



City of Cockburn
Annual General Meeting of Electors
Minutes

For Tuesday, 6 February 2018

**MINUTES OF THE ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING OF ELECTORS
HELD ON TUESDAY, 6 FEBRUARY 2018 AT 7:00 PM**

PRESENT:

ELECTED MEMBERS

Mr L Howlett	-	Mayor (Presiding Member)
Ms L Smith	-	Deputy Mayor
Mrs C Reeve-Fowkes	-	Councillor
Mr M Separovich	-	Councillor
Mrs C Terblanche	-	Councillor
Mr P Eva	-	Councillor
Ms C Sands	-	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
Mr D Vickery	-	Manager, Infrastructure Services
Mrs M Tobin	-	Executive Manager Strategy & Civic Support
Mrs A Santich	-	Media & Communications Officer
Ms M Waerea	-	PA to Elected Members
Approximately 20 Electors		

APOLOGIES:

Clr S Pratt - Councillor

1. DECLARATION OF MEETING

The Presiding Member declared the meeting open at 7.00PM and welcomed the City of Cockburn ratepayers.

The Presiding Member acknowledged the Nyungar People who are the traditional custodians of the land on which the meeting is being held and paid respect to the Elders of the Nyungar Nation, both past and present and extend that respect to Indigenous Australians who may have been present.

The Presiding Member also acknowledged the sudden passing of former Councillor Steven Portelli on 26 January, by requesting a minutes silence be observed in his memory.

2. PURPOSE OF MEETING

This Annual General Meeting of Electors has been called in accordance with the Section 5.27 of the Local Government Act 1995 and the following matters discussed. The Annual General Meeting of Electors will be conducted in accordance with Section 5.31 of the Local Government Act and Clauses 17 and 18 of the Local Government (Administration) Regulations 1996.

3. ANNUAL REPORT

3.1 ANNUAL REPORT 2016-2017

- (a) Copies available on the website and at the door to Electors attending.
- (b) Queries to be answered by Presiding Member or appropriate Staff.

4. GENERAL BUSINESS

4.1 Written Questions

4.1.1 Lew Hine, Munster - Request for installation of roundabout at Beach St and Cockburn Rd intersection.

Q1. Will Council consider installing a roundabout at Beach St and Cockburn Rd? The reason being congestion into and dangerously out of the Coogee Car Park is becoming a problem with the beach becoming more busy. With the Little Creatures pub being initiated, traffic in and out is safer at the roundabout.

A1. As Mr Hine was not present at the meeting, the Presiding Member advised a written response will be provided to him.

4.2 Motions On Notice

4.2.1 Ray Woodcock, Spearwood - Community Memorial Garden

MOTION

That the City of Cockburn establish a Reference Group with a representative from the City of Cockburn, along with residents from areas of Spearwood, Munster, South Coogee, Wattleup, Coogee and Jandakot; with the purpose in mind of establishing a community memorial garden that will recognise the early settlers and market gardeners within the City of Cockburn

MOVED Ray Woodcock SECONDED Ari Holt that the motion be accepted.

CARRIED 14/0

4.2.2 Ray Woodcock, Spearwood - Swimming Pontoon Coogee Beach

MOTION

That the City of Cockburn make plans to have constructed, a floating pontoon of the same design construction of the floating pontoon currently moored within the Eco-Shark enclosure at Coogee Beach and the new pontoon be moored at the south side of the jetty at Coogee Beach during the summer seasons.

MOVED Ray Woodcock SECONDED Tarun Dewan that the motion be accepted.

CARRIED 9/0

4.3 Other Business

4.3.1 Nicholas Gribble, Coolbellup Community Association re: Coolbellup Commercial Area

Q1. Council's response to the planning of the Coolbellup commercial area has been disappointing.

The rezoning of the centre of Coolbellup to R80, obviously requires different planning considerations to its previous R zoning. To avoid future social and environmental problems this requires a difficult and, if done properly, a painstaking process. However, it appears that the Council has no clear concept of what a well-planned R80 zoned suburban area should look like. It is not evident in the development of the old Coolbellup Hotel site (cnr Coolbellup Avenue and Waverley Rd), nor is it evident in the types of development seen through the rest of Coolbellup. But without a clear concept of what a fully built R 80 suburb should look like adequate planning is not possible.

Continued reliance on a Revitalisation Strategy that was developed before the R80 zoning was in place and so doesn't address the future issues of high density zoning is open to the charge of negligence. When the consultation for the revitalisation strategy was conducted the community where not aware of what the huge changes proposed would mean in terms of outcomes, nor did council make these obvious, despite this being essential if community participation is to be meaningful the community is not expert in the field of town planning and it appears the council is not expert in in the social details of how to make a suburb safe,

friendly and healthy which is what the community consistently say they want. Making a suburb safe, friendly and healthy obviously requires a much broader knowledge base than the engineering suburban infrastructure and buildings.

The current laissez faire planning attitude that allows developers to decide how to alter the structure of Coolbellup on a block by block basis, without significant oversight that addresses issues of suburb scale sustainability, is a guarantee of sub-optimal results. The outcomes we are seeing do not reflect the hopes and optimism of previous consultations. When council staff use the outdated Coolbellup Revitalisation plan as a shield to deflect and ignore legitimate issues there is a failure of ethical consultation and governance

Developers are necessarily driven by short term financial and practical considerations, are unlikely to be the future owners and so have an inevitable disincentive to plan for the future. This means they plan for the current situation, which in a time of fairly extreme State mandated change is planning for the past. This is inadequate, particularly when it affects commercial areas that provide necessary infrastructure. Coolbellup and other areas of Cockburn are undergoing a major transformation that will define it for several generations.

There appears to be a disconnect between what Strategic Planning says is going to happen and what Statutory Planning approves. This is an inevitability where strategic planning operates with voluntary policies, education and guidelines while Statutory Approvals is limited to the letter of the regulation.

Residents are not opposed to the principle of increased density, but when we see:

- the indiscriminate clear felling of vegetation on blocks and its replaced by fence to fence concrete,
- the maximising of the number of units a block can hold with few provisions for adequate parking for visitors or even the likely number of vehicles gauged by bedroom number,
- lack of privacy considerations for neighbours,
- no garden or green space,
- a design lack in the provision for commercial opportunities for the number of residents there will be in future and consequently an architectural denial of commercial ability to provide space for social interaction, such as cafes, or the type of town centre that attracts interesting commercial activity
- Insufficient attention given to transport issues, which is coupled with in adequate design for roads such as Coolbellup Avenue which are becoming transport arteries rather than local roads which brings attendant noise and safety issues.

Many of these issues are not due to increasing density per se, but by a lack innovative up to date design, and this is due to Statutory approvals not having the regulatory will or teeth to enforce Strategic vision, and strategic planning not having a sufficiently developed vision of how density can be increased while maintaining the provision of social and ecosystem services.

Trees are a necessary part of the urban infrastructure which everyone pays lip service to, however there is a significant loss tree cover that appears only to be opposed by vague motherhood statements. Trees on private land are worthy of protection and the council should be providing incentives for their retention; this should be both hard regulatory action and softer approaches that reward retention.

Green space can be provided not only by deep garden spaces, but also by more innovative methods such as green roofs. Coolbellup also has a lot of local roads that are little more than extended driveways for residents, however these are engineered to connecting road standards. By making these short roads one way half the road could be converted to green space, so providing space for trees and green space whilst also providing public area for socialising and safer children's activities.

Increasing density is an issue that is being poorly handled across Australia. In Cockburn this is coupled with poorly handled consultation and information provision to residents. This appears to be a systemic failure in governance, which Council needs to address by calling on both Governmental and academic networks across Australia. In this regard, Cockburn is similar other Australian Councils, we consider it unlikely any individual Council has the resources and expertise to address the exacting requirements needed to address rapid population increase in established areas in a manner that is consistent with current knowledge.

Given the current poor planning results, in Coolbellup, for both commercial and residential developments, we call on the Council to give urgent consideration to improving planning.

This includes:

- Ensuring all development fulfils the sustainability requirements that will occur when maximum R zoning is achieved and that this take into account possible future increases in R zoning (such as extension of the R80 zone) this means sustainability requirements are set at a high level rather than a minimum. This includes both regulatory requirements and “soft” procedural methods that reward better design and outcomes.
- Town planning incorporate aspects of planning that impact on social resilience and design for social interaction takes a high priority. If we all live behind high fences an increase in social

isolation and fear and consequent crime must be expected. Safe streets are streets where the neighbours know each other and so watch out for each other.

- Council provide residents with sufficient information and consideration to see that Council has a plan for the suburb to be sustainable when the increased R zone populations are achieved. This should include social and transport amenity and provide for likely economic and technological change eg. climate change, higher fuel prices and robotic vehicles.
 - Within 20 years robotic vehicle are likely to become the norm, an early adoption by council as a localised transport system to enable people to access existing public transport options that due to age, illness or distance are not currently viable for some people. This might just be transporting people to a frequently serviced bus stop such as for the 115 which goes every 15 minutes and provides easy connection to other services.
- Council extend planning and development networking: coordinating with regional and national groups, so that the experience and expertise of Councils across Australia, and other Governmental and academic resources are fully utilised
- Council provide meaningful consultation, and when developments change ensure that consultation re-occurs in a timely and meaningful manner. Meaningful consultation only occurs when it is timed so that design is sufficiently developed for residents to make meaningful comment and when their views can be taken into account, which is not evident in this case.

The Coolbellup Community Association has noted increasing dissatisfaction with council planning outcomes and this will only intensify if significant action is not taken.

- A1.** A response to the above questions will be provided in writing. Relevant officers will also be arranged to attend the next Coolbellup Community Association Meeting to discuss matters raised.

**4.3.2 NICHOLAS GRIBBLE, COOLBELLUP COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION
RE: COOLBELLUP COMMERCIAL AREA**

MOTION

MOVED Nicholas Gribble SECONDED Ari Holt that Council to take action on the issues that have been raised as written and that they will seek to unify what Strategic Planning says and the regulatory force behind approvals to make sure that they are consistent with each other so that

the sustainability and social and transport amenity within Coolbellup and Cockburn are maintained when the higher densities are achieved, and that should be so that requirements for higher density are met immediately

CARRIED 9/1

4.3.3 Tarun Dewan, Success re: Previous Question and Motion

Comment: The gentleman just now (Nicholas Gribble) raised very valid points which are fine but then it has to be indicative of development and it should also consider the overall view of the Cockburn Council in terms of transportation and in terms of density of population, as an indicative view.

4.3.4 George Jurcun, Bibra Lake re: Murdoch Drive Connection

Q1. I have been a resident of Bibra Lake since 1981. I attended a meeting at the Kardinya Shopping Centre, surrounding the Murdoch Drive new interchange and looking at the modified plans which appear to have come out of left field as far as I am concerned. When I addressed some questions to the Main Roads representatives I was clearly told that this is what the City of Cockburn had put forward to the Main Roads department. I'd like to ask the Council, what was actually submitted? Whether it was in writing or was it a detailed design of what was recommended to the Council? Because it has obviously influenced Main Roads department in going from what was appeared to be an accepted design late in 2017, to what has been released via mail in January 2018.

A1. The Murdoch Activity Centre (MAC) Link Project came somewhere out of the blue for the City of Cockburn after the cancellation of the Roe Highway project and what was known as the Perth Freight Link. The City was not aware that the MAC Link would be on the agenda. It formed part of the Roe Highway road reservation. MAC was announced in May 2017 as part of an overall funding package with the Federal Government, \$2.4B being provided to the State, including the retention of \$1.2B of the former Perth Freight Link money.

The deal that was done at the time under requirement for that funding from the Federal Government is the MAC Link that would be created. The State could accept the \$2.4B as long as it agreed to the MAC Link. As part of that, there was no detailed design or modelling. A draft mud map appeared on the website of Main Roads saying this is what has been agreed to, so the City asked questions such as, 'where is the transport modelling behind this? And what is the impact of your proposed design?' The original design included at grade in intersection with Farrington Road.

We said to the Department of Transport, the Minister for Transport, 'you are proposing to create an at grade intersection with a road that is going to carry 60,000 people a day, so we believe, between two already at grade intersections, one at Bibra Drive and one at the entrance to Allendale Entrance. You are going to cause a catastrophic impact on the local roads, particularly Farrington Road, so where is the transport model?'

It quickly became clear from a series of engagements we had with Main Roads that they had done no transport modelling, no impact analysis. As they gradually evolved their designs, which became Design 1, Design 2, Design 3 and Design 4, a variety of things became apparent. Firstly, when the State responded by saying, 'alright we will take the road intersection and we will make it a fly over, we will add \$15M to the cost and we will take that connection away. We want to facilitate it by running it back through Murdoch Drive', so we said 'well what is the impact on that intersection, will it functionally work?', and they said 'well we don't know'.

So over a number of months, the City paid for external engineering consultants from a company called Cardno, to do some detailed modelling on each and every design analysis. Main Roads have come up with iteration after iteration, and every time we have gone into a detailed analysis we have found more and more impact on local residents, to the point it became very obvious to the City that the Main Roads plan would have a catastrophic impact on the local road network. Farrington Road would pick up from just under 20,000 vehicles a day, to 30-40,000 vehicles. Farrington Road has an EPA resolution from 1984 that says should not be duplicated. If you double the amount of traffic on Farrington Drive and you can't duplicate it, where do those cars go?

Bibra Drive was going to go from 15,000 vehicles a day, to somewhere around 25,000 vehicles. Bibra Lakes sits along the Bibra Lake Reserve. You can't widen Bibra Drive without filling in the Reserve. It became evident to the City that the only way it could facilitate firstly, the strategic requirement to have the MAC Link deliver transport from the east that is by Roe Highway and the freeway into the hospital and carrying some 60,000 vehicles a day, without causing the local street network to come to a gridlock collapse, was to have the design modified to the point that there was an access from Farrington Drive on to the MAC Link but providing northwards bound movement anyway, so it will just replicate what we currently have now.

The City initially proposed to Main Roads, an option that had a dual roundabout - the existing roundabout at Murdoch Drive and another roundabout at Bibra Drive linking through to the MAC Link. However, that would have required the State Government to acquire additional land from Murdoch University, substantial land that we understand that Murdoch University were not willing to provide any concession for. It

would also have impacted on a category of major wetland that sits there. It would have put the road through all of that area including the buffer. For that reason, the State Government and Main Roads said 'look, we can't obtain the additional land from Murdoch University and we can't impact the wetlands because it would require the EPA to do another full assessment, and a commitment has already been given to the Federal Government that a road is going to go ahead'. They said though, 'we can create the same network analysis by taking the link and instead of going north off Farrington Road directly on to Murdoch Drive, by replicating that off Bibra Drive.

The City then through its engineering consultant, Cardno, did another analysis to show that, that connection alone would not cause the local connection to collapse. The analysis included a detailed assessment of where residents were travelling to and from using 'journey to work' data that is available from the 2016 Census. We were able to determine for instance, of the 3,500 residents who live in Bibra Lake, how many go in to Murdoch every day for work. There are only 136 according to the ABS data. We also looked at the journey connection going to the east on to other place such as Kewdale etc and in the balance it became quite clear. By opting for the modified Design 4 option, which is the provision of the MAC Link, a strategic link in which the State Government has made a commitment to the Federal Government to do, but limiting to a connection north bound only, the City wouldn't end up with a massive flood of traffic onto local roads that would effectively deny the thru fare for residents. For that reason, we asked the Minister to take and use all of our modelling because Main Roads hadn't done any of it. This led to the Minister to make the decision that said the best outcome for residents is to run with the modified Design 4 option, which the City also suggested was the best option, and not run with Main Roads option 2, which wouldn't allow for full connectivity with Farrington Road.

The City during the course of this, run a series of briefings for residents associations. We also put all of the analysis results on our website and put out a press release to that affect, not with the intent of trying to withhold information from residents. The challenge for us is this. The commitment was between the Federal and State Government and we are a bit like the meat in the sandwich.

- Q2.** Just looking at the latest Design 4 and Design 2, looking at the layouts, I still don't believe that the traditional traffic travellers who take Bibra Drive, they will still opt to come down that side one way street south bound into Farrington Road, turn right into Farrington Road and into Bibra Drive because they want to avoid the peak hour traffic on the freeway heading south. This impact seems to focus on the Bibra Drive congestion and I don't really believe that option 4 or the recent one is going to solve that problem. So you are going by all of these statistics from these road counters and the experts who predict it, are you satisfied with all that?

A2. The City also did an up to date detailed road count of all traffic sections around there. We could determine that when Main Roads put any of that data into the model that they would have accurate 2017 information. Main Roads also have another project happening from sometime later this year which is called a 'managed motorway' to go all the way into the City. They are going to increase the capacity of the freeway running north from Farrington Road and put on/off meter ramps at Farrington/Canning Highway and a range of other roads onto the freeway. In peak hour there will be traffic lights there managing cars on and off the freeway.

We are very comfortable that the solution that has the least impact on our resident's right across that area, is the latest Design 4 option.

Q3. Comment: It's a pity as Bibra Lake residents that we are going to bear the brunt of this whole new development which is going to create a lot of noise for our area. It would have been good if a better compromise could've been made because as Bibra Lake residents and this new development directly in our backyard, we don't get any real benefit from it. It seems purely that it is to address an access along Bibra Drive which I don't believe that Option 4 or 2 are that far apart.

4.3.5 Grant Jolly, Bibra Lake re: Murdoch Drive Connection

Q1. Can we get a copy of the report that was just referred to?

A1. Yes, we will arrange for a copy to be put on the website.

Q2. There was nothing in the way that I am aware of, of a letterbox drop. If there was an election on we certainly get a lot of information dropped off. Not everybody used electronic media. I feel this could have been handled better. All we received as a letter late last week from Main Roads and also from a Liberal politician. We received or heard nothing from our local Council or local Members. Even a notice of a meeting could have been held and residents from Bibra Lake, Leeming and possibly Coolbellup could have been informed. Maybe it's not too late to do that. The sharing and transparency has left a lot to be desired and should still be put out there now. This issue is going to turn Bibra Drive into a rat run and what are we going to do about it and all of the other issues coming from this? Can hardcopies of your reports also be provided because not everyone uses the internet? Can a meeting be called for concerned residents and it be well publicised?

A2. The City's administration can arrange for hardcopies of the reports and if any public meetings are arranged we will ensure they are widely advertised using various methods.

4.3.6 Maureen Fisher-Sim, Hamilton Hill re: Economic Development Officer

Q1. A couple of years ago we heard about an Economic Development Officer going to be appointed. Has there been any progress on that and if so, would this person be available for businesses in Hamilton Hill?

A1. As a result of a request last year from Council, the City undertook a review with local businesses across the district late last year by way of survey, identifying what their major needs were in communication. One of the key recommendations from that was in terms of engagement. They were looking for someone not so much in a business development role needs and the primary request from the business community was someone to have a business engagement function. The City's workforce plan includes an Economic Development position and it was in consideration initially for this financial year and the reason we didn't fill it was due to the Cockburn ARC additional staff that were required, so it was deferred. It is likely that position will be put forward again in next year's budget as part of the ongoing development of the City and the function will probably sit in the Communications section.

4.3.7 Angela Staniolo, South Lake re: Library Operating Hours

Q1. I work full-time, study part-time and have a child in Year 11 this year and what we have found is that you have 3 libraries which are all open Monday – Saturday, but none are open on a Sunday. We would like for Council to consider perhaps one opening on a Sunday? We do sport and shopping on Saturdays and Sunday would be our study day and there is currently no place to go.

A1. A response will be provided in writing.

4.3.8 Angela Staniolo, South Lake re: Road Network

Q1. In regards to Bibra Drive becoming a rat run. It already is. I used to live in Willetton and I used to work in Bibra Lake Industrial Area and I used to use Progress Drive and Bibra Drive as the rat runs. With the North Lake flyover that is proposed, has there been any projected traffic that is going to increase on Bibra Drive or Progress Drive or Farrington Road?

A1. The primary function of the North Lake Bridge is to deal with the East/West traffic that is currently going through Cockburn Central from Armadale Road. The bridge will split that traffic allowing traffic through Cockburn to flow far more quickly and less congestion. None of the modelling shows an increase of any traffic going along Bibra Drive as a result of that project, however the City is re-doing its district traffic model at the moment using the latest data from Main Roads, journey to work data from the ABS 2016 Census, plus all the detailed analysis done in

various projects. The modelling will allow us to determine where the future priorities should be to add the additional capacity for resident and business movement and the like.

4.3.9 Ray Woodcock, Spearwood re: Spearwood Avenue Footpath

Q1. I did raise a matter regarding Spearwood Avenue on 14 Sep 2017 and again on 12 October and still waiting on a reply about Spearwood Avenue and the footpath, if it is Council Property or Railway property?

A1. A response will be provided in writing.

4.3.10 Tracey Radcliffe, Beeliar re: Local Bus Services

Q1. Has an Intra Bus or a CAT Bus ever been considered for the City? Reason I am asking is that we have gone down to one car to reduce our carbon footprint and in the school holidays you can't get to many of the Cockburn facilities and events even on Transperth buses. The Cockburn Wetlands Education Centre is just one example which is 25 mins walk from the nearest bus stop and they offer a lot of activities. Is it something that can be considered in future?

A1. There has been a request in the past for a report to be prepared surrounding this subject. There has also been detailed discussion on a number of occasions between the PTA and Director of Engineering regarding potential CAT bus services. At this stage a report has not been finalised. The City would welcome for you to discuss your suggestions/provide your personal feedback in a separate discussion with the Director of Engineering at a later date to add to this report.

4.3.11 John Kunai, Spearwood re: Petitions Template

Q1. Approximately this time last year I approached an Ordinary Council Meeting, requesting for a petition template to be established on CoC website. I have had a look over the last week and tried to navigate through the whole system and was unable to locate one. I also enquired a customer service member today and he couldn't find it either. I am wondering where and what has happened to the petition template? Most of the local governments do have petition templates on our website. Cockburn is one of three or so that do not. Why do other Councils have it? Why are they catering for this and we are not, obligations aside?

A1. Councils previous Standing Orders stipulated that petitions needed to be submitted in a particular format for them to be accepted by Council. That was considered to be old fashioned and Council has recently decided it

was not in keeping with modern ways of doing things, so have since eliminated that requirement. There is no longer a template requirement. Councils are now able to look at petitions in any form and any way.

4.3.12 John Kunai Spearwood re: State Planning Policy (SPP) 3.6 – Development Contribution Plan

Q1. When I was the President of the former Spearwood Community Association, we did lobby hard against the integrity of the State Planning Policy (SPP) 3.6 – Development Contribution Plan (DCP). I have been on the City of Cockburn website to see what is happening and from what I can see there is no direct layout or format or accountability for monies collected through the City of Cockburn in relation to the DCP. Also regarding transparency in the DCP, whether it is indexed to CPI or does the rate go up annually and what are the actual functions of the DCP? Each Local Government has to have a wish list that they want to spend the DCP on to the area, so there should be some form of transparency of the list of projects that this DCP will be directed to. I think the public has an absolute right to know what can be expected in the future of developments or things to go into the City of Cockburn and how it is distributed when it comes to the DCP. Is it fair to me to ask on behalf of the community if this information can be put up on the website?

A1. The details are already listed on the website. Cockburn is one of the few Council's that have a comprehensive analysis of the DCP available including annual statement from the auditors on each of our DCP's, by suburb and by plan. The UDIA at their seminars, are currently holding the City of Cockburn up as an example because we provide comprehensive detail back to all of our residents about our plans for every single DCP we get and spend.

4.3.13 NICHOLAS GRIBBLE, COOLBELLUP - TRAFFIC CALMING FOR COOLBELLUP AVE

MOTION

MOVED Nicholas Gribble SECONDED Ari Holt that Council provide traffic calming for Coolbellup Avenue to ensure the current speed limits are observed and that there is safe pedestrian crossings particularly near bus stops and in the commercial area.

CARRIED 6/2

5. CLOSURE OF MEETING

The meeting closed at 8.09PM