



Additional documents

Ordinary Meeting of Council

Wednesday 27 August 2025 6:00 pm



Table of Contents

C2508-15 ADOPTION OF AMENDED SOUTH FREMANTLE HERITAGE AREA, INDIVIDUALLY LISTED PROPERTIES, AND HERITAGE-RELATED LOCAL PLANNING POLICIES	3
Proposed Amendment by Cr Ingrid van Dorssen	3
Additional Information Provided by Officers.....	4
C2508-22 PROCUREMENT POLICY.....	6
Proposed Amendment by Cr Frank Mofflin.....	6
C2508-24 URBAN FOREST PLAN REVIEW	7
Proposed Amendment by Mayor Hannah Fitzhardinge.....	7
C2508-18 MRS AMENDMENT NORTH FREMANTLE DEVELOPMENT PRECINCT	8
Alternative Motion by Cr Andrew Sullivan.....	8



C2508-15 ADOPTION OF AMENDED SOUTH FREMANTLE HERITAGE AREA, INDIVIDUALLY LISTED PROPERTIES, AND HERITAGE-RELATED LOCAL PLANNING POLICIES

Proposed Amendment by Cr Ingrid van Dorssen

Amend Part 1 the Officer's Recommendation to read as follows:

Council:

- 1. In relation to the South Fremantle Heritage Area and as per Schedule 2 Regulations 8 and 9 of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*:**
 - a. Adopts the addition of properties to the Heritage List and Local Heritage Survey within Attachment 2;**
 - b. Adopts the removal of properties from the Heritage List within Attachment 3;**
 - c. Adopts the changes to the management categories of properties within Attachment 4;**
 - d. Adopts the changes to the South Fremantle Heritage Area boundaries, changes to the Statement of Significance, and the addition of Contributory properties as shown in LPP 3.6.1 (Attachment 5); and**
 - e. Gives notice accordingly; *and***
 - f. Defer determination of 166 Hampton Rd, as detailed in Attachment 2, to the next annual heritage review.***

Reasons for amendment:

To provide additional time for consideration of the additional information provided by representatives of the property.



C2508-15 ADOPTION OF AMENDED SOUTH FREMANTLE HERITAGE AREA, INDIVIDUALLY LISTED PROPERTIES, AND HERITAGE-RELATED LOCAL PLANNING POLICIES

Additional Information Provided by Officers

In response to public questions raised at Ordinary Council Meeting 13 August 2025 regarding three properties, further review has been undertaken and comments provided below:

166 Hampton Road

Further research has identified:

- It forms a pair with the adjacent 168 Hampton Road (1942) which is also recommended for addition to the Heritage List, Level 3 and Contributory Place.
- The streetscape of this section of Hampton Road displays examples of Heritage Places from c1890s to c1950s.
- It forms a cohesive group of similar scaled houses plus the church.
- It demonstrates an evolution of heritage buildings over time comprising four predominant building periods including Victorian, Federation, Inter War and Post War.

PROPOSED CHANGES: None, information to be noted.

The overall assessment and recommendation remain unchanged.

16 Hickory Street

At the Ordinary Meeting of Council, a speaker correctly identified that, because of information received during consultation, their house was removed from listing as a Level 3 and downgraded to Level 4 (record keeping only). They requested that the house also be removed from the InHerit database. Being a Level 4, the InHerit information is simply a record-keeping document that has no statutory weight and does not impact the property. However, the record is important in maintaining the history of sites throughout the state and is not recommended for removal.

PROPOSED CHANGES: None, information to be noted.

The overall assessment and recommendation remain unchanged.

3 Trafford Street

The owners have correctly identified the house as being of timber-frame construction with a more recently applied cladding / render. Further research has identified:

- The place was part of the original lot of Ocean View.
- A further archive search has revealed the original plans for the place which indicate clearly that the place was timber framed and originally clad with



- asbestos. It has subsequently had a render applied over the wall cladding material. The window description has also been updated to reflect replacement aluminium framed windows to the front elevation.
- The identification of this property for heritage listing was carried out independently to the development application process.
 - Additional information on the history of 3 Trafford Street has also been researched, but this does not form part of Council approval as the history of a site is not a decision of Council required by the Regulations but is added to the state InHerit database for record-keeping purposes.

It is noted that the physical description of the place, as listed on page 34/1522 in Attachment 1, will be modified, as follows:

- 3 Trafford Street is a single storey rendered, *fibre cement sheet clad timber framed masonry* and tile house constructed in 1951/52 in the Post War era. The original house is clearly evident as an 'TL' shaped plan with a protruding front room and a ¼ circular concrete porch. *The walls likely have a rendered finish applied over a later added brick look fibre cement cladding over timber framing. The walls are rendered and painted brick.* The roof is red terracotta tile in a hipped form. The windows to the front elevation are generally ~~timber~~ aluminium framed triple panes with a fixed central pane and two casements either side. The windows have metal awnings over. The porch has a flat ¼ circular concrete roof on decorative round masonry columns. There is a later two storey addition to the rear. The front boundary has a low level timber picket fence.

The Statement of Significance, page 95/1522 in Attachments, will be amended as follows:

- HOUSE, 3 TRAFFORD STREET, is a rendered, *fibre cement sheet clad, timber framed, masonry* single storey house dating from 1951/52 *and has characteristics of a Post War Bungalow.*

Noting the above changes will be made administratively, and no further consideration is required, as the overall assessment and recommendation remain unchanged.



C2508-22 PROCUREMENT POLICY

Proposed Amendment by Cr Frank Mofflin

Amend Part 26 of the Procurement Policy; and Part 35.2 of the Procurement Manual, as follows:

Amendments to Procurement Policy

26. Purchase Cards

Issuing of Purchase Cards

Where operationally appropriate, the City will seek to minimise the number of purchase cards that are issued across the organisation. Issuing of purchase cards will be subject to cardholders demonstrating the ability to meet the requirements of this policy and the relevant guidelines within the Procurement Procedures Manual. Purchase cards will only be issued as per the criteria outlined in in the Procurement Procedures and Guidelines. Issuing of purchase cards requires the approval of the Director Corporate Services or CEO.

Appropriateness of purchase card usage

Purchase card holders are to have regard for what is generally considered to be appropriate and reasonable when making food, beverage, ***alcohol*** and hospitality related purchases. ***and to achieve this. These purchases should only be for the purpose of carrying out official activities of the City, and*** should adhere to value for money principles outlined in this policy and relevant guidelines within the Procurement Procedures Manual.

Amendment to Procurement Manual

35.2 Principles for Purchase Card Usage

Allowable Purchases

- g) ***Food, beverage, alcohol and*** hospitality expenditure above the value of \$50 may only occur when it is undertaken with the express permission of a member of Executive Leadership Team ***via the appropriate administrative approvals process;***

Reasons for amendment:

Changes proposed to enhance response to findings of the Officer of Auditor General audit related to Purchase Card use as presented at Audit and Risk Committee meeting on 16 June 2025 to implement policies for entertainment, food, alcohol which align with business use and community expectations.



C2508-24 URBAN FOREST PLAN REVIEW

Proposed Amendment by Mayor Hannah Fitzhardinge

To amend Part 1 of the Officer's Recommendation, to read as follows:

Council:

- 1. Note the City planted 5,519 street and reserve trees against a target of 8,264 trees *during* years 1 – 7 of the Urban Forest Plan implementation. *The ~~(a shortfall of 2,745 trees)~~ is mainly attributed to an initial lack of internal resource capacity to deliver the target, followed by a reduction in budget during the Covid-affected years, and lack of availability of high quality planting stock. Note also that the City's website has been updated with the Urban Forest Plan tree planting numbers and targets, along with information for residents on tree species characteristics and how to care for their street tree.***
- 2. Support that officers progress to:**
 - a. Plant 600 trees in 2025 (year 8).**
 - b. Target to plant 900 trees in years 9 and 10 of the Urban Forest Plan, and**
 - c. Program to continue planting of 900 trees per annum until 2031 to achieve the 80% Urban Forest Plan target of 10,804 trees.**
- 3. Request that the Chief Executive Officer prepare to undertake data capture and analysis of the the City's urban forest (in 2027), with a view to understand the effectiveness of the program, assess the loss of trees on private land and inform the urban forest program and planting targets for subsequent years; and**
 - a. Seek funding as part of the 2026/27 budget process to progress the data capture and analysis program.**

Reasons for amendment:

Provides justification for the shortfall in the target.



C2508-18 MRS AMENDMENT NORTH FREMANTLE DEVELOPMENT PRECINCT

Alternative Motion by Cr Andrew Sullivan

Council:

- 1. Acknowledges the work prepared by the applicant as part of the lifting request and their engagement with the City over the past 18 months. Notes that the Council has had limited opportunity to review the information provided and, with that context, provides the following initial response.**
- 2. Advises the WAPC that it does not support the Lifting of the Urban Deferment request for the North Fremantle Urban Precinct, until there is resolution of the following matters:**
 - a. Completion of the proposed North Fremantle Integrated Transport Design Study by DPLH that provides clear direction to transport planning for North Fremantle that also underpins sound land-use planning capable of delivering an integrated urban plan for the North Fremantle Peninsula;**
 - b. Further consideration of the coastal foreshore reserve requirements, including:**
 - i. documenting the impacts of the North Fremantle Integrated Transport Design Study on the coastal foreshore reserve area; and**
 - ii. assessment of, and long-term provision for, the additional recreational assets that are required to enable Port Beach to function as a regional coastal recreation node, in addition to but separate from the Leighton Node, noting that current recreation assets fall well short of accommodating existing and future needs;**
 - iii. assessment of, and long-term provision for, the additional land needed to mitigate the existing spatial inadequacies around the Leighton node in providing suitable accessibility and function to that node;**
 - iv. redressing the inconsistency in foreshore reserve width available to serve future generations towards the southern end of the Urban Precinct and to ensure the foreshore reserve provides adequate and continuous public access from Leighton through to Sandtracks Beach and the Future of Fremantle area;**



- 3. Council requests the following concerns be addressed by the WAPC in consultation with the City of Fremantle and community as a precursor to Council support for the lifting of the Urban Deferment:**
- a. The community preference is for managed retreat in dealing with the long-term adaptation of the coast to accommodate climate change. There is special value placed on maintaining the long stretches of wide sandy beaches unimpeded by groynes or other intrusive coastal protection devices. While it is acknowledged that some coastal protection devices will be inevitable as part of the Future of Fremantle project, these need to be restricted to the southern end as far as reasonably possible to ensure the character of Port Beach is not forever compromised by poor foreshore planning at this time. This requires the foreshore reserve adjacent to the Urban Precinct to be significantly wider than currently proposed.**
 - b. It is noted that the foreshore reserve at Leighton Beach was planned at a time when the impacts of sea level rise were underestimated in the first iteration of SPP2.6. If the sea level rise coefficient currently used was applied to that node, the required foreshore reserve width would be closer to 200m compared to the 150m that was settled on. The Port Beach Node has at least the same extent of recreational asset needs and is in a zone experiencing greater erosion compared to Leighton. Hence, it is demonstrably unacceptable that the proposed foreshore width at Port Beach would taper to being narrower than the inadequate reserve width at the Leighton Node. The reserve width at the Urban Node must be significantly wider than at the Leighton Node and increasing in width towards the southern end where erosion is greater.**
 - c. The existing reserve width at the Leighton Node has proved to be inadequate in providing for current recreational needs, especially in providing for the needs of the Leighton Surf Life Saving Club. The only opportunity to mitigate the inadequacies is for the WAPC to provide additional foreshore reserve width at the northern end of the Urban Node and in a manner that is functionally separate from the Port Beach node.**
 - d. The proponent has only provided a coastal planning assessment based on existing assets. These existing Port Beach assets are clearly inadequate in serving current needs. The current node fails to provide space for parklands, recreational areas away from the beach, sustainable dunes to provide protection from the sea breezes, or adequate parking. Furthermore, there has been no assessment of the types of community and commercial assets needed to serve the long-term needs of the regional community, noting that 70% of beach users come from South of the River, or the significant population increase associated with**



the Future of Fremantle area. For example, there is clearly a regional demand for additional surf club facilities, cafes and the like, but no spatial assessment has been carried out to ensure the reserve width will accommodate such needs now or in the future. The requirements of SPP2.6 can not be satisfied by only seeking to accommodate the demonstrably inadequate existing assets.

- e. The assessment of reserve width remaining at the 100-year planning (Fig 5.1 in the coastal assessment) highlights the inadequacy of the proposed foreshore reserve especially towards the southern end. The diagram highlights that the only way the reserve could be considered sustainable is to accept the need for radical coastal engineering devices that the community and Council have consistently opposed. A reliance on engineered solutions is inconsistent with SPP2.6 when there is ample opportunity to accommodate additional reserve width at this stage of planning.**
- f. The unique characteristics of the North Fremantle Peninsula are currently fragmented into several disconnected cells that fail to benefit from the tremendous lifestyle and commercial opportunities that the area can deliver. The further planning of individual transport corridors for each transport mode, all separated from each other and the urban cells around them, will only exacerbate the disconnect that already plagues the peninsula. The proposed North Fremantle Integrated Transport Design Study provides an opportunity to address the disconnect by exploring how regional movement needs can be integrated with connected urban environments. In particular, the eastern edge of Urban Precinct, the land between it and the North Fremantle Town Centre, and the Town Centre itself must be considered through a single planning process to properly identify how the regional north-south transport activity can be integrated with local east-west movement and connectors.**
- g. The proponent's assumption that their land can be developed independent of the potential upgrades to the surrounding movement network is a recipe to create another isolated and unintegrated cell of development. It is a proposal that seeks to ignore the need to complete the critical transport planning first. There is a genuine risk that the cell of development will essentially turn its back to the unresolved transport corridor rather than genuinely integrate with it.**
- h. The proponent offers only the opportunity for a 70's style grade separated crossing solution between the Urban Precinct and the rest of North Fremantle. The Council expectation is for fully integrated east-west connectivity between the Town Centre and the Port Beach foreshore node. Until such time as the Transport**



- Design Study is completed, it remains premature to consider urban development along the eastern edge of the Urban Precinct**
- i. While it is noted that the proponent is not advocating for the Curtin-Stirling link which is proposed by MRWA, the Council notes its fundamental opposition to the concept. In the tight confines of the peninsula, the possibility of grade separated road flyovers is diametrically opposite to the integrated urban outcome that is needed. The only acceptable resolution of the north-south transport corridors is to investigate grade separated rail options, including the possibility of an elevated rail option. It is imperative that such a fundamental change in the transport typology is understood prior to development. A grade separated rail network will also generate the possibility of east-west urban road connections that link between Stirling Highway and an extended Curtin Avenue, and by logical extension provide access into the Urban Precinct and connectivity to the Town Centre. Again, this highlights why the Transport Design Study needs to be completed first to inform how the Urban Precinct can better integrate with its surrounds.**
 - j. The Future of Fremantle studies and those related to the new bridge sought to bypass meaningful consideration of how to resolve the regional transport network through the peninsula. That is why the North Fremantle Integrated Transport Design Study is now an essential prerequisite to further development. However, the proponent relies on the initial transport concepts in the Future of Fremantle report to suggest their developments can progress independently of potential short and long-term changes in the transport networks. It is considered fundamentally premature to assume that the transport networks are resolved sufficiently to give the certainty needed once land is zoned Urban. This is particularly concerning at the southern end of the Urban Precinct in relation to both the alignment of Curtin Avenue, the rail corridor, and the ultimate location and number of future river crossings.**
 - k. The triangle of government-controlled land to the east of the Urban Precinct continues to be treated in isolation of the Urban Precinct. It remains concerning, especially where that land widens to the south, that this land may continue to act as a barrier to east west movement rather than be seen as an opportunity for urban integration. This particularly relevant to the prospect for the North Fremantle Station to be relocated in a way that ensures it is encompassed by an urban station precinct. Likewise, the significant quantity of government land locked up in the triangle must be allowed to reach its full potential by being planned as part of an integrated urban precinct rather than being blighted as left-over unplanned land.**



Reasons for alternative motion:

This is in part intended as justification for the officers two dot points, and in part giving the Council an opportunity to give some direction to the City as to how far we want staff to push these matters with DPLH and the developers.