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1. Declaration of Opening

The Chairperson declared the Planning and Engineering Services Committee Meeting open at 4:00pm, welcomed all present, and delivered the Acknowledgement of Country.

2. Record of Attendance/Apologies/Approved Leave of Absence

2.1 Councillors

Cr Chris Elliott  Chairperson
Cr Lee Downham  Deputising for Cr Whitfield
Cr Deb Hamblin (Deputy Mayor)
Cr Katherine Summers
Cr Barry Sammels (Mayor)
Cr Joy Stewart  Observer
Cr Justin Smith  Observer

2.2 Executive

Mr Bob Jeans  Director Planning and Development Services
Mr John Woodhouse  Director Legal Services and General Counsel
Mr Chris Thompson  Director Engineering and Parks Services
Mr Peter Ricci  Manager Major Planning Projects
Mr Brett Ashby  Manager Strategic Planning and Environment
Mr Mike Ross  Manager Statutory Planning
Mr Stuart McCarthy  A/Manager Engineering Services
Mr Kelton Hincks  Manager Asset Services
Mr James Henson  Manager Land and Development Infrastructure
Mr Darren Dropulich  A/Manager Engineering Operations
Mr Adam Johnston  Manager Parks Operations
Mr Allan Moles  Manager Integrated Waste Services
Mr Michael Howes  Coordinator Ranger Services
Mr Michael Wilson  Senior Projects Officer
Ms Melinda Wellburn  PA to Director Planning and Development Services

2.3 Members of the Gallery:  2

2.4 Apologies:  Cr Matthew Whitfield

2.5 Approved Leave of Absence:  Nil

3. Responses to Previous Public Questions Taken on Notice

Nil
4. **Public Question Time**

4.02pm The Chairperson invited members of the Public Gallery to ask questions. There were none.

5. **Confirmation of Minutes of the Previous Meeting**

Moved Cr Sammels, seconded Cr Hamblin:

That Committee **CONFIRMS** the Minutes of the Planning and Engineering Services Committee Meeting held on 18 April 2016, as a true and accurate record.

Committee Voting – 5/0

6. **Matters Arising from the Previous Minutes**

Nil

7. **Announcement by the Presiding Person without Discussion**

4.03pm The Chairperson announced to all present that decisions made at Committees of Council are recommendations only and may be adopted in full, amended or deferred when presented for consideration at the next Council meeting.

8. **Declarations of Members and Officers Interests**

4.03pm The Chairperson asked if there were any interests to declare. There were none.

9. **Petitions/Deputations/Presentations/Submissions**

Nil

10. **Matters for which the Meeting may be Closed**

Nil

11. **Bulletin Items**

Planning and Development Services Information Bulletin – May 2016

**Health Services**

1. Health Services Team Overview
2. Human Resource Update
3. Project Status Reports
   3.1 FoodSafe
   3.2 Industrial and Commercial Waste Monitoring
   3.3 Mosquito Control Program
   3.4 Environmental Waters Sampling
4. Information Items
   4.1 Mosquito-Borne Disease Notifications
   4.2 Food Recalls
   4.3 Food Premises Inspections
   4.4 Public Building Inspections
   4.5 Outdoor Public Event Approvals
   4.6 Permit Approvals
   4.7 After Hours Noise and Smoke Nuisance Complaint Service
   4.8 Complaint - Information
   4.9 Noise Complaints - Detailed Information
4.10 Animal Exemptions
4.11 Building Plan Assessments
4.12 Septic Tank Applications
4.13 Demolitions
4.14 Swimming Pool and Drinking Water Samples
4.15 Rabbit Processing
4.16 Hairdressing and Skin Penetration Premises
4.17 New Family Day Care Approvals
4.18 Emergency Services
4.19 Social Media
4.20 Bush Fire Hazard Reduction
4.21 Permits to Burn
4.22 Customer Requests Emergency Service Team
4.23 Review - Bush Fire Prone Mapping
4.24 Redevelopment Laurie Stanford and Rhonda Scarrott Reserves
4.25 Volunteer and Officer Training
4.26 Ranger Services - Action Requests
4.27 Prosecutions
4.28 Ranger Department News
4.29 SmartWatch Key Result Area: Visibility
4.30 SmartWatch Key Result Area: Engagement with Community
4.31 SmartWatch Key Result Area: Increasing perception of Safety
4.32 SmartWatch Notable Statistics

Building Services
1. Building Services Team Overview
2. Human Resource update
3. Project Status Reports
4. Information Items
   4.1 Monthly Building Permit Approvals - (All Building Types)
   4.2 Private Swimming Pool and Spa Inspection Program
   4.3 Demolition Permit
   4.4 Permanent Sign Licence
   4.5 Community Sign Approval
   4.6 Street Verandah Approval
   4.7 Occupancy Permits
   4.8 Strata Titles
   4.9 Unauthorised Building Works (Section 51 of the Building Act)
   4.10 Monthly Caravan Park Site Approvals
   4.11 R Code Variations

Strategic Planning and Environment
1. Strategic Planning and Environment Team Overview
2. Human Resource Update
3. Project Status Reports
   3.1 Local Planning Strategy (LUP/1352)
   3.2 Waterwise Council Program (EVM/56-02)
   3.3 Karnup District Structure Plan (LUP/1546)
   3.4 Cockburn Sound Coastal Alliance – Vulnerability and Flexible Adaptation Pathways Project Stage 3 (EVM/149)
4. Information Items
   4.1 Notification of Recommendation to Amend Structure Plan to the Western Australian Planning Commission
Statutory Planning

1. Statutory Planning Team Overview
2. Human Resource Update
3. Project Status Reports
4. Information Items
   4.1 Land Use - Planning Enforcement
   4.2 Subdivision/Development Approval and Refusals by the WAPC
   4.3 Notifications and Gazettals
   4.4 Subdivision Clearances
   4.5 Subdivision Survey Approvals
   4.6 Subdivision Lot Production
   4.7 Delegated Development Approvals
   4.8 Delegated Development Refusals
   4.9 Delegated Building Envelope Variations
   4.10 Subdivision/Amalgamation Approved
   4.11 Strata Plans
   4.12 Subdivision/Amalgamation Refused
   4.13 Renovations to Heritage Building - Chesterfield Inn
   4.14 State Bushfire Planning Framework Update

Planning and Development Directorate

1. Planning and Development Directorate Team Overview
2. Human Resource Update
3. Project Status Reports
   3.1 Rockingham Primary Centre, Centre Plan Implementation (LUP/137-08)
   3.2 Northern Smart Village Sector – Masterplan, Development Policy Plan and Proposed Amendment No’s.161 and 162 to Town Planning Scheme No.2
   3.3 Southern Gateway/Rockingham Station Sector – Masterplanning, Development Policy Plan and TPS (LUP/1846 and LUP/1847)
   3.4 ‘Mangles Bay Marina’
4. Information Items
   4.1 Perth and Peel Green Growth Plan for 3.5 Million

Committee Recommendation

Moved Cr Sammels, seconded Cr Hamblin:
That Councillors acknowledge having read the Planning Services Information Bulletin – May 2016 and the content be accepted.

Committee Voting – 5/0

Engineering and Parks Services Information Bulletin – May 2016

Engineering Services

1. Engineering Services Team Overview
2. Human Resource Update
3. Project Status Reports
   3.1 Integrated Transport Plan Review
   3.2 Stormwater Adaptation Plan
   3.3 Coastal Management Consultants (Sand Drift/Erosion Problems)
   3.4 Coastal Infrastructure Facilities Consultant (Jetties/Boat Ramp Planning)
4. Information Items
   4.1 Delegated Authority for Temporary Thoroughfare Closure.
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Delegated Authority for the payment of Crossover Subsidies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Delegated Authority to approve the release of bonds for private subdivisional works.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Delegated Authority to approve Engineering Drawings – Subdivisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Delegated Authority for Notices given under s3.25(1)(a) LG Act 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>Delegated Authority for approval of Directional Signage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>Engineering Services Design Projects 2015/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>Handover of Subdivisional Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>Structure Plan Referrals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>Traffic Report Referrals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>Urban Water Management Referrals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>Subdivision Approval Referrals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>Subdivision Clearance Requests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>Development Application Referrals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>Authorised Traffic Management Plans for Works on City Controlled Roads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>Safety Bay Road – Principal Shared Path - Stage 1 Drainage Alterations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>Safety Bay Road – Principal Shared Path Stage 1 (Warnbro Station – Mandurah Road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>Safety Bay Road – Principal Shared Path – Stage 2A (Eighty Road – Nairn Drive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>Water Corporation - Significant works within the City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>Rockingham Beach Foreshore Masterplan - Implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>Bent Street Boat Ramp Rock Armour Protection and Boat Ramp Maintenance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>Waikiki Foreshore – Foreshore Protection Specification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>Donald Drive Boat Ramp Feasibility Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>Bent Street Boat Ramp Navigation Channel Sand Bypassing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>Mersey Point Jetty Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>Palm Beach West Boat Ramp Upgrade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>Recreational Boating Facilities Scheme – Round 21 Grant Applications – Planning Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>Bus Shelters – Displaying Messages or Advertising</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Engineering Operations**

1. Engineering Operations Team Overview
2. Human Resource Update
3. Project Status Reports
4. Information Items
   4.1 Road Construction Program Roads to Recovery 2015/2016
   4.2 Road Construction Program Main Roads Grant 2015/2016
   4.3 Road Construction Program Municipal Works 2015/2016
   4.4 Drainage Program Municipal Works 2015/2016
   4.5 Footpath Construction Program Municipal Works 2015/2016
   4.6 Footpath Renewal Program Municipal Works 2015/2016
   4.7 Road Maintenance Program 2015/2016
   4.8 Litter Team 2015/2016
   4.9 LitterBusters and Sweeping 2015/2016
   4.10 Correspondence Received
   4.12 Light Commercial Vehicles Program 2015/2016
   4.13 Heavy Plant Program 2015/2016

**Parks Development**

1. Parks Development Team Overview
2. Human Resource Update
3. Project Status Reports
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#### 3.1 Secret Harbour Emergency Access Path

#### 3.2 Rockingham Foreshore Management Plan

#### 3.3 Lewington Reserve Environmental Management Plan Review

#### 3.4 Tamworth Hill Swamp, Revegetation

#### 3.5 City Parks - Central Irrigation Management System

#### 3.6 Laurie Stanford Irrigation Upgrade

#### 3.7 Laurie Stanford Practice Cricket Net Replacement

#### 3.8 City Parks - Central Irrigation Management System

#### 3.9 Laurie Stanford Practic Cricket Net Replacement

### Information Items

1. **Groundwater Monitoring**
2. **Kulija Road Environmental Offsets**
3. **Climate Change Mitigation**
4. **Lake Richmond Heritage Listing**
5. **Dixon Road Conservation Reserve AAG Funding**
6. **Urban Water Management Referrals**
7. **Structure Plan Approval Referrals**
8. **Subdivision Approval Referrals**
9. **Development Application Referrals**
10. **Delegated Subdivision Public Open Space Practical Completion**
11. **Delegated Subdivision Public Open Space Handovers**
12. **Delegated Public Open Space Approvals**
13. **Memorial Seat Approvals**

### Parks Operations

1. **Parks Operation Team Overview**
2. **Human Resource Update**
3. **Project Status Reports**
   - **Beach Lookout Replacement - Secret Harbour Foreshore**
   - **Baldivis Nature Reserve, Install Formal Limestone Access Path (Greening Plan)**
   - **Stan Twight Reserve – Cricket Net Renewal**
   - **Centenary Reserve – Garden Kerbing Renewal**
   - **Play Equipment Replacements**
4. **Information Items**
   - **Parks Maintenance Program 2015/2016**

### Asset Management

1. **Asset Management Team Overview**
2. **Human Resource Update**
3. **Project Status Reports**
   - **Road Condition Inspection and Modelling**
   - **Lighting Consultants (Technical Planning/Design, Underground Power Program)**
   - **Major Project Property Development Planning (Design Modifications/Tender Planning/Structural Testing)**
4. **Information Items**
   - **Asset Management Improvement Strategy**
   - **Asset Systems Management**
   - **Solar Power Generation**
   - **2015/2016 Public Area Lighting and Arterial Lighting**
   - **Secret Harbour Surf Life Saving Club – Renovation**
   - **Baldivis Reserve Toilet Replacement**
   - **Rockingham Day Care Fire Panel Replacement**
   - **Eighty Road Reserve Club Facility**
   - **Laurie Stanford Reserve Development**
### Building Maintenance

1. Building Maintenance Team Overview
2. Human Resource Update
3. Project Status Reports
4. Information Items
   - 4.1 Building Renewals
   - 4.2 Parks Renewals
   - 4.3 Electrical/Lighting Renewals
   - 4.4 Building Maintenance
   - 4.5 Lighting Inspections
   - 4.6 Graffiti Removal Monthly Statistics
   - 4.7 Graffiti – Out and About
   - 4.8 Graffiti Removal Annual Statistics

### Waste Services

1. Waste Services Team Overview
2. Human Resource Update
3. Project Status Reports
   - 3.1 Introduction of 3 Bin Collection System Including Roll Out of 360 Litre Recycling Bins
4. Information Items
   - 4.1 Kerbside Collection
   - 4.2 Bulk Verge Collection
   - 4.3 Waste Diversion Percentage
   - 4.4 Bin Tagging Program Results

### Millar Road Landfill and Recycling Facility

1. Millar Road Landfill and Recycling Facility’s Team Overview
2. Human Resource Update
3. Project Status Reports
   - 3.1 Landfill Access Road and Associated Internal Roads
   - 3.2 Cell Construction – Cell 16
   - 3.3 New Leachate Dams
4. Information Items
   - 4.1 Tip Passes
   - 4.2 Landfill Statistics
   - 4.3 Waste Education and Promotion
   - 4.4 Amendment of Landfill Expiry Dates

### Advisory Committee Minutes

#### Committee Recommendation

Moved Cr Sammels, seconded Cr Hamblin:

That Councillors acknowledge having read the Engineering and Parks Services Information Bulletin – May 2016 and the content be accepted.

Committee Voting – 5/0
12. Agenda Items

Planning and Development Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference No &amp; Subject:</th>
<th>Planning Procedure 1.20 - Guidelines for Flag Poles in the Residential Zone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>File No:</td>
<td>LUP/1823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Register No:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proponent/s:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author:</td>
<td>Mr Greg Delahunty, Senior Planning Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Contributors:</td>
<td>Mr David Waller, Coordinator Statutory Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Mike Ross, Manager Statutory Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Committee Meeting:</td>
<td>16 May 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously before Council:</td>
<td>February 2016 (PDS-012/16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure of Interest:</td>
<td>Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Council’s Role in this Matter:</td>
<td>Executive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Purpose of Report

To consider a new Planning Procedure 1.20 – Guidelines for Flag Poles in the Residential Zone.

Background

In December 2015, the City received a complaint regarding a flag pole erected at No.6 Icelandic Meander, Baldivis. City Officers investigated the matter and wrote to the owners of the flag pole advising that it was considered to be “development” for which Development Approval was required from the City.
On 5 February 2016, the City’s Manager Statutory Planning visited the property and explained to the owners that the City’s position on flag poles was being reviewed and until that process was complete no further action would be taken. It was also advised that they would be contacted once the City’s position on flag poles had been settled.

In February 2016, Council resolved to direct the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) to:

“develop a draft local planning policy on the installation of Flag Poles in residential areas used for domestic and non-commercial purposes and not to undertake any further action to require approvals until its position on Flag Poles has been settled.”

**Details**

The purpose of this Planning Procedure is to set out the guidelines for flag poles within the Residential Zone. The Planning Procedure also seeks to protect the quality of the streetscape and the amenity of adjoining and nearby residents by minimising any potential impact of flag poles.

While the Council directed the CEO to prepare a Planning Policy, the matter is best handled by a Planning Procedure, rather than a Policy, given the limited number of Development Applications for flag poles which would be dealt with.

It is considered that flag poles in the Residential Zone could have the potential to impact the amenity of adjoining properties and the streetscape if not appropriately located. The proposed guidelines will give guidance to ratepayers and City Officers on the location and characteristics of these structures.

**Implications to Consider**

a. **Consultation with the Community**

   There are no statutory requirements for the advertisement of a Planning Procedure. The City, however, will publish the adopted Planning Procedure on its website.

b. **Consultation with Government Agencies**

   Nil

c. **Strategic**

   **Community Plan**

   This item addresses the Community’s Vision for the future and specifically the following Aspiration and Strategic Objective contained in the Community Plan 2015-2025:

   **Aspiration D:** Sustainable Environment

   **Strategic Objective:** Land Use and Development Control – Planning for population growth and guiding development and land use to ensure that future generations enjoy a sustainable city and a genuinely desirable lifestyle.

d. **Policy**

   Nil

e. **Financial**

   Nil

f. **Legal and Statutory**

   Nil

g. **Risk**

   Nil

**Comments**

This Planning Procedure sets out clear guidelines, relating to height, setbacks and safety, that will inform the community and City Officers on the appropriate location and characteristics of flag poles.
The implementation of this Planning Procedure will reduce the regulatory burden on residents while ensuring that acceptable development outcomes are maintained in relation to residential amenity. As such, this Planning Procedure is considered to be a balanced approach to dealing with flag poles and the most appropriate tool to achieve this.

**Voting Requirements**

Simple Majority

**Officer Recommendation**

That Council **APPROVES** Planning Procedure 1.20 - Guidelines for Flag Poles in the Residential Zone, as follows:

**PLANNING PROCEDURE 1.20
GUIDELINES FOR FLAG POLES IN THE RESIDENTIAL ZONE**

1. **Statement of Intent**

The purpose of this Planning Procedure is to provide guidelines for the erection of flag poles within the Residential Zone.

2. **Planning Procedure**

2.1 **Applicability**

This Planning Procedure provides guidelines on the development requirements for flag poles within the Residential Zone (i.e. the Residential Zone).

2.2 **Guidelines for Flag Poles in the Residential Zone**

The following guidelines are provided to determine those proposals that are considered acceptable within the Residential Zone:

(a) When the maximum height of a flag pole does not exceed 7 metres from natural ground level;

(b) When a flag pole is set back at least 3m from any boundary; and

(c) When the flag pole is secured safely to the ground (e.g. bolted to a concrete footing).

3. **Authority**

All flag poles within the Residential Zone that comply with the guidelines listed at section 2.2 of this Planning Procedure are exempt from receiving Development Approval.

Should a variation to the guidelines be proposed, the Manager Statutory Planning will determine the requirement for a Development Application based upon the likelihood on an impact on adjoining landowners or the residential amenity of the area.

4. **Endorsement**

This Planning Procedure was approved by the Council at its ordinary Meeting held on the ___________ 2016.

**Committee Recommendation**

Moved Cr Sammels, seconded Cr Summers:

That Council **APPROVES** Planning Procedure 1.20 - Guidelines for Flag Poles in the Residential Zone, as follows:

**PLANNING PROCEDURE 1.20
GUIDELINES FOR FLAG POLES IN THE RESIDENTIAL ZONE**

1. **Statement of Intent**

The purpose of this Planning Procedure is to provide guidelines for the erection of flag poles within the Residential Zone.
2. Planning Procedure

2.1 Applicability
This Planning Procedure provides guidelines on the development requirements for flag poles within the Residential Zone (i.e. the Residential Zone).

2.2 Guidelines for Flag Poles in the Residential Zone
The following guidelines are provided to determine those proposals that are considered acceptable within the Residential Zone:

(a) When the maximum height of a flag pole does not exceed 7 metres from natural ground level;

(b) When a flag pole is set back at least 3m from any boundary; and

(c) When the flag pole is secured safely to the ground (e.g. bolted to a concrete footing).

3. Authority
All flag poles within the Residential Zone that comply with the guidelines listed at section 2.2 of this Planning Procedure are exempt from receiving Development Approval.

Should a variation to the guidelines be proposed, the Manager Statutory Planning will determine the requirement for a Development Application based upon the likelihood on an impact on adjoining landowners or the residential amenity of the area.

4. Endorsement
This Planning Procedure was approved by the Council at its ordinary Meeting held on the ____________ 2016.

Committee Voting – 5/0

The Committee's Reason for Varying the Officer's Recommendation
Not Applicable

Implications of the Changes to the Officer’s Recommendation
Not Applicable
### Planning and Development Services
#### Statutory Planning Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference No &amp; Subject:</th>
<th>PDS-026/16 Opportunities to Streamline the City’s Business Approval Processes to Facilitate the Establishment and Growth of Small Businesses in Rockingham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>File No:</td>
<td>CPM/113 D16/008838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Register No:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proponent/s:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author:</td>
<td>Mr Mike Ross, Manager Statutory Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Contributors:</td>
<td>Mr Bob Jeans, Director Planning and Development Services, Mr David Waller, Coordinator Statutory Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Committee Meeting:</td>
<td>16 May 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously before Council:</td>
<td>February 2016 (PDS-011/16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure of Interest:</td>
<td>Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Council’s Role in this Matter:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Purpose of Report

To consider opportunities to streamline the City’s business approval processes to facilitate the establishment and growth of small businesses in Rockingham.

### Background

In 2013, the State Government committed to simplify the WA planning system, through a ‘raft of reforms’ to the Planning and Development Act 2005 and Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015 (Regulations). The City in this regard is embracing continuous improvement as regulation reform from the State Government is ongoing.
In February 2016, Council resolved to:

“DIRECT the Chief Executive Officer to investigate and report back to Council on opportunities to streamline the City of Rockingham’s business approval processes to facilitate the establishment and growth of small business in Rockingham.”

Details

This report focuses on the Statutory Planning implications of the City’s business approval processes, as this is the starting point for the establishment and growth of small businesses. City Development Approvals are issued based on compliance with Town Planning Scheme No.2 (TPS2) and City Policies.

With respect to small business, the City’s Development Approval processes relate to:
- Home Based Businesses;
- Retail/Commercial Business; and
- Industrial/Service Industry Business.

Implications to Consider

a. Consultation with the Community
   Nil
b. Consultation with Government Agencies
   Not Applicable
c. Strategic
   Community Plan
   This item addresses the Community’s Vision for the future and specifically the following Aspiration and Strategic Objective contained in the Community Plan 2015-2025:
   
   **Aspiration D:** Sustainable Environment
   **Strategic Objective:** Land Use and Development Control – Planning for population growth and guiding development and land use to ensure that future generations enjoy a sustainable city and a genuinely desirable lifestyle.
d. Policy
   City Policies are annually reviewed and reflect contemporary planning practice.
e. Financial
   Nil
f. Legal and Statutory
   All Development Approvals are issued pursuant to TPS2 and the Regulations. The City’s TPS2 is subservient to the Regulations, as explained below.
   
   **TPS2**
   Large sections of TPS2 have been deleted as they have been superseded by the Regulations. The City does not have any statutory opportunities to streamline the types of applications it requires for small business approvals, as this matter is controlled by the Regulations. There are also no operational problems with TPS2 with respect to small business applications.
   City Officers, however, actively case manage their applications from the point of view of how applications could be approved rather than refused. Consequently, applications are approved if they are compliant or amended in order to comply with TPS2.
   The City is currently undertaking the preparation of a Local Planning Strategy and review of TPS2.
Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015 (Regulations)

The Regulations were a major part of Western Australia’s Planning reform agenda, affecting arrangements for local planning strategies, schemes and amendments. In addition to a Model Scheme Text, the Regulations introduced a set of ‘deemed provisions’ that now form part of every local planning scheme in the State.

While the Regulations provide for improved standardisation of the planning framework they replaced approximately half of the provisions in TPS2. The Regulations, rather than TPS2, apply to local planning policy, heritage, structure plan, detailed area plan, use and development of land, requirements for planning approval, application for planning approval information, advertising of applications, matters to be considered by Council, deemed refusal, amending or revoking a planning approval, advertisement provisions contained in TPS2.

Accordingly, the opportunity to streamline approval processes for Small Businesses is restricted, due to the statutory planning requirements being determined by the State Government, through the Regulations, rather than Council.

Health and Building Requirements

The City’s Health and Building requirements are governed by the Health Act 1911, and the Building Act 2011. These requirements are universal in their application to all local governments in Western Australia and apply by virtue of this legislation.

g. Risk
Nil

Comments

What is the City’s Role?
The City's role is to administer Development Approval for small businesses. It does this for home based business, retail/commercial and industry. The City considers a range of small business applications and makes decisions to approve applications. To do this, the City applies TPS2 and City Policy. In 2015/16, the City issued 589 Development Approvals with a total value of $594,438,060.

Approval Timeframes
It takes between 14 to 21 days to process most Development Approval decisions. In some cases the approval timeframes are less than seven days for simple applications. Complex applications take longer depending on advertising and agency referrals, Council Approval and JDAP Approvals. These timeframes are more than compliant with the Regulations of 60 or 90 days.

Application Fee
A Home Based Business application fee is $222. A Change of Use application for a Small Business could cost as low as $147. These application fees are prescribed by the Planning and Development Regulations 2009, which are reviewed by the State Government.

Customer Service Feedback
All Development Approval decisions include a Customer Survey Form. The applicant feedback over the past 12 months is as follows:
Quality of Advice – Majority of respondents rated advice as ‘Good’ and ‘Excellent’.
Submission of Additional Information - Around half of respondents lodged additional information.
Rating of the Time Taken to Process Application – Majority rated ‘Good’ and ‘Excellent’.
Satisfaction with Decision – Almost all of the respondents were satisfied with the decision.
Quality of Service – The majority of respondents rated as ‘Good’ and ‘Excellent’ and their comments back this up with responses such as ‘friendly, helpful’ and ‘professional and efficient service’. One respondent suggested that after dealing with many Perth Council's over the past few years the Rockingham Planning Service has been the best.
Overall, based on the customer feedback received on application processing and quality of service, the City’s Planning Services has maintained a high level of professionalism, efficiency and customer service to applicants, which continues to be reflected in the feedback received.

**Online Lodgement of Development Applications**

The City always looks to improve how it interacts with applicants and the public with the aim of streamlining processes, lowering costs and avoiding duplication of effort. The City is finalising an Online Development Application system that will allow for the lodgement, tracking and reporting on most Development Applications.

Online Development Application lodgement, tracking and reporting is expected to increase customer satisfaction, improve responsiveness and ensure that services provided are what the customer wants and needs and that they accord with the City’s requirements. As online is becoming a more popular channel, the City has been developing the Online DA system and it may be live within the next few months.

**Delegated Authority**

City Officers have delegated authority to approve or refuse most applications, which reduces application processing timeframes. The delegation authority from Council to CEO and from CEO to other employees is reviewed annually to ensure that it reflects contemporary planning practice.

**Conclusion**

The City’s Planning Service facilitates the establishment and growth of many small businesses within the district annually. Approval requirements are determined by the Regulations rather than being prescribed by TPS2.

The vast majority of the feedback received from applicants indicates that they are satisfied with the advice, support, timeframes and outcomes. Operationally the City’s Planning Services is performing at a high level with its resources and applicant expectations are being met.

Online lodgement, tracking and reporting on Development Applications is a major project that is nearing completion. It is expected to deliver administration improvements and reduce the cost of doing business with the City. The City’s planning processes are also evolving in response to the planning reforms being introduced by the State Government, many of which have already been implemented.

While the City endeavours to assist small businesses this must be based on compliance with TPS2 and the Regulations. The planning processes undertaken by the City are a direct outcome of the State Government Regulations which have superseded various sections of TPS2. As the function of the City is regulated and controlled by State Government legislation, this restricts the ability for the City to streamline approval processes for small businesses.

**Voting Requirements**

Simple Majority

**Officer Recommendation**

That Council ACCEPTS that the City’s existing planning processes support the establishment and growth of small businesses within the district, which reflects contemporary practice.

**Committee Recommendation**

Moved Cr Downham, seconded Cr Hamblin:

That Council ACCEPTS that the City’s existing planning processes support the establishment of small businesses within the district, which reflects contemporary practice.

Committee Voting -2/3

(Crs Sammels, Summers and Elliott voted against)

Motion Lost
Moved Cr Sammels, seconded Cr Summers:

That Council **ACCEPTS** that the City's existing planning processes support the establishment and growth of small businesses within the district, which reflects contemporary practice.

Committee Voting -3/2

(Crs Downham and Hamblin voted against)

**The Committee’s Reason for Varying the Officer’s Recommendation**

Not Applicable

**Implications of the Changes to the Officer’s Recommendation**

Not Applicable
**Planning and Development Services**

**Statutory Planning Services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference No &amp; Subject:</th>
<th>PDS-027/16 Proposed Building Envelope Variation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>File No:</td>
<td>DD024.2015.00000022.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Register No:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant:</td>
<td>Ben Trager Homes Pty Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner:</td>
<td>Mr M and Mrs A Taljaard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author:</td>
<td>Miss Keara Freeley, Planning Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Contributors:</td>
<td>Mr David Waller, Coordinator Statutory Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Mike Ross, Manager Statutory Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Committee Meeting:</td>
<td>16 May 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously before Council:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure of Interest:</td>
<td>Tribunal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Council’s Role in this Matter:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site:</td>
<td>Lot 131 Peelfold Glen, Golden Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Area:</td>
<td>5,904m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Zoning:</td>
<td>Special Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRS Zoning:</td>
<td>Rural</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maps/Diagrams:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Location</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Aerial Photograph</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Existing and Proposed Building Envelope</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Consultation Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Site Assessment Map from Fire Management Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Location Plan

2. Aerial Photograph
### Purpose of Report

To consider an application to vary the approved building envelope at Lot 131 Peelfold Glen, Golden Bay.

### Background

In January 1999, the Western Australian Planning Commission (WAPC) endorsed a Deposited Plan which created Lot 131 Peelfold Glen, together with several other lots between 8,089m² and 1.305ha in area. Building envelopes were identified for the proposed lots, including the subject site, as part of the subdivision process.

A Bushfire Management Plan (BMP) was not prepared for the subdivision which created difficulty in deriving a safe Bushfire Attack Level (BAL) which could be contained on the property. After extensive negotiation with the Fire Consultant and the Department of Fire and Emergency Services (DFES), the final version of the BMP was submitted to the City on 29 April 2016.

The approved building envelope is set back 10.5m from the primary street, 6m from the northern side boundary, 13.5m from the southern side boundary and 74m from the eastern rear boundary.

The subject lot is level and has a number of mature Tuart trees with a grassland understorey.

### Details

The applicant seeks approval to increase the building envelope by 10% and to alter the shape of the building envelope so that its width is increased. This is to accommodate a portion of the dwelling, a shed and the Aerobic Treatment Unit (ATU) system. The current building envelope is 753m² in area and is proposed to be increased to 828.3m² (10%).
3. Existing and Proposed Building Envelope
### Implications to Consider

**a. Consultation with the Community**

In accordance with Clause 6.3.3 of Town Planning Scheme No.2 (TPS2) and Planning Policy 3.3.17 – *Variations to Building Envelopes*, building envelopes may be varied at the discretion of the Council, only after consultation with the owners of affected or adjoining properties. The application was referred to four nearby and adjacent property owners for a period of 14 days as shown on the Consultation Plan below. At the close of the advertising period, no submissions had been received.

**b. Consultation with Government Agencies**

Not Applicable

**c. Strategic**

**Community Plan**

This item addresses the Community's Vision for the future and specifically the following Aspiration and Strategic Objective contained in the Community Plan 2015-2025:

**Aspiration D:** Sustainable Environment  
**Strategic Objective:** Land Use and Development Control - Planning for population growth and guiding development and land use to ensure that future generations enjoy a sustainable city and a genuinely desirable lifestyle.

**d. Policy**

Planning Policy 3.3.17 – *Variations to Building Envelopes (PP3.3.17)*

The proposed building envelope variation complies with the objectives and policy provisions of PP3.3.17. The building envelope is proposed to be increased by the maximum 10% permitted and it will not create an adverse environmental impact. The bushfire risk is also not considered to increase as a result of the proposed modification.
The modification is to accommodate the ATU system and a portion of the dwelling, which will have minimal effect on the neighbouring properties.

**Guidelines for Planning in Bushfire Prone Areas**

A BMP has been approved as part of the proposal and has calculated a BAL-29 to apply to the single dwelling. It is noted that the Asset Protection Zone (APZ) for the proposed single dwelling will extend outside of the proposed building envelope 13.5m to the south, 12m to the east, 6m to the north and 10.5m to the west. The BMP recommends the maintaining of short grass, the removal of leaves, twigs, dead material within shrubs and trailing bark and prune branches to two metres above ground.

_Australian Standard AS 3959-2009, Construction of buildings in bushfire prone areas_ require adjacent structures to be separated from the single dwelling by not less than 6m or the adjacent structure is required to be designed to the BAL specified in the BMP. A 16m² portion has been added to the rear of the building envelope to ensure that the proposed shed is located 6m from the dwelling. This area has been removed from the front of the building envelope to ensure that the building envelope is not increased by more than 10%.

5. Site Assessment Map from Fire Management Plan

e. **Financial**

Nil

f. **Legal and Statutory**

Schedule No.5 of TPS2 provides that the size and location of an approved building envelope may be varied with the approval of the Council.

g. **Risk**

Nil

**Comments**

The proposed building envelope complies with TPS2 and PP3.3.17. There are no adverse environmental impacts associated with the proposed building envelope or increased fire risk. The impact of the proposed building envelope on the amenity of neighbouring properties is minimal, given no vegetation is affected and no objections were raised to the proposal by adjoining owners. It is recommended that the proposed building envelope be approved.
### Voting Requirements

Simple Majority

### Officer Recommendation

That Council *APPROVES* the application to vary the building envelope at Lot 131 Peelfold Glen, Golden Bay.

### Committee Recommendation

Moved Cr Sammels, seconded Cr Hamblin:

That Council *APPROVES* the application to vary the building envelope at Lot 131 Peelfold Glen, Golden Bay.

Committee Voting – 5/0

### The Committee’s Reason for Varying the Officer’s Recommendation

Not Applicable

### Implications of the Changes to the Officer’s Recommendation

Not Applicable
## Planning and Development Services
### Statutory Planning Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference No &amp; Subject:</th>
<th>PDS-028/16 Joint Development Assessment Panel Application - Reconsideration of Pylon Signage Condition - Freeway Service Centres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>File No:</td>
<td>DD020.2012.00000322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Register No:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant:</td>
<td>Urbis Pty Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner:</td>
<td>BP Australia Pty Ltd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author:</td>
<td>Miss Donna Shaw, Senior Planning Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Contributors:</td>
<td>Mr Dave Waller, Coordinator Statutory Planning, Mr Mike Ross, Manager Statutory Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Committee Meeting:</td>
<td>16 May 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously before Council:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure of Interest:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Council’s Role in this Matter:</td>
<td>Executive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Site:

- Lot 191 Paparone Road and Lot 192 Leary Road, Baldivis
- Lot 191 - 5.990ha
- Lot 192 - 3.821ha

### LA Zoning:

- Lot 191 - Special Use (Freeway Service Centre)
- Lot 192 - Special Use (Freeway Service Centre) and Rural

### MRS Zoning:

- Lot 191 - Urban
- Lot 192 - Rural

### Attachments:

- Responsible Authority Report

### Maps/Diagrams:

1. Location Plan
2. Aerial Photo
3. McDonalds Pylon Sign
4. Red Rooster Pylon Sign
5. Southbound Pylon Sign (9m)
6. Southbound Pylon Sign (15m)
7. Southbound Pylon Sign (17m)
8. Northbound Pylon Sign (9m)
9. Northbound Pylon Sign (15m)
10. Northbound Pylon Sign (17m)
11. Revised Pylon Sign
12. Approved BP Pylon Sign
13. 1km Main Roads Signage
14. 500m Main Roads Signage
2. Aerial Photo

Purpose of Report

To provide recommendations to the Metro South-West Joint Development Assessment Panel (SWJDAP) on an application to amend the Development Approval granted by the SWJDAP on 14 February 2013 and amended on 27 November 2015 for the Freeway Service Centres, including a request to delete a condition of approval and modify the development.

Background

The following outlines the history of Development Approvals on-site:

- April 2011 - TPS2 Amendment No.89 Gazetted - Rezoning of portions of Lot 9000 Paparone Road, Baldivis from 'Rural' and 'Special Rural' to 'Special Use - Freeway Service Centre'.
- February 2013 - Conditional Development Approval issued by the Metro South-West JDAP (SWJDAP) for the Freeway Service Centres (FSC).
- November 2014 - Approval issued by the SWJDAP for amendments to the Development Approval for the Freeway Service Centres.
- August 2015 - The applicant lodged a Joint Development Assessment Panel Application for an Amendment to the SWJDAP Development Approval for the FSC, which sought to amend the Development Approval for the FSC granted by the SWJDAP on 19 November 2014, by modifying the development and deleting a condition. Specifically, the following amendments were proposed:
  1. Deleting Condition No.12
     Condition 12 stated:
     "A Sign Strategy must be prepared and include the information required by Planning Policy 3.3.1, Control of Advertisements, to the satisfaction of the City, prior to the issue of a Building Permit and implemented as such for the duration of the development."
The applicant sought to delete Condition 12 and instead include all signage in the development approval rather than have a signage strategy subsequently approved by the City. A signage strategy was included with the amendments to the application.

2. Relocating the Principal Shared Path
The applicant sought to realign the location of the Principal Shared Path to extend around the western side of the northbound FSC.

3. Include Four additional Pylon Signs
The applicant proposed to include four additional Pylon signs in the development; two on the northbound site and two on the southbound site. Each site is to have a McDonalds pylon sign and a Red Rooster pylon sign.

The McDonalds Pylons signs were to have a total height of 20m, comprising of a 5.25m high and 5.4m wide signage panel on top of a 14.57m to 14.75m high pole. The signage panel would be polycarbonate material and illuminated. The McDonalds Sign is shown in Figure 3 below.

3. McDonalds Pylon Sign
The Red Rooster Pylon signs were to have a total height of 20m, consisting of a 4.25m high and 2.5m wide light box affixed to the top of a 15.75m pole, as shown in Figure 4 below.
CONFIRMED AT A PLANNING AND ENGINEERING SERVICES MEETING HELD ON MONDAY 20 JUNE 2016

4. Red Rooster Pylon Sign

The City raised no objection to the relocation of the Principal Shared Path subject to an access easement being provided over Lot 191, and also raised no objection to the deletion of Condition No. 12 provided the signage strategy was approved as part of the Development Application and subject to deletion of the four additional pylon signs from the strategy.

The City did not support the inclusion of the four additional Pylon Signs as they did not comply with the requirements of TPS2 and City of Rockingham Planning Policy 3.3.1 - Control of Advertisements. The City considered they were excessive in number and size and were contrary to the intent of the FSC to provide a singular facility. The City also considered the signs unnecessary to provide for driver awareness of the facilities, and therefore considered the signs inappropriate for the site.

- November 2015 - Approval issued by the SWJDAP for amendments to the Development Approval for the FSC, subject to the following amended conditions:

"21. An Easement in accordance with Sections 195 and 196 of the Land Administration Act 1997 for the benefit of the public is to be placed on the Certificate of Title for Lot 191 Paparone Road, Baldivis specifying access rights for the redesigned principle shared path. Notice of this Easement is to be included on the Deposited Plan. The Easement is to state as follows:
"Public Access Easement - Principle Shared Path”.

31. The (4) four pylon signs are to be reduced in height to 9 metres and face area not exceeding 3.5 metres in width and height in accordance with Council’s Policy 3.3.1 ‘Controlled Advertisements’.

The reason provided by the SWJDAP for amending Condition 31 was as follows:

“The additional pylon signs (McDonald’s and Red Rooster) are considered acceptable in this large scale freeway environment, however, they should be reduced in size, as guided by Council’s Policy.”

The accompanying External Signage Schedule (signage strategy) dated January 2015, Received 24 September 2015 and as amended 19 October 2015 was also amended to delete the words "(excluding McDonalds pylon sign and Red Rooster pylon sign)", in accordance with the amendment to Condition 31 to include the four pylon signs.

- December 2015 - the applicant lodged an appeal with the State Administrative Tribunal (SAT) which sought to remove amended Condition 31 of the SWJDAP approval as it applies to the BP and McDonalds signs. A mediation session was held as part of the SAT proceedings on 15 February 2016 which the City was invited to participate in.

- March 2016 - the SAT invited the SWJDAP to reconsider its decision on or before the 29 April 2016.

- March 2016 - the applicant provided additional information in support of the reconsideration as a result of the concerns discussed in the mediation sessions, however, information pertaining to the northbound site was provided only. The City requested information relating to the southbound site in order to complete its assessment.

- March 2016 - SAT amended its orders to invite the SWJDAP to reconsider its decision on or before the 15 June 2016 given the applicant had provided insufficient information to enable the City’s assessment of the revised application.

- April 2016 - the applicant provided additional information pertaining to the southbound site in addition to the existing information for the northbound site, the assessment of which forms the basis of this report.

Details

The SWJDAP was invited to reconsider its decision in respect to the width and height of the Pylon signs pursuant to section 31 of the State Administrative Tribunal Act 2004.

The applicant has provided the following grounds for review:

1. Extensive mature tree planting along the frontage of the site will result in the signs being substantially obscured if reduced in height and face size.

2. Obscured signage may result in vehicles slowing down at the last moment to access the site, which could result in dangerous vehicle conditions.

3. Current signage policy does not appropriately address freeway service stop development and it is therefore not relevant to assess the application against the current policy. In respect to item 3, draft Development Control Policy 1.10 - Location, Siting and Design of freeway service centres and roadhouses at Clause 3.3.5 requires signage to comply with the requirements of Main Roads WA (MRWA) and/or the local authority. City of Rockingham Planning Policy 3.3.1 - Control of Advertisements does not contain any specific criteria for freeway service stop signage. Its requirements for pylon signs (at Clause 4.3.2), which specify a maximum height of 9 metres, and a face width of 3.5 metres wide or high, are not appropriate to a service stop location. The proposed signage is also not specifically addressed in MRWA Policy and Application Guidelines for Advertising Signs Policy.”

As part of the reconsideration, the applicant provided additional information as follows:

- Correspondence in support of a revised Pylon sign height the applicant considers appropriate for the location based on visibility and safety reasons;
- Photo montages prepare to include signage at a height of 9m, 15m and 17m, at distances of 450m approaching the Southbound FSC and 500m approaching the Northbound FSC for comparative purposes (see Figures 5-10); and

- A revised McDonalds Pylon sign, which removed the '24 hour' and 'Create Your Taste' elements logo, reducing the overall sign face area to 23.5m² (5.4m x 4.352m) and reducing the height of the sign to 17m (see Figure 11).

The applicant's preferred Pylon sign height is 17m.
7. Southbound Pylon Sign (17m)

8. Northbound Pylon Sign (9m)

9. Northbound Pylon Sign (15m)
10. Northbound Pylon Sign (17m)
Whilst the correspondence received related to the two McDonald's Pylon signs, the condition the subject of review was applicable to the two Red Rooster Pylon signs and therefore any modification to the condition will relate to all four Pylon signs.
The applicant considers that a minimum sign height of 17m is required to ensure the signs are suitably visible from an appropriate distance and to allow ample time for safe lane changing to the deceleration lane, to access the FSC. The applicant has provided justification for amended signs, as contained in Attachments 4 and 5 of this report, and discussed in the Planning Assessment section of this report. The following is an assessment of the revised Pylon signs at a height of 17m and the modified face area of the signs.

It should be noted that the City requested scaled site plans detailing the specific location of the Pylon signs, as the City considered the topography of the site at the Pylon sign locations could have an impact on the visibility of the signs and the visual amenity of the locality. The applicant failed to provide the requested scaled site plans.

Implications to Consider

a. Consultation with the Community

There was no public consultation undertaken as part of the section 31 reconsideration process as public consultation was not required pursuant to TPS2 for the original application.

b. Consultation with Government Agencies

MRWA has previously reviewed the application and advised that it did not support the four additional pylon signs as they appear to be located within the road reservation. MRWA also advised that it would prefer the Pylon signs being reduced in height to 10m.

MRWA was requested for revised comments and advised that it:
- Supports the City of Rockingham’s signage policy which restricts pylon signs to a maximum height of 9m;
- Does not support the applicant’s revised preferred pylon sign height of 17m; and
- Does not support additional pylon signage for the Freeway Service Centres.

MRWA also recommended retaining all secondary service advertising relating to businesses trading within the Service Centre to the existing “BP” pylon sign, as the Pylon sign was granted special height consideration of 20m for the purpose of integrating all secondary service advertising.

MRWA also advised that additional Pylon signage is not required as motorists approaching either Service Centres are adequately advised of businesses trading within the centre by individual coloured logos affixed to service signs, located 1km and 500m in advance of the exit.

c. Strategic Community Plan

This item addresses the Community’s Vision for the future and specifically the following Aspiration and Strategic Objective contained in the Community Plan 2015-2025:

Aspiration D: Sustainable Environment

Strategic Objective: Land Use and Development Control - Planning for population growth and guiding development and land use to ensure that future generations enjoy a sustainable city and a genuinely desirable lifestyle.

d. Policy

Development Control Policy 1.10 - Location and Design of Freeway Service Centres (DC 1.10)

The purpose of DC 1.10 is to establish where FSC may be supported where specific criteria are met. The intent of the policy is to provide for a singular centre that provides services for the travelling public as opposed to a collection of separate tenancies.

The objectives of DC 1.10 are:

“(a) To establish the circumstances under which freeway service centres may be supported for development; and
(b) To establish the criteria under which a freeway service centre may be used and developed."

The following is an assessment of the proposed amendment against the Policy Measures of DC 1.10 relevant to this application.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Measure</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Locational Requirements</strong></td>
<td>The location of the signs will not interfere with existing or proposed passenger public transport systems or pedestrian and cycle pathways.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposals should not interfere with any existing or proposed passenger public transit system designed within or adjacent to the freeway system and should not interfere with planned or existing pedestrian and cycle pathways.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Approval Requirements**              | The approval of Main Roads WA is required for the erection of any signage. This has been further discussed in the Consultation section of this report. | Noted.     |
| In addition to any requirements imposed by virtue of a development approval issued under a town planning scheme, approvals from other authorities may be required in respect of: |                                                          |            |
| - Impact of lighting on freeway, signage, design of deceleration and acceleration lanes and general access arrangements to the satisfaction of Main Roads. |                                                        |            |

The intent of the Freeway Service Centres as described by DC 1.10 is to provide a facility for the travelling public. This is a singular facility, not a collection of separate outlets, that provides for motor vehicle fuel and related accessories, emergency breakdown repairs, food and drink for the travelling public and road safety advertising.

Given the above, the provision of separate pylon signs to advertise the individual tenancies is contrary to the intent of DC 1.10 to provide a consolidated and singular facility. The City considers that one pylon sign, advertising the freeway centre as a whole and containing the individual tenant's signage, is consistent with the intent of DC 1.10. It should be noted that the City approved a modification to the signage strategy required by Condition No.12 which includes the McDonalds and Red Rooster signage on the already approved 20m high BP Pylon sign (see Figure 12) and therefore the City does not consider that additional Pylon signs are appropriate.
12. Approved BP Pylon Sign

**Planning Policy 3.3.1 - Control of Advertisements (PP3.3.1)**

The following is an assessment of the amended Pylon signs against the objectives of PP3.3.1:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) Ensure that advertisements are appropriate for their location.</td>
<td>The City considers that the amended Pylon signs result in a proliferation of signage which is considered to be inappropriate for their location.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Minimise the proliferation of advertisements.</td>
<td>The City considers that the amended Pylon signs result in increased signage on the sites, which leads to a proliferation of signage across the entirety of the sites.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) Ensure that advertisements do not adversely impact on traffic circulation and management, or pedestrian safety.</td>
<td>The additional height of the Pylon signs are not expected to adversely impact traffic circulation or management, or compromise pedestrian safety.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Protect the amenity of residential areas, townscape areas and areas of environmental significance.</td>
<td>The northbound site is surrounded by a residential area. The City considers that a Pylon sign to a height of 17m will be visible from the adjacent residential area and would compromise the amenity of the residential area.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) Protect the significance of heritage places or buildings.</td>
<td>The subject sites are not heritage listed nor are there any heritage listed sites within the vicinity of the subject sites.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) Ensure that advertisements are constructed with quality materials.</td>
<td>The use of polycarbonate materials for the signs is considered a quality material.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) Encourage advertisements located within the Rural or Special Rural Zone or in areas of environmental significance to be sympathetic with the natural environment in terms of materials and colours.</td>
<td>The southbound site includes and abuts rural zoned land. The City considers that an additional two 17m high Pylon signs in addition to the existing 20m high Pylon sign is not sympathetic with the surrounding rural land.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(h) Ensure advertisements are generally erected on land where the advertised business, sale of goods or service is being carried out.</td>
<td>The Pylon signs will be erected on the land where the advertised businesses are being carried out.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objective</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Ensure that advertisements are maintained to a high standard.</td>
<td>It will be the responsibility of the owner to ensure signs are consistently maintained to a high standard.</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the above objectives, PP3.3.1 also details non-permitted advertisements. In this respect, PP3.3.1 states that:

“illuminated, moving, pulsating or flashing advertisements will generally not be permitted particularly on major roads.”

Given the 24 hour nature of the use, in this instance illuminated signage is considered to be acceptable as proposed in the application. Moving, pulsating or flashing advertisements are not considered to be acceptable, however, none are proposed.

The following is an assessment of the proposed Pylon signs against the Assessment Criteria for Pylon signs of PP3.3.1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Compliance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pylon signs shall not:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) be located within 1.8m of a boundary.</td>
<td>Southbound Site Red Rooster = 2.5m setback to western boundary (pole) McDonalds = 3.4m setback to western boundary (pole) Northbound Site The Red Rooster = 2.7m setback to eastern boundary (pole) McDonalds = 4.45m setback to eastern boundary (pole)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) be situated within 6.0m of any other sign of the same lot.</td>
<td>The Pylon signs are not located within 6.0m of any other sign (including directional signage) on the same site.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) project over a street, walkway or any other public area by more than 1.0m.</td>
<td>The proposed Pylon signs are proposed to be wholly contained within the lot boundaries of the FSC’s.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) have a height exceeding 6.0m, unless it can be demonstrated to the Council that a greater height is warranted and it complies with the objectives of this Planning Policy. In any event, a Pylon Sign shall not exceed 9.0m in height.</td>
<td>All four Pylon signs have a proposed height of 17m. Any sign exceeding 9m in height (including the 15m height alternative provided by the applicant) will fail to comply with this requirement.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>have any part of the sign less than 2.7m from the ground level, unless the sign is designed such that the underside of the face area is located at ground level.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The face of the Red Rooster Pylon sign is located 15.75m from ground level. The face of the McDonalds sign is located 12.64m from ground level.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f)</td>
<td>have a face area exceeding more than 3.5m width or height.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The face area of the Red Rooster Pylon signs has a height of 4.25m and a width of 2.5m. The face area of the McDonalds Pylon signs has a height of 4.352m and a width of 5.4m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g)</td>
<td>have a face area of more than 4m² on each side (single tenancy) or 13m² on each side (multiple tenancy).</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The face area of the Red Rooster Pylon signs is 10.62m². The face area of the McDonalds Pylon signs is approximately 23.5m².</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only one pylon sign shall be permitted on a lot with a single tenancy. For lots with two or more tenancies, only one pylon sign will be generally permitted unless the site is large and has more than one street frontage, in which case one pylon sign per street frontage may be permitted.</td>
<td>Each site contains three tenancies within one building. Whilst the lots on which the development is located has more than one street frontage, access to the developments is limited to being solely from the freeway. In this instance the sites are considered to only have one frontage. Therefore, only one Pylon sign is permitted per site. Notwithstanding the above, the City acknowledges that the SWJDAP has approved the four pylon signs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An application for a pylon sign on any land containing two or more tenancies shall be supported by a Sign Strategy that shall generally describe and illustrate the number, location, dimensions and content of the pylon sign and any other commercial signs on the property, and demonstrate that equitable access for all tenancies can be achieved.</td>
<td>A Signage Strategy has been previously approved, which did not anticipate the additional Pylon signs.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
An application for a pylon sign on any land containing two or more tenancies shall ensure provision can be made within the allowable sign size for every tenancy to be displayed on the sign. In addition to BP, there are three individual tenancies (McDonalds, Red Rooster and Wild Bean Café) contained within each Freeway Service Centre. The applicant has proposed three Pylon signs per site, instead of containing all advertising for individual tenants on the one Pylon sign. Notwithstanding the above, the City acknowledges that the SWJDAP has approved the four Pylon signs.

A Pylon Sign shall be located wholly within the boundaries of the lot from which the product(s) or service(s) to which it relates is sited. The Pylon signs only relate to those developments contained/operating within the site.

The proposed Pylon signs fail to comply with the maximum height and maximum face area requirements of PP3.3.1. These matters have been further discussed in the Planning Assessment section of this report.

e. Financial
Nil

f. Legal and Statutory

State Administrative Tribunal Act 2004
If invited by SAT, the SWJDAP has the ability to reconsider its decision pursuant to Section 31(2) of the State Administrative Tribunal Act 2004. This Responsible Authority Report (RAR) forms the assessment for the SWJDAP to reconsider its decision.

City of Rockingham Town Planning Scheme No.2 (TPS2)

Clause 5.3 - Control of Advertisements
Clause 5.3 requires Development Approval to be obtained for any advertisement. In assessing an application, Council is required to consider the objectives of TPS2 and particularly the character and amenity of the locality within which it is to be displayed, including its historic or landscape significance and traffic safety, and the amenity of adjacent areas that may be affected.

The City considers that the approval of the four additional pylon signs and the additional height of the signs to 17m is considered to result in excessive signage on the site and as such adversely impact on the character and amenity of the locality.

g. Risk
Nil

The City requested the following additional information from the applicant to determine an appropriate height and scale for the Pylon signs:
- Explanation of terms used in applicant's justification;
- Photo montages;
- The rational for the signage; and
- Location of signage.

The proposed Pylon signs fail to comply with the maximum height and maximum face area requirements of PP3.3.1. These matters have been further discussed in the Planning Assessment section of this report.

e. Financial
Nil

f. Legal and Statutory

State Administrative Tribunal Act 2004
If invited by SAT, the SWJDAP has the ability to reconsider its decision pursuant to Section 31(2) of the State Administrative Tribunal Act 2004. This Responsible Authority Report (RAR) forms the assessment for the SWJDAP to reconsider its decision.

City of Rockingham Town Planning Scheme No.2 (TPS2)

Clause 5.3 - Control of Advertisements
Clause 5.3 requires Development Approval to be obtained for any advertisement. In assessing an application, Council is required to consider the objectives of TPS2 and particularly the character and amenity of the locality within which it is to be displayed, including its historic or landscape significance and traffic safety, and the amenity of adjacent areas that may be affected.

The City considers that the approval of the four additional pylon signs and the additional height of the signs to 17m is considered to result in excessive signage on the site and as such adversely impact on the character and amenity of the locality.

g. Risk
Nil

The City requested the following additional information from the applicant to determine an appropriate height and scale for the Pylon signs:
- Explanation of terms used in applicant's justification;
- Photo montages;
- The rational for the signage; and
- Location of signage.

The proposed Pylon signs fail to comply with the maximum height and maximum face area requirements of PP3.3.1. These matters have been further discussed in the Planning Assessment section of this report.

e. Financial
Nil

f. Legal and Statutory

State Administrative Tribunal Act 2004
If invited by SAT, the SWJDAP has the ability to reconsider its decision pursuant to Section 31(2) of the State Administrative Tribunal Act 2004. This Responsible Authority Report (RAR) forms the assessment for the SWJDAP to reconsider its decision.

City of Rockingham Town Planning Scheme No.2 (TPS2)

Clause 5.3 - Control of Advertisements
Clause 5.3 requires Development Approval to be obtained for any advertisement. In assessing an application, Council is required to consider the objectives of TPS2 and particularly the character and amenity of the locality within which it is to be displayed, including its historic or landscape significance and traffic safety, and the amenity of adjacent areas that may be affected.

The City considers that the approval of the four additional pylon signs and the additional height of the signs to 17m is considered to result in excessive signage on the site and as such adversely impact on the character and amenity of the locality.

g. Risk
Nil

The City requested the following additional information from the applicant to determine an appropriate height and scale for the Pylon signs:
- Explanation of terms used in applicant's justification;
- Photo montages;
- The rational for the signage; and
- Location of signage.
The applicant's response to each of the above and the City's subsequent comments are provided below:

**Explanation of Terms**

The City requested an explanation on what the terms ‘suitably visible’, ‘appropriate distance’ and ‘adequate visibility’ are based on with respect to the positioning and height of the signs. These terms were provided in the applicant's original justification for the signs.

**Applicant's Response:**

As discussed with the City, there is no specific applicable standard in respect of the height of signage required in this environment, from a traffic management and safety perspective. Notwithstanding, we have sought traffic advice (from Riley Consulting) on similar standards which can be applied in order to provide further justification on the need for appropriately scaled signage in this location. A summary of this advice is provided below:

- A key focus from a traffic engineering perspective is to ensure that road related items are appropriately visible to drivers from a safe distance. There are different levels set out by Austroads Guide to Traffic Engineering Practice Part 4 (Austroads), with regard to visibility. This standard relates specifically to intersections; however the principle of visibility could be applied in this instance, in the absence of any specific alternative guideline.

- Austroads states that in respect of Approach Sight Distance (ASD), the minimum level of sight distance which must be available to ensure drivers have adequate visibility to an intersection is 193m at 110km/hr. However, the above visibility does not take into consideration the need for drivers to change lanes after deciding to exit the freeway to access the centre. Whilst Austroads relates to intersections, the principle of visibility is the same in regard to obstructions and road signs. The level of visibility is calculated based on driver reaction times and standard braking distances.

- Overall, in considering various sight distances outlined in Austroads, traffic advice recommends that the minimum distance the proposed sign should be visible is approximately 865m from the sign (to allow ample warning prior to the start of the deceleration lane).

- The photo montages have been taken at a distance of approximately 450m from the location of each proposed McDonald's sign. Whilst this is short of the recommended 865m, it is noted that there is pre-warning Main Roads WA signage which indicates the presence of the service centres as well as the BP service centre signage. On this basis, some discretion has been applied, however in order to maximise visibility and achieve the principles set out by Austroads, a minimum height restriction of 17m should be applied.

- The need for additional sign height is inextricably linked to driving under freeway conditions and will assist in minimising any erratic manoeuvres.

**City's Comment:**

The City acknowledges that there are no specific Western Australian guidelines in respect to the heights of signage for the FSC and it is therefore difficult to ascertain what an appropriate distance to the signs should be and what constitutes suitable visibility of the signs.

The applicant's justification for the increase in sign height is on the basis of ensuring that road related items are appropriately visible to drivers from a safe distance.

The applicant has advised that the minimum distance the proposed sign should be visible is approximately 865m from the sign (to allow ample warning prior to the start of the deceleration lane), yet has used a distance of 450m from the location of the Pylon sign on the Northbound FSC and 500m from the Southbound FSC for the photo montages.

The applicant has not demonstrated that a 17m high Pylon sign would be visible from the required distance of 865m and therefore the development of Pylon signs to ensure road related items are appropriately visible from a safe distance is unfounded.

It is likely that a much higher sign would be required to meet the Austroads standards, which would not be supported by the City as it could become a distraction to drivers, compromising road safety, and would adversely impact the amenity of the locality.
**Explanation of Terms**

The City agrees that there must be sufficient notification to drivers of the FSC on the approach to the FSC to ensure there is adequate time for vehicles to safely decelerate into the FSC. The City considers that the existing Main Roads WA signage advising of the FSCs and McDonalds and Red Rooster tenancies, located approximately 1km and 500m from the deceleration lane to the FSC (see Figures 14 & 15), provides sufficient notification to drivers of the existence of the FSC and the McDonalds and Red Rooster tenancies and allows adequate time for drivers to change lanes to exit the Kwinana Freeway in a safe manner.

Given the proposed height of 17m for the Pylon signs are not likely to be visible from the required distance of 865m, and the existing Main Roads WA signage adequately notifies drivers of the FSC, the additional height to the Pylon signs is not considered warranted on the basis of providing safe notification to drivers of the FSC.

**Photo Montages**

The City requested photo montages for both the northbound and southbound FSC to determine the minimum sign height to enable suitable visibility.

**Applicant's Response:**

The City’s comment is acknowledged and in response, Constructive Media has been further engaged to provide additional photo montages of the southbound service centre.

The previous photo montages prepared were relating to the northbound centre only.

The revised photo montages of the southbound centre illustrate that a sign at a height of 9m is completely concealed. Whilst the sign may be just visible at a height of 15m, it is McDonald’s clear preference that a height of 17m is adopted for both signs, from an amenity perspective.

Further, whilst the montages consider topography, it is highlighted that they have taken a modest approach to the mature height of vegetation, therefore additional sign height is warranted to ensure visibility in the long term (vegetation has the potential to grow to approximately 15-20m).

On this basis, it is our strong opinion that both McDonald’s signs should be constructed at a minimum height of 17m.

**City’s Comment:**

The City has undertaken an assessment of the existing vegetation and agrees with the applicant's findings that the vegetation has the potential to grow to 15-20m in height and therefore 17m high Pylon signs are inconsequential.

**Rationale for Signage**

The City requested rationale for the signs.

**Applicant’s Response:**

The signage is required at the height requested for the following reasons:

Safety – as indicated previously, it is integral that freeway environments are maintained as safe and efficient road networks and that appropriate advanced warning is provided to motorists. A significant part of this is ensuring appropriately visible signage to signal the presence of land uses, to allow safe vehicle movements into deceleration lanes to access such uses. A sign at a height of 17m is considered to appropriately facilitate this.

Mature Vegetation – consideration of the mature height of vegetation in the road reserve leading to the centre is critical in the context of ensure the proposed sign is not obstructed in the medium to long term. This has been considered as part of the photo montages, noting again that a modest approach has been taken in this regard and that trees have the potential to grow taller than 10m.
## Rationale for Signage

**City's Comment:**
The applicant's rationale for the increased height of the Pylon signs on the basis of safety, however, the applicant's own assessment of the height of the signs in relation to acceptable approach sight distances as discussed above demonstrates that a 17m high sign would not be high enough to be visible at the required minimum distance of 865m from the sign to allow ample warning prior to the start of the deceleration lane.

The development of the Pylon signs on the basis of road safety is therefore negligible.

### Location of Signage

The City noted that the approved Signage Strategy was not to scale, and no additional information had been provided detailing the exact location of the proposed signs.

**Applicant's Response:**

> Noted however this is beyond the scope of this appeal matter. The location of the proposed McDonald’s signage is as per the approved signage strategy. Any variation in respect of other signage should be dealt with outside the appeal environment through an amendment to the strategy.

**City's Comment:**

The City requested the exact location of the Pylon signs to determine the impact the topography of the land would have on the visibility of the signs. The applicant has failed to provide this information for the City's consideration.

---

### 13. 1km Main Roads Signage

[Image of road signage with text: SERVICE CENTRE, 1 km ON LEFT]
CONFIRMED AT A PLANNING AND ENGINEERING SERVICES MEETING HELD ON MONDAY 20 JUNE 2016

PRESIDING MEMBER

14. 500m Main Roads Signage

**Pylon Sign Height**

The City does not consider it necessary to view the signs when passing the FSC, given motorists would have already passed the deceleration lane to enter the FSC. In this regard, the Pylon signs are considered to result in the proliferation of signage on the site.

The sole purpose for providing additional Pylon signs should be to alert motorists to the FSC at an appropriate distance to safely enable drivers to make the decision to merge into the left lane of the Kwinana Freeway to enter the deceleration lane.

The City undertook its own assessment of the existing 20m BP Pylon signs when driving towards the FSCs, where it found that whilst the outline of the BP Pylon signs were visible approximately 450m from the FSCs, the detail on the signs was not visible until the deceleration lanes of the FSCs. This demonstrates that both a 9m and 20m Pylon sign is not visible at the required safe distance of 865m, and therefore any additional height in the Pylon signs is negligible in respect to visibly and should be refused.

Given neither 9m, 15m or 17m high Pylon signs would be visible from the required safe distance of 865m, and the existing Main Roads WA signage adequately notifies drivers of the FSC, permitted additional height to the four Pylon signs is not considered to be justified.

**Pylon Sign Face Area**

Whilst it is acknowledged that the applicant has reduced the size of the face area of the McDonalds Pylon sign from 5.25m high and 5.4m wide (28.35m²) to 5.4m x 4.352m (23.5m²) and removed the additional ‘create your taste’ circular logo, the face area of the sign still fails to comply with the requirements of PP3.3.1 in that the face area exceeds 3.5m in width and height.

The applicant has provided the following justification for the variation to the face area requirements of PP3.3.1:

"Whilst the current approval condition restricts the width and height to 3.5m in with Council Policy, this is considered to be inappropriate and ineffective in terms of ensuring the sign is readily identifiable to motorists as well as to enable early notification of the available tenancies and services to enable a safe exit to be made."

CONFIRMED AT A PLANNING AND ENGINEERING SERVICES MEETING HELD ON MONDAY 20 JUNE 2016

PRESIDING MEMBER
The photo montages provided in support of the application varied the height of the sign, but did not provide varying sizes of the face of the sign to enable the City to consider the impact that varying the face area of the sign would have on the visibility of the sign.

It has already been established that a 17m high Pylon sign with a face area of 23.5m² is unlikely to be visible from the required distance of 865m, and the existing Main Roads WA signage adequately notifies drivers of the FSC. The additional face area to the Pylon signs is therefore not considered warranted on the basis of providing early notification of the tenancies and services to enable a safe exit to be made.

For these reasons, the City considers the SWJDAP should affirm its November 2015 decision to approve the development of the four Pylon signs to a height of 9.0 metres and not exceeding 3-5 metres in width and height. It is considered that the face area of the Pylon signs should remain compliant with the requirements of PP3.3.1.

**Conclusion**

The applicant's primary justification for the additional height to the Pylon signs is to ensure signage is appropriately visible to signal the presence of land uses, to allow safe vehicle movements into deceleration lanes to access such uses.

The applicant has failed to demonstrate that the Pylon signs will be visible from the safe distance of 865m and therefore the Pylon signs are not warranted and should be refused.

The City considers that, in terms of travelling motorists being aware of what services are available at the FSCs, the standard "white on blue" Main Roads signs provide relevant fast food logos for the FSC tenancies to notify drivers are sufficient. The Pylon signs are unnecessary to provide for driver awareness of the facilities, and therefore additional height to the Pylon signs is not considered to be justified.

**Voting Requirements**

Simple Majority

**Officer Recommendation**

That Council **ADOPTS** the Responsible Authority Report for the Reconsideration of Pylon Signage Condition - Freeway Service Centres at Lot 191 Paparone Road and Lot 192 Leary Road, Baldivis contained as Attachment 1 as the report required to be submitted to the presiding member of the South-West Joint Development Assessment Panel (SWJDAP) pursuant to Regulation 17 of the Planning and Development (Development Assessment Panels) Regulation 2011, which recommends:

"That the Metro South-West Joint Development Assessment Panel, pursuant to Section 31 of the State Administrative Tribunal Act 2004 in respect of SAT application DR 472/2015 resolves to:

1. **Reconsider** its decision dated 17 November 2015; and

2. **Reaffirm** its decision to approve DAP Application reference DP/12/01384 without modifying Condition 31 and as detailed on the DAP Form 2 dated 13 August 2015 and accompanying:
   - Pavement Marking, Signing and Fencing Principle Shared Path Sheet 1 of 2, Drawing No.201548 -1109 Rev E, dated 17 August 2015;
   - Pavement Marking, Signing and Fencing Principle Shared Path Sheet 2 of 2, Drawing No.201548 -1122 Rev D, dated 17 August 2015;
   - External Signage Schedule (signage strategy), dated January 2015, received 24 September and as amended 19 October 2015.

in accordance with Clause 68(2)(b) of the Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015 and Clause 30(1) of the Metropolitan Region Scheme, for the proposed minor amendment to the approved Freeway Service Centre at Lot 191 Paparone Road and Lot 192 Leary Road, Baldivis, subject to the approval dated 14 February 2013 and as amended on 17 November 2015."
**Committee Recommendation**

**Moved Cr Summers, seconded Cr Downham:**

That Council **ADOPTS** the Responsible Authority Report for the Reconsideration of Pylon Signage Condition - Freeway Service Centres at Lot 191 Paparone Road and Lot 192 Leary Road, Baldivis contained as Attachment 1 as the report required to be submitted to the presiding member of the South-West Joint Development Assessment Panel (SWJDAP) pursuant to Regulation 17 of the *Planning and Development (Development Assessment Panels) Regulation 2011*, which recommends:

*That the Metro South-West Joint Development Assessment Panel, pursuant to Section 31 of the *State Administrative Tribunal Act 2004* in respect of SAT application DR 472/2015 resolves to:*

1. **Reconsider** its decision dated 17 November 2015; and
2. **Reaffirm** its decision to approve DAP Application reference DP/12/01384 without modifying Condition 31 and as detailed on the DAP Form 2 dated 13 August 2015 and accompanying:
   - Pavement Marking, Signing and Fencing Principle Shared Path Sheet 1 of 2, Drawing No.201548 -1109 Rev E, dated 17 August 2015;
   - Pavement Marking, Signing and Fencing Principle Shared Path Sheet 2 of 2, Drawing No.201548 -1122 Rev D, dated 17 August 2015;
   - External Signage Schedule (signage strategy), dated January 2015, received 24 September and as amended 19 October 2015.

in accordance with Clause 68(2)(b) of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015* and Clause 30(1) of the *Metropolitan Region Scheme*, for the proposed minor amendment to the approved Freeway Service Centre at Lot 191 Paparone Road and Lot 192 Leary Road, Baldivis, subject to the approval dated 14 February 2013 and as amended on 17 November 2015.

Committee Voting – 5/0

**The Committee’s Reason for Varying the Officer’s Recommendation**

Not Applicable

**Implications of the Changes to the Officer’s Recommendation**

Not Applicable
Planning and Development Services
Statutory Planning Services

<table>
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<tr>
<th>Reference No &amp; Subject:</th>
<th>PDS-029/16</th>
<th>Proposed Road Closure - Portion of McDonald Road, Baldivis</th>
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<tbody>
<tr>
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<td>LUP/1988</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td>The Planning Group WA Pty Ltd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td>Owner:</td>
<td>Crown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author:</td>
<td>Miss Keara Freeley, Planning Officer</td>
<td></td>
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<tr>
<td>Other Contributors:</td>
<td>Mr Dave Waller, Coordinator Statutory Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
<td>Mr Mike Ross, Manager Statutory Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Committee Meeting:</td>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure of Interest:</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Council’s Role in this Matter:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site:</td>
<td>McDonald Road, Baldivis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Area:</td>
<td>91m²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Zoning:</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRS Zoning:</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachments:</td>
<td>1. Location Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maps/Diagrams:</td>
<td>2. Aerial View</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Purpose of Report

To consider proceeding with a minor road closure of a portion of McDonald Road, Baldivis to align lot boundaries for future residential development, following public advertising.
Background

In February 2016, Council resolved to advertise the proposed closure of a portion of McDonald Road, adjacent to Lot 16 and Lot 306 McDonald Road.

Details

The applicant seeks Council’s support to close a small portion (approximately 91m²) of the McDonald Road road reservation. The purpose of the closure request is to allow the future residential development of the adjoining lots to the west, Lot 16 and Lot 306 McDonald Road, to achieve an appropriate interface and a smooth transition of road reservation. The eastern boundary of Lot 16 and Lot 306 to the north currently do not align and it is therefore desirable to modify the road reservation.

Implications to Consider

a. Consultation with the Community

The proposal was advertised for 35 days in accordance with the Land Administration Act 1997. Advertising was undertaken with letters sent to neighbours within close proximity to both assets and a notice being circulated in the local newspaper. Advertising closed on 27 April 2016. No public submissions were received.

b. Consultation with Government Agencies

The following authorities were consulted during the advertising period:
- Department of Water
- Western Power
- Water Corporation
- Telstra
- Atco Gas

Submissions were received from the Water Corporation, Western Power, Atco Gas and Telstra.

1. Water Corporation

Submission:
(i) The Water Corporation has advised that it has no objections to the proposal.

City’s Comment:
Noted.

2. Western Power

Submission:
(i) Western Power has advised that it has no objections to the proposal at this time but would like to be kept informed of developments. As there are overhead powerlines and/or underground cables adjacent to or traversing the property the following should be considered prior to any works commencing at the site:
   - All work must comply with Worksafe Regulations 3.64 - Guidelines for work in the vicinity of overhead powerlines.
   - Western Power must be contacted if the proposed works involve:
     (a) Any changes to existing ground levels around poles and structures.
     (b) Working under overhead powerlines and/or over underground cables.

Proponent’s Response:
Noted.
3. **Atco Gas**

**Submission:**
(i) Atco Gas have advised that it does not operate gas infrastructure within this portion of McDonald Road and therefore has no objection to the proposal.

**City's Comment:**
Noted.

4. **Telstra**

**Submission:**
(i) Telstra has advised that there are Telstra assets in the vicinity, however, subject to compliance with certain standard conditions, Telstra has no objections to the proposal.

**Applicant's Response:**
Noted.

**City's Comment:**
Noted.

c. **Strategic**

**Community Plan**
This item addresses the Community's Vision for the future and specifically the following Aspiration and Strategic Objective contained in the Community Plan 2015-2025:

- **Aspiration D:** Sustainable Environment
- **Strategic Objective:** Land Use and Development Control - Planning for population growth and guiding development and land use to ensure that future generations enjoy a sustainable city and a genuinely desirable lifestyle.

d. **Policy**
Nil
e. **Financial**
Nil
f. **Legal and Statutory**
The responsibility for determining applications for the closure of road reserves rest with the Minister for Planning, on advice from the Department of Land Administration (State Land Services).
g. **Risk**
Nil

**Comments**
The proponent has acknowledged the comments provided by the service providers, which will ensure that the road closure will have no impact on the existing services. Additionally, no submissions were received following the community consultation procedure.
Given that no objections to the road closure have been received and considering its minor extent, it is recommended that Council request the Minister for Lands to proceed with the closure.

**Voting Requirements**

Simple Majority

**Officer Recommendation**

That Council **SUPPORTS** the closure of a portion of McDonald Road, Baldivis.

**Committee Recommendation**

Moved Cr Sammels, seconded Cr Downham:

That Council **SUPPORTS** the closure of a portion of McDonald Road, Baldivis.

Committee Voting – 5/0

**The Committee’s Reason for Varying the Officer’s Recommendation**

Not Applicable

**Implications of the Changes to the Officer’s Recommendation**

Not Applicable
## Planning and Development Services
### Directorate Planning Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Reference No &amp; Subject:</strong></th>
<th><strong>PDS-030/16</strong> Bushfire Risk Management Pilot Project - Warnbro Dunes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>File No:</strong></td>
<td>LUP/1905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Risk Register No:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Owner:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Author:</strong></td>
<td>Mrs Erika Dawson, Projects Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Contributors:</strong></td>
<td>Mr Bob Jeans, Director Planning and Development Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date of Committee Meeting:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Previously before Council:</strong></td>
<td>May 2015 (PDS-034/15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disclosure of Interest:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nature of Council’s Role in this Matter:</strong></td>
<td>Executive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Site:** | | Warnbro Dunes |
| **Lot Area:** | | |
| **LA Zoning:** | Special Residential, Public Open Space, Parks and Recreation Reserve |
| **MRS Zoning:** | Urban, Parks and Recreation Reserve |
| **Attachments:** | Bushfire Risk Planning Area Risk Assessment - Warnbro Dunes |
| **Maps/Diagrams:** | 1. Location Plan |
| | 2. Study Area Plan |
1. Location Plan
2. Study Area Plan
Purpose of Report

To seek Council endorsement of the Warnbro Dunes Bushfire Risk Planning Area Risk Assessment as a strategy for managing bushfire risk in the Warnbro Dunes study area.

Background

The City is currently preparing a Community Plan Strategy (CPS) for Bushfire Risk Management which will be presented to Council in due course. The Warnbro Dunes Pilot Project is a test case of two components of the overall CPS.

The Pilot Project for Bushfire Risk Management in the Warnbro Dunes comprises eight specific tasks including:

1. Identification of Study Area;
2. Establish the Context;
3. Communications Strategy;
4. Asset Identification;
5. Risk Assessment;
6. Risk Treatment;
7. Bushfire Risk Management Plan; and
8. Waste Considerations (including a green waste strategy).

This report relates to the first the bushfire risk assessment (task five). The green waste strategy (task eight) will be carried out should the bushfire risk assessment be endorsed by Council.

Details

The bushfire risk assessment component of the Pilot Project has been completed. It utilised the Office of Bushfire Risk Management’s (OBRM) Guidelines for Preparing a Bushfire Risk Management Plan. The methodology essentially follows the AS/NZS ISO 31000: Risk management – Principles and guidelines.

Following this methodology, the assessment has:
- Identified assets at risk from bushfire and that are of value to the community;
- Documented treatment strategies to be implemented to reduce risk to an acceptable level;
- Documented responsibilities for implementation; and
- Identified timeframes for implementation.

Integral to this process was communication and consultation with the affected community to ensure there is ownership of the risk and its management.

The final bushfire risk assessment report is attached. It outlines the entire risk assessment for the study area. The risk assessment is provided in Appendix G of the Attachment. Each property has a treatment plan prepared to clearly illustrate what works are required to reduce bushfire risk. The treatment plans are located in Appendix H of the Attachment.

This risk assessment will be subsequently rolled into the City-wide Bushfire Risk Management Plan (BRMP), which will be commenced in the near future. The BRMP will include review, monitoring and refinement of the treatment works.

Implications to Consider

a. Consultation with the Community

A communication strategy was developed as part of the Pilot Project, which involved consultation with the affected community. Consultation was carried out in the following manner:
- Affected land owners were notified of the proposal in writing and invited to participate in an online survey;
- Affected land owners were notified in writing and invited to participate in three community meetings; and
- An information package, providing a DFES guide on what bushfire mitigation measures landowners could undertake, was placed in letterboxes of affected landowners during site visits.

Appendix C of the report Attachment contains the communication strategy. The issues raised from the consultation are outlined in Appendix D of the report.

b. Consultation with Government Agencies

A communication strategy was developed as part of the Pilot Project, which involved consultation with the relevant Government Agencies. Appendix C of the Attachment contains the strategy. The issues raised from the consultation are outlined in Appendix D of the Attachment.

c. Strategic Community Plan

This item addresses the Community’s Vision for the future and specifically the following Aspiration and Strategic Objective contained in the Community Plan 2015-2025:

**Aspiration B:** Strong Community

**Strategic Objective:** Safety and Support - A community that feels safe and secure in home, work and leisure environments, and has access to a range of effective support services and partnerships when encountering challenging or difficult times.

d. Policy

State Emergency Management Plan for Fire (WESTPLAN - FIRE)

WESTPLAN - FIRE requires an integrated Bush Fire Risk Management Plan (BRMP) be prepared for each local government area across Western Australia. The BRMP is to be in accordance with the templates and guidelines prepared by the OBRM. The guidelines assign the preparation responsibility to local government.

The bushfire risk assessment component of the proposed Pilot Project will be prepared in accordance the Guidelines for Preparing a Bushfire Risk Management Plan prepared by OBRM.

e. Financial

$500,000 has been allocated in the City Business Plan in both 2016/2017 and 2017/2018 financial years for the purposes of bushfire risk mitigation. As such, the 2016/2017 Annual Budget will have $500,000 allocated to bushfire risk mitigation measures.

f. Legal and Statutory

Bush Fires Act 1954

Section 33 of the Bush Fires Act 1954 enables the local government to give notice to a land owner requiring the owner to do anything upon their land in order to prevent the outbreak of a bushfire or to prevent the spread or extension of a bushfire.

Emergency Management Act 2005


Section 20 of the EM Act requires that public authorities that are given roles and responsibilities under a State emergency management policy are to comply with the State emergency management policy.

g. Risk

Nil

**Comments**

Approach to Risk Treatment

The approach to the risk treatments has been both strategic and specific. The primary focus was on reducing the immediate risk to the asset (ie. dwelling). This will be achieved by removing vegetation in the immediate vicinity of the asset. Given the environmental constraints of the study area, however, appropriate vegetation removal relatively is limited. Therefore a strategic approach was also taken.
The primary bushfire risk to the study area is from the long fire run available in the coastal reserve area. This is where a fire has the potential to develop to its quasi rate of spread. The quasi rate of spread is what the Australian Standard 3959 - Construction of Buildings in Bushfire Prone Areas (AS3959) models bushfires to. The modelling in the AS assumes that a fire is 100m wide and has developed to a certain stage. Given the interspersed nature of the dwellings amongst the vegetation for the inland areas and the undulating topography, it is less likely that a fire that starts in these areas would reach its quasi rate of spread. Therefore the focus was on providing the best buffer possible, given environmental constraints, to the western most assets in the study area as well as limiting the ability of fire to spread inland through undeveloped lots or to reach assets inland.

Given this, the success of the treatments proposed relies on all parties carrying out their works as the treatments work cumulatively. It is therefore proposed that the treatments contained within the assessment report would constitute what the City considers appropriate as a measure for preventing the outbreak of a bushfire or the spread or extension of a bushfire pursuant to section 33 of the Bush Fires Act 1954.

Lessons Learned

Community Engagement:
Fires within the study area will be largely wind driven fires, by virtue of the vegetation types present. It is highly likely that fire response vehicles will not arrive in time to protect properties, particularly those close to the ignition point and particularly on extreme risk days. This elevates the importance of having an engaged community and for residents to have their properties prepared and having a plan to stay or go during a bushfire event.

The low rate of community engagement was disappointing. Out of the 120 properties:
- 23 (19%) properties responded to the survey (on-line and mail);
- 21 (17.5%) properties had attendees at the community meetings; and
- 21 (17.5%) properties had on-site inspections.

The low level of community engagement was also surprising given the community is fairly stable (i.e. has lived there on average longer than the remainder of the LGA) and has experienced previous fire events. Given the characteristics of a bushfire event in the locality and need for residents to be prepared, the lack of community engagement is concerning.

Level of Risk:
Whilst the area is subject to relatively high levels of bushfire risk, it is probably conservative in terms of actual risk. Residents can generally escape away from the threat and into an area of low threat (i.e. adjacent residential area east of Fendam Street) with relative ease. Consideration, however, needs to be given to the less mobile and younger members of the community. The fragmented nature of the vegetation also means that the intensity of any fire in the area is likely to be less than a completely vegetated area. Thus perceived risk may in fact be higher than actual risk.

Detail of Assessment:
The assessment component of this project was very detailed. It is unlikely that such a detailed assessment would be needed for other areas within the City. The Bushfire Risk Mitigation Plan (BRMP) being separately prepared by the City with DFES would more appropriately assess risk and determine treatment strategies for the remained for the LGA.

Voting Requirements

Simple Majority

Officer Recommendation

That Council ENDORSES the Warnbro Dunes Bushfire Risk Planning Area Risk Assessment as the strategy for managing bushfire risk in the Warnbro Dunes study area.
Committee Recommendation

Moved Cr Hamblin, seconded Cr Summers:
That Council ENDORSES the Warnbro Dunes Bushfire Risk Planning Area Risk Assessment as the strategy for managing bushfire risk in the Warnbro Dunes study area.

Committee Voting – 5/0

The Committee's Reason for Varying the Officer's Recommendation

Not Applicable

Implications of the Changes to the Officer’s Recommendation

Not Applicable

The Chairperson expressed appreciation on behalf of the Committee members to the Officers involved in the preparation of the excellent Pilot Project Report (being Mrs Erika Dawson and Mr Richard Daniel).
Purpose of Report

To consider amending ‘Planning Policy No.3.2.5 - Development Policy Plan – Waterfront Village Sector’ (PP 3.2.5) to introduce new provisions to facilitate the development of a ‘Hotel’ within the Foreshore Precinct of the Waterfront Village Sector.

This Report should be read in conjunction with PDS-32/16 - Proposed Planning Policy No.7.4 - Design Advisory Panel and PDS-33/16 - Amendment No.163 to Town Planning Scheme No.2 - Introducing a New Clause 6.5 - Design Advisory Panel.
Background

The Planning Framework

The planning and development for the Rockingham foreshore is dealt with by the Town Planning Scheme zoning of ‘Primary Centre - Waterfront Village Zone’ and by the Planning Policy No. 3.2.5 - Development Policy Plan ‘Waterfront Village Sector’.

The ‘Primary Centre - Waterfront Village Zone’ was gazetted into the Town Planning Scheme No 2 in September 2012, and PP 3.2.5 was simultaneously adopted on the day the zoning came into effect.

These two planning instruments (the zoning and the Policy) guide all existing and future development within the Waterfront Village Sector.

1. Waterfront Village Sector Indicative Development Plan

Strategic Metropolitan Centre – Activity Centre Plan

The Waterfront Village Sector forms part of the wider Rockingham Strategic Metropolitan Centre.

The planning framework for the Strategic Metropolitan Centre has been progressively implemented, following the approval of the Activity Centre Plan by the Council and Western Australian Planning Commission in 2009.
2. Rockingham Strategic Metropolitan Centre Boundary

The Activity Centre Plan sets out the following planning guidelines for the Waterfront Village Sector:

**Waterfront Village Sector**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Desired Future Character</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Port Rockingham was once the busiest port in the State by tonnage of goods shipped through the jetties at the end of Railway Terrace. The associated beachfront and townsite was subsequently transformed into one of the State’s favourite holiday and day trip destinations. With the shifting south of many of its commercial and civic functions to the new Regional Centre in the early 1970’s, the historic ‘main street’ centre retained a compact townscape character well suited to the demands of a contemporary urban waterfront lifestyle. The emerging Waterfront Village will continue with its transformation into a regionally significant beachfront hub with further redevelopment of under-utilised public and private properties. An attractive mix of medium and high density residential and short-stay apartments, hospitality-focused retail, offices and urban waterfront recreation uses will continue to make this a priority destination on the Rockingham coastline.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferred Uses</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Appropriate TOD uses lining the Transit Route</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Mixed use, urban-scaled development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Residential (medium to high density)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Serviced apartments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Entertainment/hospitality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Possible Contemporary Arts Centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Restaurants, small bars and cafes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Local convenience retailing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Public carparks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Passive parklands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Elements

Continue with transformation of the historic beachfront centre into a contemporary waterfront residential, commercial and recreational activity node servicing local residents and regional visitors.

Prepare an updated Sector Development Plan with relevant changes to residential codings to guide the progressive consolidation and transformation of the area consistent with its TOD context.

Respond to the rare combination of a northerly coastal aspect, sheltered beach and shady parkland with appropriate land uses, in detailed urban design and with site responsive architecture.

Consolidate development within the walkable catchment of the transit system.

Facilitate continued infill of residential and short-stay apartments along the central section of Rockingham Beach Road and along the south western side of Railway Terrace through to the Read Street intersection.

Retain and enhance activated commercial frontages to Rockingham Beach Road, central Kent Street, Flinders Lane (north of Kent Street) and Railway Terrace (north of Kent Street).

Update and expand application of the existing building height policy consistent with an adopted sector improvement plan.

Ensure that all new development is planned in accordance with the sustainability principles listed in Section 3.1.6 and designed to meet any applicable sustainability Key Performance Indicators endorsed by the City of Rockingham.

Planning Policy 3.2.5 – Development Policy Plan – Waterfront Village Sector

The guiding planning principles set out in the overall Activity Centre Plan have been further detailed in PP 3.2.5.

The Policy introduces an Indicative Development Plan (IDP) which deals with the recommended development pattern in much greater detail than the Activity Centre Plan. It also sets out the various requirements for future development under the following headings:

- Transit Oriented Development (TOD)
- Waterfront Village Sector Planning Guidelines
- Residential and Mixed Use Building Typologies
- Residential Design Codes
- Residential Density
- Building Height
- Frontage Types
- Car Parking

This report deals with the categories of ‘Residential Density’ and ‘Building Height’, as they are of direct relevance to the consideration of the proposed ‘Hotel’ variation provisions into the Planning Policy.
Waterfront Village Precincts

The Development Policy Plan for the Waterfront Village Sector divides the area into seven Precincts:

3. Waterfront Village Precinct Concept Plan

Residential Density

The Waterfront Village Policy illustrates a Residential Density which is intended to manage the density of development in accordance with the planning principles and the adopted TOD model for the Activity Centre.

The distribution of residential density in the Waterfront Village responds to the particular land use functions, amenity and levels of mixed use activity anticipated within the Sector, and in each Precinct within the Sector. In general, high density residential development will be located within 250m of the Central Transit Route, with particular concentrations around planned stops at Railway Terrace, Rockingham Beach Road, Flinders Lane and Wanliss Street.

Residential densities of 100-200 dwellings per hectare are proposed for the area within the Foreshore Precinct.
4. Residential Density – Waterfront Village Sector

**Building Height**

The Policy illustrates a Building Height Overlay for the Waterfront Village IDP, with permitted building heights rising with proximity to the route of the Central Transit Route and proximity to activity generators.

The building heights prescribed in PP 3.2.5 are generally consistent with the wider TOD based density height provisions set down in the approved 2009 Activity Centre Plan.

The existing Building Height Overlay requires:

- Less elevated residential development at the western end of the Waterfront Village Sector
- Varying height controls of a minimum 2-3 storeys (6m) at street level, rising to eight (8) storeys (30-32m) within 300m of the coastline; this building height limit was put in place to comply with State Governments Coastal Planning Policy (SPP 2.6). Under SPP2.6, a maximum height of eight (8) storeys or 32m was permitted, subject to public support. This provision within SPP2.6 has subsequently been deleted by the WAPC.
- Variations in additional building height is contemplated by PP 3.2.5, however, these locations were placed beyond the 300m limit prescribed by the then operable SPP2.6.
- The building height controls are subject to overshadowing and solar penetration requirements.
5. Building Height – Waterfront Village Sector

Building height limits of 32m or eight (8) storeys are currently required for the area within the Foreshore Precinct.

Foreshore Precinct – Planning Policy Elements

The Foreshore Precinct is the area relevant to a proposed Hotel (and mixed use) building proposals. In respect of the Foreshore Precinct, PP 3.2.5 states:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application</th>
<th>The Policy applies to the Foreshore Precinct as defined in the Precinct Plan (refer to Figure 4.1). The Foreshore Precinct extends along the foreshore reserve from Val Street through to Wanliss Street and incorporates Churchill and Bell Parks and properties between Rockingham Beach Road, Railway Terrace, Kent Street and Wanliss Street.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Desired Future Character | The visual and economic revitalization of the Waterfront Village area will be pivotal to the future prospects of the overall Policy Area.

The Precinct has a proud history as a timber port, a former district centre and tourist destination. Development along this ‘promenade strip’ should be designed to imaginatively respond to the opportunity presented by the rare combination of a stimulating ocean outlook, a safe family beach and well-shaded, waterfront parkland.

The Precinct should aim to achieve a lively, mixed use character with an emphasis on land-uses which will generate interest and pedestrian activity within the public domain.

A contemporary waterfront aesthetic of varied, yet unified, architectural style (similar to the newer architecture of East Perth and Subiaco) is seen as more appropriate than resorting to a superficially themed (e.g. ‘colonial’, ‘Federation’ etc.) building appearance. |
### Preferred Uses

- Retail
- Entertainment
- Eating and drinking places
- Short-stay accommodation
- Offices and commercial
- Recreation
- Multiple dwellings/residential

### Required Elements

The Indicative Development Plan (IDP) and the Foreshore Precinct Concept Plan (both within the DPP), set out the general location and pattern of development envisaged by the City. Whilst there is scope for flexibility in such matters, development is required to adhere to certain “Required Elements” as set out in the Policy, dealing with:

- buildings to be street front, mixed use, based on ‘main street’ principles.
- location, configuration and activation of built form.
- a requirement for active street fronts.
- buildings to ‘infill’ street fronts.
- recommended ground floor, street front land uses.
- preferred upper floor land uses.
- encouraging short stay and mixed use developments
- minimum residential densities.
- maximum building heights, coupled with front, side and rear setbacks.
- carparking.
- façade treatments, materials and transparency.
- high design standards, related to public domain interface.
- landscaping.

### Building Height Development Controls

The DPP sets out detailed height controls on properties along the following streets:-

- Rockingham Beach Road
- Kent Street
- Flinders Lane
- Railway Terrace
- Wanliss Street

Height controls vary between a minimum of 6m (2 storeys) at the street, through a maximum of 30m-32m setback from the street, which is subject to overshadowing and solar penetration to the street level.

This section of the Policy also deals with side setbacks, visual separation and minimum site dimensions.
The Waterfront Village Policy became operational in September 2012. In that time, several major medium rise buildings have been approved and constructed. The Policy has delivered a workable planning framework to guide the redevelopment of the Foreshore Precinct.

Town Planning Scheme No.2

Under Town Planning Scheme No.2, properties within the Waterfront Village Sector are zoned ‘Primary Centre - Waterfront Village Zone’. The Scheme defines the Waterfront Village Zone and sets out the following objectives:

6. Foreshore Precinct Concept Plan

The Waterfront Village Policy became operational in September 2012. In that time, several major medium rise buildings have been approved and constructed. The Policy has delivered a workable planning framework to guide the redevelopment of the Foreshore Precinct.

Town Planning Scheme No.2

Under Town Planning Scheme No.2, properties within the Waterfront Village Sector are zoned ‘Primary Centre - Waterfront Village Zone’. The Scheme defines the Waterfront Village Zone and sets out the following objectives:
• to promote contemporary waterfront residential and accommodation, commercial, tourism and recreational activities, which serves local residents and visitors alike, in accordance the Development Policy Plan for the Waterfront Village Sector;
• to maximise the potential of the northerly coastal aspect, sheltered beach and shady parkland of the Waterfront through appropriate quality built form and site responsive architecture;
• to achieve appropriate land use and built form outcomes, including a range of medium to high density housing, within a walkable catchment of the central public transit system;
• to create a permeable, well connected network of public streets and spaces that provides legible and high amenity linkages, particularly for pedestrians;
• to provide contiguous, activated street front development;
• to promote active day and night time retail and social environments;
• to encourage vibrant and diverse uses which promote the Waterfront as a destination;
• to provide a high amenity, street based transit route that will provide a high calibre model of sustainable, transit orientated development; and
• to provide high quality public spaces that permits a range of recreation and social activities and foster high quality development along their margins.

The Scheme also provides Council (or a Joint Development Assessment Panel) the ability to exercise discretion in the application of the Residential Design Codes to residential development. This would include any residential component of a mixed use development.

The Investment Attraction Framework


The Strategy “…proposes a different pathway to the more traditional approach taken by Local Governments when delivering economic development programs and initiatives.”

In short, the Strategy proposes a more targeted approach for the City’s involvement in ‘Economic Development’ initiatives.

The key purposes of the Strategy are to:

• Define the City’s role in local economic development.
• Attract investment to facilitate major development within the Waterfront Village and City Centre Precincts.
• Identify and utilise the City’s key competencies in facilitating local economic development.
• Identify the key areas of difference within the City that can create a comparative advantage over competing Local Governments also seeking to attract investment funds and economic development.
• Develop sustainable working relationships with key economic development stakeholders.

The adopted Strategy contains eight (8) Key Recommendations; of most relevance to this report is Key Recommendation 8, which reads:

“Engage expert tourism/property development industry consultants to undertake the development of a business case for the establishment of a major hotel in the waterfront Village Precinct based upon the latent demand for tourism visitation.” (emphasis added)

Key Recommendation 2 also deals with this issue, as follows:

“A detailed design and master planning exercise be undertaken for the area ...(the Foreshore Precinct)....

..... The Masterplan should deliver the following key outcomes.... (amongst other things) ...a design that is complementary to the functionality and feasibility of existing and future apartment/hotel/food and beverage/retail development....” (emphasis added)
The Hotel Demand Study

Following the adoption of the Economic Development Strategy by Council in June 2014, and in accordance with the recommended action as set out in Key Recommendation 8, the City subsequently commissioned a consultant to undertake a Hotel Demand Study to assess the potential for hotel development at the Waterfront Village Precinct.

The Hotel Demand Study was completed in November 2015.

For the purposes of the business case, the consultant assumed a ‘hotel’ to comprise a minimum of 160 rooms, 4 star full service internationally or nationally branded hotel, with the following facilities:

- Bar and bistro
- Restaurant (incorporating a mix of indoor and outdoor space)
- Room service
- Meeting and conference facilities
- Function room (max capacity of 300 guests)
- Leisure facilities e.g. pool, gym, spa, steam room sauna.
- Business/technology centre.

Whilst it is not intended to detail the findings of the Hotel Demand Study in this report (for reasons of commercial confidentiality), or to publish the details of the business case assembled by the consultant team, it is appropriate to discuss several findings related to the planning framework, and its influence on the potential to attract a major hotel development to the Foreshore Precinct.

As part of its findings, the consultant advised:

“The proposed hotel sites under consideration are unusual – they are very well positioned, large and in concentrated ownership. This makes them rare, and once developed it will be difficult to replicate the economic opportunity for the City they currently represent. It is therefore important that any future development on the sites maximises this opportunity.

The potential hotel sites have a prominence and importance that requires an additional level of sophistication in planning for their development, that simultaneously respects the overall objectives of the precinct plan and allow development that might be at some variance with the general provisions and development controls that might apply to the precinct generally. This might include substantial increases in height and density for these sites.

There are a number of ways in which this might be achieved:

- Ensuring discretionary provisions in the TPS and Waterfront Village Sector DPP can adequately apply to a potentially substantial increased development of the site.
- Incorporate performance criteria in the TPS for these sites to allow development increases, including the provision of at least 160 rooms of short stay/hotel accommodation, subject to meeting certain urban design criteria.
- Ensure the Council’s Design Advisory Committee or City Architect is available and skilled to assess the proposal and advise Council and the Joint Development Assessment Panel which would consider the Development Application for the site.”

The consultant also stated:

“Mixed Use Development

Given development barriers and scale of hotel development, it is likely that a hotel development in Rockingham will be a component of a larger mixed-use development. Mixed-use developments allow sharing of risk across various asset classes. This is common in major projects, even when government-sponsored. For example the Westin Hotel and the Como Hotel each have substantial co-located office space. It is likely that a hotel development in Rockingham will similarly be co-located with other uses, most likely reasonably extensive ground-floor retail and upper level residential development.”
With respect to the future hotel development, the consultant provided the following specific recommendations:

..."the City has a limited array of tools in its toolbox to influence development at a detailed use level. The Town Planning Scheme and associated policy provisions are amongst the most powerful. It is therefore recommended that the TPS and associated Policies be reviewed and adjusted to ensure it contains provisions that give significant incentive for the provision of hotel accommodation of the scale recommended here…….

Specific measures that might be considered are:

- Ensure discretionary provisions in the TPS and the Waterfront Village Sector Development Policy Plan (DPP) can adequately apply to a potentially substantial increase development on the site. The DPP could include a provision such as:

DISCRETIONARY CLAUSE:

An important provision within the Planning Policy is the opportunity for the applicant(s) or owners(s) to meet the Vision and Objectives through an alternative solution. The Council may approve a development application where the applicant(s) or owner(s) has departed from the relevant Precinct Policy, including but not limited to building height and density provisions where, in the Council’s opinion, the applicant(s) or owner(s) has demonstrated that the alternative solution(s) is consistent with the Rockingham Strategic Metropolitan Centre Visions and Planning and Development Principles. Compliance with the recommended performance standards does not guarantee approval. The Council may refuse development applications that are considered not to be in keeping with the objectives of the Planning Policy. Each application for development approval will be assessed on an individual basis within the overall context of the visions for the Rockingham Strategic Metropolitan Centre and the approval of an alternative solution will not set a precedent for other developments.

The provision of a full service hotel of a minimum of 160 rooms (including a restaurant, lounge bar, fitness centre, spa, business centre and substantial conference and meeting room product offering) on a site of 4,000m² or over in the Waterfront Village Precinct will allow this Discretionary Clause to be applied.

Establish a suitably qualified, managed and resourced Design Advisory Committee or ensure a City Architect is available and skilled to assess major project proposals and advise Council and the Joint Development Assessment Panel which would consider the Development Application for the site on design aspects of proposals. This might include the specific awarding of a level of design excellence, which might be required before a discretionary clause could be fully implemented."

Based on the findings of the consultant (related to the planning framework), City Officers have undertaken a review of the PP3.2.5 and the TPS zoning and related provisions, to ascertain the potential for change to encourage a ‘hotel’, possibly co-located within a larger mixed use development project, whilst still retaining the objectives and intent of the Planning Policy.

The results of that research are detailed in the following section.

**Details**

It has already been clearly established that a hotel development, short stay accommodation and associated food and leisure activities are all 'preferred uses' within the Waterfront Village Sector, particularly the Foreshore Precinct.

In essence, the Hotel Demand Study has proposed that the Waterfront Village Planning Policy and the related Town Planning Scheme provisions be amended to allow the Council (or a JDAP) the ability to consider, and approve, a development, which has a ‘hotel’ component (comprising certain minimum requirements for a hotel), which may exceed the current requirements for height and density, and that the planning framework be adjusted to allow for this to occur, subject to certain performance and design criteria being met.
There are three components required to allow the recommended planning framework to operate, being:

- Amend the PP 3.2.5 to include policy provisions which would permit the Council to consider variations to height and density, providing a ‘hotel’ (and its component parts) is part of the development, and providing certain design criteria are demonstrated, to ensure that the intent and objectives of the PP 3.2.5 and the Primary Centre Waterfront Village zone are not compromised.

- Amend TPS 2 to include enabling clauses to allow the Council to establish and operate a Design Advisory Panel, which would assess any proposed major developments (including a ‘hotel’ development), and provide independent expert architectural design and urban design advice to the City and the Council, to ensure that any variations to height and density provisions are reasonable, justified and align with the intent and objectives of the PP3.2.5 and Primary Centre Waterfront Village zone.

- Adopt a new Planning Policy, via the TPS 2 provisions, which sets out the administration and operation of the proposed Design Advisory Panel, to provide independent expert advice to the City and the Council on the design and site requirements of major development proposals. The Design Advisory Panel would provide the City and the Council with advice on the acceptability of major projects, related to design and urban design, impact on amenity and streetscape.

In combination, these three actions could provide a workable option for the City to consider ‘variations’ to height and density within the Foreshore Precinct, to accommodate a major ‘hotel’ development.

**Waterfront Village Planning Policy Variations:**

With respect to PP3.2.5, it is proposed that Section 4.1 ‘Foreshore Precinct Policy’ be amended to include the following changes (shown in red):

1. include the following additional text in ‘4.1.2 Desired Future Character’:

   ‘Given the attractiveness and uniqueness of Churchill and Bells Parks, the adjacent north facing family friendly beaches, and the emerging mixed use and apartment precinct along Rockingham Beach Road and Kent Street, coupled with the City’s intentions to significantly redevelop the area in accordance with the adopted ‘Rockingham Beach Foreshore Master plan’ (August 2015), to enhance the appeal of the Foreshore Precinct, the City considers that a Hotel development, based on business tourism, will provide a facility that will genuinely attract and retain both leisure and business tourists.

   Attracting a major hotel brand to the Rockingham foreshore is a Key Element of the City’s ‘Economic Development Strategy 2014-2017’; in respect of this Key Element, a ‘Hotel’ is defined as comprising a minimum of 160 rooms, 4 star full service internationally or nationally branded hotel, with the following facilities:

   • Bar and bistro
   • Restaurant (incorporating a mix of indoor and outdoor space)
   • Room service
   • Meeting and conference facilities
   • Function room (approximate minimum capacity of 300 guests)
   • Leisure facilities e.g. pool, gym, spa, steam room sauna.

   This Policy supports the development of a Hotel within the Foreshore Precinct, subject to the planning and urban design intent and objectives of the Policy being respected through the building design.

   This Policy acknowledges that potential hotel sites and buildings have a prominence and importance, together with a high level of activity, that requires an additional level of sophistication in planning and design that simultaneously respects the overall objectives of the Precinct, whilst allowing some design flexibility with respect to height and density.

   Such variations will only be considered if the building design satisfies the intent of Policy objectives, including any proposed variations.”
2. Include the following new Clause immediately after Clause 4.1.5:

"4.1.6 Hotel Development

The Council may consider variations to Required Elements (f) and (g) relating to height and density within the Foreshore Precinct, providing the proposed development:

(a) Includes a hotel as part of the building development, comprising a minimum of 160 rooms, 4 star full service internationally or nationally branded hotel, with the following facilities:
   - Bar and bistro
   - Restaurant (incorporating a mix of indoor and outdoor space)
   - Room service
   - Meeting and conference facilities
   - Function room (approximate minimum capacity of 300 guests)
   - Leisure facilities e.g. pool, gym, spa, steam room, sauna.

(b) Is located on a single consolidated site of a minimum of 4000m², located within the Foreshore Precinct.

(c) Is consistent with the Objectives of the Primary Centre, as set out in Clause 3.4.2 of the Town Planning Scheme No.2.

(d) Is consistent with Clause 4.3.3 (Special Considerations Applicable to Planning Applications, specifically sub-clause (a), (b) and (e).

(e) Is consistent with the Objectives of the Primary Centre Waterfront Village Zone, as set out in Clause 4.3B.1.

(f) Is consistent with the planning and development principles, as set out in Clause 2.2 of this Policy.

(g) Is consistent with the Required Elements – Foreshore Precinct, as set out in Clause 4.1.4 of the Policy, notwithstanding that the Council may consider variations to sub-clause (f) and (g).

(h) Receives an endorsement with respect to the building design from the City’s Design Advisory Panel."

Implications to Consider

a. Consultation with the Community

Under the Planning and Development (Local Planning Policies) Regulations 2015, if the Council resolves to add or amend a Planning Policy, it is to publish a notice of the proposed Policy one a week for 2 consecutive weeks in a newspaper circulating in the Scheme area giving details of:

(i) where the draft Policy may be inspected;
(ii) the subject and nature of the draft Policy; and
(iii) in what form and during what period (being not less than 21 days from the day the notice is published) submissions may be made.

The Council may also publish notice of the proposed Policy in such a manner, and carry out such other consultation, as the Council considers appropriate.

b. Consultation with Government Agencies

Consultation with relevant State Government agencies will occur during the formal consultation phase.
c. Strategic
Community Plan
This item addresses the Community’s Vision for the future and specifically the following Aspiration and Strategic Objectives contained in the Community Plan 2015-2025:

Aspiration A: Tourism Lifestyle
Objective: Investment Attraction: A strategic and focussed approach to attracting major investment to the City’s coastal nodes, City’s Centre and inland settlements that promotes quality retail, commercial and residential development, improved civic infrastructure and leisure tourism experiences for residents and visitors.

Objective: Coastal Facilities: A range of quality and contemporary leisure tourism facilities including a “major brand” hotel, marinas, boat ramps, jetties, boardwalks and foreshore parks that contribute to the City’s reputation as the premier metropolitan coastal tourism destination.

d. Policy
The amendment to Planning Policy 3.2.5 will be advertised in accordance with the Planning and Development (Local Planning Policies) Regulations 2015.

e. Financial
Nil

f. Legal and Statutory
Under the Planning and Development (Local Planning Policies) Regulations 2015, the Council may prepare, modify or revoke a Planning Policy.

g. Risk
Nil

Comments
The approved Activity Centre Plan and the subsequent PP3.2.5 have clearly signalled that the land uses of hotel, short stay accommodation and related food and leisure activities are all ‘preferred uses’ within the Waterfront Village Sector, particularly the Foreshore Precinct.

The proposed changes to the Waterfront Village Planning Policy, as recommended by this report, taken in combination with the proposed Design Advisory Panel Policy, and the proposed amendments to the Town Planning Scheme provisions (to set up a Design Advisory Panel) will allow the Council (or a JDAP) the ability to consider, and approve, a development, which has a ‘hotel’ component (comprising certain minimum requirements for a hotel), which may exceed the current requirements for height and density, and that the planning framework be adjusted to allow for this to occur, subject to certain performance and design criteria being met.

The recommended changes clearly communicate the City’s intent with respect to the Policy conditions under which the Council will consider a Hotel development, and potential variations to height and density, provided such variations support the objectives and intent of the Policy framework, and comply with the already ‘in place’ reasonable built form guidelines.

It is recommended that proposed changes to Planning Policy No.3.2.5 - Development Policy Plan: Waterfront Village Sector, to include new variation provisions for ‘Hotel’ Development within the Foreshore Precinct, be advertised for public comment.

Voting Requirements
Simple Majority

Officer Recommendation
That Council APPROVES the publishing of a notice that it has prepared changes to Planning Policy 3.2.5 - Development Policy Plan: Waterfront Village Sector, to include new variation provisions for ‘Hotel’ Development within the Foreshore Precinct, for public comment, as follows:
1. It is proposed that Section 4.1 “Foreshore Precinct Policy” be amended to include the following additional text in ‘4.1.2 Desired Future Character’ (shown in red):

‘Given the attractiveness and uniqueness of Churchill and Bells Parks, the adjacent north facing family friendly beaches, and the emerging mixed use and apartment precinct along Rockingham Beach Road and Kent Street, coupled with the City’s intentions to significantly redevelop the area in accordance with the adopted ‘Rockingham Beach Foreshore Master Plan’ (August 2015), to enhance the appeal of the Foreshore Precinct, the City considers that a Hotel development, based on business tourism, will provide a facility that will genuinely attract and retain both leisure and business tourists.

Attracting a major hotel brand to the Rockingham foreshore is a Key Element of the City’s ‘Economic Development Strategy 2014-2017’; in respect of this Key Element, a “Hotel” is defined as comprising a minimum of 160 rooms, 4 star full service internationally or nationally branded hotel, with the following facilities:

- Bar and bistro
- Restaurant (incorporating a mix of indoor and outdoor space)
- Room service
- Meeting and conference facilities
- Function room (approximate minimum capacity of 300 guests)
- Leisure facilities e.g. pool, gym, spa, steam room sauna.

This Policy supports the development of a Hotel within the Foreshore Precinct, subject to the planning and urban design intent and objectives of the Policy being respected through the building design.

This Policy acknowledges that potential hotel sites and buildings have a prominence and importance, together with a high level of activity, that requires an additional level of sophistication in planning and design that simultaneously respects the overall objectives of the Precinct, whilst allowing some design flexibility with respect to height and density.

Such variations will only be considered if the building design satisfies the intent of Policy objectives, including any proposed variations.”

2. Include the following new Clause immediately after Clause 4.1.5 (shown in red):

“4.1.6 Hotel Development

The Council may consider variations to Required Elements (f) and (g) relating to height and density within the Foreshore Precinct, providing the proposed development:

(a) Includes a hotel as part of the building development, comprising a minimum of 160 rooms, 4 star full service internationally or nationally branded hotel, with the following facilities:

- Bar and bistro
- Restaurant (incorporating a mix of indoor and outdoor space)
- Room service
- Meeting and conference facilities
- Function room (approximate minimum capacity of 300 guests)
- Leisure facilities e.g. pool, gym, spa, steam room sauna.

(b) Is located on a single consolidated site of a minimum of 4000m², located within the Foreshore Precinct.

(c) Is consistent with the Objectives of the Primary Centre, as set out in Clause 3.4.2 of the Town Planning Scheme No.2.

(d) Is consistent with Clause 4.3.3 (Special Considerations Applicable to Planning Applications, specifically sub-clause (a), (b) and (e).
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(e) Is consistent with the Objectives of the Primary Centre Waterfront Village Zone, as set out in Clause 4.3B.1.
(f) Is consistent with the planning and development principles, as set out in Clause 2.2 of this Policy.
(g) Is consistent with the Required Elements – Foreshore Precinct, as set out in Clause 4.1.4 of the Policy, notwithstanding that the Council may consider variations to sub-clause (f) and (g).
(h) Receives an endorsement with respect to the building design from the City’s Design Advisory Panel.”

Committee Recommendation

Moved Cr Hamblin, seconded Cr Sammels:
That Council APPROVES the publishing of a notice that it has prepared changes to Planning Policy 3.2.5 - Development Policy Plan: Waterfront Village Sector, to include new variation provisions for ‘Hotel’ Development within the Foreshore Precinct, for public comment, as follows:

1. It is proposed that Section 4.1 ‘Foreshore Precinct Policy’ be amended to include the following additional text in ‘4.1.2 Desired Future Character’ (shown in red):

‘Given the attractiveness and uniqueness of Churchill and Bells Parks, the adjacent north facing family friendly beaches, and the emerging mixed use and apartment precinct along Rockingham Beach Road and Kent Street, coupled with the City’s intentions to significantly redevelop the area in accordance with the adopted ‘Rockingham Beach Foreshore Master Plan’ (August 2015), to enhance the appeal of the Foreshore Precinct, the City considers that a Hotel development, based on business tourism, will provide a facility that will genuinely attract and retain both leisure and business tourists.

Attracting a major hotel brand to the Rockingham foreshore is a Key Element of the City’s ‘Economic Development Strategy 2014-2017’; in respect of this Key Element, a “Hotel” is defined as comprising a minimum of 160 rooms, 4 star full service internationally or nationally branded hotel, with the following facilities:

- Bar and bistro
- Restaurant (incorporating a mix of indoor and outdoor space)
- Room service
- Meeting and conference facilities
- Function room (approximate minimum capacity of 300 guests)
- Leisure facilities e.g. pool, gym, spa, steam room sauna.

This Policy supports the development of a Hotel within the Foreshore Precinct, subject to the planning and urban design intent and objectives of the Policy being respected through the building design.

This Policy acknowledges that potential hotel sites and buildings have a prominence and importance, together with a high level of activity, that requires an additional level of sophistication in planning and design that simultaneously respects the overall objectives of the Precinct, whilst allowing some design flexibility with respect to height and density.

Such variations will only be considered if the building design satisfies the intent of Policy objectives, including any proposed variations.”

2. Include the following new Clause immediately after Clause 4.1.5 (shown in red):

“4.1.6 Hotel Development

The Council may consider variations to Required Elements (f) and (g) relating to height and density within the Foreshore Precinct, providing the proposed development:
(a) Includes a hotel as part of the building development, comprising a minimum of 160 rooms, 4 star full service internationally or nationally branded hotel, with the following facilities:
  - Bar and bistro
  - Restaurant (incorporating a mix of indoor and outdoor space)
  - Room service
  - Meeting and conference facilities
  - Function room (approximate minimum capacity of 300 guests)
  - Leisure facilities e.g. pool, gym, spa, steam room sauna.

(b) Is located on a single consolidated site of a minimum of 4000m², located within the Foreshore Precinct.

(c) Is consistent with the Objectives of the Primary Centre, as set out in Clause 3.4.2 of the Town Planning Scheme No.2.

(d) Is consistent with Clause 4.3.3 (Special Considerations Applicable to Planning Applications, specifically sub-clause (a), (b) and (e).

(e) Is consistent with the Objectives of the Primary Centre Waterfront Village Zone, as set out in Clause 4.3B.1.

(f) Is consistent with the planning and development principles, as set out in Clause 2.2 of this Policy.

(g) Is consistent with the Required Elements – Foreshore Precinct, as set out in Clause 4.1.4 of the Policy, notwithstanding that the Council may consider variations to sub-clause (f) and (g).

(h) Receives an endorsement with respect to the building design from the City’s Design Advisory Panel.

Committee Voting – 5/0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Committee’s Reason for Varying the Officer’s Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implications of the Changes to the Officer’s Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Development Services Directorate Planning Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reference No &amp; Subject:</strong> PDS-032/16 Proposed Planning Policy No.7.4 – Design Advisory Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>File No:</strong> LUP/2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Risk Register No:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Owner:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Author:</strong> Mrs S Peacock, Projects Research Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Contributors:</strong> Mr R M Jeans, Director Planning and Development Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date of Committee Meeting:</strong> 16 May 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Previously before Council:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disclosure of Interest:</strong> Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nature of Council’s Role in this Matter:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lot Area:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LA Zoning:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MRS Zoning:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attachments:</strong> Draft Planning Policy No.7.4 - Design Advisory Panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maps/Diagrams:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Purpose of Report**

To consider a new Planning Policy to establish and appoint members to a new Design Advisory Panel, for advertising purposes.

This Report should be read in conjunction with PDS-031/16 – Proposed Amendment to Planning Policy No.3.2.5 – Development Policy Plan: Waterfront Village Sector- Including New Variations Provisions for ‘Hotel’ Development and PDS-033/16 – Amendment No.163 to Town Planning Scheme No.2 – Introducing a New Clause 6.5 – Design Advisory Panel.

**Background**

In November 2015, the City of Rockingham commissioned a ‘Hotel Demand Study’ to assess the potential for interest from national and international operators to invest in a new hotel development, specifically in the Rockingham Waterfront Village area.

This Study feeds into the ongoing efforts to redevelop and build amenity in the Waterfront Village Precinct and to guide investment and initiatives as detailed in the Economic Development Strategy 2014-2017.
The Hotel Demand Study has identified a number of ‘Planning Considerations’ to ensure that opportunities to develop sites within the Foreshore Precinct of the Waterfront Village Policy are maximised including:

- Ensuring discretionary provisions in Town Planning Scheme No.2 (TPS) and Planning Policy No.3.2.5 - Waterfront Village Sector Development Policy Plan can adequately apply to a potentially substantial increase in development on sites;
- Incorporating performance criteria in the TPS for sites to allow development increases including the provision of at least 160 rooms of short stay/hotel accommodation, subject to the meeting of certain urban design and planning criteria; and
- Ensuring the Council’s Design Advisory Panel or city architect is available and skilled to assess the proposal and advise Council and the Joint Development Advisory Panel, which would consider the Development Application for the site.

Details

With an increasing level of development activity in and around the City, a Design Advisory Panel would enable a more comprehensive and refined level of assessment of Development Applications which could result in significantly enhanced built form outcomes.

The Policy will apply to the administration and operation of the Design Advisory Panel to facilitate the provision of independent expert advice to the Council and the City’s Administration on the design and site planning of specified development proposals across the City.

Key requirements of the Policy are summarised as follows:

Policy Statement

Provides expert and technical advice to City Officers and Council in relation to the design of buildings and other related matters and assist in the formulation of recommendations on particular applications.

Membership

The Panel is to comprise of up to five (5) design professionals with demonstrated knowledge of the composition, character and desired built form of the City of Rockingham; possess relevant qualifications, expertise or experience in architecture, town planning, urban design or other applicable design professions and; are eligible for membership to a relevant professional association.

Referral Requirements

The Panel will examine design elements having regard to the statutory context of the particular proposal including the provisions of the City’s Town Planning Scheme No. 2, the Residential Design Codes and relevant Local and State Planning Policies.

Applications for referral to the Panel will include but not be limited to:

- Non-residential, but which is likely to have an impact;
- Residential development which involves a substantial departure from the applicable maximum height standards;
- Residential development which comprises 10 or more dwellings;
- Residential development which involves a substantial departure from the Deemed-to-Comply provisions of the Residential Design Codes;
- Development which is contentious, likely to be of significant community interest or involves unusual or unconventional design elements; and
- Development Assessment Panel applications, which, as a result of public consultation, are the subject of opposition on relevant planning grounds.

Terms of Reference

The Panel will act in an advisory capacity and provide independent expert advice on urban design, architecture, landscape design, sustainability and heritage on specified proposals with respect to matters including, but not limited to:
- The overall built form merits;
- The quality of architectural design including its relationship to the adjoining development;
- The relationship with and impact on the broader public realm and streetscape;
- The impact on the character of the precinct, including its impact upon heritage structures, significant natural features and landmarks;
- The extent to which the proposal is designed to be resource efficient, climatically appropriate, responsive to climate change and a contribution to environmentally sustainability, including TOD principles; and
- The demonstration of other qualities of best practice urban design including Crime Prevention through Environmental Design performance, protection of important view corridors and lively civic places.

**Operations**

Various operational and administrative functions include but are not limited to:

- Meetings of the Panel are not open to the public;
- The Director, Planning and Development Services or Manager, Statutory Planning shall convene and chair proceedings;
- Items considered at the meeting will not be formally voted upon;
- Proceedings at the meeting are to be recorded in the form of “notes”; and
- Notes of the meeting will be included in any subsequent report on the particular development application under consideration.

**Conflict of Interest**

Disclosure of financial and impartiality interests will apply.

**Implications to Consider**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implications to Consider</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>a. Consultation with the Community</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under the Planning and Development (Local Planning Policies) Regulations 2015, if the Council resolves to prepare a Planning Policy, it is required to publish a notice of the proposed Policy once a week for 2 consecutive weeks in a newspaper circulating in the Scheme area giving details of:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) where the draft Policy may be inspected;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) the subject and nature of the draft Policy; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) in what form and during what period (being not less than 21 days from the day the notice is published) submissions may be made.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Council may also publish notice of the proposed Policy in such other manner, and carry out such other consultation, as the Council considers appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>b. Consultation with Government Agencies</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation with relevant State Government agencies will occur during the formal consultation phase.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>c. Strategic</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Plan</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This item addresses the Community’s Vision for the future and specifically the following Aspiration and Strategic Objectives contained in the Community Plan 2015-2025:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aspiration A:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism Lifestyle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment Attraction - A strategic and focussed approach to attracting major investment to the City’s coastal nodes, City’s Centre and inland settlements that promotes quality retail, commercial and residential development, improved civic infrastructure and leisure tourism experiences for residents and visitors.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Objective: Coastal Facilities - A range of quality and contemporary leisure tourism facilities including a “major brand” hotel, marinas, boat ramps, jetties, boardwalks and foreshore parks that contribute to the City's reputation as the premier metropolitan coastal tourism destination.

d. Policy

The draft Planning Policy No.7.4 will be advertised in accordance with the Planning and Development (Local Planning Policies) Regulations 2015.

e. Financial

A sitting fee, which will be reviewed annually, will be payable to each member of the Panel for attendance at meetings. The sitting fee is based on the following calculations.

It has been estimated that an amount of $55k will be required to operate the DAP based on the following figures and estimates:
- Estimated 6 to 9 meetings per year;
- Estimated 4 members per meeting;
- Estimated 4 to 6 hours per member per meeting; and
- Estimated sitting fee of $300 per member per meeting.

Where required, a Panel member may be required to represent Council and appear as an expert witness at the State Administrative Tribunal. The appearance fee will be a mutually agreed hourly rate between the member Chief Executive Officer and which is consistent with the qualifications, experience and professional status of the member.

f. Legal and Statutory

Under the provisions of Clause 3 of the Planning and Development (Local Planning Policies) Regulations 2015, the Council may prepare, modify or revoke a Planning Policy.

g. Risk

Nil

Comments

The City is adopting a co-ordinated approach to support the outcomes of the Hotel Demand Study by modifying the Waterfront Village Planning Policy No.3.2.5 to include variation clauses to allow the Council to approve a ‘Hotel’ development, with variations to height and density, provided certain planning criteria are satisfied.

The proposed Policy to establish a Design Advisory Panel, together with amendments to TPS2 to introduce a new Clause 6.5 - Design Advisory Panel, will establish an additional level of expertise in design and built form assessment, which will also be required to allow variations for any Hotel development.

The proposed Policy will permit an independent and more comprehensive level of expert advice and assessment of various development applications, against standard statutory planning framework and regulations.

The Design Advisory Panel will operate on sites across the City, and not just within the Waterfront Village Sector.

Voting Requirements

Simple Majority

Officer Recommendation

That Council APPROVES the publishing of a notice that it has prepared draft ‘Planning Policy No.7.4: Design Advisory Panel’ for public comment.
**Committee Recommendation**

**Moved Cr Downham, seconded Cr Summers:**

That Council **APPROVES** the publishing of a notice that it has prepared draft ‘Planning Policy No.7.4: Design Advisory Panel’ for public comment.

Committee Voting – 5/0

**The Committee’s Reason for Varying the Officer’s Recommendation**

Not Applicable

**Implications of the Changes to the Officer’s Recommendation**

Not Applicable
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legislative</td>
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**Purpose of Report**

To consider initiating Scheme Amendment No.163 to Town Planning Scheme No.2 for the purpose of introducing a new Clause 6.5 - Design Advisory Panel.

This Report should be read in conjunction with PDS-31/16 - Proposed Planning Policy No.7.4 - Design Advisory Panel and PDS-032/16 - Proposed Amendment to Planning Policy No.3.2.5 - Development Policy Plan: Waterfront Village Sector - Including new Variation Provisions for ‘Hotel’ Development.

**Background**

The purpose of the amendment is to introduce a new Clause 6.5 - Design Advisory Panel which will give statutory effect to new Planning Policy No.7.4 - ‘Design Advisory Panel’.

With an increasing level of development activity, especially related to increased density in and around the Rockingham Strategic Metropolitan Centre and other Activity Centres within the City, it is considered that the expert advice from a Design Advisory Panel would enable a more comprehensive assessment of Development Applications and result in significantly improved built form outcomes.
Details

The Scheme Amendment will provide statutory effect to the Policy and applies to the administration and operation of the Design Advisory Panel, which will facilitate the provision of independent expert advice to the Council and the City’s Administration on development proposals.

Implications to Consider

a. Consultation with the Community

Scheme Amendments are required to be dealt with in accordance with the Town Planning Regulations 1967 (as amended), which includes a requirement to advertise proposals for public comment over a period of 42 days, prior to Council considering Final Adoption.

b. Consultation with Government Agencies

Scheme Amendments are required to be referred to the Environmental Protection Authority to determine if an environmental assessment is required, prior to advertising.

c. Strategic

Community Plan

This item addresses the Community's Vision for the future and specifically the following Aspiration and Strategic Objective contained in the Community Plan 2015-2025:

Aspiration D: Quality Leadership

Objective: Infrastructure - Civic buildings, sporting facilities, public places and transport infrastructure planned, designed, constructed and maintained using best practice principles and life cycle cost analysis and implemented in line with informed population growth analysis.

d. Policy

A draft Planning Policy 7.4 – Design Advisory Panel has been and will be advertised in conjunction with the Scheme Amendment.

e. Financial

Nil

f. Legal and Statutory

Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015

Regulation 35 (2) (a) and (b) of the 2015 Regulations states as follows:

"A resolution must —

(a) specify whether, in the opinion of the local government, the amendment is a complex amendment, a standard amendment or a basic amendment; and

(b) include an explanation of the reason for the local government forming that opinion.

The procedures for dealing with proposals to amend a local planning scheme, as per the Planning and Development Act 2005, are set out in the Town Planning Regulations 1967. Regulation 13(1) provides that the City shall:

(a) if it resolves to proceed with a Scheme Amendment, adopt the proposed Amendment in accordance with the Act; or

(b) if it resolves not to proceed with the Scheme Amendment, notify the Western Australian Planning Commission, in writing, of that resolution.

g. Risk

Nil

Comments

The introduction of the new Clause and implementation of ‘Planning Policy 7.4 – Design Advisory Panel’, will assist City Officers in the assessment of Development Applications and improve the quality of urban design and built form outcomes which will include but not be limited to, architectural and urban design elements/sustainability, amenity and landscape architecture.
The proposed Scheme Amendment has been assessed against the criteria set out in Regulation 34 of the Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015. The amendment has been assessed as satisfying the ‘standard’ Town Planning Scheme Amendment criteria.

It is recommended that the Council initiate Amendment No.163 to Town Planning Scheme No.2 as a ‘standard’ Amendment.

**Voting Requirements**

**Officer Recommendation**

1. **ADOPTS** (initiate) Amendment No.163 to Town Planning Scheme No.2 in pursuance of Section 75 of the Planning and Development Act 2005 as follows:

   **PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ACT 2005**
   
   **RESOLUTION DECIDING TO AMEND A LOCAL PLANNING SCHEME**
   
   **CITY OF ROCKINGHAM**
   
   **TOWN PLANNING SCHEME No.2**
   
   **AMENDMENT No.163**

   RESOLVED that the Council, in pursuance of section 75 of the Planning and Development Act 2005, initiate an amendment to the City of Rockingham Town Planning Scheme No.2 as follows:

   Amending ‘Part 6 – Use and Development of Land’ by inserting new Clause 6.5 as follows:

   “6.5 Design Advisory Panel

   6.5.1 The Council may appoint a Design Advisory Panel for the purpose of considering, and advising the Council with respect to applications.

   6.5.2 The Design Advisory Panel may be consulted on design matters relating to development.”

2. **CONSIDERS** the proposed Scheme Amendment No.163 as a ‘Standard Amendment’ in accordance with Regulation 34 (c) of the Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015.

**Committee Recommendation**

Moved Cr Sammels, seconded Cr Hamblin:

1. **ADOPTS** (initiate) Amendment No.163 to Town Planning Scheme No.2 in pursuance of Section 75 of the Planning and Development Act 2005 as follows:

   **PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT ACT 2005**
   
   **RESOLUTION DECIDING TO AMEND A LOCAL PLANNING SCHEME**
   
   **CITY OF ROCKINGHAM**
   
   **TOWN PLANNING SCHEME No.2**
   
   **AMENDMENT No.163**

   RESOLVED that the Council, in pursuance of section 75 of the Planning and Development Act 2005, initiate an amendment to the City of Rockingham Town Planning Scheme No.2 as follows:

   Amending ‘Part 6 – Use and Development of Land’ by inserting new Clause 6.5 as follows:

   “6.5 Design Advisory Panel

   6.5.1 The Council may appoint a Design Advisory Panel for the purpose of considering, and advising the Council with respect to applications.

   6.5.2 The Design Advisory Panel may be consulted on design matters relating to development.”
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2. **CONSIDERS** the proposed Scheme Amendment No.163 as a ‘Standard Amendment’ in accordance with Regulation 34 (c) of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*.

Committee Voting – 5/0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Committee’s Reason for Varying the Officer’s Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implications of the Changes to the Officer’s Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference No &amp; Subject:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File No:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Register No:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proponent/s:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Contributors:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Committee Meeting:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously before Council:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure of Interest:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Council’s Role in this Matter:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Area:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Zoning:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRS Zoning:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maps/Diagrams:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Proposed haulage route

![Map Image](image_url)
Purpose of Report

For Council to consider support for an application from a heavy vehicle operator to run bulk haulage operations under the ‘Accredited Mass Management Scheme’ along Stakehill Road, Baldvis Road and Karnup Road from the Baldivis Explosive Reserve to Kwinana Freeway.

Background

The City has received a request from a heavy haulage operator for support to run heavy haulage operations under the Main Roads Accredited Mass Management Scheme (AMMS) Level 3, for haulage of stored product from Baldivis Explosive Reserve to a mine site in Boddington.

The route selected within the application consists of the following:

- Karnup Road - Kwinana Freeway to Baldvis Road (735 metres)
- Baldvis Road - Karnup Road to Stakehill Road (1450 meters)
- Stakehill Road – Baldvis Road to Explosive Reserve entrance (420 metres)

The proposed route has already been included within the Restricted Access Vehicle (RAV) Network.

Details

The proponent has proposed the use of RAV Network 4 Vehicles under AMMS Level 3 to transport stored product from the Baldivis Explosive Reserve.

Main Roads WA (MRWA), in association with the transport industry, has recognised there are efficiencies to be generated by the availability of increased axle (truck) group loadings, under the AMMS Scheme. The AMMS has been designed to reward operators who can demonstrate consistent loading controls and practices.

The principle is that loading controls within the vehicle, accurately determine individual axle group weights of vehicles, prior to entering the public road network and that the operator must maintain an auditable trail for compliance monitoring practices. The compliance checking is undertaken by Main Roads WA Heavy Vehicles section.

The accredited operator is Toll Resources and Government Logistics, a business entity of Toll Corporation Pty Ltd and the material haulage contract is for a duration of three years. The nominated number of trips to / from the Baldivis Explosive Reserve will be two in each direction over a period of one week. The City’s support of this AMMS application will assist the operator in terms of cost saving as a result of an overall reduction in the number of truck trips.

MRWA is ultimately the approval agency for all heavy haulage operations of this type, however they work under certain policies that ensures support from the Local Government (LG) is obtained for this scheme to operate on local government roads prior to approval being given.

To support the City in terms of increased maintenance cost due to accelerated wear and tear of roads subjected to concessional loading, the operator has formally agreed to the payment of a contribution calculated according to guidelines devised by Western Australia Local Government Association (WALGA).

Implications to Consider

a. Consultation with the Community
   Not Applicable
b. **Consultation with Government Agencies**

City officers have consulted with MRWA Heavy Vehicle Services who were generally supportive of the proposal.

c. **Strategic**

**Community Plan**

This item addresses the Community’s Vision for the future and specifically the following Aspiration and Strategic Objective contained in the Community Plan 2015-2025:

- **Aspiration C:** Quality Leadership
- **Strategic Objective:** Civic buildings, sporting facilities, public places and transport infrastructure planned, designed, constructed and maintained using best practice principles and life cycle cost analysis, and implemented in line with informed population growth analysis

d. **Policy**

Nil

e. **Financial**

WALGA studies have shown that accelerated wear and tear of roads will occur when subjected to the higher axle loading permitted under the AMMS scheme. Therefore, maintenance cost of roads that are exposed to regular and higher proportions of AMMS approved vehicles are likely to increase over time.

Toll Resources and Government Logistics has formally agreed to contribute $500 towards increased maintenance cost of the roads subjected to concessional loading. The contribution amount has been calculated as per WALGA guidelines.

f. **Legal and Statutory**

*Road Traffic (Vehicles) Act 2012* Section 39(1) (Restriction on access of complying restricted access vehicles to certain roads) states that, “A person connected with a complying restricted access vehicle commits an offence if the vehicle is on the road without an access approval for the vehicle to be on the road.”

*Road Traffic (Vehicles) Act 2012* Section 40(1) (Access Approvals) states that, “The Commissioner of Main Roads may give an access approval for a complying restricted access vehicle to be on the road.”

*Local Government Act 1995* Section 9.46 (1) (Things may be alleged to be property of local government) states that, “Land or anything else, that –

(a) belongs or belonged to a local government; or

(b) is or was vested in or under the control or management of a local government,

may be alleged to be or have been the property of the local government, as the case requires.”

g. **Risk**

Nil

**Comments**

The portions of Karnup Road, Baldivis Road and Stakehill Road that will be used under the AMMS are already included within the Restricted Access Vehicle Networks as approved by MRWA. As the number of truck movements subject to the AMMS approval will be infrequent at four movements (two loaded and two empty) in total every week for a period of three years, approval of the application is unlikely to result in a long term negative impact on sections of Karnup Road, Baldivis Road and Stakehill Road or the surrounding community.

**Voting Requirements**

Simple Majority
Officer Recommendation

That Council SUPPORTS the application from Toll Resources and Government Logistics (a business entity of Toll Corporation Pty Ltd) to Main Roads WA, to run heavy vehicles under the Accredited Mass Management Scheme along the following sections of roads:

- Karnup Road - Kwinana Freeway to Baldivis Road (735 metres)
- Baldivis Road - Karnup Road to Stakehill Road (1450 metres)
- Stakehill Road - Baldivis Road to Explosive Reserve entrance (420 metres)

for a period of 36 months beginning 1 June 2016.

Committee Recommendation

Moved Cr Downham, seconded Cr Sammels:

That Council SUPPORTS the application from Toll Resources and Government Logistics (a business entity of Toll Corporation Pty Ltd) to Main Roads WA, to run heavy vehicles under the Accredited Mass Management Scheme along the following sections of roads:

- Karnup Road - Kwinana Freeway to Baldivis Road (735 metres)
- Baldivis Road - Karnup Road to Stakehill Road (1450 metres)
- Stakehill Road - Baldivis Road to Explosive Reserve entrance (420 metres)

for a period of 36 months beginning 1 June 2016.

Committee Voting – 5/0

The Committee's Reason for Varying the Officer's Recommendation

Not Applicable

Implications of the Changes to the Officer's Recommendation

Not Applicable
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference No &amp; Subject:</th>
<th>EP-015/16</th>
<th>Tender T15/16-80 – Detailed design of the Rockingham Beach Foreshore Revitalisation Stage 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>File No:</td>
<td>T15/16-80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Register No:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proponent/s:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author:</td>
<td>Mr Chris Thompson, Director Engineering and Parks Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Contributors:</td>
<td>Mr Michael Wilson, Senior Projects Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Committee Meeting:</td>
<td>16 May 2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously before Council:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure of Interest:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Council’s Role in this Matter:</td>
<td>Executive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Area:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Zoning:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRS Zoning:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maps/Diagrams:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Aerial view of Wanliss Street car park (two lots),</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Railway Terrace and the Boardwalk, Rockingham</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Aerial view of Wanliss Street car park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Aerial view of Railway Terrace and Boardwalk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**Purpose of Report**

Provide Council with details of the tenders received for Tender T15/16-80 – Detailed design of the Rockingham Beach Foreshore Revitalisation Stage 1, document the results of the tender assessment and make recommendations regarding award of the tender.

**Background**

Tender T15/16-80 – Detailed design of the Rockingham Beach Foreshore Revitalisation Stage 1 was advertised in the West Australian on Saturday, 5 March 2016. The Tender closed at 2:00pm, Wednesday, 6 April 2016 and was publicly opened immediately after the closing time.
The stated project objectives in the tender documentation are:

(a) an innovative upgrade that retains the best elements of the existing foreshore;
(b) focussed on the activation of these areas following construction;
(c) bring the foreshore businesses and the Parks area into a seamless whole;
(d) provide reasons unique to the region, and Western Australia, for people to want to come and visit the Rockingham Beach Foreshore;
(e) provide a high quality space and environment that residents of the City of Rockingham can be proud of; and
(f) incorporate a strong point of difference to similar projects – particularly in the region, but also across Australia. It is preferable if this links into elements of the local heritage, including local Nyungar heritage. Strong heritage areas include the Garden Island Naval Base, Rockingham’s maritime history and local Waakal beliefs. Ideally the stories inherent in this heritage will be brought to life the detailed design.

Details

Tender Summary:

The type of works to be undertaken under the Contract shall include:

- Detailed design (tender ready) for Wanliss Street car park, Railway Terrace and the Boardwalk at Rockingham Beach, to be completed by 25 November 2016; and
- Contract Administration services during subsequent construction phases

Submissions were received from:

Lump Sum Tender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Lump Sum Price (Excluding GST)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GHD Pty Ltd</td>
<td>$427,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardno (WA) Pty Ltd</td>
<td>$553,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACOR MCE Consultants Pty Ltd</td>
<td>$602,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Tang (WA) Pty Ltd</td>
<td>$618,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLACE Laboratory Pty Ltd</td>
<td>$668,928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackwell &amp; Associates Pty Ltd</td>
<td>$811,048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPCAD Pty Ltd</td>
<td>$813,669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDLA Pty Ltd</td>
<td>$834,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AECOM Australia Pty Ltd</td>
<td>$850,511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecoscape Australia Pty Ltd</td>
<td>$853,103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPS Australia East Pty Ltd</td>
<td>$1,049,716</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A panel comprising City of Rockingham representatives, Director Engineering and Parks Services; Manager Engineering Services; Manager Major Planning Projects; Senior Project Officer - Community Development; Landscape Architect; and Senior Projects Officer - Engineering and Parks Services undertook the tender evaluations.
Evaluation of the tender, in accordance with the advertised tender assessment criteria, produced the following weighted scores:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Criteria</th>
<th>Max. Points</th>
<th>Experience and Personnel</th>
<th>Understanding Tender Requirements</th>
<th>Tendered Price/s</th>
<th>Total Weighted Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLACE Laboratory Pty Ltd</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>75.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Tang (WA) Pty Ltd</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>74.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHD Pty Ltd</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDLA Pty Ltd</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPCAD Pty Ltd</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardno (WA) Pty Ltd</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecoscape Australia Pty Ltd</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackwell &amp; Associates Pty Ltd</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACOR MCE Consultants Pty Ltd</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AECOM Australia Pty Ltd</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPS Australia East Pty Ltd</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Implications to Consider**

a. **Consultation with the Community**

Various community user groups were consulted during the Master Planning phase of the project.

b. **Consultation with Government Agencies**

State Government Agencies were consulted during the Master Planning phase of the project.

c. **Strategic Community Plan**

This item addresses the Community’s Vision for the future and specifically the following Aspirations and Strategic Objectives contained in the Community Plan 2015-2025:

- **Aspiration A:** A Tourism Lifestyle

  **Strategic Objective:** Rockingham Beach Foreshore Precinct - A world-class foreshore precinct capitalising on its unique location and aspect, delivering a quality leisure tourism experience through contemporary design, best practice facilities and seamless linkage between beach, parkland and tourism-based commercial, retail and food and beverage outlets.

- **Strategic Objective:** Investment Attraction - A strategic and focussed approach to attracting major investment to the City’s coastal nodes, City Centre and inland settlements that promotes quality retail, commercial and residential development, improved civic infrastructure and leisure tourism experiences for residents and visitors.

- **Strategic Objective:** Safety, Appearance and Cleanliness - Attractive, appealing and welcoming foreshores, beaches and public spaces that are clean, safe and litter-free.
Aspiration B: Strong Community

Strategic Objective: Mobility and Inclusion - Community services, programs and infrastructure that effectively caters for all residents including seniors, youth and vulnerable populations.

Strategic Objective: Services and Facilities - Community facilities and services that accommodate contemporary community expectation and are justified, well used, cost effective and, where appropriate, multi-functional.

Strategic Objective: Building Capacity and Awareness - A healthy community that volunteers, embraces lifelong learning and cultural awareness, and is involved with a diverse range of vibrant and sustainable community, sporting, cultural and artistic organisations and pursuits.

Aspiration D: Sustainable Environment

Strategic Objective: Climate change - Planning systems, infrastructure standards and community awareness programs that acknowledge, mitigate and adapt to the impacts of climate change.

Strategic Objective: Coastal and Bushland Reserves - Coastal and bushland reserves that are well used and sustainably managed preserving them for future generations to enjoy.

Strategic Objective: Carbon Footprint and Waste Reduction - Carbon footprint reduction and waste minimisation programs focussed on community education and awareness, and the use of new technologies proven to be environmentally acceptable and financially sustainable.


This tender is part of the progression in addressing Key Recommendation 2:

A detailed design and master planning exercise be undertaken for the area comprising:

1. Churchill and Bell Parks
2. The Boardwalk between Churchill Park and Val Street Jetty
3. Rockingham Beach Road between Wanliss Street and Railway Parade
4. Railway Parade between Kent Street and Rockingham Beach Road
5. The Esplanade and adjacent reserve between Palm Beach Jetty and Val Street Jetty.

d. Policy

In accordance with the City’s Purchasing Policy, for purchases above $150,000, a public tender process is to be conducted in accordance with the provision of section 3.57 of the Local Government Act 1995; and Local Government (Functions and General) Regulations 1996, Part 4, Division 2, regulation 11A(1).

e. Financial

A total sum of $10m has been allotted to the design and delivery of Stage One of the Rockingham Beach Foreshore Revitalisation. Of this, $5m is from Rockingham City Council and has been allocated within the 2015/2016 Budget, in work order 24857. The remaining $5m will be provided by the Australian Government.

An allocation of $700,000 was included in the budgeted amount for the detailed design.

f. Legal and Statutory


‘Tenders are to be publicly invited according to the requirements of this Division before a local government enters into a contract for another person to supply goods or services if the consideration under the contract is, or is expected to be, more, or worth more, than $150,000 unless sub regulation (2) states otherwise’.

g. Risk

Nil
**Comments**

Following consideration of the submissions and in accordance with the tender criteria all companies demonstrated a capacity to complete the works. In assessing the submissions the assessment panel identified that the submission received from PLACE Laboratory Pty Ltd demonstrated a high level of understanding of the requirements of the tender, identified highly experienced personnel to work directly on the project and are in a position to apply the resources of the company towards the project.

PLACE Laboratory Pty Ltd was considered the tenderer that will best deliver on the stated project objectives, in particular innovation, activation, and a strong point of difference.

Therefore the submission received from PLACE Laboratory Pty Ltd is considered to represent best value to the City and is therefore recommended as the preferred tenderer.

**Voting Requirements**

Simple Majority

**Officer Recommendation**

That Council *ACCEPTS* the tender submitted from PLACE Laboratory Pty Ltd, for Tender T15/16-80 - Detailed Design of the Rockingham Beach Foreshore Revitalisation Stage 1 in accordance with the tender documentation for the lump sum value of $668,928 (excluding GST).

**Committee Recommendation**

Moved Cr Hamblin, seconded Cr Summers:

That Council *ACCEPTS* the tender submitted from PLACE Laboratory Pty Ltd, for Tender T15/16-80 - Detailed Design of the Rockingham Beach Foreshore Revitalisation Stage 1 in accordance with the tender documentation for the lump sum value of $668,928 (excluding GST).

Committee Voting – 5/0

**The Committee’s Reason for Varying the Officer’s Recommendation**

Not Applicable

**Implications of the Changes to the Officer’s Recommendation**

Not Applicable
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td><strong>Reports of Councillors</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td><strong>Addendum Agenda</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td><strong>Motions of which Previous Notice has been given</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td><strong>Notices of Motion for Consideration at the Following Meeting</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td><strong>Urgent Business Approved by the Person Presiding or by Decision of the Committee</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td><strong>Matters Behind Closed Doors</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td><strong>Date and Time of Next Meeting</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The next Planning and Engineering Services Committee Meeting will be held on <strong>Monday 20 June 2016</strong> in the Council Boardroom, Council Administration Building, Civic Boulevard, Rockingham. The meeting will commence at 4:00pm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td><strong>Closure</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There being no further business, the Chairperson thanked those persons present for attending the Planning and Engineering Services Committee meeting, and declared the meeting closed at <strong>4.36pm</strong>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>