

# TOWN OF COTTESLOE



## DEVELOPMENT SERVICES COMMITTEE MINUTES

MAYOR'S PARLOUR, COTTESLOE CIVIC CENTRE  
109 BROOME STREET, COTTESLOE  
6.00 PM, MONDAY, 19 AUGUST 2013

**CARL ASKEW**  
Chief Executive Officer

23 August 2013

## **DISCLAIMER**

**No responsibility whatsoever is implied or accepted by the Town for any act, omission, statement or intimation occurring during council meetings.**

**The Town of Cottesloe disclaims any liability for any loss whatsoever and howsoever caused arising out of reliance by any person or legal entity on any such act, omission, statement or intimation occurring during council meetings.**

**Any person or legal entity who acts or fails to act in reliance upon any statement, act or omission made in a council meeting does so at that person's or legal entity's own risk.**

**In particular and without derogating in any way from the broad disclaimer above, in any discussion regarding any planning application or application for a licence, any statement or intimation of approval made by any member or officer of the Town of Cottesloe during the course of any meeting is not intended to be and is not taken as notice of approval from the Town.**

**The Town of Cottesloe wishes to advise that any plans or documents contained within the agenda or minutes may be subject to copyright law provisions (*Copyright Act 1968*, as amended) and that the express permission of the copyright owner(s) should be sought prior to their reproduction.**

**Members of the public should note that no action should be taken on any application or item discussed at a council meeting prior to written advice on the resolution of council being received.**

**Agenda and minutes are available on the Town's website [www.cottesloe.wa.gov.au](http://www.cottesloe.wa.gov.au)**

# DEVELOPMENT SERVICES COMMITTEE

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

ITEM	SUBJECT	PAGE NO
1	DECLARATION OF MEETING OPENING/ANNOUNCEMENT OF VISITORS.....	3
2	DISCLAIMER .....	3
3	ANNOUNCEMENTS BY PRESIDING MEMBER WITHOUT DISCUSSION .....	3
4	PUBLIC QUESTION TIME .....	3
	4.1 RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS PUBLIC QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE.....	3
	4.2 PUBLIC QUESTIONS .....	3
5	PUBLIC STATEMENT TIME.....	3
6	ATTENDANCE .....	3
	6.1 APOLOGIES .....	4
	6.2 APPROVED LEAVE OF ABSENCE .....	4
	6.3 APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE .....	4
7	DECLARATION OF INTERESTS.....	4
8	CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES.....	4
9	PRESENTATIONS .....	4
	9.1 PETITIONS.....	4
	9.2 PRESENTATIONS .....	4
	9.3 DEPUTATIONS .....	4
10	REPORTS .....	5
	10.1 PLANNING .....	5
	10.1.1 NO. 257 (STRATA LOT 2) MARMION STREET – ALTERATIONS AND ADDITIONS, INCLUDING A FIRST FLOOR ADDITION, DOUBLE GARAGE, FRONT AND SIDE EXTENSIONS, PERGOLAS AND FENCING	5
	10.1.2 NO. 42 (LOTS 301 & 31) JOHN STREET – TWO-STOREY AND SINGLE-STOREY ALTERATIONS AND ADDITIONS, LANDSCAPING, FENCING AND A POOL	13
	10.1.3 REPORT ON MAINSTREET AUSTRALIA CONFERENCE MELBOURNE 2013	27
11	ELECTED MEMBERS' MOTIONS OF WHICH PREVIOUS NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN .....	37

---

**12 NEW BUSINESS OF AN URGENT NATURE INTRODUCED BY  
DECISION OF MEETING BY:..... 37**

**12.1 ELECTED MEMBERS..... 37**

**12.2 OFFICERS ..... 37**

**13 MEETING CLOSED TO PUBLIC ..... 37**

**13.1 MATTERS FOR WHICH THE MEETING MAY BE CLOSED .... 37**

**13.2 PUBLIC READING OF RECOMMENDATIONS THAT MAY  
BE MADE PUBLIC..... 37**

**14 MEETING CLOSURE..... 37**

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

The Presiding Member announced the meeting opened at 6:02pm.

**2 DISCLAIMER**

The Presiding Member drew attention to the Town's disclaimer.

**3 ANNOUNCEMENTS BY PRESIDING MEMBER WITHOUT DISCUSSION**

Nil.

**4 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME****4.1 RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS PUBLIC QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE**

Nil.

**4.2 PUBLIC QUESTIONS**

Nil.

**5 PUBLIC STATEMENT TIME**

Mr Laurie Scanlan (Lawrence J Scanlan & Associates Pty Ltd) re 10.1.1 No 257 Marmion Street

Mr Scanlan as the architect explained the design for alterations and additions rather than a replacement dwelling and how the details and materials would blend with the streetscape whereby the limited setback would perform acceptably. Based on this design effort and the functionality of the dwelling he sought support for the proposal.

Mr Steven Postmus (Carrier & Postmus Architects) re 10.1.2 No. 42 John Street

Mr Postmus as architect gave a visual presentation and described the proposal in relation to the site and street, including its architectural treatment and detailing. He promoted it as a worthwhile conception and noted the supportive comments from the HCWA and heritage architect. He also commented on the heritage and planning concerns identified in the officer report.

**6 ATTENDANCE****Present**

Cr Jack Walsh

Presiding Member

Cr Yvonne Hart

Cr Greg Boland

Cr Katrina Downes

Cr Peter Jeanes

Cr Victor Strzina

**Officers Present**

Mr Carl Askew	Chief Executive Officer
Mr Andrew Jackson	Manager Development Services
Mr Ed Drewett	Senior Planning Officer
Mr Ronald Boswell	Planning Officer
Mrs Liz Yates	Development Services Administration Officer

**6.1 APOLOGIES****Officer Apologies****6.2 APPROVED LEAVE OF ABSENCE**

Nil.

**6.3 APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE**

Nil.

**7 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS**

Cr Downes declared an impartiality interest re item 10.1.2 No. 42 John Street, as her husband is related to the property owner, and stated that as a consequence there may be a perception that her impartiality may be affected and declared that she would consider the matter on its merits and vote accordingly.

**8 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES**

**Moved Cr Strzina, seconded Cr Hart**

[Minutes July 15 2013 Development Services Committee.docx](#)

**The Minutes of the Ordinary meeting of the Development Services Committee, held on 15 July 2013 be confirmed.**

**Carried 6/0**

**9 PRESENTATIONS****9.1 PETITIONS**

Nil.

**9.2 PRESENTATIONS**

Nil.

**9.3 DEPUTATIONS**

Nil.

## 10 REPORTS

### 10.1 PLANNING

#### 10.1.1 NO. 257 (STRATA LOT 2) MARMION STREET – ALTERATIONS AND ADDITIONS, INCLUDING A FIRST FLOOR ADDITION, DOUBLE GARAGE, FRONT AND SIDE EXTENSIONS, PERGOLAS AND FENCING

<b>File Ref:</b>	<b>2669</b>
<b>Attachments:</b>	<a href="#">Photo Front of Dwelling</a> <a href="#">Applicant Submission and Plans</a>
<b>Responsible Officer:</b>	<b>Carl Askew</b> <b>Chief Executive Officer</b>
<b>Author:</b>	<b>Ed Drewett</b> <b>Senior Planning Officer</b>
<b>Proposed Meeting Date:</b>	<b>19 August 2013</b>
<b>Author Disclosure of Interest:</b>	<b>Nil</b>
<b>Property Owner:</b>	<b>Kim and Cheryl Parker</b>
<b>Applicant:</b>	<b>Lawrence Scanlan &amp; Associates Pty Ltd</b>
<b>Date of Application:</b>	<b>10 May 2013</b>
<b>Zoning:</b>	<b>Residential R20</b>
<b>Use:</b>	<b>P - A use that is permitted under this Scheme</b>
<b>Lot Area:</b>	<b>480m<sup>2</sup></b>
<b>M.R.S. Reservation:</b>	<b>Not applicable</b>

---

## SUMMARY

This application is seeking the following variations to Council's Town Planning Scheme No. 2 (TPS 2), front setback resolution (2002), Policy for Garages and Carports in Front Setback Areas and the Residential Design Codes (RDC):

- Front setback
- Visual Privacy

Both of these aspects are discussed in this report and refer to plans received on 5 July 2013. The remainder of the proposal is compliant with TPS 2 and the RDC.

Given the assessment that has been undertaken, the recommendation is to conditionally approve the application.

## PROPOSAL

This application is for alterations and additions to an existing strata-titled dwelling, incorporating a new double garage, living room, study/bedroom, bathroom, front, side and rear pergolas on the ground floor and two bedrooms, a bathroom and balcony on the first floor.

## STATUTORY ENVIRONMENT

- Town Planning Scheme No. 2.

- Residential Design Codes.

### POLICY IMPLICATIONS

- Garages and Carports in Front Setback Area.

### PROPOSED LOCAL PLANNING SCHEME NO. 3

No change is proposed to the existing density coding of this lot.

### MUNICIPAL INVENTORY

Not applicable.

### APPLICATION ASSESSMENT

#### AREAS OF NON-COMPLIANCE

##### Residential Design Codes

Design Element	Deemed-to-comply	Proposed	Design principles
5.1 – Context	6m front setback or corresponding to the average setback of existing dwellings on each side fronting the same street or minimum 3m, average 6m.	1.5m to garage.	Clause 5.1.2 – P2.1 & 2.2
5.4 – Building design	7.5m cone of vision.	6.5m cone of vision from front balcony.	Clause 5.4.1 – P1.1 & 1.2

#### Council Policy/Resolution

	Permitted	Proposed
Streetscape	6m front setback (Council resolution 28/10/02).	1.5m to garage; 3m to front balcony.
Garages and Carports in Front Setback Areas	6m, but may be reduced to 1.5m where parallel to the street and if satisfies policy criteria.	1.5m.

### ADVERTISING OF PROPOSAL

The application was advertised by the applicant to three adjoining owners in accordance with TPS 2. All three adjoining owners have provided written support for the proposal.

### BACKGROUND

An initial assessment of the application revealed a number of areas of non-compliance with Council requirements, including front setbacks, a gatehouse, side setbacks, visual privacy and fencing.



The application has been amended to overcome many of the planning concerns identified by Council Officers (see attached letter from applicant).

## **PLANNING COMMENT**

The following technical assessment is made in respect to the proposed development:

### Front setback

In 2002 Council resolved to generally require a 6m front setback for residential development (for the preservation of streetscape, view corridors and amenity). The acceptable development standards of the RDC also require a minimum 6m front setback in an R20 zone, although this may be reduced to 3m providing it averages 6m across the lot, or where a reduced setback corresponds with the average of the setback of existing dwellings on each side.

The proposed double garage will be located parallel to the street with a 1.5m front setback, bedroom 2 and 3 on the first floor will have minimum front setbacks of 3.5m and 5m respectively, and the front balcony will have a 3m front setback. The remainder of the existing dwelling and proposed additions will have setbacks varying between approximately 7.5m and 15.3m (excluding pergolas which are included in open space) and this achieves a 6m average front setback. However, the proposal is not compliant with the *deemed-to-comply* requirements of the RDC as the garage does not have a minimum 3m front setback.

The relevant *design principles* in the RDC for street setbacks state:

*Buildings set back from street boundaries an appropriate distance to ensure they:*

- *contribute to, and are consistent with, an established streetscape;*
- *provide adequate privacy and open space for dwellings;*
- *accommodate site planning requirements such as parking, landscape and utilities;*  
*and*
- *allow safety clearances for easements for essential service corridors.*

*Buildings mass and form that:*

- *uses design features to affect the size and scale of the building;*
- *uses appropriate minor projections that do not detract from the character of the streetscape;*
- *minimises the proportion of the façade at ground level taken up by building services, vehicle entries and parking supply, blank walls, servicing infrastructure access and meters and the like; and*
- *positively contributes to the prevailing development context and streetscape.*

The dwelling on the southern side of the lot is single-storey and is listed as Category 3 in the Town's Municipal Inventory and described as *a good example of pre-World War One residences in this section of Cottlesloe*. The dwelling has a front setback of approximately 5m to its verandah and garage with the main part of the dwelling being setback over 6m.

On the northern side, the dwelling is also single-storey and is listed in Schedule 1 of TPS 2 as well as in the Municipal Inventory as Category 2 which describes it as a

*very important and beautiful Edwardian filigree “Queen Anne” style bungalow. It has a front setback of approximately 10m.*

The existing dwelling on the lot has a front setback varying between approximately 6m to an existing carport and 13m to the dwelling itself.

The remainder of the streetscape is a mix of single-storey and two-storey dwellings with approximately 6m front setbacks, although several double carports have been constructed in front setback areas.

Whilst reduced front setbacks may lead to a more varied and interesting streetscape, it is considered that a 1.5m front setback to the blank side wall of the proposed garage will not contribute to the streetscape, is not consistent with the established streetscape, and will not positively contribute to the prevailing development context and streetscape which is highlighted by the two adjoining heritage-listed buildings. As such, it does not satisfy the *design principles* of the RDC for this reduced street setback to be supported.

#### Setback to garage

As mentioned above, the proposed double garage has been designed parallel to the street with a 1.5m setback from the front boundary.

The *deemed-to-comply* standards of the RDC permit garages to be setback 3m where vehicles are parked parallel to the street, providing they include an opening in the wall parallel to the street. The relevant *design principles* in the RDC state:

*The setting back of carports and garages to maintain clear sight lines along the street and not to detract from the streetscape or appearance of dwellings; or obstruct views of dwellings from the street and vice versa.*

The explanatory guidelines of the RDC further address setbacks to garages and state that *garages are not acceptable except as provided by clause 5.2.1 C1.1, unless they can be accommodated without obstruction to views between street and house at ground level. Such exceptions are likely to be rare.*

Council’s policy for *Garages and Carports in Front Setback Areas* (Policy TPSP 003) generally requires garages (and carports) to be positioned behind the 6m front setback line, although the policy does also allow for garages to be constructed with a reduced setback of 1.5m where vehicles are parked parallel to the street and the following criteria have been considered:

- *materials, design and appearance being in character with the dwelling and surrounding streetscape;*
- *consideration of view lines from adjoining properties;*
- *provision of adequate manoeuvring space;*
- *relevant objectives of the RDC;*
- *the effect of such variation on the amenity of any adjoining lot;*
- *the existing and potential future use and development of any adjoining lots;*  
*and*

- *existing setbacks from the street alignment in the immediate locality, in the case of setbacks from the principle street.*

The proposed garage will be stone clad and have roof planting which will assist in integrating its appearance with the proposed upper floor. It will also be well setback from the adjoining properties, will not obstruct view lines, and have a 6m manoeuvring area to enable vehicles to enter and exit in forward gear. However, there are no other garages in front setback areas along this section of Marmion Street and it is considered that taking into account the existing streetscape and in particular, the existing setbacks to the adjoining dwellings, the proposed location of the garage would detract from the streetscape and obstruct views to and from the house at ground level.

A compromise situation would be to require the proposed garage to be setback a minimum of 3m from the front boundary (aligned with the proposed balcony above), with an opening in the wall parallel to the street to comply with the *deemed-to-comply* standards of the RDC. Alternatively, the proposed garage could be changed to an open-sided carport which would assist in allowing unobstructed views to and from the dwelling. Both of these alternatives would provide good articulation to the frontage of the development whilst having less visual impact on the streetscape and adjoining heritage-listed dwellings.

#### Visual privacy

The proposed front balcony has a 6.5m cone-of-vision to the southern boundary, in lieu of 7.5m behind the front setback as required under the *deemed-to-comply* standards of the RDC. The relevant *design principles* in the RDC state:

*Minimal direct overlooking of active habitable spaces and outdoor living areas of adjacent dwellings achieved through:*

- *building layout and location;*
- *design of major openings;*
- *landscape screening of outdoor active habitable spaces; and/or*
- *location of screening devices.*

*Maximum visual privacy to side and rear boundaries through measures such as:*

- *offsetting the location of ground and first floor windows so that viewing is oblique rather than direct;*
- *building to the boundary where appropriate;*
- *setting back the first floor from the side boundary;*
- *providing higher or opaque and fixed windows; and/or*
- *screen devices (including landscaping, fencing, obscure glazing, timber screens, external blinds, window hoods and shutters).*

In this case, the proposed building layout and design will ensure that there will be no direct overlooking of active habitable spaces and outdoor living areas due the balcony's proximity to an existing carport and parapet wall on the southern neighbour's lot. The adjoining owner also has been consulted and has no objection to the proposal.

## CONCLUSION

The proposed first-floor addition has been designed to avoid building over the existing dwelling to minimise cost and because the applicant has advised that the existing limestone footings would not be adequate to take the load. However, this necessitates a reduced front setback to be considered that intrudes into Council's preferred 6m front setback and which does not comply with the RDC.

Although the overall design of the proposed additions is supported as it would enhance the appearance of the existing dwelling, the proposed reduced front setback to the garage would not contribute to the streetscape or compliment the adjoining dwellings on each side which are both of heritage significance. It is therefore recommended that further design revisions are necessary to ensure that the location and appearance of the proposed double garage in the front setback area does not detract from the amenity of the area.

## VOTING

Simple Majority

## COMMITTEE COMMENT

Committee discussed the approach to setbacks in relation to the streetscape which exhibited some variation and the design aspects in support of exercising discretion in this instance, with mixed opinions expressed. Committee also queried privacy and vehicular access details which officers responded to.

## OFFICER RECOMMENDATION

### **Moved Cr Strzina, seconded Cr Hart**

That Council GRANT its approval to Commence Development for the proposed alterations and additions, including a first-floor addition, double garage, front and side extensions, pergolas and fencing at 257 (Strata Lot 2) Marmion Street, Cottesloe, in accordance with the plans received on 5 July 2013, subject to the following conditions:

1. Revised plans shall be submitted at building permit stage for approval by the Manager Development Services showing the proposed garage being setback a minimum 3m from the front boundary and including an opening in the wall parallel to the street, or alternatively the garage shall be changed to a carport which is unenclosed on all sides.
2. All construction work shall be carried out in accordance with the Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations 1997, Regulation 13 – Construction Sites.
3. The external profile of the development as shown of the approved plans shall not be changed, whether by the addition of any service plant, fitting, fixture or otherwise, except with the written consent of the Town.
4. All water draining from roofs and other impermeable surfaces shall be directed to garden areas, sumps or rainwater tanks within the development site where climatic and soil conditions allow for the effective retention of stormwater on-site.

5. Air-conditioning plant and equipment shall be located closer to the existing dwelling than the adjoining dwellings, and housed or treated to ensure compliance with the Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations.
6. In accordance with Council's Fencing Local Law, the proposed fencing in the front setback area above 0.9m shall have an "open aspect" in that the palings shall be spaced to ensure the width between each paling is at least equal to the width of the paling, with a minimum space of 50mm and a minimum open aspect of 50% of the infill panel, and the piers shall not exceed 2.1m in height from Natural Ground Level.

Advice Note:

The applicant/owner is responsible for ensuring that all lot boundaries shown on the approved plans are correct and that the proposed development is constructed entirely within the owner's property.

#### **AMENDMENT**

**Moved Cr Boland, seconded Cr Hart**

**That in condition 1 of the Officer Recommendation 3m is altered to 6m and all words after 'front boundary' are deleted.**

**Lost 2/4**

#### **AMENDMENT**

**Moved Cr Jeanes, seconded Cr Downes**

**That condition 1 of the Officer Recommendation is deleted.**

**Equality 3/3**

**Presiding Member casting vote against the motion**

**Lost 3/4**

#### **OFFICER & COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION**

**Moved Cr Strzina, seconded Cr Hart**

**That Council GRANT its approval to Commence Development for the proposed alterations and additions, including a first-floor addition, double garage, front and side extensions, pergolas and fencing at 257 (Strata Lot 2) Marmion Street, Cottesloe, in accordance with the plans received on 5 July 2013, subject to the following conditions:**

1. **Revised plans shall be submitted at building permit stage for approval by the Manager Development Services showing the proposed garage being setback a minimum 3m from the front boundary and including an opening in the wall parallel to the street, or alternatively the garage shall be changed to a carport which is unenclosed on all sides.**

2. All construction work shall be carried out in accordance with the Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations 1997, Regulation 13 – Construction Sites.
3. The external profile of the development as shown of the approved plans shall not be changed, whether by the addition of any service plant, fitting, fixture or otherwise, except with the written consent of the Town.
4. All water draining from roofs and other impermeable surfaces shall be directed to garden areas, sumps or rainwater tanks within the development site where climatic and soil conditions allow for the effective retention of stormwater on-site.
5. Air-conditioning plant and equipment shall be located closer to the existing dwelling than the adjoining dwellings, and housed or treated to ensure compliance with the Environmental Protection (Noise) Regulations.
6. In accordance with Council’s Fencing Local Law, the proposed fencing in the front setback area above 0.9m shall have an “open aspect” in that the palings shall be spaced to ensure the width between each paling is at least equal to the width of the paling, with a minimum space of 50mm and a minimum open aspect of 50% of the infill panel, and the piers shall not exceed 2.1m in height from Natural Ground Level.

**Advice Note:**

The applicant/owner is responsible for ensuring that all lot boundaries shown on the approved plans are correct and that the proposed development is constructed entirely within the owner’s property.

Equality 3/3  
Presiding Member casting vote for the motion  
Carried 4/3

*Cr Downes declared an impartiality interest re item 10.1.2 No. 42 John Street, as her husband is related to the property owner, and stated that as a consequence there may be a perception that her impartiality may be affected and declared that she would consider the matter on its merits and vote accordingly.*

**10.1.2 NO. 42 (LOTS 301 & 31) JOHN STREET – TWO-STOREY AND SINGLE-STOREY ALTERATIONS AND ADDITIONS, LANDSCAPING, FENCING AND A POOL**

**File Ref:** 2721  
**Attachments:** [Response from Heritage Council](#)  
[Heritage Impact Statement](#)  
[Applicant Submission and Plans](#)  
**Responsible Officer:** Carl Askew  
Chief Executive Officer  
**Author:** Ed Drewett, Senior Planning Officer / Andrew Jackson, Manager Development Services  
**Proposed Meeting Date:** 19 August 2013  
**Author Disclosure of Interest:** Nil  
**Property Owner:** N Forrest  
**Applicant:** Carrier & Postmus Architects  
**Date of Application:** 19 July 2013  
**Zoning:** Residential R20  
**Use:** P - A use that is permitted under this Scheme  
**Lot Area:** 1863.9m<sup>2</sup> (Lot 301) & 621.9m<sup>2</sup> (Lot 31)  
**M.R.S. Reservation:** Not applicable

---

## SUMMARY

This application has been assessed specifically in the context of the property's heritage significance in addition to relevant statutory planning provisions.

The documentation submitted has evolved following detailed discussions between the applicant, the Town, and the Heritage Council of Western Australia (HCWA) to consider whether the nature, extent and design of the proposal are appropriate for a property of such high heritage significance.

This application is seeking the following variations to Town Planning Scheme No. 2 (TPS 2), the Residential Design Codes (RDC) and Council's Fencing Local Law:

- Height;
- Solid walls in the front setback;
- Visual Privacy; and
- Walls on boundaries.

These aspects are discussed in this report and refer to documentation and plans received on 18 and 26 July and 13 August 2013. The remainder of the proposal is compliant with TPS 2 and the RDC.

---

Due to concerns identified the recommendation is to defer the application at this stage.

## **PROPOSAL**

A summary of the proposed works is as follows:

### Demolition

- Demolish section of southern boundary wall for new opening;
- Demolish section of northern boundary wall;
- Demolish carport;
- Modify existing kitchen and pantry rooms;
- Demolish living room;
- Remove walls of existing store room;
- Demolish sections of bedroom walls for new openings;
- Demolish pool;
- Demolish garden retaining wall; and
- Relocate gazebo (previously approved).

### Proposed construction

- New garage in south-east part of site;
- New bedroom and living areas above garage with front and rear raised terrace (balcony) areas;
- New pool near eastern boundary;
- Modify garden pathway to pool area;
- New pool plant area below proposed carport;
- New dining and living room on site of former living room area;
- New outdoor sitting area to east of new living room;
- New cellar, media room and gym below proposed dining/living room;
- Modify existing kitchen and pantry;
- New internal gallery space; and
- New ensuite in a former bedroom to service existing guest bedroom and living area.

## **STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS**

Heritage is recognised as a cornerstone of the character and amenity of Cottesloe, which Council aims to foster through the planning approvals process and related measures.

## **POLICY IMPLICATIONS**

- WAPC SPP 3.5 Historic Heritage Conservation

## **STATUTORY ENVIRONMENT**

- Town Planning Scheme No. 2
- Heritage of Western Australia Act 1990
- Residential Design Codes
- Fencing Local Law



**PROPOSED LOCAL PLANNING SCHEME NO. 3**

No change to the existing zoning or density coding is proposed.

**HERITAGE LISTING**

- State Register of Heritage Places
- TPS2 – Schedule 1
- Municipal Inventory (MHI) – Category 1
- Register of the National Estate
- National Trust Classification

**APPLICATION ASSESSMENT****Areas of non-compliance****Town Planning Scheme No. 2**

	<b>Permitted</b>	<b>Proposed</b>
Height	Wall height – 6m Ridge height – 8.5m from NGL at centre of site. (7m can be supported for flat (concealed) roof under RDC).	7.44m to upper part of flat roof above carport structure.

**Council Resolution**

	<b>Preferred</b>	<b>Proposed</b>
Streetscape	6m front setback, no averaging.	2m front setback to covered walkway (1.3m to flat roof over).

**Fencing Local Law**

<b>Permitted</b>	<b>Proposed</b>
Open-aspect fencing above 0.9m in front setback area.	2.9m high solid walls to covered walkway; Solid wall along eastern boundary.

**Residential Design Codes**

<b>Design Element</b>	<b>Deemed-to-comply</b>	<b>Proposed</b>	<b>Design Principles</b>
5.1 – Context	6m front setback, or corresponding to the average setback fronting the same street, or minimum 3m and average 6m.	Minimum 2m to covered walkway.	Clause 5.1.2 – P2.1 & P2.2

	Walls on boundaries not higher than 3.5m, average 3m for up to one-third the length of the boundary.	4.5m high walls for 9.5m length to stairs/powder room on northern boundary.	Clause 5.1.3 – P3.2
5.4 – Building design	7.5m cone of vision from balconies.	5.65m cone of vision from upper floor rear balcony to eastern boundary.	Clause 5.4.1 – P1.1 & P1.2

## CONSULTATION

The application was advertised to the eastern neighbour in accordance with TPS 2. No submission has been received to date but the adjoining owner has verbally expressed concern regarding the proposed height of solid fencing along the common boundary.

## BACKGROUND

Planning approval and written consent for alterations and additions to the side and rear landscaped areas, modifications to the rear basement garage, relocation of the gazebo, new internal screen walls and modifications to the side and rear boundary walls was approved under delegation on 24 July 2013. These works were generally on the western side of the lot, whereas the current application is for works predominantly on the eastern and northern sides.

## APPLICANT'S JUSTIFICATION

The applicant has submitted an overview of the proposed development and a Heritage Impact Statement prepared by Griffiths Architects in support of the proposal (see attachments).

This is a brief statement which:

- summarises the high-level heritage classifications and associated values of the place;
- identifies that the extent of demolition is to recent additions of no real heritage worth, with little impact on important heritage fabric; and
- finds that the proposal, in terms of its nature, location and contemporary design, would retain the core heritage fabric and values of the place and represents an acceptable approach, thereby indirectly enhancing heritage

This appreciation is in relation to heritage principles and practice. It does not cover detailed design aspect or the planning and development considerations of the proposal under the Scheme and Codes, which are more the province of the Town.

In comparison, applications for other high-order heritage places have included more thorough heritage studies, statements in evaluating heritage values and the impact of proposals.

## HERITAGE CONSIDERATIONS

### Assessment framework

There is a well-defined planning and heritage framework for assessment of the proposal, which includes the HCWA. This framework guides consideration of the design approach to the heritage place. The Burra Charter is a further guide to the heritage dimension, including consideration of the most appropriate design approach to combining the old with the new.

Together with the planning technical assessment involved (ie: development requirements or standards), the heritage values and classification of a property have a significant bearing on the consideration of a proposal and the extent to which it is acceptable or may warrant some design modifications or conditions of approval.

In this instance, there is a strong collection of heritage instruments and classifications relating to the place and they provide guidance on how the assessment of proposals should be approached and the values of the place to take into account.

### Western Australian Planning Commission's (WAPC) Heritage Policy

The WAPC State Planning Policy (SPP) 3.5 Historic Heritage Conservation was gazetted in 2007. Its objectives are:

- to conserve places and areas of historic heritage significance;
- to ensure that development does not adversely affect the significance of heritage places and areas;
- to ensure that heritage significance at both the State and local levels is given due weight in planning decision-making; and
- to provide improved certainty to landowners and the community about the planning process for heritage identification, conservation and protection.

The Policy describes the existing statutory framework for heritage conservation and the relationship and responsibilities of the HCWA, the WAPC and local governments.

It also specifies policy measures and the means for their implementation and requires local governments to have regard to specific matters relating to heritage in considering applications for planning approval.

Those matters relevant to the proposed development include:

- the conservation and protection of any place or area that has been registered in the register of heritage places under the Heritage Act or is the subject of a conservation order under the Act, or which is included in the heritage list under a Scheme;

- whether the proposed development will adversely affect the significance of any heritage place or area, including any adverse effect resulting from the location, bulk, form or appearance of the proposed development;
- the level of heritage significance of the place, based on a relevant heritage assessment;
- measures proposed to conserve the heritage significance of the place and its setting; and
- the structural condition of the place, and whether the place is reasonably capable of conservation.

The Policy also requires that the following development control principles should be applied for alterations or extensions affecting a heritage place:

- development should conserve and protect the cultural significance of a heritage place based on respect for the existing building or structure, and should involve the least possible change to the significant fabric;
- alterations and additions to a heritage place should not detract from its significance and should be compatible with the siting, scale, architectural style and form, materials and external finishes of the place. Compatibility requires additions or alterations to sit well with the original fabric rather than simply copying or mimicking it;
- development should be in accordance with any local planning policies relating to heritage.

Local government has a role in applying and supporting the policy through ensuring that due regard is given to heritage significance in development assessment, planning schemes and planning strategies.

Proposals should aim to meet this overarching policy guidance, satisfy the heritage values associated with the particular place under its heritage classifications, and address the heritage-related requirements of the local government's planning scheme and policies.

#### State Heritage Register

The property is listed in the HCWA's State Register of Heritage Places, wherein the *Statement of Significance* for the place provides the following description:

*Pine Lodge, a single-storey Federation Queen Anne style brick house with cellars and a corrugated iron clad roof, extensive verandahs and a viewing belvedere, has cultural heritage significance for the following reasons:*

- *the place is a finely designed and executed substantial single-storey residence with a prominent belvedere in the Federation Queen Anne style, set in expansive grounds, and displaying quality craftsmanship;*

- *the place was designed by eminent architect Edwin Summerhayes for William Zimpel, a prominent furniture merchant and manufacturer. The business he established operated in Hay Street, Perth, from the 1880s to the 1960s;*
- *the place is representative of the residential development of the Peppermint Grove, Cottesloe and Swanbourne areas, in particular the establishment of large family homes and grounds following the increase in population and prosperity associated with the gold discoveries of the 1890s; and*
- *the place's setting is a well known feature of the suburb of Cottesloe and contributes to this community's sense of place; and, the pine trees in the grounds of Pine Lodge and the associated trees in John Street are representative of the garden suburb movement of the early twentieth century, when the Forestry Department provided a variety of seedlings free of charge for planting in public spaces.*

*The clinker brick wall and the 1980s additions are considered to have little cultural heritage significance.*

#### Heritage Council's comment

Within its purview, the HCWA has supported the proposed development and provided the following findings:

- we understand that the fabric to be demolished, including the existing living room, carport and swimming pool were built post 1980 and have little heritage value;
- the southern and northern boundary walls are also more recent additions and have little heritage value;
- the new carport is of contemporary design that distinguishes it as a new addition. It provides privacy to the new pool and lawn area behind;
- the new northern addition is of simple contemporary design and it is distinguishable as new work;
- the addition to the north is positioned behind the existing residence and so is largely hidden from John Street; and
- the new landscaping, pavilion and carport seeks to contribute to the overall presentation of the place.

This is a somewhat narrow technical response that while distinguishing what is not heritage fabric and recognising the functional intent of the design, is seen as falling-short of the extensive heritage values attributed to the place in a suite of listings and of the wider heritage context of the street and locality.

Town Planning Scheme No. 2 (TPS 2)

The subject property is included in Schedule 1 of TPS 2, which is the heritage listing available in terms of local government heritage control, as a scheme has the force and effect of law, ie: affording heritage protection.

The Schedule lists the property as follows:

- *House No. 42 John Street – Large brick and iron house with gazebo constructed circa 1900. Classified by the National Trust.*

This invokes Part 6 of the Scheme: *Conservation and Preservation of Places of Natural Beauty and Historic Buildings and Objects of Historic or Scientific Interest*, requiring Council's written consent to proposals in addition to a planning approval under Part 7.

Broadly, Part 6 requires virtually any change to such a place to receive Council's consent, and in practice the making of a development application enables that step to be addressed.

Part 6 states that:

*The Council considers that the places of natural beauty, and historic buildings, and objects of historic or scientific interest in Schedule 1 should be conserved and preserved.*

The matters covered requiring Council consent include to:

- *clear, excavate or fill any land;*
- *fell, remove, kill or irreparably damage any tree;*
- *erect any fence;*
- *commence or carry out any renovation, modification, refitting, decoration or demolition of any building; and*
- *alter or remove any building or object or any part thereof.*

Clause 5.1.2 of TPS 2 requires Council in considering a proposed development in relation to heritage to have regard to:

- the need for preservation of existing trees or areas or buildings of architectural or historical interest; and
- the choice of building materials and finishes where these relate to the preservation of local character and the amenity of the area generally;
- the need for limitation of height or location of buildings to preserve or enhance views; and
- the dispersal of building bulk into two or more separate buildings on a lot in order to minimise the effect of building bulk.

As a further criterion, Clause 5.1.5 of TPS 2 requires that a building be designed, constructed and finished so that its external appearance does not disfigure the locality, lack harmony with the exterior design of neighbouring buildings or tend to depreciate the value of the surrounding properties.

#### Municipal Heritage Inventory (MHI)

The property is classified Category 1 in the Town's MHI which is defined as:

*Highest level of protection: included in the State Register of Heritage Places, provides maximum encouragement to the owner to conserve the significance of the place. Photographically record the place.*

The MHI description of the place is as follows:

*An elegant Victorian 'Queen Anne' bungalow c. 1896 of tuckpointed brick with an iron roof. Sheltered by wide verandahs with large turned posts of regular square section frieze it has a belvedere to the south-west corner with pressed zinc cladding and candle-snuffer roof. The front sitting room has a bay window with casement windows. The main bedroom and dining room have bay windows with double-hung floor-to-ceiling window/doors with side windows. The front door has exquisite original leaded stained glass of a country scene. The carved mantelpieces came from Zimpel's own factory. The house has had two renovations. One c.1980 when the Georgian windows to the ballroom's north wall and the brick courtyards were added. The second c.1982 by D. Erickson saw the kitchen and cellars enlarged and the eastwing extensively remodeled adding the poolroom, three bedrooms and the eastern verandah. At this time the library was turned into a walk-in wardrobe and bathroom. The older bathrooms were demolished and two new ones, a guest pantry, sunroom and cloakroom created. Detailing in the old section of the house was copied. Stained glass windows and doors from the old National Mutual House were incorporated into the poolroom which has multipaned french doors echoing those in the ballroom. Underground garages were created next to the cellar. The old stables were demolished to make way for a tennis court.*

#### Heritage and streetscape appreciation

The proposal has been assessed against this heritage framework by the Town's planning officers with the following comments and conclusion.

Pine Lodge is one of the grandest heritage places in Cottesloe. Together with Barsden, Kulahea, Belvedere, Tukurua and Le Fanu, it is one of a handful of stately period dwellings/properties around the district that stand out from others, each being of unique historical design with distinctive features and in most cases set in prominent positions and/or on larger sites.

All of these distinctive places have been saved, as well as undergone conservation works and various additions in more recent times. The earlier tendency has been for additions copying the style of the original dwellings, while lately the trend has been for additions of contemporary design. The approach has been to extend the dwellings to the rear and side, whereby the additions are either largely concealed from view or read as logical from the street. Although there have been some upper-level additions, they have tended to be minor. There has been very little by way of

forward additions to these places, and none detracting from the dominance of the original dwellings to their streetscapes.

From an analysis of the proposed design the following is observed:

- the portions of the existing dwelling to be demolished or modified are later additions, which will not be detrimental to the heritage of the place;
- the proposed modern rear additions, being single-storey above ground with basement, are capable of being absorbed by the site and would be mostly hidden from view from the street;
- the proposed modern two-storey free-standing addition to the front facing John Street would:
  - (a) be positioned separately from the original dwelling, affording a degree of breathing space, yet with several interconnecting elements;
  - (b) project forward of the original dwelling, albeit setback 6m, and present its widest elevation to the street. At almost 17m this is quite wide in itself relative to a typical new house on an elongated lot, and adjacent to the original dwelling at almost 25m wide;
  - (c) insert a modernist design into the streetscape gap of the spacious curtilage to the original dwelling;
  - (d) interrupt views to and from the place from along the street, opposite the property and within the site, especially of the turret etc from the east;
  - (e) introduce a comparatively ultra-modern design in this section of the streetscape, which is characterised by an eclectic mix of period dwellings, including a number of other substantial and significant buildings, as well as some newer houses of conventional design;
  - (f) create a strong sense of bulk and scale due to the geometry, solidity and materiality of the new building. The two-storey blank wall on the eastern elevation, approximately 6.5m wide by 7.5m high, is an obtrusive element that would be obvious, stark and a major contributor to blocking-out that view of the original dwelling; and
  - (g) the proposed gatehouse/walkway with its solid walls and roof occupying the front setback and projecting forward of both the original dwelling and the proposed modern addition would increase the impact of mass and be obtrusive to the streetscape. It is not really necessary and would be better deleted altogether or at least minimised and of lightweight open-aspect design. Council has tended to not favour gatehouses or other forward elements impacting on front setback areas.



The officer conclusion is that, given the heritage framework and the effect to the proposed additional building to the front of the site, the design does not adequately respond to or respect the heritage values and setting of this high-order place.

## **PLANNING ASSESSMENT**

In addition to the heritage requirements, the following technical assessment is made in respect to variations sought under TPS 2, the RDC and Council Policies.

### Building height

The proposed two-storey, flat-roofed, addition partly straddles two existing lots which the applicant has indicated may be amalgamated. The natural ground level (NGL) at the centre of the lot(s) has been calculated at RL: 34.21 and the maximum acceptable height above this point that is generally supported by Council is 7m, based on the RDC *deemed-to-comply* height provisions for flat or concealed roofs.

The roof height of the proposed two-storey addition is up to 7.44m above the calculated NGL. Part VI of TPS 2 allows Council to vary building heights for heritage buildings. However, this increased height further emphasizes the bulk and scale of the addition, particularly when viewed from the eastern side of the site. It is therefore recommended that this be reduced accordingly or the location of the addition on the lot be reconsidered.

### Solid walls in front setback

A 2.9m high x 12.4m long covered walkway is proposed partly within the front setback area with a 2m setback from the front boundary (1.3m to roof canopy). The structure will have Travertine or Sim walls with a 1.6m high open metal slat entry gate.

The height of the proposed solid walls within the front setback area exceed the maximum 0.9m height generally permitted under the Council's Fencing Local Law and it protrudes into the minimum 3m setback area required under the *deemed-to-comply* provisions of the RDC.

The *design solutions* of the RDC state:

*Buildings set back from street boundaries an appropriate distance to ensure they:*

- *contribute to, and are consistent with, an established streetscape;*
- *provide adequate privacy and open space for dwellings;*
- *accommodate site planning requirements such as parking, landscape and utilities; and*
- *allow safety clearances for easements for essential service corridors.*

*Buildings mass and form that:*

- *uses design features to affect the size and scale of the building;*
- *uses appropriate minor projections that do not detract from the character of the streetscape;*

- *minimises the proportion of the façade at ground level taken up by building services, vehicle entries and parking supply, blank walls, servicing infrastructure access and meters and the like; and; positively contributes to the prevailing development context and streetscape.*

Although there are some existing solid walls in the front setback area the proposed gatehouse/walkway would be roofed, have solid sides and project forward of the original dwelling and the proposed separate front addition. This would increase the impact of mass and make it obtrusive to the streetscape, which would not minimise the use of blank walls in the front setback area or satisfy the design principles of the RDC.

#### Visual privacy

A 5.65m cone of vision is proposed to the eastern boundary from the rear raised terrace area in lieu of a 7.5m cone of vision required under the *deemed-to-comply* standards of the RDC.

The *design principles* of the RDC state:

*Minimal direct overlooking of active habitable spaces and outdoor living areas adjacent dwellings achieved through:*

- *building layout and location;*
- *design of major openings;*
- *landscape screening of outdoor active habitable spaces; and/or*
- *location of screening devices.*

*Maximum visual privacy to side and rear boundaries through measures such as:*

- *offsetting the location of ground and first floor windows so that viewing is oblique rather than direct;*
- *building to the boundary where appropriate;*
- *setting back the first floor from the side boundary;*
- *providing higher or opaque and fixed windows; and/or*
- *screen devices (including landscaping, fencing, obscure glazing, timber screens, external blinds, window hoods and shutters).*

A portion of the side and rear raised terrace will be screened to avoid direct overlooking of the adjoining eastern dwelling. Overlooking from the remainder of the terrace will generally only be at an acute angle greater than 45 degrees and would mainly be along the side of the adjoining dwelling rather than directly into active habitable spaces or outdoor living areas. The adjoining owner also has not raised any specific concern to the privacy concession sought.

#### Walls on boundaries

It is proposed to raise a 21.1m length of the existing northern boundary wall by approximately 0.3m to 0.9m thereby extending the overall wall height to between 4m and 4.5m respectively above the rear right-of-way. A portion of the wall will form the northern side of the proposed stairs and powder room and the remainder will provide increased privacy to the proposed outdoor entertaining area.

The *design principles* of the RDC state:

*Buildings built up to boundaries (other than the street boundary) where this:*

- *makes more effective use of space for enhanced privacy for the occupant/s or outdoor living areas;*
- *does not compromise the design principle contained in clause 5.1.3 P3.1;*
- *does not have any adverse impact on the amenity of the adjoining property;*
- *ensures direct sun to major openings to habitable rooms and outdoor living areas for adjoining properties is not restricted; and*
- *positively contributes to the prevailing development context and streetscape.*

The proposed additions up to the boundary make effective use of space at the rear of the existing dwelling and will not have an adverse impact on the amenity of nearby properties as it will be adjoining a right-of-way. It is also on the northern boundary so will not impact on direct sun to adjoining properties and will be of similar height to other existing screen walls that have been constructed along the right-of-way so will not appear out of keeping with the prevailing development in the area.

A new masonry wall along the eastern boundary of the site will replace an existing tennis court fence and is proposed to range in height from approximately 1.8m at the front to 3.7m at the rear. This is solid in the front setback area which is contrary to the Council's Fencing Local Law and should therefore be modified accordingly. Also the adjoining owner has expressed concern regarding the height of the remainder of the proposed wall so it has been conditioned at a maximum height of 1.8m unless agreement is reached with the adjoining owner.

## **CONCLUSION**

Council is the authority to determine this planning application under its scheme and in doing so is required to have regard to the advice of the HCWA, which is supportive of the proposal. The short Heritage Impact Statement prepared by Griffiths Architects is also supportive.

The proposed rear addition and internal upper-level renovation can be supported.

The proposed separate front addition, however, is assessed as a bold architectural statement rather than being intrinsically sympathetic to the heritage of the place or to the quality of the streetscape, hence the design is considered difficult to support in its current form. Alternative designs could explore: a greater front setback down the side of the property and behind the original dwelling; single-storey; integration with the original dwelling; less height, scale, bulk and mass; and softer, lighter aesthetic.

## **VOTING**

Simple Majority

## **COMMITTEE COMMENT**

Committee noted the heritage dimension and commented on some of the design aspects, overall concluding that the matter should be deferred as recommended.

The Manager Development Services also elaborated on the heritage and planning considerations involved.

### **OFFICER RECOMMENDATION**

#### **Moved Cr Walsh, seconded Cr Strzina**

That Council DEFER determination of the development application for Pine Lodge at No. 42 (Lots 301 and 31) John Street, Cottesloe, based on plans received 18 and 26 July and 13 August 2013, to enable the applicant to liaise with the Town towards a more acceptable design solution taking into account the heritage and planning considerations as outlined in this report.

### **AMENDMENT**

Cr Boland foreshadowed an amendment to add the following after the recommendation to defer:

That in accordance with the applicant's "Pine Lodge Renovations" notice to residents, April 2000, the applicant be requested to: (a) designate one of the rooms in the house as the John Street Heritage Room; and (b) convene a meeting at the property for neighbours and anyone interested in the heritage aspects of the house and the John Street precinct to view the current proposal.

Cr Boland explained his rationale and given discussion by Committee modified and moved the amendment as below:

#### **Moved Cr Boland, seconded Cr Hart**

**In accordance with the applicant's "Pine Lodge Renovations" notice to residents, April 2000, the applicant be requested to convene a meeting at the property for neighbours and anyone interested in the heritage aspects of the house and the John Street precinct to view the current proposal.**

**Lost 2/4**

### **OFFICER & COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION**

#### **Moved Cr Walsh, seconded Cr Strzina**

**That Council DEFER determination of the development application for Pine Lodge at No. 42 (Lots 301 and 31) John Street, Cottesloe, based on plans received 18 and 26 July and 13 August 2013, to enable the applicant to liaise with the Town towards a more acceptable design solution taking into account the heritage and planning considerations as outlined in this report.**

**Carried 6/0**

---

**10.1.3 REPORT ON MAINSTREET AUSTRALIA CONFERENCE MELBOURNE  
2013**

**File Ref:** SUB/38  
**Attachments:** [Conference Literature](#)  
[Retail Report](#)  
**Responsible Officer:** Carl Askew  
**Chief Executive Officer**  
**Author:** Andrew Jackson  
**Manager Development Services**

**Proposed Meeting Date:** 19 August 2013  
**Author Disclosure of Interest:** Nil

---

**SUMMARY**

The Manager Development Services attended the Mainstreet Australia Conference in Melbourne on 13-15 May 2013.

This report provides feedback to Council relevant to current planning topics generally and Cottesloe in particular.

**BACKGROUND****What is a mainstreet?**

Mainstreets are the hubs of our communities and we want them to survive and thrive. Other words for mainstreets include: traditional main streets, shopping strips, town centres, city centres, retail/commercial precincts and activity centres. Typically orientated towards public streets or places, they are characterised by multiple ownership, shared infrastructure and a broad mix of uses.

## **Who is Mainstreet Australia?**

Mainstreet Australia is a diverse association providing strategic direction, advocacy, education and networking for all stakeholders to ensure that local business centres remain the beating heart of our communities. Established as a forum for information exchange and professional development, Mainstreet Australia provides a collective voice and vision for mainstreets to evolve and improve.

## **Mainstreet conferences**

The Mainstreet Australia National Conference is well-respected, delivering quality speakers, practical insights, valuable information and authentic experiences. It is the largest conference that specifically supports mainstreet practitioners in the business, community, government and consultancy sectors, embracing urban planning, design and development, economic and community development, place-making and tourism.

## **What's it all about**

**This year's conference theme was *New Challenges, New Opportunities, New Values*, with a comprehensive list of topics and tours; attended by some 240 delegates from across Australia and overseas.**

The conference topics and sessions were many and varied, reflecting the dynamics of town centres and mainstreets. They included theory and practice, philosophies and technicalities, issues and trends; conveying a variety of challenges facing and approaches to today's urban centres.

Speakers covered the art and science of place-making; mainstreet activation methods; managing nightlife; competition with big-box shopping centres; the digital economy; governance and relationships; financial mechanisms; measuring and monitoring success (or failure); access, inclusion and engagement; arts and culture precincts (events and tourism); and more.

Tours offered a choice of downtown destinations, specialised localities and outer growth centres.

## **CONFERENCE LESSONS**

The conference was stimulating and enlightening, imparting the complexity of achieving healthy and vigorous mainstreets and town centres. Some of the key insights gained by this attendee are expressed below, while selected attachments to the report elaborate on certain places and matters.



Be there or be square







The conference venue of Federation Square was inspirational in many ways:

- It is a multi-functional facility catering to all sorts of activities and events. In a few days there I experienced within that overall space a conference, the arts, a union rally, excellent travel/tourist information, preparation for a weekend festival and of course the drawcard of the public plaza as a place to spend time in, mingle, meet and move on.
- It sits comfortably as avant-garde architecture alongside heritage landmarks (eg Flinders Street railway station) and addresses the city in looking out to and connecting with the station, streets, river, parkway and nearby cultural venues (eg art gallery).



- When I asked someone what was there before they could not remember, indicating how familiar and appreciated the modern replacement has quickly become.
- Federation Square has succeeded in bringing together humanity and technology, whilst also embracing the man-made and natural environments. It is available for all, providing basic needs such as food and restrooms and an urban “park” for respite, plus a complex of entertainment, cultural and educational activities.

### Come rain or sunshine



An afternoon tour of the middle-distance suburban commercial centre of Sunshine, only 11km from the CBD, was informative as follows:

- This older and spread-out town centre is low-rise, diverse and busy; not so much run-down as dated, with some poor design features.
- It survives on a large catchment population, family and migrant demographic (lots of students), numerous small businesses and has the busiest municipal library in Victoria, which is appropriately located in the heart and is an anchor use.
- Like Cottesloe and many traditional town centres, the town centre sits beside a railway line but is disconnected from that and the transit environment is unpleasant. The State Government is funding a rail system overhaul

programme which is seeing major redevelopment of train stations to integrate with town centres, including Sunshine. While welcome, the fast-track process is forcing designs and works on councils and communities with limited consultation, acquiring some properties and displacing businesses. Nonetheless the new station precincts will overcome their dislocation to create transport and activity hubs which have amenity, convenience, and security.

- The council is undertaking progressive urban design and public domain infrastructure improvements to the main streets, such as repaving footpaths, traffic management and new landscaping, but the scale of the centre makes this costly and the treatments while practical are aesthetically comparatively ordinary.
- Another rejuvenation initiative is setting-up art and design studios in vacant shopfronts as creative spaces for cultural stimulation and community interaction, leading to collaborative projects such as street furniture, wall murals, etc and fostering a sense of identity. It is cautioned that innovations like this and pop-up shops require considerable effort and must still be proven as a business case in order to be sustained.
- A local short film festival is another innovation, this year inviting entries on a theme promoting “Sunshine Rising”, with categories from the community and schools.
- A significant difficulty in proposing economic measures was engaging migrant-based traders due to language barriers and business attitudes. Through the use of interpreters and events (eg street fair with food-stall competition by local restaurants) rapport and trust has been gradually built-up to overcome apprehension and raise awareness amongst traders towards participating in economic development groups and schemes.
- The Sunshine Business Association is building strength in promoting and improving the centre, undertaking a range of actions in accordance with a five-year business plan.
- Heritage occasionally suffered due to commercial developers disrespecting the opportunity for sophisticated proposals.
- Plans to introduce the first medium-rise block of apartments, with ground level commercial uses to the locality, endeavouring to entice residents from modest single dwellings with gardens to a new lifestyle. Unfortunately the development site was next to and overlooking an unattractive shopping complex and remote from the train station. The design was also mediocre rather than imaginative and instead of being a catalyst could become a planning blunder and blot on the urban landscape. Interestingly the developer attributed the built form outcome to financial constraints and planning rules dictating the design.

### **Wider ranging**

Another tour (although not taken by this author) was to the more distant regional centre of Dandenong set in the famous ranges, 35km from the CBD. Dandenong is an important dormitory, service and tourist settlement, experiencing a State Government investment of \$290 million to revitalise the central area.

This capitalises on the foundation of a very multicultural community, a fresh-produce economic base and associated market (Victoria’s oldest), heritage, festivals (some 60

events a year) and major sports venues (eg Sandown Race Course). The redevelopment includes new housing, introducing apartments, high-tech offices, mainstreet and public spaces urban design, and commercial premises.

It is clear that with careful planning, controlled development, sufficient funding and effective management there is a future for existing centres to be rejuvenated and to generate lifestyle and employment opportunities as attractive alternatives to inner-city areas.

### **Eat, drink and be civilized**



Downtown Melbourne has avoided dominant high-rise development and retained is a compact grid of mixed uses and a very walkable city centre, augmented by trams and trains linking to inner-metropolitan activity centres and recreational/tourist destinations. The convenience and enjoyment of movement networks and modes is a vital ingredient of urban liveability.

Although like all big cities it has some grotty corners, grungy activities and dodgy characters, the active core exhibits an exciting pulse, noticeable friendliness and cultural air, with a sense of identity belonging to the people as opposed to duller atmosphere of post-WWII “modernist” CBSs. This is despite a mere trickle of a river compared to the mighty Swan, and temperatures giving a whole new meaning to “cold” for any Perthite.

Several additional factors contribute to the buoyancy and vibrancy of downtown Melbourne:

- Legibility owing to layout, scale and urban design treatments.
- Night-time activation which is more about lifestyle than night-life; ie opportunities for socialisation, recreation, education and the arts as alternative pastimes to the centre being for work, business or shopping during the day.
- A spectrum of basic through to high-brow services and facilities, catering for the gamut of interests, ages and income levels, offering choice and variety, all within easy reach and comfortably coexisting.
- Efficient transport links to near-city precincts as part of an interconnected greater urban system, achieving integration rather than separation or isolation, with economic, social and sustainability benefits.

## Fiscal fortitude

The reality-check on the surge of community engagement and design creativity in fostering and enhancing mainstreets is the financial wherewithal to operate programs, dispense services, pay consultants and fund works.

Although larger centres or councils may enjoy economies of scale and greater influence in deriving rate revenue, attracting investment and obtaining grants or government funding, their size also presents hurdles to coordination, consensus and collaboration. The sheer cost of extensive improvements or major projects mounts-up and the necessary administration demands more resources. Dedicating staff and tools to the task as well as a commitment to longer-term outcomes becomes essential.

Often mainstreet initiatives are in reaction to declining centres owing to economic, physical, social and governance difficulties, characterised by problems such as poor accessibility, vacant premises, security issues, low amenity and so on, which lead to urban blight and decay. Administratively, local governments can face constraints in funding and resources and lack of cooperation from multiple landlords/small businesses and community groups. Practically, mainstreets must deal with planning considerations, transport requirements, parking pressures, changing demographics, competition and trends (eg internet sales).

Mainstreet Australia recognises the fundamental economic and business dimension of town centres and concentrates on this as one area of learning and advocacy. Examples include professional training on detailed mechanisms such as: starting up a business association; marketing for mainstreets; rules of association - getting the frameworks right; and best practice approaches to special rates and charges.

## Cottesloe perspective



Cottesloe has always been a local village centre serving the district and hinterland of the nearby western suburbs and has evolved gradually, overcoming some periods of relative stagnation to today be in equilibrium. The geographic extent of the centre has been limited but business growth has occurred in keeping with real estate, population and lifestyle aspects. As a result the retail function of the service centre has become more fashion and food and beverage focussed. The centre has also seen mixed-use commercial/apartment developments and the new library adjacent.

In recent years council has undertaken a number of studies to address the future of the Town Centre as a basis for improvements to the public domain. Progress to date has concentrated mainly on providing more parking, better managed-parking (Meter Eye and time limits) and security (CCTV). Judicious infill developments supported by Council have contributed to the streetscape. Procott has continued to promote and enhance the Town Centre in conjunction and consultation with the Town.

Looking ahead, regional planning direction for activity centres, urban consolidation and transit-orientated development can be expected to have a stronger bearing on the Town Centre. The intended local government amalgamations would also alter the outlook to the role of the centre, its size/expansion, and the resources devoted to plan, develop and improve the locality. During this next phase, the philosophies, principles and practices of mainstreets, together with the complementary field of place-making, will continue to be of value in guiding planning and development for the Cottesloe Town Centre.

In this regard in January this year a report entitled *Perth Retail Strip Precinct Assessment* was published by Lease Equity and the Property Council of Australia (WA). It examined the economic, planning and retail sector influences and trends having a bearing on traditional inner-urban strip-shopping precincts around Perth, outlined success factors for mainstreets and profiled each centre, including Cottesloe. Key extracts are attached and salient points include the importance of:

- Connectivity (where Cottesloe is seen deficient);
- continuity of premises and street activation, with overall integration (where Station Street is seen as underdeveloped);
- efficient access, circulation and parking, plus public transport (which should be capitalised on);
- breadth of retail and business services to maintain competitiveness; and
- quality urban design and attractive streetscapes.

The extracts elaborate on these aspects and details in general and for Cottesloe in particular. The report is a useful reference for the Town's purposes of the planning, development and management of the Cottesloe's mainstreet precinct.

## **VOTING**

Simple Majority

## **COMMITTEE COMMENT**

Cr Hart, on behalf of the Committee, thanked Mr Jackson for the insightful and detailed report on the Mainstreet Conference activities and outcomes.

**OFFICER & COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION**

**Moved Cr Strzina, seconded Cr Boland**

**THAT Council receive this report on the Mainstreet Australia Conference 2013 and note the potential application of planning approaches to the Cottesloe Town Centre.**

**Carried 6/0**

**11 ELECTED MEMBERS' MOTIONS OF WHICH PREVIOUS NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN**

Nil.

**12 NEW BUSINESS OF AN URGENT NATURE INTRODUCED BY DECISION OF MEETING BY:**

**12.1 ELECTED MEMBERS**

Nil.

**12.2 OFFICERS**

Nil.

**13 MEETING CLOSED TO PUBLIC**

**13.1 MATTERS FOR WHICH THE MEETING MAY BE CLOSED**

Nil

**13.2 PUBLIC READING OF RECOMMENDATIONS THAT MAY BE MADE PUBLIC**

Nil.

**14 MEETING CLOSURE**

The Presiding Member announced the closure of the meeting at 7:26pm.

CONFIRMED MINUTES OF 19 August 2013 PAGES 1 – 37 INCLUSIVE.

PRESIDING MEMBER:

POSITION:

.....

DATE: ..... / ..... / .....