



Additional documents

Ordinary Meeting of Council

Wednesday 11 December 2024 6:00 pm



Table of Contents

C2412-1 SOUTH STREET, NO. 1/364 (LOT 4), O’CONNOR - CHANGE OF USE TO RESTRICTED PREMISES AND SIGNAGE – (JD DA0325/24)	3
Proposed Alternative Motion by Cr Ben Lawver	3
C2412-2 (S.31 SAT RECONSIDERATION) RENNIE CRESCENT, NO. 90 (STRATA LOT 1), HILTON - UNAUTHORISED ADDITIONS TO EXISTING SINGLE HOUSE (ED DA0130/24).....	4
Proposed Alternative Motion by Cr Andrew Sullivan.....	4
C2412-3 DAVIS PARK SUBDIVISION (STAGE 1) - MULTIPLE LOTS, BEACONSFIELD (ED WAPC200859)	6
Proposed Amendment (1) by Cr Andrew Sullivan	6
Proposed Amendment (2) by Cr Andrew Sullivan	7
Additional Attachment - Schedule of Submissions	9



C2412-1 SOUTH STREET, NO. 1/364 (LOT 4), O'CONNOR - CHANGE OF USE TO RESTRICTED PREMISES AND SIGNAGE – (JD DA0325/24)

Proposed Alternative Motion by Cr Ben Lawver

REFUSE, under the Metropolitan Region Scheme and Local Planning Scheme No. 4, Change of Use to Restricted Premises and Signage at No. 1/364 (Lot 4) South Street, O'Connor, as detailed on plans dated 17 October 2024, for the following reasons:

- 1. The proposal is inconsistent with the objectives of the Commercial zone.**
- 2. The proposal is inconsistent with clause 67(n) of the Deemed Provisions as the proposal will result in a detrimental impact to the character and amenity of the area.**

Reasons for alternative motion:

The change of use would have a detrimental impact on amenity of the area and the original zoning is appropriate.



**C2412-2 (S.31 SAT RECONSIDERATION) RENNIE CRESCENT, NO. 90
(STRATA LOT 1), HILTON - UNAUTHORISED ADDITIONS TO
EXISTING SINGLE HOUSE (ED DA0130/24)**

Proposed Alternative Motion by Cr Andrew Sullivan

APPROVE under the Metropolitan Region Scheme and Local Planning Scheme No. 4 the Unauthorised Additions to Existing Single House at No. 90 (Strata Lot 1) Rennie Crescent, subject to the following conditions:

- 1. This approval relates only to the development as indicated on the approved plans, dated 20 October 2024. It does not relate to any other development on this lot and must substantially commence within four years from the date of this decision letter.**
- 2. All storm water discharge from the development hereby approved shall be contained and disposed of on-site unless otherwise approved by the City of Fremantle.**
- 3. All works indicated on the approved plans, including any footings, shall be wholly located within the cadastral boundaries of the subject site.**
- 4. The unauthorised front fencing shall be removed and relocated in accordance with the approved plans within 90 days of the date of this decision.**
- 5. Prior to lodgement of a Building Permit for the development hereby approved, a detailed landscaping plan including information relating to species selection of the required tree, reticulation, details of existing vegetation to be retained, and treatment of landscaped surfaces (i.e. mulch, lawn, etc), shall be submitted to and approved by the City of Fremantle.**
- 6. Within six (6) months of the date of this decision, the approved landscaping shall be completed in accordance with the approved plans and maintained for the life of the development to the satisfaction of the City of Fremantle.**

Advice Note(s):

- i. A BA13 – Building Approval Certificate application form is required to be submitted for the unauthorised building works. A Certificate of Building Compliance (BA18) must be submitted with the application and signed and completed by a Registered Building Surveyor Contractor (private sector).**



Reasons for alternative motion:

The proposal to relocate the high metal fence forward to align with the studio, and then be further setback to align with the residence, goes a long way to restoring the open aspect of the front yard. While the studio and relocated metal fence remain forward of the house setback, and those houses to the east, the non-conforming setback is actually consistent with the side fences and the corner of the house to the west. In addition, the hedge located to the west provides a more dominant forward projection than the studio and fence. The low height of the studio and fence greatly assists in hiding the structure into the landscaped environment. The retention of the picket fence and proposed additional plantings will further enhance the desired garden suburb ambience. Council concludes that primary aim of retaining an open front aspect and garden suburb ambience is adequately achieved with the proposed modifications.



**C2412-3 DAVIS PARK SUBDIVISION (STAGE 1) - MULTIPLE LOTS,
BEACONSFIELD (ED WAPC200859)**

Proposed Amendment by Cr Andrew Sullivan (1)

Amend the Officer's Recommendation to include an additional Condition 19, to read as follows:

19. The boundary between Lot 9001 and Road 1 to be adjusted to ensure the proposed north-south carriageways of Road 1 can align with those in Nanine Street and to provide for two lanes of northbound traffic that will be required to support future signalised intersection at South Street that also accommodates a future rapid transit stop, to the satisfaction of the City of Fremantle.

Reasons for amendment:

Amendments are required to the plan to support a future signalised intersection and future rapid transit stop.



**C2412-3 DAVIS PARK SUBDIVISION (STAGE 1) - MULTIPLE LOTS,
BEACONSFIELD (ED WAPC200859)**

Proposed Amendment by Cr Andrew Sullivan (2)

Amend advice note point i and insert a new point x to read as follows:

Advice Notes:

- i. The City of Fremantle ~~supports the installation of a traffic signals in an appropriate location,~~ reiterates previous advice regarding the need for a signalised intersection at Nanine Street to be delivered in the medium term, to provide safe crossing points on South Street between White Gum Valley and Beaconsfield. *The City also vigorously advocates for a safer controlled connection to South Street from both Beaconsfield and White Gum Valley to mitigate the existing and future failure points associated with numerous side street connections to South Street. Aiming for a signalised four-way intersection where Nanine Street intersects with South Street is the most logical solution to accommodate local transport needs, to support the commercial function and viability of the new local centre and supermarket, to safely accommodate a future rapid transit stop, and to enable future changes to the local road network aimed at improving the flow of regional traffic and public transport along South Street. This is consistent with the approved As identified in the Heart of Beaconsfield Masterplan this may be in the location of Road 1 (extension of Nannine Avenue), and Davis Park Precinct Structure Plan. The subdivision should be modified to provide a logical north-south connection and local node where a future mid-tier transit stop would be logically integrated.*

- x. *The City would prefer the new road south off South Street that is directly opposite to Nanine Street, to better align the carriageways with Nanine Street to enable all future design options for this intersection and to rationalise the adjacent lots which, currently, are irregular in shape and may produce sub-optimal urban outcomes. The City anticipates the need for Road 1 to incorporate two northbound lanes and one south bound lane, as well as on-road cycle lanes and pedestrian refuge medians for the full distance of Road 1 to provide adequate safety and queuing distance for a signalised intersection, and with north-south carriageway alignments that match those in Nanine Street opposite. This requires the western boundary of Road 1 to be located further west and the reconfiguration of proposed lot 9001 to avoid the creation of a narrow, irregular and largely undevelopable portion of land at the intersection of Road 1 with South Street.*



Reasons for amendment:

Amendments are required to the plan to support a future signalised intersection and future rapid transit stop.



**C2412-3 DAVIS PARK SUBDIVISION (STAGE 1) - MULTIPLE LOTS,
BEACONSFIELD (ED WAPC200859)**

Additional Attachment - Schedule of Submissions

As detailed in the report, the Community Consultation period for this item closed after finalisation of the agenda. The following table provides the submissions received and a short applicant comment.

Date Commenced: 8 November 2024

Date Ended: 3 December 2024

Total Submissions Received: 6 Submissions

Consultation Method: Letters (200m radius), MySay Webpage, Sign on Site.

Ref#	Comments	Applicant Response
1	<p>I've been living on [redacted] for nearly 10 years and have been looking forward to the removal of social housing. the neighbourhood is a much safer and pleasant place to be these days.</p> <p>However the proposed davis park precinct plan to build over 500 dwellings in such a small area is enormously disappointing.</p> <p>3-8 storey residential units on south st, 3 storey dwellings & all dwellings to be double story terrace townhouses directly across from the existing residents is overwhelming. Double storey townhouses with a frontage of a maximum 10m, does not reflect the existing streetscape. The report mentions the existing street (5th ave) consists of a mix of single and double storey dwellings. there are two only existing dwellings that are double story & their street setback is much further than the proposed, furthermore they still observe side setbacks and do not consist of common walls. This is fremantle, beaconsfield an established suburb. please do not turn this into cockburn or cannigvale estates with wall to wall cottage blocks. Saving a few established trees does not maintain the streetscape.</p> <p>Residents on fifth avenue have put up with meth heads, alcoholics, domestic violence & constant vehicle break ins for years, waiting for the social housing to be removed and this redevelopment to proceed. we don't want it replaced with wall to wall cottage blocks. if a transition sub zone is truly endorsed, please consider making the blocks larger, present green title lots with decent street set backs and wide enough for side setbacks. at least along fifth avenue so the streetscape is actually reflected.</p> <p>The overwhelming presence of mid rise apartments around south st and lefroy regions will make the immediate region busier than central fremantle, nowhere in the council or any councils until applecross or port coogee is there density like that presented in the davis park plan.</p> <p>Surely the developments don't need to maximum the zoning to its full extent everywhere, its simply too many residents.</p>	<p>The proposed subdivision is consistent with the approved Davis Park Precinct Structure Plan (PSP) with regard to lot layouts, typologies, residential density, land uses, public open space and movement networks.</p>
2	<p>I feel this has been sprung on the community while we weren't watching. With all the interest on the TAFE site, the Govt quietly sneaks this in on us. To have 700 residential sites crammed into what's was known as the Beacy Bronks is ridiculous. You would simply be recreating a modern version of what's had been dismantled. This sort of development doesn't solve a housing crisis it creates one. People need space to breath, to move, to relax. This plan offers none of this. The TAFE site is not a lot better.</p>	<p>The proposed subdivision is consistent with the approved Davis Park PSP with regard to lot layouts, typologies, residential density, land uses, public open space and movement networks.</p> <p>The Davis Park PSP was approved by the WAPC in May 2021 and identifies a minimum dwelling target of 550 dwellings across the entire PSP</p>
3	<p>Strongly support long overdue development of this area. I have no objection to subdivision design, but the final amenity will depend on the quality of design and construction. Hopefully Development WA implement the same quality in Beaconsfield as they have in WGV</p>	<p>Noted</p>

<p>4</p>	<p>Clarity Requested</p> <p>1. <u>Current Ownership of Land / Lots</u></p> <p>The Applicant states in its Supporting Letter that its client is Development WA. Development WA is stated as being responsible for the coordination of progressive demolition of existing housing to facilitate revitalisation of the precinct. The Applicant's Supporting Letter also states that the subject site is currently owned by the State Housing Commission t/a Department of Communities. Furthermore, the letter states that the land ownership details are summarised in Appendix B. However, Appendix B is not available in the suite of documents available on this MySay website. Please make available the following documents referred to in the Applicant's Supporting Letter, which have not been provided to the public for review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Appendix B – Land Ownership Details • Appendix D – Proposed Plan of Subdivision (Plan No. 22/072/008) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ [unless Appendix D is the "Plan of Subdivision (DPLH Stamped) - Davis Park Subdivision Stage 1 (ID 6067370).pdf"]. <p>2. <u>Ultimate Ownership of Land / Lots / Dwellings</u></p> <p>If this subdivision application is approved, we are unclear who will be the owner of the lots and the subsequent nature in which those lots will retain public ownership or be sold for private ownership.</p> <p>As local residents for the past five years, we have experienced the social impact of dense and concentrated public housing. As evidenced by the extreme frequency of Police call outs to the Doig Place/Davis Park precinct attests, we have observed drug dealing, drug taking, prostitution, child welfare issues, burglary, arson, public violence and murder.</p> <p>Spatial distribution of public housing is key to the successful revitalisation of the precinct, yet the applicant has not provided any indication as to the likely distribution and density of public and privately owned housing options anticipated by the development.</p> <p>We seek clarity on this issue and evidence that the Applicant and Development WA have carefully considered the abundance of scholarly articles available on these topics, when devising the planned subdivision. This subdivision has the ability to improve the social outcomes for many people and we would be disappointed if the Applicant and Development WA does not take full advantage of this, once in a generation, opportunity to make a fundamental uplift on the neighbourhood community.</p> <p>Transition Sub-Precinct Requirements</p> <p>1. <u>Adhere to WAPC's Davis Park Precinct Structure Plan (PSP)</u></p> <p>The Applicant's Supporting Letter (Table 1 – PSP Objectives), restates the following objectives regarding the Transition Sub-Precinct, which were approved by a resolution of the Western Australian Planning Commission (WAPC) on 14 May 2021:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Provide for residential development that maintains a streetscape along Fifth Avenue that complements the existing single residential dwellings to the east, minimises building bulk and traffic impacts and provides an appropriate transition to higher density development in the remainder of the Structure Plan area. 	<p>1. <u>Current Ownership</u></p> <p>The subject sites are currently owned by the Housing Authority. Existing housing is progressively being demolished to facilitate revitalisation, DevelopmentWA is responsible for the coordination of this revitalisation.</p> <p>2. <u>Ultimate Ownership</u></p> <p>The manner in which lots will be owned and managed is not a matter for consideration as part of the subdivision application. Ownership of lots will be addressed by DevelopmentWA as part of a separate process.</p> <p>Transition Sub-Precinct</p> <p>1. <u>Adhere to WAPC's Davis Park Precinct Structure Plan (PSP)</u></p> <p>Objective (d) of the Transition Sub-Precinct requires that redevelopment "achieve a minimum dwelling target of 60 dwellings".</p> <p>The proposed subdivision seeks to balance all four objectives set out in the PSP for the Transition Sub-Precinct, including achieving a minimum density. To facilitate this, a range of lot typologies is proposed and a reduction in the density code to R30 would jeopardise the achievement of Objective (d).</p> <p>The mix of lot typologies provided enables the delivery of an R60 outcome, as required by the Davis Park PSP. However, the dimensions of Lots 4 – 15 and 18 do allow for development to an R30 standard.</p> <p>2. <u>Retention of Mature Vegetation Pursuant to the Davis Park Precinct Structure Plan</u></p> <p>The identification of existing trees that may be considered for possible retention on private lots will be a condition of the subdivision approval. The ability to accurately determine which trees can be retained will be known when the finished levels of the lots has been designed and approved with the City of Fremantle. Suitable trees within road reserves and Pedestrian Access Ways will be retained (subject to finished levels and engineering works).</p>
----------	---	--

	<p>b) Provide for two-storey terrace housing products fronting Fifth Avenue (rear loaded) with allowance for up to three-storey built form to the rear/west of sub-precinct, addressing Davis Park.</p> <p>c) Promote the retention of mature vegetation, and the integration of this into site planning and built form outcomes.</p> <p>To achieve the objectives in a) and b), we seek that Council requires the sub-division application to specify that lots 4 to 18 (inclusive) shall comply with the design requirements of the R30 density code set out in Residential Design Codes - Volume 1.</p> <p>The Applicant's Supporting Letter (Figure 2 Davis Park Precinct Structure Plan, page 3) could be read that all the lots in the Transition Sub-Precinct (lots 4 to 35) have the ability to comply with R30 to R60. Page 5 of the Applicant's Supporting Letter even states, "All lots within the Transition Sub-Precinct comply with the requirements for minimum and average lot sizes, and minimum frontages, of the R60 density code set out in Residential Design Codes - Volume 1."</p> <p>Furthermore, on page 4 of Applicant's Supporting Letter the Applicant states that, "for the Transition Sub-Precinct, 18 of the proposed 32 lots have been designed with widths of at least 10m – creating the ability to easily accommodate multiple-dwelling development." It appears on the Plan of Subdivision that 13 of these 18 lots are facing Fifth Avenue.</p> <p>Therefore, both statements in blue above by the Applicant, contradict the WAPC's resolution of objectives as outlined in a) and b) above.</p> <p>We seek the requirement that lots 4 to 18 comply with the R30 requirements set out in the Residential Design Codes – Volume 1, to maintain a maximum of two-storey single dwellings, fronting Fifth Avenue, as is currently the case.</p> <p>We would seek for the Applicant and its client to reconsider the lot sizes along Fifth Avenue and distribute the larger "multiple-dwelling development" to address Davis Park as anticipated by the WAPC.</p> <p>This approach was also clearly agreed to in the Heart of Beaconsfield Masterplan Concept, as is seen here https://www.fremantle.wa.gov.au/heart-beaconsfield# where the lots facing Fifth Avenue are described as:</p> <p>(E) - Family Houses 1-2 storeys.</p> <p>The lots facing Davis Park /Conway Court are described as a mixture of:</p> <p>(C) – Low rise apartments 3-5 storeys.</p> <p>(D) – Townhouses and maisonettes 2-3 storeys.</p> <p>2. <u>Retention of Mature Vegetation Pursuant to the Davis Park Precinct Structure Plan (PSP)</u></p> <p>As noted above, the WAPC approved the objective for the Transition Sub-Precinct to, "Promote the retention of mature vegetation, and the integration of this into site planning and built form outcomes."</p> <p>The Applicant's Appendix F demonstrates that only two trees are to be retained for the entire Transition Sub-Precinct. One tree on Fifth Avenue and one tree on Conway Court. As residents of Fifth Avenue, we observe an abundance of wildlife including Black Cockatoos, Galahs, 28s and Corellas enjoying the abundant mature vegetation surrounding this sub-precinct. We find it concerning that these mature trees and the diverse ecosystem they support are not being appropriately considered and maintained in this Sub-Precinct Local Development Plan.</p>	
--	--	--

	We request that Council imposes a requirement to maintain no less than 50% of the current mature vegetation surrounding the Transition Sub-Precinct.	
5	<p>To whom it may concern, thank you for reading my submission.</p> <p>There was been a change from the original consultation process (Heart of Beaconsfield 2017-2021) to the plans provided in the (Final Report - Davis Park Precinct) in relation to the "Transition Precinct".</p> <p>All initial consultation provided (community discussion groups in parks/schools, liaison with council representatives, Heart of Beaconsfield planning documents etc.) indicated that the Transition Precinct was planned for R30-60, with two storey "Family Townhouses" to front Fifth Avenue and three storey "Townhouses" to front Davis Park.</p> <p>The documentation in the "Final Report" indicates that there will no longer be R30 "Family Townhouses" along Fifth Avenue. Instead these will be changed to "R60 multi-dwelling townhouses".</p> <p>I believe this will dramatically change the street feel along Fifth Avenue, where there are currently standalone houses on the east side of Fifth Avenue. The new proposed structures will not be in-keeping with the streetscape. In my opinion the style of proposed buildings for R60 compared to R30 will also affect the value of other properties on the east side of the street.</p> <p>I propose the originally planned R30 zoning should be applied to Fifth Avenue in the "Transition Precinct" as it had been identified in the previous 8 years of consultation with the community, and not changed to what is indicated in the "Final Report".</p>	<p>Objective (d) of the Transition Sub-Precinct requires that redevelopment "achieve a minimum dwelling target of 60 dwellings".</p> <p>The proposed subdivision seeks to balance all four objectives set out in the PSP for the Transition Sub-Precinct, including achieving a minimum density. To facilitate this a range of lot typologies are proposed and a reduction in the density code to R30 would jeopardise the achievement of Objective (d).</p> <p>The mix of lot typologies provided enables the delivery of an R60 outcome, as required by the Davis Park PSP. However, the dimensions of Lots 4 – 15 and 18 do allow for development to an R30 standard.</p>
6	<p>Good afternoon, I am a resident of [retracted], and writing in response to the Davis Park Subdivision submission.</p> <p>I have concerns regarding the zoning for properties fronting Fifth Ave.</p> <p>The original 'Heart of Beaconsfield' masterplan depicted family homes of 1 -2 stories fronting the majority of Fifth ave.</p> <p>Likewise, the 'Application for Freehold Subdivision - Davis Park Precinct Stage 1' states that for the Transition Sub-Precinct, residential development should maintain the streetscape along Fifth Ave and complement existing single residential dwellings. It also states that its objective is to provide for two-storey terrace housing products fronting Fifth Ave.</p> <p>The concern that I have is that the proposal also states that all residential property along the Western side of Fifth Ave will be zoned R60. R60 is a significantly high rating which would allow for multiple story dwellings, and medium - high density properties. This is in conflict with the stated objectives of the application and original masterplan.</p> <p>I believe that the zoning for the residential properties facing Fifth Ave should be zoned R30, and a height restriction be placed to allow for two story properties. The Eastern side of Fifth Ave currently contains single level residences, and to allow residences greater than two stories on the Western side would create an imbalance in the street and would not maintain the streetscape that is currently in place.</p> <p>To the rear of the Transition Sub-Precinct (facing Davis Park), R60 zoning would be more appropriate as there is not an existing streetscape or existing single private residences located there.</p>	<p>Objective (d) of the Transition Sub-Precinct requires that redevelopment "achieve a minimum dwelling target of 60 dwellings".</p> <p>The proposed subdivision seeks to balance all four objectives set out in the PSP for the Transition Sub-Precinct, including achieving a minimum density. To facilitate this a range of lot typologies are proposed and a reduction in the density code to R30 would jeopardise the achievement of Objective (d).</p> <p>The mix of lot typologies provided enables the delivery of an R60 outcome, as required by the Davis Park PSP. However, the dimensions of Lots 4 – 15 and 18 do allow for development to an R30 standard.</p>