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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  
   Cr Matthew Whitfield  
   Cr Barry Sammels (Mayor)  
   Cr Deb Hamblin (Deputy Mayor)  
   Cr Katherine Summers  
   Cr Joy Stewart (Observer)

   2.2 **Executive**
   
   Mr Andrew Hammond  
   Mr Bob Jeans  
   Mr Peter Doherty  
   Mr Sam Assaad  
   Mr Peter Ricci  
   Mr Brett Ashby  
   Mr Mike Ross  
   Mr Rod Fielding  
   Mr David Caporn  
   Mr Ian Daniels  
   Mr Om Gupta  
   Mr Kelton Hincks  
   Mr James Henson  
   Mr Adam Johnston  
   Ms Melinda Wellburn  

   2.3 **Members of the Gallery:** 5

   2.4 **Apologies:** Nil

   2.5 **Approved Leave of Absence:** Nil

3. **Responses to Previous Public Questions Taken on Notice**

   3.1 **Mr Peter Green, 25 Nabberu Loop, Cooloongup - Mangles Bay Marina**

   At the Planning and Engineering Services Committee meeting held on 24 October 2017, Mr Green asked the following questions that were taken on notice and the Director Planning and Development Services provided a response in a letter dated 30 October 2017 as follows:
Question

1. Is it correct that statutory planning necessary for the MBM project includes **both** the MRS amendment process and, if the MRS amendment is approved, all required planning approvals pursuant to the City of Rockingham planning scheme, including approval of the Local Structure Plan.

Response

Should the proposed MRS rezoning proceed to final approval, the City would be required to amend its Town Planning Scheme to introduce a commensurate zoning.

The proponent for the ‘Mangles Bay Marina’ has requested that the City introduce a ‘Development’ zoning under the Town Planning Scheme, in the event that the MRS Amendment proceeds to final approval, which would trigger the need for a Local Structure Plan.

The City has not considered the proponent’s request and it is not possible to confirm whether a ‘Development’ Zone/Local Structure Plan framework will be implemented. Ultimately, the Minister for Planning will determine the Town Planning Scheme zoning upon recommendation from the City.

All of the above steps could be considered as part of the Statutory Planning process.

Question

2. At what stage is the planning assessment of the MBM project pursuant to the City’s planning scheme, including approval of the Local Structure Plan? What further steps are required to complete that planning assessment and decision-making process. Approximately how much more time does the City estimate this will take?

Response

Further to the response to Question 1 above, the City has not commenced assessment of the Local Structure Plan and it is not possible to estimate assessment or determination timeframes.

Question

3. What is the estimate of the City’s senior planning officers as to the earliest possible date by which all the statutory planning processes will be completed in relation to the MBM project?

Response

Refer to the responses to Questions 1 and 2 above.

Question

4. Does the City consider it will be possible for all the statutory planning approvals for the MBM project to be achieved by early 2018?

Response

Refer to the responses to Questions 1 and 2 above.

Question

5. During the recent Local Government Election many candidates were heard to say when asked about the MBM project, ‘it is no longer a City project, in fact it is a State Government Project now.’ If the MRS amendment is approved, is it not the case that the City will provide a Local Structure Plan for the Community to comment on, therefore making it a very important City project?
Response

Under the scenario contained in your question, the City would be performing its role as a planning agency and implementing the requirements of the Town Planning Scheme. In the same way as the numerous other Local Structure Plans progressed under the Town Planning Scheme are not considered to be ‘City projects’, a Local Structure Plan for ‘Mangles Bay Marina’ would not constitute a ‘City project’.

Question

6. Will the City provide clear up to date information to newly elected councillors on the status of the MBM project? Other to just read the Planning Bulletin?

Response

The new Councillors will be briefed on a range of matters, and it is likely that the ‘Mangles Bay Marina’ project will be one of them.

Question

7. My final question relates to item 4.13 section 6 Statutory Planning, HMAS Stirling Redevelopment Project, which states,

'During public consultation sessions on the proposal Defence responded to a number of issues such as increase to local traffic. It was advised that there will be a small increase to traffic on Point Peron Road and mitigation measures are in place to reduce congestion.'

a) When did the consultation sessions take place, is 2015 correct?

b) If the MBM project goes ahead, is it not the case that Pont Peron Road will be closed?

c) As the City of Rockingham will be responsible for the road network has the City advised Defence of the Cardno Traffic Impact Assessment completed in June 2016 for the MBM, and the potential consequences it could have with personnel traversing to and from HMAS Stirling, that being 15,000 vehicles per day using Memorial Drive?

Response

As per your email dated 26 October 2017, a response is not required as the Department of Defence has responded to your questions.

4. Public Question Time

4:02pm The Chairperson invited members of the Public Gallery to ask questions.

4.1 Mr Peter Green, 25 Nabberu Loop, Cooloongup - Port Rockingham Marina

The Chairperson invited Mr Green to present his questions to the Planning and Engineering Services Committee. Mr Green asked the following questions:

My question relates to the Port Rockingham Marina and front page article in Sound Telegraph dated Wednesday 8 Nov 2017, titled, ‘Developer reassures on funds,’ which states in part, ‘At the September Council meeting, Rockingham Councillors voted in favour of asking State Government to ensure the proponent had the financial means to successfully carry out the project.’ the article also stated, ‘We have provided that evidence of our capacity to fund the project to the Department of Transport.’ I ask,

1. Has the City received notification from State Government of the proponents capacity to fund the project?

The Chairperson advised ‘No’.
2. The WAPC recommendations on the MRS Amendment 1280/41 were presented to the Minister on 10 October 2017.

I note that since February this year there has been no headway between Cedar Woods and the City on Waterways Management and Coastal Setback, two of the issues that the City has identified as requiring resolution, I ask,

(a) Have there been any discussions between Cedar Woods and the City since 23 August on these issues?

*The Chairperson advised 'No'.*

(b) Has there been any correspondence between Cedar Woods and the City since 23 August on these issues? Yes/No, if so, are copies available,

*The Chairperson advised 'No'.*

(c) Likewise has there been any correspondence from/to the WAPC since 23 August on these issues? Yes/No if so, are copies available,

*The Chairperson advised 'No'.*

3. In accordance with SPP2.6 the allowable setback would be 162 meters, the City's Coastal Hazard Risk Management Adaptation Plan varies the distance between 48 and 83 meters, I ask,

(a) Does the City intend to maintain its long standing position on Coastal Setback noting that the CHRMAP is only requesting half of its allowable amount?

*The Chairperson advised that the City’s assessment of the CHRMAP, as reported through the Information Bulletin in August 2016, was lodged with the WAPC for consideration as part of the MRS rezoning process. The City’s position has not changed since the assessment was lodged with the WAPC.*

4.2 Mr Ron Stout, President, Naval Association of Australia City of Rockingham Sub-section - PDS-066/17 - Proposed Parking Controls - City of Rockingham Parking Station Number 1 Boat Ramp Facility, Peron

The Chairperson invited Mr Stout to present his questions to the Planning and Engineering Services Committee and tabled additional information provided by Mr Stout, with respect to this item. Mr Stout asked the following questions:

1. Why is parking being restricted between 6am and 12 midday when there are very few vehicles parking after 10am on the weekend?

2. How many Infringement Notices have been issued to people in the area over the last 12 months?

3. Why does parking need to be restricted to 104 vehicle and trailer bays?

*The Chairperson advised that this is an item contained in tonight’s Committee agenda and will be debated later in the meeting and that some of Mr Stout’s questions may be answered through that debate.*

4:10pm There being no further questions the Chairperson closed Public Question Time.

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

Moved Cr Whitfield, seconded Cr Hamblin:

That Committee CONFIRMS the Minutes of the Planning and Engineering Services Committee Meeting held on 24 October 2017, 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**

4:11pm 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**

4:11pm 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 – November 2017**

**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
   3.5 Food 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 Caravan Park and Camping Ground Inspections
   4.19 Rockingham Beach Cup Update
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building Services</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Building Services Team Overview</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Human Resource update</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Project Status Reports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Information Items</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Monthly Building Permit Approvals - (All Building Types)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Private Swimming Pool and Spa Inspection Program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Demolition Permit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4 Permanent Sign Licence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 Community Sign Approval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6 Street Verandah Approval</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7 Occupancy Permits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8 Strata Titles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9 Unauthorised Building Works (Section 51 of the Building Act)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.10 Monthly Caravan Park Site Approvals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.11 R Code Variations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Compliance and Emergency Liaison |                                                                                           |
| 1. Compliance and Emergency Liaison Team Overview |                                                                                           |
| 2. Human Resource Update |                                                                                           |
| 3. Project Status Reports |                                                                                           |
| 4. Information Items |                                                                                           |
| 4.1 Compliance and Emergency Liaison |                                                                                           |
| 4.2 Ranger Services Action Reports |                                                                                           |
| 4.3 Emergency Management and Fire Prevention |                                                                                           |
| 4.4 Restricted Burning Period |                                                                                           |
| 4.5 CRM’s |                                                                                           |
| 4.6 Urban Vacant Land Owners |                                                                                           |
| 4.7 Rockingham/Kwinana State Emergency Service |                                                                                           |
| 4.8 Hazard Reduction Burn |                                                                                           |
| 4.9 Community Engagement – Baldivis Primary School |                                                                                           |
| 4.10 SmartWatch Key Result Area: Visibility |                                                                                           |
| 4.11 SmartWatch Key Result Area: Engagement with Community |                                                                                           |
| 4.12 SmartWatch Key Result Area: Increasing Perception of Safety |                                                                                           |
| 4.13 Notable Statistics |                                                                                           |

| 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 Wetland Management Plan |                                                                                           |
| 3.4 Lake Richmond Management Plan Review |                                                                                           |
| 3.5 Coastal Hazard Risk Management and Adaption Plan |                                                                                           |
| 4. Information Items |                                                                                           |
| 4.1 Notification of Approval of Structure Plans by the Western Australian Planning Commission |                                                                                           |
| 4.2 Delegated Advertising of Proposed Structure Plans |                                                                                           |
| 4.3 2016 Census Update to City of Rockingham Population Forecasts |                                                                                           |
| 4.4 Peron Naturaliste Partnership, Community Coastal Values Study |                                                                                           |

| Land and Development Infrastructure |                                                                                           |
| 1. Land and Development Infrastructure Team Overview |                                                                                           |
Committee Recommendation

Moved Cr Sammels, seconded Cr Hamblin:
That Councillors acknowledge having read the Planning Services Information Bulletin – November 2017 and the content be accepted.

Committee Voting – 5/0
## Engineering and Parks Services Information Bulletin – November 2017

### Engineering and Parks Services Directorate

1. Engineering and Parks Services Directorate Team Overview
2. Human Resource Update
3. Project Status Reports
   - 3.1 Rockingham Foreshore Masterplan – Stage One Construction
4. Information Items
   - 4.1 Bushfire Risk

### Engineering Services

1. Engineering Services Team Overview
2. Human Resource Update
3. Project Status Reports
   - 3.1 Rockingham Future Traffic Modelling
4. Information Items
   - 4.1 Delegated Authority for Temporary Thoroughfare Closure
   - 4.2 Delegated Authority for approval of Heavy Haulage
   - 4.3 Authorised Traffic Management Plans for Works on City Controlled Roads
   - 4.4 Civil Works Program 2017/2018
   - 4.5 Civil Maintenance Program 2017/2018
   - 4.6 Road Rehabilitation Program Main Roads Grant 2017/2018
   - 4.7 Road Resurfacing Program Municipal Works 2017/2018
   - 4.8 Road Renewal Program Municipal Works 2017/2018
   - 4.9 Drainage Renewal Program Municipal Works 2017/2018
   - 4.10 Footpath Renewal Program Municipal Works 2017/2018
   - 4.11 Delegated Authority pursuant to Part 3 of the Graffiti Vandalism Act 2016
   - 4.12 Litter and Street Sweeping Program 2017/2018
   - 4.13 Graffiti Program 2017/2018
   - 4.14 Port Kennedy Drive Environmental Impact Study
   - 4.15 Delegated Authority for the payment of crossover subsidies
   - 4.16 Third Party works within the City
   - 4.17 Asset Inspections
   - 4.18 Verge Treatment Applications
   - 4.19 Verge Obstructions
   - 4.20 Coastal Infrastructure
   - 4.21 Coastal Management

### Parks Services

1. Parks Services Team Overview
2. Human Resource Update
3. Project Status Reports
4. Information Items
   - 4.1 Delegated Public Open Space Handovers
   - 4.2 2017/2018 Parks Services Projects Summary
   - 4.3 2017/2018 Parks Services Project Information
   - 4.4 Parks Maintenance Program 2017/2018

### Asset Services

1. Asset Services Team Overview
2. Human Resource Update
3. Project Status Reports
   - 3.1 Facilities and Reserve Accessibility Audits
   - 3.2 Footpath Condition Audit
   - 3.3 Specific Purpose Plan - Facility Security
4. Information Items
   4.1 Asset Maintenance Team
   4.2 Asset Maintenance – Buildings
   4.3 Asset Maintenance – Reserves
   4.4 Buildings and Facilities Construction Program
   4.5 Lighting Construction Program
   4.6 Park Infrastructure & Construction Program
   4.7 Strategic Asset Management

**Committee Recommendation**

Moved Cr Sammels, seconded Cr Hamblin:

That Councillors acknowledge having read the Engineering and Parks Services Information Bulletin – November 2017 and the content be accepted.

Committee Voting – 5/0
### 12. Agenda Items

#### Planning and Development Services

#### Compliance and Emergency Liaison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference No &amp; Subject:</th>
<th>PDS-066/17 Proposed Parking Controls - City of Rockingham Parking Station Number 1 Boat Ramp Facility, Peron</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>File No:</td>
<td>LWE/1-93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant:</td>
<td>Mr David Caporn, Manager Compliance and Emergency Liaison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner:</td>
<td>Mr Amos Dolman, Senior Ranger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author:</td>
<td>20 November 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Committee Meeting:</td>
<td>20 November 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously before Council:</td>
<td>Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site:</td>
<td>Parking Station Number 1 - Lot 2804 Point Peron Road, Peron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Area:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Zoning:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRS Zoning:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachments:</td>
<td>1. Aerial Photograph - Point Peron Boat Ramp Car Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maps/Diagrams:</td>
<td>2. Aerial Photograph Depicting Location of Standard Vehicle Parking Bays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Aerial Photograph Depicting Parking on Point Peron Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Aerial Photograph Depicting Restriction of ‘Vehicle with Trailer Only Parking’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Aerial Photograph - Point Peron Boat Ramp Car Park

**Purpose of Report**

To seek Council approval to implement changes to parking controls at the City of Rockingham, Parking Station Number 1 which is located at the Point Peron Boat Ramp Facility, Lot 2804 Point Peron Road, Peron.

**Background**

Parking Station Number 1 provides parking for users of the Point Peron Boat Ramp; the Rockingham Sea Rescue Group; and the Rockingham Navy Club. The area has 93 marked bays suitable for ‘vehicle with trailer’ and 20 marked bays suitable for vehicle only, however, no signs restricting usage of these bays have been installed.

It has been identified that during peak usage of the boat ramp, some of the bays suitable for ‘vehicle with trailer’ are not being utilised in keeping with this intention. Subsequently, boat ramp users are parking in ‘no parking’ areas and being penalised during enforcement action.

**Details**

As the location is an approved Parking Station, signs can be erected by the City to restrict parking with contraventions legally enforced. It is proposed to introduce ‘vehicle with trailer only parking’ signs to control the 93 marked ‘vehicle with trailer’ bays during certain periods.

After consultation with the Rockingham Sea Rescue Group and the Rockingham Navy Club, it is proposed to apply these restrictions during certain periods only. This includes weekends and public holidays, excluding ‘Anzac Day’ and only between 6am and 12 midday.

The proposed restrictions will allow boat owners to actively utilise the Parking Station for its original intended purpose, whilst vastly minimising the impact on the Navy Club.

The proposed restriction will only apply to the 93 extended line marked bays. There are also 20 standard vehicle bays, 4 ACROD bays and specific ‘sea rescue’ parking at the location.
Implications to Consider

a. Consultation with the Community

The City has consulted with the Rockingham Navy Club and the Rockingham Sea Rescue Group during the development of this proposal.

No objections were raised by the Rockingham Sea Rescue Group.

The Naval Association of Australia - Rockingham Navy Club has communicated objections to placing restrictions on the ‘vehicle and trailer’ bays and some of its feedback has helped shaped this proposal. The Club has no allocated parking in its lease agreement with the City.

An assessment of the concerns raised by the Navy Club is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Impact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Submission:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Restricting parking will impinge on the well-being of the club.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City's Comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The City has listened to the Navy Club’s concerns and only propose to implement restrictions on weekends, public holidays (except Anzac Day) and only from 6am to 12 midday, thus drastically reducing the impact on the club.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact on Club Events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Submission:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) The club does hold events on the occasional Saturday morning and Committee meetings are held by various organisations on Sunday mornings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City's Comments:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are 20 standard vehicle bays available in the carpark with no restrictions proposed on these bays. On days of peak boating activity, the ‘vehicle and trailer’ bays are populated early and this proposal merely seeks to ensure that ‘vehicle and trailer bays’ are utilised as intended, rather than being taken up by vehicles without trailers. See below aerial image for standard vehicle bay(s) location highlighted in red for reference.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Aerial Photograph Depicting Location of Standard Vehicle Parking Bays
### Club-only Parking

**Submission:**
(iii) There is no specifically assigned parking for the Rockingham Navy Club.

**City's Comments:**
Although not specifically assigned to the Navy Club, there are 20 standard unrestricted vehicle bays available at all times with any overflow expected to park on Point Peron Road. See below aerial image for alternate verge parking currently unrestricted and in close proximity to the Rockingham Navy Club.

![Aerial Photograph Depicting Parking on Point Peron Road](image)

### Vehicles without trailers are not using the marked bays during peak times

**Submission:**
(iv) There have been numerous occasions on Public Holidays and weekends when the car park has been full and overflows onto Point Peron Road and no vehicle without a trailer has been seen in the parking area.

**City's Comments:**
Site inspections of the area have been conducted on multiple occasions. The extended line marked bays are being actively utilised by vehicles without trailers during peak periods.

### 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 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
Nil

e. Financial
The total cost of signage, posts and labour is $2,720. This can be funded from existing Budget Accounts.

f. Legal and Statutory

"1.10 The local government may, by resolution, prohibit or regulate by signs or otherwise, the stopping or parking of any vehicle or any class of vehicles in any part of the parking region but must do so consistently with the provisions of this local law.

3.1 The local government may by resolution constitute, determine and vary and also indicate by signs:
(a) parking stalls;
(b) parking stations;
(c) permitted times and conditions of parking in parking stalls and parking stations which may vary with the locality;
(d) permitted classes of vehicles which may park in parking stalls and parking stations;
(e) permitted classes of persons who may park in specified parking stalls or parking stations; and
(f) the manner of parking in the parking stalls and parking stations."

g. Risk
All Council decisions are subject to risk assessment according to the City’s Risk Framework.

Implications and comment will only be provided for the following assessed risks.

Customer Service / Project management / Environment: High and Extreme Risks
Finance / Personal Health and Safety: Medium, High and Extreme Risks

Nil

Comments
Parking restrictions are required at this location in order to ensure the car park is utilised in keeping with its intended purpose.

Voting Requirements
Simple Majority

Officer Recommendation
That Council APPROVES the following parking controls as identified in the Aerial Photo:

1. Restriction of ‘Vehicle with Trailer Only Parking’ applying from 6am to 12 midday on weekends and public holidays, excluding Anzac Day.
Committee Recommendation

Moved Cr Sammels, seconded Cr Summers:
That Council DEFERS consideration of this item to the December 2017 Planning and Engineering Services Committee meeting.

Committee Voting – 5/0

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

To enable consideration of the additional information provided by the Naval Association.

Implications of the Changes to the Officer’s Recommendation

Not Applicable
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Reference No &amp; Subject:</strong></th>
<th>PDS-067/17 Declaration of Dog Exercise Area Acrasia Road Reserve (Barri Barri Park) - Baldivis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>File No:</strong></td>
<td>CSV/3018-02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Applicant:</strong></td>
<td>Mr David Caporn, Manager Compliance and Emergency Liaison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Owner:</strong></td>
<td>Mr Amos Dolman, Senior Ranger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Author:</strong></td>
<td>Mr David Caporn, Manager Compliance and Emergency Liaison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Contributors:</strong></td>
<td>Mr Amos Dolman, Senior Ranger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date of Committee Meeting:</strong></td>
<td>20 November 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Previously before Council:</strong></td>
<td>October 2016 CD-041/16 (Approved as the preferred location for the Baldivis Enclosed Dog Park)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disclosure of Interest:</strong></td>
<td>Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nature of Council’s Role in this Matter:</strong></td>
<td>Lot 211 Baldivis Road, Baldivis - Acrasia Road Reserve. Reserve No: 52795 (commonly known as Barri Barri Park)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30,539m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site:</strong></td>
<td>Lot 211 Baldivis Road, Baldivis - Acrasia Road Reserve. Reserve No: 52795 (commonly known as Barri Barri Park)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lot Area:</strong></td>
<td>30,539m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LA Zoning:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MRS Zoning:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attachments:</strong></td>
<td>1. Location Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Aerial Photograph</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONFIRMED AT A PLANNING AND ENGINEERING SERVICES MEETING HELD ON MONDAY 11 DECEMBER 2017

PRESIDING MEMBER

1. Location Plan

Purpose of Report

To seek Council approval for Acrasia Road Reserve, Reserve Number 52795 (commonly known as Barri Barri Park) located at Lot 211 Baldivis Road, Baldivis to be designated as an off-leash dog exercise area.

Background

In October 2016, Council endorsed Lot 211 Baldivis Road (then described as Barri Barri Park Lot 9023 Baldivis Road) as the preferred location for an enclosed dog park. In accordance with the Council’s intentions for this reserve including the enclosed area, it must now be declared a Dog Exercise Area pursuant to section 31 (3A) of the Dog Act 1976.

Details

The children’s playground and tennis courts, which are located within the reserve, are excluded areas where dogs will be prohibited.

Implications to Consider

a. Consultation with the Community

In accordance with Section 1.7 of the Local Government Act 1995 the City has given local public notice of its intention to specify Lot 211 Baldivis Road Baldivis as a Dog Exercise Area.
A Local Public Notice was advertised in the Sound Telegraph on the 16 August 2017.

A Local Public Notice was posted on noticeboards at the Administration Building and all Local Public Libraries within the City of Rockingham.

No submissions/responses were received.

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 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
Nil

e. Financial
The total cost of signage, posts and labour is $1,176. This can be funded from existing Budget Accounts.

f. Legal and Statutory
Section 31 of the Dog Act 1976 specifies that a local government may determine (by absolute majority) both dog exercise areas and dog prohibited areas.

“31. Control of dogs in certain public places

(3A) A local government may, by absolute majority as defined in the Local Government Act 1995 section 1.4, specify a public place, or class of public place, that is under the care, control or management of the local government to be a dog exercise area.”

g. Risk

All Council decisions are subject to risk assessment according to the City’s Risk Framework.

Implications and comment will only be provided for the following assessed risks.

Customer Service / Project management / Environment: High and Extreme Risks
Finance / Personal Health and Safety: Medium, High and Extreme Risks

Nil

Comments

This proposal is a follow-up to CD-041/16 entitled Baldivis Enclosed Dog Park site selection – Outcomes of public comment, whereby the Council approved Barri Barri Park as the location of the future Baldivis Enclosed Dog Park.

Voting Requirements

Absolute Majority

Officer Recommendation

That Council APPROVES the following reserve as a Dog Exercise Area with the exclusion of the Children’s Playground and Tennis Court areas:

1. Lot 211 Baldivis Road Baldivis (Reserve No. 52795)
Committee Recommendation

Moved Cr Whitfield, seconded Cr Sammels:

That Council **APPROVES** the following reserve as a Dog Exercise Area with the exclusion of the Children’s Playground and Tennis Court areas:

1. Lot 211 Baldivis Road Baldivis (Reserve No. 52795)

Committee Voting – 3/2

(Crs Hamblin and Summers voted against)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Committee’s Reason for Varying the Officer’s Recommendation</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implications of the Changes to the Officer’s Recommendation</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Planning and Development Services
### Compliance and Emergency Liaison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference No &amp; Subject:</th>
<th>PDS-068/17 Proposed Change to Parking Control in Railway Terrace, Rockingham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>File No:</td>
<td>LWE/1-94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author:</td>
<td>Mr David Caporn, Manager Compliance and Emergency Liaison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Contributors:</td>
<td>Mr Amos Dolman, Senior Ranger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Committee Meeting:</td>
<td>20 November 2017</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:                  | Railway Terrace, Rockingham                                                   |
| Lot Area:              |                                                                                |
| LA Zoning:             |                                                                                |
| MRS Zoning:            |                                                                                |
| Attachments:           |                                                                                |
| Maps/Diagrams:         | 1. Location Plan - Aerial Photograph                                           |
|                        | 2. Aerial Photograph Source IntraMaps dated April 2017                       |
Purpose of Report

To seek Council approval to change to a parking control in Railway Terrace, Rockingham.

Details

The majority of the parking bays in Railway Terrace Rockingham are restricted to 2 hour parking. The proposal is to change one of the parking bays to a 5 minute restriction for the purpose of picking up or dropping off passengers. This would leave 44 standard parking bays with 2 hour restriction.

Implications to Consider

a. Consultation with the Community
   On 10 August 2017 this proposal was put before the City’s Seniors Advisory Committee. The Committee were supportive of the suggested change which is in keeping with the recently adopted Seniors Strategy 2017 - 2021.

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 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
Nil

e. Financial
A costing has been obtained through the City’s Asset Maintenance Department to be approximately $117.60 sign, post and labour inclusive of this.

f. Legal and Statutory

“1.10 The local government may, by resolution, prohibit or regulate by signs or otherwise, the stopping or parking of any vehicle or any class of vehicles in any part of the parking region but must do so consistently with the provisions of this local law.

3.1 The local government may by resolution constitute, determine and vary and also indicate by signs:

(a) parking stalls;
(b) parking stations;
(c) permitted times and conditions of parking in parking stalls and parking stations which may vary with the locality;
(d) permitted classes of vehicles which may park in parking stalls and parking stations;
(e) permitted classes of persons who may park in specified parking stalls or parking stations;
and
(f) the manner of parking in the parking stalls and parking stations.”

g. Risk
All Council decisions are subject to risk assessment according to the City’s Risk Framework.

Implications and comment will only be provided for the following assessed risks.

Customer Service / Project management / Environment: High and Extreme Risks
Finance / Personal Health and Safety: Medium, High and Extreme Risks

Nil

Comments

Although this is an area of high demand during peak periods, there is no short-stay drop-off or pick-up area. The need for a safe location to drop-off or pick-up passengers can be simply addressed by changing the restriction on one of the parking bays located there.

The parking bay targeted for this change is close to the foreshore end of Railway Terrace where it will have maximum impact.

Voting Requirements
Simple Majority

Officer Recommendation

That Council APPROVES the installation of a 5 minute parking restriction to the vehicle parking bay depicted in the following aerial photograph of Railway Terrace, Rockingham.
Moved Cr Sammels, seconded Cr Hamblin:

That Council APPROVES the installation of a 5 minute parking restriction to the vehicle parking bay depicted in the following aerial photograph of Railway Terrace, Rockingham.
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>PDS-069/17</th>
<th>Proposed Structure Plan (Lot 19 Sixty Eight Road, Baldivis)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>File No:</td>
<td>LUP/1542-06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant:</td>
<td>Site Planning and Design on behalf of the Glow Developments (WA) Pty Ltd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner:</td>
<td>The Glow Developments (WA) Pty Ltd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author:</td>
<td>Mr Neels Pretorius, Planning Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Contributors:</td>
<td>Mr Tristan Fernandes, Coordinator Strategic Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Brett Ashby, Manager Strategic Planning and Environment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Committee Meeting:</td>
<td>20 November 2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously before Council:</td>
<td>25 October 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure of Interest:</td>
<td>Legislative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Council’s Role in this Matter:</td>
<td>Legislative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site:</td>
<td>Lot 19 Sixty Eight Road, Baldivis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Area:</td>
<td>9.1474Ha</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>Schedule of Submissions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maps/Diagrams:</td>
<td>1. Location Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Baldivis South District Structure Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Approved South Baldivis Secondary School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Advertised Structure Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Location of Advertising</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Proposed changes to Structure Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Purpose of Report**

To consider a proposed Structure Plan over Lot 19 Sixty Eight Road, Baldivis following the completion of public advertising.
Baldivis South District Structure Plan

In October 2004, the Council resolved to endorse the Baldivis South District Structure Plan ("BSDSP") for the purpose of guiding Comprehensive Development Plans (subsequently referred to as Structure Plans under Town Planning Scheme No.2) and planning generally for the South Baldivis area.

In July 2011, the City received a Structure Plan application over Lot 19 Sixty Eight Road. Following an assessment of the proposal, the Council at its ordinary Meeting in October 2011, resolved to refuse advertising of the proposed Structure Plan for the following reasons:

(i) The proposed Structure Plan is inconsistent with the Baldivis South District Structure Plan in that it does not provide for the required High School Site.

(ii) The proposed Structure Plan does not satisfy the Public Open Space (POS) requirements of Liveable Neighbourhoods (LN).

(iii) The following items have not been provided that are necessary to enable a full assessment of the proposed Structure Plan:

(a) Local Water Management Strategy;
(b) Fire Management Plan;
(c) Flora and Fauna Assessment;
(d) Traffic Impact Statement;
(e) Staging Plan; and
(f) Indicative Earthworks Plan.

In October 2011, the City supported a request to lift of Urban Deferment over Lot 19 Sixty Eight Road, Baldivis, subject to provision being made for the planned High School site through the reservation of land in the MRS at the same time as the proposed lifting of Urban Deferment.

In November 2011, the applicant (Dynamic Planning) lodged an appeal to the State Administrative Tribunal in response to the Council’s decision on the Structure Plan. Following mediation with the City the applicant requested to withdraw its appeal.
The applicant then requested the City to refer the Structure Plan to the WAPC for its determination, as permitted by Town Planning Scheme No.2 (TPS2). The WAPC determined that the Structure Plan was not satisfactory for advertising.

In June 2012, the Council resolved to endorse an update to the South Baldivis District Structure Plan to:

(i) Delete the large POS reserve located on Lot 19 and 20 Sixty Eight Road; and
(ii) Reflect approved Structure Plans within the subject area, with respect to the general location of Neighbourhood Roads, Activity Centres and significant POS.

Since its endorsement, the BSDSP (see Figure 2) has been used to guide the preparation of Structure Plans. With respect to the Structure Plan area, the District Structure Plan provides for a portion of a high school site within the subject land.

2. Baldivis South District Structure Plan
Previous Approvals
Subdivision Approval
On 24 February 2016, the WAPC granted Subdivision Approval 152961 to excise the High School site from Lot 19 Sixty Eight Road.

South Baldivis Secondary School
On 26 September 2016, the Metro South-West Metropolitan area Joint Development Assessment Panel approved the development application for the South Baldivis Secondary School. The high school is located on portions of Lots 19-21 Sixty Eight Road, part of which is located within the Structure Plan area (see Figure 3 below).

Details
Site Description and Context
The City has received a new Structure Plan application over Lot 19 Sixty Eight Road. The site is bounded by the Brightwood Estate to the east, Sixty Eight Road to the south, the ‘Bougainvillea Gardens’ estate to the west and the approved (but yet to be constructed) ‘Paramount Estate’ Structure Plan area to the northern boundary.

The south-eastern portion of the Structure Plan area is currently being developed by the Education Department for the South Baldivis Secondary College, which is due to open in 2019.

The northern portion of the site is Banksia and Tuart woodland, with the vegetation identified within the Environmental Assessment Report (EAR) varying from ‘degraded’ to ‘good’ condition.

The topography of the Structure Plan area slopes from the north to south from a maximum height of 34m AHD to a low point of 20m AHD at Sixty Eight Road.

Description of the Proposal (As Advertised)
The proposed Structure Plan includes the following elements (see Figure 4):
- Residential densities ranging from R25 - R40 to facilitate development of approximately 92 lots (101 dwelling units);
- Three POS reserves (total area 6,468m²); and
- Portion of a future High School site (2.64ha).

4. Advertised Structure Plan Map
Implications to Consider

a. Consultation with the Community

Advertising Methodology

The proposed Structure Plan was advertised from 30 August 2017 to 27 September 2017 for 28 days in the following manner:

- Adjacent/nearby landowners (properties shown within the red border in Figure 5), servicing agencies and the Baldivis Residents Association notified of the proposal in writing and invited to comment;
- A sign advertising the proposal was erected on the property in a prominent location facing Sixty Eight Road;
- A notice was placed in the Sound Telegraph newspaper on 30 August 2017; and
- Copies of the proposed Structure Plan and relevant documents were made available for inspection at the City’s Administrative Offices and placed on the City’s website.

Advertising was undertaken in accordance with the requirements of Schedule 2, Part 4, clause 18 of the Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015 (the Regulations).
Public Submissions: Following the close of the advertising period, the City received fourteen (14) submissions. A full copy of submissions is set out in the Schedule of Submissions (Attachment No.1 to this Report). The submissions that raised issues for consideration are summarised and addressed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Submission:**

1. The Structure Plan Report and Environmental Assessment Report should be amended to recognise both the quality of the vegetation onsite and the current federal environmental approval.

**Applicant's Response:**

The EAR responds to all requirements for site assessment in relation to vegetation retention and protection. Based on the existing levels of adjoining development areas and the pre-determined levels required to achieve connection to Water Corporation’s reticulated sewerage network, and consistent with the EAR and EPBC referral, no retention of existing vegetation onsite is anticipated.

**City's Comment:**

While the City is aware of the Commonwealth Government Decision Notice (EPBC 2016/7661) issued under the *Environmental Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act* (1999) (EPBC Act) for Lots 19 and 20 Sixty Eight Road, Baldivis, this is a separate process to the assessment of the Structure Plan under the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*. Notwithstanding the separate processes required to be undertaken, it is recommended that the Structure Plan documentation outline the complete approval process as it is a relevant and important element relating to the future development of the site.

In this regard, it is recommended that the Structure Plan Report and associated EAR reference the EPBC Act approval process which took place following the preparation of the EAR in 2015.

**Recommendation:**


**Submission:**

2. The Structure Plan does not provide for the protection of large remnant trees.

**Applicant's Response:**

As above, notwithstanding efforts to locate POS areas to potentially retain existing trees, pre-determined development levels required to achieve connection to Water Corporation’s sewerage network prevent retention of existing trees onsite. This will however be reviewed further through the detailed subdivision design and approval process.

**City's Comment:**

The City’s assessment of the Structure Plan documentation determined that the EAR was prepared prior to the Structure Plan being finalised. As such, it did not consider the potential for trees within the site to be retained based on final site levels. The EAR assumes that all trees within the site will be cleared.

The EAR identifies a number of large Tuart trees are located within the central POS. It is important that the Structure Plan demonstrates the potential to retain remnant trees within POS, particularly given the significance of the vegetation identified on site.

The retention of the Tuart trees is encouraged and supported by State Planning Policy 3.0 - *Urban Growth and Settlement* (SPP 3.0) and LN. In this regard, the policy framework stipulates the following criteria that should be addressed:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment (Cont…)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Section 5.4 of SPP 3.0 states &quot;the protection of key environmental areas and the incorporation of significant cultural and environmental features of a site into the design of an area&quot; as a key component of neighbourhood planning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Element 1 – ‘Community Design’ of LN stipulates that “the layout should enhance local identity by responding to the site context, site characteristics, setting landmarks and views and incorporate key elements of natural and cultural significance”.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The City’s assessment of the Structure Plan has determined that there is potential to retain mature Tuart trees within the central POS. To be able to establish which trees can be retained, it is recommended that a revised earthworks plan be prepared that show the pre-development and post-development site levels based on the Structure Plan design. It is also recommended the Structure Plan documentation be amended to outline the retention of mature trees within the central open space.

**Recommendation:**

That the following additional information be provided:

- The Structure Plan documentation be amended to outline the retention of mature trees within the proposed central POS; and
- A revised earthworks plan be prepared that show the pre-development and post-development site levels based on the Structure Plan design.

**Submission:**

3. It is requested that mature trees be retained on Sixty Eight Road and make provision for verge trees to provide for a safer road environment (shade from evening westerly sun blinding driver vision).

**Applicant’s Response:**

As above, no existing verge trees can be retained onsite as a result of predetermined given development levels (pre-determined as a result of that respond to existing and proposed subdivision on adjoining Lots 18 and 20). The provision of verge trees to be provided will be addressed at subdivision and development stages.

**City’s Comment:**

The City notes that vegetation fronting the development has been cleared as part of the construction works for the high school.

At subdivision stage, the City will seek to ensure the planting of trees within the Sixty Eight Road Reserve and POS to expand upon the existing character established west of the site on Sixty Eight Road.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Movement Network</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Submission:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The road connections into surrounding approved Structure Plan areas being maintained and ensure the reserve widths and footpath locations match the approved Structure Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Applicant’s Response:**

Noted. Detailed at subdivision stage.

**City’s Comment:**

The submission is noted. The City recommends minor amendments to the Structure Plan documentation to provide consistent road reserves connecting into neighbouring Structure Plan areas.
### Movement Network (Cont…)

**Recommendation:**

*That the Structure Plan documentation be amended to show consistent road reserve widths for roads connecting into all neighbouring Structure Plan areas.*

**Submission:**

2. The Structure Plan will adversely contribute to an increase in traffic on Sixty Eight Road.

**Applicant’s Response:**

The site is identified as ‘Urban’ under the Metropolitan Region Scheme and Local Planning Scheme, and is shown for residential purposes under the District Structure Plan. Local traffic volumes are discussed and addressed as part of the Structure Plan Report and accompanying Transport Impact Assessment.

**City’s Comment:**

The Transport Assessment Report assumes that the unconstructed portion of the Karnup Road reserve, located between Baldivis Road and Nairn Drive, will be built and accommodate the majority of traffic movements.

The City notes there are no plans to construct the extension of Karnup Road. In this regard, the Traffic Report does not appropriately model the traffic implications to the existing road network, namely Sixty Eight Road, as required by the WAPC’s Transport Impact Assessment Guidelines. It is recommended that the Traffic Report be amended accordingly.

**Recommendation:**

*That the Transport Assessment Report be amended:*

- to correctly model the traffic implications to the existing road network, including Sixty Eight Road; and
- to include remedial measures to address the increase in traffic on Sixty Eight Road (if determined to be required).

### Property Values

**Submission:**

The residential densities proposed will adversely impact property values.

**Applicant’s Response:**

This is not a valid planning consideration for the purpose of Structure Plan assessment.

**City’s Comment:**

The potential impact to property values is not a valid planning consideration in the City’s assessment of a proposed Structure Plan.

### POS and Drainage

**Submission:**

1. There is insufficient open space provided for within the Structure Plan area.

**Applicant’s Response:**

A total of three POS areas are provided across the Structure Plan area, consistent with the requirements of Liveable Neighbourhood for the provision of 10% of the gross subdivisible land area. Two of the proposed POS areas form part of larger POS areas and are proposed to perform drainage functions in coordination with adjoining Lot 18 and 20 Structure Plans.
**POS and Drainage (Cont…)**

**City's Comment:**
The City's assessment has determined that the Structure Plan provides the required 10% open space contribution.

**Submission:**
1. The Lot 19 Structure Plan area must provide for a more equitable distribution and retention of its drainage throughout and within its Structure Plan area, including utilising its ‘POS 2’ so as to not unfairly burden Lot 20 ‘Brightwood’ with the flows from Lot 19.

**Applicant's Response:**
The Applicants of the Lot 19 Structure Plan have already made significant, time-consuming and costly concessions as part of Structure Plan design and assessment process to accommodate Lot 20 stated requirement for drainage within the proposed linear POS/Drainage and to accommodate the proposed road network and lot layout across Lot 20.

The City have previously stated that the linear POS design, while not the best design outcome, is supported on the basis that the Applicants of Lot 20 argued that the low point for Lots 19 + 20 is located on the eastern side of the linear POS. The Structure Plan design for Lot 19 was therefore modified on that basis, with the majority of stormwater runoff being accommodated within drainage swales on Lot 19 and the balance of stormwater detention proposed to be accommodated within a consolidated drainage basin on Lot 20. There is therefore no unfair burden on Lot 20, with modifications to layout undertaken by Lot 19 to specifically address these earlier comments and consolidate drainage outcomes to be investigated at the UWMP stage. Furthermore it is our understanding that the City of Rockingham, in recommending approval to the Lot 20 Structure Plan, have specifically requested that any UWMP required as part of subsequent subdivision works over Lot 20 address the requirements for a consolidated drainage basin.

**City's Comment:**
The District/Local Water Management Strategy (D/LWMS) does not make reference to the City's requirement for an amalgamated basin with the adjoining development of Lot 20. The D&LWMS for Lot 19 demonstrates that all stormwater can be managed in isolation and it is recommended that the report be amended to include a future commitment to provide a consolidated drainage basin within the proposed linear open space.

**Recommendation:**
*That the District/Local Water Management Strategy (D/LWMS) be amended to include a future commitment for an Urban Water Management Plan to provide a consolidated drainage basin within the linear POS reserve.*

**Submission:**
2. The POS Schedule should be revised to reflect the restricted use of this POS where it corresponds with underground infrastructure.

**Applicant's Response:**
Underground infrastructure is provided specifically for the purpose of avoiding any blight/restriction on the usability of POS within the linear POS area fronting Sixty Eight Road. The POS schedule has been prepared consistent with previous liaison and discussions with the City of Rockingham, and conforms with the requirements of LN.

**City's Comment:**
LN does not specify that underground stormwater storage infrastructure should be considered as restricted use open space. The proposed infrastructure is not contained within an easement nor are there stormwater basins proposed within open space.
POS and Drainage (Cont…)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submission:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. The Structure Plan should ensure that all drainage from the proposed development is contained within Lot 19 Sixty Eight Road.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant's Response:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As above, the Applicant of the Lot 19 Structure Plan has previously made substantial modifications to the Structure Plan to reflect a clear position from adjoining Lot 20 that drainage within the northern linear POS is to be located in the low point at the eastern edge of the linear POS. We strongly refute any position taken to the contrary, as the sole argument for provision of a linear POS area in the manner proposed is to respond to adjoining Lot 20 design decisions with respect to drainage low points.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City's Comment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The D&amp;LWMS for Lot 19 demonstrates that all stormwater can be managed in isolation within Lot 19. The amalgamated drainage basin for both Lot 19 and 20 will be assessed during detailed design as part of any future subdivision application.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Structure Plan Design

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submission:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Proposed lot sizes are too small to accommodate family dwellings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant's Response:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed lot sizes are consistent with the proposed Residential density, and lot sizes as part of preliminary subdivision design are well in excess of minimum and average lot size requirements. The proposed lot configuration and areas have been designed to comply with the City of Rockingham's requirement to achieve an average R25 density across Lot 19 and also in response to the State Government's objective for new residential estates to provide a variety of lot sizes to meet the needs and budgets of a greater range of community sectors, including first home owners and retirees.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City's Comment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LN encourages a mix of housing types, lot sizes and densities, with smaller residential lots and higher density housing in areas close to activity centres, near public transport stops and in areas with high amenity such as next to parks. These criteria give context to the allocation of density. Any development of residential dwellings will need to comply with the provisions of the Residential Design Codes and the R-Codes will make it possible for family dwellings to be constructed on the future lots.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Submission:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. R25-R40 density coding is too broad. This coding should be more specific and provide for a transition in densities from the adjoining Structure Plan areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant's Response:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The proposed density seeks to address State planning framework requirements for increased dwelling densities, and provides flexibility through the subsequent subdivision process to provide a greater range of lot sizes. The flexibility in lot sizes respects the site’s proximity to the proposed High School site.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City's Comment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Structure Plan proposes a split R-Coding of R25/40 but the coding is not site specific.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Structure Plan Design (Cont...)**

With respect to residential density, the Structure Plan Framework states that if a density range is to be designated, a single range is generally not to be applied to entire estates/tracts of land. The Structure Plan Report does not designate any location criteria in Part One of the Structure Plan Report for the manner in which R-Codes can be selected within a subsequent R-Code Plan prepared at subdivision stage.

When the approach of using a density range is being adopted, the density range that is included on the structure plan needs to be linked to likely built form outcomes, to provide the general public, local government and the WAPC with a clear indication on the density of development that will result from the implementation of the structure plan. When considering the use of density ranges, the chosen range is to accord with the achievement of State residential density targets.

In this regard, there is insufficient justification provided to the City to rationalise the provision of R30 and R40 densities that do not have direct context to areas of amenity, public transit or activity centres.

As such, the Structure Plan should be modified to provide more specific guidance on the allocation of density, in accordance with the Structure Plan Framework.

Alternatively, it is the City's preference that the Structure Plan specifies the applicable residential densities. In this regard, the City recommends a base R25 code by applied, with the higher R30 or R40 densities being supported adjacent to or abutting POS.

**Recommendation:**

*That the Structure Plan Report be amended to comply with the requirements of the Structure Plan Framework to provide location criteria for residential densities. In this regard, it is recommended that the Structure Plan provide a base R25 residential density code and the provision of R30 and R40 densities is supported adjacent to or abutting POS.*

**Submission:**

3. The Structure Plan design shows lots terminating the vista of the easternmost road entering Lot 19 from Lot 740. To optimise the future streetscape the Structure Plan should be modified to ensure appropriate treatment of these lots to improve this vista (i.e. by requiring dwellings to be oriented to the north-south road and preventing side fencing of this area).

**Applicant's Response:**

Details regarding lot orientation and landscaping/fencing will be undertaken at the subsequent subdivision and development stage.

**City's Comment:**

The submission is noted. As part of the consideration of any future subdivision application, the City will seek to ensure appropriate lot orientation and streetscape outcomes be achieved.

**Submission:**

4. The Structure Plan should demonstrate that finished levels match with the surrounding approved Structure Plan areas.

**Applicant's Response:**

The engineering advice provided in support of the Structure Plan confirms that proposed finished levels match with adjoining Structure Plans. This is outlined in the report and Appendix Two, being a Conceptual Levels Plan. Whilst it is demonstrated that this has been considered through the detailed design, it is not a requirement under the Structure Plan provisions of the planning regulations or local planning scheme.
Structure Plan Design (Cont…)

| City's Comment: | The Structure Plan adequately addresses the interface with surrounding approved Structure Plans. |

**Submission:**
5. **Finished levels in the Structure Plan should ensure that there is no requirement for retaining walls to be provided by the adjoining land owner along the common boundary with adjoining Structure Plan areas.**

| Applicant’s Response: | Any retaining wall requirement to adjoining landowners would be undertaken as part of subdivision works by the owners of Lot 19. |

| City's Comment: | This is a detailed design consideration that is required to be addressed at subdivision stage. |

b. **Consultation with Government Agencies**

As mentioned above, relevant government agencies and servicing authorities were notified of the proposal in writing and invited to comment, pursuant to Schedule 2, Part 4, clause 18(1) (b) of the Regulations. In this regard, the City invited comments from the following agencies:

- ATCO Gas Australia
- Department of Biodiversity Conservation and Attractions
- Department of Education
- Department of Fire and Emergency Services
- Department of Health
- Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage
- Department of Water and Environment Regulation
- Department of Transport
- Public Transport Authority
- Telstra
- Water Corporation
- Western Power

Following the close of the advertising period, the City had received ten (10) submissions from State Agencies. A full copy of all submissions received during the advertising period is set out in the Schedule of Submissions (Attachment No.1 to this Report). The submissions that raised issues for consideration are summarised and addressed as follows:

1. **Water Corporation**

| Submission: | The Water Corporation has adopted water and wastewater infrastructure planning for this area, which is summarized in the Servicing Report attached to the structure plan. As noted in the report, the efficient water and wastewater servicing of subdivision of Lot 19 is to a large degree dependent on the prior development of the ABN land to the east in particular the extension of gravity sewers westwards form the receiving wastewater pump station. The infrastructure planning for this and surrounding landholdings in South Baldivis provides a guide to the developers' consulting engineers, which can be varied and staged in consultation with the Corporation's Development Services Branch at the subdivision stage. |
### 1. Water Corporation (Cont…)

**City's Comment:**
The submission is noted.

### 2. ATCO Gas

**Submission:**
ATCO Gas does not have any objection to the proposed Structure Plan being approved by the City of Rockingham, subject to the applicant considering the following advice;

- If residential properties abut and front the area defined as POS, ATCO Gas requests that gas meter boxes are located at the rear of these properties, accessible from the 6m laneway where future gas mains would generally be located within this road reserve.

- Alternately if it is proposed that all other utility’s services ice water and electricity are located within the area defined as POS within a services easement registered on the future title, ATCO Gas requests that for the purposes of gas is included to ensure ATCO Gas has rights of access and this is on the standard Utility Provider’s Code of Practice recommended alignment.

**City's Comment:**
The submission is noted.

### 3. Department of Water and Environmental Regulation. (Environmental Regulation)

**Submission:**
The site has not been reported to DWER as a known or suspected contaminated site under the Contaminated Sites Act 2003 (CS Act) and DWER holds no information on the site. Additionally, the site is not located within an acid sulfate soil risk area.

Based on historical aerial imagery, it appears that the site was historically used as a market garden, which is a land use that has the potential to cause contamination, as specified in 'Assessment and management of contaminated sites' (Department of Environment Regulation, 2014).

As the site has been used as potentially contaminating activity and is proposed to be developed for a more sensitive land use, DWER considers that investigation for contamination, and if necessary remediation and validation of contamination, will be required for this site prior to development to ensure the site suitable for the proposed use.

DWER expects that the Western Australian Planning Commission (WAPC) will request advice from DWER when a subdivision application is submitted for the proposed development. Based on the available information, DWER will recommend that contamination condition EN9 and advice ENa2 should be applied to the approval, as published in 'Model Subdivision Conditions Schedule' (Department of Planning and WAPC, May 2016).

As potential contamination issues can be addressed at the subdivision stage of the development, DWER advises that it has no objection to the proposed Structure Plan for Lot 19 Sixty Eight Road, Baldivis.

**City's Comment:**
The submission is noted. The City will recommend an appropriate condition be imposed on any future subdivision proposal to address potential site contamination.
## 4. Department of Health (DoH)

**Submission:**
Water and Wastewater Disposal: All developments for the densities proposed are required to connect to scheme water and reticulated sewerage, as required by the Government Sewerage Policy – Perth Metropolitan Region.

Public Health Impacts: DoH has a document on ‘Evidence that is supporting the creation of environments that encourage health active living’ which may assist you with planning elements related to this structure plan. A copy can be downloaded from the DoH website.

**City’s Comment:**
Any future development will be required to be connected to reticulated water and sewerage as required by the Government Sewerage Policy – Perth Metropolitan Region.

The City has assessed the Structure Plan against the criteria contained within LN. In this regard, the proposal has appropriately addressed the requirements of the document.

## 5. Public Transport Authority

**Submission:**
The Public Transport Authority (PTA) finds the proposed amendment to be generally conducive to the operation and growth of the Transperth network. Transperth has preliminary long-term plans as a part of our Service Development Plan extend the Route 566 east of the site (lot 20) via Hillsborough Ave, an unnamed north-south connector Rd and Verdant App to a terminus on Sixty Eight Rd.

Transperth are supportive of residential development at this location increasing the potential patronage catchment which will help justify extending the bus service. It should be noted that the timing of the introduction of this service extension is subject to the continued development of the area and the availability of resources.

It should be noted that bus access to the Secondary College site will be needed and will require a bus embayment area adjacent to the school site with a minimum of six bus bays (20m of straight curb for each stand + any tapers). PTA still needs to have discussions with the Department of Education regarding the final design and location of the bus embayment area.

**City’s Comment:**
The submission is noted. The City notes that the location of bus embayments to service the high school is being resolved as part of the school development application and associated subdivision works.

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**

**State Planning Policies**

**Directions 2031**

*Directions 2031 and Beyond: Metropolitan Planning Beyond the Horizon (‘Directions 2031’) was released by the WAPC in August 2010 as the plan to provide a vision for the future growth of the Metropolitan and Peel region. It provides a broad framework to guide detailed planning and the delivery of the various elements that provide for growth.*
Directions 2031 seeks to increase the proportion of infill development to the ratio of new ‘greenfield’ development sites. A target of 47% infill development is sought under the Policy. As of 2009, only 30% infill development was being achieved. This Policy seeks a 50% improvement from the existing trend.

To achieve this target, the Policy sets a density target of 15 dwellings per gross urban zoned hectare of land in new development areas.

The Structure Plan report states that the proposed Structure Plan meets the density target set out in Directions 2031.

Liveable Neighbourhoods

Liveable Neighbourhoods (LN) has been prepared to implement the objectives of the State Planning Strategy and State Sustainability Strategy, and operates as a sustainable development control policy to guide structure planning and subdivision. The document outlines all the requirements a new Structure Plan and the supporting documentation needed to assess such. These requirements are intended to facilitate the State Government’s objective to create communities that reduce dependency on private vehicles and are more energy and land efficient.

LN contains eight ‘elements’ under which Structure Plans and subdivisions are assessed, as follows:

Element 1 – Community Design
Element 2 – Movement Network
Element 3 – Lot Layout
Element 4 – Public Parkland
Element 5 – Urban Water Management
Element 6 – Utilities
Element 7 – Activity Centres and Employment
Element 8 – Schools

Each Element has two components – ‘Objectives’ and ‘Requirements’. Objectives describe the principal aims of each Element, and Requirements present a range of qualitative and quantitative responses to meeting the Objectives. Requirements include matters that ‘should’ be considered, where there is a range of design solutions, and matters that ‘must’ be satisfied.

The City has assessed the proposal in accordance with the Objectives’ and ‘Requirements’ of LN. The assessment outcomes are summarised as follows:

Element 1 – Community Design

The Structure Plan integrates appropriately with its surroundings and all lots are within a walkable catchment to POS from within the Structure Plan area.

Element 2 – Movement Network

The proposed Structure Plan fronts Sixty Eight Road, which is to be upgraded to a Neighbourhood Connector ‘A’ profile road. This upgrading requires a 2.2m road widening to northern side of Sixty Eight Road to enable its construction to its ultimate a neighbourhood connector road ‘A’ boulevard treatment profile. As such needs to be shown on the Structure Plan Map.

The City’s assessment of the Transport Assessment Report also identified minor modifications required to be made to the document for the document to be consistent with the adjacent developments, the details of which will be forwarded to the WAPC for its consideration.

Recommendation:

That the Structure Plan be modified to provide 2.2m of road widening to Sixty Eight Road abutting the southern linear open space.
Element 3 – Lot Layout

An indicative lot layout demonstrates that the Structure Plan layout can effectively accommodate the siting and construction of dwellings on generally rectangular shaped lots.

Element 4 – Public Parkland

The Structure Plan area has been appropriately designed to provide distribution of open space within a walkable catchment of approximately 200m all residential dwellings.

Element 5 – Urban Water Management

The D&LWMS for Lot 19 does not make reference to the City’s requirement for an amalgamated basin with the adjoining development of Lot 20. Whilst this is not required to be demonstrated at D&LWMS stage, it is recommended that the Report be amended to include this commitment.

The amalgamated drainage basin and landscape concept will be assessed as part of detailed design at subdivision stage for both Lots 19 and 20 Sixty Eight Road.

The City’s assessment of the District and Local Water Management Strategy also identified a minor technical modification in relation to meeting minimum standards for water quality treatment.

Recommendation:

That the District and Local Water Management Strategy be updated to address matters raised within the City’s technical assessment.

Element 6 – Utilities

The Structure Plan Report provides appropriate documentation of the utilities requirements to be implemented at subdivision stage.

Element 7 – Activity Centres and Employment

There are no Activity Centres proposed in the Structure Plan area.

Element 8 – Schools

The Structure Plan area contains a portion of a high school site located on parent Lot 19 Sixty Eight Road. Access to the school site meets the requirements of LN in that:

- All streets abutting the school are through streets;
- It is located on a future public transport route;
- There is planned walking and cycling routes to the school;
- The school is proposed to be surrounded on all sides by a public road;
- The school does not adjoin residential land uses; and
- The school is located outside the walkable catchment of a neighbourhood centre.

State Planning Policy No.3.7 – Planning in Bushfire Prone Areas (December 2015) and Guidelines for Planning in Bushfire Prone Areas (August 2017)

On 7 December 2015, the following documents were gazetted:

- Fire and Emergency Services (Bushfire Prone Areas) Order 2015;
- Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Amendment Regulations 2015;
- State Planning Policy No.3.7 – Planning in Bushfire Prone Areas; and
- Building Amendment Regulations (No.3) 2015.

The Department of Fire and Emergency Services (DFES) and the Western Australian Planning Commission (WAPC) concurrently released the:

- Map of Bushfire Prone Areas; and
- Guidelines for Planning in Bushfire Prone Areas.
The Guidelines for Planning in Bushfire Prone Areas (Guidelines) apply immediately and supersede the Planning for Bushfire Protection Guidelines (2010). The Guidelines provide further detail on the requirements of SPP3.7.

The State Map is based on the Department of Fire and Emergency Services/Office of Bushfire Risk Management’s Mapping Standard for Bushfire Prone Areas. It essentially includes any bushfire prone vegetation with a 100m buffer around the vegetation. It is a binary system, i.e. it is either bushfire prone or not. The mapping does not indicate any level of hazard; it is simply a tool to trigger further assessment.

The State Map is reviewed on an annual basis.

For all planning applications (Structure Plans, Scheme Amendments, Subdivision Applications, Development Applications), SPP3.7 and the Guidelines will apply immediately to all applications in designated bushfire prone areas identified on the State Map.

The City’s assessment of the Bushfire Management Plan identified minor modifications required to be made to the document, the details of which will be forwarded to the WAPC for its consideration.

**Recommendation:**

*That the Bushfire Management Plan (dated July 2016) be updated in accordance with the revised Guidelines for Planning in Bushfire Prone Areas (August 2017 Version 1.2).*

**Planning Policy 3.4.1 – Public Open Space**

*Planning Policy 3.4.1 – Public Open Space* (PP 3.4.1) provides guidance regarding the location and design of POS within the City. The objectives of the Policy are:

- To ensure that all residential development is complemented by well-located areas of POS that provide for the recreational and social needs of the community.
- To ensure that POS is designed, developed and maintained to an acceptable standard to enhance local amenity.

The location and distribution of POS on the proposed Structure Plan satisfies the objectives of the Planning Policy.

The Policy does stipulate design requirements to promote visual surveillance and minimise personal safety and security problems. The City will need to consider visual surveillance for development abutting POS and the provision of visitor parking at as part of detailed design at subdivision stage.

e. **Financial**

Nil

f. **Legal and Statutory**

*Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations (2015)*

In accordance Clause 19(1) of the Regulations, the local government:

(a) must consider all submissions made to the local government within the period specified in a notice advertising the structure plan; and

(b) may consider submissions made to the local government after that time; and

(c) may request further information from a person who prepared the structure plan; and
(d) may advertise any modifications proposed to the structure plan to address issues raised in submissions.

Determination of a Structure Plan ultimately rests with the WAPC. In accordance with Clause 20 of the Regulations, the local government must perform the following actions:

(1) The local government must prepare a report on the proposed structure plan and provide it to the WAPC no later than 60 days after the day that is the latest of:

(a) the last day for making submissions specified in a notice given or published under clause 18(2); or

(b) the last day for making submissions after a proposed modification of the structure plan is advertised under clause 19(2); or

(c) a day agreed by the Commission.

(2) The report on the proposed structure plan must include the following:

(a) a list of the submissions considered by the local government, including, if relevant, any submissions received on a proposed modification to the structure plan advertised under clause 19(2);

(b) any comments by the local government in respect of those submissions;

(c) a schedule of any proposed modifications to address issues raised in the submissions;

(d) the local government’s assessment of the proposal based on appropriate planning principles;

(e) a recommendation by the local government on whether the proposed structure plan should be approved by the WAPC, including a recommendation on any proposed modifications.

g. Risk

All Council decisions are subject to risk assessment according to the City’s Risk Framework.

Implications and comment will only be provided for the following assessed risks.

Customer Service / Project management / Environment: High and Extreme Risks

Finance / Personal Health and Safety: Medium, High and Extreme Risks

Nil

Comments

The proposed structure plan has been assessed by City Officers and in addition to the above, the following additional comments are provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Transport Assessment Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Access onto Lamorak Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The City’s assessment of the proposed access onto Lamorak Way determined that the intersection provided insufficient sight lines and safety concerns associated with the connection. It is recommended that the road connection to Lamorak Way be removed or be made a cul-de-sac ‘nib’ road for lot access only, restricting vehicle access to/from Lamorak Way.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

External Traffic Impact

The Transport Assessment Report (TAR) outlines there will be negligible through traffic from nearby developments. The City has determined that this justification is inadequate, as the structure plan area provides local access to future high school, which will service the surrounding locality. In this regard, it is recommended that a Signalised and Unsignalised Intersection Design and Research Aid (SIDRA) analysis be prepared for the proposed roundabout to justify the adequacy of this intersection.

Road Reservation Widths

Given the requirement for car parking embayments abutting the POS, the reduction of the road reserves adjoining the POS is not supported. It is recommended that the road reserve not be reduced where it abuts POS to ensure car parking embayments can be provided at subdivision stage.
6. Proposed changes to Structure Plan.

Recommendation:
That the Structure Plan Map, Structure Plan Report and Transport Assessment Report be amended as follows:

- Close the road access point to Lamorak Way from (nib road);
- That a SIDRA analyses be prepared and provided for the roundabout at the north west corner of the school; and
- That road reserve widths be amended to be in accordance with recommendations contained in this report.
In addition to the matters raised above, the City will also require minor corrections and updates to the documentation contained within the Structure Plan and Technical Appendices, which will be provided to the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage for its consideration.

**Conclusion**

Following the consideration of the submissions received and the City's assessment of the Structure Plan proposal, it is recommended that the Council advise the WAPC that the Structure Plan be approved subject to the following matters being addressed:

1. The Structure Plan documentation be amended to outline the retention of mature trees within the proposed central POS.
2. Amend the Structure Plan Report to comply with the requirements of the Structure Plan Framework to provide location criteria for residential density range. It is recommended that the Structure Plan provide a base R25 residential density code and the provision of R30 and R40 densities is supported adjacent to or abutting public open space.
3. Modify the Structure Plan Map to close vehicle access onto Lamorak Way with the provision of a 'nib' road.
4. A revised earthworks plan be prepared that show the pre-development and post-development site levels based on the Structure Plan design.
5. The Bushfire Management Plan, Environmental Assessment Report and Traffic Assessment Report be updated to address the recommendations contained within this Report.
6. The District/Local Water Management Strategy (D/LWMS) be amended to include a future commitment for an Urban Water Management Plan to provide a consolidated drainage basin within the linear POS reserve.

It is further recommended that the Council request that the WAPC consider the advice and recommendations outlined in this Report in its determination of the proposed Structure Plan.

**Voting Requirements**

Simple Majority

**Officer Recommendation**

That Council **APPROVES** the following recommendations to the Western Australian Planning Commission, with respect to the proposed Structure Plan prepared over Lot 19 Sixty Eight Road, Baldivis:

1. That the proposed Structure Plan be approved subject to the following matters being addressed:
   
   (i) The Structure Plan documentation be amended to outline the retention of mature trees within the proposed central public open space.
   
   (ii) Amend the Structure Plan Report to comply with the requirements of the Structure Plan Framework to provide location criteria for residential density range. It is recommended that the Structure Plan provide a base R25 residential density code and the provision of R30 and R40 densities is supported adjacent to or abutting public open space.
   
   (iii) Modify the Structure Plan Map to close vehicle access onto Lamorak Way with the provision of a 'nib' road.
   
   (iv) A revised earthworks plan be prepared that show the pre-development and post-development site levels based on the Structure Plan design.
   
   (v) The Bushfire Management Plan (dated July 2016) be updated in accordance with the revised Guidelines for Planning in Bushfire Prone Areas (August 2017 Version 1.2).
   
   
   (vii) Traffic Assessment Report be amended to address the following matters: -
(a) Show consistent road reserve widths for roads connecting into all neighbouring Structure Plan areas.

(b) Provide a SIDRA analysis for the roundabout at the north-west corner of the school;

(c) Provide amended traffic modelling to correctly show the traffic implications to the existing road network, including Sixty Eight Road;

(d) Include remedial measures to address the increase in traffic on Sixty Eight Road (if determined to be required); and

(e) Provide 2.2m of road widening to Sixty Eight Road abutting the southern linear open space.

(viii) The District/Local Water Management Strategy (D/LWMS) be amended to include a future commitment for an Urban Water Management Plan to provide a consolidated drainage basin within the linear Public Open Space reserve.

2. That the advice and recommendations as outlined in the City’s Report be considered by the Western Australian Planning Commission in its determination.

**Committee Recommendation**

Moved Cr Whitfield, seconded Cr Sammels:

That Council **APPROVES** the following recommendations to the Western Australian Planning Commission, with respect to the proposed Structure Plan prepared over Lot 19 Sixty Eight Road, Baldivis:

1. That the proposed Structure Plan be approved subject to the following matters being addressed:

   (i) The Structure Plan documentation be amended to outline the retention of mature trees within the proposed central public open space.

   (ii) Amend the Structure Plan Report to comply with the requirements of the Structure Plan Framework to provide location criteria for residential density range. It is recommended that the Structure Plan provide a base R25 residential density code and the provision of R30 and R40 densities is supported adjacent to or abutting public open space.

   (iii) Modify the Structure Plan Map to close vehicle access onto Lamorak Way with the provision of a ‘nib’ road.

   (iv) A revised earthworks plan be prepared that show the pre-development and post-development site levels based on the Structure Plan design.

   (v) The Bushfire Management Plan (dated July 2016) be updated in accordance with the revised Guidelines for Planning in Bushfire Prone Areas (August 2017 Version 1.2).


   (vii) Traffic Assessment Report be amended to address the following matters: -

       (a) Show consistent road reserve widths for roads connecting into all neighbouring Structure Plan areas.

       (b) Provide a SIDRA analysis for the roundabout at the north-west corner of the school;

       (c) Provide amended traffic modelling to correctly show the traffic implications to the existing road network, including Sixty Eight Road;

       (d) Include remedial measures to address the increase in traffic on Sixty Eight Road (if determined to be required); and

       (e) Provide 2.2m of road widening to Sixty Eight Road abutting the southern linear open space.

   (viii) The District/Local Water Management Strategy (D/LWMS) be amended to include a future commitment for an Urban Water Management Plan to provide a consolidated drainage basin within the linear Public Open Space reserve.
2. That the advice and recommendations as outlined in the City’s Report be considered by the Western Australian Planning Commission in its determination.

   Committee Voting – 4/1
   (Cr Summers voted against)

<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>
</tbody>
</table>
Purpose of Report

To consider the adoption of a new Planning Policy 3.4.3 Urban Water Management for advertising purposes.

Background

Urban development within the City has traditionally taken advantage of elevated land with sandy soils, limited surface water drains or watercourses, as well as generous clearance to groundwater. As the more suitable land has now largely been developed the focus has moved to areas which are more difficult to develop due to the presence of seasonal surface water inundation or geological complexity.

Moreover, the new focus on housing diversity typical throughout the Perth Metropolitan and regional growth areas has meant lot sizes have decreased in size; which in turn has increased the impervious area (house, driveway and pavement), as well as providing less garden area and turf suitable for infiltration purposes.
With a view to obtaining the best possible environmental and water management outcomes for the City, it is important to ensure that all development occurs with a focus on total water cycle management and not just traditional ‘end of pipe’ drainage solutions.

It is also considered important to develop an urban water management approach that can be applied consistently, while also recognising and promoting alternative water conservation and sustainability practices.

Details

The Planning Policy articulates the City’s position on the planning, design and construction of Urban Water Management proposals and is to be considered by applicants and City Officers in the design, assessment, and determination of:

- Structure Plans (District, Local and Activity Centre);
- Subdivision Applications;
- Development Applications; and
- Detailed engineering/landscape drawings.

The Planning Policy applies to proposals that facilitate residential (on both rural and urban land), commercial and industrial zoning, subdivision or development; and is also consistent with the responsibilities applied to the activities, works, services and programs conducted by the City.

The Policy objectives seek to:

- Ensure that land use planning decisions integrate land and water planning, achieve catchment specific environmental criteria, and thereby deliver better improved water management outcomes for the catchments within the City.
- Implement Water Sensitive Urban Design (WSUD) principles and best management practices for all development proposals and City Operations.
- Improve water quality within the City and ensure the protection and management of sensitive environments. Where possible, restore and enhance the environmental, economic and social values of the City’s waterways and protected wetlands.
- Assess the practical and appropriate level of risk related to the proposal (guidance on level of risk is contained in Appendix 1).

The structure of the Planning Policy is set out as follows:

1. Introduction
2. Policy Application
3. Policy Objectives
4. Policy Statement
   4.1 General Requirements
      4.1.1 District Water Management Strategy
      4.1.2 Local Water Management Strategy
      4.1.3 Urban Water Management Plan
      4.1.4 Stormwater Management Plan
   4.2 Environmental Criteria Compliance
   4.3 Urban Water Management Compliance
   4.4 WSUD Principles
   4.5 Assessment Criteria
      4.5.1 Stormwater Management
4.5.2 Groundwater Management  
4.5.3 Wastewater Management  
4.5.4 Water Conservation and Sustainability  

5. Authority  
6. Interpretations  
6.1 Agency Acronyms  
6.2 Interpretations  
7. Adoption  

### Implications to Consider

**a. Consultation with the Community**  
Clause 4(1) of the deemed provisions of Town Planning Scheme No 2 require the City to advertise the proposed Policy as follows:

"(a) publish a notice of the proposed policy in a newspaper circulating in the Scheme area, giving details of:

(i) the subject and nature of the proposed policy;
(ii) the objectives of the proposed policy;
(iii) where the proposed policy may be inspected; and
(iv) to whom, in what form and during what period submissions in relation to the proposed policy may be made."

Under Clause 4(2), the period for making submissions in relation to a local Planning Policy must not be less than a period of 21 days commencing on the day on which the notice of the Policy is published under Clause 4(1) subclause (a).

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.

**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 D:** Sustainable Environment  

**Strategic Objectives:** Climate Change – Planning system, infrastructure standard and community awareness programs that acknowledge, mitigate and adapt to the impacts of climate change.

**Strategic Objectives:** 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
Clause 3(1) of the deemed provisions of TPS2 enable the local government to prepare a local planning policy in respect of any matter related to the planning and development of the Scheme Area.

g. Risk
All Council decisions are subject to risk assessment according to the City’s Risk Framework.
Implications and comment will only be provided for the following assessed risks.
Customer Service / Project management / Environment: High and Extreme Risks
Finance / Personal Health and Safety: Medium, High and Extreme Risks
Nil

Comments
Urban Water Management refers to all water integration (stormwater, groundwater, natural surface water, potable water supply, wastewater, wetlands and rivers) within the land use planning area.
This Planning Policy articulates the City’s position on urban water management with respect to Federal and State Government statutory requirements, by applying and developing industry best practices that benefit the community, the economy and the environment. The implementation of this Planning Policy will ensure a cohesive assessment criteria is applied to all planning and development proposals.
A Planning Procedure will be implemented upon finalisation of the draft Planning Policy.

Voting Requirements
Simple Majority

Officer Recommendation
That Council APPROVES the publishing of a notice that it has prepared draft ‘Planning Policy No.3.4.3 Urban Water Management for public comment.

Committee Recommendation
Moved Cr Sammels, seconded Cr Whitfield:
That Council APPROVES the publishing of a notice that it has prepared draft ‘Planning Policy No.3.4.3 Urban Water Management for public comment, as follows:

PLANNING POLICY NO.3.4.3 – URBAN WATER MANAGEMENT

Introduction
Urban development within the City of Rockingham (the City) has traditionally taken advantage of elevated land with sandy soils, limited surface water drains or watercourses, as well as generous clearance to groundwater. As the more suitable land has now largely been urbanised the focus has moved to areas which a more difficult to develop due to the presence of seasonal surface water inundation and/or geological complexity.

In addition, the new focus on housing diversity typical throughout the Perth Metropolitan and regional growth areas has meant lot sizes have decreased in size; which in turn has increased the impervious area (house, driveway and pavement), as well as providing less garden area and turf suitable for infiltration purposes.

With a view to obtaining the best possible environmental and water management outcomes for the City, it is important to ensure that all development occurs with a focus on total water cycle management and not just traditional ‘end of pipe’ drainage solutions. The purpose of this Planning Policy is therefore to:

Ensure the application of Better Urban Water Management (WAPC, 2008) as part of the planning approvals process;

Provide guidance on the City’s urban water management requirements to ensure that planning and development proposals are dealt with in a consistent manner;
Ensure that appropriate measures are taken to manage catchments in order to maintain or improve surface and groundwater resources; and
Promote alternative water conservation and sustainability practices that reduce reliance on traditional supplies.

2. Policy Application
This Policy articulates the City’s position on the planning, design and construction of Urban Water Management proposals and is to be considered by applicants, and City Officers in the design, assessment, and determination of:
Structure Plans (District, Local and Activity Centre);
Subdivision Applications;
Development Applications;
Detailed engineering/landscape drawings.
This Policy applies to proposals that facilitate residential (on both rural and urban land), commercial and industrial zoning, subdivision or development; and is also consistent with the responsibilities applied to the activities, works, services and programs conducted by the City.

3. Policy Objectives
The objectives of the Policy seek to:


b) Ensure that land use planning decisions integrate land and water planning, achieve catchment specific environmental criteria, and thereby deliver better improved water management outcomes for the catchments within the City.

c) Implement Water Sensitive Urban Design (WSUD) principles and best management practices for all development proposals and City Operations.

d) Improve water quality within the City and ensure the protection and management of sensitive environments. Where possible, restore and enhance the environmental, economic and social values of the City’s waterways and protected wetlands.

e) Assess the practical and appropriate level of risk related to the proposal (guidance on level of risk is contained in Appendix 1).

4. Policy Statement
4.1 General Requirements
Under the Better Urban Water Management (WAPC, 2008) framework, the following table articulates the integrated urban water planning with land planning process to ensure WSUD is achieved.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Trigger</th>
<th>Document Required</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Approving Authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>District Structure Plan</td>
<td>District Water Management Strategy (DWMS)</td>
<td>Local Authority or Landowner/ Developer</td>
<td>DWER/WAPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Structure Plan</td>
<td>Local Water Management Strategy (LWMS)</td>
<td>Local Authority or Landowner/ Developer</td>
<td>DWER/WAPC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subdivision Application</td>
<td>Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP)</td>
<td>Landowner/ Developer</td>
<td>City of Rockingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Application (DA)</td>
<td>Engineering Design</td>
<td></td>
<td>Development Application (DA)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.1.1 District Water Management Strategy (DWMS)

A DWMS is to be prepared as a component of a District Structure Plan (DSP) usually in support of amendments to the Metropolitan Region Scheme (MRS). A DWMS must demonstrate that the area is capable of supporting the change in land use and is able to achieve appropriate urban water management outcomes.

A DWMS is to be prepared consistent with Guidelines for District Water Management Strategies (DoW, 2013).

4.1.2 Local Water Management Strategy (LWMS)

A LWMS is to be prepared as a component of a Structure Plan. Any Structure Plan associated LWMS is to be consistent with the overarching DWMS, where applicable. In the absence of a DWMS, a combined District and Local Water Management Strategy (D&LMWS) must be prepared.

A LWMS must demonstrate how the proposed urban form will address water use, the protection of water dependent environments and management, and identify existing and required water management infrastructure, including detailed land requirements.

Any application to amend a Structure Plan is to include an assessment of the impact of the proposed amendments on the approved LWMS. The City will then determine whether the proposed Structure Plan amendment is required to be supported by a revised LWMS.

A LWMS is to be prepared consistent with Interim: Developing a Local Water Management Strategy (DoW, 2008).

4.1.3 Urban Water Management Plan (UWMP)

An UWMP is to be submitted to the City as a condition of Subdivision Application approval and must be approved by the City prior to the commencement of any subdivisional works and/or lodgement of associated subdivision clearance. An UWMP is not generally required to subdivision in infill/brownfield areas, unless the development is likely to impact on significant water resources.

The UWMP is an extension of the LWMS that articulates the critical parameters for infrastructure design at the subdivision stage. An UWMP must demonstrate how the final urban form will use and manage water including specific infrastructure, land requirements and detailed designs for both stormwater and groundwater management.

The UWMP must include detailed hydraulic design and modelling to resolve issues identified within both the DWMS and LWMS with the level of detail required for the UWMP to be determined by the City based on the complexity and risk associated with each development proposal.

An UWMP is to be prepared consistent with Urban Water Management Plans: Guidelines for Preparing Plans and for Complying with Subdivision Conditions (DoW, 2008).

4.1.4 Stormwater Management Plan

Where applicable the City may impose conditions on Development Application (DA) approvals to ensure the implementation of strategies outlined in an approved UWMP. In the absence of an approved UWMP, a DA is still bound by the objectives and assessment criteria provided in this Policy. The applicant may be required to demonstrate the function and/or efficacy of their stormwater management methodology through the submission of a Stormwater Management Plan which includes detailed Engineering and Landscape drawings.

4.2 Environmental Criteria Compliance

Development proposals and City projects must demonstrate compliance with catchment specific environmental criteria outlined in the following:

- State Planning Policy 2.1 – Peel-Harvey Coastal Plain Catchment (WAPC, 2003)
- Water Quality Improvement Plan for the Rivers and Estuary of the Peel-Harvey System (EPA, 2008)

4.3 Urban Water Management Compliance

Development proposals and City project stormwater management systems must be designed using Australian Rainfall & Runoff (Geoscience Australia, 2016) in conjunction with the Bureau of Meteorology’s 2016 Intensity-Frequency-Duration design rainfall estimates.
Stormwater and groundwater management systems must consider the principles, objectives and guidelines outlined in the following:

- Stormwater Management Manual for Western Australia (DoW, 2004-2007)
- North East Baldivis Drainage and Water management Plan (in preparation by DWER)
- Decision Process for Stormwater Management in WA: Draft for Consultation (DoW, 2016)
- Local Government Guidelines for Subdivisional Development (IPWEA, 2011)
- Water Resource Considerations when Controlling Groundwater Levels in Urban Development (DoW, 2013)
- Specification Separation Distances for Groundwater Controlled Urban Development (IPWEA, 2016)
- Peel-Harvey Coastal Catchment WSUD Technical Guidelines (Peel Development Commission, 2006)

4.4 WSUD Principles

The following WSUD principles (in order of priority) adapted from Stormwater Management Manual for Western Australia (DoW, 2004 – 2007) must be applied for all new development proposals as well as City operational projects and activities:

Provide protection to life and property from flooding that would occur in a 1% Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP) event.

Minimise runoff as high in the catchment as possible, and retain on-site or as close to the source as practical.

Retain and restore existing elements of the natural drainage system, including waterway, wetland and groundwater features, regimes and processes, and integrate these elements into the urban landscape.

Protect and enhance sensitive receiving environments by managing the water cycle, water quality, habitat diversity and biodiversity.

Minimise pollutant inputs through implementation of appropriate non-structural source controls and structural controls.

Increase water use efficiency and reduce potable water demand by maximising use of harvested stormwater from impervious surfaces.

Achieve good urban amenity by integrating stormwater management systems within the design of road reserves and public open space.

Reduce urban temperatures, runoff volumes, and peak flow rates and improve water quality, biodiversity and aesthetics by managing stormwater through the retention and planting of vegetation.

4.5 Assessment Criteria

4.5.1 Stormwater Management

The assessment criteria for stormwater management must be cognisant of the existing hydrological regime and the level of detail to be presented in accordance with the general requirements as outlined in Section 4.1.

Stormwater Quantity

For frequently occurring small rainfall events up to and including the first 15mm, lot runoff should be managed within lots and road runoff should be managed within road reserves. Where site conditions do not allow for the full runoff to be managed at source, manage as much as practical at-source. The remaining runoff should be conveyed from a lot or road reserve via overland flow wherever practical.

For minor events up to and including 20% AEP (residential) and 10% AEP (high density residential, commercial and industrial), stormwater management systems must be designed to provide appropriate levels of serviceability, amenity and road safety.
For major events, protect people and property from flooding by constructing residential, commercial and industrial building habitable floor levels at least 0.3 m above the 1% AEP flood level of the urban drainage system and at least 0.5 m above the 1% AEP flood level of waterways or based on advice from the Department of Water and Environmental Regulation (DWER). Overland flow paths utilising the road network must be provided whilst avoiding trapped low points.

For land within the Peel-Harvey Estuary Catchment, stormwater management designs must be cognisant of the criterion specified in the Water Corporation’s Mundijong Drainage District Rural Drainage Criteria (2000) and DWER’s Drainage and Water Management Plan (DWMP) (In prep.). Where there is no published criterion, adequate on-site detention is required to maintain post development outflows relative to pre-development conditions, consistent with BUWM.

Drainage infrastructure (including basins, swales, living streams and drainage channels) should be designed so that flood depths do not exceed 0.5m for a 1 Exceedances per Year (EY) event, 0.9m for 20% AEP event and 1.2m for a 1% AEP event.

The City will not accept direct discharge of small rainfall event runoff into wetlands. Runoff from minor and major events is acceptable providing it has been demonstrated that there is appropriate onsite management and treatment of small rainfall events.

**Stormwater Quality**

Stormwater retention, use and quality treatment shall occur at source or as high as possible in the catchment. Minimise pollutant inputs through implementation of appropriate non-structural source controls and structural controls.

A treatment train approach is to be applied to maximise water quality improvement and achieve objectives of water sensitive urban design at the appropriate scale of development.

Biofiltration systems (incorporated into swales, rain gardens and drainage basins) are required to remove nutrients, sediment, heavy metals and other pollutants from stormwater runoff. Biofiltration systems should be considered as part of an overall strategy for managing stormwater in a development where the depth Maximum Groundwater Level (MGL) is less than 5m. The City requires biofiltration systems to be designed and constructed in accordance to the specifications outlined in Adoption Guidelines for Stormwater Biofiltration Systems (Version 2) (CRCWSC, 2015).

To reduce health risks from mosquitoes, retention and detention treatments should be designed to ensure detained immobile stormwater is fully infiltrated in a time period not exceeding 96 hours. Where applicable, the City may require a Mosquito Management Plan to address how mosquitoes will be controlled.

The City requires the development of Multiple Use Corridors (MUCs) to integrate water quantity and quality management within Public Open Space (POS) that preserve nature conservation and ecological function, and provide recreational and educational opportunities.

Demonstration of compliance with the environmental criteria referred to in Section 4.2 must be achieved through appropriate computer models (e.g. UNDO), assessments and calculations appropriate to the stage of planning and scope of the proposal, as supported by the DWER.

4.5.2 Groundwater Management

The assessment criteria for groundwater management must consider the existing groundwater regime to determine whether specific measures are required. This includes pre-development monitoring consistent with DWER standard practice. The level of detail to be presented is to be in accordance with the general requirements as outlined in Section 4.1.

**Groundwater Levels**

Where the Maximum Groundwater Level (MGL) is at or within 1.2m of the surface, the importation of fill will be required together with the provision of subsoil drainage. In areas where the MGL is more than 1.2m from the surface, subsoil drainage may still be required to restrict the rise in groundwater and ensure there is adequate separation to critical elements of the built form and infrastructure. Any sub-surface drainage will need to be placed at an approved controlled groundwater level consistent with the Department of Water’s Water Resource Considerations when Controlling Groundwater Levels in Urban Development (DoW, 2013).
Groundwater management systems must be designed to provide sufficient separation distances appropriate to acceptable levels of risk and amenity for critical elements of built form and infrastructure. Modelling must be performed to predict the performance of groundwater management systems under future climate, site and land use conditions. Planning and development proposals must consider the design methodology and criteria outlined in the *Specification Separation Distances for Groundwater Controlled Urban Development* (IPWEA, 2016).

**Groundwater Quality**

Groundwater discharged by subsoil drainage should be treated to the appropriate level as determined based on the requirements of the receiving environment (outlined in Section 4.2). Treatment may be achieved using a suitably selected filter material to treat groundwater prior to entry into the subsoil pipe or by construction of a treatment system at the subsoil drainage system outlet (as described in Section 4.5.1).

4.5.3 Wastewater Management

A connection to reticulated sewerage is required as part of any proposal to develop land for residential, special residential, commercial or industrial uses. If exemptions apply, then:

On-site sewerage disposal proposals are required to meet the minimum specifications outlined in the *Government Sewerage Policy* (as amended).

The City may require additional setbacks for effluent disposal facilities and/or require the installation of specific types of facilities (including those involving the removal of nutrients) where it considers such requirements appropriate or necessary for the protection of water resources or other environmental values.

4.5.4 Water Conservation and Sustainability

The City has been endorsed as a Waterwise Council under the Water Corporation and DWER's Waterwise Councils program. As such, the following water conservation and sustainability criteria must be considered.

a) At the lot scale alternative sources of water and actions to minimise the use of potable water such as the reuse of rainwater and grey water in toilets, laundries and on gardens are encouraged and should be investigated as part of the planning and design process.

b) At the development scale, where water resources are constrained, a water balance may be required for the plan area to guide identification of alternative sources of water (e.g. treated wastewater, harvested stormwater).

c) The City requires the application of waterwise design and practices to minimise total water use. Land use planning should apply an average irrigation rate across a development of 7,500 kL/ha/yr from a suitable fit-for-purpose water source, unless directed otherwise by the DWER. A reduced rate of 6,750 kL/ha/yr may be acceptable providing sufficient information is provided to demonstrate suitability.

5. Authority

This Planning Policy has been adopted by the Council and applies to the entire Scheme area. Whilst it is not part of the Scheme, the Council is to have due regard to the provisions of the Policy and the objectives which the Policy is designed to achieve.

6. Interpretations

6.1 Agency Acronyms

CRCWSC – Cooperative Research Centre for Water Sensitive Cities

DoH – Department of Housing

DoP – Department of Planning

DoW – Department of Water

DWER – Department of Water and Environmental Regulation

IPWEA – Institute of Public Works Engineering Australasia

WAPC – West Australian Planning Commission
6.2 Interpretaions

**Annual Exceedance Probability (AEP)** – the probability of an event occurring or being exceeded within a year expressed as a percentage.

**Best Management Practice** – Devices, practices or methods for removing, reducing or preventing targeted pollutants from reaching receiving waters and for reducing runoff volumes and velocities. Includes structural and non-structural controls.

**Biofilter** – (also known as biofiltration basin and rain garden) are excavated basins or trenches filled with porous filter media and planted with vegetation to remove pollutants from stormwater runoff. They use natural and physical processes to treat stormwater.

**Controlled Groundwater Level (CGL)** - The controlled (ie modified) groundwater level (measured in metres Australian Height Datum) at which drainage inverts are set. This level must maintain the hydrologic regimes of groundwater dependent ecosystems, such as wetlands, that are to be protected.

**Council** - means the Council of the City of Rockingham.

**Exceedances per Year (EY)** – expresses the probability of how many times in any year that an event will occur.

**Intensity Frequency Duration (IFD)** - IFDs are Intensity–Frequency–Duration design rainfall intensities (mm/h) or design rainfall depths (mm) corresponding to selected standard probabilities, based on the statistical analysis of historical rainfall.

**Maximum Groundwater Level (MGL)** – must be determined through modelling and/or measurement. Where this information is not available from the DoW, local studies and investigations shall be undertaken.

**Non-Structural Practices** - institutional and pollution prevention practices that prevent or minimise pollutants from entering stormwater runoff and/or reduce the volume of stormwater requiring management. They do not involve fixed permanent facilities and they usually work by changing behaviour through government regulation, persuasion and/or economic instruments. Such practices use alternative maintenance procedures, regulatory measures, economic incentives, education of management and technical personnel, or planning and design of structures to reduce the amount of pollutants entering stormwater and accumulating on impervious areas.

**Multiple Use Corridors (MUCs)** – Wide corridors of land that provide water quality treatment, flood conveyance and detention, wildlife habitat, pedestrian and cycle paths and public open space.

**Structural Practices** – Structural stormwater quality and quantity best management practices are permanent, engineered devices implemented to control and improve stormwater quality and restore natural hydrological flows and velocities. Structural controls should be installed at or near the source of run-off/pollutant inputs, to prevent or treat pollution and manage the quantity of stormwater as high in the catchment as possible.

**Total Water Cycle** - water supply, stormwater, groundwater and sewage services are interrelated components of catchment systems, and therefore must be dealt with using an holistic water management approach that reflects the principles of ecological sustainability. Water efficiency, re-use and recycling are integral components of total water cycle management.

**Treatment train** - application of several types of stormwater best management practices in series or designed to achieve improved stormwater management.

**Water Sensitive Urban Design (WSUD)** – The philosophy of achieving better water resource management outcomes in an urban context by using an integrated approach to planning and incorporating total water cycle management objectives into the planning process. The key elements of this design include protection from flooding; management of water quantity and quality to achieve ecological objectives; and water conservation, efficiency and re-use.

### 7. Adoption

This Planning Policy was adopted by the Council at its ordinary Meeting held on XX.
### APPENDIX 1: RISK CLASSIFICATION FOR SUBDIVISION AND DEVELOPMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Level</th>
<th>Site Conditions</th>
<th>Information Requirements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Good depth to Groundwater (&gt;5m). Can manage all stormwater onsite via infiltration, with no significant water dependent ecosystems, and no offsite discharge or regional drainage issues. Residential development connected to deep sewerage. Commercial or industrial use connected to deep sewerage or licenced under Part V of the Environmental Protection Act. Low-medium density residential subdivision creating less than four lots. Commercial, Industrial or Rural Residential subdivision applications that create no more than three lots.</td>
<td>Minimum Demonstrate the management of water will be consistent with: State Planning Policy 2.9: Water resources Stormwater management manual for Western Australia Decision process for stormwater management in WA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Depth to Groundwater between 1.2 and 5m. Offsite discharge to local and/or regional drainage system with low environmental risks. Medium acid sulphate soil risk. Residential, commercial and industrial development not connected to deep sewerage. Low-medium density residential subdivision creating four to 20 lots and less than 20ha. Commercial, Industrial or Rural Residential subdivision applications that create no more than 15 lots.</td>
<td>Limited Site assessment to determine management responses in terms of the surrounding (sub) catchment. On site monitoring and demonstration of representative sampling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Maximum Depth to Groundwater (MGL) less than 1.2m below the natural ground surface. Any proposed offsite drainage with potential adverse effects on wetlands or waterways. Contains a floodplain. High acid sulphate soil risk. Contains any part of a conservation category wetland or its buffer. Phosphorus input is likely to exceed 15kg/ha/annum. Nitrogen input is likely to exceed 150kg/ha/annum.</td>
<td>Comprehensive Detailed modelling and investigations. Full BUWM checklist to be addressed in detail.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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></th>
<th>Reports of Councillors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Addendum Agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15. **Motions of which Previous Notice has been given**

**Engineering and Parks Services**

**Engineering Services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference No &amp; Subject:</th>
<th>EP-022/17 Notice of Motion – Footpath connectivity to the new Baldivis Districts Sports Facility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>File No:</td>
<td>GOV/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proponent/s:</td>
<td>Cr Matthew Whitfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author:</td>
<td>Mr Changeeka Jayakody, Coordinator of Planning, Design and Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Contributors:</td>
<td>Mr Om Gupta, Interim Manager Engineering Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Committee Meeting:</td>
<td>20 November 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously before Council:</td>
<td></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>
<tr>
<td>Site:</td>
<td>Lot 4, Lot 103, Lot 104 and Lot 105 Eighty Road, Baldivis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Area:</td>
<td>194,274m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maps/Diagrams:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Purpose of Report**

To provide officer comment and advice to Cr Matthew Whitfield’s Notice of Motion.

**Background**

Cr Matthew Whitfield submitted the following motion for consideration at the November 2017 Council Meeting:

“That Council DIRECTS the CEO to ensure that there is an adequate footpath network that runs along Eighty Road from Safety Bay Road through to the Eighty Road south sports pavilion in time for the practical completion of the Baldivis District Sporting Complex. (practical completion being the 4 ovals and two clubrooms)”.

**Details**

The Baldivis District Sporting Complex is a major City project to be staged over several years. In order to ensure the project meets the needs of the community, the City is undertaking a master planning process.
The Master Plan will inform all the infrastructure requirements for the Baldivis District Sporting Complex including roads, footpaths, lighting, fencing, toilets and park furniture.

The Baldivis District Sporting Complex Master Plan will be an input into the City Business Plan and it is the business plan that ensures funds are allocated to deliver projects in line with Council’s expectations.

### Implications to Consider

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Implication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Consultation with the Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No individual consultation has been undertaken with affected residents regarding footpath connectivity, however detailed consultation will need to be carried out with affected residents as footpath connection projects are identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Consultation with Government Agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Strategic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aspiration C:</strong> Quality Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategic Objective:</strong> Infrastructure- Civic Buildings, sporting facilities, public places and transport infrastructure planned, designed, constructed and maintained using best practice principles and life cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Financial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Master Plan will identify the infrastructure requirements for the Baldivis District Sporting Complex and project estimates will be developed at this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Legal and Statutory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Council decisions are subject to risk assessment according to the City’s Risk Framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implications and comment will only be provided for the following assessed risks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Service / Project management / Environment: High and Extreme Risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance / Personal Health and Safety : Medium, High and Extreme Risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comments

Detailed requirements for additional footpaths to support the Baldivis District Sporting Complex will be identified through the Master Plan.

Council will have an opportunity to review, comment and adjust the Master Plan. It is through this process that concerns with the footpath network can be resolved.

The City’s Business Plan will ensure funds are allocated in the appropriate year to deliver the elements as part of the overall project delivery.

### Voting Requirements

Simple Majority

### Officer Recommendation

That Council **NOT SUPPORTS** Cr Matthew Whitfield’s Notice of Motion.
Notice of Motion from Cr Matthew Whitfield

That Council **DIRECTS** the CEO to ensure that there is an adequate footpath network that runs along Eighty Road from Safety Bay Road through to the Eighty Road south sports pavilion in time for the practical completion of the Baldivis District Sporting Complex.

Committee Recommendation

**Moved Cr Whitfield, seconded Cr Hamblin:**

That Council **DIRECTS** the CEO to ensure that there is an adequate footpath network that runs along Eighty Road from Safety Bay Road through to the Eighty Road south sports pavilion in time for the practical completion of the Baldivis District Sporting Complex.

Committee Voting – 1/4

(Crs Hamblin, Sammels, Summers and Elliott 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
Reference No & Subject: EP-023/17 Notice of Motion – Dredging from the Bent Street Boat Ramp

File No: GOV7
Proponent/s: Cr Lee Downham
Author: Mr Matt Donaldson, Coastal Engineering Officer
Other Contributors: Mr Jerome King, Coordinator Infrastructure and Fleet
Date of Committee Meeting: 20 November 2017
Previously before Council: 20 November 2017
Disclosure of Interest:
Nature of Council’s Role in this Matter: Executive
Site: Lot 24 Arcadia Drive, Safety Bay
Lot Area:
LA Zoning:
MRS Zoning:
Attachments:
Maps/Diagrams:

Purpose of Report
To provide Officer comment and advice on Cr Lee Downham’s Notice of Motion.

Background
Cr Lee Downham submitted the following motion for consideration at the November 2017 Council Meeting:
“That Council DIRECTS the Chief Executive Officer to produce a strategic plan with definitive dates/times/costs that either;
• Reduces significantly the cost of perpetual dredging of the channel; or
• Provides alternate cost effective and more environmentally practical solution than biennial dredging.”

Details
Councillor Downham provided the following comments in support of the Notice of Motion:
“Currently, the cost of dredging the channel from the Bent Street boat ramp exceeds (on average) $300,000 per annum. This is infinite as the City currently has no other alternative solution in place other than to dredge at significant cost to the rate payer.”
Marine infrastructure, by its nature, is impacted by the natural and ongoing movement of sediment (accretion or erosion).

All boat ramps in the City require ongoing maintenance as a result of this movement of sediment which requires sand replenishment at some locations and extraction at other locations.

The dredging and ancillary works to maintain boat ramps are undertaken through consultation with the Marine Infrastructure Advisory Committee (MIAC). MIAC includes representatives of state government agencies, commercial operators and community representatives.

Wherever possible, the City seeks to deposit sand that is removed from one location at another nearby location. This is an environmentally desirable practice and minimises the need to import materials from outside the City.

The provision of boat ramps is desirable service for the community having both recreational, tourism and economic benefits.

The Bent Street boat ramp facility is located on the northern shoreline of Safety Bay. At this location, the Tern Island Sand Bar provides protection and allows the safe operation of boats using this boat ramp. The natural movement of sand around Tern Island restricts access from the boat ramp to the deeper waters of Warnbro Sound.

It is the City’s position that dredging of this material can be undertaken effectively by returning the dredged materials to Warnbro Sound.

To provide safe, formal access, a new 300m x 30m navigation channel was dredged in 2013/2014. This dredging project was fully supported by state agency stakeholders, Department of Biodiversity, Conservation and Attractions (DBCA), Department of Transport and Department of Primary Industries and Regional Development. Despite the agreement to undertake dredging, the DBCA placed restrictions that prevented the materials from being returned to Warnbro Sound.

The Department of Transport contributed 75% towards the total capital cost of the construction of the navigation channel under the Recreational Boating Facilities Scheme (RBFS), with the City contributing $164,682.

The first round of maintenance dredging since the construction of the navigation channel was completed in 2016/2017 at a cost of $313,005.

It is noted that due to circumstances at the time, the planned dredging in 2016/2017 was ended early with only 80% of the planned sand extraction completed. This has resulted in the need to undertake the next round of dredging earlier than would have normally been expected.

### Implications to Consider

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. Consultation with the Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marine Infrastructure Advisory Committee – ongoing consultation with community representatives, boating clubs and groups and state agencies at quarterly committee meetings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b. Consultation with Government Agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department of Biodiversity, Conservation and Attractions, Swan Coastal District – ongoing consultation with Swan Coastal District relating to the navigation channel monitoring and maintenance in accordance with the conditional Deed of Licence (2403/101).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c. Strategic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspiration A: Tourism Lifestyle</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strategic 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 contributes to the City’s reputation as the premier metropolitan coastal tourism destination.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Aspiration B: Strong Community

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.

Aspiration C: Quality Leadership

Strategic 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.

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.

d. Policy
Nil

e. Financial
An amount of $350,000 is proposed in the 2018/2019 Budget for the maintenance dredging of Bent Street Boat Ramp Navigation Channel.

A further $300,000 is budgeted for the removal and disposal of the dredged sand, however it is the City's position that there is a strong argument for the dredged materials to be returned to Warnbro Sound. If approved by the Department of Biodiversity, Conservation and Attractions these funds would not be required.

The City will be seeking funding through the Recreational Boating Facilities Scheme (RBFS) in support of future dredging.

f. Legal and Statutory
On 21 June 2013, the City entered a conditional Deed of Licence (2403/101) with the Department of Parks and Wildlife (DPAW) now known as the Department of Biodiversity, Conservation and Attractions (DBCA) for the initial capital dredging of the navigation channel and future maintenance dredging requirements.

On 8 November 2016, the City entered an amended licence with the Department of Biodiversity, Conservation and Attractions (DBCA) to enter upon and use land in the Shoalwater Islands Marine Park for the purpose of the construction and maintenance of the Bent Street boat ramp dredged navigation channel and ‘one-off’ sand removal works within unnamed reserve 43903 (unofficially known as Tern Island).

g. Risk
All Council decisions are subject to risk assessment according to the City's Risk Framework.

Implications and comment will only be provided for the following assessed risks.

Customer Service / Project management / Environment : High and Extreme Risks
Finance / Personal Health and Safety : Medium, High and Extreme Risks

Nil

Comments
Due to the nature of the City’s foreshore and the location of the Shoalwater Marine Park, both the Point Peron and Bent Street boat ramps require complex arrangements to ensure that the maintenance of these facilities is conducted in an environmentally sustainable manner.

With the recent works at Bent Street boat ramp, it has become necessary to take a proactive approach with the Department of Biodiversity, Conservation and Attractions to ensure that the future maintenance activities, such as dredging can be undertaken in a practical and cost effective manner whilst balancing the environmental impacts on the marine park. This will require high level discussions between the City, the DBCA and other key stakeholders.

These discussions will also influence the maintenance practices for the City’s other boat ramps.
In addition, the City is currently reviewing its service model for boat ramp maintenance and the outcomes of these reviews will be tabled with the Marine Infrastructure Committee in order to obtain consensus on proposals for improvements and maintenance to boat ramps. The outcomes of the MIAC discussions in relation to the ongoing maintenance of boat ramps will be provided to Council for endorsement.

Voting Requirements
Simple Majority

Officer Recommendation
That Council NOT SUPPORTS Cr Lee Downham’s Notice of Motion.

Notice of Motion from Cr Lee Downham
That Council DIRECTS the Chief Executive Officer to produce a strategic plan with definitive dates/times/costs that either;

- Reduces significantly the cost of perpetual dredging of the channel; or
- Provides alternate cost effective and more environmentally practical solution than biennial dredging.

Due to the absence of Cr Downham, in accordance with Standing Orders the Notice of Motion will be referred direct to Council without Committee recommendation.
**Purpose of Report**
To provide Officer comment and advice on Cr Lee Downham’s Notice of Motion.

**Background**

Cr Lee Downham submitted the following motion for consideration at the November 2017 Council Meeting:

“That Council DIRECTS the CEO place appropriate signs around the children’s/toddlers play areas in Steel Tree Park to prevent dogs from entering the play areas. The signs must make clear that dogs are prohibited from entering the children’s play area and that owners are responsible. The sign must also (if applicable) detail any penalty if this action is breached.”

**Details**
The City has 195 playgrounds that are installed with sand soft fall areas to reduce the likelihood of injury.

Soft fall requires regular maintenance to remove foreign material, but is also highly susceptible to contaminants such as animal excrement.
In addition to the maintenance issues, there have been a number of complaints from parents who have observed dogs within play areas. This situation has the potential to put children at risk from dogs that may be boisterous or play ‘rough’ in these situations.

The City’s Compliance and Emergency Liaison (CEL) team have already commenced a survey of parks across the City and organising the installation of signs as shown in Figure 1.

![Dogs Prohibited In Playground](image)

1. Dogs Prohibited In Playground

The signs do not contain the words; ‘owners’, as this would create implications where the person in control of the dog is not the owner. Additionally the penalty is not displayed on the sign; however the words ‘Penalties apply’ will be included. This is to mitigate the large workload created when the penalty amount changes (noting that there is potentially 600 signs around the City).

The CEL team has inspected nine sites including Steel Tree Park prior to this Notice of Motion. The result of these inspections was the installation of 29 signs. Including four signs prohibiting dogs to the playground at Steel Tree Park. These have been installed by the City’s Asset Maintenance team in early November 2017.

### Implications to Consider

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a.</th>
<th>Consultation with the Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b.</th>
<th>Consultation with Government Agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nil</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c.</th>
<th>Strategic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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:** Tourism Lifestyle

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

**Aspiration C:** Quality Leadership
**Strategic 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**
Nil

e. **Financial**
The installation of four signs at Steel Tree Park cost $640.

f. **Legal and Statutory**
Nil

g. **Risk**
All Council decisions are subject to risk assessment according to the City's Risk Framework.
Implications and comment will only be provided for the following assessed risks.
- Customer Service / Project management / Environment : High and Extreme Risks
- Finance / Personal Health and Safety : Medium, High and Extreme Risks

Nil

**Comments**

The City’s Compliance and Emergency Liaison (CEL) team are completing a survey of parks and organising the installation of similar signs across the City.

Now that the signs are installed in a number of locations, the CEL team will be educating and enforcing the prohibition of dogs within playgrounds.

**Voting Requirements**

Simple Majority

**Officer Recommendation**

That Council **NOT SUPPORTS** Cr Lee Downham’s Notice of Motion.

**Notice of Motion from Cr Lee Downham**

That Council **DIRECTS** the CEO place appropriate signs around the children’s/toddlers play areas in Steel Tree Park to prevent dogs from entering the play areas. The signs must make clear that dogs are prohibited from entering the children’s play area and that owners are responsible. The sign must also (if applicable) detail any penalty if this action is breached.

**Due to the absence of Cr Downham, in accordance with Standing Orders the Notice of Motion will be referred direct to Council without Committee recommendation.**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Notices of Motion for Consideration at the Following Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urgent Business Approved by the Person Presiding or by Decision of the Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Matters Behind Closed Doors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date and Time of Next Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The next Planning and Engineering Services Committee Meeting will be held on <strong>Monday 11 December 2017</strong> in the Council Boardroom, Council Administration Building, Civic Boulevard, Rockingham. The meeting will commence at 4:00pm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Closure</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>4:52pm</strong>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>