signage causes the visual equivalent of 'white noise', where very little information is registered in the mind of the viewer.

A signage strategy is therefore recommended for Rockingham Road.

Signage could comprise large, well-lit pylons with consistent space and orientation of signs within each pylon. This would enable a greater variety of businesses more opportunity for exposure.

Addressing the issues of signage will enable tree planting between shop units because they will not obscure shop frontages for passing trade. Views of the shops are still permitted beneath the canopy of the tree planting, and these may even be improved in


quality and quantity when the current obliteration by ad hoc signage on front-lot boundaries is considered.



**Figure 36. Signage of Rockingham Road**



## PHOENIX ACTIVITY CENTRE – VISION FOR THE ENTRY AND PUBLIC SPACE



Current Phoenix Shopping Centre southern entry:

- Relies on a signage structure as landmark, and to denote entry to the centre.
- Narrow and unappealing pedestrian path adjacent to the building.
- Large crossover provides disruption for pedestrians on Rockingham Road, particularly given the proximity to the servicing crossover to the north.
- Lacks a distinct character or 'sense of place'.
- Minimal landscaping, shade or shelter.

Current southern entry to Shopping Centre from Rockingham Road



Proposed new relocated entry and concepts and ideas for a 'public space'



Proposed relocated Phoenix Shopping Centre entry and 'public space':

- Relocated entry to shopping centre from new Kent Street roundabout.
- Provides opportunity for the existing entry to be closed and an area created as a new public space, inviting pedestrian entry and feature entry to the centre with landscaping, seating etc.
- Opportunity to deliver an area that can function as a 'town square'/ community gathering space.



Public space ideas with seating and pedestrian pathway



Ideas for softening and beautifying the decked parking area, and murals for blank walls

## Public spaces

The Phoenix Central Revitalisation Strategy study area (800m catchment around the Activity Centre) includes 9.4 percent public open space, which is considered to be an adequate quantity considering that Manning Park, which is directly abutting the study area, was not included in this calculation. The City's administration building also provides a recreational function, given that it has BBQs, adult exercise equipment, seating and grassed areas suitable for picnicking.

A POS catchment assessment indicates that the majority of the 800m catchment is within the catchment of a park, with the exception of a small area around the intersection of Phoenix Road and Rockingham Road. This area comprises existing residential development, and there is not considered to be any opportunity for additional POS in this area. The area is just outside the catchments of three local and neighbourhood parks, and it is therefore considered to be acceptable in this context.

Bavich Park and Gerald Reserve are the closest parks, and both are important visual and pedestrian connections to the centre. Improvements to Bavich and Gerald Reserve are considered to be important to improve the pedestrian journey to the Activity Centre (see Concept Plan Figure 19).

The analysis demonstrates a lack of recreational facilities within the activity centre, but in particular the centre lacks a 'destination park', which would improve the recreational function of the centre, diversify the

centre, and serve to attract people to the centre to stay longer.

This finding was also apparent in LCACS, where the activity centre scored poorly for 'urban form', including for the lack of recreational destinations (outdoor recreation facilities).

There is an identified lack of diversity in recreational facilities, with traditional children's playgrounds predominating. There is also an opportunity to improve recreational facilities for older people in the area.

The Phoenix Core Precinct itself is lacking a public space that could improve the amenity of the area and

provide an informal community gathering place.

The proposed new shopping centre entrance from Kent Street, to the south of the existing southern entrance, would create an area of land to the north of the entrance (including the closed entrance area) which could be converted to 'public space', and provides an opportunity for landscaping.

This space could also provide an attractive pedestrian entrance to the centre, and will create a readily identifiable entry point to the centre that is currently lacking. It would provide a form of activation to Rockingham Road that the centre currently does not have. The space itself could have landscaping, seating, and children's play equipment.



Figure 37. Concept Plan for possible improvements to Bavich and Gerald Reserve



The expansive areas of car parking around the Phoenix Shopping Centre separate the centre from the surrounding area, however these areas represent an opportunity to host community events.

To establish a 'town centre' function, the car parking areas of the Phoenix Shopping Centre could have a program of community events that bring the community together, and reinforce the role of the centre as a community hub.

Events programming could include:


- Pop-up outdoor cinema
- Markets with market carts
- Food markets showcasing local food.
- Art exhibitions
- Temporary vegetable allotments.



**Figure 38. Existing expansive upper deck car parking**



**Figure 39. Markets in car parking areas**



**Figure 40. Ideas for car parking areas - temporary cinema**



**Figure 41. Pop up restaurants**



### *City of Cockburn Administration Site*

The City of Cockburn Administration site is located south of the Phoenix Shopping Centre, and includes the Seniors Centre, Spearwood library, Spearwood bowling club and landscaped grounds.

Currently this site has a civic role, and the grounds, with established trees and BBQ facilities, perform an important recreational function. This site provides the opportunity for the establishment of an important community gathering space.

The Phoenix Revitalisation Strategy included a concept plan for this site to become a community hub, incorporating residential development. A Master Plan will be required to determine the future of this site, and this should include investigation of the following key elements:

- Retention of a 'civic presence'
- Identification of mature trees and vegetation to be retained.
- Adaptive reuse of the existing administration building
- Creation of a new 'community space'
- Residential development with an appropriate interface with surrounding development.



## Urban Form Actions

1. **Formulation of a Public Art and Wayfinding Strategy that identifies themes to strengthen a unique identity for the Phoenix Activity Centre and improve legibility.**
2. **Creation of a new entry from Kent Street (new roundabout) to the Shopping Centre, and creation of a new 'public space' and pedestrian entry to the north of the entrance.**
3. **Preparation of Design Guidelines that require landmark built form in the Activity Centre and active frontages to add visual interest and improve legibility and amenity.**
4. **Improvements to Bavich Park and Gerald Reserve to improve their appearance, and make them more attractive pedestrian connections to the Activity Centre.**
5. **Requirement for any redevelopment of the Civic Centre site to retain a civic function, and to investigate incorporation of a nativescape playground and urban orchard.**

## LCACS Outcomes and Goals

The Phoenix Activity Centre scores a 4.80 for urban form, which equates to a medium performance level.

Current scores for legibility, amenity and development potential were all medium. Within the amenity attributes the activity centre currently scores poorly in the following 'amenity' areas:


- Features of visual interest
- Picnic facilities
- Recreational destinations (outdoor recreation facilities)
- Presence of street trees

Within the legibility attributes the centre currently scores poorly in the following areas:

- Continuity of footpaths and presence of cyclepaths

Improvements to street trees, and the requirement for improved connectivity from street footpaths will see an improvement to this score.

In addition, the inclusion of features of visual interest through landmark buildings and the inclusion of recreational destinations in the activity centre, in both the civic precinct, and the Phoenix Core (amenity space), will contribute to demonstrable increase to the 'urban form' score from 4.8 to 7.4 which is 'best of type' for a district centre.



## 5. Action Plan, Implementation and Monitoring

<i>Action</i>	<i>ACTION</i>	<i>Responsible Agency</i>	<i>City of Cockburn Service Unit</i>	<i>Priority</i>
<b>1</b>	<p><i>Adoption of Design Guidelines Local Planning Policy for the Activity Centre</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Adoption of Design Guidelines for the 'Mixed Use' zone providing guidance for mixed use development to encourage commercial uses, including offices, at ground floor.</i></li> <li><i>Adoption of Design Guidelines which require new development in the Activity Centre to address streets and public spaces.</i></li> <li><i>Preparation of Design Guidelines that require landmark built form in the Activity Centre to add visual interest and improve legibility and amenity.</i></li> </ul>	<i>City of Cockburn</i>	<i>Strategic Planning</i>	<i>High</i>
<b>2.</b>	<i>Adoption of a vehicle access plan for the Mixed Use zone to ensure safe and legible access.</i>	<i>City of Cockburn</i>	<i>Strategic Planning</i>	<i>High</i>
<b>3.</b>	<p><i>Upgrade of Rockingham Road between Coleville Crescent and Phoenix Road</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Investigation into the creation of a new entry to the Phoenix Shopping Centre from a new Kent Street/Rockingham Road roundabout, to include a new 'public space' and pedestrian entry.</i></li> <li><i>Investigate inclusion of cycle lanes on Rockingham Road as part of the proposed improvements to improve north south connection.</i></li> <li><i>Investigate improvements to the amenity at bus stops on Rockingham Road.</i></li> </ul>	<i>City of Cockburn</i>	<i>Strategic Planning, Engineering Services, Parks services and Phoenix Shopping Centre</i>	<i>Medium</i>
<b>4.</b>	<i>Investigation of reconfiguration of car parking in the northern end (BP site) to</i>	<i>City of Cockburn</i>	<i>Strategic Planning and</i>	<i>Low</i>



	<i>determine whether existing bays adjacent to the access should be parallel.</i>		<i>Engineering Services</i>	
5.	<i>Formulation of a Public Art and Wayfinding Strategy that identifies themes to strengthen a unique identity for the Phoenix Activity Centre and improve legibility.</i>		<i>Strategic Planning</i>	<i>Medium</i>
6.	<i>Improvements to Bavich Park and Gerald Reserve to improve their appearance, and make them more attractive pedestrian connections to the Activity Centre.</i>	<i>City of Cockburn</i>	<i>Parks Services</i>	<i>Medium</i>
7.	<i>Preparation of a Signage Strategy for Rockingham Road</i>	<i>City of Cockburn</i>	<i>Strategic Planning and Statutory Planning</i>	<i>High</i>
8.	<i>Preparation of a Master Plan for the City of Cockburn Administration Site to include investigation of the following key elements:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Retention of a 'civic presence'</i></li> <li><i>Identification of mature trees and vegetation to be retained.</i></li> <li><i>Adaptive reuse of the existing administration building</i></li> <li><i>Creation of a new 'community space'</i></li> <li><i>Residential development with an appropriate interface with surrounding development.</i></li> </ul>	<i>City of Cockburn</i>	<i>Strategic Planning and External consultants</i>	<i>High</i>
9.	<i>Monitor the performance of the activity centre by undertaking a review every two years, addressing the elements discussed within this Structure Plan relating to:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Land use mix diversity targets;</i></li> <li><i>Residential density targets;</i></li> <li><i>Built form and streetscape intensity;</i></li> <li><i>Measuring against the LCACS metrics.</i></li> </ul>	<i>City of Cockburn</i>	<i>Strategic Planning</i>	<i>Ongoing</i>

## Monitoring

The performance of the Phoenix Activity centre is to be monitored through a review process undertaken every two years. This should address the elements discussed within this Structure Plan relating to:

- Land use mix diversity targets
- Residential density targets
- Built form and streetscape intensity

Critically, progress of the Activity Centre Structure Plan should be measured against the LCACS metrics to determine whether the anticipated improvements are occurring.



File No. 110/033

**SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS  
DRAFT PHOENIX ACTIVITY CENTRE DOCUMENTS**

NO.	NAME/ADDRESS	SUBMISSION	RECOMMENDATION
1	Community member	<b>Object</b> It's a very bad move.	Objection noted, however not specific reasons have been given which makes it difficult to address the concerns.
2	Community member	<b>Object</b> No consideration given to residents and business` wishing to egress in both directions. A bottleneck of traffic entering from both directions. Looks good on paper but not practical.	The proposed plan has deliberately reduced the number of access points to Rockingham Road to reduce the number of unsafe traffic movements (particularly right hand turns), and to enable more comfortable pedestrian movement along Rockingham Road, given that crossovers disrupt pedestrian movement.  The proposed road design has been modelled and this has not shown that 'bottlenecks' will occur at the north or southern end.
3	Tom van Wees 13 Tidewater Close YANGEBUP WA 6164	<b>Support</b> (1) I am all in support of the plan, it is well overdue to upgrade Phoenix central.  (2) My question is, what are the plans for Burgundy crescent and the old residential building, is that included in the revitalisation plan. Also the old properties along Lancaster street will they be demolished?	(1) Support for the road upgrade is noted.  (2) The residential apartment buildings on Burgundy Court and the buildings on Lancaster Street are privately owned, and  The Phoenix Activity Centre Structure Plan does include these areas, and includes guidelines for any redevelopment, however this will be dependent on the landowners.
4	Carmelo Zagari 69 Newton Street SPEARWOOD WA 6163	<b>Object</b> (1) I object strongly because turning a 2 lane to a 1 lane all it really does create a big congestion of traffic. Therefore putting a couple of trees and a few wood chips does not beautify the street it creates anger.  (2) There are a few black spots that should be rectified such as:	(1) The proposed plan has been designed to maximise opportunities for landscaping within what is a very narrow road reserve, and it is considered that the addition of a large number of trees and other landscaping will

ATTACH 7

NO.	NAME/ADDRESS	SUBMISSION	RECOMMENDATION
		<p>a) The roundabout between Mayor Rd &amp; Beeliar Drive to Stock Rd is a disgrace because cars banked up on Rockingham Rd and can't go straight because of the congestion there.</p> <p>b) Also by doing a 1 lane the bus stops are not recessed anymore therefore when the bus stops it stops all the traffic behind. In my opinion and many others I've spoken to agree with me that traffic should always be flowing.</p>	<p>provide significant beautification to the road.</p> <p>a) These road are outside the project area which is focussed on the Phoenix Town Centre.</p> <p>b) The proposed road upgrade includes bus embayments for the buses, therefore vehicles will not be held up by busses.</p> <p>The traffic modelling for the proposed plan demonstrates that free flowing traffic will be achieved, however it is important traffic is slowed, and that the roundabouts provide some breaks in the traffic to allow pedestrians to cross safely at most points along the road, and to provide breaks for vehicles entering Rockingham Road.</p>
5	Public Transport Authority PO Box 8125, Perth Business Centre PERTH WA 6849	<p><b>Support</b> Transperth supported the initial Rockingham Road Revitalisation proposal subject to transit priority being provided due to the expected impact on bus travel times caused by traffic calming including road narrowing and ensuing traffic congestion.</p> <p>Transperth supports the need to improve pedestrian amenity and movement within the Phoenix Activity Centre. However, increased travel times can reduce the attractiveness of bus services to those accessing or passing through the Activity Centre and increases the cost of the service.</p> <p>Transperth requests that the City consider, as a part of the Rockingham Road Concept Plan, the inclusion of bus priority queue jumps lanes at Rockingham Road / Spearwood Avenue and Rockingham Road / Phoenix Road.</p> <p>This would mean extending the surface treatment of the embayment on Rockingham Road before the Phoenix Road intersection, to the traffic lights. Further, providing a queue jump for buses entering the Rockingham Road / Phoenix Road intersection from the north.</p> <p>The proposed bus embayment and two bus stops on Rockingham Road before the Kent Street intersection does not allow for the independent movement of buses in and out of</p>	<p>The City will try to accommodate all of these points in the final design of the road.</p> <p>It should be noted that the City is not seeking to achieve a dedicated bus lane scenario, or priority for buses, rather the design seeks to ensure safe and convenient access to buses, balanced with improvements for pedestrians, safer movements for vehicles and beautification to the road within a very constrained road reserve.</p> <p>It should also be noted that traffic modelling demonstrates that queuing will be acceptable.</p>



NO.	NAME/ADDRESS	SUBMISSION	RECOMMENDATION
		<p>the embayment. In this situation there are obvious constraints which limit the embayment's length; however the design should strive for the maximum practical length.</p> <p>We encourage the City to liaise with Transperth further to discuss our requirements and options to extend the embayment. The provision of an embayment which enables two buses to move independently is desirable given that this bus stop is highly frequented by the Routes 114, 512, 530, 549 and school services while buses are also required to dwell here on occasion.</p> <p>With regards to the bus stop boarding areas, prior to construction commencing, the PTA requires a detailed drawing for each boarding area to ensure compliance with relevant disability standards.</p>	
6	Western Power GPO Box L921 PERTH WA 6842	<p>As your proposed work is near energised electrical installations and powerlines, the person in control of the work site must ensure that no person, plant or material enters the "Danger Zone" of an overhead powerline or other electrical network assets.</p> <p>The "Danger Zone" is set out in Western Australian Occupational Safety and Health Regulation 1996 – Specifically Reg 3.64. (<a href="#">Link</a>)</p> <p>Any information provided to you by Western Power should not be used in isolation and we recommend that you refer to the Occupational Safety and Health Act 1984 and Occupational Safety and Health Regulations 1996. These documents outline WorkSafe WA requirements for working near electricity.</p> <p>For queries relating to these requirements, visit <a href="#">WorkSafe</a> or contact WorkSafe on 1300 307 877.</p> <p>To help you plan your works around Western Power's infrastructure, please follow the links below:  <a href="#">Working Near Electricity</a>  <a href="#">Dial Before You Dig</a></p> <p>If you require information about Western Power's infrastructure including plans, please complete a request for Digital Data attached.</p> <p>Should your project involve any changes to existing ground levels around poles and structures, or you will be working underneath power lines or around underground cables, please contact Western Power on 13 10 87.</p>	Noted.

NO.	NAME/ADDRESS	SUBMISSION	RECOMMENDATION
		We are obliged to point out that any change to Western Power's network is the responsibility of the individual developer.	
7	Community member	<p><b>Support</b></p> <p>After giving plans consideration, I agree that this needs to be done, however I think you should block off the driveway access to the shopping centre from the bus area and instead of the roundabout at Kent street it would be better for the roundabout to be at Coleville Crescent instead and have the traffic enter from that street. This way people getting off the bus won't be anywhere near traffic coming and going into the shopping centre.</p> <p>You could pave the bus area all the way into the entrance of the shopping centre and have it covered in for protection from weather.</p> <p>Also you could have café/restaurants there and some gardens.</p>	<p>The distance between the bus stop and the new proposed Kent Street roundabout is sufficient for passengers to be able to safely exit.</p> <p>Details regarding the bus stop and the new amenity space will consider cover/shade for pedestrians.</p>
8	Janet Vost 29 Sussex Street  SPEARWOOD WA 6163	<p><b>Support</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I like a lot of the ideas present in the new strategy, especially making Rockingham road one lane, planting mature trees, adding bike paths and improving pedestrian access.</li> <li>2. The idea of having an alfresco area at the new Kent Street entrance is lovely, but I can't really see in the plans how that would connect in to any existing cafes/restaurants.</li> </ol> <p>Are their new cafes being opened in that area? I would love to see more detail about plans for outdoor spaces and play areas. This could be a great opportunity to decrease the feeling of the area as a giant car park, and instead have green space. I hope that as part of the design some of the car park near Kent Street is being reclaimed as green space?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. It is hard to understand from the plans. Is this design being left up to the shopping centre? I hope that Council has some input into this and that there is someone skilled making plans for the outdoor space.</li> <li>4. The area that is a big problem spot at the moment is the access in and out of the complex with Video Ezy /Cheesecake shop etc. Is this area being addressed at all?</li> <li>5. Thanks – it is great to see the Council working to make this area more liveable</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Support noted.</li> <li>2. It is possible that there may be cafes in this area in the future. Given that the shopping centre is largely developed opportunities for creating a 'public space' are very limited, and the relocation of the vehicle entry provides the opportunity for such a space, which can also provide a more attractive and inviting pedestrian entry to the centre.</li> <li>3. The City would work with the shopping centre to design any amenity space area in the future.</li> <li>4. The proposed road upgrade closes right hand turning movements to this area, and customers would utilise the roundabout at Lancaster Street to undertake a U-turn and make a much safer left turn into this area.</li> </ol>

NO.	NAME/ADDRESS	SUBMISSION	RECOMMENDATION
		and accessible to people, bikes, kids etc	5. Noted.
9	Community member	<p><b>Support</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Although I support the design concept there is one major area of concern which is the new roundabout at Kent St. This roundabout will cause a lot of traffic to back up at the roundabout because the area they are entering into the shopping centre is very small and they will have to wait for cars to reverse out of the existing parking bays.</li> <li>2. In addition to this visibility when turning right on to Rockingham Rd from Kent St is very poor and the reason Main roads installed an island there was because my father had a bad accident there resulting in the death of a motorcyclist. Hence, the roundabout should be moved further south to Coleville Crescent and vehicles encouraged to use the back entrance to the S/C next to the council chambers.</li> <li>3. Improved signage at the intersection of Spearwood Ave and Rockingham Rd will also encourage people to enter Coleville Crescent via Spearwood Avenue and use the back entrance to the S/C. This will reduce the amount of cars turning into and exiting from the S/C on Rockingham Rd and make it safer for pedestrians whilst at the same time improving traffic flow along Rockingham Rd which will be required given that it will become a single lane.</li> <li>4. The current entrance into the S/C on Rockingham Rd should be closed and some pedestrian traffic lights or a zebra crossing installed to make it safer for people to cross the road to access the bus stop on the western side. The bus stop on the eastern side near McDonalds needs to have a dedicated bus bay installed because when buses stop here it causes a backlog of traffic all the way back to Lancaster street. With the closure of the existing entrance to the S/C on Rockingham Rd this bus stop should be brought further south and a bus lane added where the current entrance is located, which will make it easy for people to get off the bus and access the shops via foot.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The City has engaged a traffic consultant to undertake modelling which demonstrates this will not occur. Should this proposed Kent Street roundabout proceed as a four way roundabout with a new entry to the centre the internal access will require careful design to ensure this does not happen.</li> <li>2. The roundabout would make turning right onto Rockingham Road much safer, including the fact that vehicles will be travelling at slower speeds.</li> <li>3. The City does not intend to redirect traffic through the residential area of Coleville Crescent from Spearwood Avenue, when Rockingham Road is capable of safely accommodating current traffic numbers. The new proposed roundabout at Lancaster Street will provide easy access to parking to the north of the shopping centre.</li> <li>4. Bus bays are installed to ensure traffic does not queue behind buses, and the exact design and location will be finalised as part of the detailed design to ensure maximise pedestrian safety, however there are a number of constraints that need to be considered, including location of services, existing crossovers etc.</li> </ol>
10	WA Gas Networks (ATCO Australia) PO Box 3006	We wish to provide advice that ATCO Gas Australia (ATCO Gas) has Medium and Medium Low Pressure Gas Mains, residential and commercial gas lines and infrastructure within the immediate area, being the land the subject of the proposed Phoenix Activity Centre.	Noted.

NO.	NAME/ADDRESS	SUBMISSION	RECOMMENDATION
	SUCCESS WA 6964	<p>We have no objection to the proposed Plan proceeding however we do request contact by any proponent during their preliminary design stage, prior to any design being finalised.</p> <p>This is to ensure the existing gas infrastructure is addressed early and any gas pipeline third party impacts are identified and designed to ensure our ongoing operations and compliance with our design code for the ATCO Gas assets.</p> <p>Should there be proposed changes to current land tenure ie Road Reserve, ATCO Gas will request relocation of our services to the adjacent road reserve or an Easement to ensure protection, access and operations of our assets are not reduced. This is to be at no cost to ATCO Gas.</p> <p><b>Advice Notes to Proponents;</b>  <i>ATCO Gas Australia has gas mains of varying pressures in the area described, predominantly within the road reserves, within the City of Cockburn</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><i>Please see the attached document NCN_WI008_RF01_Additional_Information_For_Working_Around_Gas_Infrastrcture which details the ATCO Gas requirements when undertaking works near gas infrastructure.</i></li> <li><i>Proponents are advised to contact ATCO Gas on 9499 5272. Anyone proposing to carry out future construction or excavation works must contact 'Dial Before You Dig' (Ph 1100) to determine the location of buried gas infrastructure.</i></li> </ul> </p> <p><b>Maps included</b></p>	
11	Water Corporation PO Box 100 LEEDERVILLE WA 6902	<p>The Water Corporation offers the following comments in regard to this proposal.</p> <p><b><u>Water and Wastewater</u></b>  Reticulated water and sewerage is currently available to the subject land. Upgrades to the reticulation mains may be required especially in the later stages of the proposed expansion.</p> <p>The proposed changes to the Scheme do not appear to affect Water Corporation assets. If our assets are affected, the principle followed by the Water Corporation for the funding of subdivision or development is one of user pays. For any type of development the developer is expected to provide all water and sewerage reticulation that may be required. In addition the developer may be required to fund new works or the upgrading of existing works and protection of all works.</p> <p><b><u>General Comments</u></b></p>	Noted.

NO.	NAME/ADDRESS	SUBMISSION	RECOMMENDATION
		<p>Development within this proposal will require approval by our Building Services section prior to commencement of works. Infrastructure contributions and fees may be required to be paid prior to approval being issued.</p> <p>The principle followed by the Water Corporation for the funding of subdivision or development is one of user pays. The developer is expected to provide all water and sewerage reticulation if required. A contribution for Water, Sewerage and Drainage headworks may also be required. In addition the developer may be required to fund new works or the upgrading of existing works and protection of all works. Any temporary works needed are required to be fully funded by the developer. The Water Corporation may also require land being ceded free of cost for works.</p>	
12	Community member	<p><b>Support</b> I support all elements of the proposal, with the exception that I would prefer further variety of native flora be used rather than London Plane trees as per diagrams.</p>	Noted. When the road upgrade is revisited, the details of landscaping will be considered, however this is constrained by the limestone soil and services in this area.
13	Community member	<p><b>Object</b> I am objecting to this project unless you keep the dual carriageway. By going to a single carriageway will create more driver frustration. The diagrams do not even allow for a turning only lane into some of the shops from Cash Converters to McDonalds, so there traffic will almost come to a stop as a vehicle come to turn into the drive way. The idea of roundabouts is good and can be done with dual carriageways.</p>	<p>The reduction to one lane was considered important to slow traffic, and to create opportunities for street trees and landscaping that currently do not exist.</p> <p>Many of the right hand turning movements are proposed to be removed so there will not be queuing behind vehicles turning right. The roundabouts are proposed for the purposes of allowing vehicles to undertake a U-turn and access properties on the opposite side of the road in a safe manner.</p> <p>Notwithstanding, it is recommended that the Rockingham Road upgrade be deferred until such time as the Phoenix Shopping Centre undertake major development.</p>
14	Community member	<p><b>Object</b> Will seriously affect traffic flow- buses stopping, garbage trucks stopping will severely interrupt traffic flow. Exiting shops and petrol stations on East and West side will be very difficult and dangerous.</p>	It is considered on balance that the proposed changes would result in improvements to the way the road functions – making it safer and more attractive.



NO.	NAME/ADDRESS	SUBMISSION	RECOMMENDATION
			Notwithstanding, it is recommended that the Rockingham Road upgrade be deferred until such time as the Phoenix Shopping Centre undertake major development.
15	Christine Patmore 8 Gorham Way SPEARWOOD WA 6163	<b>Object</b> I feel that by making Rockingham Rd into single lane that no thought has been given to the increase in traffic on Hamilton Rd. Hamilton Rd will become the short cut for impatient drivers who don't want to slow down. The impact that the new development of the Watson site etc. is already have an adverse effect on Hamilton Rd and this plan will only make it worse. There is nothing wrong with the way it is now. Please don't make Hamilton Rd a race track.	<p>Consideration has been given to the impact on Hamilton Road, and the City will very closely monitor any impact on Hamilton Road as a result of the changes to Rockingham Road. It is not intended to divert traffic from Rockingham Road.</p> <p>The upgrade to Rockingham Road is considered important given that the community have expressed concern regarding Rockingham Road, particularly how unsafe it is to cross; unsafe traffic movements being taken; and a desire to improve the appearance of the road.</p> <p>Notwithstanding, it is recommended that the Rockingham Road upgrade be deferred until such time as the Phoenix Shopping Centre undertake major development.</p>
16	Community member	<b>Object</b> It should stay the way it is. I have lived here for forty years and have no problems. If you want to do anything, you could do two things: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. slow the speed to 40 or 50 kph or</li> <li>2. put in a foot overpass.</li> </ol>	<p>The community have expressed concern regarding Rockingham Road, particularly how unsafe it is to cross; unsafe traffic movements being taken; and a desire to improve the appearance of the road.</p> <p>The marked speed limit needs to match the design of road. To demonstrate this point, the current speed limit is 60km/hr, yet approximately 85 percent for vehicles travel at 68km/hr – this is because of the road environment.</p> <p>Therefore if genuinely reduced speeds are to be achieved the road design must change. A narrower road, more street trees and roundabouts will make it difficult to travel any faster than</p>

NO.	NAME/ADDRESS	SUBMISSION	RECOMMENDATION
			<p>50km/hr.</p> <p>There is insufficient space for a pedestrian overpass, and this would require substantial private land acquisitions (eg. Businesses and/or homes) which the City considers highly undesirable and not in the best interests of the community. In addition, pedestrian overpasses are very expensive, and would consume most of the budget available for the upgrade. It is also important to note that pedestrian overpasses do not actually provide good accessibility because the distances required to walk are significant due to the long ramps.</p> <p>Notwithstanding, it is recommended that the Rockingham Road upgrade be deferred until such time as the Phoenix Shopping Centre undertake major development.</p>
17	Pamela Kennington 11 Berson Court MUNSTER WA 6166	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I object to the proposal to make 4 lanes into 2 along Rockingham Road by the Phoenix Shopping Centre. It is already chaotic enough along that stretch with cars turning and exiting the many entrances, not to mention numerous buses traversing the same stretch.</li> <li>2. Phoenix Shopping Centre is already dying a slow death and I can't see how this proposal will halt that. More likely to drive them away. Besides which I love the Centre exactly as it is. I have been shopping there since it was originally built. We have enough very large and impersonal shopping centres within a reasonable distance. I think the money could be used to much better effect on upgrading and adding new footpaths in the area. As an avid walker within the area some of the footpaths leave a lot to be desired and are very difficult to walk safely on due to the severe degree of angle.</li> </ol>	<p>The proposal reduces the number of access points along Rockingham Road, therefore the current scenario would not apply. The road would function entirely differently under the proposed new design.</p> <p>The reduction to one lane is considered important to slow traffic, and to create opportunities for street trees and landscaping that currently do not exist.</p> <p>The proposal seeks to make Rockingham Road more attractive and give it more of a 'town centre' feel. Importantly it seeks to improve pedestrian movement along the street. This is a project that the Spearwood community have long advocated for.</p>

NO.	NAME/ADDRESS	SUBMISSION	RECOMMENDATION
			Notwithstanding, it is recommended that the Rockingham Road upgrade be deferred until such time as the Phoenix Shopping Centre undertake major development.
1 8	Community member	<p>We have regularly used the Phoenix Centre since 1992, and I have canvassed the views of a number of friends, relatives and colleagues.</p> <p>1. Comments against:</p> <p>a) The attempt to redirect through regional traffic is opposed. Rockingham Rd is not a short cut but is a main thoroughfare and should continue to cater for all traffic. Furthermore, priority needs to be given to completing both Cockburn Rd and Stock Rd as 4 lane restricted access roads for the full distance between Fremantle and Naval Base, and getting through traffic off residential streets.</p> <p>b) The project cost of \$3.5m is opposed. The Phoenix shopping centre is not much ahead of several other centres in the area apart from the Gateway, and is certainly not a priority for spending that amount of our funds. Such funds are required to be better spent upgrading Mayor Rd between Rockingham Rd and Stock Rd to provide 2 lanes each way and replace the roundabout with traffic lights noting this is a black spot and there is substantial residential development adjacent.</p> <p>c) Narrowing the road from 4 lanes to 2 lanes is opposed. Merging from 2 lanes to 1 is dangerous. This is not upgrading, indeed it is downgrading. Rockingham Rd is a main thoroughfare.</p> <p>d) Replacing the double-lane each-way lights at Lancaster Rd with a single lane roundabout is opposed. This infrastructure is already in place, and this is not upgrading, indeed it is downgrading. Rockingham Rd is a main thoroughfare. Roundabouts are not as safe as traffic lights, particularly for pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>e) Blocking the main exit from the Phoenix Centre for those turning north onto Rockingham Rd is opposed. This is not upgrading, indeed it is downgrading. Rockingham Rd is a main thoroughfare.</p> <p>f) Blocking northbound traffic from turning right to access numerous establishments from McDonalds to Hungry Jacks is opposed, particularly so for the BP petrol station. The</p>	<p>The key objectives of the project are to beautify the road and make it safer and more attractive for pedestrians. It is in this context that the plan seeks to 'upgrade' the road.</p> <p>a. The plan does not seek to re-direct regional traffic as such, rather it seeks to discourage heavy vehicles from using the road (who should not be using it currently). This section of road through Spearwood is the Town Centre of Spearwood, and the proposed road upgrades seek to slow traffic and beautify the road.</p> <p>b. Improvements to Rockingham Road were an action in the Phoenix Revitalisation Strategy, and have been long awaited by much of the Spearwood community.</p> <p>c. When we use the term 'upgrade', we are not referring to an upgrade to the road for moving traffic. The upgrade is in the context of improving the pedestrian environment, and providing safer vehicle movements.</p> <p>d. The proposed roundabout is essential to facilitate the U-turn movements that will allow good, safe access to both sides of Rockingham Road while removing many unsafe right hand turning movements.</p>

NO.	NAME/ADDRESS	SUBMISSION	RECOMMENDATION
		<p>alternative access routes are extensive and convoluted. Currently we frequent many of these businesses, however this will be curtailed if these obstructions proceed.</p> <p>g) Blocking access to Rockingham Rd southbound from the establishments on the western side is opposed. This is not upgrading, indeed it is downgrading. Rockingham Rd is a main thoroughfare.</p> <p>h) Reducing the speed limit is opposed. This is not upgrading, indeed it is downgrading. Rockingham Rd is a main thoroughfare.</p> <p>2. Comments in support:</p> <p>a) The concept to add bike lanes is supported.</p> <p>3. Recommendations:</p> <p>We would certainly support:</p> <p>a) The provision of pedestrian lights in the vicinity of the bus stops.</p> <p>b) A continuous dedicated centre lane to cater for northbound traffic both accessing and leaving the Phoenix Centre and also the establishments between McDonalds and Hungry Jacks.</p>	<p>e. Traffic modelling demonstrates that the road will still be able to function as a major thoroughfare.</p> <p>f. The proposed roundabout will facilitate safe access to these businesses. Many of these turning movements are considered to be unsafe.</p> <p>g. As above.</p> <p>h. Reduction of the speed limit is considered to be key to making the road safer for pedestrians, and will make access for vehicles safer.</p> <p>Notwithstanding, it is recommended that the Rockingham Road upgrade be deferred until such time as the Phoenix Shopping Centre undertake major development.</p>
19	Brian Tomlinson 3A Perlinte View NORTH COOGEE WA 6163	<p><b>Support</b></p> <p>This will be a real benefit to the local shopping precinct &amp; hopefully encourage more of a village feel. A Sunday farmers market could also be encouraged</p>	Noted.
20	Pharmacy 777 7/223 Rockingham Road SPEARWOOD WA 6163	<p><b>Support</b></p> <p>1. To whom it may concern I write on behalf of the council of owners at 223 and 235 Rockingham Road Spearwood in regards to the Draft Phoenix Activity Centre Documents for public comment.</p> <p>2. Whilst we are in support of the overall upgrade and beautification process, we are concerned that the plan as it stands currently significantly reduces access to our businesses by allowing only left hand access into our complex heading North on Rockingham Road.</p>	<p>Support for the overall upgrade and beautification process noted.</p> <p>The concerns raised regarding access under the proposed draft plans are acknowledged, and the City has investigated the addition of a roundabout in this area, as suggested in this submission, to provide improved access to both sides of the road. Traffic modelling has demonstrated that this is possible, and it is recommended that Council adopt the plan subject to the addition of this</p>


NO.	NAME/ADDRESS	SUBMISSION	RECOMMENDATION
		<p>The same issue also applies to the businesses across the road. After a lengthy review of the plans we believe that there is only one amendment which can solve ALL access issues to both sides of the road between Phoenix Road and Lancaster Street and that is by the addition of a roundabout at the existing driveway outside Liquorland.</p> <p>The addition, this roundabout allows access to ALL complexes East and West of Rockingham Road heading both North and South. While we acknowledge that there are some challenges in the construction of this roundabout such as the relocation of services we believe the investment is worthwhile is completing this project with maximum benefit to both businesses and the local community.</p> <p>Furthermore we put to you that without this roundabout there will be a significant negative impact on businesses in that precinct and the beautification upgrade should NOT proceed without it. Please see link below for a quick graphic reference of our suggestion. Note, this illustration is NOT in scale and is provided only to illustrate our point.</p> <p><b>Map included</b></p>	<p>roundabout to be subject to design feasibility.</p> <p>While it is recommended that the Rockingham Road upgrade be deferred until such time as the Phoenix Shopping Centre undertake major development; it is recommended that an additional roundabout in this location form part of any future concept plan for Rockingham Road.</p>
21	Main Roads WA PO Box 6202 EAST PERTH WA 6892	<p>Main Roads advises that as this section of Rockingham Road is classified as a local road. Main Roads has no objection to the proposed Activity Centre Structure Plan and supporting Design Guidelines for the Local Planning Policy.</p> <p>Please note that the concepts for the Rockingham Road upgrades will need to be formally submitted to Main Roads Road Network Operations - Traffic Services Section who shall undertake the following actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Undertake assessment for all signing and line marking as depicted on the concepts;</li> <li>• Provide comment to the decommissioning of the traffic signals at Rockingham Road/Lancaster Street;</li> <li>• Provide comment for any proposed reduction in speed limits to apply for this precinct</li> </ul>	Noted.
22	Community member	<p><b>Object</b></p> <p>The road plan is like Hampton road, Fremantle. Too much traffic from two lanes into one, and nowhere to go.</p> <p>The shops on the left side going south on Rockingham road have too many entries and exits. Should be cut down to one entry and angle parking.</p>	<p>The traffic modelling demonstrates that the proposed road design will still facilitate free flowing traffic.</p> <p>The plan proposes to rationalise some access points, however the parking areas are located on private land.</p>



NO.	NAME/ADDRESS	SUBMISSION	RECOMMENDATION
23	Department of Transport 140 William Street Perth WA 6000	<p>The DoT has reviewed the documents and provides the following comments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <b><u>Design of Rockingham Road</u></b> <p>Overall, the DoT is supportive of the narrowing of Rockingham Road from two lanes in each direction to one, the reduction in speed limit from 60km/h to 50km/h, the rationalisation of parking crossovers and the introduction of bicycle paths, to reduce overall traffic volumes, redistributing road space, improving safety and making the centre more bicycle-friendly. However, the Department raises the following concerns in regards to the design:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The “disappearance” of bicycle lanes at roundabouts (even with the option of entering either the normal traffic lane, or using the ramp up to the pedestrian path), which is not ideal practice. It is recommended that other options be explored, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>surface treatments and signage to alert motorists that cyclists approaching roundabouts will merge with the general traffic stream</li> <li>providing a wider off-road path for cyclists who choose to leave the roadway, one that offers pedestrian/cyclist segregation, smooth and direct ramps up from the road surface</li> <li>clear way-finding</li> </ul> </li> <li>A lack of priority at crossovers and car park entrances for pedestrians and cyclists using the pedestrian path along Rockingham Road. Greater priority could be provided at these non-signalised intersections by providing such treatments as <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>stop lines for approaching vehicles</li> <li>installing zebra crossings and/or pavements raised to footpath level</li> <li>green pavement marking in areas of potential conflict</li> </ul> </li> <li>The absence of an on-road bicycle lane on the eastern (southbound) side of Rockingham Road between Phoenix Road and Lancaster Street is not clearly justified or explained. The lane’s absence is made more serious by a lack of priority for either pedestrians or cyclists at crossovers and car</li> </ol> </li> </ul>	<p>The City will try to accommodate all of these points in the final design of the road.</p> <p>It should be noted that the City is not seeking to achieve a dedicated bus lane scenario, or priority for buses, rather the design seeks to ensure safe and convenient access to buses, balanced with improvements for pedestrians, safer movements for vehicles and beautification to the road within a very constrained road reserve.</p> <p>Comments on the Structure Plan will be addressed when it is presented to Council.</p>

NO.	NAME/ADDRESS	SUBMISSION	RECOMMENDATION
		<p>park entrances along the pedestrian path. A bicycle lane in this section should be considered.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li> <b><u>Design Guidelines</u></b> <p>The Phoenix Activity Centre Design Guidelines state that Development Applications are to be accompanied by a Pedestrian and Cyclist Movement Plan”, addressing (among other things) “(d) Provision of high quality, safe, secure and accessible end-of-trip facilities for cyclists”. This requirement is vague and does not distinguish between facilities for different cyclist user groups.</p> <p>It is suggested that the guidelines should explicitly prompt consideration of bicycle parking for tenants/staff as well as visitors, along with shower and change facilities for tenants/staff. There should also be a guide as to the rate of bicycle parking provision expected (after a brief review of whether the bicycle parking required by the Cockburn Town Planning Scheme is sufficient; a comparison of proposed provision to the 5-10% of all parking spaces for cyclists and motorcyclists required by SPP 4.2; and any provision agreed under any Parking Supply and Management Plan for the shopping centre).</p> </li> <li> <b><u>Structure Plan</u></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. DoT support the promotion of active transport, bus priority and support enhanced pedestrian amenity, access and connectivity and removing / reconfiguring / re-purposing parking recommended in the structure plan. For more information about assistance in modifying parking supply and management and about promoting active travel, refer to Parking Guidelines for Large Shopping Centres (<a href="http://www.transport.wa.gov.au/mediaFiles/projects/DOT_P_Parking_Guidelines_Large_Shopping_Centres.pdf">http://www.transport.wa.gov.au/mediaFiles/projects/DOT_P_Parking_Guidelines_Large_Shopping_Centres.pdf</a>) and Travel Plan Guidelines for Large Shopping Centres (<a href="http://www.transport.wa.gov.au/mediaFiles/projects/DOT_P_Travel_Plan_Guidelines_Large_Shopping_Centres.pdf">http://www.transport.wa.gov.au/mediaFiles/projects/DOT_P_Travel_Plan_Guidelines_Large_Shopping_Centres.pdf</a>). DoT will be happy to provide support or advice on how to implement.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
24	Community member	<p>We neither support nor object at this point, but have serious reservations regarding the proposed single-lane at Phoenix shopping centre – Phoenix Road to Spearwood Ave.</p> <p>Will this potential bottle neck create more traffic bank-ups on the Rockingham Road</p>	The traffic modelling demonstrates that traffic will be free flowing.


NO.	NAME/ADDRESS	SUBMISSION	RECOMMENDATION
		<p>approach side (Hamilton Hill -not Spearwood), bearing in mind the build-ups now when buses stop at the Puma s/station, and school drop odd/pick up/peak hours?</p> <p>We have already been impacted by build-up past our house of traffic since the “black-spot intersection” changes.</p>	
25	SBAS Holdings Pty Ltd 2 Lancaster Street SPEARWOOD WA 6163	<p>All the Directors of SBAS Holdings have lived in the Cockburn District their entire lives and have a strong passion for the area.</p> <p>As we have also owned 2 (Lot 851) Lancaster Street, Spearwood (Lancaster House) for over 30 years, we believe we are in a good position to provide the City with valuable input in regards to the Draft Phoenix</p> <p>Activity Centre documents.</p> <p>In upgrading Rockingham Road, we are aware the City of Cockburn are proposing for the main access points to the Spearwood commercial area east of Rockingham Road (between Lancaster Street and Phoenix Road) to be off both Phoenix Road and Lancaster Street respectively.</p> <p>After considering its implications, we believe the proposed Concept Design for the Rockingham Road Upgrade could negatively impact our property and that of adjoining owners of commercial properties situated to the eastern side of Rockingham Road, between Lancaster Street and Phoenix Road.</p> <p>Although we are generally supportive of upgrading the Spearwood town centre, we believe closing the two crossovers fronting Rockingham Road could potentially negatively impact the market value of our property and create a undesirable rat run on the eastern side of our property.</p> <p>The positioning of the two crossover points fronting Rockingham Road and the potential undesirable rat run are best indicated on the following Aerial Map:</p>	<p>The concerns raised regarding access under the proposed draft plans are acknowledged, and the City has investigated the addition of a roundabout in this area to provide improved access to both sides of the road. Traffic modelling has demonstrated that this is possible, and it is recommended that Council adopt the plan subject to the addition of this roundabout to be subject to design feasibility.</p> <p>This is considered to be preferred than slip lanes which will removed opportunities for landscaping which is considered key to beautification of the area. The example of ‘Main Street’ shown here is much less constrained road, with a much larger road reservation, and in this example pedestrian movement is primarily accommodated adjacent to commercial premises which cannot be achieved along this section of Rockingham Road.</p>

NO.	NAME/ADDRESS	SUBMISSION	RECOMMENDATION
		<div>  <p>Rockingham Road Frontage</p> <p>Potential 'rat run'</p> <p>2 Lancaster Street</p> <p>Lancaster St</p> </div> <p>At present, we currently benefit from two crossover points fronting Lancaster Street and a third crossover point which is situated to our immediate north-east fronting Rockingham Road.</p> <p>We would estimate that 50% of the vehicles who enter our property arrive via Rockingham Road and 50% via Lancaster Street.</p> <p>Long term tenants within 2 (Lot 851) Lancaster Street, Spearwood (Lancaster House)</p>	


NO.	NAME/ADDRESS	SUBMISSION	RECOMMENDATION
		<p>include Westpac, H &amp; R Block, the TAB, Phoenix Podiatry, the Dialysis Clinic, Harcourts and Interchange.</p> <p>With the imminent opening of an Aldi supermarket on the corner of Lancaster Street and Burgundy Crescent, we believe there is potential for the 'rat run' that is situated on the eastern side of our main building to become even more busier if the two crossovers fronting Rockingham Road were closed.</p> <p>Our concern is further heightened by the fact that a number of elderly and disabled customers enter our building on a daily basis to attend the Dialysis Clinic - a tenant within our building. In our eyes the 'rat run' could potentially be a hazard.</p> <p>In our opinion the closure of the two crossover points fronting Rockingham Road will also make it more difficult for our tenants to trade and increase the prospect of potential vacancies within our property.</p> <p>We are also aware that multinational firms including BP, KFC, Liquorland, City Farmers, Hungry Jacks, Subway, Dominos and Auto Masters - which are situated to our property's immediate north - also benefit from the two crossover points on Rockingham Road which are situated to the immediate north-east of our property.</p> <p>All these businesses. would be negatively impacted by the closure of the two crossover points fronting Rockingham Road</p> <p>More particularly, we are aware that vehicle access is crucial to both service stations and fast food retailers. Drive through customers likely generate between 70% to 80% of KFC and Hungry Jacks Spearwood's overall revenue.</p> <p>If the two crossover points are closed, the City is likely to experience a strong backlash from the numerous owners and businesses who own property and trade between Lancaster Street and Phoenix Road.</p> <p>As one of the aims of the Phoenix Activity Centre is to rejuvenate and beautify the area, we believe the City should rethink its proposal to close the two crossover points fronting Rockingham Road.</p> <p>As a solution, we believe that vehicles travelling in a northerly direction along Rockingham Road should still retain the ability to turn right into the two existing crossover points fronting Rockingham Road.</p>	



NO.	NAME/ADDRESS	SUBMISSION	RECOMMENDATION
		<p>As a compromise, we believe that vehicles turning right out of our property and adjoining properties should be restricted from making a right turn in a northerly direction along Rockingham Road. Instead, customers could turn left into Rockingham Road in a southerly direction and then enter the roundabout on the corner of Rockingham Road and Lancaster Street to eventually move in a northerly direction.</p> <p>Our concept is best shown in the following Plan:</p>	

NO.	NAME/ADDRESS	SUBMISSION	RECOMMENDATION
		 <p>After considering the location of the various retailers and businesses situated on the eastern side of Rockingham Road between Lancaster Street and Phoenix Road, we believe access in (ingress) is more important to them that access out (egress).</p> <p>Although we acknowledge that the area needs to be upgraded, we do not support the closure of the two crossover points fronting Rockingham Road that currently exist between</p>	

NO.	NAME/ADDRESS	SUBMISSION	RECOMMENDATION
		<p>Lancaster Street and Phoenix Road.</p> <p>We believe our proposed access solution would assist local businesses and assist the City in achieving its goals to revitalise the precinct by beautifying Rockingham Road.</p> <p>In our opinion a good example for the Rockingham Road upgrade would be the City of Stirling's redevelopment of Main Street, Osborne Park.</p> <p>The following aerial photograph provides an excellent example of what the City of Stirling were able to achieve within the Osborne Park Town Centre Precinct.</p>	

NO.	NAME/ADDRESS	SUBMISSION	RECOMMENDATION
		 <p>We believe the aerial photograph provides an excellent indication of how a median strip can be created which still permits ingress and egress from the various commercial buildings which front a busy thoroughfare.</p> <p>We recommend that the City explores the road design layout of the above commercial precinct.</p> <p>Although we acknowledge that upgrading a major thoroughfare is a costly exercise, we believe it is important that the Rockingham Road upgrade is done properly to ensure that it enhances the various businesses that front Rockingham Road.</p>	

NO.	NAME/ADDRESS	SUBMISSION	RECOMMENDATION
		<p>We believe the City should not attempt to undertake the road upgrade, if it can't afford to do it properly. In our opinion it is integral that the current proposal for the Rockingham Road upgrade between Lancaster Street and Phoenix Road does not go ahead in its existing form.</p> <p>We believe our proposed access solution is sensible and could potentially provide a sensible outcome for all the businesses and owners who are presently located within the Spearwood Commercial Centre.</p> <p>We hope our proposed access solution is looked upon favourably by the City and is acted upon.</p>	
26	Cockburn Chiropractic Centre 243 Rockingham Road Spearwood WA 6163	<p>With respect to the draft concept plan for Rockingham Road, my concern is the access to the Cockburn Chiropractic Centre at 243 Rockingham Road.</p> <p>Currently, the width of the driveway allows vehicles to enter and exit the premises at the same time. When turning into the property from the south, ie making a left turn into the drive, it is effectively a u-turn to enter the main car park (as opposed to the rear staff parking). This requires a significant turning circle.</p> <p>It would appear on the plans that this access is significantly reduced by close to one half. The reduction in width would prevent vehicles from entering and exiting at the same time. This could create hold ups on the roundabout as vehicles wait to enter the property. Being just off the roundabout, it may also pose a hazard to drivers not expecting to stop for vehicles accessing the property.</p> <p>Possible solutions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Retain current drive width - this would allow vehicles to access and exit the property without any undue hold ups, allowing free flowing traffic.</li> <li>2. Create a southern entry to the carpark and retain the northern exit point as an exit only.</li> </ol> <p>Further planning and design with consultation is required to ensure a satisfactory outcome.</p>	Noted. It is recommended that the City liaise further with the landowner to ensure this access is safe and adequate in future when the project is revisited.
27	Community member	<p><b>Support</b></p> <p>I am very excited by the prospect of the redevelopment of this sad looking section of Cockburn. In particular I wholeheartedly support:</p>	Noted.



NO.	NAME/ADDRESS	SUBMISSION	RECOMMENDATION
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• decreased speed limit to 50kmph</li> <li>• pelican crossing (I often witness elderly people struggling to cross the road here)</li> <li>• greening of the area via streetscaping, particularly tree plantings</li> <li>• cycle paths</li> <li>• public art and sitting spaces</li> <li>• installation of the two roundabouts I would also welcome</li> <li>• greening of the paved sitting area with public art near the shopping centre entrance</li> <li>• addition of a dog parking' area similar to that at the Spearwood library.</li> </ul> <p>I am currently harassed by Phoenix shopping centre security staff when I walk my dog to the shopping centre. I encourage the Council to engage with the shopping centre management regarding this issue. I understand the vicious attack by a dog many years ago has impacted their feelings on the matter, however having a place to tie my dog up while I quickly do my shopping encourages me and my two daughters to walk to the shops rather than drive, which has a positive impact on our City via increased well-being.</p> <p>I would welcome the opportunity to assist. -removal of the line of sight hazards when pulling out of the many driveways from the shopping precinct near city farmers/hungry jacks.</p> <p>I thank all staff for their wonderful work in maintaining the City of Cockburn as a fantastic place to live.</p>	
28	Community member	<p><b>Object</b> More and more cars are on the roads and you want to decrease the lanes. That makes no sense.</p> <p>Phoenix offers very little to shoppers anyway.</p>	The proposed changes to the road have been modelled and demonstrate that traffic will be free flowing. The changes to the road are seeking to make traffic movements safer, and in particular improve safety and comfort for pedestrians.
29	Community member	<p><b>Object</b> Rockingham Road from Phoenix Road to Spearwood Avenue is a very busy road now, especially around the bus stop outside the shopping centre on each side of the road. The</p>	The proposed changes to the road have been modelled and demonstrate that traffic will be free flowing. The changes to the road are seeking to

NO.	NAME/ADDRESS	SUBMISSION	RECOMMENDATION
		<p>entrance to the shopping centre near the bus stop is a disaster as well as the right turning lane into the shopping centre from the opposite of the road.</p> <p>If Rockingham Road was made into single lanes in each direction, it would only increase the congestions. Also a roundabout at Lancaster Street when the traffic lights are perfect with Aldi moving into Lancaster Street. Why would a roundabout at Lancaster Street and Rockingham Road work better?</p> <p>It would be better if at Kent Street and Rockingham Road for a traffic light pedestrian crossing there, as in South Street Hilton (near IGA). Spend the \$4million doing this instead of causing more congestion on this stretch of Rockingham Road.</p>	<p>make traffic movements safer, and in particular improve safety and comfort for pedestrians.</p> <p>The proposed roundabout at Lancaster Street is proposed to allow for U-turns to provide access to both sides of the road. This allows unsafe traffic movements to be removed.</p>
30	Community member	<p><b>Support</b> Revitalisation of this precinct is long overdue and the proposed activity centre structure plan and included Rockingham Rd improvements goes a long way towards achieving this.</p>	Noted.
31	Community members	<p><b>Support</b> We support in principal the upgrade and traffic calming of Rockingham Road between Coleville Crescent and Phoenix road.</p> <p>As long term residents we have participated over the past decade in various workshops and forums regarding these road upgrades as part of the overall revitalisation of this main precinct / shopping hub of Spearwood, which is a definitely overdue project!</p> <p>To be successful, it is essential that this project be thoroughly researched and be implemented with care to accommodate: A: Road users and pedestrians. B: Business stakeholders for now and into the future. C: Property owners and residents,</p> <p>We are also of the mind that this project should not be compromised by budgetary constraints. We do not have information on what basis the initial budget was derived and are concerned this is being viewed somewhat as a hard limit. If allocated budget funding for this project is found not to be sufficient for the pre-construction and construction stages, Council should actively consider the reasonable extension of further funds and time in order to achieve a functional design that works, meets stakeholder requirements, presents a quality finish and proudly highlights this area of Spearwood for years to come.</p> <p>We would like to formally acknowledge the pleasant professionalism and willingness of Andrew Trosic and Donna Di Renzo to organise consultation and update meetings with the Phoenix Working Group and accommodating of their time for any further consults /</p>	<p>1) It may be possible for this to be achieve in the future to achieve a connection here if this site is redeveloped.</p> <p>2) The City acknowledges the issues with access between Lancaster Street and Phoenix Road, and has considered an additional roundabout at this location, which has been supported by the adjacent landowners as a way of improving access. This would be subject to further detailed design work. This will minimise the impact on the areas of proposed landscaping in the median, which provides the key opportunities for beautify the area.</p> <p>3) The new proposed roundabout between Lancaster and Phoenix Road is considered to provide much improved access to this area than shown in the draft advertised plan. It is also recommended that the plan be adopted</p>

NO.	NAME/ADDRESS	SUBMISSION	RECOMMENDATION
		<p>questions regarding this project.</p> <p>The design draft drawings have been beneficial in enabling a perception of proposed traffic flow and business / resident access. We suggest moving into the future that council adopts a digital (CAD) presentation for this project to facilitate meeting discussions and so interested community members will be able to see the finished design concept (via the Council website). We're sure this will garner more community interest in this major project.</p> <p>We would recommend in this submission some variations to allow better access to businesses on either side of Rockingham road, both currently and into the future. The following are suggested - refer to numbered points on marked up proposed concept draft plan (which also forms part of this submission).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ideally the Lancaster roundabout (currently proposed as a 3 way), could be extended to a 4 way now or into the future depending on negotiations with the property owners west side of Rockingham road. A western entry could be used to provide access to businesses in the block where the pharmacist and doctor's surgery are located.</li> <li>2. Alternatively entry to these same businesses could be moved south (near Goodall sign), with a new left turn only exit replacing the current entry / exit on Rockingham road. This exit could be protected by repositioning of the adjacent bus stop to the south of this exit.</li> </ol> <p>Entry into businesses east side (eg. BP, Liquorland, etc) heading north could be improved by a slip lane (3 to 4 car capacity) in centre of Rockingham road. This entry could be duplicated in this area.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. Entry/exit to this same business block from Phoenix road heading east could/should be provided to alleviate traffic off Rockingham road.</li> <li>4. For businesses east side between Phoenix Shopping Centre entry and Lancaster street (Nando's, Cheesecake Shop, etc) , slipways should be provided on Rockingham road to allow traffic heading north to enter.</li> </ol> <p>We recommend these variations be carefully considered by council, and again stress that this project design and funding should not be compromised.</p>	<p>subject to the review and any associated modification to improve access from Phoenix Road to the car park entry behind Hungry Jacks and BP such that it is safer and more legible for cars to utilise this access point;</p> <p>4) Right access is being restricted to these properties to allow for safer access via the two roundabouts.</p>

NO.	NAME/ADDRESS	SUBMISSION	RECOMMENDATION
		<p>This road upgrade and revitalisation of Spearwood's main precinct will be the City of Cockburn's legacy to the long term ratepayers of this area, as well as those yet to come to be proud to call Spearwood home.</p> <p><b>(map included with notes)</b></p>	
32	<p>Department of Health PO Box 8172 Perth Business Centre WA 6849</p>	<p>Any developments are required to connect to scheme water and reticulated sewerage as required by the Government Sewerage Policy - Perth Metropolitan Region.</p> <p>DOH has a document on 'Evidence supporting the creation of environments that encourage healthy active living' which may assist you with planning elements related to this activity centre plan. A copy is attached or may be downloaded from: <a href="http://www.public.health.wa.gov.au/cproot/6111/2/140924_wahealth_evidence_statement_be_health.Pdf">http://www.public.health.wa.gov.au/cproot/6111/2/140924_wahealth_evidence_statement_be_health.Pdf</a></p> <p>The City of Cockburn should also use this opportunity to minimise potential negative impacts of the increased density development such as noise, odour, light and other lifestyle activities. To minimise adverse impacts on the residents, the City of Cockburn could consider the incorporation of additional sound proofing/ insulation, or design aspects related to the location of air conditioning units and other appropriate building/construction measures.</p>	Noted.
33	<p>Nivio Madeira 38 Kent Street SPEARWOOD WA 6163</p>	<p><b>Object</b> Living on Kent Street my family and neighbours are directly impacted by this proposal on Rockingham Rd upgrade. There are a couple of issues I have for objecting to this proposal.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The supposedly independent consultants paid by Cockburn council to assess traffic movements excluded peak hour traffic from there assessment, Why was that? If we are trying to get the real traffic condition surely peak hour needs to be taken into account or was the council looking for a favourable result.</li> <li>2. Where is the existing traffic supposed to go when you close off a lane? There's plenty of traffic on Hamilton road now so is that going to be the new Rockingham road?</li> <li>3. The two roundabouts proposed are going to create a traffic jam when you come from the south towards the Kent street roundabout. It won't be a flowing merging</li> </ol>	<p>The traffic modelling demonstrates free flowing traffic and the proposed road can accommodate the existing traffic. Hamilton Road will be monitored to ensure that there is no significant increase to traffic.</p> <p>The reduced width road will be much easier for pedestrians to cross anywhere along the road, particularly with the median.</p> <p>The Structure Plan and Rockingham Road Concept plan attempt to work within the existing constraints of the shopping centre to achieve an outcome that can be implemented.</p> <p>There is insufficient space for any substantial additional landscaping in the existing road reserve without removing a lane.</p>

NO.	NAME/ADDRESS	SUBMISSION	RECOMMENDATION
		<p>traffic from two lane to one as cars have to give way on the roundabout and on peak hour traffic, cars will be banked up past Spearwood Ave . It will be the same on Coleville Crescent the traffic will bank up past Phoenix rd. Also cars going into the shopping centre on Kent street will cause traffic jams going South as cars line up to get into the shopping centre. Not to mention the buses who have now only one lane to move into. Lt's going to contribute to the traffic gridlock along Rockingham road . So if the Upgrade is supposed to rationalise movement and safely manage business access on Rockingham road it's going to fail miserably it's only going to create chaos and frustration.</p> <p>4. Pedestrians: How are we supposed to cross with the increase of traffic around the roundabout, are pedestrians supposed to take their chances between the cars .There is no plan for pedestrians coming from the south to enter the shopping centre. Lt's going to be a real hazard to pedestrians. The optional pedestrian crossing with lights in the middle of Rockingham road is a crossing to nowhere. I tried to find the path into the shopping centre, its somewhere behind McDonalds not a real solution.</p> <p>5. The draft documentation says it will transform into an attractive and welcoming environment. So what's going to happen to the shopping centre all we see is the backside of Coles supermarket by putting some plants in front of it doesn't make it more inviting nor by taking a lane away.</p> <p>In conclusion all this beautification can be done there's enough space to plant these trees and shrubs without losing a lane. Spearwood has been rezoned and has become more densely populated. A lot more younger families live in the area which means more cars. So why are we reducing car lanes. Young families' means more kids playing, riding their bikes and walking to school so why are we increasing more traffic to the residential areas around phoenix shopping centre. It's going to be more of a hazard for everyone as the proposal suggest, bike lanes, bus lanes ,cars and pedestrians have to share one lane if that's not a hazard i don't know what is.</p> <p>There's not even a plan for a practical pedestrian crossing. With this proposed upgrade there will be increased traffic on Kent street where there's no speed humps in sight with Cockburn soccer fields which has always kids around. Just to note the speed humps on Kent street will come in eventually and should not be use to justify a solution to the</p>	<p>The proposal is seeking to reduce traffic speeds along Rockingham Road to make it safer and more attractive for pedestrians, and it not considered that substantial amounts of traffic will be diverted into residential areas.</p> <p>It is recommended that the plan be adopted with inclusion of traffic calming along Kent Street and specifically between the steep section of Kent Street from Rockingham Road to Sussex Street;</p>



NO.	NAME/ADDRESS	SUBMISSION	RECOMMENDATION
		<p>increase traffic on Kent street!</p> <p>As a resident of Kent street I'm not looking forward to have an increase of cars driving down my street to avoid the traffic gridlock proposed by this upgrade or the cars lined up my street waiting to get on Rockingham road. If Rockingham road is considered a low traffic area as the independent consultants have said, then one solution will be too close of Kent street intersecting with Rockingham rd.</p>	
34	Susanna Ialacci 255 Rockingham Road SPEARWOOD WA 6163	<p><b>Object</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Hello, I have lived at this house for 40 years and I know this part of Spearwood very well. I have seen the increase of traffic over the years but having dual lanes is not an issue for me. However, I would hate to see Rockingham Road turned into a single lane. It's already quite hard at peak traffic times to reverse onto traffic on Rockingham Road, but by changing it to a single lane; I fear that it's going to be even worse. Reducing to a single lane does not reduce the amount of cars which pass by – I can envisage there will be a queue of cars just crawling through this street which is not any advantage to us who live on this street. Would be quite a nightmare.</li> <li>2. I saw this same scenario happen on Hampton Road many years ago and I truly believe it was the worst thing they did. In fact, I had to change my route to work (changed from Hampton Road to Carrington Street) as I found I was stuck in continuing traffic all the time. Carrington Street was much faster as it had 2 lanes and was my new route to work.</li> <li>3. I am all for "beautifying" this part of the road (it's been well overdue) and I think plants can still be placed on the side of the dual road (business side only) and also around Phoenix Shopping Centre.</li> <li>4. As for changing the amount of entrances for businesses opposite my house (where Video Ezy is - this also gets hectic but i think an entrance needs to be removed) Only 1 entrance and 1 exit is required. Maybe even to have the exit come out onto the phoenix shopping centre driveway just outside McDonalds.</li> </ol>	<p>Noted. However, improvements to Rockingham Road were an action in the Phoenix Revitalisation Strategy, and have been long awaited by much of the Spearwood community.</p> <p>The traffic modelling demonstrates free flowing traffic.</p> <p>There is insufficient opportunities for street trees and landscaping within the current road reserve.</p> <p>The proposed changes to these intersection, and use of the two proposed roundabout will provide much safer access to these properties.</p> <p>The roundabout at Lancaster Street is required to facilitate the U-turn movements that allow the continuous median and changes to access.</p> <p>There is insufficient space for a pedestrian overpass, and this would require substantial private land acquisitions (eg. Businesses and/or homes) which the City considers highly undesirable and not in the best interests of the community. In addition, pedestrian overpasses are very expensive, and would consume most of the budget available for the upgrade. It is also important to note that pedestrian overpasses do not actually provide good accessibility because the distances required to walk are significant due to the long ramps.</p>

NO.	NAME/ADDRESS	SUBMISSION	RECOMMENDATION
		<p>As for the hectic intersection outside Phoenix Shopping Centre, I do believe it is a hazard. There have been many accidents here.</p> <p>5. There is a lot of people who get off the bus and cross the road to go to the shops. Would be great to have an overpass, this would be ideal.</p> <p>6. Another option is to create a dual lane huge roundabout there but again - not a single lane. This would create too much traffic bank up between Spearwood Avenue and Kent Street.</p> <p>7. I think the traffic lights at Lancaster Street should remain. There doesn't seem to be an issue here and doesn't stop people crossing the road if need be.</p> <p>8. Overall, I understand why you want to do this, but it's not beneficial. I think it will create more traffic chaos. It's a busy flowing road which needs to remain this way. I would be happy to discuss this further if needed.</p>	
	TPG on behalf of Rockworth, Phoenix Shopping Centre owners.	<p><b>Extract of comments from Rockworth relating to the Activity Centre Structure Plan and Local Planning Policy Design Guidelines:</b></p> <p>Additional Comments</p> <p>1) Covered walkway for northern upper deck Rockworth are also of the view that costs associated with the construction of item 1(a) referred to in the staging plan, being the requirement to construct a covered walkway on the north-south pedestrian path of the northern upper car parking deck, should be borne by the City of Cockburn and not Rockworth.</p> <p>2) We have undertaken a thorough review of the draft Phoenix Activity Centre Structure Plan and provide the following comments for consideration by the City.</p> <p>a. Proposed entry reconfiguration - It is requested that the draft Structure Plan documentation be modified to accommodate the proposed alternative access arrangements previously outlined in our submission. Specifically, the Development Concept Plan relating to the Core Precinct should be modified to include the following:</p>	<p>1) Not supported. This provision of a covered walkway to improve pedestrian amenity, and support pedestrian movement which is currently poorly provided for, in the event of expansion of the shopping centre is considered justifiable given the objectives of SPP 4.2. The City is seeking to encourage people to walk to the centre through improvements to the pedestrian environment, and this particularly important given the disjointed nature of the Aldi site and the Shopping Centre itself.</p> <p>Without these provisions being included it will be difficult to ensure any expansion of the Shopping Centre will result in improvements to the interface with Rockingham Road and the pedestrian environment. It is therefore considered</p>

NO.	NAME/ADDRESS	SUBMISSION	RECOMMENDATION
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provision of four way vehicular access at the crossover located immediately south of the existing McDonald's tenancy, including provision for a slip lane on the north bound carriageway on Rockingham Road.</li> <li>Modification to the existing ramp entry to facilitate better accessibility between the existing southwestern car parking area and the car parking located in the north-eastern section of the Phoenix Shopping Centre.</li> </ul> <p>3.) Location of gathering space within the Core Precinct - The proposed Structure Plan designates a new community gathering space and pedestrian connection within the 'Core Precinct'. We have given careful consideration to the proposed location of this community space, and while it is a sound principle for the Centre to provide a community focal space, we consider that the draft Structure Plan proposes it in a problematic location, for reasons outlined below:</p> <p>1. The community space would be located between the proposed Kent Street roundabout and the car parking deck associated with Coles (the southern carpark). The proposed location would therefore have a low level of amenity as a result of being exposed to a significant amount of vehicle movement.</p> <p>2. The proposed location of the community space adjacent to the roundabout and primary entry to the shopping centre also represents a safety concern, particularly for children, as there is potential for human activity to inadvertently conflict with adjacent vehicular traffic.</p> <p>3. The proposed location would be exposed to prevailing south-westerly winds and harsh afternoon sun. There is limited opportunity to mitigate these factors due to its location adjacent to Rockingham Road. The space will therefore not be a pleasant space to linger, particularly in summer.</p> <p>4. The proposed location is not associated with any active uses within the Centre. It is located adjacent to an existing car parking area and would be overlooked by the back of house area of the Coles tenancy. In order for such a space to be inviting and successful, it should be located adjacent to active retail tenancies, such as food and beverage outlets.</p> <p>5. The location would compromise the ability to provide car parking to offset the loss</p>	<p>justifiable to include these requirements in the Activity Centre Structure Plan.</p> <p>2) The proposed alternate plan is not supported because it removes the amenity space and does not result in any beautification to the area. Given that agreement could not be reached on the proposed Rockingham Road upgrade it is recommended that the project be deferred until such time as the Shopping Centre undertakes major development. These details discussed would be considered through a development application.</p> <p>3) Supported in part. It is agreed that some additional flexibility is required in relation to the amenity space given the upgrade concept plan for Rockingham Road is now unknown. It is therefore recommended that references to the 'amenity space' in the Activity Centre Structure Plan be modified to refer to a location on or adjacent to Rockingham Road. It is still considered important that this space be located on Rockingham Road and not internal to the site where it will not contribute to the public realm or interface.</p> <p>4) See 3 above.</p> <p>5) It is recommended that variation of this requirement be included as follows:</p> <p>"If an application is made for Major Development as defined by the State Planning Policy 4.2, a functional 'public space' is to be included as part</p>

NO.	NAME/ADDRESS	SUBMISSION	RECOMMENDATION
		<p>of 35 car parking bays within the southern car park as a result of the proposed Kent Street roundabout.</p> <p>6. It is also considered that the proposed creation of a public space should be linked with a major floor space expansion of the centre (i.e. proposed building &gt;10,000m<sup>2</sup> or extensions &gt;5,000m<sup>2</sup>) and not a minor expansion. The reason for this is that any minor redevelopment is not likely to have the potential to yield significant change to the public realm in order to create a functional public space with a high level of activation and amenity.</p> <p>As an alternative, we propose that the Structure Plan provide greater flexibility relating to the location of a community gathering space with the opportunity for creating a successful public space associated with an application for major floorspace expansion within the centre. It is suggested that a provision in the Structure Plan be included to provide flexibility relating to the location of a new community space, associated within any substantial redevelopment.</p> <p>It is requested that the following modifications be made to the draft Structure Plan documentation:</p> <p>4.) That the specific location of the community gathering space be deleted from the Development Concept Plan for the Core Precinct (item 2) and replaced with a generic notation on the plan which refers to the requirement to create a new community space associated within any future retail redevelopment adjacent to Rockingham Road.</p> <p>With respect to the development requirements and staging table located under the heading 'Staging Plan', delete requirement 2 in relation to 'Minor expansion to the floor space'.</p> <p>5.) Insert a new requirement in relation to 'Major floor space expansion', as follows:</p> <p><i>a. "If an application is made for a Major Development Application as defined by the LCACS, in a location that has high levels of public visibility and accessibility (i.e. adjacent Rockingham Road), then the application should propose the creation of a functional 'public space', and this space should be activated with retail tenancies ('shop' and/or food and beverage) and provide a high level of amenity. Where an application for Major Development is received that does not propose a 'public space', then the applicant shall</i></p>	<p>of the proposal, to be located in an area with high levels of public visibility and accessibility (i.e. adjacent to Rockingham Road). This space should be activated with retail tenancies ('shop' and/or food and beverage), provide a high level of amenity, and contribute to a more active and attractive interface with Rockingham Road.</p> <p>6) See 3 above.</p> <p>7) It is not considered appropriate to stipulate upper parking requirements in this case as there are no 'reciprocal parking and availability of on-street parking' opportunities at this stage. The City can consider reductions in parking on a case by case basis as deemed appropriate. Given the highly constrained nature of the site an unknown future re-development outcomes it is not recommended that a parking cap be set, the purpose of which is to encourage other forms of transport. Improvements to the pedestrian environment and end of trip facilities for cyclists, amongst other things, would be more effective in this regard.</p>

NO.	NAME/ADDRESS	SUBMISSION	RECOMMENDATION
		<p><i>provide justification as to why such a space is not proposed as part of the application. Once a 'public space' has been provided, further requirements for public space as part of future applications will be considered on an as needs basis."</i></p> <p>6.) Delete dot point 1 of Action no. 3 under the 'Action Plan' as it requires the community gathering space to be provided in a specific location and would not result in a good outcome for reasons already outlined in our submission.</p> <p>7.) Reduced car parking rates - It is requested that the draft Structure Plan be modified to include a section providing guidance on the application of reduced car parking ratios for the Centre. State Planning Policy 4.2 – Activity Centres Policy for Perth and Peel (SPP 4.2) states that for activity centres, upper limits should be prescribed for car parking provision, due to opportunities for reciprocal parking, availability of on-street parking and the need for land efficiency.</p> <p>SPP 4.2 prescribes a guide of between 1 bay per 20 to 25 square metres of shop floorspace for activity centres.</p> <p>On this basis, we request that the Structure Plan prescribe an upper limit of car parking of 1 bay per 25 square metres of shop floorspace, acknowledging the current oversupply of car parking within the Centre.</p> <p>Draft Phoenix Activity Centre Design Guidelines</p> <p>We have reviewed the draft Phoenix Activity Centre Design Guidelines and provide comment as summarised in the following table.</p>	



NO.	NAME/ADDRESS	SUBMISSION	RECOMMENDATION														
		<p><b>Draft Phoenix Activity Centre Design Guidelines</b></p> <p>We have reviewed the draft Phoenix Activity Centre Design Guidelines and provide comment as summarised in the following table.</p> <table><tr><th>Extract of Policy Provision</th><th>Comment</th></tr><tr><td><b>(1) General policy objectives</b></td><td>No specific comment.</td></tr><tr><td><b>(2) General Provisions</b> 1. Signage</td><td>This section should include an additional provision which encourages a coordinated approach to signage, including consolidated pylon signage and wall panel signage incorporated into the design of future buildings.</td></tr><tr><td><b>(3) Phoenix Core Precinct</b> <b>1. Movement</b> 2. Development Applications are to be accompanied by a Pedestrian and Cyclist Movement Plan...</td><td>The provision is silent on the trigger for requiring a Pedestrian and Cyclist Movement Plan. It is considered an onerous requirement for minor applications which will have limited or no ability to modify movement and accessibility within the public realm. It is suggested that this provision be amended to relate specifically to development applications proposing Major Floorspace Expansion.</td></tr><tr><td><b>(3) Phoenix Core Precinct</b> <b>1. Movement</b> 3. All development applications for the Phoenix Shopping Centre site that propose expansion of floorspace, or extensions or modifications to car parking areas or vehicle access ramps, must address the following matters...</td><td>This provision should be amended to clarify that the matters are only required to be addressed where applicable to the specific development application.</td></tr><tr><td><b>(3) Phoenix Core Precinct</b> <b>1. Movement</b> 3. b. Demonstrate improvements to the servicing areas on March Street including:</td><td>This policy provision is incomplete as it does not specify what improvements are required to be undertaken.</td></tr><tr><td><b>(3) Phoenix Core Precinct</b> <b>3. Built Form</b> c) Ground floor non-residential frontages are to be designed as shop fronts with no less than 70% of the shop front glazed with clear glass to facilitate passive surveillance and ensure an interesting pedestrian environment.</td><td>In our experience, a requirement to provide 70% glazing is not able to be achieved when taking into account structural requirements of buildings, the need to externally locate some services and other factors.  It is suggested that this provision be reworded as follows:</td></tr></table>	Extract of Policy Provision	Comment	<b>(1) General policy objectives</b>	No specific comment.	<b>(2) General Provisions</b> 1. Signage	This section should include an additional provision which encourages a coordinated approach to signage, including consolidated pylon signage and wall panel signage incorporated into the design of future buildings.	<b>(3) Phoenix Core Precinct</b> <b>1. Movement</b> 2. Development Applications are to be accompanied by a Pedestrian and Cyclist Movement Plan...	The provision is silent on the trigger for requiring a Pedestrian and Cyclist Movement Plan. It is considered an onerous requirement for minor applications which will have limited or no ability to modify movement and accessibility within the public realm. It is suggested that this provision be amended to relate specifically to development applications proposing Major Floorspace Expansion.	<b>(3) Phoenix Core Precinct</b> <b>1. Movement</b> 3. All development applications for the Phoenix Shopping Centre site that propose expansion of floorspace, or extensions or modifications to car parking areas or vehicle access ramps, must address the following matters...	This provision should be amended to clarify that the matters are only required to be addressed where applicable to the specific development application.	<b>(3) Phoenix Core Precinct</b> <b>1. Movement</b> 3. b. Demonstrate improvements to the servicing areas on March Street including:	This policy provision is incomplete as it does not specify what improvements are required to be undertaken.	<b>(3) Phoenix Core Precinct</b> <b>3. Built Form</b> c) Ground floor non-residential frontages are to be designed as shop fronts with no less than 70% of the shop front glazed with clear glass to facilitate passive surveillance and ensure an interesting pedestrian environment.	In our experience, a requirement to provide 70% glazing is not able to be achieved when taking into account structural requirements of buildings, the need to externally locate some services and other factors.  It is suggested that this provision be reworded as follows:	<p>COMMENTS ON DRAFT LOCAL PLANNING POLICY</p> <p>1) Noted. This will be dealt with through a Signage Strategy.</p> <p>2) Not supported. It is proposed that this is required for all proposals, and they will be expected to demonstrate how they consider and accommodate pedestrian and cyclist movement in the context of the proposal, as minor as it may be. The City does not want to see minor incremental changes to the Shopping Centre exacerbating the current situation or poor pedestrian amenity and connectivity by not considering such matters.</p> <p>3) Not supported, in line with SPP 4.2 and the Draft Activity Centre Structure Plan it is recommended that these improvements are critical as part of any proposal for the centre.</p> <p>4) Noted. It is recommended that this be modified to state “Demonstrate improvements to the servicing area on March Street which reduce negative impacts on residential amenity.”</p> <p>5) Supported. It is recommended that the alternative proposed wording be included.</p> <p>6) Supported. It is recommended that this</p>
Extract of Policy Provision	Comment																
<b>(1) General policy objectives</b>	No specific comment.																
<b>(2) General Provisions</b> 1. Signage	This section should include an additional provision which encourages a coordinated approach to signage, including consolidated pylon signage and wall panel signage incorporated into the design of future buildings.																
<b>(3) Phoenix Core Precinct</b> <b>1. Movement</b> 2. Development Applications are to be accompanied by a Pedestrian and Cyclist Movement Plan...	The provision is silent on the trigger for requiring a Pedestrian and Cyclist Movement Plan. It is considered an onerous requirement for minor applications which will have limited or no ability to modify movement and accessibility within the public realm. It is suggested that this provision be amended to relate specifically to development applications proposing Major Floorspace Expansion.																
<b>(3) Phoenix Core Precinct</b> <b>1. Movement</b> 3. All development applications for the Phoenix Shopping Centre site that propose expansion of floorspace, or extensions or modifications to car parking areas or vehicle access ramps, must address the following matters...	This provision should be amended to clarify that the matters are only required to be addressed where applicable to the specific development application.																
<b>(3) Phoenix Core Precinct</b> <b>1. Movement</b> 3. b. Demonstrate improvements to the servicing areas on March Street including:	This policy provision is incomplete as it does not specify what improvements are required to be undertaken.																
<b>(3) Phoenix Core Precinct</b> <b>3. Built Form</b> c) Ground floor non-residential frontages are to be designed as shop fronts with no less than 70% of the shop front glazed with clear glass to facilitate passive surveillance and ensure an interesting pedestrian environment.	In our experience, a requirement to provide 70% glazing is not able to be achieved when taking into account structural requirements of buildings, the need to externally locate some services and other factors.  It is suggested that this provision be reworded as follows:																

NO.	NAME/ADDRESS	SUBMISSION	RECOMMENDATION
		<div> <div></div> <div> <p><i>"c) Ground floor non-residential frontages fronting Rockingham Road or primary pedestrian linkages are to be designed as shop fronts with no less than 70% glazing. Buildings fronting other public areas shall be glazed for a minimum of 50%. Glazing percentages are to apply from between 0.9m and 2.1m above footpath/street level."</i></p> </div> </div> <div> <p><b>(3) Phoenix Core Precinct</b>  <b>5. Capacity for future residential</b>  a) Major redevelopment or expansion of the shopping centre must demonstrate a capacity for future residential above retail on the shopping centre site.</p> </div> <div> <p>The construction of residential apartments above the existing shopping centre is currently constrained by the <i>Strata Titles Act 1985</i>. While there is a reform proposed to the Act, it is ultimately unclear if and when this reform will be gazetted, and in what ultimate form.</p> <p>With this uncertainty, it is requested that this requirement be removed from the current draft policy, with an opportunity to revisit the policy to include such a requirement if and when the reform to the <i>Strata Titles Act 1985</i> occurs.</p> </div> <p>On behalf of Rockworth Capital Partners, we thank you for the opportunity to make a submission in relation to the draft Phoenix Activity Centre policy framework and concept for the redesign of Rockingham Road. We trust that the City will give due consideration to the comments that we have provided in this submission and proceed to incorporate our requested modifications into the draft framework. We would welcome the opportunity to meet with the City to discuss our submission in further detail and also welcome the opportunity to continue to work with the City to improve the functionality and amenity of the Phoenix Activity Centre on an ongoing basis.</p> <p>Please do not hesitate to contact the undersigned on (08) 9289 8300 should you wish to discuss our submission.</p>	be deleted.
	McDonald's Australia Ltd and Mr Terry Creasey	<p>McDonald's Australia Ltd and Mr Terry Creasey are the proprietors of the McDonald's Restaurant at Lot 63 (254) Rockingham Road, Spearwood.</p> <p>We thank the City of Cockburn for the opportunity to review and provide comment on the Rockingham Road upgrade concept, and meeting with ourselves and the project team on 25 August 2016 to discuss our initial concerns and the alternative</p>	It is recommended that these matters will be considered when the Rockingham Road upgrade occurs in the future as part of the major development of the Shopping Centre.

NO.	NAME/ADDRESS	SUBMISSION	RECOMMENDATION
		<p>access proposal.</p> <p>In principle, we support the City's initiative to activate Rockingham Road and improve the pedestrian environment, however the proposed works as they are currently designed will significantly adversely impact our business operations, access for customers and will create traffic conflicts.</p> <p>We object to the current proposal, as presented, as there will be significant adverse safety issues caused to our customers by the adjacent loading dock access point. Furthermore, the proposed access arrangements will cause a substantial detrimental impact on our business through the removal of the right turn access into our site for northbound traffic on Rockingham Road.</p> <p>Based on our business modelling, the removal of the right turn access into our site for northbound traffic on Rockingham Road will reduce revenue by at least 30%. This represents a substantial impact to the business operations and as a consequence it will affect the ability for both Terry Creasey and McDonald's Australia to reinvest in the restaurant to provide improved services and facilities to the community in the future. Page 2</p> <p>Importantly, a loss of revenue of this scale will also significantly impact the ability to not only employ additional staff at the store but also to retain the existing numbers. Such an impact on revenue will also affect the ability for the store to continue the level of community support in the local area as well as the ability to support any new initiatives into the future.</p> <p>McDonald's remains committed to providing local employment and community sponsorship opportunities, however the proposed access arrangements puts in serious jeopardy the level of employment and community sponsorship that they store can support.</p> <p>We have worked closely with the owners of the Phoenix Shopping Centre to prepare</p>	

NO.	NAME/ADDRESS	SUBMISSION	RECOMMENDATION
		<p>an alternative access proposal that maintains satisfactory access to the site. Refer Appendix 1.</p> <p>The alternative access proposal maintains the right turn access into our site for northbound traffic and provides satisfactory access to the both the restaurant and shopping centre, whilst achieving the City's objectives to improve the streetscape through additional landscaping, pedestrian safety and renewal of the shopping centre frontage.</p> <p>We request the City modify the Rockingham Road upgrade concept to include the access arrangements presented in the alternative access proposal. We thank the City's officers for engaging with us and look forward to achieving a mutually acceptable solution.</p>	

CITY OF COCKBURN  
MUNICIPAL BANK ACCOUNT

**OCM 9/3/2017 - Item 16.1**

<b>Cheque/</b>	<b>Account No.</b>	<b>Account/Payee</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Value</b>
EF100054	10152	<b>AUST SERVICES UNION</b> PAYROLL DEDUCTIONS	9/01/2017	1,497.50
EF100055	10154	<b>AUSTRALIAN TAXATION OFFICE</b> PAYROLL DEDUCTIONS	9/01/2017	391,236.00
EF100056	10305	<b>CHILD SUPPORT AGENCY</b> PAYROLL DEDUCTIONS	9/01/2017	3,633.66
EF100057	10733	<b>HOSPITAL BENEFIT FUND</b> PAYROLL DEDUCTIONS	9/01/2017	295.05
EF100058	11001	<b>LOCAL GOVERNMENT RACING &amp; CEMETERIE</b> PAYROLL DEDUCTIONS	9/01/2017	328.00
EF100059	11857	<b>CHAMPAGNE SOCIAL CLUB</b> PAYROLL DEDUCTIONS	9/01/2017	600.00
EF100060	11860	<b>45S CLUB</b> PAYROLL DEDUCTIONS	9/01/2017	20.00
EF100061	18553	<b>SELECTUS PTY LTD</b> PAYROLL DEDUCTIONS	9/01/2017	9,446.12
EF100062	19726	<b>HEALTH INSURANCE FUND OF WA</b> PAYROLL DEDUCTIONS	9/01/2017	1,255.65
EF100063	25987	<b>TOYOTA FLEET MANAGEMENT</b> PAYROLL DEDUCTIONS - NOVATED LEASE	9/01/2017	567.62
EF100064	99997	<b>COC GRANTS, DONATIONS &amp; REFUNDS</b> GRANTS, DONATIONS & REFUNDS	9/01/2017	389.00
EF100065	99997	<b>COC GRANTS, DONATIONS &amp; REFUNDS</b> GRANTS, DONATIONS & REFUNDS	9/01/2017	300.00
EF100066	99997	<b>COC GRANTS, DONATIONS &amp; REFUNDS</b> GRANTS, DONATIONS & REFUNDS	9/01/2017	104.00
EF100067	10244	<b>BUILDING &amp; CONST INDUSTRY TRAINING FU</b> LEVY PAYMENT	11/01/2017	135,826.93
EF100068	99996	<b>PULSE REALTY PROPERTY MANAGEMENT</b> REFUND	11/01/2017	14,725.00
EF100069	26517	<b>CLICKSUPER</b> PAYROLL DEDUCTIONS	19/01/2017	499,201.41
EF100070	23302	<b>BUILDING SERVIC</b> BUILDING SERVICES LEVIES	12/01/2017	130,352.05
EF100071	27056	<b>DIRECT PROPERTY VALUATIONS</b> PROPERTY VALUATION	12/01/2017	825.00
EF100072	10152	<b>AUST SERVICES UNION</b> PAYROLL DEDUCTIONS	16/01/2017	1,497.50
EF100073	10154	<b>AUSTRALIAN TAXATION OFFICE</b> PAYROLL DEDUCTIONS	16/01/2017	378,806.00
EF100074	10305	<b>CHILD SUPPORT AGENCY</b> PAYROLL DEDUCTIONS	16/01/2017	3,633.66
EF100075	10733	<b>HOSPITAL BENEFIT FUND</b> PAYROLL DEDUCTIONS	16/01/2017	295.05
EF100076	11001	<b>LOCAL GOVERNMENT RACING &amp; CEMETERIE</b> PAYROLL DEDUCTIONS	16/01/2017	328.00
EF100077	11795	<b>WESTERN POWER</b> ELECTRICAL SERVICES	16/01/2017	781.00
EF100078	11857	<b>CHAMPAGNE SOCIAL CLUB</b> PAYROLL DEDUCTIONS	16/01/2017	592.00
EF100079	11860	<b>45S CLUB</b> PAYROLL DEDUCTIONS	16/01/2017	20.00
EF100080	18553	<b>SELECTUS PTY LTD</b> PAYROLL DEDUCTIONS	16/01/2017	10,149.86
EF100081	19726	<b>HEALTH INSURANCE FUND OF WA</b> PAYROLL DEDUCTIONS	16/01/2017	1,255.65
EF100082	25987	<b>TOYOTA FLEET MANAGEMENT</b> PAYROLL DEDUCTIONS - NOVATED LEASE	16/01/2017	567.62



CITY OF COCKBURN  
MUNICIPAL BANK ACCOUNT

Cheque/	Account No.	Account/Payee	Date	Value
EF100083	99997	<b>SINTA NG</b> 50% CPA MEMBERSHIP FEE 2017	16/01/2017	360.00
EF100084	12565	<b>SOUTHERN METRO REGIONAL COUNCIL - LO</b> LOAN REPAYMENT	23/01/2017	30,435.17
EF100085	25797	<b>DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENT REGULATIO</b> ANNUAL LICENCE - HWRP	23/01/2017	125,000.00
EF100086	11753	<b>WASTE MANAGEMENT &amp; RECYCLING FUND</b> QUARTERLY LANDFILL LEVY PAYMENT	26/01/2017	891,910.39
EF100087	26517	<b>CLICKSUPER</b> PAYROLL DEDUCTIONS	25/01/2017	497,733.07
EF100088	10152	<b>AUST SERVICES UNION</b> PAYROLL DEDUCTIONS	30/01/2017	1,497.50
EF100089	10154	<b>AUSTRALIAN TAXATION OFFICE</b> PAYROLL DEDUCTIONS	30/01/2017	390,114.00
EF100090	10305	<b>CHILD SUPPORT AGENCY</b> PAYROLL DEDUCTIONS	30/01/2017	3,633.66
EF100091	10733	<b>HOSPITAL BENEFIT FUND</b> PAYROLL DEDUCTIONS	30/01/2017	295.05
EF100092	11001	<b>LOCAL GOVERNMENT RACING &amp; CEMETERIE</b> PAYROLL DEDUCTIONS	30/01/2017	328.00
EF100093	11857	<b>CHAMPAGNE SOCIAL CLUB</b> PAYROLL DEDUCTIONS	30/01/2017	588.00
EF100094	11860	<b>45S CLUB</b> PAYROLL DEDUCTIONS	30/01/2017	20.00
EF100095	18553	<b>SELECTUS PTY LTD</b> PAYROLL DEDUCTIONS	30/01/2017	11,723.95
EF100096	19726	<b>HEALTH INSURANCE FUND OF WA</b> PAYROLL DEDUCTIONS	30/01/2017	1,333.35
EF100097	25987	<b>TOYOTA FLEET MANAGEMENT</b> PAYROLL DEDUCTIONS - NOVATED LEASE	30/01/2017	567.62
EF100098	26647	<b>MULTIPLEX CONSTRUCTIONS PTY LTD</b> BUILDING - CONSTRUCTION PROGRESS	30/01/2017	3,930,795.88
EF100099	10000	<b>21ST CENTURY BUSINESS EQUIPMENT</b> OFFICE SUPPLIES AND EQUIPMENT	31/01/2017	346.50
EF100100	10031	<b>ADVANCED SPATIAL TECHNOLOGIES PTY LT</b> SOFTWARE MAINTENANCE & SUPPORT	31/01/2017	2,684.00
EF100101	10035	<b>ADVENTURE WORLD WA PTY LTD</b> ENTERTAINMENT SERVICES	31/01/2017	1,018.00
EF100102	10058	<b>ALSCO PTY LTD</b> HYGIENE SERVICES/SUPPLIES	31/01/2017	3,367.85
EF100103	10071	<b>AUSTRALASIAN PERFORMING RIGHT ASSOC</b> LICENCE - PERFORMING RIGHTS	31/01/2017	728.72
EF100104	10084	<b>ARRB GROUP</b> ROAD MANAGEMENT	31/01/2017	495.00
EF100105	10091	<b>ASLAB PTY LTD</b> ASPHALTING SERVICES/SUPPLIES	31/01/2017	10,743.89
EF100106	10118	<b>AUSTRALIA POST</b> POSTAGE CHARGES	31/01/2017	31,794.99
EF100107	10160	<b>DORMA AUSTRALIA PTY LTD</b> AUTOMATIC DOOR SERVICES	31/01/2017	16,342.76
EF100108	10170	<b>MACRI PARTNERS</b> AUDITING SERVICES	31/01/2017	4,665.10
EF100109	10184	<b>BENARA NURSERIES</b> PLANTS	31/01/2017	154.00
EF100110	10207	<b>BOC GASES</b> GAS SUPPLIES	31/01/2017	71.60
EF100111	10220	<b>BOYA EQUIPMENT</b> EQUIPMENT SUPPLIES	31/01/2017	118,785.00

CITY OF COCKBURN  
MUNICIPAL BANK ACCOUNT

Cheque/	Account No.	Account/Payee	Date	Value
EF100112	10221	<b>BP AUSTRALIA LIMITED</b> DIESEL/PETROL SUPPLIES	31/01/2017	27,103.27
EF100113	10226	<b>BRIDGESTONE AUSTRALIA LTD</b> TYRE SERVICES	31/01/2017	43,425.31
EF100114	10239	<b>BUDGET RENT A CAR - PERTH</b> MOTOR VEHICLE HIRE	31/01/2017	1,280.00
EF100115	10246	<b>BUNNINGS BUILDING SUPPLIES PTY LTD</b> HARDWARE SUPPLIES	31/01/2017	2,855.08
EF100116	10247	<b>BUNZL AUSTRALIA LTD</b> PAPER/PLASTIC/CLEANING SUPPLIES	31/01/2017	1,039.35
EF100117	10255	<b>CABCHARGE AUSTRALIA PTY LTD</b> CABCHARGES	31/01/2017	1,123.03
EF100118	10287	<b>CENTRELINE MARKINGS</b> LINEMARKING SERVICES	31/01/2017	11,110.00
EF100119	10333	<b>CJD EQUIPMENT PTY LTD</b> HARDWARE SUPPLIES	31/01/2017	2,086.72
EF100120	10346	<b>COATES HIRE OPERATIONS PTY LTD</b> EQUIPMENT HIRING SERVICES	31/01/2017	184.91
EF100121	10348	<b>COCA COLA AMATIL</b> SOFT DRINK SUPPLIES	31/01/2017	347.00
EF100122	10359	<b>COCKBURN PAINTING SERVICE</b> PAINTING SUPPLIES/SERVICES	31/01/2017	3,993.00
EF100123	10375	<b>VEOLIA ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES</b> WASTE SERVICES	31/01/2017	10,313.45
EF100124	10384	<b>PROGILITY PTY LTD</b> COMMUNICATION SERVICES	31/01/2017	4,729.51
EF100125	10386	<b>COMMUNITY NEWSPAPER GROUP</b> ADVERTISING SERVICES	31/01/2017	10,285.63
EF100126	10483	<b>LANDGATE</b> MAPPING/LAND TITLE SEARCHES	31/01/2017	8,268.77
EF100127	10526	<b>E &amp; MJ ROSHER PTY LTD</b> MOWER PARTS	31/01/2017	11,803.15
EF100128	10527	<b>EAGLE SPORTS</b> SPORTING GOODS	31/01/2017	226.60
EF100129	10556	<b>INSTITUTE OF WEIGHT AND LIFE MANAGEM</b> SEMINARS/TRAINING SERVICES	31/01/2017	968.00
EF100130	10573	<b>FAIRBRIDGE WESTERN AUSTRALIA INC</b> OUTDOOR RECREATION SERVICES	31/01/2017	792.00
EF100131	10580	<b>FC COURIERS</b> COURIER SERVICES	31/01/2017	2,023.43
EF100132	10589	<b>FINES ENFORCEMENT REGISTRY</b> FINES ENFORCEMENT FEES	31/01/2017	1,450.00
EF100133	10590	<b>DEPARTMENT OF FIRE AND EMERGENCY SE</b> ESL LEVY & RELATED COSTS	31/01/2017	19,301.02
EF100134	10597	<b>FLEXI STAFF PTY LTD</b> EMPLOYMENT SERVICES	31/01/2017	74,552.76
EF100135	10609	<b>FORESTVALE TREES P/L</b> PLANTS - TREES/SHRUBS	31/01/2017	20,592.00
EF100136	10636	<b>FUJI XEROX AUSTRALIA PTY LTD</b> PHOTOCOPY CHARGES	31/01/2017	21,722.14
EF100137	10711	<b>HERALD PUBLISHING COMPANY PTY LTD</b> ADVERTISING SERVICES	31/01/2017	792.00
EF100138	10726	<b>HOLTON CONNOR ARCHITECTS &amp; PLANNERS</b> ARCHITECTURAL SERVICES - PROJECT 1121-	31/01/2017	13,365.00
EF100139	10739	<b>HYDRAMET PTY LTD</b> POOL PARTS/EQUIPMENT	31/01/2017	363.00
EF100140	10779	<b>J F COVICH &amp; CO PTY LTD</b> ELECTRICAL SERVICES	31/01/2017	36,638.79

CITY OF COCKBURN  
MUNICIPAL BANK ACCOUNT

Cheque/	Account No.	Account/Payee	Date	Value
EF100141	10783	<b>JANDAKOT METAL INDUSTRIES</b> METAL SUPPLIES	31/01/2017	2,821.50
EF100142	10787	<b>JANDAKOT ACCIDENT REPAIR CENTRE</b> PANEL BEATING SERVICES	31/01/2017	5,000.00
EF100143	10791	<b>JASMAN ENTERPRISES PTY LTD</b> HIGH PRESSURE CLEANING	31/01/2017	884.57
EF100144	10794	<b>JASON SIGNMAKERS</b> SIGNS	31/01/2017	8,745.83
EF100145	10879	<b>LES MILLS AEROBICS</b> INSTRUCTION/TRAINING SERVICES	31/01/2017	1,171.79
EF100146	10883	<b>LIFTRITE HIRE &amp; SALES</b> LIFTING SERVICES	31/01/2017	594.00
EF100147	10884	<b>WSP BUILDINGS PTY LTD</b> CONSULTANCY SERVICES - PROJECT	31/01/2017	24,980.25
EF100148	10888	<b>LJ CATERERS</b> CATERING SERVICES	31/01/2017	2,231.64
EF100149	10892	<b>LOCAL GOVERNMENT PROFESSIONALS AUSTRALIA</b> SUBSCRIPTION	31/01/2017	513.00
EF100150	10912	<b>M2 TECHNOLOGY PTY LTD</b> MESSAGING SERVICES	31/01/2017	396.00
EF100151	10913	<b>BUCHER MUNICIPAL PTY LTD</b> PURCHASE OF NEW PLANT / REPAIR	31/01/2017	728,141.63
EF100152	10917	<b>MAGIC NISSAN</b> PURCHASE OF VEHICLES, PARTS & REPAIRS	31/01/2017	313.10
EF100153	10918	<b>MAIN ROADS WA</b> REPAIRS/MAINTENANCE SERVICES	31/01/2017	107,914.67
EF100154	10923	<b>MAJOR MOTORS PTY LTD</b> REPAIRS/MAINTENANCE SERVICES	31/01/2017	737.09
EF100155	10942	<b>MCGEES PROPERTY</b> PROPERTY CONSULTANCY SERVICES	31/01/2017	2,200.00
EF100156	10944	<b>MCLEODS</b> LEGAL SERVICES	31/01/2017	38,216.57
EF100157	10991	<b>BEACON EQUIPMENT</b> MOWING EQUIPMENT	31/01/2017	2,387.10
EF100158	11022	<b>NATIVE ARC</b> GRANTS & DONATIONS	31/01/2017	600.00
EF100159	11026	<b>NESTLE FOOD SERVICES</b> CATERING SUPPLIES	31/01/2017	1,444.80
EF100160	11028	<b>NEVERFAIL SPRINGWATER LTD</b> BOTTLED WATER SUPPLIES	31/01/2017	1,761.36
EF100161	11036	<b>NORTHLAKE ELECTRICAL</b> ELECTRICAL SERVICES	31/01/2017	28,592.82
EF100162	11039	<b>NOVUS AUTO GLASS</b> WINDSCREEN REPAIR SERVICES	31/01/2017	320.00
EF100163	11068	<b>VODAFONE HUTCHISON AUSTRALIA PTY LTD</b> PAGING SERVICES	31/01/2017	665.50
EF100164	11077	<b>P &amp; G BODY BUILDERS PTY LTD</b> PLANT BODY BUILDING SERVICES	31/01/2017	2,084.50
EF100165	11182	<b>PREMIUM BRAKE &amp; CLUTCH SERVICE</b> BRAKE SERVICES	31/01/2017	10,066.65
EF100166	11205	<b>QUALITY TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT PTY LTD</b> TRAFFIC CONTROL SERVICES	31/01/2017	18,400.21
EF100167	11208	<b>QUICK CORPORATE AUSTRALIA PTY LTD</b> STATIONERY/CONSUMABLES	31/01/2017	4,056.80
EF100168	11235	<b>REINFORCED CONCRETE PIPES PTY LTD</b> CONCRETE PIPE SUPPLIES	31/01/2017	26,811.73
EF100169	11244	<b>RESEARCH SOLUTIONS PTY LTD</b> RESEARCH SERVICES	31/01/2017	3,209.68

CITY OF COCKBURN  
MUNICIPAL BANK ACCOUNT

Cheque/	Account No.	Account/Payee	Date	Value
EF100170	11284	<b>ROYAL LIFE SAVING SOCIETY AUSTRALIA</b> TRAINING SERVICES	31/01/2017	120.00
EF100171	11307	<b>SATELLITE SECURITY SERVICES PTY LTD</b> SECURITY SERVICES	31/01/2017	12,390.06
EF100172	11308	<b>SBA SUPPLIES</b> HARDWARE SUPPLIES	31/01/2017	1,844.84
EF100173	11331	<b>SHAWMAC PTY LTD</b> CONSULTANCY SERVICES - CIVIL	31/01/2017	4,400.00
EF100174	11337	<b>SHERIDANS FOR BADGES</b> NAME BADGES & ENGRAVING	31/01/2017	630.15
EF100175	11361	<b>SIGMA CHEMICALS PTY LTD</b> CHEMICAL SUPPLIES	31/01/2017	3,415.10
EF100176	11373	<b>SKIPPER TRUCK PARTS</b> SPARE PARTS & MAINTENANCE SERVICES	31/01/2017	612.64
EF100177	11375	<b>SLATER-GARTRELL SPORTS</b> SPORT SUPPLIES	31/01/2017	45,320.00
EF100178	11387	<b>BIBRA LAKE SOILS</b> SOIL & LIMESTONE SUPPLIES	31/01/2017	600.00
EF100179	11425	<b>SOUTHERN METROPOLITAN REGIONAL COUNCIL</b> WASTE DISPOSAL GATE FEES	31/01/2017	869,857.26
EF100180	11470	<b>SPORTSWORLD OF WA</b> SPORT SUPPLIES	31/01/2017	931.70
EF100181	11483	<b>ST JOHN AMBULANCE AUST WA OPERATIONS</b> FIRST AID COURSES	31/01/2017	1,275.52
EF100182	11496	<b>STANLEE WA LTD</b> CATERING EQUIPMENT/SUPPLIES	31/01/2017	255.75
EF100183	11502	<b>STATE LAW PUBLISHER</b> ADVERTISING SERVICES	31/01/2017	361.92
EF100184	11511	<b>STATEWIDE BEARINGS</b> BEARING SUPPLIES	31/01/2017	188.14
EF100185	11531	<b>SUNNY INDUSTRIAL BRUSHWARE PTY LTD</b> BRUSH/ROAD BROOM SUPPLIES	31/01/2017	429.00
EF100186	11533	<b>SUPERBOWL MELVILLE</b> ENTERTAINMENT SERVICES	31/01/2017	353.40
EF100187	11546	<b>T FAULKNER &amp; CO</b> INSTALLATIONS/SUPPLY OF HAND RAILS	31/01/2017	3,520.00
EF100188	11625	<b>TOTAL EDEN PTY LTD</b> RETICULATION SUPPLIES	31/01/2017	87,855.10
EF100189	11651	<b>TREE WATERING SERVICES</b> TREE WATERING SERVICES	31/01/2017	39,168.00
EF100190	11657	<b>TRUCKLINE PARTS CENTRES</b> AUTOMOTIVE SPARE PARTS	31/01/2017	1,052.10
EF100191	11665	<b>TUNNEL VISION</b> PLUMBING SERVICES	31/01/2017	495.00
EF100192	11667	<b>TURFMASTER FACILITY MANAGEMENT</b> TURFING SERVICES	31/01/2017	17,882.70
EF100193	11697	<b>VAT MAN-FAT FILTERING SYSTEMS</b> FILTER CLEANING SERVICES	31/01/2017	999.90
EF100194	11699	<b>VERNON DESIGN GROUP</b> ARCHITECTURAL SERVICES	31/01/2017	3,150.40
EF100195	11701	<b>VIBRA INDUSTRIA</b> FILTER SUPPLIES	31/01/2017	1,128.60
EF100196	11708	<b>VITAL PACKAGING PTY LTD</b> PACKAGING SUPPLIES	31/01/2017	8,495.96
EF100197	11715	<b>WA BLUEMETAL</b> ROADBASE SUPPLIES	31/01/2017	16,074.21
EF100198	11722	<b>WA HINO SALES &amp; SERVICE</b> PURCHASE OF NEW TRUCKS /	31/01/2017	5,885.74

CITY OF COCKBURN  
MUNICIPAL BANK ACCOUNT

Cheque/	Account No.	Account/Payee	Date	Value
EF100199	11725	<b>WA LIBRARY SUPPLIES PTY LTD</b> LIBRARY SUPPLIES	31/01/2017	106.60
EF100200	11726	<b>WA LIMESTONE</b> LIMESTONE SUPPLIES	31/01/2017	4,031.98
EF100201	11749	<b>WARRENS EARTHMOVING CONTRACTORS</b> EARTHMOVING SERVICES	31/01/2017	330.00
EF100202	11773	<b>WESFARMERS LANDMARK LIMITED</b> CHEMICAL SUPPLIES	31/01/2017	803.00
EF100203	11789	<b>WALGA</b> ADVERTISING/TRAINING SERVICES	31/01/2017	1,924.77
EF100204	11793	<b>WESTERN IRRIGATION PTY LTD</b> IRRIGATION SERVICES/SUPPLIES	31/01/2017	25,025.36
EF100205	11795	<b>WESTERN POWER</b> ELECTRICAL SERVICES	31/01/2017	14,008.00
EF100206	11806	<b>WESTRAC PTY LTD</b> REPAIRS/MTNCE - EARTHMOVING	31/01/2017	444.69
EF100207	11835	<b>WURTH AUSTRALIA PTY LTD</b> HARDWARE SUPPLIES	31/01/2017	1,286.49
EF100208	11854	<b>ZIPFORM</b> PRINTING SERVICES	31/01/2017	5,150.43
EF100209	11873	<b>WATTLEUP TRACTORS</b> HARDWARE SUPPLIES	31/01/2017	1,359.60
EF100210	11985	<b>IVO GRUBELICH</b> BUS HIRE	31/01/2017	9,350.00
EF100211	12014	<b>TUTT BRYANT EQUIPMENT BT EQUIPMENT F</b> EXCAVATING/EARTHMOVING EQUIPMENT	31/01/2017	687,035.80
EF100212	12153	<b>HAYS PERSONNEL SERVICES PTY LTD</b> EMPLOYMENT SERVICES	31/01/2017	6,016.56
EF100213	12394	<b>MP ROGERS &amp; ASSOCIATES PTY LTD</b> CONSULTANCY SERVICES - MARINE	31/01/2017	6,584.16
EF100214	12589	<b>AUSTRALIAN INSTITUTE OF MANAGEMENT</b> TRAINING SERVICES	31/01/2017	2,090.00
EF100215	12796	<b>ISENTIA PTY LIMITED</b> MEDIA MONITORING SERVICES	31/01/2017	1,447.34
EF100216	12998	<b>PLAYRIGHT AUSTRALIA PTY LTD</b> INSPECTION SERVICES - PLAYGROUNDS	31/01/2017	2,167.20
EF100217	12999	<b>SV GLASS</b> GLAZING SERVICES	31/01/2017	429.00
EF100218	13037	<b>PPCA LTD</b> LICENCE FEE - SOUND & MUSIC	31/01/2017	1,679.76
EF100219	13056	<b>CLEANDUSTRIAL SERVICES PTY LTD</b> CLEANING SERVICES	31/01/2017	67,394.89
EF100220	13073	<b>CUSTOM BUILT SAUNAS</b> SAUNA EQUIPMENT/SERVICES	31/01/2017	135.00
EF100221	13102	<b>MICHAEL PAGE INTERNATIONAL</b> EMPLOYMENT SERVICES	31/01/2017	1,457.62
EF100222	13462	<b>ATI-MIRAGE PTY LTD</b> TRAINING SERVICES	31/01/2017	262.50
EF100223	13563	<b>GREEN SKILLS INC</b> EMPLOYMENT SERVICES	31/01/2017	11,314.28
EF100224	13582	<b>DBS FENCING</b> FENCING SERVICES	31/01/2017	1,589.50
EF100225	13619	<b>YMCA OF PERTH</b> YOUTH & FAMILY SERVICES	31/01/2017	136.00
EF100226	13671	<b>STAPLES AUSTRALIA PTY LTD</b> OFFICE SUPPLIES/SOFTWARE LICENCES	31/01/2017	54,798.97
EF100227	13767	<b>ELLIOTTS IRRIGATION PTY LTD</b> IRRIGATION SERVICES	31/01/2017	418.00



CITY OF COCKBURN  
MUNICIPAL BANK ACCOUNT

Cheque/	Account No.	Account/Payee	Date	Value
EF100228	13825	<b>JACKSON MCDONALD</b> LEGAL SERVICES	31/01/2017	21,532.52
EF100229	13860	<b>KRS CONTRACTING</b> WASTE COLLECTION SERVICES	31/01/2017	3,112.50
EF100230	13873	<b>COCKBURN SES</b> TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT SERVICES	31/01/2017	1,026.40
EF100231	14311	<b>BBC ENTERTAINMENT</b> ENTERTAINMENT SERVICES	31/01/2017	1,155.00
EF100232	14459	<b>BIDVEST (WA)</b> FOOD/CATERING SUPPLIES	31/01/2017	1,356.99
EF100233	14476	<b>COCKBURN PLEASURE BOAT STORAGE</b> STORAGE SERVICES	31/01/2017	990.00
EF100234	14593	<b>AUSTREND INTERNATIONAL PTY LTD</b> ALUMINIUM SUPPLIES	31/01/2017	2,631.77
EF100235	14598	<b>ALF REBOLA THE GOOD GUYS</b> ELECTRICAL GOODS	31/01/2017	129.00
EF100236	14667	<b>APPEALING SIGNS</b> SIGNS	31/01/2017	264.00
EF100237	15109	<b>REPEAT PLASTICS (WA)</b> PLASTIC PRODUCTS	31/01/2017	10,733.58
EF100238	15271	<b>PLE COMPUTERS PTY LTD PLE CORPORATE</b> COMPUTER HARDWARE	31/01/2017	7,938.00
EF100239	15393	<b>GREENWAY ENTERPRISES</b> HARDWARE SUPPLIES	31/01/2017	1,343.72
EF100240	15588	<b>NATURAL AREA HOLDINGS PTY LTD</b> WEED SPRAYING	31/01/2017	9,244.68
EF100241	15676	<b>ADH FENCING</b> FENCING SERVICES	31/01/2017	1,089.00
EF100242	15678	<b>A2Z PEST CONTROL THE TRUSTEE FOR CAL</b> PEST CONTROL	31/01/2017	4,069.00
EF100243	15785	<b>DIEBACK TREATMENT SERVICES</b> CONSULTANCY SERVICES - ENVIRONMENTAL	31/01/2017	19,845.00
EF100244	15850	<b>ECOSCAPE</b> ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTANCY	31/01/2017	24,007.50
EF100245	15868	<b>CARDNO (WA) PTY LTD</b> CONSULTANCY SERVICES - ENGINEERING	31/01/2017	1,260.60
EF100246	16064	<b>CMS ENGINEERING PTY LTD</b> AIRCONDITIONING SERVICES	31/01/2017	23,278.41
EF100247	16107	<b>WREN OIL</b> WASTE DISPOSAL SERVICES	31/01/2017	66.00
EF100248	16257	<b>THE FINISHING TOUCH GALLERY</b> FRAMING SERVICES	31/01/2017	468.00
EF100249	16363	<b>ATCO GAS AUSTRALIA</b> GAS SUPPLIES/SERVICES	31/01/2017	27,593.45
EF100250	16384	<b>BULL MOTOR BODIES</b> MOTOR BODIES	31/01/2017	88.28
EF100251	16396	<b>MAYDAY EARTHMOVING</b> ROAD CONSTRUCTION MACHINE HIRE	31/01/2017	38,782.33
EF100252	16704	<b>ACCIDENTAL FIRST AID SUPPLIES - PERTH S</b> MEDICAL SUPPLIES	31/01/2017	2,141.77
EF100253	16985	<b>WA PREMIX</b> CONCRETE SUPPLIES	31/01/2017	22,532.84
EF100254	16997	<b>AUS SECURE</b> SECURITY SERVICES/PRODUCTS	31/01/2017	160.00
EF100255	17097	<b>VALUE TISSUE</b> PAPER PRODUCTS	31/01/2017	400.40
EF100256	17279	<b>AUSSIE COOL SHADES</b> SHADE SAILS & AWNINGS	31/01/2017	48,459.35

CITY OF COCKBURN  
MUNICIPAL BANK ACCOUNT

Cheque/	Account No.	Account/Payee	Date	Value
EF100257	17305	<b>NOEL MORRISON</b> ARTIST	31/01/2017	1,750.00
EF100258	17471	<b>PIRTEK (FREMANTLE) PTY LTD</b> HOSES & FITTINGS	31/01/2017	3,631.15
EF100259	17481	<b>ADS AUTOMATION PTY LTD</b> DOOR/GATE REPAIRS	31/01/2017	1,284.80
EF100260	17555	<b>ALLEASING PTY LTD</b> LEASE REPAYMENTS	31/01/2017	46,615.73
EF100261	17600	<b>ERECTIONS (WA)</b> GUARD RAILS	31/01/2017	4,072.29
EF100262	17608	<b>NU-TRAC RURAL CONTRACTING</b> BEACH CLEANING/FIREBREAK	31/01/2017	10,648.00
EF100263	17798	<b>WESTERN DIAGNOSTIC PATHOLOGY</b> ANALYTICAL SERVICES	31/01/2017	1,678.77
EF100264	17887	<b>RED SAND SUPPLIES PTY LTD</b> MACHINERY HIRE	31/01/2017	2,706.00
EF100265	17942	<b>MRS MAC'S</b> FOOD SUPPLIES	31/01/2017	1,256.70
EF100266	18147	<b>AURECON AUSTRALASIA PTY LTD</b> CONSULTANCY - CIVIL ENGINEERING	31/01/2017	445.96
EF100267	18203	<b>NATSYNC ENVIRONMENTAL</b> PEST CONTROL	31/01/2017	2,800.50
EF100268	18272	<b>AUSTRACLEAR LIMITED</b> INVESTMENT SERVICES	31/01/2017	21.27
EF100269	18508	<b>JOHN TURNER</b> BRICK LAYING SERVICES	31/01/2017	13,324.50
EF100270	18533	<b>FRIENDS OF THE COMMUNITY INC.</b> DONATION	31/01/2017	500.00
EF100271	18628	<b>UNILEVER AUSTRALIA LTD</b> BEVERAGES	31/01/2017	743.98
EF100272	18725	<b>CLARE STACE</b> STORYTELLING/ENTERTAINMENT SERVICES	31/01/2017	770.00
EF100273	18734	<b>P &amp; R EDWARDS</b> ENTERTAINMENT SERVICES	31/01/2017	235.00
EF100274	18763	<b>LOCAL COMMUNITY INSURANCE SERVICES</b> COMMUNITY INSURANCE POLICIES	31/01/2017	36.30
EF100275	18801	<b>FREMANTLE BIN HIRE</b> BIN HIRE - SKIP BINS	31/01/2017	450.00
EF100276	18941	<b>ALLSTAMPS</b> STATIONERY	31/01/2017	206.60
EF100277	18962	<b>SEALANES (1985) P/L</b> CATERING SUPPLIES	31/01/2017	1,341.34
EF100278	19107	<b>FOREVER SHINING</b> MONUMENT	31/01/2017	12,100.00
EF100279	19306	<b>ZIP HEATERS (AUST) PTY LTD</b> HEATERS	31/01/2017	160.05
EF100280	19502	<b>WORLEYPARSONS SERVICES PTY LTD</b> ENGINEERING CONSULTANCY SERVICES -	31/01/2017	16,969.23
EF100281	19505	<b>ADVANCED WINDOW SHUTTERS</b> WINDOW SHUTTERS	31/01/2017	300.00
EF100282	19533	<b>WOOLWORTHS LTD</b> GROCERIES	31/01/2017	2,078.61
EF100283	19541	<b>TURF CARE WA PTY LTD</b> TURF SERVICES	31/01/2017	6,089.60
EF100284	19543	<b>THE PLANT SUPPLY COMPANY</b> PLANTS	31/01/2017	577.50
EF100285	19657	<b>BIGMATE MONITORING SERVICES PTY LTD</b> COMPUTER HARDWARE/SOFTWARE	31/01/2017	1,655.50

CITY OF COCKBURN  
MUNICIPAL BANK ACCOUNT

Cheque/	Account No.	Account/Payee	Date	Value
EF100286	19718	<b>SIFTING SANDS</b> CLEANING SERVICES - SAND	31/01/2017	1,230.25
EF100287	19847	<b>PFD FOOD SERVICES PTY LTD</b> CATERING SERVICES	31/01/2017	380.70
EF100288	20000	<b>AUST WEST AUTO ELECTRICAL P/L</b> AUTO ELECTRICAL SERVICES	31/01/2017	28,677.32
EF100289	20146	<b>DATA#3 LIMITED</b> CONTRACT IT PERSONNEL & SOFTWARE	31/01/2017	15,103.00
EF100290	20307	<b>OCTAGON-BKG LIFTS</b> MAINTENANCE SERVICES	31/01/2017	1,422.84
EF100291	20321	<b>RIVERJET P/L</b> EDUCTING-CLEANING SERVICES	31/01/2017	20,641.50
EF100292	20409	<b>CANDOR TRAINING</b> TRAINING SERVICES	31/01/2017	891.00
EF100293	20427	<b>ENVIRONMENT HOUSE INC</b> ENVIRONMENT HOUSE	31/01/2017	80.00
EF100294	20549	<b>A1 CARPET, TILE &amp; GROUT CLEANING</b> CLEANING SERVICES - TILES/CARPET	31/01/2017	825.00
EF100295	20746	<b>ACCUWEIGH</b> WEIGHING EQUIPMENT	31/01/2017	2,789.97
EF100296	20867	<b>FARM INFORMATION SERVICES</b> TRAINING/INSTRUCTION	31/01/2017	6,612.60
EF100297	21005	<b>BRAIN TEASERS OZ PTY LTD</b> EDUCATIONAL PRODUCTS	31/01/2017	66.00
EF100298	21127	<b>JOANNA AYCKBOURN (VOICES IN SINC)</b> INSTRUCTION - SINGING	31/01/2017	450.00
EF100299	21193	<b>SPM CONSULTANTS PTY LTD</b> CONSULTANCY SERVICES	31/01/2017	2,050.29
EF100300	21287	<b>T.J.DEPIAZZI &amp; SONS</b> SOIL & MULCH SUPPLIES	31/01/2017	18,961.80
EF100301	21291	<b>CHITTERING VALLEY WORM FARM</b> ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION	31/01/2017	385.00
EF100302	21364	<b>OFFICINO OFFICE FURNITURE</b> OFFICE FURNITURE	31/01/2017	1,854.50
EF100303	21371	<b>LD TOTAL SANPOINT PTY LTD</b> LANDSCAPING WORKS/SERVICES	31/01/2017	57,947.38
EF100304	21627	<b>MANHEIM PTY LTD</b> IMPOUNDED VEHICLES	31/01/2017	543.40
EF100305	21664	<b>ACT INDUSTRIAL PTY LTD</b> SKIP BINS - MANUFACTURE	31/01/2017	11,542.30
EF100306	21665	<b>MMJ REAL ESTATE (WA) PTY LTD</b> PROPERTY MANAGEMENT SERVICES	31/01/2017	16,929.31
EF100307	21678	<b>IANNELLO DESIGNS</b> GRAPHIC DESIGN	31/01/2017	192.50
EF100308	21697	<b>ICT EXPRESS PTY LTD</b> CONSULTANCY SERVICES - IT	31/01/2017	14,034.90
EF100309	21782	<b>WEST COAST TIMBER FLOORING</b> FLOORING SUPPLIES	31/01/2017	15,268.00
EF100310	21946	<b>RYAN'S QUALITY MEATS</b> MEAT SUPPLIES	31/01/2017	1,150.83
EF100311	22106	<b>INTELIFE GROUP</b> SERVICES - DAIP	31/01/2017	4,290.00
EF100312	22404	<b>CLEVERPATCH PTY LTD</b> ARTS/CRAFT SUPPLIES	31/01/2017	1,557.27
EF100313	22553	<b>BROWNES FOOD OPERATIONS</b> CATERING SUPPLIES	31/01/2017	2,228.30
EF100314	22569	<b>SONIC HEALTH PLUS PTY LTD</b> MEDICAL SERVICES	31/01/2017	4,444.00

CITY OF COCKBURN  
MUNICIPAL BANK ACCOUNT

Cheque/	Account No.	Account/Payee	Date	Value
EF100315	22613	<b>VICKI ROYANS</b> ARTISTIC SERVICES	31/01/2017	1,050.00
EF100316	22614	<b>CPD GROUP PTY LTD</b> BUILDING CONSTRUCTION SERVICES	31/01/2017	23,114.30
EF100317	22624	<b>AUSSIE EARTHWORKS PTY LTD</b> EARTHWORKS	31/01/2017	1,584.00
EF100318	22639	<b>SHATISH CHAUHAN</b> TRAINING SERVICES - YOGA	31/01/2017	425.00
EF100319	22681	<b>ABBEY BLINDS PTY LTD</b> BLINDS	31/01/2017	150.00
EF100320	22682	<b>BEAVER TREE SERVICES PTY LTD</b> TREE PRUNING SERVICES	31/01/2017	53,752.71
EF100321	22749	<b>PEOPLE SOLUTIONS AUSTRALASIA PTY LTD</b> CONSULTANCY SERVICES - HR	31/01/2017	522.50
EF100322	22805	<b>COVS PARTS PTY LTD</b> MOTOR PARTS	31/01/2017	3,173.95
EF100323	22806	<b>PUMA ENERGY (AUSTRALIA) FUELS PTY LTD</b> FUEL SUPPLIES	31/01/2017	70,820.47
EF100324	22903	<b>UNIQUE INTERNATIONAL RECOVERIES LLC</b> DEBT COLLECTORS	31/01/2017	448.00
EF100325	23213	<b>SPOTLESS FACILITY SERVICES PTY LTD (LA</b> LAUNDRY SERVICES	31/01/2017	245.34
EF100326	23253	<b>KOTT GUNNING</b> LEGAL SERVICES	31/01/2017	1,786.40
EF100327	23332	<b>WRIGHTS HEAVY RECOVERY</b> TOWING SERVICES	31/01/2017	1,430.00
EF100328	23351	<b>COCKBURN GP SUPER CLINIC LIMITED T/A C</b> LEASING FEES	31/01/2017	991.01
EF100329	23379	<b>CAMBRON PTY LTD</b> SOFTWARE	31/01/2017	10,175.00
EF100330	23450	<b>CLEVER DESIGNS</b> UNIFORMS	31/01/2017	2,670.25
EF100331	23457	<b>TOTALLY WORK WEAR FREMANTLE</b> CLOTHING - UNIFORMS	31/01/2017	7,166.83
EF100332	23511	<b>TWIST ENGINEERING</b> IRRIGATION DESIGN & SPECIFICATIONS	31/01/2017	3,433.10
EF100333	23570	<b>A PROUD LANDMARK PTY LTD</b> LANDSCAPE CONTRUCTION SERVICES	31/01/2017	7,997.00
EF100334	23579	<b>DAIMLER TRUCKS PERTH</b> PURCHASE OF NEW TRUCK	31/01/2017	8,605.20
EF100335	23694	<b>TIGER FITNESS (WA) PTY LTD</b> GYM EQUIPMENT/SERVICE	31/01/2017	2,252.25
EF100336	23849	<b>JCB CONSTRUCTION EQUIPMENT AUSTRALI</b> PLANT/MACHINERY	31/01/2017	1,446.49
EF100337	23858	<b>SPECIALISED SECURITY SHREDDING</b> DOCUMENT DESTRUCTION SERVICES	31/01/2017	30.36
EF100338	23971	<b>FIND WISE LOCATION SERVICES</b> LOCATING SERVICES - UNDERGROUND	31/01/2017	6,059.90
EF100339	24035	<b>NEXT POWER</b> RENEWABLE ENERGY	31/01/2017	350.00
EF100340	24156	<b>MASTEC AUSTRALIA PTY LTD</b> PURCHASE OF NEW BINS	31/01/2017	33,100.50
EF100341	24183	<b>WELLARD GLASS</b> GLASS REPAIR SERVICES	31/01/2017	4,492.40
EF100342	24195	<b>PAYNE'S WINDOW CLEANING AND SERVICES</b> WINDOW CLEANING SERVICES	31/01/2017	19,262.78
EF100343	24198	<b>RICOCHET CIRCUS</b> ENTERTAINMENT SERVICES	31/01/2017	792.00

CITY OF COCKBURN  
MUNICIPAL BANK ACCOUNT

Cheque/	Account No.	Account/Payee	Date	Value
EF100344	24281	<b>ECO LOGICAL AUSTRALIA PTY LTD</b> MAPPING SERVICES	31/01/2017	3,146.00
EF100345	24497	<b>WATER FEATURES BY DESIGN</b> WATER FEATURES	31/01/2017	6,380.00
EF100346	24524	<b>CALO HEALTH</b> HEARTMOVE CLASSES	31/01/2017	410.00
EF100347	24595	<b>CONTEMPORARY IMAGE PHOTOGRAPHY PTY</b> PHOTOGRAPHY SERVICES	31/01/2017	1,243.00
EF100348	24599	<b>POOLWERX SPEARWOOD</b> ANALYTICAL SERVICES	31/01/2017	2,536.75
EF100349	24655	<b>AUTOMASTERS SPEARWOOD</b> VEHICLE SERVICING	31/01/2017	5,035.50
EF100350	24724	<b>QUALITY MARINE COATING SYSTEMS P/L</b> CLEANING SERVICES - ROAD SURFACES	31/01/2017	1,860.00
EF100351	24734	<b>MYRIAD IMAGES</b> PHOTOGRAPHY SERVICES	31/01/2017	1,375.00
EF100352	24736	<b>ZENIEN</b> CCTV INSTALLATION/CAMERA LICENCES	31/01/2017	80,719.46
EF100353	24748	<b>PEARMANS ELECTRICAL &amp; MECHANICAL SE</b> ELECTRICAL SERVICES	31/01/2017	2,164.83
EF100354	24812	<b>GARAGE SALE TRAIL FOUNDATION LTD</b> PARTICIPATION FEE	31/01/2017	6,875.00
EF100355	24886	<b>A NATURAL SELF</b> ENTERTAINMENT SUPPLIES	31/01/2017	576.00
EF100356	24945	<b>NS PROJECTS PTY LTD</b> PROJECT MANAGEMENT SERVICES	31/01/2017	742.50
EF100357	24949	<b>BITUMEN SURFACING THE TRUSTEE FOR CO</b> BITUMEN SUPPLIES	31/01/2017	4,801.50
EF100358	24974	<b>SCOTT PRINT</b> PRINTING SERVICES	31/01/2017	14,350.60
EF100359	24976	<b>SNAP PRINTING - COCKBURN CENTRAL</b> PRINTING SERVICES	31/01/2017	6,881.74
EF100360	25060	<b>DFP RECRUTIMENT SERVICES</b> EMPLOYMENT SERVICES	31/01/2017	13,110.37
EF100361	25063	<b>SUPERIOR PAK PTY LTD</b> VEHICLE MAINTENANCE	31/01/2017	255.20
EF100362	25092	<b>LINKS MODULAR SOLUTIONS PTY LTD</b> COMPUTER SOFTWARE	31/01/2017	1,760.00
EF100363	25102	<b>FREMANTLE MOBILE WELDING</b> WELDING SERVICES	31/01/2017	3,234.00
EF100364	25115	<b>FIIG</b> INVESTMENT MANAGEMENT SERVICES	31/01/2017	2,750.00
EF100365	25121	<b>IMAGESOURCE DIGITAL SOLUTIONS</b> BILLBOARDS	31/01/2017	1,423.40
EF100366	25127	<b>MILMAR DISTRIBUTORS</b> PRINTING SERVICES - ID CARDS	31/01/2017	358.60
EF100367	25128	<b>HORIZON WEST LANDSCAPE &amp; IRRIGATION I</b> LANDSCAPING SERVICES	31/01/2017	3,567.11
EF100368	25158	<b>MPIRE SECURITY</b> SECURITY SERVICES	31/01/2017	6,969.89
EF100369	25189	<b>SPORT AND RECRE</b> SPORTS SURFACES	31/01/2017	17,553.25
EF100370	25262	<b>SANDOVER PINDER ARCHITECTS</b> ARCHITECTURAL SERVICES - RFT13/2013	31/01/2017	43,777.92
EF100371	25263	<b>SYSTEM MAINTENANCE</b> SEWERAGE PUMP MAINTENANCE	31/01/2017	829.29
EF100372	25264	<b>ACURIX NETWORKS PTY LTD</b> WIFI ACCESS SERVICE	31/01/2017	2,145.00

CITY OF COCKBURN  
MUNICIPAL BANK ACCOUNT

Cheque/	Account No.	Account/Payee	Date	Value
EF100373	25265	<b>SNAKE R&amp;R TRAIN</b> TRAINING SERVICES	31/01/2017	1,400.00
EF100374	25330	<b>THE SCENE TEAM</b> PHOTOGRAPHY SERVICES	31/01/2017	660.00
EF100375	25415	<b>JANDAKOT STOCK &amp; PET SUPPLIES</b> PET SUPPLIES	31/01/2017	147.50
EF100376	25418	<b>CS LEGAL</b> LEGAL SERVICES	31/01/2017	21,137.76
EF100377	25471	<b>ELEMENTAL SURF PTY LTD</b> SURFING LESSONS	31/01/2017	750.00
EF100378	25540	<b>JOHN MASSEY GROUP PTY LTD</b> BUILDING SURVEYING SERVICES	31/01/2017	1,485.00
EF100379	25644	<b>DYMOCKS GARDEN CITY</b> PURCHASE OF BOOKS	31/01/2017	1,563.83
EF100380	25713	<b>DISCUS ON DEMAND THE TRUSTEE FOR DIS</b> PRINTING SERVICES	31/01/2017	1,836.89
EF100381	25733	<b>MIRACLE RECREATION EQUIPMENT</b> PLAYGROUND INSTALLATION / REPAIRS	31/01/2017	100,314.50
EF100382	25813	<b>LGCONNECT PTY LTD</b> DEVELOPMENT CONSULTANCY	31/01/2017	2,640.00
EF100383	25822	<b>FIT2WORK.COM.AU MERCURY SEARCH AND</b> EMPLOYEE CHECK	31/01/2017	76.78
EF100384	25832	<b>EXTERIA</b> STREET AND PARK INFRASTRUCTURE	31/01/2017	47,477.10
EF100385	25962	<b>ALL LINES</b> LINEMARKING SERVICES	31/01/2017	1,760.00
EF100386	26067	<b>SPRAYKING WA PTY LTD</b> CHEMICAL WEED CONTROL SERVICES	31/01/2017	9,524.50
EF100387	26090	<b>FREMANTLE MILK DISTRIBUTORS</b> MILK DISTRIBUTORS	31/01/2017	211.30
EF100388	26110	<b>DASH CIVIL CONTRACTING</b> CONCRETING SERVICES	31/01/2017	8,639.51
EF100389	26114	<b>GRACE RECORDS MANAGEMENT</b> RECORDS MANAGEMENT SERVICES	31/01/2017	1,244.03
EF100390	26116	<b>CAMPBELLS CASH AND CARRY</b> CATERING SUPPLIES	31/01/2017	104.90
EF100391	26173	<b>SOUTHSIDE PLUMBING</b> PLUMBING SERVICES	31/01/2017	1,753.40
EF100392	26195	<b>PLAY CHECK</b> CONSULTING SERVICES	31/01/2017	330.00
EF100393	26211	<b>AMCOM PTY LTD</b> INTERNET/DATA SERVICES	31/01/2017	6,510.00
EF100394	26253	<b>CREATE IT</b> TIME LAPSE CAMERA	31/01/2017	913.00
EF100395	26257	<b>PAPERBARK TECHNOLOGIES</b> ARBORICULTURAL CONSULTANCY SERVICES	31/01/2017	4,075.00
EF100396	26303	<b>GECKO CONTRACTING TURF &amp; LANDSCAPE</b> TURF & LANDSCAPE MAINTENANCE	31/01/2017	108,559.00
EF100397	26314	<b>CPE GROUP</b> TEMPORARY EMPLOYMENT SERVICES	31/01/2017	289.80
EF100398	26329	<b>SAFETY SIGNS SERVICE PTY LTD</b> SAFETY SIGNS	31/01/2017	61.93
EF100399	26330	<b>KENNARDS HIRE - BIBRA LAKE</b> EQUIPMENT HIRE	31/01/2017	196.00
EF100400	26359	<b>WILSON SECURITY</b> SECURITY SERVICES	31/01/2017	191,935.82
EF100401	26386	<b>AIRMASTER AUSTRALIA PTY LTD</b> AIRCONDITIONING MAINTENANCE SERVICES	31/01/2017	2,308.27



CITY OF COCKBURN  
MUNICIPAL BANK ACCOUNT

Cheque/	Account No.	Account/Payee	Date	Value
EF100402	26399	<b>PAPERSCOUT THE TRUSTEE FOR PETERS M</b> GRAPHIC DESIGN SERVICES	31/01/2017	2,805.00
EF100403	26418	<b>INTEGRANET TECHNOLOGY GROUP PTY LTD</b> ICT CONSULTANCY SERVICES	31/01/2017	6,765.00
EF100404	26442	<b>BULLANT SECURITY PTY LTD KEY WEST LOC</b> LOCKSMITH & SECURITY SERVICES	31/01/2017	10,359.42
EF100405	26461	<b>777 MAINTENANCE PTY LTD</b> MAINTENANCE SERVICES	31/01/2017	4,455.00
EF100406	26470	<b>SCP CONSERVATION AND LAND MANAGEMEN</b> FENCING SERVICES	31/01/2017	11,001.10
EF100407	26480	<b>MATTRESS REMOVAL WA</b> MATRESS REMOVAL SERVICES	31/01/2017	8,906.80
EF100408	26486	<b>BIBRA LAKE FABRICATORS PTY LTD</b> FABRICATION SERVICES	31/01/2017	6,985.00
EF100409	26516	<b>ULTIMATE LIMESTONE</b> CONSTRUCTION SERVICES	31/01/2017	2,145.00
EF100410	26536	<b>SKYLINE LANDSCAPE SERVICES (WA)</b> LANDSCAPING SERVICES	31/01/2017	26,962.84
EF100411	26549	<b>SHARON GREGORY (KOORT-KADAK CONSUL</b> CONSULTANCY SERVICES	31/01/2017	100.00
EF100412	26558	<b>HEALTHCARE AUSTRALIA PTY LTD</b> TEMPORARY EMPLOYMENT SERVICES	31/01/2017	86.23
EF100413	26563	<b>INTO THE MASK THEATRE</b> DRAMA CLASSES	31/01/2017	150.00
EF100414	26567	<b>THE HANGOUT INDOOR CLIMBING CENTRE</b> ROCK CLIMBING	31/01/2017	359.90
EF100415	26574	<b>EVA BELLYDANCE</b> ENTERTAINMENT - BELLY DANCING	31/01/2017	150.00
EF100416	26578	<b>AHAM VRITTI HERBAL</b> ENTERTAINMENT AND WORKSHOPS	31/01/2017	490.00
EF100417	26597	<b>WEST COAST SHADE PTY LTD</b> SHADE STRUCTURES	31/01/2017	440.00
EF100418	26606	<b>ENVIRO INFRASTRUCTURE PTY LTD</b> CONSTRUCTION& FABRICATION	31/01/2017	2,526.11
EF100419	26610	<b>TRACC CIVIL PTY LTD</b> CIVIL CONSTRUCTION - BERRIGAN DV	31/01/2017	508,130.76
EF100420	26613	<b>AVE BIN AND BBQ CLEANING PTY LTD.</b> CLEANAING SERVICES (BBQ - BINS)	31/01/2017	2,379.00
EF100421	26614	<b>MARKETFORCE PTY LTD</b> ADVERTISING	31/01/2017	1,284.38
EF100422	26619	<b>SPEARWOOD NEWS DELIVERY</b> NEWSPAPER DELIVERY	31/01/2017	934.50
EF100423	26623	<b>TELFORD INDUSTRIES</b> CHEMICALS - POOL	31/01/2017	310.42
EF100424	26639	<b>SAFEGUARD INDUSTRIES</b> SECURITY DOORS, SCREENS AND ROLLER	31/01/2017	300.00
EF100425	26644	<b>FIRE PROTECTION ASSOCIATION AUSTRALL</b> FIRE SERVICES TRAINING	31/01/2017	2,370.00
EF100426	26655	<b>WORLDWIDE PRINTING SOLUTIONS EAST PE</b> PRINTING SERVICES	31/01/2017	1,281.00
EF100427	26667	<b>TANGELO CREATIVE</b> GRAPHIC DESIGN	31/01/2017	2,024.00
EF100428	26669	<b>TURNER DESIGN PTY LTD</b> GRAPHIC DESIGN CONSULTANCY	31/01/2017	12,416.25
EF100429	26673	<b>PROJECT 3 PTY LTD</b> EVENT AND MARKETING AGENCY	31/01/2017	10,890.00
EF100430	26688	<b>PETER DELLE COSTE</b> ENTERTAINMENT SERVICES - MUSIC	31/01/2017	300.00

CITY OF COCKBURN  
MUNICIPAL BANK ACCOUNT

<b>Cheque/</b>	<b>Account No.</b>	<b>Account/Payee</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Value</b>
EF100431	26698	<b>MELVILLE MITSUBISHI</b>	31/01/2017	32,493.85
EF100432	26721	PURCHASE OF NEW VEHICLES & <b>QUAD SERVICES PTY LTD</b>	31/01/2017	258.50
EF100433	26732	CLEANING SERVICES <b>AMARE SAFETY</b>	31/01/2017	850.21
EF100434	26735	CLOTHING UNIFORMS <b>SHANE MCMASTER SURVEYS</b>	31/01/2017	7,865.00
EF100435	26739	SURVEY SERVICES <b>KERB DOCTOR</b>	31/01/2017	14,796.76
EF100436	26743	KERB MAINTENANCE <b>STATEWIDE TURF SERVICES</b>	31/01/2017	5,511.00
EF100437	26745	TURF RENOVATION <b>EMBROIDME MYAREE</b>	31/01/2017	58.00
EF100438	26746	EMBROIDERY <b>MOWER CITY</b>	31/01/2017	1,971.60
EF100439	26747	LAWN MAINTENANCE <b>BELL-VISTA FRUIT &amp; VEG</b>	31/01/2017	978.50
EF100440	26749	FRUIT AND VEGETABLES. <b>BOOMERS PLUMBING AND GAS PTY LTD</b>	31/01/2017	1,083.50
EF100441	26750	PLUMBING SERVICES <b>KLEENIT PTY LTD</b>	31/01/2017	748.00
EF100442	26754	GRAFFITTI REMOVAL <b>INSIGHT CALL CENTRE SERVICES</b>	31/01/2017	11,214.95
EF100443	26759	CALL CENTRE SERVICES <b>METRO FILTERS</b>	31/01/2017	26.40
EF100444	26761	CANOPY, FLUE AND FANS CLEANIND AND <b>THE SAND CARD COMPANY</b>	31/01/2017	390.00
EF100445	26781	ENTERTAINMENT SERVICES <b>THE ARCHERY CENTRE &amp; LASER RANGER</b>	31/01/2017	790.00
EF100446	26782	ENTRY FEES <b>SOFT LANDING</b>	31/01/2017	8,520.00
EF100447	26786	RECYCLING SERVICES <b>NUTURF</b>	31/01/2017	517.00
EF100448	26795	HERBICIDE PRODUCTS <b>OPUS INTERNATIONAL CONSULTANTS (AUST</b>	31/01/2017	26,400.00
EF100449	26810	ENGINEERING CONSULTANCY - C0017213 <b>RMSS</b>	31/01/2017	31,460.00
EF100450	26820	SOFTWARE <b>NBN CO LTD</b>	31/01/2017	2,000.00
EF100451	26823	TELECOMMUNICATIONS <b>THE FREEDOM FAIRIES</b>	31/01/2017	275.00
EF100452	26824	AMUSEMENT <b>WEB KEY IT PTY LTD</b>	31/01/2017	2,351.25
EF100453	26826	WEBSITE CONSULTANCY <b>PINDAN CONTRACTING PTY LTD</b>	31/01/2017	529,871.06
EF100454	26830	BUILDING CONSTRUCTION SERVICES - <b>ECO EATS CATERING</b>	31/01/2017	235.75
EF100455	26831	CATERING <b>AFL SPORTS READY LTD</b>	31/01/2017	545.26
EF100456	26837	EDUCATION & TRAINING <b>VINSAN CONTRACTING</b>	31/01/2017	8,800.00
EF100457	26854	RESIDENTIAL DEMOLITION <b>IFAP</b>	31/01/2017	1,045.00
EF100458	26855	TRAINING <b>MKDC</b>	31/01/2017	10,894.13
EF100459	26864	INTERIOR DESIGN SERVICES <b>GUARDIAN TACTILE SYSTEMS P/L</b>	31/01/2017	1,234.09
		TACTILES,STAIRNOSING,WHEEL STOPS		

CITY OF COCKBURN  
MUNICIPAL BANK ACCOUNT

<b>Cheque/</b>	<b>Account No.</b>	<b>Account/Payee</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Value</b>
EF100460	26883	<b>GTA CONSULTANTS</b> TRANSPORT PLANNING	31/01/2017	5,500.00
EF100461	26888	<b>MEDIA ENGINE</b> GRAPHIC DESIGN, MARKETING, VIDEO	31/01/2017	8,815.00
EF100462	26893	<b>THE BASKETBALL MAN</b> SPORTING GOODS	31/01/2017	9,769.10
EF100463	26898	<b>SPANDEX ASIA PACIFIC PTY LTD</b> SIGNAGE SUPPLIER	31/01/2017	1,919.87
EF100464	26901	<b>ALYKA PTY LTD</b> DIGITAL CONSULTANCY AND WEB	31/01/2017	11,740.11
EF100465	26907	<b>MADJITIL MOORNA INC</b> ENTERTAINMENT	31/01/2017	1,100.00
EF100466	26913	<b>MIRANDA KISSELL CONTRACTING</b> CARPENTRY SERVICES	31/01/2017	26,634.37
EF100467	26914	<b>NATURE CALLS PORTABLE TOILETS</b> SUPPLY OF PORTABLE TOILETS	31/01/2017	693.00
EF100468	26915	<b>FOCUSED VISION CONSULTING PTY LTD</b> CONSULTING	31/01/2017	177.65
EF100469	26917	<b>CIRRUS NETWORKS PTY LTD</b> IT SERVICES	31/01/2017	15,621.10
EF100470	26921	<b>JULIET COGHLAN - PHOTOGRAPHER</b> PHOTOGRAPHY SERVICES	31/01/2017	640.00
EF100471	26923	<b>WOODLANDS DISTRIBUTORS &amp; AGENCIES PT</b> RUBBISH COLLECTION EQUIPMENT	31/01/2017	18,376.60
EF100472	26932	<b>CENTRAL REGIONAL TAFE</b> TAFE	31/01/2017	458.80
EF100473	26935	<b>IRRIGATION WA PTY LTD</b> IRRIGATION SERVICES	31/01/2017	1,780.90
EF100474	26938	<b>MAJESTIC PLUMBING</b> PLUMBING	31/01/2017	3,979.20
EF100475	26939	<b>UDLA PTY LTD</b> LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE AND URBAN	31/01/2017	15,939.61
EF100476	26946	<b>AV TRUCK SERVICES PTY LTD</b> TRUCK DEALERSHIP	31/01/2017	1,235.84
EF100477	26950	<b>WALCON MARINE AUSTRALASIA PTY LTD</b> MARINE SERVICES	31/01/2017	3,944.60
EF100478	26953	<b>ROCK AND ROLL MOUNTAIN BIKING</b> MOUNTAIN BIKE TOURS	31/01/2017	560.00
EF100479	26959	<b>PLAYSCAPE CREATIONS</b> PLAYGROUND EQUIPMENT	31/01/2017	73,018.00
EF100480	26965	<b>END OF LIFE CARE</b> ARTISTIC	31/01/2017	850.00
EF100481	26968	<b>THE DISTRIBUTORS PERTH</b> CONFECTIONARY WHOLESALER	31/01/2017	681.35
EF100482	26970	<b>FARHANAAZ CLEAK</b> SPEECH WRITING	31/01/2017	7,830.00
EF100483	26974	<b>MISTER MAGNETS</b> PROMOTIONAL PRODUCTS - MAGNETS	31/01/2017	1,098.00
EF100484	26977	<b>THE YOUNG BOXING WOMAN PROJECT</b> TRAINING/MENTORING	31/01/2017	3,080.00
EF100485	26986	<b>AHA CONSULTING</b> CONSULTANCY	31/01/2017	4,290.00
EF100486	26988	<b>BLADON WA PTY LTD</b> PROMOTIONAL PRODUCTS	31/01/2017	1,650.00
EF100487	26990	<b>A&amp;O FACILITY MANAGEMENT</b> ASBESTOS TESTING & REMOVAL	31/01/2017	2,970.00
EF100488	26999	<b>DUNCAN NISSAN</b> CAR SALES	31/01/2017	497.40

CITY OF COCKBURN  
MUNICIPAL BANK ACCOUNT

Cheque/	Account No.	Account/Payee	Date	Value
EF100489	27000	<b>PONY CYCLES PERTH</b> HIRE SERVICE - TOYS	31/01/2017	806.00
EF100490	27006	<b>BIBRA LAKE IGA XPRESS</b> LIQUOR SUPPLIES	31/01/2017	3,171.88
EF100491	27010	<b>QUANTUM BUILDING SERVICES PTY LTD</b> BUILDING MAINTENANCE	31/01/2017	1,689.71
EF100492	27014	<b>FIVE ELEMENTS THEATRE</b> ARTISTIC	31/01/2017	550.00
EF100493	27018	<b>MARK NORMAN CONSULTING</b> CONSULTANCY - ELECTRICAL	31/01/2017	3,750.00
EF100494	27020	<b>TENDERLINK.COM</b> INTERNET ACCESS SERVICES	31/01/2017	660.00
EF100495	27026	<b>FIRST ACTION PTY LTD</b> EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT SOLUTIONS	31/01/2017	7,177.50
EF100496	27027	<b>FRIG TECH WA</b> REFRIDGERATION SERVICES	31/01/2017	11,229.84
EF100497	27031	<b>DOWNER EDI WORKS PTY LTD</b> ASPHALT SERVICES	31/01/2017	658.21
EF100498	27034	<b>ADELBY PTY LTD</b> FIREBREAK CONSTRUCTION	31/01/2017	220.00
EF100499	27038	<b>PETER FARMER DESIGNS</b> ARTISTIC (ARTIST)	31/01/2017	11,000.00
EF100500	27044	<b>GRAFFITI SYSTEMS AUSTRALIA</b> GRAFFITI REMOVAL & ANTI-GRAFFITI	31/01/2017	11,587.46
EF100501	27046	<b>TFH HIRE SERVICES PTY LTD</b> HIRE FENCING	31/01/2017	1,746.25
EF100502	27047	<b>FREMANTLE ASBESTOS REMOVAL</b> ASBESTOS REMOVAL	31/01/2017	715.00
EF100503	27051	<b>PUREWATER POOL SERVICES</b> SERVICE & MAINTENANCE POOL	31/01/2017	761.20
EF100504	27055	<b>BRAD GOODE AND ASSOCIATES PTY LTD</b> CONSULTANCY ANTHROPOLOGY	31/01/2017	110.00
EF100505	99996	<b>MELISSA TARRANT</b> PROPERTY REFUNDS	31/01/2017	30.00
EF100506	99996	<b>REBECCA GETTY</b> PROPERTY REFUNDS	31/01/2017	42.50
EF100507	99996	<b>RENAE GEORGE</b> PROPERTY REFUNDS	31/01/2017	500.00
EF100508	99996	<b>HEIDI MAY</b> PROPERTY REFUNDS	31/01/2017	30.00
EF100509	99996	<b>RODNEY POHL</b> PROPERTY REFUNDS	31/01/2017	15.00
EF100510	99996	<b>BUILDING DEVELOPMENT GROUP PTY LTD</b> PROPERTY REFUNDS	31/01/2017	444.30
EF100511	99996	<b>MEG LANE</b> PROPERTY REFUNDS	31/01/2017	30.00
EF100512	99996	<b>PRD NATIONWIDE</b> PROPERTY REFUNDS	31/01/2017	447.69
EF100513	99996	<b>COMMUNITY PROPERTY SERVICES</b> PROPERTY REFUNDS	31/01/2017	290.40
EF100514	99996	<b>ANE JONES</b> PROPERTY REFUNDS	31/01/2017	291.51
EF100515	99996	<b>ANKE AND GRANT SMEDING</b> PROPERTY REFUNDS	31/01/2017	1,506.00
EF100516	99996	<b>IFINITE REAL ESTATE</b> PROPERTY REFUNDS	31/01/2017	697.14
EF100517	99996	<b>EMMAUS DEVELOPMENTS PTY LTD</b> PROPERTY REFUNDS	31/01/2017	556.47

CITY OF COCKBURN  
MUNICIPAL BANK ACCOUNT

Cheque/	Account No.	Account/Payee	Date	Value
EF100518	99996	<b>CHRISTOPHER PARLANE</b> PROPERTY REFUNDS	31/01/2017	718.67
EF100519	11867	<b>KEVIN JOHN ALLEN</b> MONTHLY COUNCILLOR ALLOWANCE	31/01/2017	2,613.67
EF100520	12740	<b>MAYOR LOGAN HOWLETT</b> MONTHLY COUNCILLOR ALLOWANCE	31/01/2017	11,325.83
EF100521	19059	<b>CAROL REEVE-FOWKES</b> MONTHLY COUNCILLOR ALLOWANCE	31/01/2017	4,465.00
EF100522	20634	<b>LEE-ANNE SMITH</b> MONTHLY COUNCILLOR ALLOWANCE	31/01/2017	2,613.67
EF100523	21185	<b>BART HOUWEN</b> MONTHLY COUNCILLOR ALLOWANCE	31/01/2017	2,613.67
EF100524	23338	<b>STEVE PORTELLI</b> MONTHLY COUNCILLOR ALLOWANCE	31/01/2017	2,613.67
EF100525	23339	<b>STEPHEN PRATT</b> MONTHLY COUNCILLOR ALLOWANCE	31/01/2017	2,613.67
EF100526	25352	<b>LYNDSEY SWEETMAN</b> MONTHLY COUNCILLOR ALLOWANCE	31/01/2017	2,613.67
EF100527	25353	<b>PHILIP EVA</b> MONTHLY COUNCILLOR ALLOWANCE	31/01/2017	2,613.67
EF100528	26696	<b>CHAMONIX TERBLANCHE</b> MONTHLY COUNCILLOR ALLOWANCE	31/01/2017	2,613.67
EF100529	10047	<b>ALINTA ENERGY</b> NATURAL GAS & ELECTRCITY SUPPLY	31/01/2017	1,141.25
EF100530	11794	<b>SYNERGY</b> ELECTRICITY USAGE/SUPPLIES	31/01/2017	104,555.40
EF100531	12025	<b>TELSTRA CORPORATION</b> COMMUNICATIONS SERVICES	31/01/2017	17,906.97
EF100535	23250	<b>DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING</b> DAP APPLICATIONS & DAP FEES	31/01/2017	150.00
EF100536	88888	<b>PAULA FITZGERALD</b> TEACHING WORKSHOP	31/01/2017	550.00
EF100537	88888	<b>HARRY CLARK</b> SKATE PARK JUDGE	31/01/2017	750.00
EF100538	99997	<b>YANGEBUP KNIGHTS JUNIOR BALL CLUB</b> KIDSPORT	31/01/2017	400.00
EF100539	99997	<b>YANGEBUP KNIGHTS JUNIOR BALL CLUB</b> KIDSPORT	31/01/2017	179.00
EF100540	99997	<b>ANDREW SPENCER</b> CROSSOVER CONTRIBUTION	31/01/2017	300.00
EF100541	99997	<b>NATHAN HOYLE</b> CROSSOVER CONTRIBUTION	31/01/2017	905.00
EF100542	99997	<b>JANDAKOT VOLUNTEER BUSH FIRE BRIGAD</b> EXPENSES REIMBURSEMENT	31/01/2017	40.00
EF100543	99997	<b>JANDAKOT VOLUNTEER BUSH FIRE BRIGAD</b> EXPENSES REIMBURSEMENT	31/01/2017	727.00
EF100544	99997	<b>JANDAKOT VOLUNTEER BUSH FIRE BRIGAD</b> EXPENSES REIMBURSEMENT	31/01/2017	86.68
EF100545	99997	<b>KIN VUN CHIN</b> COMPOST REBATE	31/01/2017	39.90
EF100546	99997	<b>ANTHONY KEVIN REGAN</b> CROSSOVER CONTRIBUTION	31/01/2017	300.00
EF100547	99997	<b>HELEN MAMTAZI</b> CROSSOVER CONTRIBUTION	31/01/2017	300.00
EF100548	99997	<b>DR OYEWAKE AND MRS OPEYEMI OYEWOPO</b> CROSSOVER CONTRIBUTION	31/01/2017	300.00
EF100549	99997	<b>ALISON WALLER</b> CROSSOVER CONTRIBUTION	31/01/2017	300.00

CITY OF COCKBURN  
MUNICIPAL BANK ACCOUNT

Cheque/	Account No.	Account/Payee	Date	Value
EF100550	99997	<b>DOLLY HOCHKIRCHER</b> MILEAGE REIMBURSEMENT	31/01/2017	45.75
EF100551	99997	<b>ALISON WATERS</b> PARKS BBQ REIMBURSEMENT	31/01/2017	227.19
EF100552	99997	<b>BERT SMITH</b> LANDOWNER BIODIVERSITY GRANT	31/01/2017	675.00
EF100553	99997	<b>YVONNE NICHOLLS</b> LANDOWNER BIODIVERSITY GRANT	31/01/2017	1,435.00
EF100554	99997	<b>LINDA CHAN</b> LANDOWNER BIODIVERSITY GRANT	31/01/2017	649.00
EF100555	99997	<b>DAVID MARTIN</b> LANDOWNER BIODIVERSITY GRANT	31/01/2017	2,411.00
EF100556	99997	<b>GRAEME DOIG</b> LANDOWNER BIODIVERSITY GRANT	31/01/2017	364.00
EF100557	99997	<b>KAYE LEVETT</b> LANDOWNER BIODIVERSITY GRANT	31/01/2017	530.00
EF100558	99997	<b>KLAUS FAHMER</b> LANDOWNER BIODIVERSITY GRANT	31/01/2017	2,935.00
EF100559	99997	<b>VIV SLOSS</b> LANDOWNER BIODIVERSITY GRANT	31/01/2017	2,461.50
EF100560	99997	<b>THORSTEN STROMBACK</b> LANDOWNER BIODIVERSITY GRANT	31/01/2017	2,090.00
EF100561	99997	<b>GUNTHER FAHMER</b> LANDOWNER BIODIVERSITY GRANT	31/01/2017	1,808.30
EF100562	99997	<b>HAZEL PARSONS</b> LANDOWNER BIODIVERSITY GRANT	31/01/2017	1,123.80
EF100563	99997	<b>KATINKA RUTHROF</b> LANDOWNER BIODIVERSITY GRANT	31/01/2017	975.00
EF100564	99997	<b>AMANDA AND ROB NOOYEN</b> LANDOWNER BIODIVERSITY GRANT	31/01/2017	1,986.60
EF100565	99997	<b>SARAH MCELWEE</b> LANDOWNER BIODIVERSITY GRANT	31/01/2017	2,470.00
EF100566	99997	<b>MERYLIN ROSENAUER</b> LANDOWNER BIODIVERSITY GRANT	31/01/2017	1,897.50
EF100567	99997	<b>PHIL AND BRONWYN GENONI</b> LANDOWNER BIODIVERSITY GRANT	31/01/2017	2,004.00
EF100568	99997	<b>DAN CORINNE FRANKLIN</b> LANDOWNER BIODIVERSITY GRANT	31/01/2017	1,806.94
EF100569	99997	<b>BRAD KROEBER</b> LANDOWNER BIODIVERSITY GRANT	31/01/2017	1,280.95
EF100570	99997	<b>SHARON CLINCH</b> LANDOWNER BIODIVERSITY GRANT	31/01/2017	2,064.00
EF100571	99997	<b>COCKBURN BASKETBALL ASSOCIATION</b> KIDSPORT	31/01/2017	220.00
EF100572	99997	<b>SPEARWOOD HAKS JUNIOR BASKETBALL CLUB</b> KIDSPORT	31/01/2017	400.00
EF100573	99997	<b>COCKBURN COUGARS SOFTBALL CLUB</b> KIDSPORT	31/01/2017	600.00
EF100574	99997	<b>DAIMLER TRUCKS PERTH</b> TRADE IN REFUND TAKEN UP ON INVOICE	31/01/2017	24,002.00
EF100575	99997	<b>BLUE FLAMES</b> KIDSPORT	31/01/2017	200.00
EF100576	99997	<b>BLUE FLAMES</b> KIDSPORT	31/01/2017	200.00
EF100577	99997	<b>COCKBURN COUGARS SOFTBALL CLUB</b> KIDSPORT	31/01/2017	200.00
EF100578	99997	<b>SPEARWOOD HAKS JUNIOR BASKETBALL CLUB</b> KIDSPORT	31/01/2017	200.00



CITY OF COCKBURN  
MUNICIPAL BANK ACCOUNT

Cheque/	Account No.	Account/Payee	Date	Value
EF100579	99997	<b>SOUTHERN LIONS RUFC</b> SPORTS EQUIPMENT GRANT	31/01/2017	1,000.00
EF100580	99997	<b>GAIL BOWMAN</b> STUDY FEE CONTRIBUTION	31/01/2017	7,900.00
EF100581	99997	<b>JANDAKOT VOLUNTEER BUSH FIRE BRIGAD</b> EXPENSES REIMBURSEMENT	31/01/2017	125.00
EF100582	99997	<b>JANDAKOT VOLUNTEER BUSH FIRE BRIGAD</b> EXPENSES REIMBURSEMENT	31/01/2017	547.00
EF100583	99997	<b>JANDAKOT VOLUNTEER BUSH FIRE BRIGAD</b> EXPENSES REIMBURSEMENT	31/01/2017	125.00
EF100584	99997	<b>ROBER PAUL McJANNETT</b> MEMBERSHIP REFUND	31/01/2017	121.50
EF100585	99997	<b>SOUTH COOGEE VOLUNTEER BUSH FIRE BR</b> EXPENSES REIMBURSEMENT	31/01/2017	100.00
EF100586	99997	<b>DISABILITY SERVICES COMMISSION</b> REFUND NOAMI PERRY	31/01/2017	118.00
EF100587	99997	<b>JENNFER WALTON</b> LANDOWNER BIODIVERSITY GRANT	31/01/2017	2,893.00
EF100588	99997	<b>DOUGLAS CHEVERALLS LAW PRACTICE</b> CITY OF COCKBURN V. ONYX FITNESS PTY	31/01/2017	9,000.00
EF100589	99997	<b>MELA WALIC</b> CROSSOVER CONTRIBUTION	31/01/2017	300.00
EF100590	99997	<b>MANZUR ELAHI</b> CROSSOVER CONTRIBUTION	31/01/2017	300.00
EF100591	99997	<b>CHRISTOPHER HARRIS</b> CROSSOVER CONTRIBUTION	31/01/2017	300.00
EF100592	99997	<b>CHRISTOPHER SHANE KOSSEN</b> CROSSOVER CONTRIBUTION	31/01/2017	300.00
EF100593	99997	<b>BHARAT KUMAR PANCHAL</b> CROSSOVER CONTRIBUTION	31/01/2017	300.00
EF100594	99997	<b>SIJAN STHAPIT</b> CROSSOVER CONTRIBUTION	31/01/2017	300.00
EF100595	99997	<b>EVELYN DAMJANOVICH</b> CAT STERILISATION REFUND	31/01/2017	50.00
EF100596	99997	<b>AMY NICHOLLS</b> CAT STERILISATION REFUND	31/01/2017	50.00
EF100597	99997	<b>AMY NICHOLLS</b> CAT STERILISATION REFUND	31/01/2017	50.00
EF100598	99997	<b>SALEENA KOTA</b> CAT STERILISATION REFUND	31/01/2017	50.00
EF100599	99997	<b>JODI A WARD</b> CAT STERILISATION REFUND	31/01/2017	50.00
EF100600	99997	<b>FIONA J RUSSELL</b> CAT STERILISATION REFUND	31/01/2017	50.00
EF100601	99997	<b>THE DANCE COLLECTIVE</b> KIDSPORT	31/01/2017	220.00
026881	26987	<b>CTI RISK MANAGEMENT</b> SECURITY - CASH COLLECTION	4/01/2017	1,230.00
026882	26987	<b>CTI RISK MANAGEMENT</b> SECURITY - CASH COLLECTION	12/01/2017	2,291.90
026883	26987	<b>CTI RISK MANAGEMENT</b> SECURITY - CASH COLLECTION	18/01/2017	2,085.65
026884	26987	<b>CTI RISK MANAGEMENT</b> SECURITY - CASH COLLECTION	25/01/2017	2,467.15
026885	99999	<b>BILL NUTTALL</b> AUSTRALIA DAY CITIZEN AWARD	25/01/2017	300.00
026886	99998	<b>BORIS GABEN</b> BOND REFUND	31/01/2017	3,465.75

CITY OF COCKBURN.  
MUNICIPAL BANK ACCOUNT

Cheque/	Account No.	Account/Payee	Date	Value
026887	99998	<b>LOST WAVE CO FLUER HUDSON</b>	31/01/2017	514.24
		BOAT PEN REFUND		
026888	99999	<b>ACEFIELD HOLDINGS PTY LTD</b>	31/01/2017	86,333.87
		BOND REFUND		
026889	99999	<b>BORIS P GABIN</b>	31/01/2017	500.00
		BOND REFUND		
026890	99999	<b>EMMA McGIVEN</b>	31/01/2017	150.00
		HALL BOND REFUND		
026891	99999	<b>ZUMBA FITNESS</b>	31/01/2017	96.00
		HALL BOND REFUND		
026892	11760	<b>WATER CORPORATION</b>	31/01/2017	6,184.68
		SEWER EASEMENT		
026893	11758	<b>WATER CORP UTILITY ACCOUNT ONLY - PLE</b>	31/01/2017	24,611.17
		WATER USAGE / SUNDRY CHARGES		
026894	99995	<b>RESOLVE LEGAL</b>	31/01/2017	216.47
		PROPERTY REFUNDS		
026895	99995	<b>KENNETH AND VALERIE NORRIS</b>	31/01/2017	950.00
		PROPERTY REFUNDS		
026896	26987	<b>CTI RISK MANAGEMENT</b>	1/02/2017	1,149.80
		SECURITY - CASH COLLECTION		
		<b>ADD RETENTION HELD</b>		
		NIL		-
		<b>LESS CANCELLED CHEQUES/EFTS</b>		
026724		WATER CORPORATION	3/01/2017	6,979.20
EF100003		YANGEBUP KNIGHTS JUNIOR BALL CLUB	10/01/2017	400.00
EF100034		YANGEBUP KNIGHTS JUNIOR BALL CLUB	10/01/2017	179.00
026836		MALCOLM D REES	11/01/2017	2,000.00
026845		GEOFF WHITBY	19/01/2017	500.00
026869		BUILT NUTAL	25/01/2017	300.00
026896		CTI RISK MANAGEMENT	1/02/2017	1,149.80
EF100068		PULSE REALTY PROPERTY MANAGEMENT	11/01/2017	14,725.00
EF100069		CLICKSUPER	25/01/2017	499,201.41
		<b>PAYMENT LIST TOTAL</b>		<b>14,197,327.12</b>
		<b>TOTAL AS PER AP SOURCE 17GLACT9991000</b>		<b>14,197,327.12</b>
		<b>ADDITIONAL DIRECT PAYMENTS</b>		
		BANK FEES		
		MERCHANT FEES COC		
		MERCHANT FEES SLLC		
		MERCHANT FEES VARIOUS OUT CENTRES		
		NATIONAL BPAY CHARGE		5,916.16
		RTGS/ACLR FEE		5.00
		NAB TRANSACT FEE		2,497.66
		MERCHANDISE / OTHER FEES		20.00
				<b>8,438.82</b>
		<b>FAMILY DAY CARE AND IN HOME CARE PAYMENTS</b>		
		FDC PAYMENTS		82,266.93
		IHC PAYMENTS		204,258.74
				<b>286,525.67</b>
		<b>PAYROLL TRANSACTIONS</b>		
	11/01/2017	COC10/01/17 PYMTID 90799363 City of Cockburn		1,184,935.33
	11/01/2017	COC30/12/16 PYMTID 90754468 City of Cockburn		4,696.86

CITY OF COCKBURN  
MUNICIPAL BANK ACCOUNT

Cheque/	Account No.	Account/Payee	Date	Value
	12/01/2017	COC11/01/17 PYMTID 90860467 City of Cockburn		3,234.88
	19/01/2017	COC11/01/17 PYMTID 91171426 City of Cockburn		5,947.82
	25/01/2017	COC18/01/17 PYMTID 91488031 City of Cockburn		4,552.96
	25/01/2017	COC24/01/17 PYMTID 91488165 City of Cockburn		1,214,590.16
		Rebank		1,188.44
				<b>2,419,146.45</b>
		<b>CREDIT CARD PAYMENTS</b>		
		CBA CREDIT CARD PAYMENT		<b>57,257.20</b>
		<b>TOTAL PAYMENTS FOR JANUARY 2017</b>		<b>16,968,695.26</b>

## **PAYMENT SUMMARY**

### **CHEQUE PAYMENTS**

026881 - 026896

### **ELECTRONIC FUNDS TRANSFER PAYMENT**

EF100054 – EF100601

### **CANCELLED PAYMENTS**

026724; 026836; 026845; 026869; 026896; EF100003  
EF00034; EF100068; EF100069

# STATEMENT OF FINANCIAL ACTIVITY

for the period ended 31 January 2017

OCM 9/3/2017 - Item 16.2

	Actuals	YTD Revised Budget	Variance to YTD Budget	\$ Variance to YTD Budget	Revised Budget	Adopted Budget
	\$	\$	%	\$	\$	\$
<b>Operating Revenue</b>						
Governance	99,127,116	99,089,623	0%	37,494	104,763,874	104,743,874
Financial Services	614,362	571,896	7%	42,466	690,050	690,050
Information Services	3,250	875	271%	2,375	1,500	1,500
Human Resource Management	163,975	170,329	-4%	(6,354)	292,000	292,000
Library Services	26,788	37,829	-29%	(11,041)	55,146	55,146
Recreation & Community Safety	2,796,668	2,729,624	2%	67,044	5,680,403	5,648,025
Community Development & Services	5,698,759	5,349,255	7%	349,504 ✓	8,039,336	6,464,424
Corporate Communications	2,839	10,850	-74%	(8,011)	13,400	13,400
Statutory Planning	780,152	925,750	-16%	(145,598)	1,587,000	1,587,000
Strategic Planning	1,778,644	1,979,887	-10%	(201,243) X	2,955,811	2,955,811
Building Services	871,892	1,036,908	-16%	(165,016)	1,605,408	1,605,408
Environmental Health	301,172	208,992	44%	92,181	260,500	260,500
Waste Services	6,252,001	6,814,467	-8%	(562,466) X	9,907,593	9,907,593
Parks & Environmental Services	81,769	58,986	39%	22,783	59,778	1,900
Engineering Services	195,160	185,570	5%	9,590	318,120	318,120
Infrastructure Services	1,091,517	1,059,794	3%	31,723	1,147,099	1,072,099
	119,786,066	120,230,635	0%	(444,569)	137,377,018	135,616,850
<b>Total Operating Revenue</b>	<b>119,786,066</b>	<b>120,230,635</b>	<b>0%</b>	<b>(444,569)</b>	<b>137,377,018</b>	<b>135,616,850</b>
<b>Operating Expenditure</b>						
Governance	(2,194,676)	(2,530,104)	-13%	335,427 ✓	(4,564,453)	(4,681,477)
Strategy & Civic Support	(655,702)	(677,592)	-3%	21,891	(1,177,428)	(1,197,428)
Financial Services	(4,427,035)	(4,668,330)	-5%	241,295 ✓	(6,350,165)	(6,300,165)
Information Services	(3,112,076)	(3,125,484)	0%	13,408	(5,105,162)	(5,044,232)
Human Resource Management	(1,555,943)	(1,606,262)	-3%	50,319	(2,782,444)	(2,782,444)
Library Services	(1,981,568)	(2,118,400)	-6%	136,831	(3,563,075)	(3,508,075)
Recreation & Community Safety	(5,911,102)	(7,144,309)	-17%	1,233,207 ✓	(12,614,633)	(12,570,826)
Community Development & Services	(5,922,337)	(5,859,020)	1%	(63,318)	(10,268,704)	(8,499,849)
Corporate Communications	(1,764,637)	(1,817,638)	-3%	53,002	(3,418,681)	(3,369,861)
Statutory Planning	(768,648)	(829,590)	-7%	60,942	(1,478,763)	(1,478,763)
Strategic Planning	(1,054,470)	(957,744)	10%	(96,726)	(1,866,193)	(1,846,310)
Building Services	(900,149)	(924,078)	-3%	23,929	(1,651,768)	(1,651,768)
Environmental Health	(942,858)	(1,022,205)	-8%	79,347	(1,809,573)	(1,807,798)
Waste Services	(11,660,591)	(12,047,400)	-3%	386,810 ✓	(20,898,986)	(20,898,986)
Parks & Environmental Services	(7,313,677)	(7,250,520)	1%	(63,157)	(12,606,094)	(12,596,094)
Engineering Services	(4,596,179)	(4,464,816)	3%	(131,363)	(7,795,741)	(7,795,741)
Infrastructure Services	(4,902,639)	(5,728,248)	-14%	825,609 ✓	(9,630,988)	(7,257,566)
	(59,664,287)	(62,771,740)	-5%	3,107,453	(107,582,850)	(103,287,382)



# STATEMENT OF FINANCIAL ACTIVITY

for the period ended 31 January 2017

	Actuals	YTD Revised Budget	Variance to YTD Budget	\$ Variance to YTD Budget	Revised Budget	Adopted Budget
	\$	\$	%	\$	\$	\$
Less: Net Internal Recharging	1,323,565	2,288,342	-42%	(964,776) X	2,229,821	3,294,820
Add: Depreciation & Amortisation on Non-Current Assets						
Computer Equipment	(129,362)	(150,192)	-14%	20,830	(257,472)	(257,472)
Furniture and Equipment	(83,405)	(107,695)	-23%	24,291	(184,620)	(184,620)
Plant & Machinery	(1,685,443)	(1,770,084)	-5%	84,640	(3,034,473)	(3,034,473)
Buildings	(2,494,603)	(2,490,089)	0%	(4,514)	(4,464,644)	(5,175,945)
Infrastructure - Roads	(6,340,773)	(6,433,763)	-1%	92,990	(11,029,308)	(11,029,308)
Infrastructure - Drainage	(1,443,838)	(1,530,018)	-6%	86,180	(2,622,888)	(2,622,888)
Infrastructure - Footpaths	(690,959)	(708,554)	-2%	17,595	(1,214,664)	(1,214,664)
Infrastructure - Parks Equipment	(2,116,882)	(2,136,575)	-1%	19,693	(3,662,700)	(2,834,244)
Landfill Infrastructure	(640,947)	(694,827)	-8%	53,880	(1,191,132)	(1,191,132)
Marina Infrastructure	(557,124)	(556,269)	0%	(855)	(953,601)	-
	(16,183,336)	(16,578,066)	-2%	394,730	(28,615,502)	(27,544,746)
<b>Total Operating Expenditure</b>	<b>(74,524,057)</b>	<b>(77,061,464)</b>	<b>-3%</b>	<b>2,537,407</b>	<b>(133,968,531)</b>	<b>(127,537,308)</b>
<b>Change in Net Assets Resulting from Operations</b>	<b>45,262,008</b>	<b>43,169,171</b>	<b>5%</b>	<b>2,092,837</b>	<b>3,408,487</b>	<b>8,079,541</b>
<b>Non-Operating Activities</b>						
<b>Profit/(Loss) on Assets Disposal</b>						
Plant and Machinery	140,031	1,126,000	-88%	(985,969) X	434,650	14,650
Freehold Land	1,029,737	12,550,000	-92%	(11,520,263) X	12,840,000	-
Buildings	(168,330)	-	0%	(168,330)	-	-
	<b>1,001,438</b>	<b>13,676,000</b>	<b>-93%</b>	<b>(12,674,562)</b>	<b>13,274,650</b>	<b>14,650</b>
<b>Capital Expenditure</b>						
Computer Equipment	(343,138)	(883,989)	-61%	540,851 ✓	(1,499,167)	(484,800)
Furniture and Equipment	(117,296)	(451,768)	-74%	334,472 ✓	(2,562,618)	(33,808)
Plant & Machinery	(4,006,109)	(4,467,000)	-10%	460,891 ✓	(8,199,000)	(5,791,000)
Land	(265,841)	(1,333,680)	-80%	1,067,839 ✓	(1,792,797)	-
Buildings	(41,159,908)	(47,450,614)	-13%	6,290,706 ✓	(58,283,718)	(58,655,520)
Infrastructure - Roads	(6,276,370)	(13,926,784)	-55%	7,650,415 ✓	(21,898,220)	(10,865,703)
Infrastructure - Drainage	(238,808)	(962,025)	-75%	723,217 ✓	(1,713,768)	(1,061,475)
Infrastructure - Footpaths	(320,501)	(827,225)	-61%	506,724 ✓	(1,176,530)	(1,003,360)
Infrastructure - Parks Equipment	(4,622,387)	(6,111,524)	-24%	1,489,137 ✓	(9,537,984)	(5,642,000)
Infrastructure - Parks Landscaping	(425,047)	(841,975)	-50%	416,928 ✓	(1,235,235)	(970,000)
Landfill Infrastructure	(168,633)	(213,494)	-21%	44,861	(398,329)	(225,000)
<b>Note 1.</b>	<b>(57,944,037)</b>	<b>(77,470,078)</b>	<b>-25%</b>	<b>19,526,040</b>	<b>(108,297,365)</b>	<b>(84,732,666)</b>
Add: Gifted Subdivision Assets	(54,299,256)	(54,299,256)	0%	-	(54,299,256)	-
Add: Transfer to Reserves	(27,874,789)	(38,661,105)	-28%	10,786,316 ✓	(56,114,515)	(44,411,004)



# STATEMENT OF FINANCIAL ACTIVITY

for the period ended 31 January 2017

	Actuals	YTD Revised Budget	Variance to YTD Budget	\$ Variance to YTD Budget	Revised Budget	Adopted Budget
	\$	\$	%	\$	\$	\$
<b>Add Funding from</b>						
Non-Operating Grants, Subsidies and Contributions	6,269,631	12,102,801	-48%	(5,833,170) X	17,618,081	23,245,184
Developers Contributions Plans: Cash	3,852,904	7,785,298	-51%	(3,932,394) X	10,594,432	11,721,922
Proceeds on Sale of Assets	2,283,208	13,676,000	-83%	(11,392,792) X	14,524,650	1,264,650
Reserves	62,347,494	68,286,754	-9%	(5,939,260) X	83,345,284	52,676,958
Gifted Subdivision Assets	54,299,256	54,299,256	0%	-	54,299,256	-
	<b>129,052,493</b>	<b>156,150,109</b>	<b>-17%</b>	<b>(27,097,616)</b>	<b>180,381,703</b>	<b>88,908,714</b>
<b>Non-Cash/Non-Current Item Adjustments</b>						
Depreciation on Assets	15,542,389	15,883,239	-2%	(340,849) ✓	27,424,370	26,353,614
Amortisation on Assets	640,947	694,827	-8%	(53,880)	1,191,132	1,191,132
Profit/(Loss) on Assets Disposal	(1,001,438)	(13,676,000)	-93%	12,674,562 X	(13,274,650)	(14,650)
Loan Repayments	(1,296,075)	(1,296,075)	0%	0	(2,593,138)	(2,593,138)
Non-Current Leave Provisions	342,320	-	0%	342,320 X	-	-
Deferred Pensioners Adjustment	24,211	-	0%	24,211	-	-
	<b>14,252,354</b>	<b>1,605,991</b>	<b>787%</b>	<b>12,646,364</b>	<b>12,747,714</b>	<b>24,936,958</b>
Opening Funds	9,267,511	9,267,511	0%	0	9,267,511	10,500,000
<b>Closing Funds</b>	<b>58,717,723</b>	<b>53,438,343</b>	<b>10%</b>	<b>5,279,380</b>	<b>368,929</b>	<b>3,296,194</b>
	-	-		-	-	-

Note 2, 3.

## Notes to Statement of Financial Activity

### Note 1.

Additional information on the capital works program including committed orders at end of month:

	Actuals	Commitments at Month End	Commitments & Actuals YTD	YTD Revised Budget	Full Year Revised Budget	Uncommitted at Month End
	\$	\$			\$	\$
<b>Assets Classification</b>						
Computer Equipment	(343,138)	(227,193)	(570,330)	(883,989)	(1,499,167)	928,837
Furniture and Equipment	(117,296)	(684,973)	(802,269)	(451,768)	(2,562,618)	1,760,349
Plant & Machinery	(4,006,109)	(2,607,821)	(6,613,931)	(4,467,000)	(8,199,000)	1,585,069
Land	(265,841)	-	(265,841)	(1,333,680)	(1,792,797)	1,526,956
Buildings	(41,159,908)	(8,762,490)	(49,922,398)	(47,450,614)	(58,283,718)	8,361,320
Infrastructure - Roads	(6,276,370)	(6,811,801)	(13,088,170)	(13,926,784)	(21,898,220)	8,810,049
Infrastructure - Drainage	(238,808)	(26,868)	(265,676)	(962,025)	(1,713,768)	1,448,092
Infrastructure - Footpaths	(320,501)	(78,748)	(399,250)	(827,225)	(1,176,530)	777,280
Infrastructure - Parks Equipment	(4,622,387)	(1,219,172)	(5,841,559)	(6,111,524)	(9,537,984)	3,696,425
Infrastructure - Parks Landscaping	(425,047)	(163,703)	(588,750)	(841,975)	(1,235,235)	646,485
Landfill Infrastructure	(168,633)	(101,742)	(270,375)	(213,494)	(398,329)	127,954
	(57,944,037)	(20,684,511)	(78,628,548)	(77,470,078)	(108,297,365)	29,668,817

### Note 2.

Closing Funds in the Financial Activity Statement are represented by:

	Actuals	YTD Revised Budget	Full Year Revised Budget	Adopted Budget
	\$	\$	\$	\$
<b>Current Assets</b>				
Cash & Investments	138,857,733	142,857,081	113,947,104	117,882,206
Rates Outstanding	18,931,918	1,600,000	1,600,000	1,600,000
Rubbish Charges Outstanding	157,691	133,800	133,800	133,800
Sundry Debtors	1,861,218	5,300,000	5,300,000	5,300,000
GST Receivable	465,202	-	-	-
Prepayments	13,467	65,000	65,000	65,000
Accrued Debtors	-	-	-	-
Stock on Hand	25,788	13,700	13,700	13,700
	160,313,017	149,969,581	121,059,604	124,994,706
<b>Current Liabilities</b>				
Creditors	(8,154,963)	(2,225,000)	(2,225,000)	(2,225,000)
Income Received in Advance	(597,526)	-	-	-
GST Payable	344,928	-	-	-
Withholding Tax Payable	-	-	-	-
Provision for Annual Leave	(3,773,648)	-	-	-
Provision for Long Service Leave	(2,113,784)	(2,000,000)	(2,000,000)	(2,000,000)
	(14,294,992)	(4,225,000)	(4,225,000)	(4,225,000)
<b>Net Current Assets</b>	146,018,024	145,744,581	116,834,604	120,769,706
<b>Add: Non Current Investments</b>	4,826,950	4,668,070	4,668,070	4,668,070
	150,844,975	150,412,651	121,502,674	125,437,776
<b>Less: Restricted/Committed Assets</b>				
Cash Backed Reserves #	(92,127,252)	(96,974,308)	(99,369,187)	(115,812,070)
Deposits & Bonds Liability *	-	-	-	(6,329,512)
	58,717,723	53,438,343	22,133,487	3,296,194
<b>Closing Funds (as per Financial Activity Statement)</b>	58,717,723	53,438,343	22,133,487	3,296,194

# See attached Reserve Fund Statement

\* See attached Restricted Funds Analysis

**Note 3.**

**Amendments to original budget since budget adoption. Surplus/(Deficit)**

Ledger	Project/ Activity	Description	Council Resolution	Classification	Non Change (Non Cash Items) Adjust.	Increase in Available Cash	Decrease in Available Cash	Amended budget Running Balance
					\$	\$	\$	\$
<b>Budget Adoption</b>				<b>Closing Funds Surplus(Deficit)</b>				<b>299,049</b>
GL	202	Remove transport expenses		Operating Expenditure		2,100		<b>301,149</b>
GL	410	Recovery of administration charged to NDIS		Operating Income		46,181		<b>347,330</b>
			OCM 8/10/15					
GL	378	Council contribution to the Financial Counselling	#5614	Operating Expenditure			8,128	<b>339,202</b>
GL	161	FESA budget reallocation		Operating Expenditure		10,789		<b>349,991</b>
GL	162	FESA budget reallocation		Operating Expenditure		13,619		<b>363,610</b>
GL	175	FESA budget reallocation		Operating Expenditure		5,319		<b>368,929</b>
				<b>Closing Funds Surplus (Deficit)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>78,008</b>	<b>8,128</b>	<b>368,929</b>



**Statement of Comprehensive Income *by Nature and Type***  
for the period ended 31 January 2017

	Actual	Amended YTD Budget	\$ Variance to YTD Budget	Forecast	Amended Budget	Adopted Budget
	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$	\$
<b>OPERATING REVENUE</b>						
01 Rates	93,343,986	92,713,030	630,956	96,330,956	95,700,000	95,700,000
02 Specified Area Rates	306,453	330,000	(23,547)	306,453	330,000	330,000
05 Fees and Charges	14,582,888	15,707,105	(1,124,217)	23,302,160	24,426,378	24,368,500
06 Service Charges	440,700	446,000	(5,300)	440,700	450,000	450,000
10 Grants and Subsidies	7,043,074	7,713,390	(670,315)	10,361,624	11,031,939	9,357,649
15 Contributions, Donations and Reimbursements	648,593	394,090	254,503	921,168	666,665	638,665
20 Interest Earnings	3,420,371	2,927,021	493,351	5,265,387	4,772,036	4,772,036
25 Other revenue and Income	-	-	-	-	-	-
<b>Total Operating Revenue</b>	<b>119,786,066</b>	<b>120,230,635</b>	<b>(444,569)</b>	<b>136,928,448</b>	<b>137,377,018</b>	<b>135,616,850</b>
<b>OPERATING EXPENDITURE</b>						
50 Employee Costs - Salaries & Direct Oncosts	(28,072,604)	(27,611,769)	(460,834)	(49,591,013)	(49,130,179)	(47,426,397)
51 Employee Costs - Indirect Oncosts	(482,775)	(510,874)	28,099	(1,370,958)	(1,399,057)	(1,395,994)
55 Materials and Contracts	(21,151,914)	(23,539,981)	2,388,067	(37,792,372)	(40,180,439)	(40,006,001)
65 Utilities	(2,578,768)	(2,637,338)	58,570	(4,608,090)	(4,666,661)	(4,684,525)
70 Interest Expenses	(385,941)	(475,000)	89,059	(840,941)	(930,000)	(930,000)
75 Insurances	(2,109,308)	(2,244,006)	134,699	(2,109,349)	(2,244,048)	(2,244,048)
80 Other Expenses	(4,882,978)	(5,752,772)	869,794	(8,162,673)	(9,032,466)	(6,600,417)
85 Depreciation on Non Current Assets	(15,542,389)	(15,883,239)	340,849	(27,083,521)	(27,424,370)	(26,353,614)
86 Amortisation on Non Current Assets	(640,947)	(694,827)	53,880	(640,947)	(1,191,132)	(1,191,132)
<b>Add Back: Indirect Costs Allocated to Capital Works</b>	<b>1,323,565</b>	<b>2,288,342</b>	<b>(964,776)</b>	<b>1,265,045</b>	<b>2,229,821</b>	<b>3,294,820</b>
<b>Total Operating Expenditure</b>	<b>(74,524,057)</b>	<b>(77,061,464)</b>	<b>2,537,407</b>	<b>(130,934,819)</b>	<b>(133,968,531)</b>	<b>(127,537,308)</b>
<b>CHANGE IN NET ASSETS RESULTING FROM OPERATING ACTIVITIES</b>	<b>45,262,008</b>	<b>43,169,171</b>	<b>2,092,837</b>	<b>5,993,629</b>	<b>3,408,487</b>	<b>8,079,541</b>
<b>NON-OPERATING ACTIVITIES</b>						
11, 16 Non-Operating Grants, Subsidies and Contributions	6,269,631	12,102,801	(5,833,170)	11,784,911	17,618,081	23,245,184
18 Developers Contributions Plans: Cash	3,852,904	7,785,298	(3,932,394)	6,662,037	10,594,432	11,721,922
17 Gifted Subdivision Assets	54,299,256	54,299,256	-	54,299,256	54,299,256	-
95 Profit/(Loss) on Sale of Assets	1,001,438	13,676,000	(12,674,562)	1,001,438	13,274,650	14,650
<b>Total Non-Operating Activities</b>	<b>65,423,229</b>	<b>87,863,355</b>	<b>(22,440,127)</b>	<b>73,747,643</b>	<b>95,786,419</b>	<b>34,981,756</b>
<b>NET RESULT</b>	<b>110,685,237</b>	<b>131,032,527</b>	<b>(20,347,289)</b>	<b>79,741,271</b>	<b>99,194,906</b>	<b>43,061,297</b>

## Notes to Statement of Comprehensive Income

### Note 1.

Additional information on main sources of revenue in fees & charges.

	Actual	Amended YTD Budget	Amended Budget	Adopted Budget
	\$	\$	\$	\$
<b><u>Community Services:</u></b>				
Recreational Services	354,589	331,788	568,780	568,780
South Lake Leisure Centre	1,547,775	1,810,164	2,231,074	2,231,074
Law and Public Safety	403,618	302,456	518,496	518,496
	2,384,311	2,444,409	5,141,627	5,141,627
<b><u>Waste Services:</u></b>				
Waste Collection Services	2,627,377	2,595,454	2,675,000	2,675,000
Waste Disposal Services	3,603,506	4,219,013	7,232,593	7,232,593
	6,230,883	6,814,467	9,907,593	9,907,593
<b><u>Infrastructure Services:</u></b>				
Marina & Coastal Services	1,016,518	982,871	1,068,802	1,068,802
	1,016,518	982,871	1,068,802	1,068,802
	9,631,712	10,241,747	16,118,022	16,118,022

### Note 2.

Additional information on Salaries and Direct On-Costs by each Division.

	Actual	Amended YTD Budget	Amended Budget	Adopted Budget
	\$	\$	\$	\$
Executive Services	(1,336,067)	(1,458,134)	(2,578,913)	(2,578,913)
Finance & Corporate Services Division	(4,399,879)	(4,181,733)	(7,232,487)	(7,232,487)
Governance & Community Services Division	(8,953,890)	(8,853,293)	(16,247,784)	(14,544,002)
Planning & Development Division	(3,133,045)	(3,126,013)	(5,488,489)	(5,488,489)
Engineering & Works Division	(10,249,723)	(9,992,596)	(17,582,506)	(17,582,506)
	(28,072,604)	(27,611,769)	(49,130,179)	(47,426,397)


### Note 3

Additional information on Materials and Contracts by each Division.


	Actual	Amended YTD Budget	Amended Budget	Adopted Budget
	\$	\$	\$	\$
Executive Services	(1,001,199)	(1,158,557)	(1,976,181)	(2,113,205)
Finance & Corporate Services Division	(2,113,561)	(2,538,932)	(3,907,940)	(3,796,510)
Governance & Community Services Division	(5,420,732)	(6,120,061)	(10,759,595)	(10,577,544)
Planning & Development Division	(459,633)	(563,906)	(1,157,591)	(1,135,933)
Engineering & Works Division	(12,156,789)	(13,158,524)	(22,379,133)	(22,382,810)
Not Applicable	0	0	0	0
	(21,151,914)	(23,539,981)	(40,180,439)	(40,006,001)




**Operating Income by Nature and Type**  
(YTD Actual)



**Operating Expenditure by Nature and Type**  
(YTD Actual)




**Operating Expenditure by Business Unit**  
(YTD Budget vs YTD Actual)







### YTD Operating Expenditure Vs YTD Revised Budget




### YTD Operating Income Vs YTD Revised Budget




### Capital Expenditure YTD Actual Vs Revised Budget




# **Current Assets** (YTD Actual)




# **Current Liabilities** (YTD Actual)



**Municipal Liquidity Over the Year**  
(Based on Closing Funds in the Financial Activity Statement)



**Cash & Investments Positions**  
YTD Actual Vs YTD Revised Budget





# City of Cockburn - Reserve Funds

Financial Statement for Period Ending 31 January 2017

Account Details	Opening Balance		Interest Received		t/f's from Municipal		t/f's to Municipal		Closing Balance	
	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual	Budget	Actual
<b>Council Funded</b>										
Bibra Lake Management Plan Reserve	985,439	985,439	10,648	11,148	-	-	(789,367)	(386,166)	206,720	610,421
C/FWD Projects Reserve	4,020,698	4,020,698	-	-	6,147,183	6,147,183	(9,630,443)	(5,523,109)	537,439	4,644,772
CCW Development Fund	10,880,762	10,880,762	53,000	112,885	8,300,000	8,300,000	(17,814,000)	(17,814,000)	1,419,762	1,479,647
Community Infrastructure	12,096,036	12,096,036	109,782	161,731	1,304,636	-	(4,010,722)	(463,372)	9,499,732	11,794,395
Community Surveillance Levy Reserve	1,245,490	1,245,490	22,594	16,935	200,000	-	(334,000)	(51,526)	1,134,084	1,210,899
DCD Redundancies Reserve	40,825	40,825	797	558	-	-	-	-	41,622	41,384
Environmental Offset Reserve	291,595	291,595	7,691	3,988	-	-	-	-	299,286	295,583
Green House Emissions Reductions	901,331	901,331	10,330	11,770	1,450,000	-	(2,362,700)	(258,437)	(1,039)	654,663
HWRP Post Closure Management	2,322,695	2,322,695	47,780	31,719	-	-	(100,000)	(5,451)	2,270,475	2,348,963
Information Technology	379,658	379,658	8,082	5,193	100,000	-	(395,930)	-	91,810	384,851
Insurance	488,961	488,961	8,090	6,688	-	-	-	-	497,051	495,649
Land Development & Investment Fund Reserve	6,348,831	6,348,831	251,777	56,864	13,080,095	1,775,113	(11,032,895)	(8,794,829)	8,647,808	(614,021)
Major Buildings Refurbishment	9,828,567	9,828,567	133,850	134,429	1,620,328	-	-	-	11,582,745	9,962,996
Municipal Elections	34,213	34,213	2,681	468	120,000	-	-	-	156,894	34,681
Naval Base Shacks	935,871	935,871	22,969	12,800	158,696	-	-	-	1,117,536	948,671
Plant & Vehicle Replacement	8,252,372	8,252,372	105,975	106,143	2,949,690	-	(4,413,350)	(1,947,506)	6,894,687	6,411,009
Port Coogee Marina Assets Replcmt	-	-	-	-	-	-	(50,000)	-	(50,000)	-
Port Coogee Special Maintenance Reserve	1,400,129	1,400,129	26,794	18,162	274,000	250,453	(313,509)	(302,554)	1,387,414	1,366,191
Port Coogee Waterways Reserve	-	-	8,685	1,951	188,590	188,590	(79,742)	-	117,533	190,541
Port Coogee WEMP	-	-	40,372	16,229	2,100,000	2,163,409	(203,192)	-	1,937,180	2,179,638
Roads & Drainage Infrastructure	8,159,206	8,159,206	64,880	146,063	4,250,000	3,000,000	(3,692,542)	(55,012)	8,781,544	11,250,257
Staff Payments & Entitlements	2,115,293	2,115,293	45,068	28,126	119,822	-	(162,000)	(162,000)	2,118,183	1,981,419
Waste & Recycling	23,846,752	23,846,752	348,847	224,714	1,949,433	-	(12,598,318)	(12,199,622)	13,546,713	11,871,844
Waste Collection Levy	2,641,530	2,641,530	63,366	33,004	1,638,621	-	(1,385,000)	(621,083)	2,958,517	2,053,451
POS Cash in Lieu (Restricted Funds)	5,471,641	5,471,641	108,937	53,833	96,000	96,000	(5,621,474)	(5,621,474)	55,104	(0)
	<b>102,687,894</b>	<b>102,687,894</b>	<b>1,502,995</b>	<b>1,195,403</b>	<b>46,047,094</b>	<b>21,920,747</b>	<b>(74,989,184)</b>	<b>(54,206,140)</b>	<b>75,248,798</b>	<b>71,597,904</b>
<b>Grant Funded</b>										
Aged & Disabled Vehicle Expenses	326,947	326,947	8,628	3,651	-	-	(162,000)	(145,000)	173,575	185,598
CIHF Building Maintenance Resrv	3,323,192	3,323,192	-	47,682	1,400,000	576,765	(250,000)	(40,891)	4,473,192	3,906,747
Family Day Care Accumulation Fund	8,295	8,295	-	113	-	-	-	-	8,295	8,408
Naval Base Shack Removal Reserve	461,814	461,814	10,217	6,316	54,693	-	-	-	526,724	468,130
Restricted Grants & Contributions Resrv	2,230,479	2,230,479	-	-	-	-	(1,928,710)	(2,111,888)	301,769	118,591
UNDERGROUND POWER	222,504	222,504	-	3,043	-	-	-	-	222,504	225,547
Welfare Projects Employee Entitlements	479,810	479,810	10,933	6,603	13,000	7,583	-	-	503,743	493,997
	<b>7,053,040</b>	<b>7,053,040</b>	<b>29,778</b>	<b>67,409</b>	<b>1,467,693</b>	<b>584,348</b>	<b>(2,340,710)</b>	<b>(2,297,779)</b>	<b>6,209,801</b>	<b>5,407,019</b>
<b>Development Cont. Plans</b>										
Aubin Grove DCP	500	500	4,705	7	-	-	(656)	-	4,549	507
Cockburn Coast DCP14	(66,932)	(66,932)	-	(915)	-	-	(54,716)	-	(121,648)	(67,847)
Community Infrastructure DCA 13	10,361,258	10,361,258	220,238	144,898	5,000,000	3,253,702	(5,865,800)	(5,825,327)	9,715,696	7,934,531
Gaebler Rd Development Cont. Plans	500	500	18,924	7	-	-	(3,385)	-	16,039	507
Hammond Park DCP	975,033	975,033	9,354	15,595	396,000	335,552	(15,491)	-	1,364,896	1,326,180
Munster Development	1,079,480	1,079,480	18,147	15,045	443,798	39,828	(10,883)	-	1,530,542	1,134,352
Muriel Court Development Contribution	(92,248)	(92,248)	-	(1,262)	206,000	-	(32,025)	-	81,727	(93,510)
Packham North - DCP 12	25,036	25,036	10,529	379	434,388	18,219	(7,128)	-	462,825	43,634
Solomon Road DCP	617,423	617,423	8,493	8,445	120,000	-	(5,166)	-	740,750	625,868
Success Lakes Development	500	500	3,817	7	-	-	(1,061)	-	3,256	507
Success Nth Development Cont. Plans	2,398,845	2,398,845	15,311	32,894	11,700	31,371	(4,596)	(18,248)	2,421,260	2,444,861
Thomas St Development Cont. Plans	12,699	12,699	294	174	-	-	-	-	12,993	12,873
Wattleup DCP 10	(3,401)	(3,401)	-	463	-	100,304	(10,161)	-	(13,562)	97,366
Yangebup East Development Cont. Plans	1,130,859	1,130,859	6,026	15,815	130,036	90,618	(2,161)	-	1,264,760	1,237,292
Yangebup West Development Cont. Plans	419,471	419,471	9,195	5,737	-	-	(2,161)	-	426,505	425,208
	<b>16,859,023</b>	<b>16,859,023</b>	<b>325,033</b>	<b>237,287</b>	<b>6,741,922</b>	<b>3,869,594</b>	<b>(6,015,390)</b>	<b>(5,843,575)</b>	<b>17,910,588</b>	<b>15,122,329</b>
<b>Total Reserves</b>										
	<b>126,599,957</b>	<b>126,599,957</b>	<b>1,857,806</b>	<b>1,500,100</b>	<b>54,256,709</b>	<b>26,374,689</b>	<b>(83,345,284)</b>	<b>(62,347,494)</b>	<b>99,369,187</b>	<b>92,127,252</b>

# DETAILED BUDGET AMENDMENTS REPORT

#REF!

PROJECT/ACTIVITY LIST		ADD/LESS	EXPENDITURE	TF TO RESERVE	FUNDING SOURCES			
					RESERVE	EXTERNAL	MUNICIPAL	NON-CASH
OP 8985	New funding from Healthway	ADD	8,000			(8,000)		
CW 1280	HACC office chair - funded from grant surplus	ADD	1,060			(1,060)		
			9,060	0	0	(9,060)	0	0

Ratepayers/Residents of Leaside Way  
Spearwood, 6163. WA

City Of Cockburn

Date: 21<sup>st</sup> November 2016

Attention: The Mayor and Elected Members

We the Ratepayers/Residents of "Leaside Way" and "Adela Place" with shared boundary fencing adjoining Spearwood Avenue, greatly welcome the Councils initiative to explore the further beautification and possible upgrade of the fencing between Rockingham Road and Hamilton Road. We are also appreciative of the Councils Vision and implementation of the current themes that are gracing this section of Spearwood Avenue.

At the September Ordinary Council Meeting (Minute No 5890), the City of Cockburn decided to move forward with a vegetation beautification program to screen this fenced section of Spearwood Avenue. A number of queries and concerns have been raised by "us" the impacted residents regarding the process implemented by council in arriving at this decision, including whether the appropriate residents were consulted, the format of consultation and overall submission outcome.

Keeping in step with the City of Cockburn Customer Service Charter, we the Ratepayers/Residents strongly believe the survey sent to us, and the resulting final report and actions to be taken (Spearwood Avenue Fence Proposal 2016), has not met the intent and expectations of the impacted Ratepayers/Residents.



To the Mayor and Elected Members, we the undersigned signatories' as ratepayers of the City of Cockburn respectfully request:

"That the Spearwood Avenue Fencing Proposal Survey/Report passed by council at the September 2016 Ordinary Meeting (Minute No# 5890) be re-investigated, with a particular focus on the fencing option which we believe was supported by the majority of impacted residents per the signatures below"



Details of person submitting this petition:

Name: Joe FALTON

Address: 47 LEASIDE WAY

Mobile: 0407299723

Date: 21-11-16

Name	Address	Signature
MELISSA SHARPE	53a LEASIDE WAY	
CARLOS GONCALVES	49 LEASIDE WAY	
STAN HUGHES	43 LEASIDE WAY	S Hughes
Ann-Marie Spanjic	41 Leaside Way Spearwood	a-pajic
Amy Thatchers	39 LEASIDE WAY S80	e/thatchers
Lance SMITH	37 Leaside Way Spearwood	L.S. Smith
Mario Moreschi	45 Leaside way Spearwood	Moreschi
FRANK Janni	51 LEASIDE WAY Spearwood	frank janni

Ratepayers/Residents of Adela Place  
Spearwood, 6163. WA

City Of Cockburn

Date: 21<sup>st</sup> November 2016

Attention: The Mayor and Elected Members

We the Ratepayers/Residents of "Leaside Way" and "Adela Place" with shared boundary fencing adjoining Spearwood Avenue, greatly welcome the Councils initiative to explore the further beautification and possible upgrade of the fencing between Rockingham Road and Hamilton Road. We are also appreciative of the Councils Vision and implementation of the current themes that are gracing this section of Spearwood Avenue.

At the September Ordinary Council Meeting (Minute No 5890), the City of Cockburn decided to move forward with a vegetation beautification program to screen this fenced section of Spearwood Avenue. A number of queries and concerns have been raised by "us" the impacted residents regarding the process implemented by council in arriving at this decision, including whether the appropriate residents were consulted, the format of consultation and overall submission outcome.















Keeping in step with the City of Cockburn Customer Service Charter, we the Ratepayers/Residents strongly believe the survey sent to us, and the resulting final report and actions to be taken (Spearwood Avenue Fence Proposal 2016), has not met the intent and expectations of the impacted Ratepayers/Residents.

To the Mayor and Elected Members, we the undersigned signatories' as ratepayers of the City of Cockburn respectfully request:

"That the Spearwood Avenue Fencing Proposal Survey/Report passed by council at the September 2016 Ordinary Meeting (Minute No# 5890) be re-investigated, with a particular focus on the fencing option which we believe was supported by the majority of impacted residents per the signatures below"

Details of person submitting this petition:

Name: Adam C. ALAJBEG Address: 12 ADELA PL SPEARWOOD  
Mobile: 0410 455 656 Date: 21/11/16.

Name	Address	Signature
Adam C. ALAJBEG	12 ADELA PL SPEARWOOD.	
Kate Croose	2 Adela Pl Spearwood	
(R) GRABME REND	16. ADELA PLACE "	
FRANCESCO PARVANA	22 ADELA PLACE SPEARWOOD.	
C. MAKSEMIUK	24 ADELA PLACE SPEARWOOD	C. MAKSEMIUK
M. KATALINIC	26 ADELA PLACE SPEARWOOD	
(R) J. Andrews	26 Adela Pl Spearwood	
(R) ALAN HART	28 B ADELA PL SPEARWOOD	
Josh DeBuelle	14 Adela Pl, Spearwood	
Josh DeBuelle	14A Adela Pl, Spearwood	
HAUIS PESICH	28A + 28B adela. Place	
Carlin Lyle	16 adela Place, Spearwood	
Greta Tomas	25 ADELA PLACE SPEARWOOD	
Simon Manson	7 Adela place spearwood	Simon
(R) D. MARZESPANI	39 ROCKINGHAM RD	
KATIE EVERS	321 Rockingham Rd Spearwood	

\*(R) - represents residents/tenants.



## SPEARWOOD AVE FENCE PROPOSAL

I, .....(insert name and property address), hereby

Caitlin Lyle of Autism Association of WA  
of 16 Adela Place, Spearwood WA 6163



- Support Councils recommendation to remove the existing fibro fence and replace with Colourbond fencing.
- Assist council with the construction of the fence by removing all material within 5 metres of the fence for the period of construction and ensuring all animals are fenced off to mitigate risk to the installers.
- Agree to accept all ongoing maintenance and renewal costs following installation of the Colourbond fence.

Comments:

---

---


---

---

---

---

Caitlin Lyle



Name

Signature



- Not support Councils recommendation to remove the existing fibro fence and replace with Colourbond fencing.

Comments:

---

---

---

---

---

---

Name

Signature

## SPEARWOOD AVE FENCE PROPOSAL

I CONSOLATA MAKSEMIUK of 24 ADELA PL hereby,



- Support Councils recommendation to remove the existing fibro fence and replace with Colourbond fencing.
- Assist council with the construction of the fence by removing all material within 5 metres of the fence for the period of construction and ensuring all animals are fenced off to mitigate risk to the installers.
- Agree to accept all ongoing maintenance and renewal costs following installation of the Colourbond fence.

Comments:

~~✓~~ UNABLE TO COMPLY -  
GARDEN SHED / CHICKEN COOP NOT  
POSSIBLE TO MOVE.

Name

Signature



- Not support Councils recommendation to remove the existing fibro fence and replace with Colourbond fencing.

Comments:

---

---

---

---

---

---

Name

Signature CONSOLATA MAKSEMIUK

CONSOLATA MAKSEMIUK



## SPEARWOOD AVE FENCE PROPOSAL

I, .....(insert name and property address), hereby

28 A + 28 B

I CLAUS PESICH of Adela Place



- Support Councils recommendation to remove the existing fibro fence and replace with Colourbond fencing.
- Assist council with the construction of the fence by removing all material within 5 metres of the fence for the period of construction and ensuring all animals are fenced off to mitigate risk to the installers.
- Agree to accept all ongoing maintenance and renewal costs following installation of the Colourbond fence.

Comments:

---

---

---

---

---

---

CLAUS PESICH

m/pesch

Name

Signature



- Not support Councils recommendation to remove the existing fibro fence and replace with Colourbond fencing.

Comments:

---

---

---

---

---

---

Name

Signature

## SPEARWOOD AVE FENCE PROPOSAL

I GOLDA TOMAS of 25 ADELA PLACE  
SPEARWOOD

hereby,



- Support Councils recommendation to remove the existing fibro fence and replace with Colourbond fencing.
- Assist council with the construction of the fence by removing all material within 5 metres of the fence for the period of construction and ensuring all animals are fenced off to mitigate risk to the installers.
- Agree to accept all ongoing maintenance and renewal costs following installation of the Colourbond fence.

Comments:

---

---

---

---

---

---

Name

GOLDA TOMAS

Signature

[Signature]



- Not support Councils recommendation to remove the existing fibro fence and replace with Colourbond fencing.

Comments:

---

---

---

---

---

---

Name

Signature

## SPEARWOOD AVE FENCE PROPOSAL

I KATIE EVERY of 321 ROCKINGHAM RD hereby,  
ON BEHALF OF JAKA BACICH 317 ROCKINGHAM RD SPEARWOOD



- Support Councils recommendation to remove the existing fibro fence and replace with Colourbond fencing.
- Assist council with the construction of the fence by removing all material within 5 metres of the fence for the period of construction and ensuring all animals are fenced off to mitigate risk to the installers.
- Agree to accept all ongoing maintenance and renewal costs following installation of the Colourbond fence.

Comments:

---

---

---

---

---

---

KATIE EVERY

Name

L. Every

Signature



- Not support Councils recommendation to remove the existing fibro fence and replace with Colourbond fencing.

Comments:

---

---

---

---

---

---

Name

Signature

Address	Property Owner/Owners	Suburb	YES/NO
2 Adela Place	Jayson W Grose & Kate Grose	2 Adela Place SPEARWOOD WA 6163	YES
10 Unit 1,2,3 & 4 Adela Place	Frankman Nomineed Pty Ltd	PO Box 9329 GOLD COAST MC QLD 9726	NO
12 Adela Place	Adam C Alajbeg	12 Adela Place SPEARWOOD WA 6163	YES
14 Adela Place	Josh De Buelle	3 Lewis Court SAMSON WA 6163	YES
16 Adela Place	Housing Authority	Private Bag 22 EAST PERTH WA 6892	No response
18 Adela Place	Fay Marie Armstrong	SUPPRESSED ADDRESS	No response
20 A,B & C Adela Place	Roger Martin Godfrey	24 Westmorland Drive LEEMING WA 6149	No response
22 Adela Place	Francesco & Anna R Parvana	22 Adela Place SPEARWOOD WA 6163	YES
24 Adela Place	Consolata Maksemiuk	24 Adela Place SPEARWOOD WA 6163	YES
26 Adela Place	Orit Lahav	37 Hesperia Avenue CITY BEACH WA 6015	No response
28A&B Adela Place	Mavis Nellie Pesich	44 Hanlon Street HAMILTON HILL WA 6163	Yes
317 Rockingham Rd	Jaka Bacich	317 Rockingham Road SPEARWOOD WA 6163	Yes
31A Leaside Way	Alexandra Lewis Hooper	31A Leaside Way SPEARWOOD WA 6163	No response
31B Leaside Way	Elizabeth EB	31B Leaside Way SPEARWOOD WA 6163	YES
33 Leaside Way	Housing Authority	Private Bag 22 EAST PERTH WA 6892	No response
35 Leaside Way	Calliope Katsapis and Panagiotis Katsapis	8 Ashbourne Way HAMILTON HILL WA 6163	YES
37 Leaside Way	Lance Smith	37 Leaside Way SPEARWOOD WA 6163	YES
39 Leaside Way	Wayne A Thatcher & Amy C Thatcher	39 Leaside Way SPEARWOOD WA 6163	YES
41 Leaside Way	Ann-Marie Spanjic	41 Leaside Way SPEARWOOD WA 6163	YES
43 Leaside Way	John Hughes & Stanley Hughes	43 Leaside Way SPEARWOOD WA 6163	YES
45 Leaside Way	Mario A Moreschi	45 Leaside Way SPEARWOOD WA 6163	YES
47 Leaside Way	Debbie M Falzon & Joseph P Falzon	47 Leaside Way SPEARWOOD WA 6163	YES
49 Leaside Way	Joao C G B & Cecilia M S C Goncalves	49 Leaside Way SPEARWOOD WA 6163	YES
51 Leaside Way	Francesco Ianni	51 Leaside Way SPEARWOOD WA 6163	No
53A Leaside Way	Melissa C Sharpe	35A Antonio Street COOLBELLUP WA 6163	Yes
53B Leaside Way	Anthony M & Frances J Davies	SPEARWOOD WA 6163	Yes
55 Leaside Way	Davor Nedic	55 Leaside Way SPEARWOOD WA 6163	No response
311A Rockingham Rd	Patricia M Cleary	311A Rockingham Road SPEARWOOD WA 6163	No
311B Rockingham Rd	Andrew D Riley	311B Rockingham Road SPEARWOOD WA 6163	Yes

## CONSULTATION SUMMARY

### Safety of the Wyola Wreck

The City of Cockburn is investigating the public safety of the Wyola Wreck and barge on the beach at Coogee and sought community feedback by 17 February, 2017. Can it safely remain in its current location, given its deteriorating state or should it be shifted, such as to an underwater site as part of the maritime dive trail near the Omeo Wreck?

As the first stage of consultation, the City interviewed some key local stakeholders to flesh out the issues and received feedback from some maritime archaeologists around Australia. As the second stage of consultation, the City invited residents across the City to voice their concerns and sentiments via an online survey on Comment on Cockburn (**153 responses**) and via Facebook (**53 responses**). This was publicised through electronic newsletters and a newspaper advertisement.

The outcome was:

	Retain wreck on beach	Remove wreck from beach	Neutral	Safety concern	Not a safety concern
Facebook (53 responses)	49	4		2	2
Survey (153 responses)	111 happy if it stayed 99 don't want it removed	28 unhappy if it stayed 47 want it removed	6	50	100
WA Museum	1				
Maritime archaeologists	2				2
Coogee Beach Progress Assn		1		1	
Horse trainers		2		2	
Council landscape architect	1				1
Cockburn historical society		1		1	
Aboriginal Reference Group	No action in dunes				
Journalist/publisher		1		1	
South Beach Community Group			1	1	

### **Comments ranged from:**

“Almost 33 years, I'm walking near every day on this beach with my dogs (and) my two sons grown up on this beach. My son make his first steps on this beach. (Removing the wreck) will be like removing heart from my body”.

“The wreck is a safety hazard that detracts from the beauty of the beach and should be removed. It's just junk.”

“We need to be wary of sanitising our coastline by acting as if our coast can be made "safe". The ocean and the coastline are inherently risky, that is part of their value. This wreck is no different to reef areas and rocky outcrops. We adults can handle it! Our children can learn to handle these areas and conditions. Leave it be. There are many other beaches that people can go to that don't have wrecks if they need to.

“Having viewed Viking boats in museums in Scandinavia, I realise the importance of preservation. I believe it will disappear over the next decade (so) I would be happy to see it moved away from its current location”.

### **Points in favour of retaining the Wyola and barge on the beach:**

Sentimental attachment to wreck's history – role in WWI, Fremantle Port and Coogee beach, growing up with it on the beach

Landmark for local photographers

Cost of removal may be too high for ratepayers

Potential heritage constraints in the sand dunes

Landmark for beach goers who regard the wreck as a terminus – “I walk up to the wreck and back”.

### **Points in favour of removing the Wyola and barge from the beach**

Safety concern for beach users – people walking, walking their dogs, or trainers riding horses

Potential legal liability for the City

Suggestions there was nothing romantic about the shipwreck. The Wyola was deliberately wrecked by its owner, close to a scrapyard, and when court action required its removal from the beach, the owner skipped town and left the wreck there.


Preservation of the wreck because it will deteriorate in its current location

Extra asset for dive trail





**Figure 3-3** Landgate aerial image taken September 6, 1974, with Robb Jetty. Note *Wyola* and barge on beach near jetty, and railway between jetty and abattoir (Western Australian Museum, Landgate).



## Summary of input from key stakeholders

Danielle Wilkinson, maritime archaeologist

	Question	
1	What association have you had with the Wyola Wreck.	I completed my Masters of Maritime Archaeology thesis on the Wyola wreck site, studying the changing perceptions of Wyola from its working life to now. This also included Robb's Jetty, the demolished abattoir and the 'Horse and Rider' statue in the water.
2	What do you value about the Wyola wreck?	I value its heritage significance. It was an icon of Fremantle Harbour for over 50 years, recognised interstate and internationally for its services and proficiency. The vessel was seen as heroic, braving dangerous conditions to aid boats in trouble. It is also currently a unique and interesting feature in the landscape of CY O'Connor Beach, along with remains of Robb's Jetty and the statue.
3	Do you have any concerns about safety at this location?	None at all
4	How would you feel if it remained in place?	I would feel pleased that it would remain in situ, preserving the archaeological and social significance of the site. Other measures may reduce the perceived hazard it poses without requiring relocation.
5	How would you feel if it was removed from this site?	I would feel disappointed and I would doubt that this was the best management option to reduce the safety risk and preserve the wreck's heritage significance.
6	History	<a href="https://www.flinders.edu.au/ehl/fms/archaeology_files/dig_library/theses/DJWilkinson%20%202013.pdf">https://www.flinders.edu.au/ehl/fms/archaeology_files/dig_library/theses/DJWilkinson%20%202013.pdf</a>
7	Any other comments	I work as a maritime archaeological consultant and have assisted councils with the management of similar shipwrecks. A thorough assessment should be undertaken of the actual safety risk this wreck poses before any interference. Based on the findings, proportionate measures can then be implemented to manage this wreck. In my experience, it is likely that relocation would not be justifiable for this shipwreck and other management measures would be better suited.

Ross Anderson, Assistant Curator, Department of Maritime Archaeology, Western Australian Museum – Shipwreck Galleries, 47 Cliff St, Fremantle WA

	Question	
1	What association have you had with the Wyola Wreck.	<p>I am a maritime archaeologist who works at the WA Museum and as part of my duties I am responsible for providing management advice for the Wyola wreck. As part of my work I also use the wreck to undertake land-based exercises in recording shipwrecks for the purposes of education and training of school and university students. I am also a City of Cockburn/ Spearwood resident and regularly use the CY O'Connor Beach for recreation with my family.</p> <p>As discussed today please find the following points below in relation to our recommendations for best practice management for these sites:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The WA Museum recommends in situ preservation wherever possible, and minimal disturbance to historic fabric and maritime archaeological sites. This is consistent with standard heritage practice following the 2013 Burra Charter Guidelines for the Management of Heritage Places [<a href="http://australia.icomos.org/publications/burra-charter-practice-notes/">http://australia.icomos.org/publications/burra-charter-practice-notes/</a>] and the 2001 UNESCO Convention on the Protection of Underwater Cultural Heritage that states the first priority to protect shipwrecks is in situ preservation; [<a href="http://www.unesco.org/new/en/culture/themes/underwater-cultural-heritage/2001-convention/">http://www.unesco.org/new/en/culture/themes/underwater-cultural-heritage/2001-convention/</a>]</li> <li>• The Wyola and timber barge are not protected by the State Maritime Archaeology Act 1973 as they were wrecked post-1900. However we believe the sites have historical significance to the heritage and maritime history of Fremantle and Cockburn region;</li> <li>• The WA Museum also regularly uses the wrecks and Robb Jetty for work with school students as a training ground for underwater and above water archaeological survey training;</li> </ul> <p>The State Heritage Office has a register of heritage consultants that can assist with preparing a Management Plan including Heritage Impact Statement for the sites:  <a href="http://stateheritage.wa.gov.au/state-heritage-register/professionals/incontact-find-heritage-specialists">http://stateheritage.wa.gov.au/state-heritage-register/professionals/incontact-find-heritage-specialists</a></p>

2	What do you value about the Wyola wreck?	It is rare that shipwrecks are visible to the general public, and the Wyola is a landmark in the seascape at CY OConnor Beach. It is also part of a 'maritime precinct' with the wreck of the timber barge and Robbs jetty dive site offshore, and CY O'Connor statue, and adjacent cattle run interpretation for the meatworks. From a heritage perspective it is always preferable according to international best practice that heritage sites remain in situ. The wreck has significant historical associations and is part of the maritime heritage of both Fremantle and Cockburn. There is potential to better interpret the historical values of the wreck and also include it a part of a foreshore walking/ cycling wreck/heritage trail that would extend from Fremantle to Woodman Point. There are other buried wrecks north of Port Coogee in the vicinity of the power station namely James (1830) and Diana(1878), bookended by the also visible Omeo (1905) shipwreck a key feature of the newly created Coogee Maritime Trail at Coogee Beach. There may be an opportunity to manage the Wyola site to both preserve the site in situ and ensure beachgoers and horse riders safety, and this should be explored as part of a suite of potential management options including in situ preservation or partial removal of hazardous structure.
3	Do you have any concerns about safety at this location?	The beach regime of exposure and accretion does cause sharp remains of the iron hull to be occasionally exposed, just covered, or well covered by sand. This does present some risk at times of beach erosion but could be managed in a variety of ways including warning signs if necessary. However generally speaking I don't think it presents a major safety issue to beach walkers.
4	How would you feel if it remained in place?	Speaking as a Spearwood resident, I feel that if the wreck could remain in situ and managed appropriately to ensure beachgoers safety that this would be the best outcome.
5	How would you feel if it was removed from this site?	Speaking as a Spearwood resident, I feel that this outcome should be a last resort.
6	Any other comments	I am glad that the City of Cockburn is undertaking this public consultation and providing as much information as possible to the public to make their decision. I feel that if people see the Wyola wreck as a heritage asset that adds to the City of Cockburn's maritime cultural landscape they will appreciate its significance, in much the same way that the Omeo's heritage significance is being appreciated as part of the Coogee Maritime Trail with enhanced education and interpretation.

Andy Jarman, Landscape architect, City of Cockburn

	Question	
1	What association have you had with the Wyola Wreck.	As a local resident, I'm someone who walks my dogs around this area. I was also closely involved with reviewing the Cockburn Coast planning proposals submitted by Landcorop over the past five years.
2	What do you value about the Wyola wreck?	The wreck is one of the few remaining landmarks on the coast here. At one time residents would walk south from Fremantle, passing low cliffs, the old power station, the Wyola wreck eventually ending up at the Coogee Beach Fish and Chip shop (since demolished, now a café). It was wild and lonely. Since various developments have occurred, we have lost some of that natural character and sense of continuity with past.
3	Do you have any concerns about safety at this location?	No. The sea is a wild place, the City should question whether it is responsible for injuries incurred by people climbing on ship wrecks. Surely this is an unstable and undeveloped stretch of coastline containing many hazards – ship wrecks are inherently hazardous, does that necessarily mean that they should be removed or fenced off? Common law has established the City is not responsible for fencing off cliff faces and wetlands in case people are placed at risk – so why is this old wreck different?
4	How would you feel if it remained in place?	It would be interesting. The wreck is right out in the ocean now. Ten years ago, someone had placed an old deck chair there and you could sit right next to it, so the beach has moved inland some 10 or 15m.
5	How would you feel if it was removed from this site?	Sad. It would be sterilisation of the area's character. If it had to be moved, I would like to see it preserved, perhaps on a plinth out of the path of the horses and visitors. Timber from the barge, and local limestone could be used to complement the weathered maritime feel of the wreck. Bronze and copper interpretive sculptures could be installed to augment the wreck as a link with the past.
6	History	<p>Memories – Robb Jetty foundations are there.</p> <p>He has researched its history with anthropologists - Aboriginal camps, Smelters and Hollywood are commemorated with the two shelters at McTaggart Cove. Anthropologist Rory O'Connor has advised Aboriginal graves are likely to occur in the dunes.</p> <p>The site was listed as an Aboriginal Heritage site under section 18 of the the Aboriginal Heritage Act 1972. One of the earliest recorded sites recorded in the 1970s.</p> <p>Any changes to the site need approval under the Act</p>

		<p>Cattle used to be landed on the beach there from the Kimberley before Robbs jetty was built. Artist Tony Jones created a cattle race art installation called 'the human race' and his statue of C Y Oconnor (moments before he suicided alongside where the Wyola now lies). There were a number of other art works close to the Human Race recalling the site's historical importance – but these fell into disrepair and have been removed. There are many 'ghosts' from the past occupying this part of the coast – they are important mental landmarks enriching the community.</p>
7	Coastal issues	<p>The State Government's Coastal planning policy (policy 2.6) instructs local government to plan to retreat from coastal erosion, and not to develop significant infrastructure within 100m of the high water mark. This is in anticipation of climate change and sea level increases. At the Wyola, the coastline is reckoned to be more or less stable, accretion will occur south of the Wyola and erosion north of it. Engineering Consultants M P Rogers have pointed out how Robb Road north of the Wyloa and the adjacent freight railway will be under threat from coastal erosion in coming decades. This erosion will remove the beach and dunes – a community asset that has not been given a monetary value to date.</p>
8	Development	<p>The Cockburn Coast planning structure plan provides for development between the McTaggart Cove picnic area and the railway line. This is likely to be residential with commercial on the ground floor. Commercial enterprises this close to the beach tend to be cafes and restaurants. The combination of several stories of residential development above ground floor commercial will be likely to generate a lot of demand for resident and visitor car parking. Robb Road north is likely to evolve into a large linear car park - at the expense of the coastal dunes and the views.</p>
9	Any other comments	<p>It's a precious piece of beach that should be preserved from erosion by both coastal processes and the demands of the 10,000 people that will shortly be moving into the area. The coastal reserve provides a lot of free social and ecological services for the City and should be valued more highly. Substantial investment is required to stabilise and retain the beach and dunes and to manage the pressures the burgeoning population of Cockburn Coast and the wider region. Newly arrived populations will present dilemmas for the City – Cockburn Coast residents will be likely to demand a constraint on development along the beach and a preservation of the coast as a rural style recreational reserve.</p> <p>The regional demand for beach access is likely to create pressure for the beach to be developed especially for car parking. The freight line is projected to contain an increasing level of traffic. In 10</p>



		<p>years, projections by the Fremantle Port Authority have predicted three trains an hour, day and night – will be obstructing the level crossings leading to Robb Road North.</p> <p>By removing vehicular access from Robb Road north and by stabilising coastal erosion north of the Wyola the recreational reserve could accommodate a larger number of people and provide a higher quality of environment for Cockburn as a whole. Additional picnic lawns at the back of the dunes adjacent to Robb Road and the conversion of Robb Road north into a bridle path and regional shared path could increase the reserve's capacity for recreational pursuits, remove the pressure to retain the beach as a horse racing venue and reduce the nuisance that the Wyola currently presents.</p>
--	--	--

Diane Stewart, President of Cockburn Historical Society

	Question	
1	What association have you had with the Wyola Wreck.	My uncle Alfred Armstrong was the engineer on the Wyola. Three years before it was scrapped, they used a crane to put a new engine into the tugboat. There was an accident on board and he was crushed to death under the engine as it was being lifted into place. It was May 1967. They gave his wife, my aunt, the clock from the Wyola. Considering it was scrapped three years later, you wonder why they bothered to put in a new engine.
2	What do you value about the Wyola wreck?	Maybe it could go alongside the Omeo and a plaque erected detailing its history on the shore nearby.
3	Do you have any concerns about safety at this location?	I know that a few people and horses have been cut whilst walking over it. So maybe the danger issue will come into the debate.
4	How would you feel if it was removed from this site?	If its not removed now, there will be nothing left in 10 years.
5	Any other comments	The beaches are becoming more and more populated. I think the Wyola should be removed from the public beach as more and more of the wreck will be exposed over the next decade or so as the sand shifts.

Carmelo Amalfi, Journalist and business man, Fremantle

	Question	
1	What association have you had with the Wyola Wreck.	As a journalist, I have published over many years reports about the use of heritage-listed CY O'Connor Beach, particularly by horse trainers and owners in Fremantle and Cockburn. In 2012, I reported on an incident in which a horse and its rider were injured at the Wyola wreck site (photographs of injured animal available). As a result, Council removed those parts of the wreck whose 'ribs' poked out of the sand, presenting a potential public hazard. Cockburn mayor Logan Howlett's wife walked into one of those ribs after council staff inspected the site together. In 2015, I was approached by Terry Patterson, of Daly Street in South Fremantle, to help him establish a permanent memorial and host a horse race on CY O'Connor Beach to mark the original site where the first horse race was held in WA in 1833. The plaque was unveiled by Cockburn mayor Logan Howlett on October 2, 2016. The horse race is expected to be held October 1, 2017.
2	What do you value about the Wyola wreck?	Not much at its present location. I suspect it would not be cheap to remove but, potentially, I see its value as part of the nearby maritime dive trail. Unfortunately, there is little left of Wyola to move, with parts of the structure falling away as it sits exposed to winds and waves.
3	Do you have any concerns about safety at this location?	Yes. Since 2012, half a dozen people, dogs and horses have reported being injured by exposed sections of the wreck. It's a potential legal issue if it's not made safe. It's four years since the worst of the incidents was reported, so I'm hopeful Council will want to reduce its risk to any claims asap.
4	How would you feel if it remained in place?	The stern will eventually erode and fall away within the next five to 10 years. In terms of the horse race, I made the point to Council in 2016 that the race can be held further north or south, away from the wreck. This was acknowledged by Council staff involved in the plaque unveiling in October 2016. There is a good stretch of beach south of South Beach, including the elevated park overlooking the beach at the end of Rollinson Road.
5	How would you feel if it was removed from this site?	Common sense to remove it before more people and pets, and in particular horses, are injured. I emphasise horses because the beach is listed as a horse exercise area under the Heritage Act of WA. The question is whether Wyola impedes or interferes with the heritage values of the site in its current state.

6	History	I have a personal and professional interest in the history of the area I grew up in. Having reported on the development of the coastal area since the early 1980s, my first reports focused on the use of the beach by horse owners/trainers and moves to recognise the heritage values of the beach.
7	Coastal issues	As science and environment writer at The West Australian for most of my reporting life, I am very familiar with the changing coastal environment in Cockburn Sound. CY O'Connor Beach moves with the tides. How far it moves depends on the time of year and ocean conditions, which over recent years has exposed the wreck, both in the water and across the narrow beach

### Horse trainers Terry Patterson and Keith Frost

	Question	
1	What association have you had with the Wyola Wreck.	Too many visits to hospital to see people injured by it. It's no fun seeing someone with their leg ripped off, someone we know.
2	What do you value about the Wyola wreck?	Nothing. The horses see shiny bits and they shy away, throwing the rider on to the wreck. We had a horse race there in the year 2000. There were six horses and 1000 people. The wreck was under the sand. Nobody saw it and we ran over it.
3	Do you have any concerns about safety at this location?	I am fed up of going down the hospital to deal with injuries that the young girl riders get. One girl had her leg stitched up after being injured on the Wyola. The scars will be there forever. The horse looked like a tiger had grabbed it from behind. Nancy Watson's dog cut her leg on it. There was blood everywhere and they had to wrap the leg up in a towel. Everyone asks me whats going to be done about it. We tell them to ring the Shire.
4	How would you feel if it remained in place?	Pissed off. People are cautious about taking their horses or dogs or just jogging on the beach
5	How would you feel if it was removed from this site?	I'd have a beer. It would make a fantastic dive site. We need to finish what George Stewart started. We need the beach to train, to win races in WA and to keep the history of horse racing in Cockburn alive. When I see a horse from this area win a race it fills me with pride.
6	History	It was dumped there illegally by George Stewart, who died two years ago in Dwellingup. The Wyola was originally tied up at Robbs jetty and when it ran ashore, there was a court case. George

		<p>disappeared and the wreck remained. He picked that spot because it was the closest place to the scrap yard in Rolliston Rd.</p> <p>George owned a boxing tent at the Royal Show and on the country circuits. There was a book about him called A Hard Man.</p> <p>Horses have a long history on this section of beach – there's going to be an Australian Story episode about it soon. The beach is heritage listed for beach use but we cant use it for the purpose that its listed for because the wreck is in the way.</p>
7	Development	There are going to be thousands more people living here.
8	Any other comments	<p>Keith Frost: Been training horses here for 50 years. A jogger who knows everyone on the beach. People put hazard plastic bags over the dangerous bits of the wreck to warn others. Its quite dangerous.</p> <p>As a 13-year-old he first went down the beach there with horse training people. Robbs Jetty was still there. The wreck wasn't exposed.</p> <p>Today it's a landmark when people give directions – ride down to the wreck and back etc. But really it's a bugbear and a safety issue. It will only be a matter of time before another rider is sliced up. Jaggedy bits are hidden in the sand.</p> <p>I would be very happy, elated if it was removed. You'd get a sigh of relief from trackwork riders who just want to concentrate on riding the horses.</p>

Samantha Mourish, coordinator, Aboriginal Reference Group, City of Cockburn

1	Summary	<p>The issue was raised at the Aboriginal Reference Group meeting in January at Cockburn City Council, with the response that: "The ARG were happy that the area where the significant site/s are (ie the dunes) will not be disturbed."</p>
---	---------	--

Geoff Sach and Darryl Smith, Coogee Beach Progress Association

	Question	
1	What association have you had with the Wyola Wreck.	The Progress Association looks after the interests of people in Coogee, North Coogee, Spearwood, Munster and Henderson. We have 60 members and about 30+ make it to meetings regularly.
2	What do you value about the Wyola wreck?	The Wyola Wreck issue was raised at the CBPA general meeting on the 13 <sup>th</sup> December. The CBPA authorised a response by the President and Vice President which is set out in this response.
3	Do you have any concerns about safety at this location?	The CBPA view is that if we can keep it intact, we should remove it to improve safety to beach users. Action should be taken to ensure that it will not breakup once removed and repositioned on the dive trail. Removing the wreck to the dive trail is a brilliant idea
4	How would you feel if it remained in place?	The CBPA view is that if it is to remain in place then the exposed section needs to be cut away because it is a danger to horse riders and trainers and the general public.
5	How would you feel if it was removed from this site?	It should only be removed if it can be kept substantially intact. This includes the section buried in the sand dunes as it should be removed as a whole and not leave some segments behind.
6	History	Clearance should be gained from WA Museum or other appropriate authority before any disturbance to the wreck
7	Coastal issues	The wooden barge should also be removed at the same time as the wreck and the beach restored in sympathy with the surrounding environment following any earthworks due to removal.
8	Development	No comment
9	Any other comments	Any action needs to be a two-step process; firstly an investigation as whether the wreck can be removed intact, or can be modified to improve safety; secondly any removal needs to be based upon the initial investigation outcomes.

Brad Duncan, formerly of Fremantle, now NSW State Maritime Archaeologist and Team Leader of Maritime Heritage Program with the Office of Environment and Heritage, managing shipwrecks and historic maritime infrastructure sites. He has 27 years' experience in the maritime/historical/indigenous archaeological field with 8 government departments and three universities in Australia and internationally on over 90 projects.

	Question	
1	What association have you had with the Wyola Wreck.	I was until recently a long time resident of Fremantle. I also have a strong interest in maritime archaeology and maritime history (I have a PhD in maritime archaeology and am working for Govt managing maritime heritage sites.
2	What do you value about the Wyola wreck?	The site is an integral part of the beach landscape for this area. It is a tangible reminder of the history of the area, and in particular the Wyola has a long a distinguished career associated with the Port of Fremantle. The associated timber barge also is associated with the story of the Wyola site and the maritime history of the area. On a more personal level, as a child and teenager, I would regularly come to this beach and look forward to seeing and playing on and around the wrecks. They are an integral part of the beach experience to local residents in this area and were certainly a major focal point of my childhood which helped form my interest in my later career. I would not come to this beach if it wasn't for these wrecks and it feels like I am home and generates strong memories of times there when I see them. They are also highly valued by maritime history buffs as one of the few surviving wrecks in the Fremantle area that can easily be accessed by non-divers. On another level, they are also a tourist attraction at this beach. I recently attended a conference in Fremantle, and many of the delegates specifically went out of their way to visit this beach both due to the CY O'Connor, but also to visit these easily accessible wrecks. They form part of the attraction of visiting this somewhat remote beach.
3	Do you have any concerns about safety at this location?	None at all - the wreck sites have always been highly visible and are well sign posted.
4	How would you feel if it remained in place?	I would strongly encourage their retention at this place due to the strong social values that I (and a lot of other people) have for these sites.
5	How would you feel if	It was be a tragedy to see them removed. They are one of the few remaining sites where I can bring my



	it was removed from this site?	own kids to see a wreck without diving, and they form part of a popular tourist attraction which encourages tourists to visit the area. They do not interfere with any practical use of the beach and present no danger to anyone using the beach.
6	Any other comments	Please don't take them away. They are part of my fond memories of this area.

Thorsten Goedicke, South Beach Community Group

	Question	
1	What association have you had with the Wyola Wreck.	Our community group crosses over both councils, Fremantle and Cockburn, and we are aware of the existence of the wreck and the barge.
2	What do you value about the Wyola wreck?	Its story is interesting. Thank you for sharing it.
3	Do you have any concerns about safety at this location?	We are not aware of any history of safety concerns. Ask any kite surfer or swimmer about danger on the beach and they say it's their responsibility to inform themselves about beach conditions before they go there.
4	How would you feel if it remained in place?	Indifferent
5	How would you feel if it was removed from this site?	It could be put to good use on the dive trail. I would be keen to snorkel the trail. Council could tell the story of the Wyola and it would be interesting and preserving a part of storytelling / history to our area for our neighbours.
6	Any other comments	This is not a priority for our group. It is not a pressing issue for us. We appreciate being asked. Our overall position is that we are relatively neutral about the wreck; however understand that due to injuries occurred (even a hospitalisation) and future liability issues the City might need to address this matter.

## Facebook consultation 21 December 2016



**City of Cockburn**

December 21 at 6:49pm · 🌐

Should the Wyola Wreck at North Coogee be moved? Let us know:  
<http://comment.cockburn.wa.gov.au/>



👍 13

48 Comments



**Michael Separovich** First ever horse race in WA was held on this site in 1833... the reason the city is asking is because someone is keen to revive them. But to do so the wreck would need to be moved off the sand... perhaps out a bit further to become a better snorkling wreck.

dont get caught out here, theyre saying "moved" not "removed". wreck will still be somewhere nearby, it just needs to be off that historically important bit of beach.

lets face it, first horse race in WA is a bit more interesting than the wreck of the wyola.

Like · Reply · 4 · December 21 at 7:42pm · Edited



**Angie Street Gullede** Oh my! From a friend in your sister city, Mobile, AL ...

a few years ago, shifting winds from a hurricane revealed a shipwreck on our beaches and the photos were nearly identical to this! The wrecked ship was a "rum-runner" into Mobile Bay. Small world! 😊

Like · Reply · 2 · December 21 at 8:52pm



**Nicki O'Neill** No leave it where it is. Have the Horse race at Woodmans point to Coogee Beach

Like · Reply · 14 hrs



**Jenny Langridge** Have a look at what they did on Fraser Island with the wreck of the Maheno -



**Leanne M Ross** A relic is a relic and therefore should be left where it is. Otherwise we are losing heritage for money making events yet again

Like · Reply · 1 · Yesterday at 10:45am



**Oliver Nokes** Sign up process too long. Just use social media. It's a no to relocate, destroy or any other reasons.

Like · Reply · 1 · December 21 at 7:06pm · Edited



**Pam Corbyn** The beach has been closed for lengthy periods this year already. No doubt this would mean another closure at some expense. Beaches have hazards, and there is plenty of signage about this one.

Like · Reply · Yesterday at 10:36am



**Heidi May** Providing you're tetanus shots 📌 are up to date. Too many people I've seen rip open their toes, feet etc. At least tidy up the trailing part.

Like · Reply · December 21 at 10:29pm



**Kate Martin** Nope - but maybe something could be done to make the parts in the sand a bit safer for dogs.

Like · Reply · 3 · December 21 at 6:57pm



**Ben Stalley** No way this is our beach heritage stop wrecking cockburn you have done enough already making port coogee.

Like · Reply · 1 · December 21 at 9:11pm



**Jared Mash Bray** No Way. It's an icon of the beach and a feature. There should be more of things like this along the coast.

Like · Reply · 1 · 18 hrs



**Tim Lance** God no. We don't need to bubble wrap the entire world

Like · Reply · 4 · December 21 at 6:59pm



**Michael Separovich** If it means they get to hold that awesome horse race on the sands... yep.

Like · Reply · December 21 at 7:20pm



**Anthony D'Orazio** No, use the money to clean up the trail and create a little bit of grassland

Like · Reply · 15 hrs



**Derek Hughes** what a shame the jetty was not kept the remains are in the background

Like · Reply · 14 hrs




**Nicki O'Neill** No leave it where it is. Have the Horse race at Woodmans point to Coogee Beach


Like · Reply · 14 hrs



**Jenny Langridge** Have a look at what they did on Fraser Island with the


 **Michael Separovich** To hold an anniversary race for the first ever horse race in WA held in 1833... hey want to start them back up as a yearly thing, leading up to the big 200 year anniversary in 17 years.


Like · Reply · December 21 at 7:22pm

 **Tracey Cousens** Michael, in that case a definite hard no from me. Not a fan of using animals for entertainment, regardless of its history or culture.

I vote leave it.

Like · Reply ·  2 · December 21 at 7:31pm

 **Eloise Lucretia Melissa Howlett** I have never heard of a worse reason! That is NOT progress. It may only take another generation or two at most before horse racing will be looked back on as the historic and barbaric "sport" that it is.

Like · Reply ·  2 · December 21 at 7:31pm

 **Cassie Green** No

Like · Reply · December 21 at 7:10pm

 **Carlie Love** No

Like · Reply · December 21 at 8:35pm

 **Leon Veale** No

Like · Reply · December 21 at 7:40pm

 **Owen Cowdell** No! No! No!

Like · Reply · December 21 at 7:11pm

 **Melan Kowa** No

Like · Reply · Yesterday at 5:47am

 **Melinda Allen** No - leave it please

Like · Reply · December 21 at 8:20pm

 **Jasmin Grace** Nope

Like · Reply · December 21 at 7:44pm

-  **Alison Abel** No  
Like · Reply ·  2 · December 21 at 6:59pm
-  **Ross Kirby** Move it to the underwater trail  
Like · Reply ·  1 · December 21 at 8:18pm
-  **Amanda Fauntleroy** Nope  
Like · Reply ·  1 · December 21 at 6:50pm
-  **Russell Lawrence** No  
Like · Reply ·  1 · December 21 at 6:55pm
-  **Jo Rowlands** No just leave it alone...we need history  
Like · Reply · December 21 at 7:28pm
-  **Kel Enchantlered** Yep! move it in the water for the snorkel trail.  
Like · Reply · December 21 at 11:50pm
-  **Emily Zanki** No 🙄 i remember playing on it as a kid  
Like · Reply · December 21 at 7:20pm
-  **Samantha Garcia** No, why would you want to move it?  
Like · Reply · December 21 at 7:15pm  
↳ 3 Replies
-  **Dom Canci** Bring it to the underwater trail.  
Like · Reply · December 21 at 7:31pm
-  **Shane Sands** Hell no  
Like · Reply · December 21 at 7:22pm
-  **Margret Mitchell** No leave it alone  
Like · Reply · December 21 at 9:27pm
-  **Garry Bickley** No leave it alone.  
Like · Reply · 21 hrs
-  **Margot Wilson** No  
Like · Reply · December 21 at 9:41pm
-  **Boby B Bobson** No please  
Like · Reply · December 21 at 7:13pm
-  **Justine Morgan** No  
Like · Reply · December 21 at 7:44pm
-  **Matthew Anderson** NO  
Like · Reply · December 21 at 7:13pm
-  **Bryce Snosrap** No  
Like · Reply · December 21 at 9:55pm
-  **Mark Green** No  
Like · Reply · December 21 at 8:32pm



 **Matthew Anderson** NO  
Like · Reply · December 21 at 7:13pm

 **Bryce Snosrap** No  
Like · Reply · December 21 at 9:55pm

 **Mark Green** No  
Like · Reply · December 21 at 8:32pm

 **Jolene Blake** No  
Like · Reply · December 21 at 7:14pm

 **Chris Wood** No  
Like · Reply · December 21 at 8:15pm

 **Paige Vincent** No  
Like · Reply · December 21 at 7:23pm

 **Jessica Palfalvy** No way  
Like · Reply · December 21 at 7:03pm

 **Linda McInnes** No  
Like · Reply · Yesterday at 7:01am

 **Sinead Burke Harris** No  
Like · Reply · Yesterday at 6:44am

 **Quinn Kwan Tsz Sin** No.  
Like · Reply · December 21 at 7:26pm

 **Jane Fitch** No  
Like · Reply · December 21 at 10:51pm

 **Cassie Green** No  
Like · Reply · December 21 at 7:10pm

 **Carlie Love** No  
Like · Reply · December 21 at 8:35pm

### Online survey results – Comment on Cockburn

<b>1.</b>	<b>What association have you had with the Wyola Wreck?</b>
1	Walk past the wreck when walking along CY O'Connor beach
2	Aware that it was a tug in the early 1900s
3	I walk my dog on the beach where the wreck is located
4	Only just discovered it yesterday
5	Frequently visit the beach
6	Childhood memories. Personal enjoyment. It is one of the many reasons I am choosing to live in the area - it adds to an atmosphere that I love
7	I am a beach walker there
8	Years of walking O'Connor beach, sitting on the prow of the wreck enjoying the view
9	I walk past it often
10	We walk our dog at CY O'Connor beach and we pass by the wreck every time
11	Walk the beach with our dogs on a regular basis
12	I walk by it often
13	Our family walks along that stretch of beach at least twice a week
14	Regular walker & lover of the CY O'Connor beach & history
15	As a visitor to CY O'Connor beach
16	Walk on beach with dogs at least 5 times per week
17	None
18	Seen it
19	No association
20	None
21	Most weekends I take my two Kelpies down to CY O'Connor beach. It is surprising how many people you meet on the beach who ask about the history of the beach and of the wreck. An engraved stainless steel plate should inform visitors of the history of area, the beach and the remnants of the old jetty and customs building the ship wreck and the bronze statue of horse and rider. Few people know why the beach is named after C Y O'Connor. As for the ship wreck itself, many photographers include the bow section in their picture framing, so let's keep it like it is. It is visible and prominent at high and low tide . However the other section of the ship is a danger to anyone walking along the beach. Although exposed today I have seen it covered over with a thin layer of sand. Being sharp it is a danger to people, horses and dogs. If the council could

	dig down a metre or so and cut off the exposed sections, it would avoid serious injury in the future. It adds nothing to the history of the beach. Hope this helps
22	We have walked this beach for the last 28 years. Attached photos go back many years.
23	I enjoy photographing the wreck at sunset, as do many other photographers.
24	Walk the beach regularly
25	Minimal, only when using the adjacent coastline.
26	None
27	Walk to the dog at the dog beach
28	I walk along the beach past the iconic wreck every day and was aghast when you thought it necessary to erect warning signs.....and had a giggle when they were subsequently washed away and had to be reinstated Exactly how many deaths and serious injuries have been caused by the stupidity of people not seeing it!!!! Action is even less necessary than your decision to close the power station beach to dogs.....dog owners were the only users and now no one goes at all Find something else to worry about and leave the wreck alone
29	I see it when I walk on the beach at that location, about 4 times a week. That's the only association I have with it; it's a feature of the landscape at C.Y O'Conner beach.
30	I walk my dogs at the beach where the wreck is located on a weekly basis.
31	I have no association rather a resident of Success (since 1st September 2015)
32	Loved it for years when walking along historic beach
33	I see it on the beach when I walk my dog.
34	We walk our dogs on the beach over weekends.
35	I have visited the site numerous times and taken visitors to see it.
36	Been walking at beach for years.
37	When my son was 4 we used to muck around saying it was an pirate ship. He will have kids soon and can't wait to do the same with his kids. It is our heritage, It has been there a long, long time and is a feature just like CY on his horse and the stock yards. Somebody could have cut their foot on Barracks Arch and IT wasn't removed. No difference. Retain our romantic links with the past please.
38	O'Connor beach is a regular walk for us and the dog from our home in Coogee. The wife is a keen scuba diver and Robbs jetty is a popular dive spot for her and her fellow divers
39	I have exercised dogs on the beach for more than 20 years
40	I have been walking my dog at this beach for about 12 months now and walk past it quite often
41	Walking past it on the beach whilst walking dog.

42	Walking on the beach with my dog.
43	Local photographer
44	I've not known the history of it before today, but have always appreciated its presence - I often walk my dog down at CY O'Connor beach and we both enjoy the addition and interest to the landscape.
45	Use CY O Connor to walk dog at the beach
46	Almost 33 years I'm walking near every day on this beach with my 3 dogs (two pass away. one live 13 and another 16 years) and my two sons grown up on this beach ans it was a great fun to watch them. This wreck is part of our family.
47	Member of the public who uses o Connor beach.
48	None apart from seeing it at the beach.
49	My young daughter and I have explored that area
50	Twenty five years of regularly visiting the beach
51	I have visited the beach on most days over the past 11 years. In summer months I swim from the wreck to the northern groyne and back.
52	I frequent CY O'Connor beach with my dogs
53	Walking around the wreck at low tide
54	I am a regular user of CY O'Connor Beach.
55	I completed my Masters of Maritime Archaeology thesis on the Wyola wreck site, studying the changing perceptions of Wyola from its working life to now. This included Robb's Jetty, the demolished abattoir and the 'Horse and Rider' statue in the water.
56	I visit the C Y O'Connor beach every day to walk my dogs and have had injuries sustained to both dogs from the wrecks. Luckily only minor ones but only a matter of time before someone gets seriously injured.
57	Having lived in the area for over 10 years and visiting C Y O'Connor on a weekly basis with our dog, we are very familiar with seeing this wreck, however, since there is no plaque or signage we were unaware of its history until now.
58	I have walked past it regularly over the past 5 years that I have lived here
59	We use the dog beach often one to two times a week and walk past the wreck each time
60	None apart from its general historical context
61	My partner and I walk/run/swim on this beach almost every day
62	I am a Beeliar resident and I walk this stretch of beach with my dog almost daily
63	I walk along the beach every weekend all throughout the year for 20+ years with dogs.
64	Regular dog walk along the beach
65	Historical and fishing spot
66	I grew up in Bicton. I became interested in WA's maritime history when the ground-breaking Fremantle maritime museum was

	opened in the old asylum in Finnerty St. My dad worked in the Robbs Jetty abattoir, as I did after him, but now many years ago. I now live in Beaconsfield, and have been have been going to the Wyola wreck on and off for 38 years.
67	I've been going to this beach for more than 50 years and fully understand it's heritage.
68	I visit the beach where the wreck is regularly.
69	Walk along the beach
70	I have been walking on the beach and passed the wreck for 30 years
71	Regular walker on CY O'Connor beach.
72	I often walk along the south beach cycle path or the beach
73	I walk past it on the beach
74	I regularly exercise along the beach past the Wyola and Robbs jetty
75	I assisted archaeologist Danielle Wilkinson with her research and survey.
76	I remember Wyola as a very young boy working in the harbour and seeing it being broken up in the 1970s. It has been a fixture and a talking point on the beach at Robbs Jetty for some 45 years. So it is hard to see how it has "suddenly" become a safety issue.
77	Coming to area and playing as a kid. Now live in area and visit weekly. Even taken visitors to WA there
78	Fish along the areas
79	Walking the dog on the beach
80	Have been past the wreck and have friends in the area who grew up with the wreck.
81	Have dogs and ride on the beach
82	Like it when walking
83	Regularly use CY O'Connor beach, walking dogs, swimming and snorkelling
84	Swimming and walking the dog on the beach. Diving and snorkelling Robb's Jetty and surrounding area. A great photo point
85	Just seeing it as I walk by with my dogs or enjoying some time on the beach
86	I am a regular visitor to the beach where the wreck is located for fishing, swimming and walking for many years.
87	I have ridden horses on CY O'Connor beach for many years. I mainly rode there between 1998-2004 when the wreck was not as exposed as it is today. I also often walk up to it from South Beach and stop there before turning around.
88	I regularly go to O'Connor beach to walk along the beach and exercise.
89	See it often walking along the beach or driving on Robb road behind it.
90	Walking on the beach and family with our dog
91	I've been a frequent beach walker and swimmer at this location. It's been a source of history telling by original residents and multigenerational local families. Part of a magic view in location shattered with historical reminders.

92	Recreational beach user
93	I have walked the beach for many years and have always been curious about the wreck's history. I am a professional seafarer and greatly value our maritime history.
94	Walk dogs on beach from local Coogee home and when young our children always stopped to play on the bow post without ever any adverse outcome.
95	I encounter the wreck while walking the dog along CY O'Connor
96	I am a dog walker and swim at the beach regularly
97	It is a hazard during my beach walk
98	As a keen Scuba diver and supporter of Maritime Archaeology, I have regularly passed the wreck.
99	I was the inaugural President of the Maritime Archaeological Association of WA. We briefly visited it in the 1970's. I can't recall any real interest in it then. It had been stripped for its metals. I consider what is left is rubbish. Maybe the stem post could be mounted up further inland with a plaque and some photos. It should be otherwise just left to corrode away.
100	I use this stretch of beach regularly.
101	Walk along the beach as a local.
102	I walk my dog along the beach past it regularly
103	Have walked past many times
104	Walk there regularly, 30 odd years
105	My dog and I regularly walk on the beach and past the wreck
106	I walk past it a couple of times a week with my dog
107	Walking around it while I enjoy the beach, taking photos, drawing the shipwreck. Research and simple enjoyment. It is the iconic feature of that beach. There are such amazing photographs capturing the beauty and history it represents - google it!
108	I love seeing it there. It is a part of the history of the area.
109	Apart from seeing it on the beach - no association
110	I walk past it several times a week.
111	I see it weekly
112	Myself and my partner regularly go down to CY O'Conner beach and enjoy the view. The Wyola Wreck is a part of that and I love walking past it and looking at the various sections of the boat.
113	Part of a maritime archaeology course which required recording of dimensions and other aspects. Regularly undertake scuba dives on Robb Jetty and this important wreck is a distinctive marker.
114	Maritime archaeology. Also general looking with my family.
115	My daily visits to the beach and seeing the wreck.



116	I walk along this stretch of beach regularly
117	I am a local resident
118	None
119	For many years I have visited this portion of the beach, both as a walker and as a scuba diver. The Robbs jetty dive is quite a diverse and interesting dive site.
120	Walk dog at CY O'Connor Beach
121	Fished from beach nearby
122	I regularly visit the beach. The wreck is one of the unique attractions
123	I walk past it almost daily
124	I have a degree in maritime archaeology from the Western Australian Maritime Museum and Curtin University and have a deep appreciation for the history of Western Australia.
125	I live nearby.
126	See it regularly on dog walks
127	I live in Coogee but have only just discovered it due to some friends amazing photos.
128	Only walking past it when walking on beach
129	I have walked my two small dogs along C Y O'Connor beach for more than 9 years, at least 4 -5 x per week. The Wreck is an integral aspect of this beach
130	Walking the beach with dogs and grandchildren always a point of discussion with them, grandchildren that is not the dogs they just love climbing over it when it is exposed by the weather
131	Years of seeing it
132	I don't have anything to do with it
133	No association other than walking past it regularly
134	A local resident that walks the beach, and always stops with the kids and family dog to play around the wreck.
135	Beach user
136	I take my dog for walks and swims near the wreck.
137	I walk my dog every week at this beach
138	Walking on beach and swimming around it.
139	Regular beach walker and swimmer. Dog exercise.
140	I live in Cockburn, and use the beach.

<b>2.</b>	<b>What do you value about the Wyola Wreck?</b>
	Not valued
1	Holds no value to me
2	The wreck is a safety hazard that detracts from the beauty of the beach and should be removed along with the wrecked wooden barge
3	Nothing
4	Nothing
5	Nothing
6	Nothing
7	Nothing
8	Nothing. Sorry.
9	Nothing!! Bit of an eyesore and should be relocated out in the bay
10	Nothing! It's rubbish.
11	Nil now
12	Minimal, I think it's currently of no use or purpose where it is.
13	Nothing. It can hurt me, my dogs or the horses while riding
14	Limited historic value associated with the remnants of the vessel that was deliberately beached for dismantling.
15	Nothing
16	Nothing
17	Nothing, it is nothing more than a rusted relic
18	None
	Valued
1	Gives a great sense of history and promotes tourism - have answered many questions from tourists and directed them to Google info about CY O'Connor as an aside
2	Its history
3	I like that there is something different at the beach that you don't see very often
4	It provides a beautiful point of interest and history
5	A reminder of the maritime past within the wider coastal region
6	Its history
7	Its interesting history. It is different. It adds to the atmosphere/heritage of the area and uniqueness of the beach. Could be an attraction (it is for me, but also for others)

8	It's got a slight bit of history. Might be an excuse for some people to ask why it's there
9	It is a unique, historical location, a wonderful photographic spot
10	Reminder of times past
11	It is an historical part of the beach's landscape. It is a midpoint landmark on this beach. Walkers often pause briefly at the site
12	I enjoy seeing children playing in the small pools that are created by the structure
13	It's such a neat part of the beachscape and it's pretty unique on a public beach
14	Appears to be untouched and also the history
15	It's historical significance
16	Great piece of history and a landmark that my family can interact with
17	It tells us the story of the Wyola and its resting place. It has remained in this position almost 40 years without any problems to the community
18	It is interesting, historical and makes for great photos
19	It's a terrific reminder of our maritime past and forms a focal point of C Y O'Connor Beach.
20	Historical asset
21	Perhaps it's good to be kept in museum
22	We have collected pottery and glass along the wonderful shore line. Nature has created these wrecks due to bad weather or poor control of conditions.
23	Historic
24	Its history
25	It's a nice feature to look at
26	Basic local marine history
27	History
28	It's is mildly aesthetically pleasing, more so the portion that protrudes from the sea below the high tide.
29	The wreck is an iconic feature of this beach. I and many others have also seen value in the wreck from a photography perspective. (Which has now been "wrecked" with 3 signs surrounding the wreck. Doesn't make for the greatest photo)
30	I value where it came to rest. It is significant where it is now.
31	It certainly gives the beach some character and history
32	I love the historical connection of the wreck and the barge.
33	It adds to the total experience of the beach as an historic set of objects that represent part of the history of the area.
33	The wreck is part of the history of the port of Fremantle and with the associated barge forms part of the history of Robbs Jetty days as an industrial area. Both wrecks have significant heritage value for the City and for the state.

19	I think it looks great and add character to the beach
20	It makes the beach look more interesting.
21	Creates unique and beautiful pictures
22	History location near old jetty near CY O Connor Artwork
23	Wyola Wreck it is part of Fremantle history and history of my family too. If Roman will do what Australian do, Who will travel to Rome? I'm sure no one, as all city will be the same. Why destroying everything what is old? This not make any sense at all.
24	I like that it is virtually untouched, rustic and organic. What a wreck should look like. It is a great reminder of the history of our coast and also a tangible part that we can engage with.
25	Significant of Australian heritage and of Western Australia.
26	It has extreme value in relation to Western Australia's relatively short history
27	It's interesting, ever changing and is an opportunity for learning and discovery for my young child.
28	An iconic relic, makes the beach unique.
29	It adds interest; it's a reminder of the area's history; it's a conversation starter with people who come to the beach (especially tourists but also people who remember the wreck from their childhood. The wooden section is a beaut swimming hole for little children, whilst the 'steel' structure is loved by older children as a climbing frame; it is a buffer against the terrible erosion of the beach that's been brought about by the construction/extension if the groynes; it makes 'our' beach distinctive; it has been part of numerous wedding photos over the years (showing how it's valued); currently one of the wooden pylons is used as a place to sit and watch for fish by a lovely Labrador
30	It is part of the local history
31	History & connection to the past
32	I value its heritage significance. It was an icon of Fremantle Harbour for over 50 years, recognised interstate and internationally for its services and proficiency. The vessel was seen as heroic, braving dangerous conditions to aid boats in trouble. It is also currently a unique and interesting feature in the landscape of C. Y. O'Connor Beach, along with remains of Robb's Jetty and the statue. It's not the best thing about that beach, by a long way, but it has always been there. I guess it reminds me about the industrial history of the area, which is something that I value.
23	Historic events are always important to remember. The wreck should be preserved and information should be written about it.
24	I love that it is close to the statue of CY OCONNOR & the cattle yards
25	We feel that the wreck provides a unique piece of history to the area and often reminds us of the origin of the area. It's something a little bit different that other beaches in Perth don't have.
26	The history attached
27	It is a connection with the heritage of the local area. It has been there for a long time. It makes an otherwise boring beach

	interesting. It is part of the cultural diversity of Fremantle and Cockburn. It is real life.
28	The element of history and it's a historical landmark which has meaning
29	It's authenticity and it breaks up the coastline
30	The helm? Sticking way out of the sand is beautiful and has so many colours and character about it, however, the base/bottom of the tug is very dangerous, rusty and Constantly being uncovered with the changes of the seasons/tides. Particularly worse since you have put extended the groin at Catherine point, which has changed the topography and sand dunes/ exposed everything far worse than it ever was!
31	Unique
32	You can see the wreck without having to put on scuba gear, or need a boat. Not everyone can do or afford these things. It is a link to those different times when south of Fremantle was a sparsely populated industrial area where things such as ship breaking on a beach were tolerated. It shows the transition of the WA economy and the changes in society, as such activities would no longer be permitted, as opposed to Allang in India, which has become one of the great ship breaking sites in the world, precisely because as a developing economy it still permits this activity. Further, the wreck site makes a good terminus for any beach walk, either commencing from north or south of the wreck.
33	I value the wreck as a physical representation of Cockburn maritime heritage. I enjoy going to the beach and being able to see the wreck and associated remains of Robbs Jetty.
34	The way it shows the movement of the sand along the beach. How it shows the effect of storms and tides. The fact that it is part of Cockburn's industrial past. How it marks the passing of time It is a land mark that gives the beach a unique character
35	Interesting bit of local maritime history. Visually interesting.
36	I find it fascinating that there is a wreck on the beach and interested to see how it is breaking down over time. I often wonder how the wreck occurred and the history of the boat.
37	It has a very interesting and long history, right back to the first world war
38	I think the Wyola and the associated barge is an interesting part of the history of Cockburn and a reminder of the operation that once took place on Robbs jetty unloading cattle for the meat works. WYOLA has played a significant part in WA's maritime history. It would be a huge pity to see her remains removed from the public as a result of an ill-informed, unjustified knee-jerk "public-liability" reaction
39	Heritage values. Often used for maritime archaeology training.
40	It is a Cockburn landmark that with the associated barge, the Robb Jetty remains, the C Y O'Connor statue and the horse racing interpretation provides in one tiny footprint, a beautiful snapshot of Cockburn and WA's history. The tug itself, with its distinctive two funnels, was the first contact with their new home that many migrants had as it met their ship off Fremantle. It should be valued and interpreted for all its many roles, not taken away!
41	Significance to locals and area

42	A little bit of history
43	The uniqueness of its features and history.
44	Artistic and intriguing, suits as a great back drop to CY
45	Adds character to the beach, reminds me that we are all very transient in the life of this beach.
46	Being its history of a rescue style of barge, I believe it should be preserved or honored before it rusts away
47	I think it adds an interesting point of interest to the beach
48	It is a piece of history and provides a point of interest along the beach, good for snorkellers as lots of fish gather around it.
49	That it is a historical feature visible for all to see. When walking on the beach with visitors who aren't from Fremantle, it's a point of interest, along with the CY O'Connor statue, that people are always interested to see.
50	It reminds me of the history of the area. It gives me pause to contemplate those who have been in the area before me.
51	Great piece of history and a landmark that my family can interact with.
52	Historical value and visual aesthetic it brings to the beach
53	It's a beautiful reminder of Fremantle's history. Its location makes it accessible to all, it's a pretty special sight on the beach
54	History, a reminder of our origins and duration of human habitation on a very special piece of ground.
55	The wreck is a valuable reminder about the history of the area especially with so much change happening at present.
56	It is history, it reminds us that the sea provides a beautiful environment on occasions whilst at other times the sea is corrosive on human construction. The sea is eternal and a wreck reminds us of what has come before our recent experiences.
57	The wreck adds to the history and context of the Robb's jetty area. It creates an interesting focal point along the beach too.
58	The heritage of it, I love seeing it at this beach. It characterizes the beach
59	It is a valuable part of Perth's history
60	It is part of the history of the place.
61	Its photos
62	It is a part of Cockburn's history. It provides a point of interest on this part of the beach
63	It is historical. It is like a piece of art, every time I see I take the time to look at it.
64	I appreciate the fact that it's historic and a locally recognisable feature. Its structure is quite artistic.
65	Historical
66	The history, ties in with the horse
67	It adds interest to the beach
68	I like the way it changes so much with the tide and the winds, plus it is interesting to see on what is otherwise a fairly long stretch of beach
69	That such a unique and unusual piece of our history sits on one of the most stunning beaches where everyone can easily



	enjoy it and climb on it for free. I value the extra feeling of history that it brings to me every time I visit CY O'Connor beach. It is very rare for everyone - particularly in the metro area - to be able to go on a short journey (or down to their local beach) and see and touch a shipwreck!
70	It provides more context to the area, more historical value compared to other beaches in Perth
71	It adds character to the beach and is a piece of history
72	The history of the wreck and the character it gives to CY O'Connor beach.
73	Unique visible shipwreck
74	It adds to the already amazing view. As an engineer I like the structural aspect of the wreck and it being there and accessible to view.
75	Maritime historical value. Important feature on the beach. Also an indicator of beach movements and coastal dynamics.
76	Part of the region's history
77	Let your imagination run wild about where it has been and what it has seen. Also makes for a beautiful sunset photo.
78	It is an important part of WA heritage
79	It's history. It's ability to weather the storm.
80	It is an historic shipwreck
81	I believe that it is an important piece of Australian and Maritime history, and something that should be celebrated by the people of Cockburn, and also of Perth.
82	Its heritage and availability. Many wrecks are submerged. People feel more a part of this history because it is exposed and available for viewing.
83	It captures a story of WA's coastal history. As an anthropological researcher and teacher, I place great importance in material culture because it helps us connect with past and future generations.
84	That it's there as a pleasant distraction on an otherwise ordinary beach. It's also a welcome link to Freo's seafaring past. I love how it changes with the seasons
85	It is a physical reminder of our shared history and it contributes to the appreciation of what it means to be a resident of WA.
86	Its history and age.
87	It's become a familiar land mark; feels like being home :)
88	I've been reading about the history of the tug boat. It's over 100 years old! There is so much history in Cockburn which I have been discovering by reading the information in various historical places. I came to live here from England 16 years ago and most of the information I have heard from local people who remember the old Robbs jetty and the horses exercising on the beach etc. It's fascinating but not too many people know about it. We should embrace our history. Tourists would love it.
89	The unique visual pleasure it gives to visitors to the beach. It always looks different and provides heaps of photo opportunities

	for tourists and locals alike. It is of historic value
90	Only what I have just read
91	History, uniqueness
92	I don't value it too much but it's a nice thing to see
93	I like that it's a bit of history on the beach
94	A local treasure! As a family we guess about how exposed it would be when we walk the beach.
95	What I have read online.
96	Heritage. It's also a great thing for people to learn from and to get them interested in the local history.
97	It's beautiful, it contrasts against the colours of the ocean, sky and sand
98	Gives character to the beach. It's of historical value.
99	Landmark. Diving spot. Attractive feature of beach. Adds interest and aesthetically pleasing.
100	I appreciate the value of something rare like this being so accessible to viewing. It's a great thing to have access to.

<b>3.</b>	<b>Do you have any concerns about safety at this location?</b>
	Yes, concerned
1	Yes some of the wreck is very sharp
2	Yes. Very dangerous for those using the beach both people and dogs
3	Yes, not safe for children or the general public due to the sharp iron edges which are constantly being exposed after storms
4	I have cut my foot on the wreck as it is difficult to see where the sharp edges are due to movement of sand and water
5	Yes. It's a hazard to people and dogs.
6	Yes it's a danger
7	Well a big shard of rusted metal on a beach isn't ideal
8	Rusty Steel does not belong on the beach
9	Yes
10	Yes
11	It's not the best spot
12	Yes, keep the bow and dig out the dangerous bits.
13	Yes. The portion of the wreck(s) that exists above and slightly below the high tide level represent a hazard to canines and humans using the beach. Although some sections that protrude from the sand are easy to see and avoid others are not or are only slightly buried by sand. It concerns me that someone could suffer a puncture wound to their foot or a deep laceration due to the slightly or partially concealed portions of the wreck as some of the portions that protrude are quite sharp and ragged.

	Some people have tied plastic bags to the top of the more hazardous protrusions to help alert people to their presence.
14	Somewhat but can it be moved without it collapsing into bits and pieces?
15	Yes, but driving to the carpark itself is a safety issue/concern.
16	Yes, being buried in the sand is not ideal where beach users frequent.
17	Yes, we walk our dogs and kids here often and it's dangerous
18	Yes is becoming dangerous to beach walkers and swimmers
19	Yes it's very dangerous to dogs and beach goers
20	Yes. I have cut my foot on the wreck.
21	I always worry that we will be cut as often the rusted bits are not exposed so you can't see them.
22	Yes I do actually, we don't let our dog go near it in case she trips over it or cuts herself on it
23	I have always been concerned about getting cuts and injuries when walking on the sand near the wreck and stepping on concealed wreckage.
24	Yes. I think the metal is sharp and dangerous, especially to children and dogs.
25	Yes submerged hazards concerned for dogs feet and my feet being cut warning signs are sporadically there
26	Yes, as I have seen the Omeo fall apart over the years due to it's position mainly in water that is affected by breaking waves and vandalism.
27	Every day I wait for news of a serious injury sustained from the wrecks. Only a matter of time !!
28	Yes I do have great concerns about safety at its current location. The tide often pushes sand up over the smaller fragment of the wreck so it is easy not to know it's there until you trip over it and stub you toes on the metal. Some unknowing person could be seriously injured if they weren't careful.
29	Yes it is a safety problem definitely. Sometimes it's worse than others and the jagged rusty edges either exposed or covered up just below the surface is dangerous for all -humans and animals that use the beach.
30	Yes! I've already seen (and helped) plenty of people sustain injuries due to this wreck and do not wish to see anymore. I now have great grandchildren and would like the beach to be as safe as possible for future generations. As it gets older it's only going to become more dangerous.
31	Yes
32	Yes
33	The beach regime of exposure and accretion does cause sharp remains of the iron hull to be occasionally exposed, just covered, or well covered by sand. This does present some risk at times of beach erosion but could be managed in a variety of ways including warning signs if necessary. However generally speaking I don't think it presents a major safety issue to beach walkers. I have also been told that the newspaper report provided in the associated documentation of a horse being injured

	was a media 'beat up' as the injury actually occurred on a fence and not the wreck of Wyola.
34	Yes, it's a danger to citizens
35	Yes I'm a little concerned about beach walkers safety, but they must take care and be responsible themselves
36	Yes. Rust and cutting wounds
37	Yes. A few years ago when safety concerns were raised, I dismissed them as I valued the historical significance of the wreck and I thought that the wreck was obvious and common sense would prevail that caution was necessary. However I no longer feel this way. Early this year I visited the wreck with my 3 young sons. My 11 yr old son ran up to the waters edge to view the wreck. Unfortunately due to the position of the tide, the water and sand disguised the metal from his view and he badly sliced open the underside of four toes on the wreck as he unsuspectingly stepped on it. We spent the next 3 hours in A&E as it was Sunday and no medical practices were open. My son could not walk properly for the next fortnight. Since then when I have gone for my regular morning walks I have seen dangerous jagged spears of rusty metal poking up. Sometimes these are exposed by sand and tide, and at others they are just under the surface level. To me, it looks an accident waiting to happen and I think they could cause significant injuries. I was fortunate that I could carry my son to the car with the help of a passerby, but if it had been an adult it would have been a very tricky situation.
38	Yes
39	A potential trip and laceration hazard in its current condition and location.
40	Clearly recently sand erosion of dunes has reduced cover over the landward most part of the wreck. This has exposed some sharp edges of steel previously covered for a long period. Beach shores recede and progress over time as the tidal action moves the sand.
41	Yes. Just small metal rusting on the beach and a safety hazard to beach walkers
42	Some concerns, however the public also have a duty to act responsibly around it.
43	At times when the beach is short, then it can be tricky to walk around as part of the rusting hulk is covered in the sand and needs to be navigated around.
44	Yes, have almost tripped over
45	On the beach, yes. I think this can be overcome with a small wooden jetty over the wreck with some clear Perspex and blocks (floor windows for viewing)
46	Some small concerns. I enjoy that the wreck exists where it does, but I acknowledge that there is potential for injury being caused through people falling or climbing on it.
47	Yes it's a hazard to anyone on the beach
48	Only in so much as sharp points sticking up could be flattened. Otherwise you can hardly miss it really!
49	A little.
50	Yes, as I believe the metal in the sand can be dangerous. I feel that some kind of limestone barrier, no more than 1 limestone

	block high, should be erected around it where it is in the sand. Maybe a plaque on its history for visitors to the beach.
	No, not concerned
1	No
2	No problem foreseeable.
3	No. I have never seen anybody injured as a result of the wreck. Most people who use this beach are walking their dogs, and both walkers and horse-riders using the beach are mindful of the wreck.
4	No
5	No
6	Not at all.
7	No we have no concerns as this site is generally well signed
8	No. The protruding sharp edges could be cut back to the rivet level where there will be no long term issues. Very small cost.
9	No
10	The wreck is a trip hazard, but this is where it has laid for many years....
11	No, I know it's there. Perhaps someone who doesn't may be at risk?
12	No. The new signs advertising this survey are more hazardous as you are looking down watching where you are going so don't hurt yourself on the wreck and could walk into sign.
13	No. The wreck has in no way been a cause for concern for myself or my dogs.
14	None at all
15	No
16	None - there are clear signposts - I DO think historic information could be added to the caution signs already up
17	There are no safety concerns about the wrecks. Some signage is in place and this is adequate.
18	No concerns at all. People can see it and navigate around it. In this economic environment surely the council can spend money more wisely. Relocating a wreck that many don't even know exist is crazy and wasteful at this time. Put in more services that build relationships between people. It is great to have a safety focus but realistically I am usually the only person at the wreck site on many days.
19	None at all
20	No as the remains are easy to see Some additional signage may be of use
21	No
22	No. If it is to be considered a trip hazard you would also need to remove any rocks, sand erosion etc
23	I have not any concerns about safety at this location, my son made his first steps on this beach and nothing had happen to him or to any member of our family.

24	Not really, the council could put a heritage sign with a hazard warning.
25	I have no concerns about safety, if you exercise common sense there is absolutely no issue with being hurt.
26	No
27	None
28	No
29	Absolutely not, the area is well signposted and just requires a little bit of common sense to look up and walk around any pieces of the wreck exposed depending on the tide at the time.
30	Never had before but then I'm from the generation that was allowed to be adventurous
31	None whatsoever.
32	None at all
33	No
34	No! In all the time that I've used this beach I've never seen a single person injured by the wreck. The idiotic signs to warn us of the danger are a greater threat - especially the ones at head height! (The sign posts in the water and on the sand at this location are horrendously ugly and completely out of keeping with both its natural beauty and commemoration of CY O'Connor's life. Please take them down; they are ruining one of the few iconic sites in the city)
35	Absolutely not - it is clearly visible and every one can see it. We are not sure who considers it a safety risk but the alternate view to it being a safety hazard is that people using the beach need to take responsibility for their own safety - and they do. Does the Council intend to remove all the rocks that get washed up and concrete over all the rocky groins so they are smooth and no one hurts themselves? There is more risk from broken glass (at any beach) than from the wreck.
36	I am more worried about driving my car to the beach
37	No
38	No
39	I understand a horse and its rider rode into it. I have sympathy with this unfortunate accident. However, the wreck does stand prominently out of the beach. There is plenty of beach above the water mark to go around, and the site is well known. Riding a horse does have certain risks associated with it. Low hanging branches in trail riding being among them. It is the rider's obligation to maintain a proper lookout and ride safely according to the conditions. A beach is not always a controlled location like a riding school, stables, etc. I have no concerns about safety in this location. Further, the root cause is not the Wyola. When I was younger this location was surrounded by noxious industry. Access was difficult as many roads were private and served those industries, and not beach goers. All this has changed and now the public has better access to the site.
40	No
41	No. Having walked there for 30 years it has never been an issue for myself or any of my friends including children



42	No
43	None at all - the wreck sites have always been highly visible and are well sign posted.
44	No. Having walked there for 30 years it has never been an issue for myself or any of my friends including children
45	None
46	No
47	no. It is a very obvious hazard on the beach unlike the glass and broken tins that people leave there
48	None. The the wreck is obvious and provided people take reasonable care it presents absolutely no safety issues. the story in the Fremantle Herald in 2012 stating a horse had injured itself on the wreck was later shown that the horse injured itself on the fence not the wreck.
49	No
50	None whatsoever. Anybody that can't see it or the barge probably isn't safe to venture on any beach.
51	No
52	Not at all. Parents should be watching their children and make them aware of the wreck.
53	Only a dumb arse would cut their feet on it by stepping on it, so no, no concerns
54	No: it is not like you can miss it, I find it difficult to understand how someone could trip over it or injur themselves on it. You can easily walk around it and avoid the structure.
55	I do have a concern mainly for children who have and may play on it and cut themselves on the deteriorating wreck
56	No
57	No, the majority of the time now the beach has changed, it is never out of the water. People have got to take responsibility for the own safety. If you are worried about it, don't go near it!
58	As a horse rider, I am wary of the wreck because of the possibility of horses spooking at the wreck or stepping on a piece of metal. However, it is one of the risks of riding on the beach that one simply has to manage. Regarding safety for people and dogs, I think it's up to people to care for their own safety and that of their children and dogs when in the region of the wreck.
59	No
60	No
61	No. Some less obtrusive signs than are currently in place should be sufficient in warning people about the dangers.
62	No more than on any other beach area - bays, rocky outcrops, submerged objects, never mind the dangers of mussel shells are all part of the natural and historic beauty that add to the value of this bit of Indian Ocean border. If you're running yourself, your horse or dog through a bit of wilderness, then it's common sense to be aware of potential obstacles. If you want to run on a race track, go to a race track.
63	Some of the metal is jagged but overall it is safe, no more hazardous than swimming in the water nearby it.

64	No, there are signs and the wreck is visible
65	None, all children should be supervised around any water by their parents
66	No
67	None whatsoever
68	No. Just peg it off.
69	Not at this time. However I can see that it could in the future.
70	I have no safety concerns. It is an obvious landmark and it is clear that you need to be careful when walking in the vicinity
71	None whatsoever, I've never tripped over it. It's pretty easy to see!
72	None at all. It is well signed and very well-known.
73	None at all
74	No
75	No
76	No
77	None. I acknowledge it is old and as such in a corroded state but it is a part of the beach history.
78	None whatsoever
79	No
80	No
81	None
82	None
83	No. Most people walking on a beach should be able to avoid this and it is well signposted. Similarly people in small boats using the area should also be able to observe its presence
84	No
85	No
86	None at all
87	No
88	Please! Sharks, jelly fish, rips. There are plenty of unseen hazards at the beach that we know about and respect. The wreck is easily seen. Signs and information about the history would suffice.
89	Nope, it's been there for years
90	Not at all
91	No I don't at all. At low tide people carefully negotiate around the wreck and I often see how much pleasure sitting on it and contemplating 'life' it gives to people. It is unique.

92	I don't it has always been there and my family and I are fully aware of it
93	I think it's fine where it is
94	None
95	No
96	Minor concerns but structurally it seems safe to the public. My children have played around this structure for years.
97	No, it's always exposed. I don't see the risk at all.
98	No
99	No
100	No - I know we have to take in to consideration the lowest common denominator on issues like these.

<b>4</b>	<b>How would you feel if it remained in place?</b>
	Favour its removal
1	Disappointed that Cockburn is not willing to create a safer more aesthetic beach
2	Annoyed that something that has the potential to injure users of the beach will remain in place when it could be better used elsewhere and still be recognised as playing a significant role along the WA coast.
3	The City may well be liable for any injury or hurt caused to a person who may injure themselves by falling etc over the wreck
4	I would continue to worry about harming myself or my dog on the wreck
5	If moved to deeper waters (intact) as a dive site, this would be the best option. Removing it to the area behind would lose the impact
6	Sad
7	If you want to keep it, should be done properly. Museum is the best place.
8	Unsatisfied
9	Not a good idea
10	Lost opportunity
11	some concerns as it mostly hidden from view
12	It wouldn't stop me visiting the beach but it's not nice to look at and it's something to be mindful of it you don't want to cut your foot off
13	Not happy
14	I don't see why it is there at all. It is dangerous.
15	I think it should be moved
16	Irritated every time I have to call my dog away from it.

17	Pretty pissed off. Serious concerns about public safety have been voiced for many years and about time the council pulled their heads in and relocated the wrecks.
18	Personally I think it is dangerous leaving it where it is. No one discovers the history of the wreck when they walk along the beach anyway.
19	Very disappointed and uncomfortable
20	Eventually it will disintegrate.
21	Not happy
22	I wouldn't use the beach, as I don't use it now due to it being there.
23	Concerned.
24	I would prefer it was relocated as part of the dive trail
25	If it was moved to a location where it could be better preserved but still easily accessible to the public then I would feel like it continues to be valued
26	Concerned that gradual deterioration and dispersion of debris will increase risk to public safety.
27	Would not like it
28	Is a safety hazard
	Prefer it to stay
1	I would be happy
2	I would prefer it to remain where it is if possible
3	Quite happy for it to be remain in its current location
4	Very happy
5	Happy
6	Relieved
7	I think it would be really good for it to remain on the beach
8	Pleased
9	I think it should remain in place
10	Very happy for this wreck to remain in its current location
11	The wrecks have been there for over 100 years & should be left. Walkers need to be made aware of the wreck as you have done.
12	Not bothered
13	Content
14	I would be happy for it to remain in place. (Without the signs!)

15	I would be delighted, as I mentioned previously it is part of the character of that length of beach
16	Ok. But if this were the case I would think better signage would be required. I would not want my council to be exposed to the potential risk of legal action from litigation should the wreck remain in place.
17	Very happy
18	I don't mind, but we all need to be very aware when walking in that area.
19	The wrecks could be left as is but maybe include some interpretative signage. Horse riding should be confined to the area of beach near the power station. This way horses could be kept away from any wreckage and people using the beach.
20	Intact and unviolated
21	I would feel great if it stayed in place. Council needs to start listening to the people it represents.
22	No concerns at all but.....Maybe it's a waste of a historical resource if it remains there.
23	Delighted
24	I actually wouldn't mind if it stayed there, I would just keep my dog away from it. I just think as it keeps on eroding that is going to get more sharp and dangerous.
25	I think it would be a satisfying result where common sense prevailed
26	We support the wreck remaining in its place, there would be something missing from the area if it were to be removed.
27	I think it adds to the interest of the area
28	Great
29	Very pleased
30	Very happy
31	Absolutely fine. It's the public's job to watch where they are going. If council are worried of incidents then appropriate hazard signage should be put up.
32	Very happy that common sense had a victory for once
33	Great, because common sense would have prevailed and we wouldn't have sacrificed this part of our historical record to the ultra risk averse crowd
34	I would feel pleased that it would remain in situ, preserving the archaeological and social significance of the site. Other measures may reduce the perceived hazard it poses without requiring relocation.
35	I would feel happy to be able to see it every time I visit the beach.
36	Very pleased
37	I will be very happy about this.
38	We would be very, very pleased.
39	Very good!

40	I would not be concerned about the helm (front part of the tug), but very concerned about the bottom/ribs which have been getting worse, since you have extended the groin at Catherine's point.
41	Very happy
42	I would be very happy. In situ is the only place the Wyola should be.
43	I would feel happy.
44	I cannot see any reason why it should not stay in place I want it to remain in place There is no reason to move it
45	Very pleased
46	Very happy. I like to see the wreck on the beach and the way it sits under the sand.
47	I would like that
48	ok
49	I cannot see any reason why it should not stay in place I want it to remain in place There is no reason to move it
50	I would strongly encourage their retention at this place due to the strong social values that I (and a lot of other people) have for these sites.
51	I think it should remain in place with interpretive signage outlining its interesting history that the Council is no doubt aware of.
52	Delighted! But it, and the whole precinct needs to be properly interpreted, as I often hear kids asking about the Wyola, the barge, the statue and the Jetty pylons, and being told rubbish.
53	Awesome
54	It is my wish that it remain where it is
55	Good!
56	Very happy
57	Fine but erect a limestone barrier to prevent further corrosion. Make it a museum piece in the community, complimenting CY
58	I do not believe it is a good idea for public or council due to injury and public liability. Leaving it where it is, is asking for injury or public liability issue.
59	I would like it to stay
60	Very happy.
61	I enjoy walking as far as the wreck so would be glad for it to stay.
62	Satisfied, as it taints the historic value if it is moved.
63	Happier than if it were moved
64	It should remain in place and some interpretive signs located nearby.
65	Content that relevant history is being preserved.
66	The current warning signage is an eyesore, it's way out of place. A small warning sign as you walk onto the beach would be



	fine. Happy to have it left in place but it does need some sort of Didactics to accompany it as it could be mistaken for junk.
67	It should remain in place and some interpretive signs located nearby.
68	Content that relevant history is being preserved.
69	The current warning signage is an eyesore, it's way out of place. A small warning sign as you walk onto the beach would be fine. Happy to have it left in place but it does need some sort of Didactics to accompany it as it could be mistaken for junk.
70	Great, I want it to remain there
71	It should remain right where it is, otherwise you should dispose of it completely as you will be liable if you willfully relocate it.
72	Happy for it to remain or made safe at minimal cost
73	Happy
74	Fine
75	I would love it to remain where it is.
76	This would be a good decision.
77	I'd be comfortable with that.
78	Doesn't bother me - I know to walk around it
79	Very happy!
80	I would be happy, I've been walking there for 12 years.
81	Happy and relieved. It should remain in its final resting place.
82	I would prefer it
83	Pretty happy
84	Happy
85	Happy
86	I would be very happy as I feel it adds to the beach.
87	Would greatly prefer for it to stay where it is and not be moved.
88	That is the best outcome
89	That is my preference.
90	It would be good. There a few places along the coast where you can see a shipwreck so clearly
91	Very happy to be able to see history as it's been made.
92	I'd feel wonderful. Would love to see it in person one day. Tourist attraction.
93	I would feel completely ok about this. I would prefer that if it was to remain in place that some sort of plaque or information board was erected nearby to it to inform people about the ships history.
94	Happy, it is a part of the beach's character

95	Very pleased. This is where it belongs. It makes our history seem more real to people. It gives CY O'Connor its unique character.
96	I would be very happy
97	I'd be very happy
98	I would be delighted if the wreck remained in place.
99	I prefer to see artefacts in their place of origin, not in a dusty museum. It's much more exciting to read about the history of something while you're standing in that space.
100	I believe it HAS to STAY in place. Why move it???? There is already so much interference with our coastline with all the urban expansion and development. Just leave this beach as it is, please.
101	I would prefer if it did, though I can understand that people may need to be made more aware of that it is there
102	Fine as long as any hidden parts beneath the sand can't impact on anyone running across. So it shall require monitoring as it rusts away. Perhaps a rail over top to highlight with a plaque attached giving the history of it.
103	Happy as that is its original spot so why not leave it
104	Happy!
105	Would prefer it remained in place with some kind of barrier that is visual and keeps people safe.
106	Satisfied. It is historically in the right place.
107	Great.
108	Fine, leave it. Please just leave it.
109	I'd prefer that it remains
110	Happy and satisfied
111	I am 100% in favour of it staying
	No preference
1	Ambivalent
2	If it does remain in place the current signage needs to be relocated. I would suggest a low fence (knee high) that takes a wide berth around the wreck site may achieve more than the current signage (if the idea is to stop people walking into or onto it accidentally). The current signage is awful!!!
3	ok
4	I believe that it will disappear over the next decade.
5	If it remains in place needs to be amended to reduce potential for hazards for cut feet.
6	Prefer it to remain or be demolished, the council should not waste more of our precious funds on this sort of folly

<b>5</b>	<b>How would you feel if it was removed from this location?</b>
	Favour its removal
1	Pleased that this popular beach is now safer
2	It should be removed and relocated and used as part of the City of Cockburn dive Trail
3	It would be sad to not to have a piece of history around but it would be easier to enjoy the beach
4	I would prefer if it was moved. It would invite more marine life if it were submerged within the nearby Omeo Maritime Trail.
5	It would be great if it was relocated to a shipwreck gallery in Freo
6	Ecstatic and commend Cockburn for doing what needs to be done
7	Quite pleased, chuck it onto the diving trail, open up the beach for the horse races in time for the 2033 200th anniversary of the first horse race in WA.
8	Better
9	Creates a much nicer beach, what's wrong with removal of a man-made wreck?
10	If it was removed and placed with the Omeo it would add to the Maritime Trail site and potentially more people would enjoy it.
11	Move it higher on to the dune where it can be a piece of history without being a hazard.
12	Great opportunity to relocate to dive trail area.
13	Satisfied
14	Good idea
15	Content
16	Very happy
17	Ok. I do appreciate that it adds some aesthetic quality to the location but it is in effect a man-made wreck. I can't say I would be overly disappointed should it be removed. That said, I would not want the council to have to pay an exorbitant amount of money to have it removed; in my mind it is junk, old junk, but junk none the less.
18	Happy
19	Ok, as long as it could be kept and displayed elsewhere.
20	Also it would be very interesting to see the rest of the wreck on display somewhere or as a dive wreck which would attract fish and divers and more dive interest in the area. Divers spend money in the area, I know being married to one! Sad as the human created beach environment that has evolved over time is being changed.
21	I wouldn't mind, it's sad if it did go, but totally understandable why it would be removed
22	This would be a good idea, especially to near the Omeo to make it a dive and snorkel site.
23	It would be very interesting to see the rest of the wreck on display somewhere or as a dive wreck which would attract fish and divers and more dive interest in the area. Divers spend money in the area, I know being married to one!

24	This would be a good idea, especially to near the Omeo to make it a dive and snorkel site.
25	Satisfied.
26	I would be happy to see it moved away from its current location
27	Not unhappy. It would cost a lot of money to shift the wreck, so it would need to be going to a better (more useful) place. So if it were going to be used to enhance a dive site, then that could potentially be a good use of the council's financial resources.
28	About bloody time
29	I would like to see the wreck moved and placed either in a maritime museum or in a safe environment with an account of its history written on a plaque next to it to commemorate its existence.
30	I would not mind.
31	Fantastic!!
32	Remove now while there is something to remove
33	Very happy
34	I'd love to see it moved nearer to Omeo. I snorkel around that area and it would be great to have it stimulate the sea life.
35	A part of me would feel sad as I do like seeing it. However, I would feel relieved that the area was safe and I would be less concerned for the dogs and new visitors to the area.
36	Pleased
37	Pleased
38	Happy to have it removed as well although it would be nice if it was integrated into the architecture of the beach area.
39	Sad to see it go but would be ok with it as long as it was moved in order to better preserve it. if it was moved to a dive site that would also be a good idea as it would become an attraction for local divers and snorkelers and again, would remain a valued and important part of history preserved in the area
40	Fine
41	Not concerned. It will eventually corrode away
42	Would appreciate it
43	Partially moved inland and "plaqued".
44	Happy
45	I would like to see it relocated to the marine park near Omeo. This would add to the fantastic marine facility that is developing there and becoming well known across Perth.
46	I would like to see it relocated.
47	Better off gone

	Prefer it to stay
1	I would prefer if it was not moved. Perhaps signs could be put in place or other mechanisms discussed if there are safety concerns.
2	Saddened beyond measure
3	Sad, not everyone can swim or snorkel to see if it's moved.
4	Sad, disappointed.
5	Disappointed. This stretch of beach would lose its major point of interest that complements the CY O'Connor statue.
6	It would be very sad as it is such a defining feature of CY O'Connor beach
7	Disappointed.
8	Moving it from its grave would make me angry and sad.
9	Would be disappointed at the removal of this piece of history.
10	Most unhappy!! I am sure the silent majority would feel the same if it were to be removed
11	I would be disappointed that I could no longer stroll past it. It is the only beach I visit regularly as there are very few dog beaches in Perth. I would be annoyed that such an interesting landmark would be moved due to unreasonable concerns about public safety. People should be responsible for themselves and their animals.
12	Saddened
13	The wrecks offer a glimpse into the history of the state and add interest to the beach area. There are also ceramic and glass remains washed up onto the beach from the old days and potentially from wrecks. These shards also contribute to the history and cultural heritage of the beach and surrounding area.
14	I voice the opinion of myself & wife that the wreck should not be altered or removed.
15	Extremely disappointed. How would you move a rusting hulk like this? Let it stay in place. It causes no harm to anyone.
16	Please don't remove the wreck. I enjoy walking past Wyola when on walks with my dogs and have taken many (many!) photos of the wreck over the years. If it needed to be removed to preserve it, I could understand the reasoning behind it. But to remove it because certain individuals can't use common sense around something like a wreck? No thanks.
17	Violated and incomplete
18	It would be a waste of council funds given the wreck has been there for so long. What a waste of finances in this economic climate. I wonder which company will get the contract? Will it be a local company? Someone known to the shire?
19	Sad as the human created beach environment that has evolved over time is being changed.
20	Disappointment that a landmark has been relocated. If it's places under the water it can't be seen
21	Very sad. It's Australian heritage and should be left in situ.
22	Keep the ship's head where it is. It is a great feature

23	Annoyed that something was removed for no good reason.
24	This will be like remove heart from my body.
25	Disappointed
26	Very unhappy
27	Disappointed. I would doubt this was the best management option to reduce the safety risk and preserve the wreck's heritage significance.
28	Very upset at this ridiculous cotton wool world we are becoming
29	Frustrated to live in a city where a part of its historical fabric is dismantled to facilitate one beach party or respond to the complaints of a few beachgoers who can't step around small obstacles.
30	Disappointed
31	We would be disappointed if it was removed. The general public needs to take responsibility for their actions and read the warning signs in an area and take caution where required. The City shouldn't have to spend money that could be well spent on other projects in the City on removing a piece of history if members of the public are too careless or injure themselves by not paying attention.
32	It is meaningless unless it remains where it is
33	Very upset. We would be appalled that new people to the area/or administrative rules can have such an impact on a place people have used happily for many years - well before Cockburn City Council started making changes to the beach. We would believe that removing the wreck has got to do with the new housing developments in the area and is about trying to make the beach look 'beautiful'. Rottnest has all sorts of hazards on its beaches but people love going there.
34	Quite a pity that that part of history wouldn't be communicated to my children
35	I don't believe it will be money well spent in the financial environment WA is in right now
36	Very disappointed if it is moved!
37	Waste of rate payers money
38	I would be very unhappy if the Wyola was moved. It would be like the US where historical objects are relocated without regard for provenance and become a mere curiosity (think London Bridge). Moving it would completely destroy the historical sense of why the Wyola is there on that part of the beach. Anyway, time and tide will do it eventually. Meantime it must stay in situ.
39	I would feel very disturbed that Cockburn Council's answer to heritage management of this type was to remove the wreck. This does not inspire confidence that the Council will manage its unique heritage assets well in the future. It also goes against the general principles on heritage management and does not set a very good precedent for the future management of maritime heritage in Cockburn. There is a lot of beach either side of the wreck that can be used by people who have concerns about being close to the wreck site for whatever reason. Therefore if the Council's immediate answer to these perceived concerns regarding heritage assets is to remove them, I would be gravely concerned. I believe other avenues such as increased



	education and other community programs to minimise the perceived risk of the wreck site as well as inform people of its heritage value would be fundamentally better than to remove the heritage. Similarly, removal of the heritage would be a waste of taxpayer money
40	Really disappointed
41	It was be a tragedy to see them removed. They are one of the few remaining sites where I can bring my own kids to see a wreck without diving, and they form part of a popular tourist attraction which encourages tourists to visit the area. They do not interfere with any practical use of the beach and present no danger to anyone using the beach.
42	Really disappointed
43	Rather upset
44	Very sad that a piece of our history has been taken away for public liability reasons
45	Really disappointed
46	I would be sad. The beach would have less character.
47	I believe it would cost an enormous amount of money to completely remove and relocate the two wrecks, the wooden barge in particular would be extremely difficult and a waste of money.
48	Not happy
49	Devastated! What a loss of Cockburn's history, for no reason, and what a lost opportunity to build awareness of Cockburn's history and community.
50	Real crap
51	Disappointed that common sense didn't prevail
52	Sad about the wreck being moved as children can play pirates on the wreck.
53	Would you move a white cross from the road? No, so don't move the final resting spot of this historical artefact.
54	I feel that the beach will lose part of its character. It is a landmark as much as the statue and the remains of the jetty.
55	Very unhappy. To "please" a few people, many have to do without this piece of history on our beach.
56	I think it would detract interest from the beach and I would be unhappy to see it go
57	I am open to the wreck being moved to a location on the same beach but equally don't see how its value could be preserved while also being moved. I would be sorry to see it removed entirely. I would be particularly sorry to see it go because of safety concerns for people - people do need to care for themselves and not expect every environment to be utterly without risk.
58	Annoyed
59	A loss
60	Very disappointed. It is a valuable and genuine reminder of the area's history
61	Disappointed. My concern with placing the wreck slightly off shore is that it become an obscured hazard to swimmers or kayak

	paddlers. At least at present one can see prominent edges and safely pass by.
62	Sad, this wreck characterizes the beach, there is nothing like it along the coast that you can see on the beach. The wreck is amazing and should stay. I often take my tourist friends here.
63	It is a part of history and should remain. We cannot keep sanitising the world at taxpayers/ratepayers expense.
64	Sad
65	I would sorely miss this landmark if it was removed. It is our history.
66	Disappointed, as it belongs there.
67	I wouldn't like to see the whole wreck gone
68	Saddened that, once again, something interesting has been removed because of the safety of a few careless people who should be looking out for themselves
69	Upset. It wouldn't be right to have it removed from there. Where it came to rest is where it should remain
70	Very sad - upset that it would be taken away from such an iconic place. It represents so much to the community down there.
71	Upset
72	Upset
73	Disappointed
74	I would think nanny state - dumbing down the world and not giving people credit to look after themselves
75	I would be very disappointed in the City of Cockburn for removing something that has been there for a long time.
76	Very upset. Removal may cause some erosion in the area as how would it be removed? Use of large machinery to dig it out?
77	Angry. Disappointed. Sick of the nanny state mentality
78	Disheartened
79	I would be sad. It would feel like our heritage was being sanitized and that beachgoers were being treated like incompetent children needing protection
80	Disappointed that we have to intervene with everything.
81	Removal of the wreck would constitute a breach of the Commonwealth Historic Shipwreck Act 1976 and subject to financial penalties and/or imprisonment.
82	If the wreck was removed from its current position and disposed of I would be quite upset, because of the loss of history. However, if the wreck was relocated to a site underwater nearby to the Omeo (though preferably a little deeper under the water for divers) then I would be completely fine with that.
83	Unhappy. It would change the vibe of CY O'Connor beach - it is part of the beach's character.
84	Devastated! It's too iconic and valuable a feature to be moved.
85	Disappointed, let down, a sense of loss of something unique to this area

86	The beach would lose a significant portion of its unique character and feel. I might as well go to Cottesloe or another beach.
87	A sense of loss
88	I'm guessing it would cost quite a bit to move it and I'm not sure if it would survive a move.
89	Total waste of money
90	I think it would be a very bad idea and would ruin something very special to the area.
91	I would not like it to be removed from this location
92	Wouldn't like it shifted.
93	Would be disappointed.
94	Uneasy. It's significance certainly would diminish and I'm not sure it would survive being moved which would be a shame.
95	Annoyed, over regulated, nanny state
96	Empty!
97	Disappointed.
98	Terribly disappointed.
99	I am completely against it. It will lose its significance and it will lower the value of the historical value.
	Other
1	Nothing
2	I wouldn't mind, it's sad if it did go, but totally understandable why it would be removed
3	Can't see how it can be moved without damage
4	I do like the wreck where it is, although it would be the right thing
5	I'd want to know where and how it would be still a feature of the local community and accessible (not just in a museum behind closed doors)
6	Happy to have it removed as well although it would be nice if it was integrated into the architecture of the beach area.
7	Not happy but not upset
8	Would its history still be shared..?

<b>6</b>	<b>General comments</b>
1	Action should be taken ASAP to deal with this issue.
2	I do not agree with one of the reasons for removal, that being: so there can be safe horse races. Will this event that includes horse races be once off or a regular event? If there are real safety concerns for people and animals whom use the beach I am willing to accept removal of the wreck if there is no other option. However, I do not believe we should tailor the beach to suit every proposed event especially if that event requires we alter the heritage of the area.

3	Move it. Boats aren't meant to live on beaches.
4	Please don't waste money moving it for one annual horse race.
5	Don't waste any more of our ratepayers' money.
6	I've visited this beach often during the past 25 years and I've not heard concerns regarding the wreck. If there are concerns then perhaps the council will erect signage that alerts visitors to the wreck, including information about the Wyola's history. The wreck should be highlighted, not relocated. Perhaps the local horse-riding community support relocating the Wyola. However, they have accommodated the Wyola's existence for 80 years and they are a small fraction of total number of people using the beach. The Wyola should be left where it came to rest.
7	I think you should really leave the wreck where it is, even if the weather does eventually wear it away - this won't be for years and years anyway
8	The signage that is in place is adequate warning to beach users. We have walked this beach for at least 10 years and have never had a problem (or noticed anyone else having a problem) with this piece of national history.
9	This site is usually well signposted and the Council should not have to take responsibility for every conceivable obstruction in the environment. The general public needs to take some responsibility for their own safety.
10	If we continue to destroy our old historic relics even though the Wyola is not listed, we will end up with a sterile coast & a lot of sterile people walking their dogs. The next step will be to prevent horses then dogs!
11	Please leave it where it is.
12	Beaches should be cleared of all man made debris.
13	I think it should stay there
14	Would be happy to see it partially salvaged
15	The new signage installed is crude, badly placed and ruins the aesthetics of the site, including the view to the Tony Jones CY O'Connor artwork in the water. Photographing it now is impossible. If the public requires warning, the signs need to be placed further down the beach as people head towards the wreck - not at the site itself.
16	Relocated to dive trail would be an excellent solution
17	I don't believe there is any need to relocate it just get rid of it
18	Can't believe this is even being considered - HISTORY IS IMPORTANT WE HAVE SO LITTLE LEFT
19	If it is moved, a commemorative plaque could be built in the general area with the interesting history
20	The barge doesn't seem to be a hazard in anyway leave that where it is I'd say. The cost of removing the Wyola must be considered using rate payers money is critical in the final decision
21	Heritage Detection Australia is a local company which specialises in heritage assessment and management. They may be interested in doing a management plan for the area and implementing suggestion mentioned above.

22	Thanks CCC for these comment sessions!
23	In my mind it appears that the proposal to relocate the wrecks carries a real risk of incurring a huge financial burden on the city of Cockburn. If they are to be moved on the grounds of safety then they should be extracted quickly and on the basis of minimal cost, not maximum preservation. The proposal to relocate them appears ludicrous to me for a number of reasons; firstly it would likely be hugely expensive. Secondly it appears it would result in a feature of little to no aesthetic value to the community, which is as I see it their present primary function. Thirdly I would be sceptical regarding the recreational value it would present if used on a 'dive trail' and to this regard surely a more suitable vessel/wreck could be sourced should that be required; that's a smart idea but is neither a particularly practical nor good one. Conserving ship wrecks has the potential to be a very costly and time consuming undertaking, I do not believe that the Wyola wreck is historically significant enough to warrant this. I believe the best and most appropriate course of action is to address the safety concerns and to make safe the wrecks by their complete or partial removal and disposal. To those ends any such procedure should be undertaken so as to minimise cost to the city. Due to the limited historical value of the wrecks the manner in which they are extracted should not, I believe, have to be sympathetic. They are not the Mary Rose, they are Junk that was left there because they were too expensive to move. If the wrecks are too dangerous to now stay in their current position then that should not be used as an excuse to create a conservation project. Surely our city has better things to spend our money on than a maritime restoration project that would be conceived to be of little historical value and would fail to provide any benefit to the majority of the community. I implore you to treat this matter as a safety concern and deal with it on a cost benefit basis.
24	I was appalled a few months ago when I saw the signs go up warning about the wreck?!? Those signs need to be removed and let common sense prevail. Such a photogenic site spoilt by galvanised poles. It is plainly obvious there is a wreck there all you have to do is to open your eyes. Perhaps it would be better to put signs up 'Danger Ocean- You May Drown' ....I'm being facetious now but you can see what I am saying. Leave the wreck where it is. In a generation or two it will gradually disappear with only photographs to show it ever existed.
25	Wouldn't we be better off putting the money towards a car park, fuel and facilities at our marina? Or employing security and/or people who work when boaties use their boats instead of during the week when very few do. With all the pens available in other areas in Freo many boaties are talking about abandoning the marina due to lack of services, break ins and abrupt staff. Surely we want the marina to thrive so people want to live and boat there then the shire can increase rates. At present there seems to be disenchantment all around. Finish things off before starting new projects.
26	If you remove the wrecks due to their alleged danger I suggest you have to add other signs warning of the adjacent water hazard and risk of dangerous marine life such as marine life - sea lions & sharks. Both present in that area
27	Interpretive signage/plinth near location
28	Maybe you can put a fence along the beach that no one can drown, or stop people from doing suicide like O'Connor did on this beach. I hope that people will more value & appreciate what we have and make this place different from other boring places.

29	As above. Leave the wreck and put up heritage and hazard signage. Cheaper than relocating.
30	Having viewed previously buried Viking boats in museums in Scandinavia, I realise the importance of preservation where possible considering the conditions will eventually lead to it total destruction.
31	We need to be wary of sanitising our coast line by acting as if our coast can be made "safe". The ocean and the coastline are inherently risky, that is part of their value. This wreck is no different to reef areas and rocky outcrops. We adults can handle it! Our children can learn to handle these areas and conditions. Leave it be. There are many other beaches that people can go to that don't have wrecks etc if they need to.
32	Please leave it in place and remove warning signs
33	The underlying problem - of the severe erosion if the beach and dunes, brought about by the construction/extension of the groynes - needs to be addressed. Please take down the signs. They make our whole city look ridiculous (who else would place such signs in front of their memorial statues?)
34	Leave the wreck there, if people are concerned they should not go to that beach. The signs warning people of the hazard are ridiculous. The wreck is clearly visible and easily avoided.
35	Prefer it to stay as is.
36	I currently work as a maritime archaeological consultant and have assisted councils with the management of similar shipwrecks. A thorough assessment should be undertaken of the actual safety risk this wreck poses before any interference. Based on the findings, proportionate measures can then be implemented to manage this wreck. In my experience, it is likely that relocation would not be justifiable for this shipwreck and other management measures would be better suited.
37	If the wreck is to stay in its current location, could you please take down the warning signs? It just seems silly to me that there needs to be three signs in place to tell people what is plainly evident to see. If there were some information about the history of the wreck, that could be good. The appearance of any sign on the beach would ideally be sympathetic to the location, but those three existing signs are just spoiling the outlook on what is a very beautiful beach, which also has a rich history. My preferred outcome would be: - the wreck stays - the signs come down, and - any money to be spent on signs be used to share knowledge about the history of the location. Thank you for speaking feed-back on this issue.
38	Leave it rest where it belongs
39	There is too much concern about people injuring themselves in public areas. They have to take responsibility for behaving with a little common sense.
40	We see many, many people taking photos of the wreck, of the sunsets and the wreck and of themselves with the wreck (eg for special occasions). People like its unique beauty.
41	About time you guys listened to the people of Cockburn instead of wasting our money on unnecessary and unwanted beach works done such as what was done in 2016
42	Thank you for including me and asking for comments from us rate payers.



43	The remains of the Wyola must be preserved in a safe manner. The scrapping contractors' barge is of no historic value. This steam tug was built in South Shields UK in 1912 and served WA for generations. Wyola was partially dismantled Alongside Victoria Quay then towed to where she now lays for final dismantling but it was not completed and all that remains above ground is her Stern post and some plate. Little has been preserved of this famous Fremantle tug which was well known to all mariners and Fremantle folk. The Maritime museum displays a few items in a glass case but no photograph or story of this well know vessel. Apparently racing yachts etc. are more interesting. I would have put these remarks on your "Comments Section" but couldn't get on! I hope the Council can arrive at a good solution that satisfies beach walkers and our maritime history. Certainly not another "Kwinana" cement over.
44	Suggest you ask ADF to remove all for free. They would love the exercise and it could also involve many divisions. Plus they can blow something up, if they want. I know the Services like to do something like this. Good training and good result for us all.
45	Surely lighting could be installed to illuminate the wreck site. Dusk would appear to be the appropriate time. Or possibly, signage and fencing to divert users away from the wreck site, if they were unaware of its presence.
46	Yes, wonder also if you are not at the same time going to do any environmental sand bank/bagging about the entire dunes around the wreck. They have completely washed away. All the trees that were holding the dunes have also washed away. And the new plantings that were done a few years ago have also washed away in winter storms all because of the groin extension, (making the walk from South Beach to CY O'Connor beach just awful to walk on with bricks/asphalt and rocks/etc all located on the shore line making it completely uncomfortable and dangerous. Poor job planning that, ruining such a lovely beach. Also suggest you put a bin near the walkway/path of the Catherine Point/Mums Point groin and the pathway, which might just make people put their doggie bags/rubbish in the bin.
47	It's a disaster waiting to happen.
48	Safety for the public is paramount and be able to create more beach activities.
49	I believe the Council should think of it as an icon, not a safety hazard. It gives the beach a unique character that differentiates it from other beaches and says "this is Cockburn".
50	Reading with interest about the Wyola ship wreck, my suggestion is the possible simplest solution would be, is erect a 1 metre or 1.5 metre rust/salt resistant fence around the wreck.
51	I imagine removal would be costly to Cockburn ratepayers, and would necessitate lengthy closure of the beach for minimal gain. In 2016, the beach was closed for over two months in total. It is a very popular walking spot for people with dogs and any closure would be extremely annoying.
52	Please keep the wreck.
53	The wreck has been going through a series of changes over the years where it is exposed and then covered up. Currently the wreck is relatively exposed as are the jetty piles. It is quite likely that in a year or so it will disappear once again and be buried in the sand.

54	Removing it would destroy it.
55	My understanding is that this idea of a "safety" hazard came from an ill-informed and politically motivated piece written by a journalist a few years ago (who was subsequently sacked) and the piece to have been factually incorrect, and biased to fit with the journalist's own agenda. Given the wreck has been there for 45 years, how many incidents have been caused by it? I would suggest more lamp-posts attack cars than this wreck site attacks people.
56	There are dangers in all forms of life, we must recognise them and take care and be responsible for our own safety. At the very most a sign could be put up at the site, alerting walkers to the danger of sharp metal in the sand
57	It is this time of structure that provides opportunity to get out in the great area of Cockburn, you can make this a focal point of the area with the right measures for decades to come, erect an Information sign about it so people can reference its significance as well as a sign about CY, our kids need to know this stuff long after we are gone or they will only have computer images of what it was and god knows they spend enough time on the damn things, get them out and give them a reason to explore, the coast needs information points to explore!!
58	I grew up here and have so many great memories of this beach and the wreck. Please leave it be. In all my travels around the world I have never found another beach that offers the same experience. Further down the coast you are creating a man-made reef, you already have a historic land mark here. The wreck also compliments the statue of O'Conner riding his horse into the ocean, I can't help but think the artist was influenced by it. I don't doubt that a few people have stubbed their toe on the wreck over the years and someone may have complained, but I'm in danger of that around my kitchen table. I'm a psychologist. It is not the states responsibility to protect people from all dangers, especially at the cost of experience. It is important that people take responsibility for their actions in regards to their environment. We learn these valuable lessons through access to different environments. Considering the amount of fun I had on this beach as a kid, I wouldn't doubt that access to this wreck has inspired different passions in adults and children. Personally I liked playing pirate and occasionally still do. Now I get the pleasure of sharing that experience with my nephews. All this aside, it is helpful to make people aware. Signs are great for this. They are one of the reasons I'm writing this email. So my suggestion is to make signs that inform people. Incorporate information on the wreck and people will respect it more and behave accordingly. I'd read that and love to learn more about it. So PLEASE leave the wreck alone.
59	Maybe having a notice/info near the wreck to explain its presence/history might help others to appreciate it. Where on earth would it be moved to???
60	I think it should be moved off the beach and sunk in the same area to create a fish habitat, dive and snorkel location
61	I walk my dogs past the wreck often and have never had an issue with it
62	Please don't move it.
63	It would make the shoreline safer and not a dumping ground from the time the vessel had been stripped of 95 percent of its metal.it should have been removed back then

64	It's a special little historic collection around this wreck - remember that special component of its value. Thanks
65	Please don't move the wreck. There are plenty of other beaches to go to if people have concerns. This wreck is part of the beach's heritage. Please keep it there.
66	It's a good chance for children to learn and be supervised in its careful consideration as does anything we encounter in nature.
67	There are many more deserving causes to spend money on than trying to shift a rusty old piece of scrap metal. If it remains then could the wreck be completely enclosed by a non-rust material and of course fixed rigidly.
68	No great expenditure please.
69	If parents are worried about their children climbing on the wreck they need to supervise their children closely at this part of the beach. I have seen many children climbing on the wreck and playing on the beach surrounding it with no bad consequences.
70	Please move it
71	More information and signage explaining Cockburn landmarks and artwork
72	The new signs all around the wreck seem to be a bit pointless. They state the obvious and wreck the scenery. I guess they do provide a new place for dogs to leave their calling cards. If there have to be signs then a bit of information about the wreck on the signs would increase their value from little to some.
73	The horses walk around it, there's very little foot traffic, let it be! Thanks for the opportunity.
74	Thank you for taking the time to bring this to the community! We love this feature on our local beach. Once lost it will be gone forever!
75	Appreciate having the online survey. Great to be able to provide feedback easily
76	The wreck is a central feature and attraction of this particular beach. Together with the CY O'Connor statue offshore, the wreck speaks to the treacherous and marginal conditions we face in WA. It adds to the local historical fabric.
77	Does not need to be moved. Possibly roped off if needed
78	No need to remove it at all. If anything is to be done, a plaque providing information about the wreck should be installed nearby.
79	You should leave the wreck in place as it is part of the story of the region.
80	Keep it where it is. If people really see it as a safety hazard they can move around it/use another beach and leave us who do enjoy it to do our thing.
81	Perth's beaches should accommodate a variety of different values and users. Not every beach in WA has the heritage that this beach does. It would feel disrespectful to the memory of CY O'Connor - who did so much for this State.
82	The site is an archaeological site and should be respected as such. It is a tangible reminder of our past maritime culture.
83	I would hate to see the loss of a piece of Australian history because it is scrapped, and would love to see the wreck added to the new wreck and dive snorkel trail. As an aside to that, I would love to see the creation of some sort of trail map that details


	the locations of the structures on the dive trail
84	Dump it in in ocean for fish or dive attraction
85	I'd rather see tours undertaken to tell the story of this beach.
86	Please leave it there as part of our history fir people to enjoy.
87	The council should be concentrating more important issues
88	There are already so many rules and regulations which I believe make people lazy. They stop taking responsibility for their own lives and safety and lose being mindful to their environment. I find that this beach has been interfered with too much already. For example, all that sand that you transported last winters, changing the contours of my favourite beach has already, halfway the first summer, been washed away!
89	If the general consensus is that it should be removed of the beach it should only be moved higher up the water line. It is part of local history and should remain at its resting place or near it. To move anywhere else will take away some of the history of that stretch of beach.
90	Can you take the ugly stupid safety signs down? They are ruining a beautiful piece of scenery. What happened to common sense? If you can't see a massive hunk of metal then you can't be helped.
91	I understand Council may have concerns about risk but really I think it is a giant risk if everything in our public domain becomes safe for the lowest common denominator. As humans we need 'wild' environments. If there is a concern about safety of public, perhaps create some tasteful creative solutions but please don't fence it off or remove it.
92	We need to find better things to focus on. While I think perhaps a bit of effort (money) could be spent to outline a safe point around the wreck, we don't need to nitpick every little thing in our community when it comes to "dumbing" things down for safety. Perhaps install permanent pylons outlining a safe point around the wreck so people know not to enter that boundary? This isn't Cott beach or even South Beach we are discussing, and it's not and most likely will never be busy enough to warrant a heavy concern to public safety.

estion:

Suburb




Choose a signup form question to see details



## What is your gender?




Choose a signup form question to see details





Question: Which age group are you in? ▼

Choose a signup form question to see details





# LOCAL GEOTECHNICS

01 February 2017

**Report on**  
**Geotechnical Inspection for Wyola Shipwreck**  
Robb's Jetty at C Y O'Connor Beach WA

Project:  
**LG8182017GI**  
**REV\_0**

Client: **City of Cockburn**

Geotech

Civil

Pavement

Drainage

01 February 2017

To  
**City of Cockburn**  
54 Wellard St, Bibra Lake WA 6163  
PO Box 1215, Bibra Lake DC, WA 6965

Dear Sir,

**RE:** Geotechnical Inspection for Wyola Shipwreck  
Robb's Jetty at C Y O'Connor Beach WA

This letter presents our report on Geotechnical Inspection for Wyola Shipwreck at C Y O'Connor Beach WA. If you have any questions related to the report or we can be of further assistance, please do not hesitate to contact local geotechnics or the undersigned.

For and on behalf of Local Geotechnics.



**Dr. Harun Meer**

*Ph.D.(Geotech), M. Eng. (Geotech), B. Eng. (Civil), MIE Aust*

Director

**Local Geotechnics**

<b>Project</b>	<b>LG8182017GI</b>			
	<b>Geotechnical Inspection for Wyola Shipwreck</b>			
<b>Site Location</b>	<b>Robb's Jetty at C Y O'Connor Beach WA</b>			
Rev	Description	Date	Prepared by	Approved by
0	Issued to client	01 February 2017	A. Rahman	H Meer

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

1.0	INTRODUCTION.....	4
2.0	METHODOLOGY OF THE INSPECTION.....	5
2.1	Desktop Study .....	5
2.2	Landgate Map Review .....	5
3.0	FIELD WORKS.....	6
3.1	Visual Inspection .....	6
3.2	Hand Auger Holes and DCP Test.....	7
3.3	Ground Penetrating Radar (GPR) Scanning.....	7
4.0	ENGINEERING CONSIDERATIONS AND DISCUSSIONS .....	8
5.0	LIMITATION OF USE .....	9
6.0	REFERENCES.....	9

## LIST OF FIGURES

---

Figure 1.	Site Location Map (Source: Google Maps)
Figure 2.	The condition of the existing shipwreck, <i>30 December 2016</i>
Figure 3.	Land gate Photo on <i>30 August 1981</i>
Figure 4.	Landgate Photo (enlarged) on <i>30 August 1981</i>
Figure 5.	Site condition
Figure 6.	Site condition on 23 January 2017
Figure 7.	GPR scanning data (a typical slide)
Figure 8.	The approximately depth of the bottom of the shipwreck

## LIST OF TABLE

---

Table 1.	Shipwreck Coordinates (Land gate photo on 30 August 1981)
----------	---

## APPENDICES

---

**Appendix A:** Landgate Photos

**Appendix B:** Site Photos

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

The City of Cockburn (the client) engaged Local Geotechnics (LG) to find out the location and depth of Wyola Shipwreck, near Robb's Jetty at C Y O'Connor Beach WA (the site). The site area is shown in Figure 1.



**Figure 1.** Site Location Map (Source: Google Maps)

The site is located at approximately 30 km south of the Perth City and the Indian Ocean coastline. We are given to understand that the geotechnical investigation is required for the following main objectives:

- Identify and confirm the size and scale of the shipwreck below the sand.
- Confirm the depth of the shipwreck and it's alignment;

Based on the above our engineer visited the site on 30 December 2016 together with the project manager from the City of Cockburn to determine the field inspection methodology and objectives. The condition of the shipwreck is shown in Figure 2.



**Figure 2.** The condition of the existing shipwreck, 30 December 2016

It was decided during site meeting that field inspection would be conducted by using hand auger to determine the depth of shipwreck and Ground Penetrating Radar (GPR) would be used to map out the shipwreck locations.

## 2.0 METHODOLOGY OF THE INSPECTION

The inspection methodology consists of the details of the desktop study by using publicly available data followed by intrusive inspection by using a hand auger and non-intrusive testing by using a Ground Penetration Radar (GPR).

### 2.1 Desktop Study

A desktop study was conducted by Local Geotechnics (LG) on SS Wyola and Robb's Jetty, which revealed the followings:

*Robb Jetty*, south of Fremantle, was used for the unloading of cattle from the state's north-west to the abattoirs situated here that operated between 1890s–1970s.

*SS Wyola* was a 306 GRT steam tug built in 1912 by LT Eltringham & Co of South Shields, England for the Swan River Shipping Company of Western Australia. Wyola was 125 ft (38 m) long between perpendiculars, had a beam of 24.7 ft (7.5 m), a depth of 13.1 ft (4.0 m) and a draught of 14 ft 0 in (4.3 m). The 306-ton steam tug Wyola worked in the Port of Fremantle.

In 1970 Wyola was dismantled at Robb Jetty. Her remains are buried in the sand at CY O'Connor Beach in North Coogee, a couple of hundred metres south of Catherine Point Groyne. The stern frame can still be seen protruding from the beach while the bottom of the hull lies buried in the sand. A timber barge buried in the sand just to the north and sometimes visible is said to have been used in the scrapping of Wyola.

### 2.2 Landgate Map Review

Landgate maps were reviewed to assess the change of position in different period of time and also the location of the shipwreck. The landgate photos from different years are shown in Appendix A. One of the landgate map photos, taken on 30 August 1981, is shown in Figure 3, revealed that bow of the shipwreck is at the sea side and stern is at the shore side. The coordinates of the different points of the shipwreck were also determined from landgate photo. The enlarged photo with coordinates is shown in Figure 4.





Figure 3. Land gate Photo on 30 August 1981





**Figure 4.** Landgate Photo (enlarged) on 30 August 1981

### 3.0 FIELD WORKS


Field works consists of visual inspection, hand auger holes and Ground Penetrating Radar (GPR) scanning.

Field works was conducted on 30 December 2016, 07 and 23 January 2017. A site meeting was conducted on 30 December 2016. A preliminary assessment by conducting two hand auger holes was conducted on 07 January 2017. The final inspection by using hand auger, Dynamic Cone Penetrometer (DCP) and GPR scanning were conducted on 23 January 2017.

#### 3.1 Visual Inspection

It was observed during field inspection that the shipwreck was exposing day by day due the current condition of the sea, due to raising of water level or high tide. The site condition at different days are shown in Figure 5 and Figure 6. It is observed from Figure 5 and 6 that the shipwreck was more exposed due to high tide on 23 January 2017 than on 30 December 2016.

The side shell of the shipwreck was found rusted and damaged. The middle beam of the shipwreck was also found rusted and decayed. The condition of the shipwreck and site photos are shown in Appendix B.




### 3.2 Hand Auger Holes and DCP Test

The test holes were conducted using hand auger. It is found from the test auger holes that the shipwreck is filled with beach sand. Black colour sand was observed at bottom 200 mm of the test hole. The hand auger holes also revealed that the depth of shipwreck varies from 1.0 m (from the bow end to the middle beam), approximately 1.8 m at the middle part and approximately 2.0 m to 2.5 m at the stern end (shore side).

Dynamic Cone Penetrometer (DCP) test was conducted at the hand auger holes to confirm the bottom shell of the shipwreck. DCP observed refusal in all the hand auger holes.

### 3.3 Ground Penetrating Radar (GPR) Scanning

Ground Penetrating Radar (GPR) Scanning was conducted at the site to determine the depth and boundary condition of the shipwreck. A typical slide of the GPR scanning image is shown in Figure 7. The GPR scanning revealed the same as observed from intrusive investigation.



**Figure 7. GPR scanning data (a typical slide)**

#### 4.0 ENGINEERING CONSIDERATIONS AND DISCUSSIONS

Land gate photo on 30 August 1981 also revealed that bow of the ship wreck is at the sea side and stern is as the shore side. The coordinates are shown in Table 1. However, the coordinates may vary for few meters.

Table 1. Shipwreck Coordinates (Land gate photo on 30 August 1981)

Bow (sea side)		Stern (shore side)	
Northing	Easting	Northing	Easting
6449 020	50 352 513	6449 047	50 352 531
		6449 043	50 352 535

The depth of shipwreck varies from 1.0 m (from the bow end to the middle beam), approximately 1.8 m at the middle part and approximately 2.0 m to 2.5 m at the stern end (shore side). The approximately depth of the bottom of the shipwreck at different locations are shown in Figure 8.



**Figure 8. The approximately depth of the bottom of the shipwreck**



The depth of the bottom of the shipwreck was determined based on the date of investigation. However, the depth may vary as the depth was measured from the existing surface level which has been changing continuously due to sand filling or erosion by tidal wave occurring at the site.

Hand auger holes revealed that the shipwreck is filled with beach sand. Black colour sand was observed at bottom 200 mm of the test hole.

The upraised portion of side shell of the shipwreck was found rusted and damaged. The middle beam of the shipwreck was also found rusted and decayed. The condition of the bottom shell of the shipwreck was not possible to examine within the scope of this investigation. However, solid steel was felt at the bottom of the test holes during the test by using hand auger and at the tips of the Dynamic Cone Penetrometer during testing.

It is highly recommended that the engagement of Local Geotechnics (LG) will be required for any earthworks or any relocation planning of the shipwreck so that any encountered variation of information contained in this report may address properly. LG's supervision is also required to advise on any changes that may needed to support the earthworks and relocation plan.

## **5.0 LIMITATION OF USE**

The ground is a product of continuing natural and man-made processes and therefore exhibits characteristics and properties which vary from place to place and can change with time. This site assessment report involves gathering and assimilating limited facts about these characteristics and properties in order to better understand or predict the behaviour of the ground under certain conditions.

The facts reported in this document are fully based on verbal discussions, limited number of field testing and GPR survey undertaken by DM Contracting. No investigation was carried out to understand the karst geology (sinkhole features) of the site. The reported facts are directly relevant only to the ground at the place where, and time when, the investigation/inspection or repairing was carried out and are believed to be reported accurately.

The level of geotechnical assessment that has been completed to date is considered appropriate for the project objectives. If the client, its subcontractors, agents or employees use this factual information for any other purpose for which it was not intended, then the client, its subcontractors, agents or employees does so at its own risk and Local Geotechnics will not and cannot accept liability in respect of the advice, whether under law of contract, tort or otherwise.

Any interpretation or recommendation given in this report is based on judgment and experience and not on greater knowledge of the facts reported.

Local Geotechnics does not represent that the information or interpretation contained in this report addresses completely the existing features, subsurface conditions, karst geology or ground behaviour at the subject site.

## **6.0 REFERENCES**

- <http://www.museum.wa.gov.au/collections/maritime/march/march.asp>
- Text by Jane Taylor, Penrhos College. Updated by Jessica Berry, Tracey Miller and Jessica Reynolds, WAM 2008.



# APPENDIX A

## LAND GATE PHOTOS

---





1. Landgate Photo on **6/9/74**



2. Landgate Photo on **7/6/77**

#### **LOCAL GEOTECHNICS**

Project: LG8182017GI\_Rev0

Geotechnical Inspection

Site: Wyola Shipwreck, C Y O'Connor Beach WA

Client: City of Cockburn





3. Landgate Photo on **30/8/81**



4. Landgate Photo on **14/6/83**

#### LOCAL GEOTECHNICS

Project: LG8182017GI\_Rev0

Geotechnical Inspection

Site: Wyola Shipwreck, C Y O'Connor Beach WA

Client: City of Cockburn



5. Landgate Photo on **19/6/85**



6. Landgate Photo on **15/9/2016**

#### LOCAL GEOTECHNICS

Project: LG8182017GI\_Rev0

Geotechnical Inspection

Site: Wyola Shipwreck, C Y O'Connor Beach WA

Client: City of Cockburn



# APPENDIX B

## SITE PHOTOS

---







**Photo 1.** Site condition, looking towards west



**Photo 2.** Sub-surface probing by hand auger, observed black sand at the bottom at about 0.8 m

# **LOCAL GEOTECHNICS**

Project: LG8182017GI\_Rev0

Geotechnical Inspection

Site: Wyola Shipwreck, C Y O'Connor Beach WA

Client: City of Cockburn





**Photo 4.** Sub-surface probing, looking toward south

---



**Photo 4.** Sub-surface probing and DCP test  
observed black sand at the bottom at about 1.8 m

---

**LOCAL GEOTECHNICS**

Project: LG8182017GI\_Rev0

Geotechnical Inspection

Site: Wyola Shipwreck, C Y O'Connor Beach WA

Client: City of Cockburn





**Photo 5.** Condition of the middle beam, looking toward north



**Photo 6.** Condition of the right side, looking toward west (sea)

---

**LOCAL GEOTECHNICS**

Project: LG8182017GI\_Rev0

Geotechnical Inspection

Site: Wyola Shipwreck, C Y O'Connor Beach WA

Client: City of Cockburn





**Photo 7.** Condition of the right side, looking toward south

---



**Photo 8.** GPR Scanning just outside of the middle beam, looking toward south

---

---

**LOCAL GEOTECHNICS**

Project: LG8182017GI\_Rev0

Geotechnical Inspection

Site: Wyola Shipwreck, C Y O'Connor Beach WA

Client: City of Cockburn

## MetroCount Traffic Executive Weekly Vehicle Counts (Virtual Week)

### VirtWeeklyVehicle-68 -- English (ENA)

#### Datasets:

**Site:** [Rigby-01] Rigby Avenue - 40m west of Plum Place (Spearwood) <50>  
**Attribute:** [-32.107385 +115.780628]  
**Direction:** 8 - East bound A>B, West bound B>A. Lane: 0  
**Survey Duration:** 13:04 Thursday, 28 April 2016 => 13:07 Friday, 27 May 2016,  
**Zone:**  
**File:** Rigby-01 0 2016-05-27 1308.EC0 (Plus )  
**Identifier:** CT91G03P MC56-L5 [MC55] (c)Microcom 19Oct04  
**Algorithm:** Factory default axle (v4.08)  
**Data type:** Axle sensors - Paired (Class/Speed/Count)

#### Profile:

**Filter time:** 14:00 Thursday, 28 April 2016 => 13:00 Friday, 27 May 2016 (28.9583)  
**Included classes:** 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12  
**Speed range:** 10 - 160 km/h.  
**Direction:** East, West (bound), P = East, Lane = 0-16  
**Separation:** Headway > 0 sec, Span 0 - 100 metre  
**Name:** Default Profile  
**Scheme:** Vehicle classification (AustRoads94)  
**Units:** Metric (metre, kilometre, m/s, km/h, kg, tonne)  
**In profile:** Vehicles = 80255 / 80490 (99.71%)

## Weekly Vehicle Counts (Virtual Week)

**VirtWeeklyVehicle-68**
**Site:** Rigby-01.0.1EW

**Description:** Rigby Avenue - 40m west of Plum Place (Spearwood) <50>

**Filter time:** 14:00 Thursday, 28 April 2016 => 13:00 Friday, 27 May 2016

**Scheme:** Vehicle classification (AustRoads94)

**Filter:** CIs(1-12) Dir(EW) Sp(10,160) Headway(>0) Span(0 - 100) Lane(0-16)

	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat	Sun	Averages	
								1 - 5	1 - 7
<b>Hour</b>									
0000-0100	4.8	6.5	7.0	6.5	11.6	16.8	29.5	7.5	11.8
0100-0200	3.0	3.3	3.8	4.8	5.2	8.8	10.0	4.0	5.5
0200-0300	3.3	4.3	2.8	2.8	4.0	7.5	12.0	3.4	5.2
0300-0400	3.8	6.0	5.3	4.5	3.6	7.0	6.0	4.6	5.1
0400-0500	13.8	14.0	17.5	17.0	14.2	9.0	5.3	15.2	13.0
0500-0600	52.0	51.3	61.0	56.8	54.6	16.0	6.8	55.1	43.0
0600-0700	117.0	113.5	108.0	113.0	109.6	42.8	29.5	112.1	91.1
0700-0800	175.3	181.0	172.5	166.5	169.6	65.3	42.3	172.8	140.0
0800-0900	205.5	198.0	202.8	193.8	207.6	153.5	92.8	201.8	180.1
0900-1000	170.5	162.8	176.0	180.5	196.8	202.0	141.3	178.2	176.4
1000-1100	176.0	157.8	173.5	186.5	188.0	215.8	186.0	176.9	183.5
1100-1200	189.8	173.5	195.0	169.3	198.0	242.0	203.3	185.7	195.9
1200-1300	176.3	171.0	180.5	185.0	180.8	227.0	220.5	178.8	191.2
1300-1400	166.3	159.5	177.0	172.5	186.0	213.5	194.5	172.3	181.3
1400-1500	184.0	184.5	184.8	192.6	224.5	184.5	194.0	194.0	192.7
1500-1600	258.0	265.3	265.5	247.8	276.8	200.3	184.5	262.0	242.8
1600-1700	262.8	261.5	265.0	262.4	278.0	203.3	201.5	265.8	248.3
1700-1800	261.3	237.3	255.5	269.8	279.3	204.5	177.3	261.0	241.7
1800-1900	163.8	180.0	175.3	189.8	210.8	143.3	126.8	184.2	170.6
1900-2000	98.5	94.5	113.8	112.2	96.5	90.3	75.0	103.5	97.8
2000-2100	61.0	74.3	75.8	64.4	55.5	62.8	62.5	66.1	65.1
2100-2200	46.0	48.0	45.0	43.4	43.5	50.0	38.5	45.1	44.9
2200-2300	28.3	24.0	29.8	20.8	39.8	42.3	21.8	28.1	29.2
2300-2400	9.0	14.8	13.0	11.8	32.0	30.5	12.8	15.9	17.5
<b>Totals</b>									
0700-1900	2389.3	2332.0	2423.3	2416.4	2596.1	2254.8	1964.5	2433.5	2344.5
0600-2200	2711.8	2662.3	2765.8	2749.4	2901.1	2500.5	2170.0	2760.3	2643.4
0600-0000	2749.0	2701.0	2808.5	2782.0	2972.9	2573.3	2204.5	2804.3	2690.0
0000-0000	2829.5	2786.3	2905.8	2874.3	3066.1	2638.3	2274.0	2894.2	2773.7
<b>AM Peak</b>	0800	0800	0800	0800	0800	1100	1100		
	205.5	198.0	202.8	193.8	207.6	242.0	203.3		
<b>PM Peak</b>	1600	1500	1500	1700	1700	1200	1200		
	262.8	265.3	265.5	269.8	279.3	227.0	220.5		

\* - No data.

## Weekly Vehicle Counts (Virtual Week)

VirtWeeklyVehicle-69

Site: Rigby-01.0.1EW

Description: **Rigby Avenue - 40m west of Plum Place (Spearwood) <50>**Filter time: **14:00 Thursday, 28 April 2016 => 13:00 Friday, 27 May 2016**

Scheme: Vehicle classification (AustRoads94)

Filter: Cls(1-12) Dir(E) Sp(10,160) Headway(&gt;0) Span(0 - 100) Lane(0-16)

	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat	Sun	Averages	
								1 - 5	1 - 7
Hour									
0000-0100	1.3	1.8	1.5	2.5	3.8	5.5	9.5	2.2	3.7
0100-0200	1.5	2.0	1.3	1.8	2.4	4.0	4.0	1.8	2.4
0200-0300	1.3	2.3	1.8	1.3	2.2	4.8	5.8	1.8	2.7
0300-0400	2.5	5.3	4.3	3.3	3.0	4.5	3.3	3.6	3.7
0400-0500	11.5	11.0	13.8	14.0	10.0	4.8	3.3	12.0	9.8
0500-0600	40.0	41.8	47.8	44.3	43.2	10.8	3.8	43.4	33.4
0600-0700	81.0	81.5	71.0	78.8	71.6	21.3	16.0	76.5	60.6
0700-0800	124.5	133.3	124.3	124.3	124.0	45.5	29.8	126.0	101.6
0800-0900	127.8	126.5	130.3	124.3	127.8	99.5	58.5	127.3	114.0
0900-1000	96.5	94.3	98.8	104.3	115.8	120.5	74.0	102.6	101.1
1000-1100	96.5	87.5	94.5	101.5	103.2	114.8	98.8	97.0	99.7
1100-1200	91.5	89.3	94.8	87.8	95.6	113.0	107.8	92.0	97.0
1200-1300	84.3	84.8	89.0	81.8	79.2	100.8	107.0	83.6	89.2
1300-1400	81.3	77.0	84.0	82.3	85.8	96.3	96.8	82.0	86.2
1400-1500	89.5	87.3	86.0	87.8	102.5	92.3	87.0	90.5	90.2
1500-1600	107.0	101.3	98.0	95.2	115.0	86.5	85.5	102.9	98.2
1600-1700	89.3	101.8	99.0	99.0	103.0	79.0	87.0	98.4	94.2
1700-1800	97.8	83.5	100.8	100.0	95.3	83.3	80.3	95.7	91.8
1800-1900	67.0	73.3	66.0	76.8	92.0	66.3	50.3	75.1	70.4
1900-2000	41.3	41.0	45.3	43.4	40.0	38.0	33.0	42.2	40.4
2000-2100	24.8	28.8	28.5	25.4	23.3	28.3	26.3	26.1	26.4
2100-2200	15.5	16.5	16.5	12.2	17.8	19.3	18.5	15.5	16.4
2200-2300	8.0	6.8	9.0	6.0	14.8	18.3	8.3	8.8	10.0
2300-2400	3.0	6.0	4.8	3.8	12.5	9.5	4.8	5.9	6.2
Totals									
0700-1900	1152.8	1139.5	1165.3	1164.8	1239.1	1097.5	962.5	1173.0	1133.7
0600-2200	1315.3	1307.3	1326.5	1324.6	1391.7	1204.3	1056.3	1333.3	1277.5
0600-0000	1326.3	1320.0	1340.3	1334.4	1419.0	1232.0	1069.3	1348.0	1293.7
0000-0000	1384.3	1384.0	1410.5	1401.4	1483.6	1266.3	1098.8	1412.8	1349.4
AM Peak	0800	0700	0800	0800	0800	0900	1100		
	127.8	133.3	130.3	124.3	127.8	120.5	107.8		
PM Peak	1500	1600	1700	1700	1500	1200	1200		
	107.0	101.8	100.8	100.0	115.0	100.8	107.0		

\* - No data.

## Weekly Vehicle Counts (Virtual Week)

**VirtWeeklyVehicle-70**
**Site:** Rigby-01.0.1EW

**Description:** Rigby Avenue - 40m west of Plum Place (Spearwood) <50>

**Filter time:** 14:00 Thursday, 28 April 2016 => 13:00 Friday, 27 May 2016

**Scheme:** Vehicle classification (AustRoads94)

**Filter:** Cls(1-12) Dir(W) Sp(10,160) Headway(>0) Span(0 - 100) Lane(0-16)

	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat	Sun	Averages	
								1 - 5	1 - 7
<b>Hour</b>									
0000-0100	3.5	4.8	5.5	4.0	7.8	11.3	20.0	5.2	8.1
0100-0200	1.5	1.3	2.5	3.0	2.8	4.8	6.0	2.2	3.1
0200-0300	2.0	2.0	1.0	1.5	1.8	2.8	6.3	1.7	2.4
0300-0400	1.3	0.8	1.0	1.3	0.6	2.5	2.8	1.0	1.4
0400-0500	2.3	3.0	3.8	3.0	4.2	4.3	2.0	3.3	3.2
0500-0600	12.0	9.5	13.3	12.5	11.4	5.3	3.0	11.7	9.6
0600-0700	36.0	32.0	37.0	34.3	38.0	21.5	13.5	35.6	30.6
0700-0800	50.8	47.8	48.3	42.3	45.6	19.8	12.5	46.9	38.4
0800-0900	77.8	71.5	72.5	69.5	79.8	54.0	34.3	74.5	66.1
0900-1000	74.0	68.5	77.3	76.3	81.0	81.5	67.3	75.7	75.3
1000-1100	79.5	70.3	79.0	85.0	84.8	101.0	87.3	80.0	83.9
1100-1200	98.3	84.3	100.3	81.5	102.4	129.0	95.5	93.8	98.9
1200-1300	92.0	86.3	91.5	103.3	101.6	126.3	113.5	95.2	102.0
1300-1400	85.0	82.5	93.0	90.3	100.3	117.3	97.8	90.2	95.1
1400-1500	94.5	97.3	98.8	104.8	122.0	92.3	107.0	103.5	102.4
1500-1600	151.0	164.0	167.5	152.6	161.8	113.8	99.0	159.0	144.5
1600-1700	173.5	159.8	166.0	163.4	175.0	124.3	114.5	167.3	154.1
1700-1800	163.5	153.8	154.8	169.8	184.0	121.3	97.0	165.4	149.9
1800-1900	96.8	106.8	109.3	113.0	118.8	77.0	76.5	109.1	100.2
1900-2000	57.3	53.5	68.5	68.8	56.5	52.3	42.0	61.3	57.4
2000-2100	36.3	45.5	47.3	39.0	32.3	34.5	36.3	40.0	38.7
2100-2200	30.5	31.5	28.5	31.2	25.8	30.8	20.0	29.6	28.4
2200-2300	20.3	17.3	20.8	14.8	25.0	24.0	13.5	19.4	19.2
2300-2400	6.0	8.8	8.3	8.0	19.5	21.0	8.0	10.0	11.2
<b>Totals</b>									
0700-1900	1236.5	1192.5	1258.0	1251.6	1357.0	1157.3	1002.0	1260.5	1210.8
0600-2200	1396.5	1355.0	1439.3	1424.8	1509.5	1296.3	1113.8	1427.0	1365.9
0600-0000	1422.8	1381.0	1468.3	1447.6	1554.0	1341.3	1135.3	1456.3	1396.3
0000-0000	1445.3	1402.3	1495.3	1472.9	1582.6	1372.0	1175.3	1481.4	1424.3
<b>AM Peak</b>	1100	1100	1100	1000	1100	1100	1100		
	98.3	84.3	100.3	85.0	102.4	129.0	95.5		
<b>PM Peak</b>	1600	1500	1500	1700	1700	1200	1600		
	173.5	164.0	167.5	169.8	184.0	126.3	114.5		

\* - No data.



**From:** John McDonald  
**Sent:** Thursday, 7 July 2016 11:15 AM  
**To:** 'M.Jaceglav@murdoch.edu.au'  
**Cc:** Cr Carol Reeve-Fowkes - Deputy Mayor; Cr Kevin Allen; Cr Lyndsey Sweetman; Mayor - Logan K Howlett  
**Subject:** Rigby Avenue traffic counts (Customer Request EA16/0378)

Dear Ms Jaceglav

Thank you for your recent enquiry to the City's West Ward Councillors about the results of the latest traffic count on Rigby Avenue, which has been forwarded to the City's Engineering Services unit for a response.

A much longer than normal traffic survey was conducted in Rigby Avenue over 4 weeks from Thursday 28 April to Friday 27 May and the Average Weekday Traffic (AWT) volume during that survey period was 2,894 vehicles. A copy of the Virtual Week report for that survey period is attached for your information. The week by week volumes and a comparison with previous surveys is provided below:

Survey date	September 2013	September 2014	April 2015	Week 1 2016 (1.5 weekdays)	Week 2 2016	Week 3 2016	Week 4 2016	Week 5 2016 (4.5 weekdays)	Virtual (average d) AWT 2016
Weekday Traffic volume	2,912	2,732	2,948	2,970	2,898	2,904	2,862	2,844	2,894

The above information shows that average weekday traffic volumes during the survey period were fairly consistent, and that traffic volumes have generally been stable in Rigby Avenue during the last few years.


In regard to traffic data in Intramaps, please note that data from multiple traffic surveys completed at the same locations is viewable by choosing the survey location and then using the arrow keys at the top of the sidebar that appears on the right of the screen to view the summarised details of each survey. The location of those arrows is highlighted on the attached screenshot.

In the case of Rigby Avenue, the data from 9 previous surveys is viewable from a total of 3 sites, including data collected in 2013, 2014 and 2015. The data from the recent traffic survey in Rigby Avenue was added to our Traffic Database at the end of May and whilst it is visible in the version of Intramaps accessible by staff, and therefore should also be visible to the public, for unknown reasons it is not visible as you noted. I will request the City's GIS staff investigate and rectify this. Thank you for bringing that to the City's attention.

Regards

**John McDonald**  
Transport Engineer  
Road Planning and Development Services  
9 Coleville Crescent, Spearwood WA 6163  
PO Box 1215, Bibra Lake DC WA 6965  
P 08 9411 3444 F 08 9411 3333


[johnm@cockburn.wa.gov.au](mailto:johnm@cockburn.wa.gov.au)  
[www.cockburn.wa.gov.au](http://www.cockburn.wa.gov.au)





Screenshot from City of Cockburn Intramaps – Public (Traffic Count module)

View data from multiple surveys at the same location by using the arrows



Enquiries: Lynnette Jakovich, Ph: 9411 3571  
Our Ref: 450156

23 November 2016

Dear Residents

### **RIGBY AVENUE – PUBLIC INFORMATION SESSION**

I wish to invite you to attend a public information session with the Mayor and Ward Councilors on Tuesday 13 December to discuss the traffic issues in Rigby Avenue and your local area.

A number of requests/complaints regarding traffic volume and traffic speeding along Rigby Avenue were submitted to the City early this year and a report on this matter is planned to be included on the agenda for the February 2017 meeting of the Council.

The purpose of the information session is to explain to residents the issues that Engineering officers have been investigating for traffic management in the area.

The information session will be held from 6.30-7.30pm on Tuesday 13 December at:

1<sup>st</sup> Floor Function Room  
City of Cockburn Office  
9 Coleville Crescent  
Spearwood WA 6163

If you plan to attend this information session then we would appreciate if you could advise Lynnette Jakovich, Personal Assistant to Engineering and Planning Directors, by close of business on Tuesday 6 December on 9411 3571 or via email on [ljakovich@cockburn.wa.gov.au](mailto:ljakovich@cockburn.wa.gov.au).

Yours faithfully



Charles Sullivan  
**Director Engineering & Works**

**Resident 1**

Resident rang to say they have many times had cars go onto their front lawn at high speed because they had been speeding. They had patio equipment put on their front for a patio to go up today and a car had gone into it on the weekend and damaged the patio parts. The company is now assessing the damage and see what they can salvage and now parts will need to be replaced. Residents would like to see a round-about Cnr of Mell and Hamilton (which they asked for many years ago, but Council put one on Cnr King and Hamilton instead. Cars every Saturday night and sometimes during the week are flying around this corner or coming through the roundabout Cnr King and flying down Hamilton Road towards Hamilton Hill. Sometimes people are leaving Coogee Plaza shops and speeding away. Something needs to be done in this area and perhaps involve the Police. Resident lives in the area and will be attending the information session Tues 13 December.

**Resident 2**

I will be going into hospital to have an operation so won't be able to attend, here are my concerns:

There is no 50km/h around this area at all. Cars are constantly speeding along Penlake. Lisa, my wife and I have on many occasions nearly been missed or swiped by cars. We have to really stop and look at all these corners before proceeding onto the next road. It's not look at proceed; we need to stop, look and give way to everyone as many cars driving through here don't.

At the bottom of Gerovich near the paved intersection, there should be a "Give Way" sign, or markings on the road, from Mell Road past Gerovich towards Aspic but there is none.

There is a boat and 4WD parked in a driveway of a home and when these are parked there you cannot see for traffic or anything else past these vehicles. He is parked in his driveway but the vision is bad.

A 'Give-Way' or 'Stop sign' is needed at the intersection of Gerovich and Penlake T section from Mell Road towards Gerovich.

There is no 50km/h signs which are needed as traffic comes down Gerovich and turns into Penlake and speeds. Traffic is turning out and not looking. I know signs can't be everywhere but 1 or 2 in the vicinity would hopefully help.

**Resident 3**

Resident who received your letter to attend the public information session wants to know if anyone can send him some stats on speeding and know many people have reported this etc.

He thinks the people who are complaining are whinges. I said you were all in a meeting and get someone to call him back. 0417388128.

## Resident 4

Thanks for your letter about Rigby Avenue public awareness session which arrived last Thursday. Unfortunately I have another commitment on the evening planned for your information session Tuesday 13 December. I live in the area and use that intersection frequently. I have some feedback to share and some suggestions. I also have some other surrounding road/neighbourhood feedback to share.

It would be great to hear a summary of what are the actions to be taken by the Engineering Officers, given I cannot attend. And please let me know if you have any more questions about my feedback.

### My Feedback about Rigby Avenue

1. I observe cars cut the corner turning into Rigby Avenue from Rockingham Road (heading south on Rockingham Rd, turning right into Rigby Rd).
2. I observe cars cut the corner turning into Rigby Avenue from Mell Rd (heading North on Mell Rd, turning right into Rigby Rd).
3. I observe cars merging from the double lanes of Rockingham Road after the railway crossing (Heading south on Rockingham Rd) into single lane often do not indicate or keep left so that turning onto Rigby road is dangerous with cars almost hitting each other.
4. I observe lots of cars frequently go above the speed limit of 60KMH and ride close to my bumper on Rockingham Rd in both directions on Rockingham Rd around Rigby Rd. (heading north and south on Rockingham Rd around Rigby Ave).

### Suggestions

1. Could you put up a community safety sign around Rigby Ave that says something like 'Keep Safe, please don't cut the corner' visible to cars turning onto Rigby Ave.
2. Repaint the white lines and stopping line on intersection of Rockingham Rd and Rigby Ave.
3. Repaint the white lines and stopping line on intersection of Mell Rd and Rigby Ave.
4. Add signage for cars on Rockingham Rd indicating a turn approaching into Rigby Ave.
5. Permanent change in speed limit to 50kmh around Rigby Avenue, and for Rigby Avenue itself including community safety signs.
6. Periodic speed camera; implementing with warning infringements for a period on Rockingham Rd around Rigby Rd, and Rigby Rd.

Other nearby road feedback: Entrance Road after Pallett Road round-about heading toward Mell Rd.

1. I observe cars parked in non-parking bays, on the left and right verge with wheels on the road. Cars approach from Mell Rd very fast and it's very dangerous, in particular at night if you are coming from the Pallett Rd roundabout.

### Suggestions

1. Permanent change in speed limit to 50kmh on stretch of Entrance Rd after Pallett Road round-about toward Mell Rd. This borders the park and is good for foot traffic and bikes around the park too.
2. Add more cat-eye reflective markers to denote the center of the road as it's not very light at night in this bend/stretch of road.

**Resident 5**

Resident from Rigby Ave rang to say that the lady at No. 13 parks her car on the road side and it has caused accidents. Residents don't know why she needs to park on the road when she has an area to park.

**Resident 6**

Please be advised we will be attending this meeting on Tuesday 13 December. I trust interested and effected residents will also get a chance to have an opinion at this meeting. I use Rigby Avenue every day and my biggest concern is the inconsiderate residents at no 13 Rigby Avenue who continually park on the road causing issues with being so close to the corner of Plum Street. We have approached the ranger to ask no parking signs be erected in this street but he did nothing.

**Resident 7**

He rides his bike a lot around here and sees all this first hand.  
Rigby Ave has become a traffic hazard with many trucks using it.  
It becomes a shortcut from Hamilton Road.  
You cannot walk down here any more for the traffic, trucks, speeding etc.  
This has become a speedway as everyone speeds down this road.

**Resident 8**

Although through travel commitments I am unable to attend the proposed Public Information Session I wish to give my opinion on traffic dispersion in the Market Garden Swamp Area.

I have been resident in this area for 23 years and I am very surprised at the lack of alternate routes out of the area. I had friends who were resident on Rigby Ave 15 years ago and they moved due to the possibility of increased traffic due to future developments. All people and residents on Rigby Ave have every right to be concerned about traffic volume not necessarily speed (short street with a rise in elevation which tends to limit speed) however there is little alternative for MGS residents to access Rockingham Road.

Poor planning is the cause of the traffic problems in the area and no so called traffic management measures will change traffic volumes. All these measures just increase travel times and increase noise for those residents adjacent to, for instance speedbumps. Prevention of street parking on Rigby Ave will assist with safety of passage through the road.

There is in my opinion little that can be done to alter traffic flows in the area as there are limited exit points. These being Rigby Ave, Bramston Crt, Mell Rd, Gerovich Way. Unless the City is prepared to open new access points to the major roads in the MGS area those residents on these four thoroughfares will have to endure the vehicle traffic.





City of  
**Cockburn**




wetlands to waves

# Public information forum Rigby Avenue area traffic issues


13<sup>th</sup> December 2016







# Rigby Avenue















# Traffic data

	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Average Weekday Traffic (vehicles)	2,744	2,912	2,732	2,948	2,894
Average speed (km/h)	50	50	50	50	51
Operating speed (km/h)	58	57	57	57	59
Heavy vehicles (%)	2.6	3.5	5.4	5.4	5.8

# VEHICLE CLASSIFICATION SYSTEM

## AUSTROADS

CLASS	LIGHT VEHICLES
<b>1</b>	SHORT Car, Van, Wagon, 4WD, Utility, Bicycle, Motorcycle 
<b>2</b>	SHORT + TOWING Trailer, Caravan, Boat 
HEAVY VEHICLES	
<b>3</b>	TWO AXLE TRUCK OR BUS *2 axles 
<b>4</b>	THREE AXLE TRUCK OR BUS *3 axles, 2 axle groups 
<b>5</b>	FOUR (or FIVE) AXLE TRUCK *4 (5) axles, 2 axle groups 
<b>6</b>	THREE AXLE ARTICULATED *3 axles, 3 axle groups 
<b>7</b>	FOUR AXLE ARTICULATED *4 axles, 3 or 4 axle groups 
<b>8</b>	FIVE AXLE ARTICULATED *5 axles, 3+ axle groups 
<b>9</b>	SIX AXLE ARTICULATED *6 axles, 3+ axle groups or 7+ axles, 3 axle groups 
LONG VEHICLES AND ROAD TRAINS	
<b>10</b>	B DOUBLE or HEAVY TRUCK and TRAILER *7+ axles, 4 axle groups 
<b>11</b>	DOUBLE ROAD TRAIN *7+ axles, 5 or 6 axle groups 
<b>12</b>	TRIPLE ROAD TRAIN *7+ axles, 7+ axle groups 

Dwg No: 0293-009

Asset and Network Information - January 2002

# Rigby Avenue 5-year crash history

- Reported crashes from 1/1/2011–31/12/2015
- Between Mell Rd and Rockingham Rd = 1 minor mid-block crash in December 2015
- Rigby Ave/Mell Rd intersection = 0 crashes
- Rigby Ave/R'ham Rd intersection = 6 crashes



# Traffic Calming Warrant System (Policy SEW3)

- The City uses a Traffic Calming Warrant System to assess the need for, and priority of, traffic calming/management treatments
- The warrant system considers a number of factors including traffic and crash data; road geometry; activity generated by adjacent land uses; and amenity factors
- The current system was adopted by the Council in 2013
- The use of this type of system is consistent with National practice by Local Government Authorities



## City of Cockburn Traffic Management Warrant System

Road name: **Rigby Avenue (Road No. 1030156)**  
 Suburb: **Spearwood**  
 Location detail: **(SLK 0.02 - 0.29)**  
 Road classification: **Access road**  
 Reason for analysis: **Annual monitoring**

Analysis officer: John McDonald Date: 12/08/2016

*Table 1 – Warrant criteria and weightings*

**Note:** Maximum road length for each analysis = 500 metres

<b><u>PARAMETER</u></b>		<b><u>VALUE</u></b>	<b><u>SCORE</u></b>
Traffic speed		59	10
Traffic volume		2,894	14
Reported crash data (5-year period)	Fatalities	0	0
	Injuries	0	0
	Non-injuries	1	2
Road design and topography	Restricted sight crest curve	No	0
	Restricted sight horizontal curve	No	0
	Bends with unrestricted sight	No	0
	Steep hill	No	0
Vulnerable road users	Major bicycle or ped. crossing point	No	0
	Important bicycle route	No	0
Activity generators	College	No	0
	School	No	0
	Retail	No	0
Amenity factors	Heavy vehicles	5.8%	12
	Peak hour volume	9.1%	0
<b>Total:</b>			<b>38</b>

*Table 2: Intervention warrant*

A minor technical problem site - consider low cost non-capital works solutions.

# Traffic Calming Warrant System (Council Policy SEW3)

- July 2012: Score = 28
- August 2016: Score = 38

**Table 2: Intervention warrants**

Total point score	Decision	Action response
Less than 30 points	Considered to be a site with low safety and amenity concerns.	No further action required
30 to 50 points	Considered to be a minor technical problem site.	Consider low cost non-capital works solutions (e.g. traffic signs and pavement markings), if appropriate. Review again after 2 years.
More than 50	Considered to be a technical problem site	Considered to be a site that has problems. Identify suitable solutions for consideration for funding and implementation.

# Comparison to other roads

Road	Average weekday traffic volume	Operating speed (km/h)	Heavy vehicles	Warrant system score
Mell Road	2,234	59	3.8%	31.8
<b><i>Rigby Avenue</i></b>	<b><i>2,894</i></b>	<b><i>59</i></b>	<b><i>5.8%</i></b>	<b><i>38</i></b>
Fawcett Road	622	66	5.5%	48
Barrington St	5,261	64	5.4%	53
Ocean Road	1,388	67	8.8%	62
Gwilliam Drive	6,779	58	5.8%	71.5
Osprey Drive	8,713	61	5.1%	89

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1995**

***City of Cockburn Parking and Parking Facilities Amendment Local Law 2017***

Under the powers conferred by the *Local Government Act 1995* and under all other powers enabling it, the Council of the City of Cockburn resolved on..... to adopt the following local law.

**1. Citation**

This local law may be cited as the *City of Cockburn Parking and Parking Facilities Amendment Local Law 2017*.

**2. Commencement**

This local law will commence 14 days after the date of the publication in the *Government Gazette*.

**3. Principal Local Laws**

This Local Law *City of Cockburn Parking and Parking Facilities Local Law 2007* published in the *Government Gazette* on 11 January 2008 and as amended on 16 May 2014, 26 September 2014 and 21 July 2015.

**4. Schedule 1 amended**

Insert the following after clause (2):

(3) Parking Station 3, Lot 125, 126 Poletti Road, Cockburn Central.


Dated:

The Common Seal of the City of Cockburn was affixed by authority of a resolution of the Council in the presence of -

LOGAN HOWLETT, Mayor.

STEPHEN CAIN, Chief Executive Officer.







**The Aboriginal Reference Group Consultation Report February 2017**

**City of Cockburn Australia Day Celebrations  
Aboriginal Reference Group (ARG) Recommendations & Responses**

***Relevant questions for discussion:***

1. Are ARG members in agreement for these Aboriginal cultural activities to take place on January 26, and is there anything in addition that they'd like to see there, or in future years? (it could be cultural or healing activities, if agreed to).
2. Is there anything further that ARG members would like to discuss in regard to the 'fireworks' or Australia Day celebrations, over the next year?
3. Is it appropriate to conduct cultural and/or healing activities on the 26<sup>th</sup>?
4. The Grant and Donations request for \$25,000.

**Summary**

These four questions were presented as discussion points and people responded verbally in the consultation meeting and in writing through email correspondence. I have summarized these views and comments and present them in this report.

Australia Day represents many things to the modern Australian citizen of 2017. There is the historical perspective of British Australia, the multicultural perspective of modern Australia, the citizenship celebration of our newest arrivals and the *forgotten* perspective of the First Peoples of Australia. It was from this perspective (forgotten/not represented) that ARG members wanted change to occur.

People generally felt supportive of the fact that it was too late to make changes to the arrangements for the 2017 event, however they were clear about making changes to the way the City of Cockburn engaged with the Aboriginal community about Australia Day events post 2017. In terms of the date and the decision by City of Fremantle, 3 members thought Council should follow suit with City of Fremantle and change the date completely. All members did not see the Australia Day event/date as a celebration, unless it was in the context of 'survival' (of Aboriginal peoples and our cultures). All members also expressed concerns about how community perspectives were represented by those community members who participated in events and activities. For example, cultural and healing activities that were conducted as part of the overall event, could be misconstrued by Non---Indigenous Australians as endorsements of/for the 'celebrations' of the day/date. All members felt there needed to be a stronger statement made by Council of the acknowledgment and respect for Indigenous Australians' perspectives on this specific date and what it actually represented for our peoples – ie. the beginning of our traumatic history. This statement could also serve to clarify the conflicting views between celebrating arrival and celebrating survival.

Members stated various concerns around the cultural activities of the Australia Day celebrations. Primarily, that the participation of Aboriginal people was not for the purpose of celebrating the date, but more about stating the struggles endured, the healing still required and the resilience and strength of Australia's First Peoples. As a part of the planning process it was clearly stated that a slower, more comprehensive engagement process (carried out over the 12 months prior to the date) be committed to as a means of demonstrating Council's compassion, understanding and commitment to its Indigenous community. The ARG committed to provide the guidance and support to Council as part of this strategy. All members were committed to working openly and collaboratively with Council over the next calendar year.



***List of Activities & recommendations:***

1. Conducting pro-active and interactive workshops with key personnel in CoC around protocols/procedures concerning sacred knowledge/sites etc
  - i. Dealing with this business in an appropriate and sensitive and respectful way – where Nyungar and Aboriginal people are thoroughly consulted and engaged.
2. Comprehensive consultation process (over the next 12 months) to 'slow the process down' in order to get a better outcome through proper engagement with community
3. Consideration to change the date – like City of Fremantle, would Council consider this?
4. Citizenship ceremony – having Nyungar engagement at ceremony to conduct welcome to country, smoking ceremony etc.
5. Statement of commitment read by Mayor at beach party and potentially at ALL ceremonies (words to be consistent with RAP and previous levels of commitment from Council – eg. 'Speaker' to use phrase "Wanju Wadjuk Budjar" somewhere in the statement...)
6. Nyungar protocols to be recognized/stated and implemented across all business of Council.
7. Generally a statement that is a 'reminder' that we are still here...
8. Support Quoborup Open Forum – focus on language and its teaching.
9. Expanding the 'Bush Babies' project as a means of promoting survival and resilience.
10. Men's & Women's areas to be recognized and acknowledged more prominently.
11. Use of appropriate language – 'ancient culture & customs', 'Nyungar culture alive and thriving, still standing strong' .... Proactive, assertive and current.
12. Language to represent current situation more appropriately – present not past tense...

### **ARG Member personal statements:**

The City of Cockburn has no responsibility or onus to this group of business owners, to provide them with such support!

If the City of Cockburn (by way of majority) supports the basis of what the City of Fremantle is trying to do, then surely the City of Cockburn's best foot forward at this level is to back the City of Fremantle and NOT seek to undermine this, by enabling a group, who refuse to discuss this properly, in the first place!

Try as I might, I can't see this group actually wanting to commit to the cultural ideals that the City of Cockburn espouses too! Why would the City want to undo the hard work it has achieved at this point, to support this group, given its cultural aims in its own community?

*... Asking Aboriginal people to 'heal' was inappropriate according to some – like to suggest that we should heal ourselves in order to get over this – we can only heal if we are shown the appropriate levels of compassion, empathy and respect for what we have endured, the impact we still feel (around the public debate on key dates/issues like this).*

...we could identify 5 major issues affecting many of our community members and consider sharing the money to the most appropriate organisations? (This was regarding the \$20k sought by FIBD).

Representing mob from other country (alongside Elder/s as part of the welcome to country ceremony at citizenship ceremony) is empowering. That's empowering our culture I think.

...participating in citizenship ceremonies on Australia Day could be a very empowering experience as a part of that healing journey for Indigenous (First) Australians and those people who become Australian citizens on the day – inclusive culture.

...it would be good if on that day they can do more cultural and healing activities?

I don't think non---Indigenous Australia has the right to use the word 'healing or cultural' where Aboriginal people's perspectives are concerned – this is for us to determine.

Shire of Cockburn consults with the ARG and the meaning of that day to most Aboriginal and Torres Strait islanders in the community, we work together to come up with a statement for future events.

Acknowledgment of the true history of what that day actually means for our people.

No I don't support the City of Cockburn's Australia Day event.



## AUSTRALIA DAY FIREWORKS REVIEW CONSULTANT REPORT

prepared by  
PROJECT3

prepared for  
CITY OF COCKBURN

project  
2018 AUSTRALIA DAY FIREWORKS EVENT

date  
31 JANUARY 2017

events.  
digital.  
marketing.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	Executive Summary .....	3
2.0	Background .....	4
2.1	Australia Day Fireworks	
2.2	City of Fremantle	
2.3	SWOT Analysis	
3.0	Consultation .....	7
3.1	Stakeholders	
3.2	Feedback	
4.0	Concept Development .....	10
4.1	Potential Locations	
4.2	Format	
4.3	Production	
5.0	Operational Considerations .....	16
5.1	Spectator Management	
5.2	Traffic & Parking Management	
5.3	Public Transport	
5.4	Environmental Considerations	
5.5	Labour & Resource Considerations	
6.0	Commercial Considerations .....	20
6.1	Sponsorship Opportunity	
6.2	Community Economic Benefit	
6.3	Budget	
7.0	Appendix	
	Howard & Sons Report	
	Expenditure budget detail	

© PROJECT3

This document is and shall remain the property of Project3 Pty Ltd. The document may only be used for the purpose for which it was commissioned and in accordance with the Terms of Engagement for the commission. Unauthorised use of this document in any form whatsoever is prohibited.

PHONE: 08 9314 3820  
8/11 MILSON PLACE, O'CONNOR 6163  
[WWW.PROJECT3.COM](http://WWW.PROJECT3.COM)  
[INFO@PROJECT3.COM](mailto:INFO@PROJECT3.COM)  
ABN 25 874 014 092

## 1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The City of Cockburn recently requested quotes from event management contractors to prepare a report on the viability of an Australia Day Fireworks event.

Consultation was undertaken with internal and external stakeholder to gather feedback and provide an informed recommendation on how such an event could be delivered in Cockburn.

It is recommended that the only viable location for a display of the size and nature that is desired would be off Coogee Beach. The fireworks could be launched from a barge approximately 350m offshore to mitigate environmental and bushfire risks.

This location would also provide for the largest spectator viewing areas while also highlighting the picturesque coastal environment to the public. Attendance numbers would be anticipated as approximately 10,000 – 15,000 dependent on the level of promotion that was conducted.

It is advised that detailed cultural consultation is undertaken before any decision to proceed is made. The Fremantle Council decision has begun a public discussion about the potential insensitivities of such an event and if there was not well documented consultation that supported the introduction of the event the Cockburn Council may be opening themselves to the possibility of significant negative public relations.

It is unlikely that any firework display would attract the crowd numbers that Fremantle received with limited entertainment and restaurant venues in the Coogee Beach area. There is also the risk that a new event may impact on the success of the Australia Day morning event and split crowds between the two events, rather than increase overall crowds.

Key Recommendations should the event proceed:

- Detailed consultation with the Aboriginal Reference Group and Aboriginal Elders is undertaken prior to any decision (underway)
- Coogee Beach, with fireworks launched off shore, is the recommended location based on consultation, feedback and risk mitigation

## 2.0 BACKGROUND

### 2.1 AUSTRALIA DAY EVENTS

The City of Perth hosts the annual Skyworks fireworks and laser light show on Australia Day. The event has grown exponentially over time with numerous areas of entertainment across Perth and South Perth, including Survival Perth concert that celebrates Aboriginal culture.

Approximately 300,000 people attend the event at the various locations. The operational planning and delivery is extensive with support and collaboration from all agencies. The City of Perth are major funders, also enjoying support from Lotterywest, 7West Media and 9.45fm.

While Skyworks is very popular and for the most part a highly successful event, there are a number of well documented social issues that go with such a large scale event of this nature. Large scale complex events such as this also carry crowd and participant safety risks and while the likelihood is low, it can have significant impact as seen at the 2017 event.

<http://www.visitperthcity.com/skyworks>



Other local governments such as Armadale, Bassendean, Hillarys, Mindarie and Wanneroo have previously held Australia Day fireworks. The City of Armadale still hosts a successful Australia Day small scale fireworks event as part of their community celebrations.

<https://www.armadale.wa.gov.au/events/australia-day-armadale-0>



<http://www.communitynews.com.au/comment/news/city-of-armadale-to-push-on-with-australia-day-fireworks/>


Following the media interest in the City of Fremantle, the City of Bayswater council expressed interest in hosting an Australia Day Fireworks event at a river location.

<http://www.communitynews.com.au/eastern-reporter/news/bayswater-councillor-calls-for-australia-day-fireworks/>

## 2.2 CITY OF FREMANTLE

In August the City of Fremantle announced they no longer wanted to continue with the Indian Ocean Fireworks event on Australia Day. The reasoning behind this decision was cited as cultural considerations and based on Fremantle residents and Aboriginal Elders feedback.

The City of Fremantle have since announced an event to be held two days after Australia Day on the 28 January, called One Day. This new event will deliver live music and culturally inclusive performances and has met with conflicting and at times extreme feedback, both positive and negative. However the City of Fremantle has reported a successful event with approximately 15,000 in attendance.



Fremantle Traders subsequently joined forces to plan and deliver a smaller fireworks event on Australia Day. The fireworks were launched from the groyne beside Fremantle Sailing Club. The display was sizeable and attracted approximately 10,000 spectators.

<https://heraldonlinejournal.com/2016/09/30/private-fireworks-approved/>

Following is a selection of news reports following the story as it unfolded:

<http://www.watoday.com.au/wa-news/fremantle-cancels-culturally-insensitive-australia-day-fireworks-20160825-gr0n6z.html>

<http://www.watoday.com.au/wa-news/aboriginal-leader-warren-mundine-labels-freo-fireworks-snob-a-silly-mistake-20160826-gr1rto.html>

<http://www.news.com.au/national/breaking-news/council-fireworks-ban-bad-for-business/news-story/58032e02bffa89120e02afb5cee31457>

<http://www.abc.net.au/news/2016-11-25/fremantle-axes-australia-day-celebrations-changes-to-january-28/8057116>

<http://www.abc.net.au/news/2016-11-25/fremantle-axes-australia-day-celebrations-changes-to-january-28/8057116>

<http://www.fremantle.wa.gov.au/celebrate-australia-one-day-fremantle>

### 2.3 SWOT ANALYSIS

The following assessment considered the event opportunity as outlined in the City of Cockburn scope and consultancy brief. The analysis is also based on industry knowledge, experience and comparable events and outcomes.

Often aspects of strength can also be a weakness and with focus on specific areas threats can be turned into opportunity.

STRENGTH	OPPORTUNITY
Elected member interest in event Local business community support Experienced contractors/suppliers Visually appealing venue option at Coogee Beach	Opportunity to raise awareness of area Future economic benefit Engagement with stakeholders and community groups
WEAKNESS	THREAT
Committed budget allocations Public transport large scale access Traffic & Parking Management Lack of local restaurants and public amenities to service attendees Questionable attendance from outside Cockburn Less value for investment compared to other unique events	Competing events in other areas Additional funding required Risk management on event Cultural considerations Negative PR associated with the Fremantle event Social issues associated with the event Stretched resources

## 3.0 CONSULTATION

### 3.1 STAKEHOLDERS

External Agency	Name	Contact
DFES	Paul Maddern	<a href="mailto:CESMCockburn@dfes.wa.gov.au">CESMCockburn@dfes.wa.gov.au</a>
SES Cockburn	Allison Lamb	<a href="mailto:allilamb@hotmail.com">allilamb@hotmail.com</a>
Dept Potroleum & Mines	Iain Danty	9222 3333
Dept Transport	Simon Miller	1300 863 308
Public Transport Auth	Sophie Cicchini	<a href="mailto:sophie.cicchini@pta.wa.gov.au">sophie.cicchini@pta.wa.gov.au</a>
DEC	Sound Management Council	6467 5454
Cockburn Police	James Bradley	<a href="mailto:james.bradley@police.wa.gov.au">james.bradley@police.wa.gov.au</a>
Dept of Health	Sherie Sampson	<a href="mailto:sherie.sampson@health.wa.gov.au">sherie.sampson@health.wa.gov.au</a>
Coogee Caravan Park	Andrew Clout	<a href="mailto:andrew.clout@gmail.com">andrew.clout@gmail.com</a>
Australia Day Council WA	Anne-Marie Farley	<a href="mailto:amfarley@ausdaywa.com.au">amfarley@ausdaywa.com.au</a>
Howard & Sons	Shayne Lewis	<a href="mailto:shayne@howardsfireworks.com.au">shayne@howardsfireworks.com.au</a>
Coogee Beach SLSC	Kelly	<a href="mailto:clubadministrator@cbslsc.com.au">clubadministrator@cbslsc.com.au</a>
Internal Department	Name	Contact
Director Community Services	Don Green	<a href="mailto:don@cockburn.wa.gov.au">don@cockburn.wa.gov.au</a>
Director Finance Services	Stuart Downing	<a href="mailto:stuartd@cockburn.wa.gov.au">stuartd@cockburn.wa.gov.au</a>
Manager Corporate Communications	Sam Seymour Eyles	<a href="mailto:sseymour@cockburn.wa.gov.au">sseymour@cockburn.wa.gov.au</a>
Events Officer	Sandra Edgar	<a href="mailto:sedgar@cockburn.wa.gov.au">sedgar@cockburn.wa.gov.au</a>
Community Development Coordinator	Simone Sieber	<a href="mailto:ssieber@cockburn.wa.gov.au">ssieber@cockburn.wa.gov.au</a>
Grants Officer	Melissa Bolland	<a href="mailto:mbolland@cockburn.wa.gov.au">mbolland@cockburn.wa.gov.au</a>
Recreation Development Officer	Nathan Johnston	<a href="mailto:njohnston@cockburn.wa.gov.au">njohnston@cockburn.wa.gov.au</a>
Manager Community Development	Rob Avard	<a href="mailto:rob@cockburn.wa.gov.au">rob@cockburn.wa.gov.au</a>
Manager Parks and Environment	Anton Lees	<a href="mailto:alees@cockburn.wa.gov.au">alees@cockburn.wa.gov.au</a>
Manager Health Services	Nick Jones	<a href="mailto:njones@cockburn.wa.gov.au">njones@cockburn.wa.gov.au</a>
Environmental Health Officer	Rob Biddiscombe	<a href="mailto:rbiddiscombe@cockburn.wa.gov.au">rbiddiscombe@cockburn.wa.gov.au</a>
Health Promotions Officer	Gilly Street	<a href="mailto:gstreet@cockburn.wa.gov.au">gstreet@cockburn.wa.gov.au</a>
Environment Manager	Chris Beaton	<a href="mailto:cbeaton@cockburn.wa.gov.au">cbeaton@cockburn.wa.gov.au</a>
Sustainability Officer	Melanie Bainbridge	<a href="mailto:mbainbridge@cockburn.wa.gov.au">mbainbridge@cockburn.wa.gov.au</a>
Enviro & Waste Education Officer	Clare Dunn	<a href="mailto:Cdunn@cockburn.wa.gov.au">Cdunn@cockburn.wa.gov.au</a>
Manager Engineering services	Jadranka Kuiurski	<a href="mailto:jkuiurski@cockburn.wa.gov.au">jkuiurski@cockburn.wa.gov.au</a>
Transport Engineer	John Mc Donald	<a href="mailto:jmcdonald@cockburn.wa.gov.au">jmcdonald@cockburn.wa.gov.au</a>
Project Manager Facilities	Peter McCullach	<a href="mailto:pmccullach@cockburn.wa.gov.au">pmccullach@cockburn.wa.gov.au</a>
Waste Collection Coordinator	Mickey Danilov	<a href="mailto:mdanilov@cockburn.wa.gov.au">mdanilov@cockburn.wa.gov.au</a>
Ranger and Community Safety Services	Bruce Mentz	<a href="mailto:bmentz@cockburn.wa.gov.au">bmentz@cockburn.wa.gov.au</a>
Travel Smart Officer	Jillian Woolmer	<a href="mailto:jwoolmer@cockburn.wa.gov.au">jwoolmer@cockburn.wa.gov.au</a>
Marina & Coastal Manager	Joanna Garcia-Webb	<a href="mailto:jgarcia@cockburn.wa.gov.au">jgarcia@cockburn.wa.gov.au</a>

## 3.2 FEEDBACK

In summary, the feedback (both internal and external) was for the most part not supportive of a firework event on Australia Day for varied reasons. Notwithstanding that, many agencies that raised concerns would still provide appropriate approvals for a firework event provided it complied with all relevant guidelines and regulations and was professionally managed by contractors and suppliers experienced in delivering these types of events.

Feedback from internal stakeholders within the City of Cockburn favoured investigating other entertainment alternatives to a firework display if there was a desire to progress with an evening event.

Following are summary points of feedback where deemed relevant and helpful to inform decision making:

### External Agencies:

- Risk of bushfire was raised by a number of agencies and obviously the key consideration for DFES. They recommended the Coogee Beach offshore location as the most easily managed from a risk perspective.
- Crowd management was highlighted as a key consideration by the police. This was not raised directly as a concern, more something that will require careful management given the recommended location and lack of existing amenities for the public.
- SES strongly recommended the Coogee Beach location over any other.
- Feedback from the Australia Day Council, not surprisingly, was very supportive of any Australia Day event. They had some helpful feedback around cultural inclusion and it would be advisable to consult with them should the concept progress further to take their key learnings on board from other events, specifically the Survival Perth concert.
- Health Dept raised no specific concerns however felt there were challenges to the location that may limit the number of attendees that could safely be accommodated.
- The Coogee Beach Surf Life Saving Club were strongly supportive of an event of this nature, or any other event not limited to fireworks, welcoming any opportunity to work with the City of Cockburn to deliver large public events.

### Internal Departments:

- Risk of bushfire due to the increased fuel loads at the time of year were a concern for a number of departments however a barge launch location would largely mitigate this.
- Environmental considerations were also raised across the board. Citing concerns to wildlife from falling debris and related waste but also potential contamination of the waters off Coogee Beach and the associated impact on recreational and commercial fishing activity.

- On water management of an exclusion zone was also raised as a concern. The Skyworks event has certain safety advantages with the layout of the bridges which makes the exclusion zones easier to manage. This would be a consideration which could become complex should there be strong swell.
- Noise pollution was raised by a number of departments, not just from an environmental and wildlife perspective but also for noise sensitive groups and the related stress that a firework event could cause.
- Concern was raised over the internal resources and public holiday costs of the City to support and effectively manage an event of this size. The operational delivery by contractors is not in question, more the services that can't be outsourced such as ranger services to manage all associated issues that will arise such as noise complaints and illegal parking.





## 4.0 CONCEPT DEVELOPMENT

### 4.1 POTENTIAL LOCATIONS

A number of locations have been considered through the consultation and assessment process. The recommend venue based on feedback through consultation is off Coogee Beach. However the following venues were considered as potential viable locations:

**Cockburn Central** – a specific location for the launch of the fireworks was not assessed as it is likely that by January 2018 the development of the area would have progressed significantly. This location could deliver a similar event to the fireworks that are delivered in Armadale. However it was thought that given the accessibility and public amenity available in the area it would be viable although a smaller fireworks display than desired would be delivered.

#### Positive

- Accessibility for attendees
- Public Transport network existing
- Restaurants and cafes to service customers and provide an economic boost to local business

#### Negative

- Limited space for exclusion zones would require small shell sizes only to be launched
- Risk management concerns from emergency services
- Lack of support from internal departments for location






**Port Coogee Marina** – the fireworks could be launched from the groyne at the marina which will provide an easy to control, land based exclusion and launch zone. The launch location when considering likely wind conditions will necessitate a smaller shell size which will also reduce the viewing areas.

Positive

- Land based launch is cost effective
- Benefit to promote new Port Coogee developments

Negative

- Small shell sizes will be required due to exclusion zones
- Limited viewing areas
- Fire risk concern to boats in marina
- Accessibility and for patrons and vehicles will be limited



**Coogee Beach Jetty** – the fireworks could be launched from the end of the jetty which will provide an easy to control, land based exclusion and launch zone. The launch location when considering likely wind conditions will necessitate a smaller shell size, Viewing will be better than from the marina however the reduced size of shell will reduce the viable viewing up and down the beach.


Positive

- Land based launch is cost effective
- Existing event management plans for the Coogee Beach Reserve area
- Improved spectator viewing locations

Negative

- Small shell sizes will be required due to exclusion zones
- Usable space on jetty will restrict the amount of shells that can be launched

- Fire risk concern to jetty infrastructure
- Proximity of display will require a swimming/water access ban during the display




**Barge off Coogee Beach**– A barge increases cost for labour and infrastructure however allow increased shell sizes to be launched which improves the size of display and viewing areas. The barge location can also be adjusted based on wind conditions to deliver the optimal viewing and reduce risk. The increased display size also increases viewing areas

#### Positive

- Increased viewing areas to include Coogee Beach SLSC
- Existing event management plans for the Coogee Beach Reserve area
- Optimal spectator viewing locations
- Preferred location from internal City of Cockburn departments

#### Negative

- Increased cost for labour and barge infrastructure



## 4.2 FORMAT

The recommended venue for the fireworks display is from a barge off Coogee Beach. The adjacent area will require a number of key spectator viewing areas to support the public attending. The main parking and access point will dictate that the Coogee Beach Reserve would make the sensible choice for the main hub of activity for the public.

The Coogee Beach SLSC has indicated strong interest in developing a schedule of activities to also welcome the public to their venue for this event or any other large scale event. This will ease the pressure somewhat on Coogee Beach Reserve that would anticipated to be at capacity.

The Australia Day morning event, if maintained, will enable some infrastructure share however will also make it a very long day for some providers, contractors and staff. The timing of a firework event would be recommended to start later in the afternoon to ease the pressure on staff and allow for appropriate turn around and bump in time for the site crew and contractors.



## 4.2 PRODUCTION

Initial interest has been expressed by 96fm to do a simulcast and outside broadcast of the fireworks display. This would enable a choreographed pyromusical display in conjunction with Howard & Sons and designed based on the preferred duration, launch location and budget.

An offshore barge location is suggested to increase the spectator viewing area with a larger shell size being possible. This will also allow for a greater choice of displays with an increase in size of shell. With the prevailing wind being onshore it is suggested that the barge location only is utilized which will mean that it will only be an aerial firework display.

To complement the firework display creative site lighting of infrastructure and the sand dunes can be implemented, budget permitting, to increase the appeal of the location however this is likely to only be possible in the central locations given the cost of equipment hire and installation.

Live music performances pre and post firework display can be held on the stage on Coogee Beach Reserve. It would be proposed that local performers and community or school groups are programmed to encourage attendance from within the region.

As recommended in the budget, there would be minimal difference in the firework display by increasing the budget by only a few thousand. Therefore it would be suggested that with an increased budget the level and profile of entertainment was increased with the possibility of also providing live performances at the Coogee Beach SLSC.

A suggested schedule and timing of activity could be as follows:

4.30pm	Site ready for the public
5pm	Food vendors open
	Market stalls open
	Live music performances on stage by local artists
	Childrens performances and activities
	Culturally inclusive performances
	Outside broadcasts by radio simulcast partner
7.30pm	Welcome to Country and Introduction on stage
8pm	Firework display – 20 mins
8.20pm	Food vendors continue to trade
	Low level live music performances continue
9pm	Close

Notes:

- Children's activities and performances could include dance, theatre, craft participation activities. Involvement and participation in the activities lead by experience educators

and performers would be recommended rather than passive entertainment.

- It would be suggested that food vendors and some live performances continue at the conclusion of the fireworks to allow a staged egress of the public to avoid everyone departing on mass. This will also reduce the impact on any public transport network and the traffic and parking egress.
- It would be anticipated that people would want to locate themselves on the beach to view the fireworks so it may be a case of the reserve not being the centre of activity. It would be recommended that roving and moveable entertainment options such as street buskers and live performers are engaged to perform on the beach and rove through the crowds.
- The above schedule could be mirrored at the Coogee Beach SLSC and effectively managed in house by them with support on ingress and egress of the public and crowd management.
- The Omeo Park viewing area could have a reduce version of the Coogee Beach reserve with food vendors, roving entertainment and basic amenities.
- Should at any stage daylight savings be implemented in WA, the timing would need to be revised.

It is anticipated that attendance at the Coogee Beach Australia Day fireworks event is likely to be predominantly from within the City of Cockburn with potential for interest from some residents from the surrounding suburbs. With the lack of additional attractors to the area in the form of restaurants or bars, we believe that the appeal will be relatively low to justify the public travelling from further afield. A risk is that the two events will end up splitting the attendance between the morning and evening events, rather than attracting new people to the area.

## 5.0 OPERATIONAL CONSIDERATIONS

The following operational considerations are assuming a preferred launch location from a barge off Coogee Beach based on consultation from both internal and external stakeholders.

### 5.1 SPECTATOR AREAS

Assuming the preferred launch location is from a barge off Coogee Beach the following main spectator areas are highlighted. Viewing would be good all the way along the beach however accessibility for some attendees may be limited. The spectator areas would require basic amenities such as toilets, food, beverage and shade.

**Omeo Park** - A central and easily accessible location that will provide for a good view for local residents. Limited amenities available and parking is restricted however the grassed area could accommodate a small serviced spectator area.





**Coogee Beach Reserve** - A well serviced space that has a good track record in hosting events. Existing facilities however no access to power.



**Coogee Beach Surf Lifesaving Club** - The Coogee Beach Surf Lifesaving Club is very supportive of the concept and would welcome the opportunity to encourage the public to attend. The Surf Life Saving Club would also offer a suitable venue for a VIP function if desired.



## 5.2 TRAFFIC & PARKING MANAGEMENT

There are established operational plans for traffic and parking management along Cockburn road adjacent to Coogee Beach Reserve. It is believed that this area can accommodate parking for approximately 7,000 patrons. The management plans for this location however have only been tested in daytime conditions. Darkness will bring a new element to the management of this area and will quite likely require increased labour and lighting

infrastructure to safely implement a traffic and pedestrian management plan from the parking area.

A Traffic Management plan of this size requires significant consultation and preparation by licensed professionals and will need to be approved by Police and Main Roads.

The surrounding areas are likely to also be impacted by illegal parking which may require increased ranger services to ensure that the local residents are too negatively impacted as well as deal with complaints.

### **5.3 PUBLIC TRANSPORT**

The only viable temporary public transport services that could be implemented are increased bus services. Dedicated free public transport could be implemented from either Fremantle or Cockburn Central train stations.

The suggested drop off locations would be clearly identified and signposted points along Cockburn Road. The directional flow of drop offs and pick ups would suggest a south to north direction to reduce the amount of patrons crossing Cockburn Road. Bus stop locations would need to consider patron queue safety which will require increased lighting to safely implement as well as marshals to assist.

Free public transport networks are well established and often expected at major public events. They can be effective in transporting large numbers of patrons quickly and clearing the area however they are expensive to implement.

Encouraging other forms of transport such as walking or bike riding would also be advised to reduce the impact on the road network as well as improve the environmental impact. It would be recommended that secure and accessible bike parking be provided and promoted.

### **5.4 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS**

Fireworks are well known to have a negative impact on the environment with significant debris and waste generated in the firing process. This debris is a consideration for both ocean and land based wildlife. Chemical residue can also have an ongoing impact and it is difficult to clearly assess associated impact until after the event.

There are also prevailing weather conditions and increased fuel loads that raise the risk of bushfires at that time of year which will impact on the preferred launch locations. Significant concern is raised in relation to this from both internal and external departments and agencies.

Any outdoor event is subject to the environment conditions at the time. This increases the risk also of cancellation or impact to patron safety depending on weather conditions, with either extreme heat or storm conditions a risk.

## **5.5 LABOUR & RESOURCE CONSIDERATIONS**

It is anticipated that should the current Australia Day morning event continue that an outside event contractor would be required to successfully plan and implement the evening event. It is likely that an outside contractor would be needed regardless to accommodate the increased complexity of aspects such as traffic and crowd management for such an event.

Additional resource may be needed to safely implement the normal resident support and services offered by the local authority for such an event, particularly in year one of introduction.

Australia Day is one of the busiest days of the year in the event industry and suppliers and contractors will be stretched across the state. This not only increases costs compared to other times of the year but would also require an early decision to ensure that competent and experience contractors were available and equipment and infrastructure bookings were confirmed well in advance.

## 6.0 COMMERCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

### 6.1 SPONSORSHIP OPPORTUNITY

A number of potential key partners were approached for an initial opinion on the likelihood of funding success should the City of Cockburn wish to proceed with an Australia Day Fireworks event. The following feedback was gained through discussion:

#### **Healthway – Shane Pavlinovich, Arts Program Manager**

Healthway don't normally support community fireworks events as they don't tend to offer the opportunity to promote their health messages effectively. Exceptions to this rule would be if a community or council were putting on additional community and family activities in the day and period leading up to the fireworks.

One example of where they do sponsor the community Australia Day fireworks is in The City of Albany. This is because they offer a number of activities throughout the day before the fireworks which attracts 1,000's of people and allows Healthway to promote their messages in a more conducive atmosphere and environment.

#### **Lotterywest – Lucy Renolds, Grants Manager.**

Lucy highlighted that Lotterywest love supporting community entertainment events and therefore although they do strongly support the Skyworks event in Perth they would also consider supporting other local community fireworks events in addition.

It was thought that there was the opportunity for a successful funding application. However the level of funding would most likely be significantly less than that of Skyworks, closer to approximately \$20,000. No funding is guaranteed and would be assessed on its merits and opportunity at the time of submission.

#### **Cockburn Gateway – Andrew Wilkinson, Marketing Manager**

Andrew advised that this is something he would have to discuss with the owners of the property and highlighted that he wasn't sure it would be something that they would support due to the media attention that Fremantle received from this. He also said that he thought that given the centre would be closed at the time of the fireworks it would not be seen as a viable opportunity to drive customers.

There did seem to be interest in the other activities that the City were putting on at the Australia Day morning event and suggested that this was more in line with the events that they would support as it would provide them with an opportunity to drive people into their centre.

**Suppliers** – Initial discussions with a number of suppliers indicated that Australia Day is one of the busiest days of the year for them. Given this it is unlikely that any in kind support could be offered particularly given the scope of the requirements.

**Media Partners** – Should the decision to proceed with a fireworks event be made then more detailed discussions could be initiated with media partners and it is likely that some level of support would be provided. They were hesitant to engage in meaningful discussions until a decision to proceed was taken.

## 6.2 COMMUNITY ECONOMIC BENEFIT

The following potential economic benefit has been assessed based on location:

### **Coogee Beach Reserve**

While the Coogee Beach Reserve location offers the optimum viewing and maximizes any potential attendance capacity, we believe it will offer relatively little economic benefit to the area. There are limited businesses that would be in a position to benefit from the increased foot traffic and trade potential. A number of businesses within the Port Coogee marina may experience increased trade and the Coogee Beach Cafe, if they are in a position to open at the time, would have an opportunity for increased trade.

The Coogee Beach Surf Life Saving Club would be the most likely business to benefit from the event being held. The Australia Day morning event would already drive traffic to the venue however the addition of a fireworks event would lengthen the potential time of increased foot traffic.

If the attendance projection is not significantly increased over and above the current attendance at the morning event then it is unlikely that any significant increase in localized economic benefit would be seen.

### **Cockburn Central**

There is a greater opportunity for increased economic benefit to the area were the event to be held within the Cockburn Central precinct. However this timing again will not benefit all businesses given that it is a public holiday and the event would see the greatest attendance in the evening.

Restaurants and related businesses would be the most likely to benefit from the event through increased attendance in the area. There would definitely be an increase opportunity however it is important to note that the Fremantle restaurants and related businesses are very experienced in servicing increased crowds at holiday and event periods. It is not always easy for businesses to scale up to benefit from an opportunity like this as a one off if they do not do this regularly.



### 6.3 BUDGET

The following budget details a topline breakdown of expected expenditure, given two cost options. The following breakdown on each section details where the increase from option 1 to option 2 are and what the increase would deliver.

The increases in option 2 can be selected as required, with not all aspects having to be included, rather giving the upper limit budget option. The budget has been prepared considering that an outside contractor would be engaged to plan and deliver as a minimum the operational aspects of the event, with the option to engage an all-encompassing event manager to also manage marketing and sponsorship delivery aspects.

Attached as an appendix is the full budget with each worksheet. Following is a breakdown of each worksheet detail with further information:

**Summary** – this is a topline summary of all costs that calculates from the detail in each of the following worksheets. The two column options show that a minimum overall cost is anticipated at \$203,750 and the maximum forecast budget, based on the brief and scope, is \$300,250.

AUSTRALIA DAY FIREWORKS CONCEPT					
SUMMARY					
		OPTION 1	OPTION 2	Details	
<b>Expenditure</b>					
<b>Administration</b>					
Management		36,500	72,500		
Admin		2,500	2,500		
Approvals		1,750	1,750		
Volunteers		1,500	1,500		
VIP's		1,000	7,000		
<b>Marketing</b>					
Advertising		11,000	21,000		
Design & Collateral		5,500	7,000		
Publicity		4,500	4,500		
<b>Operations</b>					
General		35,000	69,000		
Equipment		14,500	14,500		
Labour		14,000	14,000		
Production		71,000	80,000		
<b>Contingency</b>		5,000	5,000		
<b>Total Expenditure</b>		<b>203,750</b>	<b>300,250</b>		



**Admin** – all general event administration and documentation functions including event management fee. The increase in management fee in option 2 would include the marketing, promotion and sponsorship delivery management. It would be expected that sponsorship management would only include the relationship management and delivery on event and there would be a commission charged (industry standard is 20%) on any sponsorship directly acquired by the contractor.

The increased insurance in option 2 is based on total expenditure which will be variable based on budget. Option 2 also includes an allowance for cancellation and abandonment insurance if required.

Option 2 also includes an allowance for a VIP function.

AUSTRALIA DAY FIREWORKS CONCEPT					
Administration					
		Option 1	Option 2	Details	
<b>ADMIN BUDGET</b>					
<b>MANAGEMENT</b>					
Event Management Fee		25,000	50,000		
Auditing		2,500	2,500		
Insurance		9,000	20,000		Option 2 includes C&A coverage
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>36,500</b>	<b>72,500</b>		
<b>ADMIN</b>					
Office consumables		1,000	1,000		
IT/Data onsite		1,500	1,500		
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>2,500</b>	<b>2,500</b>		
<b>APPROVALS</b>					
Local Authority		500	500		
RMP Sign off		1,000	1,000		
Liquor Licence		250	250		
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>1,750</b>	<b>1,750</b>		
<b>VOLUNTEERS &amp; OFFICIALS</b>					
Water		500	500		
Catering		1,000	1,000		
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>1,500</b>	<b>1,500</b>		
<b>VIP's</b>					
Gifts		500	500		
Sponsor packs		500	500		
Catering			6,000		Function optional
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>1,000</b>	<b>7,000</b>		
<b>Total</b>		<b>43,250</b>	<b>85,250</b>		
<b>Current Spend</b>					
<b>Remaining</b>					

**Marketing** – a breakdown of marketing and comms costs with proposed allocations for advertising of the event to the public. The advertising spend would be variable based on the desired number of attendees. It is anticipated that the amount in option 1 would be adequate to promote to the City of Cockburn residents and surrounding suburbs and the Option 2 budget would allow for the promotion of the event in more mainstream, metro media. With increased advertising there would be an increase in the artwork provision required.

AUSTRALIA DAY FIREWORKS CONCEPT					
Marketing					
		OPTION 1	OPTION 2	Details	
<b>MARKETING BUDGET</b>					
	<b>TOTAL</b>	-	-		
<b>ADVERTISING</b>					
Social Media Advertising		1,000	1,000		
Metro		5,000	15,000		
Community		5,000	5,000		
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>11,000</b>	<b>21,000</b>		
<b>DESIGN &amp; COLLATERAL</b>					
Creative		1,000	1,000		
Artwork / Design		1,500	3,000		
Poster / Flyers		3,000	3,000		
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>5,500</b>	<b>7,000</b>		
<b>PUBLICITY</b>					
Radio Simulcast		10,000	10,000		
Photography		3,000	3,000		
Misc		1,500	1,500		
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>4,500</b>	<b>4,500</b>		
<b>Total</b>		<b>21,000</b>	<b>32,500</b>		

**Operations** – general event operational costs that will be incurred for delivery such as traffic management, security etc.

Regardless of budget option 1 or 2, should the event proceed, the operational costs will need to be scoped in detail as soon as possible based on the preferred location. An early decision to proceed will ensure equipment is available however it is a peak time of year for events and it is anticipated that quotes will be higher than normal.

Entertainment programming, production and the fireworks contractor will require early advice to enable accurate quoting. This will ensure the operational costs are refined and an accurate budget to be finalized.

We do not recommend increasing spend on fireworks for a more dramatic display unless it is a significant (\$20k +) increase in budget. Any small increase will have a negligible impact. Therefore any increase in budget for fireworks is not recommended however an increased entertainment budget on performers and children's activities would deliver a greater overall positive impact.

The Increased costs for marketing and promotion in option 2 will likely drive greater attendance. This will increase the requirement for provision of equipment, infrastructure and contractors such as security and first aid, which is why there is a greater budget allocation for these items in option 2. Budget option 2 also includes a proposed public transport plan with a view to working in partnership with the Public Transport Authority.

AUSTRALIA DAY FIREWORKS CONCEPT				
OPERATIONS				
		OPTION 1	OPTION 2	Details
<b>OPERATIONS BUDGET</b>				
<b>GENERAL</b>				
Signage		2,500	2,500	
Security		12,000	15,000	
First Aid		3,000	4,000	
Transport		3,000	3,000	
Waste Management		6,000	6,000	
Traffic Management		8,500	8,500	
Public Transport/Shuttles			30,000	
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>35,000</b>	<b>69,000</b>	
<b>EQUIPMENT</b>				
Consumables		1,000	1,000	
Hire		2,500	2,500	
Marquees & Dongas		3,000	3,000	
Fencing		3,000	3,000	
Toilets		2,500	2,500	
Electrical/Generators		2,500	2,500	
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>14,500</b>	<b>14,500</b>	
<b>LABOUR</b>				
Site Manager		5,000	5,000	
Site Crew		8,000	8,000	
Local/Contractors		1,000	1,000	
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>14,000</b>	<b>14,000</b>	
<b>PRODUCTION</b>				
Fireworks		45,000	45,000	
Barge & water support		11,000	11,000	
Entertainment		10,000	17,000	
Staging		5,000	7,000	
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>71,000</b>	<b>80,000</b>	
<b>Total</b>		<b>134,500</b>	<b>177,500</b>	
<b>Current Spend</b>				

**perth market research**

**Report on the  
City of Cockburn Australia Day  
Coogee Beach Festival Survey 2017**



**(January 2017)**

**Prepared by**

**perth market research**

103 Solomon St

FREMANTLE WA 6160

Phone: (08) 9336 7989

Email: [info@perthmarketresearch.com.au](mailto:info@perthmarketresearch.com.au)

# Report on the City of Cockburn Australia Day Coogee Beach Festival Survey – January 2017

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1.0</b>	<b>METHODOLOGY .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2.0</b>	<b>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>3.0</b>	<b>RESULTS OF THE INTERCEPT/ONLINE SURVEY</b>	
<b>3.1</b>	<b>Transport Method</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>3.2</b>	<b>Origin of Festival Visitors</b>	
3.2.1	Origin of visitors	12
3.2.2	Locality of Perth visitors	13
3.2.3	Country/city of origin	14
3.2.4	Number of people in visitor's group	15
<b>3.3</b>	<b>Frequency of Visit to the Coogee Beach Reserve</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>3.4</b>	<b>Visit to the Coogee Beach Festival</b>	
3.4.1	Reason for Visit	17
3.4.2	Did the respondent stay for the event	18
<b>3.5</b>	<b>Attendance at the Coogee Beach Festival</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>3.6</b>	<b>Awareness Method for Coogee Beach Festival</b>	
3.6.1	Method of hearing about it	20
3.6.2	Awareness of Promotional material/advertising	21
<b>3.7</b>	<b>Event Bin System</b>	
3.8.1	Awareness of bin system change	23
3.8.2	Bin purpose	24
3.8.3	Intention to use recycling bin	25
<b>3.8</b>	<b>"Meet PAT"</b>	
3.8.1	Awareness of 'Meet PAT'	26
3.8.2	Intent to use 'Meet PAT' - Aware respondents	27
3.8.3	Intent to use 'Meet PAT' - Unaware respondents	28
<b>3.9</b>	<b>Food Offerings</b>	
3.9.1	Satisfaction with food offerings	29
3.9.2	Types of food desired	31

<b>3.10</b>	<b>Satisfaction with Coogee Beach Festival</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>3.11</b>	<b>Event Perceptions</b>	
3.11.1	Things liked	33
3.11.2	Potential improvements	34
<b>3.12</b>	<b>Australia Day Time Preference</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>3.13</b>	<b>Demographics</b>	
3.13.1	Gender	36
3.13.2	Age group	37
3.13.3	Employment status	38
3.13.4	Type of work	39
<b>APPENDIX</b>	<b>Questionnaire – Intercept/Online Survey</b>	



## **1.0 METHODOLOGY**

On Australia Day 2017, Thursday the 26<sup>th</sup> of January, the City of Cockburn held its annual Australia Day Coogee Beach Festival at Coogee Beach Reserve.

An intercept survey was conducted in the general vicinity of the event. Potential respondents were selected on a random basis from people walking past interviewers at the event as well as coming and going from the parking area on the eastern side of Cockburn Road. Interviewers were situated around the area and asked respondents to participate in a 5 minute survey comprising a series of demographic and attitudinal questions.

As in previous years, a two-tiered system of questionnaire completion was conducted in order to maximise responses. This system has been used successfully for event surveys in the past. Potential respondents were initially asked to participate in a verbal survey. If respondents were not able to stop and participate in this manner they were asked for their email address and advised that they would be sent a link to an online survey. Two interviewers were tasked with obtaining email addresses only.

Following Australia Day, an email with the survey link was sent to these potential respondents for online survey completion.

A total of 219 respondents participated in the survey. The responses have provided a sampling error within +/- 6.3% at the 95% confidence level for all overall results (assuming approximately 5,000 visitors to the event). 23 intercept surveys and 186 online surveys were completed based on the event.

The resultant data was collated using PMR's statistical analysis software and used to form the basis of this report.

Perth Market Research was able to undertake the survey on behalf of the City in accordance with standards suggested by the Office of the Auditor General, Western Australia. The research methodology suggested in this proposal conforms to recommendations made to State Parliament in the "Performance Examination - Listen and Learn - Using customer surveys to report performance in the Western Australian public sector" document dated June 1998 and the follow-up in 2001. Consequently, the results quoted in this report are considered to be satisfactory in terms of survey and reporting accuracy and reliability to meet required standards.

## **2.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

On Australia Day 2017, Thursday the 26<sup>th</sup> of January, the City of Cockburn held its annual Australia Day Coogee Beach Festival at Coogee Beach Reserve. The City commissioned a survey to independently develop a profile of visitors to the event and explore a range of issues to determine their perception of and satisfaction with the event.

An intercept survey was conducted in the general vicinity of the event. Potential respondents were selected on a random basis from people walking past interviewers at the event as well as coming and going from the parking area on the eastern side of Cockburn Road.

A total of 209 respondents participated in the survey. The responses have provided a sampling error within +/- 6.3% at the 95% confidence level for all overall results (assuming approximately 5,000 visitors to the event). 23 intercept surveys and 186 online surveys were completed based on the event.

- **Overall Feedback**

Respondents were highly satisfied with this event and had few suggestions for improvement that were not related to weather conditions on the day. Responses indicated that the event was well-organised and met community requirements for an event that celebrated Australia Day.

- **Method of Transport**

Survey respondents used their car as their primary mode of transport (82.1%). This was followed by 10.6% of respondents who walked and those who rode a bicycle (3.2%) for transport. 4.1% of respondents cited 'other' methods of transport. These consisted of 2.3% who used public transport and 1.8% who were dropped off at the event and/or picked up from the event by others.

- **Nationality of Visitors**

97.7% of respondents lived in the Perth metropolitan area compared to 2.3% who were visiting from intrastate, interstate or overseas.

- **Locality of Metropolitan Area Visitors**

Survey respondents from the Perth metropolitan area were concentrated within the City of Cockburn. 85.4% of all respondents from the **Perth metropolitan area** lived within the City of Cockburn (83.5% of all respondents). 23.9% of these respondents came from Coogee and a further 61.5% came from other suburbs within the City of Cockburn.

Of respondents who did not live within the City of Cockburn, the largest proportion came from suburbs within the City of Fremantle (8.0%). This was followed by respondents from the southern suburbs (4.2%), the

western suburbs (0.9%), the northern suburbs (0.9%) and the eastern suburbs (0.5%).

- **Non-metropolitan Area Visitors**

Visitors to the event who did not live in the Perth metropolitan area came from a limited number of areas. Of the 5 visitors from out of the metropolitan area 3 came from regional Western Australia (60% of all non-metropolitan visitors or 1.4% of all respondents), 1 came from interstate (20% of all non-metropolitan visitors or 0.5% of all respondents) and 1 came from overseas (20% of all non-metropolitan visitors or 0.5% of all respondents).

- **Number of People in Group**

The largest proportion of respondents came to the event in a group consisting of 4 people (37.6%). This was followed by respondents in groups of 3 people (26.3%), 5 or more people (23.9%), 2 people (10.8%) and singles (0.9%).

These results highlight that the event is essentially family or community based, with high proportions of groups consisting of more than 2 people.

- **Frequency of Visits**

The largest proportion of respondents came to Coogee Beach Reserve on a monthly basis (19.7%), followed by weekly (17.9%). 15.1% of respondents visited annually, 9.8% of respondents visited fortnightly, with a further 8.3% coming six monthly. 6.9% visited bi monthly, followed by three monthly (6.0%) and more than twice a week (3.2%). 13.3% of respondents cited 'other' frequencies that they visited the Coogee Beach Reserve.

- **Reason for Visit to Coogee Beach Reserve**

95.4% of respondents did visit specifically for the event compared to 2.3% who did not visit specifically for the event.

The majority of respondents who did not visit specifically for the event did choose to stay for some or all of it (70%). Only 30% chose not to stay.

- **Attendance at the Coogee Beach Festival**

One third of respondents were attending the Coogee Beach Festival for the first time (33.5%). Of the 66.5% of respondents who had previously attended the Coogee Beach Festival, the largest proportion had previously visited 3 or more times (28.0%). This was followed by 20.6% who indicated that they had previously visited 2 times and 17.9% who had previously visited 1 time.

These results show a large number of people recently becoming aware of the event and visiting for the first time, building on a solid base of previous

attendees. Future iterations of this survey will indicate the success of promotional activities in drawing new attendees.

- **Festival Awareness Methods**

Respondents became aware of the Coogee Beach Festival by a variety of means. 56.9% of respondents advised that they were aware because they had attended before. 28.4% heard about it through the Events Guide/brochure, 26.2% became aware through word of mouth and 19.3% became aware through the Newspaper (advertising or articles). 15.1% became aware through Facebook and 14.2% mentioned the Internet. 13.3% advised that they had seen poster, 11.9% became aware through the City website and 8.7% became aware through Twitter. 15.6% of respondents did not supply a response to this question.

- **Promotional Material/Advertising Awareness**

67.9% of respondents had seen promotional/advertising material for the Coogee Beach Festival. 32.1% advised that they had not seen any promotional material.

41.9% of all respondents aware of promotional material/advertising listed the Events Guide (delivered to their letterbox) as a source. This was followed by 23.6% who listed Facebook, 20.9% who listed posters and a further 19.6% that listed the City's website. 15.5% of respondents listed print advertising in the newspaper and a further 12.8% listed Twitter as a source. 3.5% of respondents listed 'other' sources of awareness which could not be classified as promotional material or advertising.

- **Event Bin System**

11.4% of respondents advised that they noticed the information wrappers on the bins at the Coogee Beach Festival. 78.4% advised that they were unaware of the information wrappers.

The largest proportion of respondents was correct in advising what could be included in each bin (47.2%). 44.0% of respondents were partially correct in advising what could be included in each bin whereas only 5.1% were either mostly or completely incorrect. 3.7% of respondents did not know what should be included in each bin.

84.4% of respondents intended to use the recycling bins. 15.6% advised that they were unlikely to use the recycling bins.

- **'Meet PAT'**

18.9% of respondents were aware of 'Meet PAT' compared to 81.1% who were not.

70.7% of respondents who were aware of 'Meet PAT' did use the system or intended to use it compared to 29.3% who did not.

72.3% of respondents who were previously unaware of the system would use 'Meet PAT' compared to 27.7% who would not.

- **Food Satisfaction**

Almost half of respondents were not able to provide an opinion on their satisfaction with the food offerings, presumably because they did not use any of the outlets.

Of those that did use the food outlets, quality was the area that gained the most satisfaction, followed by healthiness. Price was the lowest ranked issue.

Dissatisfaction was low across all areas, however price raised the greatest level of dissatisfaction

- **Satisfaction with Experience**

The majority of respondents (92.2%) were 'at least' satisfied with the experience they had. 45.0% of these respondents were very satisfied with the experience with a further 47.2% being satisfied.

Only 0.9% of respondents were dissatisfied with the experience. 6.9% of respondents were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied.

- **Positive Event Characteristics**

Respondents were asked what they liked about the Coogee Beach Festival. The key responses were:

- Community event to celebrate Australia Day (emphasis on community) (25.7%)
- Good atmosphere (19.3%)
- Entertainment (16.5%)
- Well organised (12.4%)
- Event close to the beach (11.5%)
- Suncream, water, etc. on offer (10.1%)
- Free event (9.2%)
- Able to meet with family and friends (8.7%)

- **Areas for Improvement**

Respondents were asked what they thought would improve the Australia Day events at the Coogee Beach Reserve. The key responses were:

- Nothing/fine as it is (50.9%)
- More shade needed (25.7%)
- Too crowded/larger space (15.6%)
- Closer parking (5.5%)
- Healthier food (5.0%)

- **Event Timing**

Respondents were asked at what time of day they would prefer to see Australia day events held. The key responses were:

- Fine as it is (46.3%)
- Prefer an evening event (22.0%)
- Evening fireworks (16.1%)
- Depends on weather (8.7%)

- **Demographics**

- 46.8% of respondents were male compared to 53.2% who were female.
- Age ranges were broadly spread, as would be expected from the general population distribution. 26.1% of respondents were in the 35 – 44 age group, 24.3% were between 25 – 34, 22.0% were between 45 – 54, 12.4% between 55 – 64, 12.8% between 18 – 24 and 1.8% were 65 and over. Only one respondent (0.5%) refused to provide their age.
- 39.9% of respondents were employed full-time, 13.3% were part-time employees and 6.9% were employed on a casual basis. 11.0% of respondents were self-employed and 6.9% of respondents were students. 2.3% were retired and 9.2% were not employed.
- Of the respondents who were employed, 32.2% advised that they worked in a clerical capacity. 21.0% were tradespeople and a further 15.1% were employed in a professional capacity. 9.9% of respondents were technicians or associated professionals and 7.2% were managers. 16.5% of respondents advised that they were blue-collar workers.



### **3.0 RESULTS OF THE INTERCEPT/ONLINE SURVEY**

This section summarises the results of the Intercept /online survey of people who actually attended the Festival. The results are presented in broad category headings representing the general topic areas included in the questionnaire.

Questions for the face-to-face survey are shown in the report text. Minor differences exist between these and the online questions, but are limited to referring to their experience of the event in a past tense rather than as 'today'.

#### **3.1 Transport Method**


In **question 1**, all survey respondents were asked:

**“How did you get to Coogee Beach Reserve today?”**

Graph 3.1 shows that respondents used their car as their primary mode of transport (82.1%). This was followed by 10.6% of respondents who walked and those who rode a bicycle (3.2%) for transport. 4.1% of respondents cited 'other' methods of transport. These consisted of 2.3% who used public transport and 1.8% who were dropped off at the event and/or picked up from the event by others.

It should be noted that in this survey period the weather was extremely hot, with the temperature exceeding 40 degrees towards the end of the Festival. It is expected that the preceding awareness by respondents of the likely weather conditions may have resulted in a greater use of the car than would have been the case in more moderate conditions.

**Graph 3.1 Method of Transport**



## **Demographic Results**

- A larger proportion of respondents living in Coogee walked or cycled to the event compared to respondents from other areas. Respondents living in further suburbs were more likely to use the car.
- A larger proportion of people in the middle or older age brackets came to the City by car than those in other brackets. Younger respondents were more likely to walk or cycle to a larger degree than those in the older age brackets.
- Employment status had little influence on respondent's mode of transport to the event.


## **3.2 Origin of Festival Visitors**

**3.2.1** In **question 2**, all survey respondents were asked:

**“Do you usually live in the Perth metropolitan area?”**

Graph 3 shows that 97.7% of respondents lived in the Perth metropolitan area compared to 2.3% who were visiting from intrastate, interstate or overseas.

**Graph 3.2.1**      **Origin of Visitors**




**3.2.2** In **question 3** survey respondents who lived in the Perth metropolitan area (213 respondents) were asked:

**“What suburb do you live in?”**

Graph 3.2.2 shows that survey respondents from the Perth metropolitan area were concentrated within the City of Cockburn. 85.4% of all respondents from the **Perth metropolitan area** lived within the City of Cockburn (83.5% of all respondents). 23.9% of these respondents came from Coogee and a further 61.5% came from other suburbs within the City of Cockburn.

Of respondents who did not live within the City of Cockburn, the largest proportion came from suburbs within the City of Fremantle (8.0%). This was followed by respondents from the southern suburbs (4.2%), the western suburbs (0.9%), the northern suburbs (0.9%) and the eastern suburbs (0.5%).

**Graph 3.2.2**      **Locality of Perth Metro Area Visitors**



**3.2.3** In **question 4**, the survey respondents who did not live in the Perth metropolitan area (5) were asked:

**“What city/country do you usually live in?”**

Visitors to the event who did not live in the Perth metropolitan area came from a limited number of areas. Of the 5 visitors from out of the metropolitan area 3 came from regional Western Australia (60% of all non-metropolitan visitors or 1.4% of all respondents), 1 came from interstate (20% of all non-metropolitan visitors or 0.5% of all respondents) and 1 came from overseas (20% of all non-metropolitan visitors or 0.5% of all respondents).


**3.2.4** In **question 6**, all survey respondents were asked:

**“How many people are you here with today?”**

Graph 3.2.4 shows that the largest proportion of respondents came to the event in a group consisting of 4 people (37.6%). This was followed by respondents in groups of 3 people (26.3%), 5 or more people (23.9%), 2 people (10.8%) and singles (0.9%).

These results highlight that the event is essentially family or community based, with high proportions of groups consisting of more than 2 people.

**Graph 3.2.4**      **Number of People in Group**





### **3.3 Frequency of Visits to Coogee Beach Reserve**

In **question 5**, all survey respondents were asked:

**“How often do you come to the Coogee Beach Reserve?”**


Graph 3.3 shows that the largest proportion of respondents came to Coogee Beach Reserve on a monthly basis (19.7%), followed by weekly (17.9%).

15.1% of respondents visited annually, 9.8% of respondents visited fortnightly, with a further 8.3% coming six monthly. 6.9% visited bi monthly, followed by three monthly (6.0%) and more than twice a week (3.2%).

13.3% of respondents cited ‘other’ frequencies that they visited the Coogee Beach Reserve. The key responses to this were:

- Frequently in summer, but seldom in other months (6.9%)
- Only for this event (4.1%)

**Graph 3.3 Frequency of Visits to Coogee Beach Reserve**



### **Demographic Results**

- Respondents residing in Coogee and other suburbs in the City of Cockburn were more likely to come to Coogee Beach Reserve with greater frequency than other respondent residential groups.
- Respondents outside of the City of Cockburn were less likely to come to Coogee Beach Reserve with greater frequency than those within the City of Cockburn.


### **3.4 Visit to Coogee Beach Reserve**

**3.4.1** In **question 7a**, all survey respondents were asked:

**“Did you come to Coogee Beach Reserve today specifically for the Australia day Coogee Beach Festival?”**

Graph 3 shows that 95.4% of respondents did visit specifically for the event compared to 2.3% who did not visit specifically for the event.

**Graph 3.4.1 Reason for Visit to Coogee Beach Reserve**



#### **Demographic Results**

- Numbers for those visiting Coogee Beach Reserve, but not specifically for the event, are too small to analyse with any degree of accuracy.


**3.4.2** In **question 7b** survey respondents who did not visit Coogee Beach Reserve specifically for the event (10 respondents) were asked:

**“If no (to question 7a), did / will you stay for the Australia Day Coogee Beach Festival?”**

Graph 3.4.2 shows that the majority of respondents who did not visit specifically for the event did choose to stay for some or all of it (70%). Only 30% chose not to stay.

While these results are positive it should be noted that they do not capture statistics of those who may have chosen to go to another beach (or home) and did not enter the car park or go on to the Coogee Beach Reserve.

**Graph 3.4.2**      **Did Respondent Stay for the Event**



### **Demographic Results**

- Numbers for those visiting Coogee Beach Reserve, but not specifically for the event, are too small to analyse with any degree of accuracy.

### **3.5 Attendance at the Coogee Beach Festival**

In **question 8**, all survey respondents were asked:


**“Have you attended the Australia Day Coogee Beach Festival before?”** (Respondents were asked to nominate the number of times they had previously attended if answering ‘yes’ to this question).

Graph 3.5. shows one third of respondents were attending the Coogee Beach Festival for the first time (33.5%).

Of the 66.5% of respondents who had previously attended the Coogee Beach Festival, the largest proportion had previously visited 3 or more times (28.0%). This was followed by 20.6% who indicated that they had previously visited 2 times and 17.9% who had previously visited 1 time.

These results show a large number of people recently becoming aware of the event and visiting for the first time, building on a solid base of previous attendees. Future iterations of this survey will indicate the success of promotional activities in drawing new attendees.

**Graph 3.5 Previous Attendance at the Coogee Beach Festival**



### **Demographic Results**

- Responses showed a marginally higher level of first time attendees from respondents outside the City of Cockburn. While these attendees had a slightly elevated level of first time attendance, respondents from the City of Cockburn still factored prominently in these results.

### **3.6 Awareness Method for the Coogee Beach Festival**

**3.6.1** In **question 9**, all survey respondents were asked:

**“How did you hear about the Australia Day Coogee Beach Festival?”**


This question was asked through the use of an open-ended format eliciting a ‘top of mind’ response. Respondents were not prompted with a list of response options, indicating that the most important responses are listed rather than a complete list. **Respondents provided multiple responses if they had more than one source of awareness therefore results tally to greater than 100%.** Many of the responses highlighted served as a reminder to attend. Most respondents cited 2 to 3 methods of awareness.

Graph 3.6.1 shows that respondents were made aware of the Coogee Beach Festival by a variety of means. 56.9% of respondents advised that they were aware because they had attended before.

28.4% heard about it through the Events Guide/brochure, 26.2% became aware through word of mouth and 19.3% became aware through the Newspaper (advertising or articles). 15.1% became aware through Facebook and 14.2% mentioned the Internet. 13.3% advised that they had seen poster, 11.9% became aware through the City website and 8.7% became aware through Twitter.

15.6% of respondents did not supply a response to this question.

**Graph 3.6.1 Method of Festival Awareness**




**3.6.2** In **question 10**, all survey respondents were asked:

**“Have you seen any promotional/advertising material for the Australia Day Coogee Beach Festival in any media recently?”**

Graph 3.6.2 shows that 67.9% of respondents had seen promotional/advertising material for the Coogee Beach Festival. 32.1% advised that they had not seen any promotional material.

**Graph 3.6.2a**      **Awareness of Promotional/Advertising Material**



Survey respondents who claimed that they were aware of promotional/advertising material (148 respondents) were asked:

**“Please advise which of the following media you saw it in?”**

Graph 3.6.2b, presented overleaf, shows where people **who were aware of promotional material/advertising** claimed to have seen it. Multiple responses were permitted therefore results tally to greater than 100%.


41.9% of all respondents aware of promotional material/advertising listed the Events Guide (delivered to their letterbox) as a source. This was followed by 23.6% who listed Facebook, 20.9% who listed posters and a further 19.6% that listed the City’s website. 15.5% of respondents listed print advertising in the newspaper and a further 12.8% listed Twitter as a source.

3.5% of respondents listed ‘other’ sources of awareness which could not be classified as promotional material or advertising.



**Graph 3.6.2b**

**Source of Advertising/promotional Material**




## **3.7 Event Bin System**

**3.7.1** In **question 11**, all survey respondents were asked:

**“Did you notice the information wrappers on the bins?”**

Graph 3.7.1 shows that only 11.4% of respondents advised that they noticed the information wrappers on the bins at the Coogee Beach Festival. 78.4% advised that they were unaware of the information wrappers.

**Graph 3.7.1 Awareness of Bin Information Wrappers**



### **Demographic Results**

- Responses were generally spread uniformly across the different residential and demographic groups. No specific group was either aware or unaware of the information wrappers.


**3.7.2** In **question 12**, survey respondents who were either unaware or incorrectly aware of changes to the waste system at this year's events were asked:

**"The City of Cockburn is using a 2 bin waste separation system at the event. Which waste do you think goes in which bin?"** (probe for which bin they would use for food scraps, aluminium cans, glass bottles, chip packets, nappies, etc.)

Graph 3.7.2 shows that the largest proportion of respondents were correct in advising what could be included in each bin (47.2%).

44.0% of respondents were partially correct in advising what could be included in each bin whereas only 5.1% were either mostly or completely incorrect. 3.7% of respondents did not know what should be included in each bin.

**Graph 3.7.2**      **Bin Purpose**



### **Demographic Results**


- Responses were generally spread uniformly across the different residential and demographic groups, with the exception that younger age ranges (18 – 24) were less likely to be correct in their assessment of what could be placed in the recycling bins. Females were also more likely to be aware of the correct use of the recycle bins than males.

**3.7.3** In question 13, all survey respondents were asked:

**“Do you intend to use the recycling bins?”**

Graph 16 shows that 84.4% of respondents intended to use the recycling bins. 15.6% advised that they were unlikely to use the recycling bins.

**Graph 16 Intention to Use the Recycling Bins**



### **Demographic Results**

- Responses to this question were generally spread uniformly across the different residential and demographic groups, with the exception that younger age ranges (18 – 34) were less likely to use the recycling bins. Females were also more likely to use the recycle bins than males.


### **3.8 Awareness and Use of 'Meet PAT'**

**3.8.1** In **question 14**, all survey respondents were asked:

**"Are you aware of 'Meet PAT'?"**

Graph 3.8.1 shows that 18.9% of respondents were aware of 'Meet PAT' compared to 81.1% who were not.

**Graph 3.8.1 Awareness of 'Meet PAT'**



#### **Demographic Results**


- Females were more likely to be aware of 'Meet PAT' than males.
- A larger proportion of people in the middle or older age brackets were aware of 'Meet PAT' than those in younger brackets. Younger respondents were less likely to be aware than those in the older age brackets.
- Employment status had little influence on respondent's awareness of 'Meet PAT'.

**3.8.2** In **question 14a**, survey respondents who were aware of 'Meet PAT' (41 respondents) were asked:

**"Have you or do you intend to use it?"**

Graph 3.8.2 shows that 70.7% of respondents who were aware of 'Meet PAT' did use the system or intended to use it compared to 29.3% who did not.

**Graph 3.8.2**      **Use of 'Meet PAT'**



### **Demographic Results**

- Females were more likely to use 'Meet PAT' than males.
- A larger proportion of people in the middle or older age brackets intended to use/or did use 'Meet PAT' than those in younger brackets. Younger respondents were less likely to use it than those in the older age brackets. Anecdotally, family groups appeared to be the biggest users.
- Employment status had little influence on respondent's use of 'Meet PAT'.




**3.8.3** In **question 14b**, survey respondents who were unaware of 'Meet PAT' (177 respondents) were asked:

**"Do you intend to/would you use the system?"**

Respondents were provided with an explanation that 'Meet PAT' is the portable water filtration system available for everybody's use. They were advised that the system was available for use on the day of the event.

Graph 3.8.3 shows that 72.3% of respondents who were previously unaware of the system would use 'Meet PAT' compared to 27.7% who would not.

**Graph 3.8.3**      **Intention to Use 'Meet PAT'**



**Demographic Results**

- Females would be more likely to use 'Meet PAT' than males.
- A larger proportion of people in the middle or older age brackets would use 'Meet PAT' than those in younger brackets. Younger respondents would be less likely to use it than those in the older age brackets.
- Employment status had little influence on respondent's likely use of 'Meet PAT'.

### 3.9 Satisfaction With Food Offerings

3.9.1 In **question 15**, all survey respondents were asked:

**“In each of the following areas, how satisfied were you with the food offerings?”**

Respondents were asked to rate their satisfaction levels with each of the following aspects of the food offerings at the event:


- Price
- Quality
- Healthiness
- Overall

Graph 3.9.1 shows that, in most assessment areas, almost half of respondents were not able to provide an opinion on their satisfaction with the food offerings, presumably because they did not use any of the outlets.

Of those that did use the food outlets, quality was the area that gained the most satisfaction, followed by healthiness. Price was the lowest ranked issue.

Dissatisfaction was low across all areas, however price raised the greatest level of dissatisfaction.

**Graph 3.9.1 Food Offering Satisfaction Levels**



Respondents that indicated they were dissatisfied were asked why they felt this way. Responses to this question fell within a limited range of categories that were commented on repeatedly. The key responses were:

## **Price**

- Too expensive. Ongoing research (for a range of event-based food – outside of Cockburn) is that food vans are becoming more expensive and are providing less value for money.

## **Quality**

- Despite a range of offerings, food vans are perceived as providing a more generic product (across different ethnic fares) due to their prevalence.

## **Healthiness**

- While some of the vans provide good quality product, others provide less healthy meals. Negative responses came from respondents who believed that the food was not healthy across the entire range.

**3.9.2** In question 16, survey respondents were asked:


**“What types of food would you like to see at events like this?”**

Graph 3.9.2 shows that the majority of respondents (67.4%) did not respond to this question. It is assumed that they did not desire any changes to the food offerings provided or did not use the services in the first place. Correlations between respondents who answered ‘don’t know’ to the majority of satisfaction ratings to question 15 (satisfaction with food offerings) were high.

Of those respondents who did provide a response, 8.3% indicated that they would like to see cold foods being offered at the event. This was followed by healthy foods (7.8%), salads (6.4%), fruit salads (5.0%), freshly-made drinks (4.1%) and sandwiches/rolls (3.2%).

2.8% of respondents provided ‘other’ responses that could not be classified in the above areas and should not be considered as appropriate responses.

**Graph 3.9.2**      **Desired Food Offerings**



### **3.10 Satisfaction with the Coogee Beach Festival**


In **question 17**, survey respondents were asked:

**“How satisfied are you with the experience you had today?”**

Graph 3.10.1 shows that the majority of respondents (92.2%) were ‘at least’ satisfied with the experience they had. 45.0% of these respondents were very satisfied with the experience with a further 47.2% being satisfied.

Only 0.9% of respondents were dissatisfied with the experience. 6.9% of respondents were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied.

**Graph 3.10.1 Festival Satisfaction Levels**



Respondents that indicated they were dissatisfied (2) were asked why they felt this way. The responses were:

- Too crowded/not enough space (1 response)
- Insufficient shade (1 response)

#### **Demographic Results**

- Overall satisfaction responses were generally spread uniformly across the different residential and demographic groups.

## 3.11 Event Perceptions

3.11.1 In question 18, all survey respondents were asked:

**“What did you like about the Australia Day event at Coogee Beach Reserve?”**

This question was asked through the use of an open-ended format eliciting a ‘top of mind’ response. Respondents were not prompted with a list of response options, indicating that the most important responses are listed rather than a complete list. Respondents were able to provide multiple responses if they had more than one comment. In this case results tally to greater than 100%.

Responses have been coded to represent the main inference of the respondent’s statement. In some cases a statement covers two themes that differ marginally to each other. In these instances the statement has been counted once for each response grouping.

The largest proportion of respondents enjoyed it was a community event to celebrate Australia Day (22.5%). Also appreciated was that it had a good atmosphere (19.3%) and provided good entertainment (16.5%). Respondents indicated that it was well organised (12.4%) and was an event close to the beach (11.5%). 10.1% appreciated the facilities offered by the City of Cockburn including suncream, water and other items (10.1%). Also appreciated was that this was a free event (9.2%). People were able to make the most of this to have a day with family and friends (8.7%).

1.4% were unsure of exactly what they liked about the Coogee Beach festival on Australia Day.

The key responses were:

- Community event to celebrate Australia Day (emphasis on community) (25.7%)
- Good atmosphere (19.3%)
- Entertainment (16.5%)
- Well organised (12.4%)
- Event close to the beach (11.5%)
- Suncream, water, etc. on offer (10.1%)
- Free event (9.2%)
- Able to meet with family and friends (8.7%)
- Weather (6.0%)
- Friendly people (6.0%)
- Child friendly (5.5%)
- No response (8.7%)
- Other (4.6%)
- Unsure (1.4%)



**3.11.2** In question 19, all survey respondents were asked:

**“What do you think would improve future Australia Day events at Coogee Beach Reserve?”**

This question was asked through the use of an open-ended format eliciting a ‘top of mind’ response. Respondents were not prompted with a list of response options, indicating that the most important responses are listed rather than a complete list. Respondents provided multiple responses. In this case very few negative responses were provided therefore results tally to 100%.

Responses have been coded to represent the main inference of the respondent’s statement. In some cases a statement covers two themes that differ marginally to each other. In these instances the statement has been counted once for each response grouping.

The largest proportion of respondents thought that nothing needed to be done to improve future Australia Day events at the Coogee Beach Reserve (50.9%).

25.7% of respondents wanted more shade. 15.6% of respondents believed that the area was too crowded/needed a larger space and 5.5% of respondents wanted parking nearer to the event. The only other key response was from 5.0% of respondents who wanted healthier food provided.

0.5% of respondents were unsure what would improve the Australia Day events.

The key responses were:

- |                            |         |
|----------------------------|---------|
| ➤ Nothing/fine as it is    | (50.9%) |
| ➤ More shade needed        | (25.7%) |
| ➤ Too crowded/larger space | (15.6%) |
| ➤ Closer parking           | (5.5%)  |
| ➤ Healthier food           | (5.0%)  |
| ➤ Other                    | (2.3%)  |
| ➤ Unsure                   | (0.5%)  |

### **3.12 Australia Day Events Time Preference**

In **question 20**, all survey respondents were asked:

**“At what time of day would you prefer to see Australia Day events held?”**

This question was asked through the use of an open-ended format eliciting a ‘top of mind’ response. Respondents were not prompted with a list of response options, indicating that the most important responses are listed rather than a complete list. Respondents provided few responses tallying to 100%. Responses have been coded to represent the main inference of the respondent’s statement.

The largest proportion of respondents thought that the timing of Australia Day events at the Coogee Beach Reserve is fine as it is (46.3%).

22.0% of respondents would prefer an evening event. 16.1% of respondents cited evening fireworks as an option and 8.7% of respondents indicated that event timing depends on the weather at the time.

2.8% of respondents were unsure what would improve the Australia Day events.

The key responses were:


- |                           |         |
|---------------------------|---------|
| ➤ Fine as it is           | (46.3%) |
| ➤ Prefer an evening event | (22.0%) |
| ➤ Evening fireworks       | (16.1%) |
| ➤ Depends on weather      | (8.7%)  |
| ➤ Other                   | (4.1%)  |
| ➤ Unsure                  | (2.8%)  |

### **3.13** **Demographics**

**3.13.1** In **question 21**, the interviewers were asked to note the gender of respondents.

Graph 3.13.1 shows that 46.8% of respondents were male compared to 53.2% who were female.

**Graph 3.13.1**      **Gender**




**3.13.2** In question 22, all survey respondents were asked:

**“Which of the following age groups best represents your age?”**

Graph 3.13.2 shows age ranges were broadly spread, as would be expected from the general population distribution. 26.1% of respondents were in the 35 – 44 age group, 24.3% were between 25 – 34, 22.0% were between 45 – 54, 12.4% between 55 – 64, 12.8% between 18 – 24 and 1.8% were 65 and over. Only one respondent (0.5%) refused to provide their age.

Then normal distribution of age groupings lends confidence to the results obtained from the survey. The tendency for results to prefer the middle-age ranges lends confidence to the perception that this is primarily a family event.

**Graph 3.13.2**      **Age Group**




**3.13.3** In **question 23**, all survey respondents were asked:

**“Which of the following best describes your current employment status?”**

Graph 3.13.3 shows that 38.5% of respondents were employed full-time, 13.3% were part-time employees and 6.9% were employed on a casual basis. 11.0% of respondents were self-employed and 6.9% of respondents were students. 2.3% were retired and 10.6% were not employed.

**Graph 3.13.3**      **Employment Status**




**3.13.4** In **question 24**, all survey respondents who were employed (152) were asked:

**“Which of the following best represents the type of work you do?”**

Graph 3.13.4 shows that of the respondents who were employed, 32.2% advised that they worked in a clerical capacity. 21.0% were tradespeople and a further 15.1% were employed in a professional capacity. 9.9% of respondents were technicians or associated professionals and 7.2% were managers. 16.5% of respondents advised that they were blue-collar workers.

**Graph 3.13.4**      **Type of Work**





## **Appendix**

### **Questionnaire – Intercept/Online Survey**