



Additional documents

Ordinary Meeting of Council

Wednesday 28 June 2023 6pm



Table of Contents

PC2306-10	PRECINCT STRUCTURE PLAN – 140 STIRLING HIGHWAY, NORTH FREMANTLE	2
FPOL2306-12	CORPORATE ENERGY PLAN UPDATE	5
ARMC2306-7	FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT REVIEW REPORT – JUNE 2023	6
C2306-1	ADOPTION OF THE ANNUAL BUDGET 2023-2024	7
C2306-1	ADOPTION OF THE ANNUAL BUDGET 2023-2024	8



**PC2306-10 PRECINCT STRUCTURE PLAN – 140 STIRLING
HIGHWAY, NORTH FREMANTLE**

Proposed amendment by Cr Andrew Sullivan

To amend the Committee Recommendation as follows:

Council

- 1) Note the submissions received as detailed in the Officer's report and Attachment 1
- 2) Pursuant to Regulation 20 of the Deemed Provisions in Schedule 2 of the Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015, submit this report and attachments to the Western Australian Planning Commission with a recommendation that the Commission refuse the proposed Precinct Structure Plan for the following reasons:
 - i) The proposal effectively seeks to create a new ~~Local Centre~~ **'Activity Centre' at a scale could be defined as a 'District Centre' or 'Secondary Centre',** as per State Planning Policy 4.2 – Activity Centres for Perth and Peel / draft State Planning Policy 4.2 – Activity Centres, which is not provided for in the established state and local strategic planning frameworks, including Perth and Peel@3.5million, the Fremantle Planning Strategy (2001), ~~and~~ the draft Fremantle Local Planning Strategy (2022), **and is not supportable as the Site falls outside of any existing or proposed 'Station Precinct'.**
 - ii) The proposal is inconsistent with the principles for development within a Heritage Area, as set out in State Planning Policy 3.5 – Historic Heritage Conservation.
 - iii) The proposal is inconsistent with the design principles contained in State Planning Policy 7.0 – Design of the Built Environment.
 - iv) The proposal is inconsistent with a number of the objectives of State Planning Policy 7.2 – Precinct Design, specifically:
 - ~~R~~**It does not** ~~respond~~**se** to and ~~enhancement of~~ the distinctive characteristics of the **adjacent** local areas **or define a new development characteristic that will integrate with and transition to the adjacent low density residential areas.**
 - ~~Integration of~~**The proposed** landscape design ~~that~~ does not enhance ~~s~~-sustainability outcomes **or adequately connect with and enhance the green networks of the Vlamingh Parklands.**



- ~~B~~**The** built form height and massing ~~that~~ is **not** responsive to existing built form, topography, key views and landmarks, ~~and the intended future character of the area.~~
 - Delivery of a sustainable built environment through passive environmental design measures, adaptive reuse of existing structures and promotion of active and public transport modes.
 - Provision of comfortable public spaces that encourage physical activity and enable a range of uses.
 - ~~Provision of a place that is easy to navigate with clear connections and good lines of sight.~~
- v) The proposed built form controls seek numerous variations to the primary controls set out in State Planning Policy 7.3 – Residential Design Codes – Volume 1, Part C – Medium Density and Volume 2 – Apartments, **especially in relation to open space, street widths and deep soil planting**, without sufficient justification.
- vi) The proposal is inconsistent with the principles set out in the Visual Landscape Planning in Western Australia manual.
- vii) The proposal does not nominate a zoning and the land use table is incompatible with the City of Fremantle Local Planning Scheme No.4.
- viii) The proposal does not meet the broad objectives of Local Planning Policy 3.6 – Heritage Areas, particularly with regard to conservation of the existing office building on the Site.
- ix) The proposal is inconsistent with the building height limits set out in Local Planning Policy 3.11 – McCabe Street Area, North Fremantle – Height of New Buildings and will likely result in significant visual amenity impacts on the immediate locality and wider area, significant overlooking and overshadowing of adjoining properties.
- x) The proposal would place significant pressure on the local road network, resulting in failure of the Stirling Highway / McCabe Street intersection to deliver an adequate level of service.
- xi) The proposal seeks to cede ~~its~~ **the entire** road network and public open space to the City of Fremantle, which would ordinarily be accepted for the benefit of the wider community; however, in this ~~instance the City does not believe that their~~ **the** design and location of **some laneways (i.e. "Lane 1" and "Lane 2") and public open space (primarily "POS 2")** are **not** conducive to attracting use by the wider community and **the City of Fremantle** is not prepared to receive them as public assets. [amended officer recommendation for 2(xi) used as base]
- xii) **The intensity of residential development combined with the extent of commercial floorspace proposed cannot currently be**



accommodated in the McCabe Street precinct as it is inadequately served by rapid transit and the configuration of the regional road and rail networks remain unresolved. As such, in the absence of the McCabe Street node being an integral part of a station precinct, it is considered premature to support the structure plan until further sub-regional land use and transport planning identifies realistic opportunities for appropriately located public infrastructure that would complement and underpin such an activity centre.

Reasons for amendment:

To provide in 2 (i) the correct classifications referred to in the relevant documents and to expand on the reason the proposal can't be supported.

In relation to 2 (iv), to provide more specific reasons why the proposal does not meet the objectives of good Precinct Design, and to delete the dot point that has not been substantiated.

In relation to 2 (v) to provide clarification of the main parts of the codes that have been deviated from without adequate justification.

In relation to 2 (xi) to provide clarity about the parts of the road and POS design that are not supported as land to be ceded to the city.

In introducing a new point 2 (xii), to highlight the premature nature of a proposal for such residential and commercial intensity on a site located in a precinct that has not yet been identified as land suitable for such intensive development.



FPOL2306-12 CORPORATE ENERGY PLAN UPDATE

Proposed amendment by Cr Rachel Pemberton

To add an additional part 4 and 5 to the Committee Recommendation as follows:

- 4. Request Officers to develop a project inception document (PID) for the following projects, to be brought to the next appropriate FPOL for consideration of allocation of funds from the Renewable Energy / Sustainability Reserve:**
 - a) Carbon Emission Reduction Strategy (CERS),**
 - b) Climate Risk Framework, and**
 - c) the update to LPP2.13**

- 5. Request Officers to transfer city properties currently not using renewable energy to 'natural' (renewable) power – estimated at an increased utility cost of \$55,608. This to be funded by allocating \$55,608 from the Sustainability Investment Reserve allocation to the suitable operational utilities budget.**

Rationale:

Sustainability and the Corporate Energy Plan appears to have fallen off the agenda, largely thanks to the pandemic and subsequent implications. It is vital that the City re-engages with this work and prioritises work and actions to address the Climate Emergency that the Council (and city) has declared.

The Renewable Energy / Sustainability Reserve exists to deliver outcomes to meet our sustainability (Net Zero) goals, including the target of 100% renewable energy by 2025. While that target is unlikely to be met, we can do better than we are doing using those funds.

The Sustainability Reserve may also enable the work to be done to progress the next stages, being the CERS and Climate Risk and Resilience work that is needed asap. It is suggested that Officers scope out this work and bring it to committee for consideration to use funds from the reserve to facilitate this work.

The PID will also enable consideration of these projects in the mid-year budget review, should the Reserve funds not be used or sufficient.



**ARMC2306-7 FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT REVIEW REPORT – JUNE
2023**

Alternative Officer's Recommendation

Council:

- 1. Receive the Financial Management Review June 2023, as shown in Attachment 1 of this item.**
- 2. *Note the auditor's report (attachment 1) contains repeat findings captured and addressed in the Audit Actions update report of this agenda (ARMC2306-3).***
- 3. *Accept the proposed audit actions and completion dates as outlined in the audit action report provided in this agenda (ARMC2306-3).***
- 4. *Request officers provide information in the audit action report outlining causes, implications and expected new completion date, if an existing completion date is likely to be exceeded.***

Reason for amendment:

The above alternative recommendation is provided to address the Audit and Risk Management Committee request for an amendment to the recommendation to acknowledge repeat findings and accept audit actions and completion dates.



C2306-1 ADOPTION OF THE ANNUAL BUDGET 2023-2024

Proposed amendment by Cr Ben Lawver

To add an additional part to the Officer's Recommendation as follows:

2.13. Improving Parks;

Authorise the reallocation of an amount of \$500,000 from Destination Marketing account 100557.6823 associated with the delivery of the draft Destination Development Strategic Plan 2023-2027 to the most appropriate budget account for improving our parks, noting:

- a. The total budget allocated towards destination marketing related activities, inclusive of estimated staffing costs and operational expenditure is approximately \$850,000.**
- b. The intent of the reallocation is to deliver currently unfunded projects of high strategic value with an emphasis on converting disused sumps into new accessible greenspaces.**
- c. Any prioritisation for the creation of new parklands should include the following:**
 - a. Equity of access (prioritise areas where residents do not currently have access to green spaces)**
 - b. Making existing parks larger (including consideration if converting a sump would add significantly to an already existing greenspace.)**
- d. The money is to remain quarantined until a further report on the most suitable parks related allocation of those funds is brought back to council for approval.**

Reason for amendment:

The best advertisement to encourage investment in our city is to ensure the amenities available to residents and visitors are of the highest quality possible.



C2306-1 ADOPTION OF THE ANNUAL BUDGET 2023-2024

Proposed amendment by Cr Andrew Sullivan

To amend the proposed City Centre Commercial differential rate as follows:

2.2. Differential Rates;

Pursuant to Sections 6.32, 6.33, 6.34 and 6.35 of the Local Government Act 1995 Council impose the following differential general rates and minimum payments on Gross Rental Values for 2023-24 financial year:

Differential Rate Category	Proposed Rate in the Dollar (\$)	Proposed Minimum Payment
Residential Improved	0.079212	1,649
Commercial & Industrial General	0.107416	1,649
City Centre Commercial	0.107416 0.114552	1,649
Residential Short Term Accommodation	0.107378	1,649
Vacant Residential Land	0.136819	1,599
Vacant Commercial & Industrial	0.158423	1,649

Reason for amendment:

To allocate sufficient funds (approximately \$513,000) to implement destination marketing, the differential rate in the dollar for City Centre Commercial properties be increased to 0.114552 and the additional funds raised through that increase be allocated to the Destination Development Strategic Plan implementation in the 2023/24 budget, and that amount be quarantined to allow for further Council consideration about the implementation plan.