

# TOWN OF COTTESLOE



## FORESHORE PRECINCT IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

# MINUTES

MAYOR'S PARLOUR, COTTESLOE CIVIC CENTRE  
109 BROOME STREET, COTTESLOE  
5.00PM, TUESDAY 31 JULY 2018

**MAT HUMFREY**  
Chief Executive Officer

3 August 2018



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	Declaration of Meeting Open / Announcement of Visitors.....	4
2	Attendance .....	4
4	Confirmation of Minutes from Previous Meeting.....	4
5	Declaration of Interests .....	4
6	Presentations .....	5
7	Officer Reports .....	5
7.1	Foreshore Renewal - Shade Structures .....	6
7.2	Foreshore – Landscape Package – Tender CONFIDENTIAL .....	11
8	Items for Consideration in Future Stages .....	12
9	External Funding sources .....	12
10	Other Business .....	12
10.1	Agenda Printing .....	12
10.2	Beach Access Path – South of Barchetta.....	12
10.3	Footpath Colour .....	14
10.4	Master Plan Consultation and Approval Process.....	14
10.5	Concrete Path Specifications.....	15
11	General Business .....	15
11.1	Cr Boulter’s Email Regarding the SeaPines Scheme Amendment.....	15
11.2	Cr Sadler Requested for Next Agenda .....	15
12	Next Meeting .....	15
13	Meeting Closure .....	15

**1 DECLARATION OF MEETING OPEN / ANNOUNCEMENT OF VISITORS**

Mr Fini declared the meeting open at 5:00pm.

**2 ATTENDANCE****Committee Members Present**

Mr Adrian Fini	Chair, Community Representative	left 5:58pm
Mr Dick Donaldson	Community Representative	entered 5:03pm
Mr Deon White	Community Representative	
Mr Simon Rodrigues	Community Representative	
Cr Melissa Harkins	Elected Member	
Cr Helen Sadler	Elected Member	
Cr Lorraine Young	Elected Member	entered 5:01pm

**Officers Present**

Mr Mat Humfrey	Chief Executive Officer
Mrs Denise Tyler-Hare	Manager of Projects
Mr Shaun Kan	Manager of Engineering Services
Ms Mary-Ann Winnett	Temporary Governance Officer

**In Attendance**

Mr Zac Fried	Emerge Associates
Mr Chris Newton	Emerge Associates
Mr Michael Patroni	Space Agency

**Visitor**

Cr Sandra Boulter	Elected Member
-------------------	----------------

**Apologies**

Mayor Philip Angers	Elected Member
Cr Mark Rodda	Deputy Chair, Elected Member

**4 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES FROM PREVIOUS MEETING**

**Moved Mr Rodrigues, Seconded Cr Harkins**

**The Minutes of the meeting of the Foreshore Precinct Implementation Committee meeting held Monday 18 June 2018 be confirmed.**

**Carried 5/0**

**Cr Young and Mr Donaldson were not present at this time**

*Cr Young entered at 5.01pm.*

**5 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS**

Nil

**6 PRESENTATIONS**

**6.1 Ross Neumann**

Mr Neumann cancelled his presentation.

**7 OFFICER REPORTS**

The Chair determined to consider Item 7.2 first and then return to the standard order of the agenda.

DRAFT

## 7.1 FORESHORE RENEWAL - SHADE STRUCTURES

<b>File Ref:</b>	<b>SUB/2525</b>
<b>Attachments:</b>	<b>Tender documentation</b>
<b>Responsible Officer:</b>	<b>Mat Humfrey, Chief Executive Officer</b>
<b>Author:</b>	<b>Denise Tyler-Hare, Project Manager</b>
<b>Proposed Meeting Date:</b>	<b>31 July 2018</b>
<b>Author Disclosure of Interest:</b>	<b>Nil</b>

---

### SUMMARY

The Committee is requested to review the tender documentation for the beach shade structures and provide guidance to the administration on how to proceed to address the call-in concerns.

### BACKGROUND

At the May 2018 Foreshore Precinct Implementation Committee Meeting, the Committee resolved to endorse the plans for tender, subject to review of the retaining wall materials and paving extents.

This documentation for the ocean universal access and beach shade structure prototype was sent to Council for call-in, with 3 call-ins received by 12pm on the 25th June. Due to the call-ins, both the beach shade structure prototype and the ocean universal access path tenders were put on hold.

The call-ins can be summarised as follows:

#### Beach Shade Structures

1. Climate change and the wisdom of building permanent structures on the beach, particularly with the amount of erosion we get on the main beach in winter. Any new beach structure should be wholly removable in winter;
2. Cost – concerns over value for money with design life of less than 25 years, the use of galvanised steel in lieu of a high grade stainless steel which would be prohibitively expensive and moving forward with a design that is regarded as unsatisfactory. The proposed cost does not reflect the “off the shelf” nature of the proposed materials, and nor does the design.  
Maintenance costs associated with posts being encased in concrete.
3. Aesthetics – does not fit in with the curves along the beach and is too angular. The new design does not tie in with the curves of the beach path, the terrace curves, or relate in any way to the foreshore design. The placement of the structures in front of each other on the beachfront is too congested/cluttered, and bamboo does not fit the palette of the WA coastal landscape, as well as not providing full shade.  
The shade structures would look better if they were a single line width and followed the curve of the path all the way round, with gaps in between say banks of three.
4. Durability – concerns over compliance with Australian Standards for materials within 200m of the ocean, type of steel, and the components of steel knuckles, wire lacing and

poles in a corrosive environment. Additionally, concern over the concrete footings being exposed and damaged during a storm surge.

There does not appear to be any diagonal bracing to stop swaying and being sideways.

5. Flat roof design – concerns over the increased lift, and arbitrary pitching of the roof planes for sub control, cost and aesthetics.
6. Permanent Structure – concerns over the way it would look if the roof was removed every winter e.g. scaffolding.
7. Workability - concerns over forcing people into a confined space.
8. Design – current design bears little relation to the original design and has far less architectural merit. The original choice of “off the shelf” materials by the designer is now dictating the design, as they do not have the strength to span the previous design. The choice of materials is flimsy/cheap, and not in keeping with the rest of the foreshore design.
9. Concern with accumulated litter under the shelters, and provision of seating.

### **STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS**

The implementation of the Foreshore Master Plan is identified as a community priority in the Strategic Community Plan.

*Strategic Community Plan 2013 to 2023*

*Priority Area Three: Enhancing beach access and the foreshore.*

*Corporate Business Plan (2014 – 2018)*

*Priority Area Three: Enhancing beach access and the foreshore.*

*3.1 Implement the ‘Foreshore Redevelopment Plan’ in consultation with the community*

### **POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

#### **Beach Policy**

The Foreshore Renewal Masterplan complies with the policy as adopted by Council.

### **STATUTORY ENVIRONMENT**

All works in the Cottesloe Foreshore Precinct will require a planning approval from the West Australian Planning Commission (WAPC) as the land sits under the Metropolitan Region Scheme. As the changes are minimal and do not significantly alter the purpose for which the land is to be used, there are no significant challenges that are expected when approvals are sought.

Much of the land contained within the Cottesloe Foreshore Precinct is also listed on the State Heritage Register. Officers will work with the State Heritage Office during the detailed design phase of every element to ensure heritage considerations are met.

### **FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

This project is expected to require significant resources over the next two years. The budget for the shade structures is \$635,212.00, including the decking, and the Ocean Universal Access Path is \$619,566, but this includes the foreshore universal access path as well.

**STAFFING IMPLICATIONS**

Administration resources are limited and consideration to the preparation of agenda and minutes ahead of time must be allowed.

**SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS**

The design approach for the Foreshore Masterplan has covered issues such as sustainability and the long term maintenance and management of the precinct. The design will need to include selected materials that have been chosen to ensure sustainability, longevity and ease of maintenance.

**CONSULTATION**

Foreshore Precinct Implementation Committee  
Elected Members  
Town of Cottesloe Staff

**STAFF COMMENT***Beach Shade Structures Current Design*

It is noted that the current design is proposed to remain in place all year round, negating the removal costs that come with this, and the bare structure look in winter. The original proposal was to have the roof covering coming off in winter, however through much discussion with the Committee, the decision was made to make it an all year round element.

The structures do not follow the soft curve of the existing path. This has been done so that rather than forcing a mismatch between the curve and the inherent straight edge of the rectilinear form of the componentry, the design responds to the axis of the groyne by proposing a strong, counter, cross axis at 90°. Additionally, the basis of achieving maximum shade for the dollars is based on using off the shelf components, unfortunately the connectors only accommodate a 90° connection.

The suggestion of a single line width with banks of three and gaps between the shade structures would be an alternative design response. As to whether it would be better is a subjective view.

With regard to the positioning of the structures, it is noted that beach users do not form a single file fronting the water. They form a random, multi-layered matrix, many people deep, and they traditionally, and without fuss, weave their way past others to the water. People using the design would do the same.

There is no compulsion for people to sit under the shades. The beach goers will retain their freedom of choice to sit in the sun, the provided shade, or bring their own shade. The objective is to provide as much shade as possible for the money spent.

The structural engineer and structure designer have confirmed that the design life is 25 years for the steel, and 15 years plus for the bamboo. The proposed bamboo will be in one length, without an intermediate join. They will be supplied in panels, woven together with



marine grade stainless steel 316 lacing wire. The strainer wire cable will also be marine grade stainless steel 316. All hot dip galvanising will be in accordance with AS4680 and AS1650. The pros and cons of galvanising and marine grade stainless steel 316 have been considered in the design, and whilst the marine grade stainless steel 316 is more corrosive resistant, it will cost many times more, and is also not available in some of the coupling componentry necessary for the project.

It is noted that the footings have been designed to account for the lowest winter sand level, with the footings set 500mm below, so the possibility of them becoming exposed is very low. A substantial limestone outcrop adjacent to the beach means that it would be a good idea to do a subsurface investigation, as it is likely to be present under the beach sand. It is prudent to provide as much information to tenderers as possible, to avoid cost variations.

The flat roof and associated structure have been designed to accommodate the upwards lift caused by the wind, and lateral forces. The footings have three options, one will be to use a bolted baseplate on to a concrete pad. The design has been certified by a structural engineer.

It is also noted that any litter accumulating under the shelters would be comparable to what is there currently.

Seating is not proposed under the shelters.

#### **VOTING**

Simple Majority.

#### **OFFICER RECOMMENDATION**

That Committee provide direction to the administration on required documentation amendments.

**COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION****Moved Cr Young, Seconded Mr White****That the Committee:**

1. **Endorse the design and recommend that a prototype be built.**

**Carried 6/1****For: Crs Harkins, Young, Mr Fini, Mr Donaldson, Mr White, Mr Rodrigues****Against: Cr Sadler****Moved Cr Harkins, Seconded Cr Young**

2. **Refer the design to the Design Advisory Panel for further comment.**

**Carried 7/0****Moved Cr Young, Seconded Mr White**

3. **Recommend that Council endorse the design and proceed to tender for the prototype.**

**Carried 6/1****For: Crs Harkins, Young, Mr Fini, Mr Donaldson, Mr White, Mr Rodrigues****Against: Cr Sadler****Rationale**

The Committee considered the design, timing, duration, and commencement of the project and determined they would endorse the design and send it to the DAP and Council.

**7.2 Foreshore – Landscape Package – Tender CONFIDENTIAL**

**File Ref:** SUB/2660  
**Attachments:** Tender Submissions Evaluation Table (**CONFIDENTIAL**)  
**Responsible Officer:** Mat Humfrey  
Chief Executive Officer  
**Author:** Denise Tyler-Hare  
Project Manager  
**Proposed Meeting Date:** 31 July 2018  
**Author Disclosure of Interest:** Nil

---

This item is considered confidential in accordance with the *Local Government Act 1995* section 5.23(2) (c) and (e(ii)) as it contains information relating to a contract entered into, or which may be entered into, by the local government and which relates to a matter to be discussed at the meeting and a matter that if disclosed, would reveal information that has a commercial value to a person.

## 8 ITEMS FOR CONSIDERATION IN FUTURE STAGES

- Foreshore lighting – design light poles to allow for future CCTV, and ensure any CCTV installed is in line with state regulations. Can look at federal funding as well, similar to City of Fremantle.
- Art acquisition panel regarding public art in foreshore
- Bin locations and recycling – note that this is not currently within scope. If the committee would like to propose an alternative, they will need to prepare a proposal with key items such as appearance, costs, maintenance requirements, etc, and vote on it.
- Bin store location and appearance.
- Funding options as part of the Master Plan.

## 9 EXTERNAL FUNDING SOURCES

The Lotterywest application has been submitted.

Mrs Tyler-Hare advised that a response was anticipated in August 2018.

## 10 OTHER BUSINESS

### 10.1 Agenda Printing

Mrs Tyler-Hare asked if all Committee members required a hard copy of the agenda. Crs Harkins and Young advised they did.

### 10.2 Beach access path – South of Barchetta

The Committee advised they agree with point c below and requested that the Beach Access Path Committee consider access in future planning.



Suggestion from community to remove the log step ladder as it seems to be a shortcut for people from the OBH to get down to the beach as follows:  
*Immediately south of Barchetta there is a log stepped path from Marine Pde to the lower path. Its main function seems to be to facilitate the short cut by the happy drinkers from the OBH to get to the beach by jumping the fence.  
I think this path could be removed without any loss of amenity, and that area of the foreshore planting unified.*

The administration has reviewed this and notes the following:

- a) The log ladder facilitates access from the car park at Barchetta down to the lower path, without having to zigzag down.
- b) The main concern appears to be with the ease at which people can then jump the fence to the beach.
- c) Rather than removing the log ladder, it is suggested that a more appropriate solution would be to revegetate the area directly opposite the ladder between the beach and the fence, and perhaps make the fence less palatable to jump.
- d) As this is a beach access path, it appears to be within the beach access path committee's purview, however it also falls into the area where the masterplan will extend to. As a result, we would recommend that each committee reviews the recommendation to revegetate and improve the fence, and provide a recommendation as to how they would like to move forward. The Town will then review, and determine how to proceed, and whether further Committee or Council input is required.

### 10.3 Footpath colour

Mrs Tyler-Hare to circulate the email regarding footpath colours from the Community for Committee response via email.

### 10.4 Master Plan Consultation and Approval Process

Comment has been sought from the relevant committees on four key principles they would like to see incorporated into the masterplan. A list of key principles and aspirations based on this and the design forum has been prepared as per the attached.

Following the confirmation of design principles received back from the attendees at the design workshop, three quotes are being sought to prepare a plan incorporating the key principles, to form a part of the brief.

The process from here is intended to be:

1. Work with the community members of the Foreshore Precinct Implementation Committee, along with Sharni Howe to prepare the plan;
2. Review the plan, and proposed project brief, with the Foreshore Precinct Implementation Committee for their endorsement;
3. Send the plan and brief to the relevant committees as noted above, along with any Elected Members not on the Foreshore Precinct Implementation Committee;
4. Incorporate feedback into the brief and plan, and then ask Council to accept the brief for tender;
5. Tender the brief;
6. Engage a consultant to prepare the master plan;
7. ~~Undertake community consultation to ask what people want to see in a master plan, before the master plan is started;~~
8. Consultant to prepare a draft master plan;
9. Foreshore Precinct Implementation Committee to endorse the draft master plan for committee and Elected Member comment;
10. Incorporate the feedback into the draft master plan, and Foreshore Precinct Implementation Committee to endorse this for community consultation;
11. Ask Council to approve the draft master plan for community consultation;
12. Undertake community consultation;
13. Incorporate community consultation into the master plan;
14. Foreshore Precinct Implementation Committee to endorse final plan;  
and,
15. Ask Council to adopt the final plan.

There may be some iterations with the amount of community consultation to be undertaken, depending on the type and amount of comments received back.

The Committee requested Mrs Tyler-Hare remove point 7 from the above process list as this has already been completed.

### **10.5 Concrete Path Specifications**

This item was requested to be included on the agenda by Simon Rodrigues.

Mr Rodrigues provided a summary and his comments were noted by Mrs Tyer-Hare. Mrs Tyler-Hare to send path specification to Mr Kan for his consideration.

## **11 GENERAL BUSINESS**

Mr Fini advised he was leaving the meeting and nominated Mr White as Chair. As there were no other nominations, Mr White was elected unopposed.

*Mr Fini left at 5.58pm.*

### **11.1 Cr Boulter's Email regarding the SeaPines Scheme Amendment**

Mr Donaldson referred to an email sent by Cr Boulter regarding Sea Pines and the Committee discussed issues such as floor to ceiling height of 4.5m, wide alfrescos on the southern side and points 4 and 5 from the email.

#### **COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION**

**Moved Mr White, Seconded Cr Sadler**

**This Committee resolves to provide:**

- **Specific recommendations on the scheme amendment provisions for Sea Pines.**
- **Design excellence criteria for a local planning policy for the foreshore precinct development area.**

**Carried 6/0**

#### **Seapines Scheme Amendment - Legal Involvement and Jurisdiction**

Cr Sadler requested the administration provide some clarity around the legal involvement and jurisdiction.

### **11.2 Cr Sadler Requested for Next Agenda**

Raise level of involvement of the Reserves, Parks and Playgrounds Committee in the foreshore playground.

## **12 NEXT MEETING**

Monday, 27 August, 4.00pm.

## **13 MEETING CLOSURE**

Mr White declared the meeting closed at 6:11pm.