

TOWN OF COTTESLOE



DEVELOPMENT SERVICES COMMITTEE MINUTES

MAYOR'S PARLOUR, COTTESLOE CIVIC CENTRE
109 BROOME STREET, COTTESLOE
6.00 PM, WEDNESDAY, 21 OCTOBER 2009

CARL ASKEW
Chief Executive Officer

21 December 2009

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES COMMITTEE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ITEM	SUBJECT	PAGE NO
1	DECLARATION OF MEETING OPENING/ANNOUNCEMENT OF VISITORS.....	1
2	APPOINTMENT OF PRESIDING MEMBER AND DEPUTY PRESIDING MEMBER.....	1
3	RECORD OF ATTENDANCE/APOLOGIES/LEAVE OF ABSENCE (PREVIOUSLY APPROVED).....	2
4	RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS PUBLIC QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE.....	2
5	PUBLIC QUESTION TIME.....	2
6	PUBLIC STATEMENT TIME.....	2
7	APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE.....	2
8	CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING.....	3
9	ANNOUNCEMENTS BY PRESIDING MEMBER WITHOUT DISCUSSION.....	3
10	PETITIONS/DEPUTATIONS/PRESENTATIONS.....	3
11	REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND OFFICERS.....	4
11.1	PLANNING.....	4
11.1.1	PLANNING FOR COTTESLOE FORESHORE – THE NEXT PHASE: IMPLEMENTING THE CONCEPT IMPROVEMENT PLAN	4
11.1.2	PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT ASSESSMENT PANELS IN WA – COUNCIL SUBMISSION TO DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING	11
11.1.3	PLANNING FOR COTTESLOE TOWN CENTRE & ENVIRONS – STATUS REPORT	28
12	ELECTED MEMBERS' MOTIONS OF WHICH PREVIOUS NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN.....	33

**13 NEW BUSINESS OF AN URGENT NATURE INTRODUCED BY
ELECTED MEMBERS/OFFICERS BY DECISION OF MEETING 33**

14 COMMITTEE DISCUSSION..... 33

15 MEETING CLOSURE..... 33

1 DECLARATION OF MEETING OPENING/ANNOUNCEMENT OF VISITORS

The Chief Executive Officer announced the meeting opened at 6:10pm.

2 APPOINTMENT OF PRESIDING MEMBER AND DEPUTY PRESIDING MEMBER

Section 5.12 of the *Local Government Act (1995)* provides that the members of a committee are to elect from amongst themselves a Presiding Member and Deputy Presiding member.

The election is to be conducted by the CEO and nominations for the office are to be given to the CEO in writing.

If a Councillor is nominated by another elected member, the CEO cannot accept the nomination unless the nominee has advised the CEO orally or in writing that he or she is willing to be nominated for the office.

If there is more than one nomination, elected members are to vote on the matter by secret ballot as if they were electors voting at a **first past post** voting election. The votes cast are to be counted and the successful candidate determined, as if those votes were votes cast at an election – provided there is not an equality of votes. If there is an equality of votes between 2 or more candidates who are the only candidates in, or remaining in, the count, the count is to be discontinued and not more than 7 days later, a special meeting of the Council is to be held. Any nomination for the office may be withdrawn, and further nominations may be made, before or when the special meeting is held.

Once nominations have been received and, if required a ballot is taken, the Presiding Member is then declared and the presiding member assumes responsibility for the meeting, including the nomination and election of the Deputy Presiding Member using the same approach as described above.

The CEO called for nominations for Presiding Member of the Development Services Committee. Cr Carmichael nominated Cr Walsh who accepted the nomination. There being no further nominations, Cr Walsh was duly elected to the position of Presiding Member of the Development Services Committee.

As the Presiding Member was an apology for the meeting the CEO called for nominations for the position of Deputy Presiding Member. Cr Birnbrauer nominated himself. There being only one nomination Cr Birnbrauer was duly elected to the position of Deputy Presiding Member of the Development Services Committee.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

That Council appoint Cr Jack Walsh as the Presiding Member, and Cr Jay Birnbrauer as the Deputy Presiding Member, of the Development Services Committee.

**3 RECORD OF ATTENDANCE/APOLOGIES/LEAVE OF ABSENCE
(PREVIOUSLY APPROVED)**

Present

Cr Jay Birnbrauer
Cr Ian Woodhill
Cr Patricia Carmichael
Cr Davina Goldthorpe

Officers Present

Mr Carl Askew	Chief Executive Officer
Mr Andrew Jackson	Manager Development Services
Mr Will Schaefer	Planning Officer
Ms Pauline Dyer	Development Services Secretary

Apologies

Cr Jack Walsh
Cr Jo Dawkins
Cr Victor Strzina

Officer Apologies

Mr Ed Drewett	Senior Planning Officer
---------------	-------------------------

Leave of Absence (previously approved)

Nil

4 RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS PUBLIC QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE

Nil

5 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

Nil

6 PUBLIC STATEMENT TIME

Nil

7 APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Nil

8 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

Moved Cr Woodhill, seconded Cr Birnbrauer

[Minutes August 17 2009 Development Services Committee.doc](#)

The Minutes of the Ordinary meeting of the Development Services Committee, held on 17 August 2009 be confirmed.

Carried 4/0

[Unchanged Committee Recommendation](#)

9 ANNOUNCEMENTS BY PRESIDING MEMBER WITHOUT DISCUSSION

Nil

10 PETITIONS/DEPUTATIONS/PRESENTATIONS

Nil

11 REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND OFFICERS

11.1 PLANNING

11.1.1 PLANNING FOR COTTESLOE FORESHORE – THE NEXT PHASE: IMPLEMENTING THE CONCEPT IMPROVEMENT PLAN

File Name: A PLANNING FOR COTTESLOE FORESHORE THE NEXT PHASE IMPLEMENTING THE CONCEPT IMPROVEMENT PLAN.doc - This line will not be printed do not delete

File No: D14.2
Responsible Officer: Carl Askew
Chief Executive Officer
Author: Andrew Jackson
Manager Development Services
Proposed Meeting Date: 21 October 2009
Author Disclosure of Interest Nil

INTRODUCTION

Over recent years Council has undertaken valuable broad-brush planning for the public domain foreshore centred on Cottesloe beach.

Initiated in connection with the Scheme Review, this has been a highly-consultative process involving the community, interest groups and experts to help shape a vision for the precinct.

It has evolved from the Andrew Forrest-sponsored Foreshore Vision Masterplan through the Foreshore Vision Working Group to the Enquiry by Design (EbD) exercise and final report. The EbD gathered considerable information and input from a variety of stakeholders and translated this into a statement of intent as a concept plan.

On 23 February 2009 Council considered the background, outcome and next steps of the EbD in this respect; and that discussion is now repeated further below, with the key points highlighted as a guide to the way forward.

STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS

Improvement of the foreshore is a key strategic aim of Council in meeting the needs of the district and enhancing the sub-regional role of the Cottesloe Beach precinct.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Detailed planning for the foreshore may lead to changes to existing policy measures or to new policies to address the aspects involved.

STATUTORY ENVIRONMENT

Metropolitan Region Scheme.
TPS2 and proposed LPS3.

State Government coastal planning policy (SPP2.6) and strategy (PCPS).

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Detailed planning, consultation, works and administration for foreshore improvement are anticipated to be a significant cost to Council and additional funding sources may be required.

SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS

Sensitive planning for and development of the foreshore embraces a range of sustainability aspects including environmental, social and economic, as well as a sense of place.

CONSULTATION

Planning and implementation of proposals for the foreshore will continue to be a consultative process involving the community, stakeholders and agencies.

FORESHORE CONCEPT PLAN

Background

The idea of a Foreshore Concept Plan originated from Council's consideration of the earlier Foreshore Vision Masterplan, which was a private initiative that Council supported in principle to stimulate exploration of opportunities to improve the public domain foreshore, especially in the vicinity of the main Cottesloe beach.

Community comment on the Vision plan was sought in association with previous consultation undertaken on draft LPS3. Council then looked at ways to approach the matter and a working group recommended an enquiry-by-design process. This became included in the overall EbD for LPS3, with a view to examining the foreshore area in relation to how the central beachfront containing the two hotel sites may develop.

As Marine Parade and the public foreshore west of it are classified Parks & Recreation (P&R) Reserve under the Metropolitan Region Scheme (MRS), town planning control for this land is governed by that rather than the local planning scheme. Council is, however, the custodian of the foreshore regarding its day-to-day use and maintenance, as well as planning for the provision and management of infrastructure.

Therefore, consideration of how the foreshore could be enhanced and how beachfront development may affect it was seen as a worthwhile component of the EbD, so as to gain a better appreciation of the interrelationship between the two areas.

EbD Outcome for Foreshore Concept Plan

The EbD process has enabled a vision for the foreshore to be studied in greater depth, with the benefit of stakeholder participation and a focus on tangible outcomes.

As set out in the Hames Sharley report, this has considered the historical context, issues and opportunities, desired future character, and key principles and elements for design and development.

The Foreshore Concept Plan formulated by the EbD is contained in an attachment to this report.

Next Steps

The Foreshore Concept Plan is a basis for Council to give further consideration to the preferred improvement of the area. As the Plan does not form part of LPS3 and is not required to finalise the Scheme, Council is free to decide how to progress the Plan.

Once a preferred Concept Plan is adopted, implementation would occur over time, subject to detailed planning, funding and works programs, and following the various approvals involved (eg Council, WAPC, HCWA).

Nonetheless, given the EbD exercise it is desirable to advertise the Plan as part of the findings at this point, in order to convey the concept to date, to provide the context of the beachfront precinct, and to obtain comments; all of which will assist Council on this matter and in finalising LPS3.

Resolution

On 9 March 2009 Council in considering the above resolved that it: *Agrees to pursue realisation of the Foreshore Concept Plan on an ongoing basis, through further examination of the indicative proposals for the preparation and approval of detailed plans and implementation programs.*

VALUE OF CONCEPT PLAN

Chapter 3: Cottesloe Foreshore of the EbD report is attached in full. The benefit of the EbD was to advance the earlier vision by pooling and testing stakeholder ideas through consultation and preliminary design, to arrive at a general consensus of preferred and realistic proposals for improvement as reflected in the Concept Plan.

This review of options and potentials for the foreshore was comprehensive and consolidated the main ingredients for further consideration. It went into sufficient design detail to demonstrate creative yet practical suggestions to enliven the foreshore precinct in the context of the historical setting and desired character.

This holistic approach has refined the concept for the form and function of an enhanced foreshore to create a better place, being sensitive to the qualities and ambience to be preserved, while also responding to the needs and invigoration of the locality.

The report in text and images describes and illustrate the framework and objectives, identify issues and opportunities, outline principles and elements, and scope implementation – the next steps suggested are:

- Plan adoption – *Council has agreed to the plan in-principle.*
- Implementation strategy, including staging – *the focus of this report.*

- Detailed design of each improvement project – *this would be prioritized, performed and endorsed.*
- Manual for public domain fabric – *to guide the urban design of infrastructure, street furniture, signage, landscaping, art installations and so on in terms of style, materials and finishes in rejuvenating the precinct.*
- Costings for works programs – *detailed design and materials selection will enable cost estimates for budgeting and programming.*

ONGOING APPROACH

As explained, while the starting point for improving the foreshore is the overall Concept Plan, pragmatically any vision is realised over time in accordance with the sequence of detailed planning, consultations, approvals, staging, funding, works programs and so on.

This incremental method is also necessary because the foreshore is a constantly and seasonally heavily-used area, including events, which cannot be unduly disrupted.

As it is Council who carries out the day-to-day maintenance, with only limited funding assistance for foreshore-related works, the impetus for improvement is unlikely to come directly from the State government and does not entail private land development (although Council may be able to harness some support and contributions from both of these sources in addressing the overall public domain foreshore and beachfront development area).

An ongoing approach which entails short, medium and long-term improvements is advocated, in order to commence with enhancements that can be readily achieved while working towards more substantial changes that require formal approvals and substantial project management.

An advantage of progressing small improvements is that collectively they can have a significant positive effect on enhancing the amenity and attractiveness of the area at relatively low cost (and often not much more than normal maintenance expenditure).

To administer this approach the following course of action is conceived:

Action	Aspects
Reconvene the working group as the Foreshore Concept Plan Working Group.	As previously, comprising appropriate staff and Council representation with the ability to co-opt community representatives.
Re-appoint the lead urban design consultant (Linley Lutton) to provide a directing, facilitating and problem-solving role for continuity over time in refining and carrying-out the Concept Plan.	This is vital to following-through with the vision, fostering relationships and integrating the foreshore with the planning objectives and development parameters for the adjacent beachfront.
Commission a manual of urban	This is to set the scene to ensure that

Action	Aspects
design guidance for the precinct.	improvements to the precinct are cohesive and compatible while still allowing for creativity. It would not be too prescriptive and would focus on themes, styles, durability and sustainability.
Review submissions to EbD and LPS3 for further input and direction to detailed planning and liaison.	This is to refresh appreciation of the stakeholder views and to capture ideas for more detailed consideration.
Prioritise the sites and components to be addressed as short, medium and long-term improvements.	Setting-out the number, nature, scale and timeframe of improvement projects will enable them to be tackled and coordinated on several fronts in fulfilling the overall concept.
Oversee detailed planning for the various sites and components, involving in-house resources and external consultants.	The commitment to the Concept Plan facilitates the next level of more detailed planning in order to clarify proposals, costs and works.
Formulate detailed implementation programmes for major proposals involving State government approvals and substantial works/costs.	These entail the larger-scale, longer-term changes with approvals to land tenure, use, zoning and boundaries; the involvement of public agencies and private owners, developers or operators; formal consultations; special funding; and professionally-managed projects and works programmes.
Ascertain consultation needs with the community, stakeholders and agencies as the various proposals proceed.	Applying appropriate consultation methods to a range of matters with diverse implications will be important to gathering feedback and gaining support.
Report to Council as required for information and decisions.	Council will need to make numerous decisions ranging from minor approvals to strategic choices and resource/financial allocations.
Promote and celebrate the place-making improvements for good public relations.	Keeping the community and visitors informed and engendering support from stakeholders (including property owners and responsible authorities) to contribute to achieving improvements.

CONCLUSION

The multi-faceted function of the Cottesloe central foreshore has been examined in depth and the indicative Concept Plan produced depicts the form envisaged for the improvement of the precinct as the defining feature of the district.

Council is committed to the implementation phase in order to keep alive vision and the considerable investment in and enthusiasm about it.

The recommended strategy is to pursue several streams of action from small to large at the technical and consultative levels, together with governance arrangements to oversee the big picture and manage the associated decision-making and works activities.

VOTING

Simple majority.

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

StartOfRecommendation - This line will not be printed Please do NOT delete

That Council endorses the direction expressed in this report and the course of action outlined above towards detailed planning for and implementation of the Concept Improvement Plan for the Cottesloe Foreshore.

COMMITTEE COMMENT

The MDS summarised the background and proposed way forward outlined in the report in order to stimulate foreshore improvements. He advised that making a start would set the urban design scene/standard, respond to regional planning considerations and help to lift the amenity of the beachfront private properties. Committee strongly encouraged getting on with projects, including timeframes and budgets, to make real changes on the ground and to gain momentum for the overall Foreshore Concept Improvement Plan to be achieved. On this basis Committee discussed priorities for improvements and how the recommendation should be expanded, and requested officers to provide that detail for Council's determination.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

Moved Cr Birnbrauer, seconded Cr Carmichael

That Council

- 1. Reconvene the Foreshore Vision Working Group as the Foreshore Concept Plan Implementation Working Group to oversee realisation of the Concept Plan.**
- 2. Engage the lead urban design consultant from the Enquiry by Design to assist in implementation of the Foreshore Concept Plan, including a manual of urban design guidance for the precinct.**
- 3. Focus on the coordinated redevelopment of Nos 1 & 2 Car Parks (including interim parking arrangements) and the provision of additional change-rooms/public toilets (in more than one location) as the immediate priorities for improvement of the foreshore precinct.**
- 4. Pursue point 3 and the balance of the Foreshore Concept Plan proposals by undertaking detailed planning, setting timelines, ascertaining costs and funding (including consideration of the Town's assets and resources), and programming works (subject to approvals and consultations as appropriate).**

Unchanged Committee Recommendation

Carried 4/0

EndOfRecommendation - This line will not be printed Please do NOT delete

**11.1.2 PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT ASSESSMENT PANELS IN WA –
COUNCIL SUBMISSION TO DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING**

File Name: A PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT ASSESSMENTS PANELS IN WA COUNCIL SUBMISSION TO DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING.doc - This line will not be printed do not delete

File No: Sub 843
Responsible Officer: Carl Askew
Chief Executive Officer
Author: Andrew Jackson
Manager Development Services
Proposed Meeting Date: 21 October 2009
Author Disclosure of Interest Nil

INTRODUCTION

The State Government through the Department of Planning (DoP) has issued a Discussion Paper *Implementing Development Assessment Panels in WA*, September 2009 (DAP).

The paper presents the decision and intended arrangements to create DAP as part of a planning system reform process, stemming from the national level, and invites submissions on the proposed framework, by no later than 2 November 2009. The submissions are to be considered in drafting the necessary regulations for the DAP.

This report to Council outlines the matter and recommends a submission.

INFORMATION

A copy of the Discussion Paper is attached, which is a detailed document explaining the rationale and proposed framework. It also contains a submission form, with preconceived questions.

Also attached is a copy of a supplement, *DAP: Questions & Answers*, which summarises key aspects from the paper.

The Manager Development Services has attended a DoP briefing and a forum by McLeods lawyers on the DAP proposal, as well as discussed the matter with other Planners and Solicitors for the Town.

Council on 29 September 2009, in preparing for a WALGA Central Metropolitan Zone meeting, resolved: *That Council encourages WALGA to strongly oppose the introduction of Development Assessment Panels in Western Australia.*

RATIONALE

The Discussion Paper in several sections reveals the rationale for DAP, but this construct is debatable.

Referring to section 4 in page 11, for example, why should large scale, *non-complying* proposals be given special treatment and be dealt with by DAP, as

surely it is those that demand extra attention towards acceptability? And would not high value *complying* proposals be supported anyway under the normal process?

There is the attempt to overcome controversy or local opposition by sending sensitive proposals to DAP. However, while DAP may inject technical expertise into decision-making, they would be less well-equipped to mediate solutions between proponents and objectors. Moreover, a heavy reliance on purely technical justification of decisions would foster the science but ignore the art of decision-making.

The premise of better separation between setting policy and determining applications is dubious, and likewise for concentrating on strategic planning as distinct from its implementation. This is because to relinquish overseeing the realisation of a plan made deprives it of knowledge, continuity and consistency in ensuring that it is fulfilled as intended and designed.

Sub-section 4.4 in page 21 alludes to applying local or State planning policy and overcoming local planning restrictions. While having regard to policy is important, it should not be applied unreasonably to planning schemes or other instruments made under a public or Parliamentary process and holding a higher statutory status.

Sub-section 4.5 in page 22 discusses applications of State or regional significance and the Minister's call-in power if the impact extends beyond a single local government (LG), with no right of appeal. This is an uncertain feature of the DAP proposal, as to the criteria for such applications, the whim of the Minister versus that office being bound by the criteria and the planning controls, the Minister's reasons for call-ins and decisions (including exposure to lobbying), and the absence of an appeal right.

In summary, the overall tenor of the case for DAP throughout the Discussion Paper is that alleged shortcomings in the established planning system demand an additional layer of process and administration to exempt particular proposals from LG or WAPC determination. This proposition does not stand up to what it purports.

OVERVIEW

The Discussion Paper should be read for a full appreciation of the DAP proposal. Building on the above comments, the following key observations are derived from an interpretation of its content.

The paper promotes DAP as a *fait accompli*, founded on failings under the existing development control regime, and claims several benefits in the proposal, then is very prescriptive about how DAP would work.

While the basic objective to improve the planning process is worthy and the principles involved are acknowledged, it should not be assumed that the introduction of DAP is justified or is the only alternative for improvement.

The better integration of regional and local planning has merit, provided that local area planning is not unduly overridden, but the DAP would not necessarily result in enhanced coordination and balanced outcomes.

The notion that the present planning system and LG is not organised and experienced to handle significant projects or major applications is flawed – the suggestion seems to be that selected proposals be removed from scrutiny, and possibly consultation, and fast-tracked owing to some special nature; when it can be argued that it is precisely large, complex, costly or controversial proposals that warrant proper processing and consideration to be determined appropriately, taking into account all stakeholders and implications.

This overlooks and undervalues the growth of LG in recent decades in taking responsibility for and resourcing (including funding) the administration of an increasingly complex planning system, with authority for both local and regional-level assessments and determination in accordance with various delegated powers.

If the proportion of DAP applications is small as anticipated, it is difficult to see that this would significantly free-up LG or the WAPC to do more strategic planning as claimed; and it would be ironic were these decision-makers to pass-on development control for major proposals which are strategic or part of the fulfilment of strategic plans.

The move to implementation of DAP based on the initial reform consultation and somewhat limited response may be considered as presumptuous and premature to the current round of consultation on the detailed concept and operational arrangements.

The best-practice model for development assessments promotes a shift from elected member to professional officer determination (such as the delegation already common), although there would still be elected member participation on the DAP, but this would be reduced and would not occupy the chair.

The involvement of a wider field of planning and development-related professions in the DAP is likely to alter the complexion of decision-making, to be more technically and perhaps business-orientated rather than LG-managed and community-based. This has been described as an undesirable departure from community-responsive planning, as shaped by history and legislation, to a private sector development industry focus; ie, away from the local governance of planning in the public interest and towards (indeed into the hands of) those meant to be regulated.

The Ministerial call-in power, in echoing the powers of intervention or direction of that office under the Act, is potentially problematic in terms of: the criteria for what constitutes State or regional interest; attracting lobbying; access to reasons for the decision; and the absence of a right of review. In this light the proposed DAP system is a contradiction: while seeking to facilitate important applications and empowering the Minister to call up ones to ensure that, it also denies a right of review on a Ministerial decision. Furthermore, in this manner an application

would be twice-removed from the purview of the LG or WAPC and determined at a distance from the community.

STATED BENEFITS

The Discussion Paper in section 5 page 23 describes the identified benefits of DAP as justification for the change, which are commented on below and elaborated upon in the pro forma submission.

It is noted that the dialogue in the Discussion Paper neglects to refer to the effectiveness of the processes and outcomes, or to a consultative approach, as features and benefits incorporated in a DAP system.

Timeliness

The paper again emphasises facilitating significant projects. It is doubtful that DAP members would be able to replace the role of technical experts to brief a panel as decision-maker, and nor should they if the decision-maker is to be independent.

Efficiency

Whilst there may be some efficiency offered by DAP, that should not compromise the proper evaluation of applications for appropriate outcomes.

Simplicity

Prospectively, DAP may be a vehicle to avoid one approval and one refusal of a proposal where separate local and regional determinations occur. However, neither level of planning consideration should be fettered by the other and they should be coordinated.

Transparency

LG already ensures open, public and inclusive processes and decisions, and is more accessible via officers, elected members and consultation than DAP could be – hence it cannot be said that independent experts will improve transparency (and the opposite could occur).

Sustainability

The statement that involving independent experts and elected members should ensure sustainable decisions lacks clarity. What sort of sustainability is in mind: environmental, economic, or social; and how would a DAP decision be any more sustainable than if by a LG or the WAPC?

Accountability

The intended checks and balances for ethical accountability are sound and essential to good governance. As to accountability to the community, however, the non-LG panel members would be unelected, remote and technically-orientated, with less awareness of the local context and a shorter-term outlook. There may be a tendency for DAP to lean away from local area planning considerations or the consistent assessment of proposals, potentially with too much “on-merit” reliance for supporting proposals.

Fairness

The normal appeal right to the SAT is valid and, as for LG, the SAT's deliberations would help to guide DAP in future decision-making in applying planning instruments. The proposed call-in power of the Minister, however, is akin to an appeal decision by that office, but that avenue was disbanded when the SAT was introduced, so this is now questionable. Further, what about a fair choice to applicants who may prefer to work with the LG or WAPC, with an appeal right to the SAT, instead of a DAP and run the risk of a Ministerial call-up with no appeal right?

Consistency

The regulations are to set criteria for the application and determination process for significant projects, which while aiding consistency, should not be too streamlined or inflexible so as to result in consistently inferior handling and outcomes. It cannot be so easily contended that DAP would be any more consistent than LG or the WAPC in adhering to the planning framework and exercising discretion, whether for local or regional-level determinations. The tendency would be more towards the independence of DAP which is being promoted, while individual decisions made few and far between with limited comparisons would be deprived of adequate reference-points and contextual awareness. The pattern of DAP decisions should be carefully monitored and any serious inconsistencies with correct LG or WAPC decisions redressed.

Suitability

The prescription that DAP would determine applications of State or regional significance conflicts with the intended call-in power of the Minister for that reason. The Ministerial power to create DAP to overrule "non-performing" LG needs clarification and is an undesirable stick rather than carrot approach.

OPERATIONAL IMPLICATIONS

The Discussion Paper in section 4 from page 11 set out how DAP would be formed and function. Specific comments on the implications of these proposed operations are as follows and are reflected in the pro forma submission.

Formation

Page 14 refers to an alternate decision maker for complex development applications, but the motivation for the formation of DAP on this basis is premeditated.

Applications Invoked

The types and scales of applications identified to be invoked as candidates for DAP determination seems to be a catch-all method which is excessive and impractical.

The value of \$2M as the trigger for applications falling within the ambit of DAP is far too low, and many of the types of proposals do not warrant special consideration; eg, what is the demand for an eleven-townhouses development with a value of \$2.1M to go to a DAP, when it could easily be approved under delegation by a LG or by the council?

At the crux of the issue is why should the most significant applications made in a municipality be removed from the LG as the responsible authority under its town planning scheme, which it is best placed to administer?

Furthermore, were the values and classes of applications refined and the numbers therefore reduced, the impetus to establish DAP to deal with a restricted spectrum of proposals would be meaningless.

Number of Members

A DAP of five members is not many in order to achieve an adequate cross-sectional view, a majority or a quorum, which would lead to a narrow approach in the consideration of proposals. For joint DAP in particular this is an insufficiently small number of members to properly represent large geographic areas or populations.

Duration of Panels

While the Minister would have power to alter the composition of DAP according to changing circumstances, the DAP and LG also ought to be able to initiate and have a say in the evolution of DAP.

Panel Membership

Preferably LG should participate in the selection of the specialist members, or at least be consulted about them, in order to ensure their suitability for the characteristics of the geographical area and the planning matters arising.

Accountability

The intended control over lobbying should be extended to the Minister in relation to that call-in power.

The various guiding instruments should be published – possibly including the expressions of interest, credentials, selection and register of non-LG panel members.

Training and review of DAP should be on a group basis for peer development and collective input.

Planning Support

Where a DAP engages a consultant to prepare a report due to lack of LG planning expertise, the CEO should review the report with a right to make comment.

Secretarial Support

It is appropriate that DAP contact with LG staff should be through the Chair.

Administration Costs

In reality the costs to LG in administering DAP would mount-up, entailing staff time and expertise, all consumables, dealing with stakeholders and so on.

The State government should be prepared to pay for any new arrangements it imposes upon LG.

Sitting Fees

These would take away from LG income for its overall planning administration.

Code of Conduct

This would be vital to the integrity of DAP.

Panel Quorum

The minimum of three, with a majority of only two, would be too small for balanced decision-making.

Meeting Frequency

How would DAP members in meeting only occasionally keep abreast of planning matters and in touch at a local level as elected members do?

Requiring elected members from several councils to attend panel meetings and wait for their individual council items to be heard to take turns in decision-making would be inconvenient, inefficient and may not attract participants or hold their interest.

Reporting on Performance

This should not be limited to quantitative assessment of how DAP are performing as there must be an emphasis on qualitative assessment in the evaluation of how DAP function.

Appeals

As a carry-through of their focus on technical assessment, DAP members should be prepared to appear as expert witnesses to defend appeals accordingly.

Other

The Discussion Paper makes no mention of the need sometimes to refer applications back for more information or to defer consideration pending associated actions – which might be instigated by a LG, DAP or applicant – and which are provided for by extension of time clauses in schemes or managed administratively. Were the DAP system to overlook this useful facility, appeal could arise unnecessarily and be a burden.

IMPLICATIONS FOR COTTESLOE

The Town of Cottesloe would be part of the *West JDAP*, together with Cambridge, Claremont, Mosman Park, Nedlands, Peppermint Grove and Subiaco.

This grouping is consistent with the western suburbs geography and sub-regional LG cooperation such as the WESROC, with several similarities in relation to planning schemes, urban character and components (eg, Stirling Highway), communities, management and so on, all of which should have an instructive and constructive bearing on the approach taken by the JDAP if operated properly.

However, the nature and range of proposals that could be captured by the DAP and Ministerial call-in process raises concerns for the appropriate development of the beachfront, town centre, institutional sites and development zones of Cottesloe.

Poorly informed or “expeditious” decision-making divorced from mainstream Council consideration would be to the detriment of all the strategic and statutory planning undertaken by Council in the past several years as the primary custodian of the district, including the involvement of a very active and committed community.

CONCLUSION

The Discussion Paper outline of the DAP proposal is only superficially plausible and is not credible.

The proposition of DAP views the established planning system, which has evolved and been refined over time with good intent, negatively, and is a top-down approach. LG has expressed that it is not receptive to the idea, nor convinced of its efficacy.

The concept amounts to an unnecessary further fragmentation of an already overly-complicated planning system with too many decision-making authorities, and an additional administrative burden.

Fundamentally, DAP are considered to be at odds with locally-led community-based planning.

Practically, DAP do not seem worth the effort: an enormous amount of change-management and new administration for little if any real advantage – how would occasional meetings for a few applications for a few hours truly improve anything; and how would part-time, non-LG members keep abreast of planning matters and in-touch with the community as elected members do; or make good decisions on an ad hoc basis looking at a confined canvas?

It is improbable that DAP would be any more efficient or effective, especially in respect of planning outcomes and cost-benefits.

Although DAP are to stand in the shoes of LG or the WAPC, plus as the original decision-maker not a review authority, there is the danger that DAP may view themselves as set-apart from or superior to LG in dealing with the deemed significant applications, which obviously would not engender trust about the process amongst officers, members, the community and stakeholders.

There is also the potential for DAP to be expanded over time in number, size, ambit and powers to be more dominant in decision-making.

FURTHER CONSULTATION

The Discussion Paper at page 24 *Next steps* indicates further consultation with LG in the drafting of the regulations – are draft regulations to be circulated for consultation?

Page 24 also indicates stakeholder and planning industry consultation on the draft guidance documents – should DAP be pursued this is strongly supported, as it is vital that as the primary administrator LG is satisfied with workable and equitable arrangements.

COUNCIL SUBMISSION

The submission form with recommended answers to the preset questions plus general comments is contained in this report after the recommendation.

This can be revised to reflect Council's consideration or any additional points it wishes to make.

This report could also be included to provide the background detail of Council's deliberations in its assessment of and response to the Discussion Paper.

VOTING

Simple majority

COMMITTEE COMMENT

StartOfRecommendation - This line will not be printed Please do NOT delete

Committee expressed its unanimous opposition to the DAP proposal and endorsed the range of issues raised in the officer report.

OFFICER & COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

Moved Cr Goldthorpe, seconded Cr Woodhill

That Council endorses the submission to the Department of Planning in opposition to the proposal for Development Assessment Panels in WA, including a copy of this report as background discussion of Council's concerns and objections.

EndOfRecommendation - This line will not be printed Please do NOT delete

Carried 4/0

Unchanged Committee Recommendation

PUBLIC SUBMISSION FORM
DEVELOPMENT ASSESSMENT PANELS DISCUSSION PAPER

Name: (contact: Andrew Jackson)
Organisation: Town of Cottesloe
Address: 109 Broome Street, Cottesloe, 6011
Interest: Local Government
Date: October 2009

Notes by Submitter:

- *The following responses apply to local government but are often applicable to the WAPC, also.*
- *The erroneous numbering in the submission form after 13 has been corrected, together with some minor editing*

Development Applications Criteria

1. Do you consider that additional criteria of development type (value \$AUD and class) are required for the metropolitan local/joint development assessment panels? If yes, what additions would you propose and why?

Response:

The criteria overall should be reviewed as follows:

- *A development cost threshold of \$10M or more.*
 - *Exemption of any type of application in accordance with an approved strategy plan, structure plan, centre plan and so on.*
 - *Only applications for grouped dwellings or aged/dependent persons dwellings numbering more than 25, or multiple dwellings numbering more than 50 (unless exempt as above), whether or not complying.*
 - *Only strategic land use, transport and infrastructure projects or public works of State or regional significance which are fully-formed, have undergone all consultation and are capable of being approved.*
2. Do you consider that additional criteria of development type (value \$AUD and class) are required for the non-metropolitan joint development assessment panels? If yes, what additions would you propose and why?

Response:

This should be similarly revised as above.

Panel Membership

Local Government Members

3. How should local governments nominate and choose council members to represent the council on its local or joint development assessment panel? Should this be set out in the regulations, or left to local governments to determine?

Response:

Local governments should be free to determine how and who, given the variables involved, for example: size and location of local government (metro/regional), size and composition of council, governance operations, committee structure, experience and availability of elected members, and so on.

The regulations could outline such relevant considerations for local governments to have regard to (including the value of having the chair of the planning committee participate), and entail calling for nominations and voting in the normal manner.

4. Do you consider it an appropriate requirement for local government representatives appointed to a development assessment panel in Western Australia to have a certain qualification or type of experience, in addition to being an elected member of council?

Response:

Yes, it would be best for local government panel members to have knowledge, qualifications and/or experience related to planning or associated fields; and to have planning or associated council committee experience, or associated professional/industry experience outside council.

Specialist Members

5. Should development assessment panels in Western Australia be required to have a "reasonable balance" of experience represented on the panel? Or should every panel be required to have an expert from a particular set of fields? (For example, one expert with substantial planning experience, one expert with substantial environmental experience and one expert with substantial urban design experience or three experts with reasonable experience across a number of the fields indicated in section 4.3.1).

Response:

The chair should have mainstream planning experience and be a respected practitioner.

Other members should be complimentary, with a preference for core planning or closely-allied experience.

A fixed set of fields would be inflexible and probably could not be filled statewide, and might result in less-suitable members being appointed in order to fill fields.

It would be appropriate to tailor panels to geographic/development needs (eg, environmental or indigenous dimensions), plus to be able to alter membership as needs evolve.

A "reasonable balance" approach may tend to dilute the calibre and competency of panels.

6. Is it suitable for specialist members to be able to rotate within the panel according to the expertise required for that particular development assessment or should the panel be a constant set of specialists regardless of the development being assessed?

Response:

Rotation would assist in providing due regard to particular aspects in certain cases, however, constant rotation would not foster consistency, predictability (in the positive sense) or continuity of decision-making, and would be administratively cumbersome.

Alternatively, panels could be augmented by the specialist expertise required from time-to-time, by way of addition rather than replacement, to ensure appropriate consideration of the subject proposal (in the eyes of all stakeholders).

7. Independent specialist members of development assessment panels in Western Australia will be required to have a certain level of experience in their chosen field. How many years of experience (in a relevant field) and/or what level of qualification would be appropriate for the appointment of independent specialist members to a development assessment panel in Western Australia?

Response:

Twenty years minimum mainstream experience, to ensure professional maturity and standing, comparative experience, decision-making capability and a worldly perspective.

Tertiary qualifications or substantial industry-recognised experience would be essential and professional membership/s highly desirable.

If academics are to be considered for appointment they should have a background of relevant practical and/or research experience.

8. Is it appropriate for specialist members to be permitted to sit on several development assessment panels during the same time period? Or should each specialist member only be permitted to sit on a single panel?

Response:

The membership or rotation of specialist members on more than one panel would nurture their experience and skills, although they would be obliged to operate according to each jurisdiction and even-handedly.

However, to encourage diversity and guard against dominance members could be limited to two panels.

9. Should specialist members be required to go through a formal interview process with the State Government to be eligible for the panel?

Response:

Definitely, as it should be a comparative selection rather than direct appointment process, and as such screening would provide a useful cross-section of members individually and collectively.

The local governments should participate in the interview at elected member or management level. This is because DAP are an extension of local government, in lieu of decisions by councils or officers under delegation, and with the purpose of applying local planning instruments.

Operation of Panels

10. The Minister will nominate a specialist member as proxy from the Register of Panel Members to attend meetings of the development assessment panel on behalf of a specialist member when they are unable to attend. Should the proxies be assigned to a particular panel or is it more appropriate to have a pool of proxy members that any panel can call upon as needed? Is it appropriate for the relevant local government (secretariat) to be responsible for coordinating the replacement of core panel members with the nominated proxy (from the register)? Are there any other process issues relating to the use of specialist proxy panel members that need further consideration?

Response:

In line with the response to Q6, the proxies should be assigned to particular panels in the first instance.

As a back-up, drawing on any pool should be in accordance with a predetermined short-list and guidelines to ensure suitability to each panel. On this basis the local government secretariat could readily coordinate proxies.

As to process, proxies should be briefed by the panel chair ahead of the meeting about procedures, the approach for the area and recent decisions.

11. Each local government will be required to nominate a permanent local government representative proxy to replace the core local government panel members when they are unable to attend panel meetings. The nominated proxy along with the core local government members will need to be on the Register of Panel Members managed by the Department of Planning. Are there any other process issues relating to the use of local government proxy panel members that need further consideration?

Response:

All proxies should attend training, be kept abreast of DAP and planning matters and be periodically checked as still suitable, willing and available.

12. If a panel member declares that they have a conflict of interest in relation to a particular development application should that member be replaced for the duration of the discussion on that item or the duration of the entire meeting? Should the Minister appoint 'alternate' members to each panel, whose role is to replace permanent members where a conflict of interest arises?

Response:

As with local government practice, declaring an interest and if necessary vacating the meeting should only be necessary for the subject item.

However, this may affect the quorum, it would be inefficient to call-upon proxies for individual items, and affected panel members would need to notify the chair and secretariat ahead of the meeting so that arrangements could be made.

It is considered that proxies would operate better than freelance-like 'alternate' members with limited involvement.

13. What specific issues need to be covered by the Department of Planning when producing a guidance document for development assessment panels?

Response:

- *An overview of the complete planning system.*
- *Understanding local and regional area planning determinism – ensuring orderly and proper planning and the preservation of amenity.*
- *Appreciating development control – a regulatory regime, not a rubber stamp.*
- *Good decision-making: reconciling the public interest, development rights and stakeholder inputs; exercising discretion; the principles of context, merit, precedent and consistency; deficiencies of arbitrary decisions.*
- *The importance of consultation.*
- *Their “privileged” yet closely-guided role and powers.*

14. Minutes of the development assessment panels are intended to be posted on both the WAPC and relevant local government website? Is this the most appropriate method of providing transparency on decision making or are there other processes also required? Is there a need for a dedicated WA development assessment panel webpage?

Response:

As with local government practice, minutes (and agendas) should also be available in hard copy at the offices of the agencies, plus applicants and submitters should be informed in writing of decisions.

This is important to enable elected members, staff and interested parties to access proposals and outcomes.

An all-DAP webpage would be useful in addition to each agency's (ie, similar to the SAT decisions facility), to afford an overview and monitoring of proposals and determinations.

Code of Conduct

15. What should the WA Code of Conduct cover? Does the list provided in section 4.3.7 exclude any items that should be covered? If yes what additional information needs to be addressed in the *Planning and Development (Development Assessment Panel) Regulations 2010 code of conduct?*

Response:

- *Local government and WAPC standards of conduct.*
- *Conduct of meetings.*
- *Representing the decision-making entity.*
- *Confidentiality circumstances and privacy considerations.*
- *Managing lobbying and disclosure there of.*
- *Avoiding discrimination.*

16. Is it appropriate to incorporate the Code of Conduct into the Development Assessment Panels Guidance Manual (discussed in section 4.3.5) so that there is one holistic manual for running DAPs within the State or [should it] be one in a series of documents on operating a DAP?

Response:

A consolidated manual is preferable, being comprehensive, integrated, accessible (for transparency), convenient and a ready-reference.

It should be capable of being (publically) amended if found necessary, preferably by following an administrative procedure instead of requiring regulation.

Administrative Issues

17. How should secretariat support for a joint development assessment panel be shared by the participating councils? The current proposal is for each local government to appoint an officer to undertake the secretariat role (eg, take minutes, organise the agenda and provide other general administrative support) to the development assessment panel on a six-monthly rotation.

Response:

A six-monthly rotation would be practical and fair, with a handover period. However, as councils have differing practices and software there may not be continuity in procedures or consistency of formats between councils, and hence between DAP.

While standardisation across all DAP would be ideal for uniformity of documentation, accessing information, monitoring and reporting, this would require a whole new operational infrastructure which is not resourced or funded.

18. What would be an appropriate process for development assessment panels to report on their performance? Should they provide data to the Department of Planning and the relevant local government on a monthly basis?

Response:

The workings of the DAP should be compiled meeting-by-meeting (whether seldom or frequent) for ongoing access to information, statistics, trends, issues and problem-solving.

19. The Department of Planning will be required to produce an annual report on the performance of all development assessment panels across the State? What

input should be provided by each development assessment panel on its operations?

Response:

In addition to the aspects identified in section 4.3.10 of the Discussion Paper:

- *The number of Ministerial call-ins, the reasons why, the nature of the proposals, the decisions and reasons, the time taken and a profile of that avenue of decision-making.*
- *A total qualitative assessment of efficiency, effectiveness, fairness, benefits, disbenefits, stakeholder satisfaction, costs and operations.*
- *A comparative analysis with the performance and outcomes of applications processing and decision-making under the normal local government and WAPC systems.*
- *An evaluation of trends, issues, improvements and whether the DAP is worthwhile.*

Financial Arrangements

20. Given that the proposed sitting fees need to be set low enough to be reasonably paid from established application fees (as set out in the *Planning and Development Regulations 2009*) and high enough to attract appropriately experienced candidates, is there a need to increase the proposed sitting fees?

Response:

- *The sitting fees are pitched too high, given that payment will be relatively “easy money” derived from reading and discussion (with others having done all the leg work) and allowing for future incremental increases.*
- *Higher sitting fees would also deprive local governments of revenue which is ordinarily not lost to paying decision-makers.*

21. The current model proposes that the chair will attract a higher sitting fee rate than other specialist members given the additional responsibilities the role demands and elected members will not attract a sitting fee as their role is considered to be within their elected duties. Is this the most appropriate sitting fees arrangement?

Response:

If the panel members are to be financially recompensed or rewarded for their extra efforts to their main occupation then it is only fair that the elected members likewise be paid for their additional work, all as a positive incentive to perform well.

This would also treat all panel members as equals and avoid being seen to diminish the role or importance of local government, which the panel is making decisions for anyway.

It is reasonable for the chair to be paid a modest proportion more (maximum 25%).

Training of Panel Members

22. What does the WA training course need to cover? Is the proposed content outlined in section 4.3.9 detailed enough or do we need to cover other issues?

Response:

In addition to the matters identified in the responses to Q13&15:

- *The planning legislation.*
- *Strategic planning.*
- *Region schemes and local schemes.*
- *Planning policy.*
- *Terms and conditions of approval and reasons for refusal.*
- *The SAT.*

23. Is it appropriate for all members, regardless of their experience and background, to be required to attend the same panel training session outlining planning law and procedures for DAPs in WA?

Response:

Definitely, in order to ensure universal training and uniform operations, plus to engender a shared ethos and expectations.

General Comments

To assist in the collation of comments please reference the section, page number and paragraph number (where appropriate) that corresponds to your comments (e.g. Section 4.5, page 22, paragraph 2). If your comment is of a more general nature please place in a "general comments" section in your response.

Please provide any additional comments you may have on the discussion paper.

1. *It is disappointing that the first forum was terminated 20 minutes before the advertised time when discussion should have been allowed to continue so as to disseminate the proposal and gather feedback.*
2. *A due date for submissions is obviously fine but to say that no late submissions would be considered is contrary to the spirit and intent of consultation and would defeat the purpose of seeking feedback.*
3. *It is clear that the Local Government sector is widely and strongly against the introduction of DAP.*
4. *Cottesloe Town Council's report is attached as part of its submission.*

* * * * *

11.1.3 PLANNING FOR COTTESLOE TOWN CENTRE & ENVIRONS – STATUS REPORT

File Name: A PLANNING FOR COTTESLOE TOWN CENTRE ENVIRONS STATUS REPORT WAY FORWARD.doc - This line will not be printed do not delete

File No: D15.02 & SUB/440
Responsible Officer: Carl Askew
Chief Executive Officer
Author: Andrew Jackson
Manager Development Services
Proposed Meeting Date: 21 October 2009
Author Disclosure of Interest Nil

SUMMARY

This report briefly updates Council on the status of planning initiatives for the Town Centre and environs, for information as well as direction regarding further detailed work and reports.

STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS

Planning for the Town Centre area is a key strategic aim of Council to guide development of the Cottesloe activity centre, with a particular emphasis on solutions for the transport network.

POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Structure planning and detailed planning for the Town Centre and surrounds is likely to stimulate policy changes and innovations for this multi-faceted precinct.

STATUTORY ENVIRONMENT

Metropolitan Region Scheme.
TPS2 and proposed LPS3.
State Government urban planning strategies and policies.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Planning, consultation and implementation for improvement of the Town Centre and environs are expected to generate substantial costs to Council entailing additional resources.

SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS

Planning for and development of the Town Centre precinct links to several dimensions of sustainability including environmental, social and economic, plus the concepts of place making and land use-transport integration.

CONSULTATION

Town Centre precinct planning and development is an ongoing consultative process engaging the community, stakeholders and agencies.

BACKGROUND

Over recent years Council has made a number of resolutions relating to the Town Centre locality, which essentially note the various studies and reports to date, for continual action to explore or implement the findings, generally moving from the broad concepts to detailed planning, and ultimately leading to actual proposals.

They are strategic and forecast more planning work, which also requires more programming, including other agencies, stakeholders and funding for consultancy inputs.

Much of this effort was tied to producing LPS3 (now submitted for final approval) but extends beyond that process; eg, structure planning, MRS Amendment/s, community consultation, and so on.

The Enquiry-by-Design (EbD) in relation to LPS3 advanced these matters and Council's objective for east-west connectivity.

The Station Street Working Group has drafted concepts for the subject sites which have been presented to stakeholders and councillors.

Council has agreed to a consultant being appointed to examine Public Domain Infrastructure Planning for the Town Centre.

The Stirling Highway Activity Corridor Study has recognised the Town Centre as an area under metropolitan planning consideration for intensification.

An update on the main matters at this stage follows.

CURTIN AVENUE

Curtin Avenue was closely-considered at the EbD in relation to the railway line, surplus lands, connectivity and Town Centre.

Given the EbD outcomes report, Council has resolved to pursue a Railway Lands Structure Plan including the future of Curtin Avenue for implementation over time, as below.

That Council: Agrees to pursue the Preliminary Structure Plan for Development Zone 'E' of proposed Local Planning Scheme No. 3, including a preferred solution for future Curtin Avenue, overall improved connectivity and indicative future development of the railway lands, through further liaison with relevant agencies towards an agreed structure plan to be formalised under the Scheme after it becomes operative. That a supplementary report be sought from Rawlinson's that reconsiders costings for option 2, within the Town Centre Transport Options section of the report, on the basis that the rail line cover does not need to extend from Jarrad Street to Forrest Street, but is confined to a traffic bridge over Jarrad Street and a pedestrian bridge between Napoleon Street and Station Street above the new railway station, and addresses Cr Cunningham's other concerns related to traffic management.

The follow-up advice from Rawlinson's has been commissioned for consideration and future reporting.

A broad scoping of actions to address this wide-ranging resolution includes:

- *Review EbD outcomes and other background material.*
- *Review Rawlinson's and related advice.*
- *Consider traffic concerns.*
- *Liaise with agencies.*
- *Convene a working group.*
- *Scope the more detailed structure planning.*
- *Engage consultants.*
- *Carry out stakeholder consultation.*
- *Undertake structure planning and urban design.*
- *Report to Council.*

PUBLIC DOMAIN INFRASTRUCTURE

Council has previously resolved to:

Move forward on an integrated plan to improve all aspects of the infrastructure of the town centre to be funded by the Town of Cottesloe.

Ensure that all planned works and infrastructure to the town be designed to meet with the needs of people with disabilities to the fullest extent possible.

Note a report on the approach to a Town Centre Public Domain Infrastructure Improvement Plan, support the outline brief subject to adding appropriate reference to public toilets, consultation and reporting, and agree to officers following-through to commission consultants accordingly.

Action on this matter awaited progress of other Town Centre aspects in relation to parking, LPS3, Curtin Avenue and Station Street. These have now added direction to the infrastructure study to gain greater benefit from it, for a more coordinated product.

Quotations are currently being sought from consultants.

STATION STREET SITES

The Station Street project has also awaited the EbD and LPS3, both of which inform what may be entertained for the subject two sites – the EbD is about broad urban design ideas while LPS3 contains land use and development requirements which allow as well as limit what may occur.

Council has recently called for a status report from staff on the next steps, including the need for any design guidelines.

The purpose of the study was to scope indicative development concepts as a precursor to design guidelines, which in turn would feed into an expression of interest/tender process to realise development of the sites.

Although Council was not wholly receptive to the indicative scenarios, the study was very useful in exploring what's possible for the sites, how they might be

developed in the context of the street/locality and character of the Town Centre, and the sorts of design objectives/ingredients to be considered.

The role of the overall study has been expressed as to:

- *Generate a layer of detail in determining how development should address the surrounds* – this has been done.
- *Formulate and apply design guidelines for the preparation and assessment of development proposals* – this is to be done and the consultant is presently quoting for this task.

PLANNING METHODS

Looking ahead, a variety of planning methods could be employed to pursue an integrated and coordinated approach to the area, including:

- *A steering committee and working group/s.*
- *Structure planning.*
- *A second stage Town Centre study.*
- *Design guidelines.*
- *Partnerships with key players.*
- *Participation by the Design Advisory Panel, Procott and other stakeholders.*
- *A pool of consultants.*
- *A place-maker.*

FUTURE REPORTING

As more detailed work is performed and the products are refined for decisions leading to implementation programs and projects, the following future reporting to Council is envisaged:

- Preliminary Structure Plan for Development Zone 'E'.
- Curtin Avenue and Connectivity Solutions.
- Town Centre Design Guidelines for LPS3.
- Station Street Sites Design Guidelines.
- Public Domain Infrastructure Planning.
- Stirling Highway Activity Corridor Study.

VOTING

Simple majority

COMMITTEE COMMENT

Committee supported reconvening the Station Street Working Group and completion of design guidelines for the two Council sites, with a view to moving ahead with redevelopment proposals in order to improve Station Street and the Town Centre.

OFFICER & COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

Moved Cr Woodhill, seconded Cr Goldthorpe

StartOfRecommendation - This line will not be printed Please do NOT delete

That Council:

- 1. Note the officer status report regarding planning initiatives for the Town Centre and environs.**
- 2. Endorse the re-convening of the Station Street Working Group in order to:**
 - i. Complete the design guidelines for the two Council sites (by re-appointment of the consultant);**
 - ii. Formulate preferred redevelopment proposals for the sites, including land uses, development parameters, built form and urban design, in the interests of Town Centre integration and enhancement;**
 - iii. Ascertain the best method to proceed with the redevelopment of each site, including consideration of Town of Cottesloe involvement, asset management, partnerships, tenders or other means; and**
 - iv. Make recommendations to Council on implementation programmes accordingly, including actions (including approvals/processes and consultations), timeframes, costs.**

Carried 4/0

[Unchanged Committee Recommendation](#)

EndOfRecommendation - This line will not be printed Please do NOT delete

12 ELECTED MEMBERS' MOTIONS OF WHICH PREVIOUS NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

Nil

13 NEW BUSINESS OF AN URGENT NATURE INTRODUCED BY ELECTED MEMBERS/OFFICERS BY DECISION OF MEETING

The MDS displayed and explained an alternative design for the recently approved additions to the northern end of the NCSLSC premises, which the architect has approached the Town about for preliminary consideration as a possibility. The Manager Development Services requested that the matter be considered as Urgent Business.

Moved Cr Woodhill, seconded Cr Carmichael

That the information be considered as new business of an urgent nature introduced by officers by decision of the meeting.

Carried 4/0

COMMITTEE DISCUSSION

Committee indicated that the streetscape appearance was a positive improvement but queried the loss of club parking bays and how that may be dealt with.

Moved Cr Goldthorpe, seconded Cr Woodhill

That the potential alternative design be noted pending any further development application for it.

Carried 4/0

[Unchanged Committee Recommendation](#)

14 MEETING CLOSURE

The Deputy Presiding Member announced the closure of the meeting at 7:30pm.

CONFIRMED: PRESIDING MEMBER _____ DATE: _____