



TOWN OF CLAREMONT

ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING

MINUTES

TUESDAY 2 APRIL 2019

Liz Ledger

CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER

Date: 3-4-19

DISCLAIMER

Would all members of the public please note that they are cautioned against taking any action as a result of a Council decision tonight until such time as they have seen a copy of the Minutes or have been advised, in writing, by the Council's Administration with regard to any particular decision.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ITEM	SUBJECT	PAGE NO
1	DECLARATION OF OPENING/ANNOUNCEMENT OF VISITORS	2
2	RECORD OF ATTENDANCE/APOLOGIES/LEAVE OF ABSENCE	2
3	DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS	2
4	RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS PUBLIC QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE .	3
5	PUBLIC QUESTION TIME	10
6	PUBLIC STATEMENT TIME	12
7	APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE	13
8	PETITIONS/DEPUTATIONS/PRESENTATIONS	13
8.1	PETITION NOT TO SEGRAGATE THE NEWLY EXTENDED OFF-LEAD AREA AT LAKE CLAREMONT PARKLAND	13
9	CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS	13
10	ANNOUNCEMENT OF CONFIDENTIAL MATTERS FOR WHICH MEETING MAY BE CLOSED TO THE PUBLIC	13
11	BUSINESS NOT DEALT WITH FROM A PREVIOUS MEETING	13
12	REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.....	14
12.1	FRESHWATER BAY MUSEUM ADVISORY COMMITTEE	14
12.1.1	NOTICE OF MOTION - FRESHWATER BAY MUSEUM ADVISORY COMMITTEE	14
13	REPORTS OF THE CEO.....	23
14	ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PRESIDING PERSON.....	23
15	ELECTED MEMBERS' MOTIONS OF WHICH PREVIOUS NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN.....	23
16	NEW BUSINESS OF AN URGENT NATURE APPROVED BY THE PERSON PRESIDING OR BY DECISION OF MEETING	23
17	CONFIDENTIAL MATTERS FOR WHICH THE MEETING MAY BE CLOSED TO THE PUBLIC	23
18	FUTURE MEETINGS OF COUNCIL	23
19	DECLARATION OF CLOSURE OF MEETING	24

TOWN OF CLAREMONT
ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING
2 APRIL 2019
MINUTES

1 DECLARATION OF OPENING/ANNOUNCEMENT OF VISITORS

His worship the Mayor, Jock Barker, welcomed members of the public, press, staff and Councillors, and declared the meeting open at 7:01pm.

2 RECORD OF ATTENDANCE/APOLOGIES/LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mayor Jock Barker	Town of Claremont
Cr Bruce Haynes	East Ward
Cr Kate Main	East Ward
Cr Alastair Tulloch	East Ward
Cr Chris Mews	South Ward
Cr Jill Goetze	South Ward
Cr Paul Kelly	South Ward
Cr Peter Browne OAM, JP	West Ward
Cr Peter Edwards	West Ward
Cr Sara Franklyn	West Ward

Ms Liz Ledger (Chief Executive Officer)
Mr Les Crichton (Director Corporate and Governance)
Mr Andrew Smith (Director Infrastructure)
Ms Cathy Bohdan (Director People and Places)
Ms Katie Bovell (Governance Officer)

Twenty one members of the Public
Two members of the Press

APOLOGIES

Mr David Vinicombe (Director Planning and Development)

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

NIL

3 DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS

NIL

4 RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS PUBLIC QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE

Mr Don Frayne, 3A Walter Street, Claremont WA 6010
Re: Proactive Removal of Queensland Box Tree.

Question 1(a)

The response does not address the question, namely "is there any empirical evidence to show the reticulation is insufficient and that hand watering is needed?" Instead I get ambiguous or misleading statements e.g. saying that new plants require considerable water in the early stages of planting. I suggest that there must be some underlying factor at work as plants keep dying even if watered. So, I repeat, is there any empirical evidence that supports the claim that reticulation is insufficient?

Response

There is considerable evidence from across a wide range of sources that advocate hand watering for trees in their early stages, so as to ensure that they get the amount of water required.

Fields of expertise including fruit growers, tree plantations and public authorities all of whom extensively use hand watering to assist their trees to establish.

Once trees are considered to be established many (particularly in large scale horticultural facilities and farms) are transferred to reticulation or drip feed systems as the water required is far lower and the trees have established root systems.

Hypothetically an irrigation system could generate the water required similar to that of hand watering, however it would have to be purpose built to generate this volume of water and would require a considerable amount of water over the period in which the tree is to be established.

Question 1(b)

Please advise the dates of planting of the trees at 26 and 28 Walter Street. Please compare rate of the growth trees of the age of the ones at 26 and 28 Walter Street to other jacaranda trees of the same age without reticulation to ascertain if there are different rates of growth and survival and advise me of the result

Response

In 2009 an advanced transplant of a 5m+ Jacaranda was undertaken by owner of 28 at their expense. They maintained and watered it following its planting.

The Two trees at 26 Walter Street were installed sometime around 2013 by the adjacent property owner, information relating to this is not current held in the Town's records.

Question 2 Failure Rate

The answer is circuitous- on one hand it states that the Town is constantly reviewing processes to see why tree losses are being sustained and then in the next breath states that there is no obvious solution which is the town is aware that would dramatically change the rate of losses.

To say it is incorrect of me to describe it as repetitive is to ignore reality that the council is doing the same thing over and over again with similar poor results.

So, please explain to me how reviewing the practices yet doing the same thing is not repetitive? Please provide me with the copies of last 3 reviews

Response

Provision of this information is not provided for in documents that would be considered in the public domain, are contained in Council minutes or agendas or are otherwise publicly available.

Copies of this information may be requested through the use of the Freedom of Information process.

A link to the relevant section of the Town of Claremont website in respect to Freedom of Information applications is provided below;

<https://www.claremont.wa.gov.au/MediaLibrary/TownOfClaremont/Documents/Freedom-of-Information-Application-for-website.pdf>

Question 2(b)

Why is there no analysis of the data collected- that is at least a start?

Response

It is unclear as to why the assumption has been made that no analysis of data takes place, or if this influences decisions made in respect to street tree plantings. Whilst data is collected and used to inform such matters, it is only part of the process, which also includes the Street Tree Masterplan and the opinion of the Council as it might apply from time to time.

Question 2(c)

Has the town been considered better to plant younger plants that need less water and suffer less plant shock?

Response

It is unclear as to why it is assumed that younger trees suffer less plant shock, however street tree losses are not restricted to young trees only, and we have also seen more mature trees with well-established root systems suddenly succumb to the rapid onset of disease.

Question 3(a) Walkability

I am not asking for much evidence-based decision but isn't this "definition" entirely subjective?

Response

The definition provided is one that is accepted across a range of field including town planning, urban design and architecture. Previously a definition was requested as to what walkability meant, this was provided.

Question 3(b)

Why cannot the mess caused by the box trees be described as decreasing the walkability of the place and that jacaranda lined streets as increasing the walkability?

Response

This theory could be considered in determining walkability or in terms of influencing the types of trees suitable for high volume pedestrian areas.

Question 3(c)

What source was the "generally accepted definition" drawn from- what tangible factors make a place friendly to walking?

Response

Walkability is not an unusual term nor is it one that is uncommonly used. Most every Town and City Centre strategy considers walkability in respect to its pedestrian network and the function of its public realm.

It is assumed that the definition of walkability is perhaps not agreed with, however this is not something that the Town can resolve as the application of this term and it is generally understood meaning is accepted across a wide range of professional fields.

Ms Judy Paish – 2 Deakin Street, Swanbourne WA 6010.

Re: Swanbourne Local Centre Planning Study.

Questions relating to the Swanbourne Local Centre Planning Study

At the 18.12.2018 Council meeting, I asked various questions about the Swanbourne Local Centre Planning Study (SLCPS) and the Congdon Street Bridge. These were "taken on notice". On the Agenda for the next meeting on 5.2.2019, all my questions from 18.12.18, were answered, however they were not included in the Minutes.

Question 1

Could my questions and the answers be included in the Minutes for this meeting, (19.3.19) please?

Response

The answers to your questions at Council on 18.12.18 printed in the Agenda for the Council meeting on 5.2.19 were inadvertently omitted from the minutes. The Council minutes of that meeting are to be amended to accurately reflect the answers provided in the Agenda.

Question 2

Will Swanbourne residents, ratepayers and business proprietors be advised every time there is a change in the plans for the Swanbourne Local Centre?

Response

Council is to review the comments made on the Draft SLCPS and consider any necessary modifications to the Study to progress the matter. These changes will not be publically advertised for further comment but will be included in the Agenda for the relevant Council meeting. Any person who made comments on the Draft SLCPS will be advised of the report and its recommendations, and be given to opportunity to address the changes and report recommendations at the Council meeting. Once the SLCPS has been adopted, the facilitating Local Planning Scheme Amendment and Local Planning Framework documents (Local Planning Policies and Local Development Plans) will be prepared and advertised for further public comment to local residents businesses and ratepayers as part of their adoption processes.

The plan on page 68 is meant to show the areas that are proposed as 2 storey, 4 storey, streetscape protection, the laneway plaza, and the Residential Transition Area.

The plan on page 68 is poorly coloured in, but appears to show 4 storeys on Claremont Crescent and Franklin Street.

Also, there is no streetscape protection area around the Residential Transition Area.

Question 3

Would Council provide an accurate, easily “readable”, plan of that on page 68, please. This is an extremely important part of the Study, and is needed for accurate comments on the SLCPS before Tuesday, 26 March 2019.

Response

Two-storey (red hatching) and four-storey (marron hatching) look similar on the plan but are identifiable via the legend along with the Streetscape Protection Area. This is in part due to the black and white aerial photography base to add context to the plan. The 3D illustrations on the following pages (p.69-70) provide the necessary clarify the building height proposals. No streetscape protection Area is proposed for the northern portion of Franklyn Street and Rob Roy Street as these areas are not proposed for Mixed Use (Residential and Commercial) and is identified as a Residential Transition Area with specific design controls to apply to manage the transition to the adjacent residential zones.

Question 4

Page 41 in Council Minutes 20 November 2018, states “The plan proposes up to four storey developmentfacing Claremont Crescent and Franklin Street....” Can this happen where there is no heritage façade on these streets?

Response

As per the full statement (above) in Council minutes dated 20.11.18, “the plan proposes up to four storey development (2-3 storeys above the existing heritage shops) fronting Claremont Crescent and Franklin Street (setback behind the heritage facades) and further setback to reduce impacts on Saladin Street.” This will not apply to the Parking and Access Areas or the Residential Transition Area shown on pg. 68 (Figure 25) of the Study, however as per the details contained on Figure 25, it will also apply in the same way to 105-115 Claremont Crescent (Lot 43) which is contained in the Local Government Inventory Claremont Crescent Commercial Heritage Precinct (but not of specific heritage significance due to its more recent construction).

Question 5

Will there be 4 storeys anywhere on Claremont Crescent and Franklin Street, built to the street boundary i.e. right beside the footpath?

Response

No. The 4m wide Streetscape Protection Area limits height within 4m of the property boundary.

Question 6

Will there be 2 storeys anywhere on Franklin Street, or Rob Roy Street, built to the street boundary, i.e. right beside the footpath?

Response

Residential buildings facing Rob Roy Street will be required to comply with setbacks as per the R50 density code, which requires a 2m primary and secondary street setbacks. Mixed Use development on the corner of Franklin Street and Claremont Crescent has a 4m wide ‘Streetscape Protection Area’ to reduce the impacts of development on the streetscapes.

Question 7

For the buildings on Rob Roy Street to be set back 2 metres from Rob Roy Street, would this 2 metres consist of the verge and footpath?

Response

No. The 2m setback is taken from the front boundary and is in addition to the verge area.

Question 8

If so, would the total possible number of apartments over the whole proposal (including the Residential Transition Area) be approximately 560 units with possibly 1,000 residents? (using average apartment = 75 square metres.) Businesses would possibly need smaller spaces.

Response

The initial development yield calculations contained in the Council report dated 20.11.18 were based on an R50 coding using the current R-Codes. Given the

R-Codes have now been reviewed and will take effect on 24.05.19, revised density proposals (including related plot ratios) will need to be clarified in the final report to Council on Draft SLCPS. It is noted that the Draft SLCPS provide for 10,350m² of residential building envelopes. When the plot ratios applicable to the low rise residential R50 (0.7) and an R80 (1.0) Neighbourhood Centre are applied, the total residential development area is reduced 6080m² (approx.). Based on an average area of 75m² per dwelling, the resultant development yield may increase to 81 dwellings. It is noted however that taking into account the building envelope height and setback requirements (including the proposed Parking and Access Areas) together with other building massing requirements (as detailed in the new Apartment Design Guidelines), the total yield expectations are likely to be reduced further.

Question 9

If not, what is the possible number of apartments?

Response

Based on land area and the above revised calculations taking into account the new Apartment Guidelines, the likely development outcome is around 80 dwellings.

Question 10

Why is a Special Control Area needed for this proposed development?

Response

The Study includes a number of options for implementation, including a Special Control Area, which would allow the Town to differentiate Swanbourne from the more general Local Centre controls within the Local Planning Scheme provisions.

Thank you for the personally addressed letter that my husband and I received, dated 25th January 2019, informing us that the Draft Swanbourne Local Centre Planning Study (SLCPS) is available for public comment.

Question 11

How many letters were sent to property owners, residents and business proprietors North of Stirling Highway and West of Stirling Road, informing them that the SLCPS was available for viewing and comment?

Response

1721 letters were posted.

Question 12

If Game Planning Australia is to do more work for the Town of Claremont, could they please number ALL pages, and in larger, black numbers for easier reading.

Response

Noted.

Question 13

Figure 7, page 14, shows the population of Swanbourne in the 2016 census. What is the area of Swanbourne in Figure 7?

Response

All of the Swanbourne suburb, noting that parts of the suburb of Swanbourne are not located within Claremont.

Question 14

Could Game Planning Australia also check that page numbers correspond with page content, as, in the Table of Contents, (page 3), pages numbered 93 to 98 of the SLCPS do not correspond with the correct Attachment? Also, Attachment 3 is missing (Open House Image Panels), so that the following Amendments are incorrectly numbered.

Response

The final version of the SLCPS to be adopted by Council will address this matter.

Question 15

4.2 Summary of The Open House” and Online Survey Findings, (pages 48 to 50).

When applying the population of? 2,800 to the attendance of 40 people at the Open House, this is 1.43% of 2,800 people. When applying the population of? 2,800 to the responses of 67 people to the survey, this is 2.4% of 2,800 people. When these figures are applied to 13% of the 67 respondents to the survey, this is 9 people from 2,800 people. And when 72 % of the 67 respondents are mentioned, this is 48 people of 2,800 people. And when only 16% of respondents preferred office space, this is 11 people of 2,800 people which is 0.39% of 2,800 people. Are these figures enough to warrant new large development at Swanbourne?

Response

The above response figures relate to the public engagement (not consultation) strategy employed by the consultant to gauge community responses and aspirations prior to considering formulation of the Draft SLCPS proposals. They are not intended to determine the level of support or otherwise for those proposals, which will be considered as part of the final determination by Council on the Study.

The development proposals earmarked in the Draft Study also take into account other factors such as the Local Centre’s strategic location adjacent to a train station and its identification under the State Government’s strategic planning document “Perth and Peel @ 3.5 million” as a Station Precinct. One of the purposes of the Study is address the State Government’s strategic directions for all Station precincts to promote and facilitate public transport

use, capitalise on the investment made in public transport infrastructure, encourage spatial development patterns that make it easier to both operate and access public transport, create transit stations as destinations, ensure the development of complementary land uses around transit stations and establish high levels of amenity, safety and permeability of urban form. Although no specific densities for development are articulated for Station precincts in “Perth and Peel @ 3.5million”, planning to increase residential densities surrounding railway stations is an expectation of the State Government. The Town, in proactively preparing the Draft SLCPS is intended to propose a statutory framework to guide development at a density appropriate to the locality.

Question 16

When “residents and visitors” are mentioned, are these the 67 respondents to the survey, as it seems to imply ALL 2,800 residents?

Response

The reference is to the 67 respondents only.

Question 17

How much did the Swanbourne Local Centre Planning Study (SLCPS) that Game Planning Australia carried out, cost the Council?

Response

Inclusive of the recent public consultation process for the Draft SLCPS, the total spending for the Study is well under the allocated budget of \$46,000.

5 PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

**Ms Judy Paish, 2 Deakin Street, Swanbourne.
Re: Swanbourne Local Centre Planning Study.**

Questions relating to the SLCPS

There are some misleading statements and figures in the Draft Swanbourne Local Centre Planning Study (SLCPS)

1. Behind the shops, ground level is up to 4 metres higher, than Claremont Crescent, so 4 storey buildings behind the shops, could appear to be 4 metres higher, that is, over 1 storey higher.

In photo A, a line is drawn approximating the height of 4 storey buildings at Claremont Crescent footpath level. Any 4 storey building built behind the present shops, could be 4 metres higher than this line, which means they could be nearly the same height as the top of the mast, as 3 metres is equivalent to 1 storey.

Q1. How high is the top of the mast, measured from the footpath at Claremont Crescent?

2. No West to East Cross-Section Is Shown.

It is very misleading that, in the “Built Form Modelling – Cross Section (as in Figures 19-22, pages 53-56)” the 4 cross-sections are only North to South, and none are showing from West to East. The contour plan (as in Figure 4, page 14) does not show any contour from the corner of West Coast Highway and Claremont Crescent (where the Service Station is - See photo B) eastwards towards Saladin Street. Presuming that the contour line at this corner is less than 20 metres, and that the 34m contour line on the East side of Rob Roy Lane, is where the 4 storey building is proposed, this means there is at least a 14 (fourteen) metre height difference at ground level which is nearly the equivalent of a 5 storey building.

To then build a 4 storey building on top of that, would be completely overwhelming and out of scale with the Claremont Crescent Commercial Heritage Precinct.

Q2. Would Council please request Game Planning Australia (GPA) to provide a “Built Form Modelling – Cross Section from the west side of the corner of West Coast Highway and Claremont Crescent, through the 34m and 33m contour lines on the East side of Rob Roy Lane where the 4 storey building is proposed, to the East side of Saladin Street, to accurately determine the height difference at ground level between these two positions.

3. A Contour map is needed, similar to Figure 4 page 14.

Q3. Would Council please request Game Planning Australia (GPA) to provide a contour map similar to Figure 4 page 14, showing the contours from the west side of the corner of West Coast Highway and Claremont Crescent, to the East side of Saladin Street, including 2.

Claremont Crescent and the railway line, to accurately determine the height difference at ground level between the west side of the corner of West Coast Highway and Claremont Crescent and the 34m and 33m contour lines, on the East side of Rob Roy Lane where the 4 storey building is proposed. (See photo C).

4. In the Summary and Frequently Asked Questions, which was sent to 1,721 residents, owners and business proprietors, it states: “With the “Perth and Peel @ 3.5 Million” objectives in mind, and interest being shown by a number of property owners in the Swanbourne Local Centre ,for the exploration of opportunities to develop a mini TOD in the precinct.....”

Q4. Who were the property owners?

5. Misleading statements in 4.2 Summary Of “Open House” And Online Survey Findings. In built form, page 49, “.the highest positive response rate (76%)...”

This reads as if it is 76% of all residents of Swanbourne.

Q5. Is this the response of the respondents? if so, this equals only 50 people out of 3,000.**

6. Also, there is another misleading reference, being “residents and visitors”, such as on page 46 “...97% of residents and visitors” feel safe in the area. This reads as if 97% of ALL residents of Swanbourne feel safe.

Q6. Who are the “residents and visitors” who are mentioned 6 times? Are they the 67 respondents or the 40 visitors? If so, this 97% of respondents is 65 or 39 people respectively, out of 3,000**.

**This population of possibly 3,000 is based on 1,721 letters being sent out to residents, owners and business proprietors, to advise that the Draft SLCPS was available for review and also based on an average of 2.8 people per household) (1721 x 2.8 = 4,819 presumably of all ages, so it is presumed that there are approximately 3000 adults aged 20 years and older).

7. A misleading statement on page 2 is that the Beaumont Retirement Village is 3/4 storeys high. The underground basement is being counted as one storey, whereas the Beaumont Retirement Village is 1 to 3 storeys above the ground level and is considerably lower than most of the proposed development. See 18th December 2018 – Council Minutes (after A 20) for more details. (See photo D).

Q7. Would Council please ensure that Game Planning Australia corrects these misleading statements in their report to Council?

Answer: The Mayor took the questions on notice.

**Emeritus Professor Jenny Gregory, 39 Loch Street, Claremont.
Re: Item 12.1.1, Notice of Motion - Freshwater Bay Museum Advisory Committee.**

Q1. Has the Council obtained the advice of an expert in Museum conservation?

Q2. Has the Council obtained advice on the location of the new toilets to ensure access for the elderly and disabled and school children?

Answer: The Mayor took the questions on notice.

6 PUBLIC STATEMENT TIME

**Dr Ricki Hewitt, 28 Goldsmith Road, Claremont.
Re: Item 12.1.1, Notice of Motion - Freshwater Bay Museum Advisory Committee.**

Dr Hewitt spoke in favour of the Committee recommendation.

**Ms Rosemary Hunter, 7a Melville Street, Claremont.
Re: Item 12.1.1, Notice of Motion - Freshwater Bay Museum Advisory Committee.**

Ms Hunter spoke in favour of the Committee recommendation.

Mr Tim Graham-Taylor, 30 Megalong Street, Nedlands.
Re: Item 12.1.1, Notice of Motion - Freshwater Bay Museum Advisory Committee.

Mr Graham-Taylor spoke in favour of the Committee recommendation.

Ms Judy Paish, 2 Deakin Street, Swanbourne.
Re: Swanbourne Local Centre Planning Study.

Ms Paish commented on some of her concerns regarding the Swanbourne Local Centre Planning Study.

7 APPLICATIONS FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Moved Cr Main, seconded Cr Mews

That Leave of Absence be granted for Cr Haynes from 29 August 2019 to 16 September 2019.

**CARRIED(32/19)
(NO DISSENT)**

8 PETITIONS/DEPUTATIONS/PRESENTATIONS

8.1 PETITION NOT TO SEGRAGATE THE NEWLY EXTENDED OFF-LEAD AREA AT LAKE CLAREMONT PARKLAND

Moved Cr Browne, seconded Cr Main

That the petition be received.

**CARRIED(33/19)
(NO DISSENT)**

9 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

Moved Cr Kelly, seconded Cr Franklyn

That the minutes of the Ordinary Meeting of Council held on [19 March 2019](#) be confirmed.

**CARRIED(34/19)
(NO DISSENT)**

10 ANNOUNCEMENT OF CONFIDENTIAL MATTERS FOR WHICH MEETING MAY BE CLOSED TO THE PUBLIC

NIL

11 BUSINESS NOT DEALT WITH FROM A PREVIOUS MEETING

NIL

12 REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

12.1 FRESHWATER BAY MUSEUM ADVISORY COMMITTEE

12.1.1 NOTICE OF MOTION - FRESHWATER BAY MUSEUM ADVISORY COMMITTEE

File ref:	GOV/00050
Attachment:	<u>Notice of Motion Report (extract from Minutes 14 March 2019 Freshwater Bay Museum Advisory Committee)</u>
Responsible Officer:	Liz Ledger Chief Executive Officer
Author:	Cathy Bohdan Director Peoples and Places
Proposed Meeting Date:	2 April 2019

Purpose

For the Council to consider issues raised by the Freshwater Bay Museum Advisory Committee on the proposed Museum community facility redevelopment project.

Background

The Freshwater Bay Museum Advisory Committee (FBMAC) at its 14 March 2019 meeting considered a Notice of Motion (refer attachment) and resolved;

1. The following issues related to the proposed new Freshwater Bay Museum facilities project be urgently addressed:

- the location and adequacy of the toilet facilities dedicated to Museum use.*
- the 'meet and greet' reception space.*
- the extent of glass in the exhibition area of the new building*
- the feasibility of using the existing "education buildings" for storage space and other purposes.*

2. Further consultation be undertaken with stakeholders and specialist Museum advisors, including Freshwater Bay Museum staff, Friends of Freshwater Bay Museum and the community to address any areas of concern, prior to detailed design plans being presented to Council for approval.

3. Museum programs and activities be reopened on-site until detailed design plans for the Museum facilities redevelopment project have been approved, tenders for construction signed off and a commencement date established.

Discussion

The development of a new community facility at the Museum site commenced in November 2015 with the presentation to Council of a Museum Briefing Paper. This document highlighted the potential safety concerns and inadequacies of the on-site

shed that was being used for public programs. This led to the implementation of a consultation strategy and planning process to enable the project to get to its current point of detailed design phase.

Please see Table 1 below for a timeline summary of events from planning, to concept design and detailed design.

Table 1: Museum Site Community Facility - Summary of Process

DATE	PROCESS
November 2015	'Freshwater Bay Museum Briefing Paper' was provided to Council detailing the current status of the Museum, how it has developed over the years, and highlighted the strengths and weaknesses of the current structure.
December 2016 – March 2017	Extensive consultation to develop a Future Directions Plan; including a community survey, teacher's survey, Volunteer, Museum Committee and Friends of the Museum workshops.
June 2016	At its meeting held on 21 June 2016, Council endorsed the Freshwater Bay Museum's 'Future Directions Plan 2016-2020'. This document was created through stakeholder consultation, and research to support and guide the Museum into the medium-term future, which included the need for a community facility.
July/August 2016	Officers identified and worked with Museum stakeholders, including Freshwater Bay Museum Advisory Committee select members to develop the Expressions of Interest (EOI) Document seeking a consultant/s to create the 'Facility Development Plan'.
September 2016	Hames Sharley was appointed to undertake the concept design. Museum Committee, Council and Friends were consulted through the development process.
March 2017	At its meeting held on 21 March 2017, Council endorsed the Freshwater Bay Museum Facility Development Concept Plan and supported the application of a Lotterywest grant to fund the shortfall of the project.
June 2017	Lotterywest funding for \$760K approved.
July/August 2017	A Request for Quotation was advertised seeking a consultant to develop the detailed design for the Museum redevelopment.
August 2017	Sandover Pinder appointed for detailed design

September 2017	Application for change in boundary submitted to Department of Planning, Land and Heritage (DPLH) to allow any works to occur at the site.
October 2017	While working through the detailed design, Sandover Pinder has identified some new options for the site, including an alternate entrance and proposed a second option for the placement of the Community Facility building.
November 2017	Elected Members briefed on Redevelopment progress, including the option of the alternate site for the Community Facility.
December 2017	Redevelopment update presented to Museum Advisory Committee, including the option of the alternate site for the Community Facility.
December 2017 January 2018	Carabiner (formerly Sandover Pinder) finalising detailed design on Conservation Building. Community Facility detailed design on hold pending further consultation.
March 2018	As per Council resolution, Director People and Places presented the Freshwater Bay Museum Redevelopment risks and benefits of both site options to the Freshwater Bay Museum Advisory Committee. From this they raised concerns about design.
April 2018	Due to concerns raised by the Committee as it's 8 th March meeting the Town's officers arranged a workshop with Committee members facilitated by Carabiner to work through their design concerns which were: Size of meet and greet area Toilet design Extent of glass in the new building. Design changes were made to reflect this feedback.
May 2018	CEO and Director People and Places presented updated design from additional architect workshop at Elected Member Forum.
June 2018	At the 14 June Freshwater Bay Museum Advisory Committee meeting updated plans, including suggested design changes from the April workshop, were presented to the committee with informal feedback from some committee members with still not being satisfied.
June 2018	At its meeting held on the 19 June Council endorsed Carabiner to commence on detailed design option 2.

November 2018	At the 29 November Freshwater Bay Museum Advisory Committee meeting, Director People and Places provided an update on the project, specifically the land extension. At this point some Committee members raised their concerns with the design and sought advice on how to stop the detailed design that was approved by Council. Administration advised that a Notice of Motion would need to be raised.
March 2018	At the 14 March Freshwater Bay Museum Advisory Committee meeting - Notice of Motion was raised.

Discussion

The Freshwater Bay Museum Advisory Committee (FBMAC) at its 14 March 2019 meeting considered a Notice of Motion and resolved three main points, which are detailed below with responses from the Town's Administration.

Point 1: The following issues related to the proposed new Freshwater Bay Museum facilities project be urgently addressed:

- *the location and adequacy of the toilet facilities dedicated to Museum use.*
- *the 'meet and greet' reception space.*
- *the extent of glass in the exhibition area of the new building*
- *the feasibility of using the existing "education buildings" for storage space and other purposes.*

This point raised by the FBMAC relates to three elements of the design being: toilets, customer entry point and the use of glass in the design. It also includes the repurposing of the old existing shed.

With respect to the toilets and the customer entry point these are items that were considered and discussed in length over the duration of the project. They were raised at the initial consultation (along with many other items to consider such as a café, larger conservation area, staff facilities and separate volunteer offices), and then prioritised in order of importance to all stakeholders so that the project could continue within the budget allocation.

With some adjustments to the design and final location of the new building along the way, this allowed for some modifications and improvements to both the toilets and the customer entry points, the details of which are expanded on below.

Toilets

Option 2 concept design was endorsed by Council in June 2018 as it allowed for the Community Facility Building to be placed in an alternative location, above the ablution block which supported a greater connection between the building and the toilet facilities. This was seen as advantageous connecting the 2 facilities to provide improved security between the facilities and reduce duplication of such facilities.

The current design includes a Universal Access Toilet (UAT) in the new building, with stairs to lead directly under the new building to access a further 3 x female, 2 x male and 1 x UAT ablutions.

While the request of an additional toilet on the site was explored when request by the FBMAC back in November 2018, it was not supported due to the requirement for an increased building footprint resulting in further cost considerations which are estimated to be between \$100,000 to \$150,000 for redesign and construction.

Meet and Greet

The original concept design provided by Hames Sharley allowed for a customer walkway entry only, not a dedicated Customer Entry Point. At the request of the FBMAC, the architects redesigned the front area to allow for a dedicated customer area at the front of the facility. This resulted in moving the existing toilets from the front of the facility into the new building (where a UAT was added) and allowed for a customer window. FBMAC requested that this design be reviewed again where the window progressed to a small customer walk in area, which has added an additional unbudgeted cost the project of over \$5,000 in redesign fees.

The design of this area has been redesigned several times, any further change to this would be considerable, including increased footprint and potential reduction of storage space already allocated in the office building, which has always been a concern throughout this project.

Extent of glass in the new building

Extent of glass in the community facility building has also been previously addressed in detail. The south facing windows have limited exposure to direct sunlight (possible early morning and late afternoon winter sunlight), and in addition to this the architects have given consideration to a specification of UV suitable glass and coverings for these windows.

The windows are considered to be a design feature of the facility, allowing river views when the coverings are open.

Using existing shed for storage space and other purposes

This option was already considered previously and is being supported. One of the major benefits of the current design is that it gives the Museum the opportunity to retain the existing shed (formerly used as the education kitchen and converted cart shed), with the possibility of renovating this space for use as on-site storage and other Museum purposes.

Point 2: Further consultation be undertaken with stakeholders and specialist Museum advisors, including Freshwater Bay Museum staff, Friends of Freshwater Bay Museum and the community to address any areas of concern, prior to detailed design plans being presented to Council for approval.

There has been extensive consultation on this project to date, which can be seen through the project timeline in Table 1. This has included Museum users, Museum volunteers, Friends of the Museum, Town Officers, Museum Advisory Committee, Architects and Council.

Although the project has been exempted from requiring a Development Approval (DA) by the Western Australian Planning Commission, consultation with stakeholders

on the project is proposed once detailed designs (including the car park) are available.

Point 3: Museum programs and activities be reopened on-site until detailed design plans for the Museum facilities redevelopment project have been approved, tenders for construction signed off and a commencement date established.

Returning staff to the Museum site is not possible for a number of reasons, but predominantly because it will soon be a construction site. In addition, just for re-establishing the IT network would come at a cost of \$10,000 and take up to 6 weeks, along with the risk of the IT network infrastructure being damaged during the construction phase.

Office equipment and other associated costs now and then again when the building is complete would financially disadvantage the Town.

It is important to note that the Museum Programs are still operating during the site closure, and the complement of staff still fully employed as they undertake the following duties:

- Vital deaccessioning work, which has taken approximately 18 months to date, and is still progressing. This is as a result of the Collection not being afforded the time to complete this work until now.
- Education programs (these have been adjusted during the building closure to be 'Incursions', where the staff deliver the program in the schools. These are all booked out for Term 1).
- Public Programs (same number of History in a Coffee Cup events being held as previously but with larger numbers of attendees as the various alternative venues have supported bigger audiences).
- Planning the internal spaces in the Museum building which includes new interpretive zone and re-installation of the school room (which is the main interpretive display, and from which one of the education programs is run).

In summary, The Town has worked collaboratively with stakeholders to deliver the best outcome possible for the broader community within the defined budget allocation. The advice from the FBMAC has been addressed at several points along the project process, and to accommodate these proposals would be at a further financial cost and risks to the Town.

Therefore, the Committee's recommendations are not supported.

Past Resolutions

Ordinary Council Meeting 19 June 2018, Resolution 103/18:

That Council:

Endorse the Museum Precinct redevelopment architect (Sandover Pinder) to commence the detailed design immediately based on Option 2.

**CARRIED
(NO DISSENT)**

Ordinary Council Meeting 21 March 2017, Resolution 36/17:

THE AMENDED PRIMARY MOTION WAS PUT

That Council

1. *Endorses the Freshwater Bay Museum Facility Development Plan as detailed in Attachment 2;*
2. *Support the application to Lotterywest to fund the shortfall of the project;*
3. *Endorses the CEO call tenders to source a Project Manager for the Facility Redevelopment based on receiving the shortfall of funding from Lotterywest.*
4. *Includes \$50,000 for consideration in the 2017-2018 Annual Budget to support the actual funding required for the Public Car Park.*

CARRIED

Ordinary Council Meeting 21 June 2016, Resolution 95/16:

1. *Adopt the five-year strategic plan for the Freshwater Bay Museum, which incorporates the budget of allocation \$500,000, plus \$200,000 for the public toilets; and*
2. *Develop a facility development plan for the Freshwater Bay Museum Strategic plan which includes further consultation with stakeholders.*

Reason: To clarify that a facility development plan is part of the strategic plan.

*CARRIED
(NO DISSENT)*

Financial and Staff Implications

In June 2016, Council resolved to support the project with a financial commitment of \$500,000, plus \$200,000 for new public toilets. Officers worked with stakeholders to develop a concept design and estimated total project costing which amounted to \$1,460,000. The shortfall of \$760,000 was successfully obtained through a Lotterywest application from the Town. (Please note this application has, at the request of Lotterywest, been put on hold. The Town liaises regularly with Lotterywest in regards to the project status).

To date the project is at a \$15,000 overspend as a result of delays and requested changes from the FBMAC made in November 2018.

If these requests outlined in this report are accommodated, it will send the project further over budget, and additional funding will need to be sourced.

For the redesign and build of an additional toilet it is estimated to cost approximately \$150,000.

With the redesign of the glassed area in the new community facility a minimum of \$1000, and a complete change in the design aesthetics.

Relocating staff to the site would cost in excess of \$20,000, would take 5-6 weeks to establish and only be possible for the period of time until the building works commenced.

Policy and Statutory Implications

NIL

Communication / Consultation

As outlined in detail in the timeline (refer to Table 1), the project has engaged stakeholders at key stages of the project, in order to determine exactly what type of facility was needed in the future.

This includes considering and making design changes.

This takes into account where the Town's museum services are heading, as well as the broader community needs.

The community facility could have been bigger, or include a café component, or more storage space and so on. However, this was not the original project scope, and would be outside the financial capacity for a small Local Government Community Facility, as well as additional building costs, there is the ongoing maintenance costs of the facility and the increase in human resources costs required to manage such a facility.

The outcome that the Officers have delivered meets the scope of the project as approved by Council in 2016.

Strategic Community Plan

Liveability

We are an accessible community, with well-maintained and managed assets, and our heritage preserved for the enjoyment of the community.

- Maintain and upgrade the Town's assets for seamless day to day usage.

People

We live in an accessible and safe community that welcomes diversity, enjoys being active and has a strong sense of belonging.

- Effectively manage and enhance the Town's community facilities in response to a growing community.
- Provide opportunities for local community groups that supports their capacity and ongoing sustainability.
- Promote and encourage an active lifestyle through supporting local community clubs, groups and recreation / leisure facilities.

Urgency

This project has been subject to delays due to two reasons:

- Seeking and awaiting for approval for a land extension (the decision is now expected by the first week of April);
- Several requests from FBMAC.

It is now critical that project can progress with as minimal amount of delay as possible to avoid further costs and the reflection on the Town.

Voting Requirements

ABSOLUTE MAJORITY DECISION OF COUNCIL REQUIRED.

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

Moved Cr Mews, seconded Cr Haynes

That Council:

1. **The following issues related to the proposed new Freshwater Bay Museum facilities project be urgently addressed:**
 - **the location and adequacy of the toilet facilities dedicated to Museum use**
 - **the ‘meet and greet’ reception space**
 - **the extent of glass in the exhibition area of the new building**
 - **the feasibility of using the existing “education buildings” for storage space and other purposes.**
2. **Further consultation be undertaken with stakeholders and specialist Museum advisors, including Freshwater Bay Museum staff, Friends of Freshwater Bay Museum and the community to address any areas of concern, prior to detailed design plans being presented to Council for approval.**
3. **Museum programs and activities be reopened on-site until detailed design plans for the Museum facilities redevelopment project have been approved, tenders for construction signed off and a commencement date established.**

LOST

For the Motion: Crs Mews, and Tulloch.

Against the Motion: Mayor Barker and Crs Browne, Edwards, Franklyn, Goetze, Haynes, Kelly, and Main.

13 REPORTS OF THE CEO

NIL

14 ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE PRESIDING PERSON

Mayor Barker reported on his attendance at Head of the River and noted Christ Church Grammar School's fifth position in the National Championships.

Cr Haynes reported on the success of the golf course and his attendance at the Friends of Lake Claremont Night Chats.

Cr Franklyn attended ride to school day at Swanbourne Primary School and commended the new 'off lead area' dog signs and toilets at the golf course.

Cr Goetze and Cr Kelly reported on their attendance at Ride to School Day at Freshwater Bay Primary School.

Cr Main commented on the success of Ride to School Day throughout the Western suburbs.

Cr Kelly reported on his attendance at the WALGA Central Zone and the State Council Meetings, and commented on WALGA's submission to the review of Local Government Act, on behalf of W.A. local governments.

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

NIL

16 NEW BUSINESS OF AN URGENT NATURE APPROVED BY THE PERSON PRESIDING OR BY DECISION OF MEETING

NIL

17 CONFIDENTIAL MATTERS FOR WHICH THE MEETING MAY BE CLOSED TO THE PUBLIC

NIL

18 FUTURE MEETINGS OF COUNCIL

Ordinary Council Meeting, 7:00pm Tuesday 16 April 2019.

19 DECLARATION OF CLOSURE OF MEETING

There being no further business, the presiding member declared the meeting closed at 7:59PM.

Confirmed this day of 2019.

PRESIDING MEMBER