

13.5.2 CENTRAL MADDINGTON OUTLINE DEVELOPMENT PLAN AND AMENDMENT NO. 89 TO TOWN PLANNING SCHEME NO. 6

Author:	L Gibson
Author's Declaration of Interest:	Nil
Reference:	N/A
Application No:	PF07/00051 and PF07/00052
Applicant:	City of Gosnells
Owner:	Various
Location:	Maddington
Zoning: MRS:	Urban, Urban Deferred, Parks and Recreation, Waterways, Primary Regional Roads and Other Regional Roads
TPS No. 6:	Residential R17.5, Residential R30, Residential R40, Highway Commercial, Mixed Business, Local Open Space, Public Purposes, Water Courses and General Rural.
Review Rights:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nil for the Scheme amendment, however, final determination is with the Minister for Planning. • Yes for the Outline Development Plan, to the State Administrative Tribunal or the Western Australian Planning Commission against any discretionary decision of Council.
Area:	150ha (approximately)
Previous Ref:	OCM 26 May 2009 (Resolution 211) OCM 25 March 2008 (Resolution 103) OCM 12 February 2008 (Resolutions 22, 24-27) OCM 27 March 2007 (Resolution 111) OCM 19 December 2006 (Resolution 625) OCM 8 August 2006 (Resolution 382) OCM 23 May 2006 (Resolution 228) OCM 26 October 2004 (Resolution 617) OCM 23 September 2003 (Resolution 644) OCM 8 April 2003 (Resolution 216) OCM 13 August 2002 (Resolution 654)
Appendices:	The appendices that formed part of Item 13.5.2 on 26 May 2009 Council Agenda are not included in the current report. These appendices may be viewed on the City's web site at www.gosnells.wa.gov.au :

The following appendices are included as part of the current Agenda:

13.5.2C	Amendment No. 89 Scheme Amendment Map
13.5.2D	Schedule of Submissions – Amendment No. 89
13.5.2E	Schedule of Submissions – Draft Central Maddington ODP
13.5.2S	Draft revised Central Maddington Outline Development Plan Map (as amended following advertising)
13.5.2T	Draft revised Central Maddington Outline Development Plan Text (as amended following advertising)
13.5.2W	Draft revised Central Maddington Outline Development Plan (as amended following advertising)

Item 13.5.2 Continued

	and further review of road layout)			
13.5.2X	Draft revised Central Maddington	Outline		
	Development Plan (Alternate Option No. 1)			
13.5.2Y	Draft revised Central Maddington	Outline		
	Development Plan (Alternate Option No. 2)			
13.5.2Z	Subdivision Concept Plan provided by	Submitter		
	No. 54			

PURPOSE OF REPORT

For Council to consider:

- final adoption of Amendment No. 89 to Town Planning Scheme No. 6 (TPS 6) to rezone part of the Central Maddington Outline Development Plan (ODP) area to Residential Development and establish the broad parameters for the operation of a development contribution arrangement (DCA).
- adoption of the draft Central Maddington ODP, with or without modifications. The ODP is intended to guide subdivision and development (incorporating a range of land uses and residential densities) generally within 800m of the existing Maddington Railway Station.

BACKGROUND

Council at its meeting of 12 February 2008 considered a proposed amendment to TPS 6 and a draft ODP, both of which related specifically to the Central Maddington ODP area, and resolved to determine that the proposals were satisfactory for advertising for public comment for 42 days. The associated report provided background and details relating to the proposals.

At its meeting on 26 May 2009, Council considered a report that detailed the submissions received during the public comment period on the proposed ODP and TPS Amendment, discussed a range of matters requiring consideration and set out seven recommendations relating to the proposals. Council resolved (Resolution 211) to refer the proposals to a Councillor workshop for further discussion.

A Councillor workshop was held on 17 June 2009, and additional analysis has been added for the Council's consideration.

The matter is now presented to Council to again consider final adoption of Amendment No. 89 to TPS 6 and adoption of the draft Central Maddington ODP.

Due to the complexity of this issue, and size of the resulting report, the attachments to the 26 May Agenda item have not been included with this report. They are, however available on the internet, or by referring to the previous agenda papers.

The original report to Council on 26 May 2009 is reprinted in its entirety, as follows:

"PURPOSE OF REPORT

For Council to consider:

- *final adoption of Amendment No. 89 to Town Planning Scheme No. 6 (TPS 6) to rezone part of the Central Maddington Outline Development*

Item 13.5.2 Continued

Plan (ODP) area to Residential Development and establish the broad parameters for the operation of a development contribution arrangement (DCA).

- *adoption of the draft Central Maddington Outline Development Plan (ODP), with or without modifications. The ODP is intended to guide subdivision and development (incorporating a range of land uses and residential densities) generally within 800m of the existing Maddington Railway Station.*

BACKGROUND**Site Description**

The Central Maddington ODP area encompasses approximately 150 hectares of land generally located within 800m of the Maddington railway station and is comprised of approximately 550 individual landholdings and 470 individual landowners. Lots range in area from 547m² to 5.5 hectares.

The Albany Highway road reserve provides a useful division of the ODP into two areas, each one similar in size but having distinctive characteristics. The two areas are summarised as follows:

Area North of Albany Highway

The area north of Albany Highway is generally bound by Albany Highway, Kelvin Road, Yule Street, Westfield Street, properties fronting the east side of Morley Street and Dalziell Street.

With the exception of land reserved for Railways, Primary Regional Roads and Other Regional Roads, all land within this area is zoned Urban in the Metropolitan Region Scheme (MRS). Under TPS 6, land within the area is generally zoned Residential R17.5, with the exception of several small areas coded R30 and R40, and Highway Commercial located between Albany Highway and the Perth to Armadale railway reserve.

The predominant land use in this area, accounting for approximately 70% of all lots and 90% of the land area, is low density residential development. Relatively large underdeveloped single residential lots characterise the area. Approximately 70% of the total number of lots exceed 1,000m² in area with around one third exceeding 2,000m². Of those lots less than 1,000m² the majority are in the 700m² to 1,000m² range. Land between the railway reservation and Albany Highway is occupied by car/caravan sales yards, an office complex and a small amount of retail development. There is also some vacant land.

Area South of Albany Highway

The area south of Albany Highway is generally bound by Albany Highway, Olga Road/Burslem Drive, the "Arcadia Waters" aged persons' development, the regional Parks and Recreation reserve abutting the Canning River and the Perth to Armadale railway reserve.

Item 13.5.2 Continued

This area consists of land zoned both Urban and Urban Deferred in the MRS, in addition to land reserved for Parks and Recreation, Waterways and Regional Road purposes. Under TPS 6, this area is predominantly zoned Residential R17.5, with smaller areas of land being zoned Residential R30, Highway Commercial, Mixed Business and General Rural.

Land uses in this area are more varied, with low density residential lots accounting for approximately 50% of the land area. This land, like the northern area, is characterised by large underdeveloped lots, however there is a greater proportion of lots below 1,000m² in area compared to the northern area. These lots are generally situated within 150m of Olga Road.

Approximately 35% of the southern area consists of non-urbanised land abutting the Canning River Parks and Recreation Reserve. Most of these landholdings are used for small-scale horticultural pursuits (such as orange orchards and market gardens) or are vacant.

Previous Consideration of Proposals

Council at its meeting of 12 February 2008 considered a draft ODP and an amendment to TPS 6, both of which related specifically to the Central Maddington ODP area, and resolved as follows:

Resolution 24

“That Council, pursuant to Clause 7.4.2(b) of Town Planning Scheme No. 6:

- 1. Determine that the proposed Central Maddington Outline Development Plan, contained in Appendix 13.5.1B, is satisfactory for the purposes of advertising for public comment, subject to the Plan first being modified to the satisfaction of the Director Planning and Sustainability to increase the amount of Local Open Space shown on the Plan from approximately 5.4% to 8%, in accordance with Liveable Neighbourhoods, with the Local Open Space being equitably distributed, as far as practicable, between Areas A and B, based on the proportionate size of each area.*
- 2. Advertise the Central Maddington Outline Development Plan for public comment, once modified in accordance with 1 above, by way of:*
 - a) Letter to all landowners within the Central Maddington Outline Development Plan area.*
 - b) Letters to relevant public authorities.*
 - c) Advertisements in two local newspapers for three consecutive weeks.*

Item 13.5.2 Continued

- d) *Display on the City's website, and at the City's Administration Building and Libraries."*

Resolution 25

"That Council, pursuant to Clause 7.4.6 of Town Planning Scheme No. 6, forward a copy of the proposed Central Maddington Outline Development Plan, as contained in Appendix 13.5.1B, to the Western Australian Planning Commission for information."

Resolution 26

"That Council, pursuant to Section 75 of the Planning and Development Act (2005), adopt Amendment No. 89 to Town Planning Scheme No. 6 for the purpose of:

- 1. Rezoning land within the Central Maddington Outline Development Plan area from Residential R17.5, Residential R30, Residential R40, Highway Commercial, Mixed Business, Local Open Space, Public Purposes, Water Courses, and General Rural to Residential Development, as depicted on the Scheme Amendment maps attached as Appendices 13.5.1C and 13.5.1D.*
- 2. Adding to Schedule 12 of the Scheme Text Attachment D, as set out below, and Map 1 (attached as Appendix 13.5.1E) regarding the specific common infrastructure works and costs for the Central Maddington Outline Development Plan area:*

"ATTACHMENT D

SPECIFIC PROVISIONS RELATING TO THE CENTRAL MADDINGTON OUTLINE DEVELOPMENT PLAN AREA

- 1. "Central Maddington Outline Development Plan area" means the area shown on Map 1, titled Central Maddington Outline Development Plan area.*
- 2. Common infrastructure works additional to those detailed in the Twelfth Schedule of the Scheme as follows:*
 - (a) The construction of new, and upgrading of existing drainage infrastructure, and associated urban water management measures.*
 - (b) The construction of dual-use paths as required by the adopted Outline Development Plan.*

Item 13.5.2 Continued

- (c) *The construction of Outline Development Plan funded roads as required by the adopted Outline Development Plan.*
- (d) *The construction of traffic management devices as required by the adopted Outline Development Plan.*
- (e) *The upgrading of street lighting.*
- (f) *The provision of underground power.*
- (g) *The planting of street trees.*
- (h) *The development of Local Open Space.*

3. *Cost contributions additional to those detailed in the Twelfth Schedule of the Scheme as follows:*

- (a) *The cost of construction of new, and upgrading of existing drainage infrastructure, and associated urban water management measures.*
- (b) *The cost of construction of dual-use paths as required by the adopted Outline Development Plan.*
- (c) *The cost of construction of Outline Development Plan funded roads as required by the adopted Outline Development Plan.*
- (d) *The cost of acquisition of land required for Outline Development Plan funded roads as required by the adopted Outline Development Plan.*
- (e) *The cost of construction of traffic management devices as required by the adopted Outline Development Plan.*
- (f) *The cost of upgrading of street lighting.*
- (g) *The cost of provision of underground power.*
- (h) *The cost of planting of street trees.*
- (i) *The cost of general administration of the Outline Development Plan.*

Item 13.5.2 Continued

(j) *The cost of preparation of the Outline Development Plan.*

(k) *The cost of acquisition of land required for Local Open Space as required by the adopted Outline Development Plan.*

(l) *The cost of development of Local Open Space.*

4. *A development contribution plan shall be prepared to detail the intended operation of the development contribution arrangement pursuant to the Twelfth Schedule of the Scheme."*

Resolution 27

"That Council forward Amendment No. 89 to Town Planning Scheme No. 6 to:

1. *The Environmental Protection Authority for comment, pursuant to Section 81 of the Planning and Development Act (2005).*
2. *The Heritage Council of Western Australia for advice, pursuant to Section 79 of the Planning and Development Act (2005).*
3. *The Western Australian Planning Commission for information.*

and subject to no objections being received from the Environmental Protection Authority and advice being received from the Heritage Council of Western Australia, the amendment be advertised for public comment pursuant to Regulation 25(2) of the Town Planning Regulations (1967) for a period of 42 days to the satisfaction of the Director Planning and Sustainability."

Consultation

In accordance with the abovementioned Council resolutions from 12 February 2008, the draft Central Maddington ODP was modified to the satisfaction of the Director Planning and Sustainability and Amendment No. 89 was referred to the EPA and Heritage Council of Western Australia for comment. The EPA determined that no environmental assessment was required and the Heritage Council advised that it had no objection to the proposals. As such, Amendment No. 89 and the draft ODP were advertised for public comment by way of:

- *letters to all landowners within the ODP area*
- *letters to all landowners within 100m of the ODP area*
- *an advertisement placed in the two local newspapers for three consecutive weeks*

Item 13.5.2 Continued

- *an advertisement placed in the West Australian newspaper*
- *the placement of six (6) signs in prominent locations throughout the ODP area*
- *advertising on the City's website*
- *public displays at the City's administration building and libraries*
- *hosting two (2) public information evenings at the Maddington Community Centre*

The advertised draft ODP is contained in Appendices 13.5.2A and 13.5.2B and the advertised Scheme Amendment map is contained in Appendix 13.5.2C.

The City received 36 submissions in relation to Amendment No. 89 and 93 were received in relation to the draft ODP.

A summary of the matters raised in the submissions relating Amendment No. 89, and comments in response, is attached as Appendix 13.5.2D, with a summary of the matters raised in the submissions relating to the draft ODP, and comments in response, attached as Appendix 13.5.2E.

A list of persons making submissions and related reference numbers is contained as Appendix 13.5.2F.

The properties of landowners that made submissions are indicated on the Location Plans attached as Appendices 13.5.2G to 13.5.2J.

Three of the submissions received (Submission Reference Numbers 58, 70 and 92) raised numerous detailed objections to the draft ODP and the planning for Central Maddington in general. The key planning comments applicable to the draft ODP have been extracted and provided in the abovementioned submission tables (including the City's responses), with the submissions in their entirety contained as Appendices 13.5.2K-13.5.2M.

In accordance with the abovementioned Council resolutions from 12 February 2008, both planning proposals (the draft ODP and proposed Amendment No. 89) were referred to a number of government agencies for review and comment. The City received eight submissions from government agencies, with a summary of those submissions and comments thereon detailed in the table contained as Appendix 13.5.2N.

DISCUSSION

Amendment No. 89 to Town Planning Scheme No.6

The submissions received in response to the advertising of proposed Amendment No. 89 did not raise any major technical concerns with the amendment itself, but rather queried the likely operation of a Development Contribution Arrangement. It should be noted that any future Development Contribution Arrangement will need to be properly established through consultation with affected landowners and consideration by Council and the State Government. It will be a key aspect of the planning framework for Central Maddington. A Development Contribution Plan (DCP) will outline the

Item 13.5.2 Continued

operational aspects of the Arrangement including details pertaining to the extent and cost of common infrastructure works and the methodology for the apportionment of costs within the ODP area, as part of establishing the arrangement.

Central Maddington Outline Development Plan

There are significant issues associated with the draft ODP, many of which were raised in submissions. Discussion of the main issues is provided in the following sections of this report:

Commercial Zoning

The draft advertised ODP provides for both Highway Commercial and Mixed Business designated land within the Central Maddington area, the locations of which are strictly consistent with the current TPS 6 zoning within the subject area. Submission No. 91 advocates a modification to the ODP so as to designate the northern portions of Lots 188, 189 and 190 Albany Highway and Lots 5 and 6 Albany Highway as Highway Commercial (rather than Residential R60). The submission is indicated on the plan contained at Appendix 13.5.2O. In reviewing the submission, it is considered appropriate that the ODP be modified in the suggested manner (but to also include Lots 1 and 500 Albany Highway) for the following reasons:

- The modification would be consistent with the defined objectives of the Highway Commercial zone under TPS 6, which is “to provide for a range of commercial development, including particularly bulk retailing and open air display, which is suitable for a highway frontage location” (emphasis added) insofar as the subject area is located adjacent Albany Highway within an identified town centre.*
- The modification would be consistent with Council’s adopted Maddington Town Centre Development Policy, which states the objective for the subject area is “to consolidate Highway based commercial uses within the Town Centre area, and accommodate residential infill where possible”.*
- The modification would be consistent with the City’s Draft Local Commercial Strategy.*
- The proposed extent of the Highway Commercial zoning on the subject sites would mirror the extent of the existing zoning (and proposed designation) on the northern side of Albany Highway.*
- The modification would respond positively to the dominant landowner’s submission and is consistent with that landowner’s stated development intentions.*

It will be recommended that Council modify the draft ODP by designating the northern portions of Lots 188, 189 and 190 Albany Highway and Lots 1, 5, 6 and 500 Albany Highway as Highway Commercial.

Item 13.5.2 Continued

Residential Densities

The draft ODP, as advertised for public comment, provided for a range of residential densities between R20 and R60, with the higher densities proposed for the areas considered to be the most conveniently located in terms of their accessibility to key services and community facilities. In response to the public consultation on the draft ODP, numerous landowner submissions received by the City suggested that the densities proposed should be modified in particular areas. These submissions are discussed below and indicated on the plan contained at Appendix 13.5.2O.

1. Submission No. 45 suggests that the area bound by River Avenue, Lot 26 River Avenue and the proposed Local Open Space should be identified as Residential R40 rather than R30.

Response: It is considered appropriate to modify the draft ODP to indicate portions of Lots 19, 800 and 501 River Avenue as Residential R40 for the following reasons:

- Whilst the subject area is not located within 800m of the Maddington Railway Station, it is located within 250m of Albany Highway, which accommodates bus routes.
- The proposed R40 residential density would mirror the previously proposed residential coding on the western side of the River Avenue.

Whilst it is acknowledged that other submitters object to any increase in residential density in the subject location, it must be noted that when adopted, the Central Maddington ODP will provide a framework for subdivision and development, but will not compel landowners to develop and subdivide if they do not wish to do so.

2. Submissions No. 46 and 72 suggest that Lot 91 Weston Street and Lot 16 Attfield Street should be identified as Residential R60 rather than R30.

Response: The draft ODP has identified the subject sites as Residential R30, effectively acknowledging that they are located within 800m of the Maddington Railway Station, an approach which is consistent with WAPC's Liveable Neighbourhoods Policy. Notwithstanding the above, the submitters suggestions are not supported as the sites are not located in close enough proximity to the Maddington Railway Station (that is, within 400m; as prescribed by the City's Local Housing Strategy) to warrant a further increase in residential density beyond R30.

3. Submission No. 47 suggests that Lot 58 The Crescent should be identified as Residential R60 rather than R30 and R40.

Response: The draft ODP has identified the subject site as Residential R30 and R40, effectively acknowledging that it is located within 800m of the Maddington Railway Station, an approach which is consistent with WAPC's Liveable Neighbourhoods Policy. Notwithstanding the above,

Item 13.5.2 Continued

the submitter's suggestion is not supported as the site is not located in close enough proximity to the Maddington Railway Station (that is, within 400m; as prescribed by the City's Local Housing Strategy) to warrant a further increase in residential density beyond R30 and R40.

4. *Submissions No. 58 and 70 object to the proposed Residential R20 coding for the land on the east of River Avenue and the proposed Residential R40 coding for the land bound by Cowan Street, Attfield Street and River Avenue. Submitters prefer a maximum density coding of R17.5 for the abovementioned areas.*

Response: *Whilst the submitters' objections to the proposed increases in residential density are noted, the density codings designated by the draft ODP are supported for the following reasons:*

- The R20 coding is consistent with the recommendations of the City's Local Housing Strategy to lift the 'base' residential coding of the district from R17.5 to R20.*
- The proposed R40 area is located within 800m from the Maddington Railway Station and the Maddington Town Centre, as well as being in close proximity (i.e. within 250m) of a major transport route (Albany Highway). In addition to maximising the number of residences within close proximity to key transport links, the proposed density is expected to encourage two-storey development which can provide a useful barrier between adjoining residential areas and the noise generated on the abovementioned transport route.*

5. *Submissions No. 58 and 70 suggests that only areas within 100m of the railway station should be coded above Residential R20.*

Response: *Both the City's Local Housing Strategy and the WAPC's Liveable Neighbourhoods Policy advocate the increase in residential density for areas located within 400m (and in some cases 800m) of railway stations and commercial centres.*

6. *Submissions No. 63 and 64 suggests that the area bound by River Avenue, Phillip Street and the Canning River Parks and Recreation Reservation should be identified as R40 and R80 rather than R20.*

Response: *The submitter provided two conceptual development plans (contained as Appendices 13.5.2P and 13.5.2Q) to support the requested increase in density. The concept plans indicate the following:*

- Two separate five-storey multiple dwelling buildings (providing a total of 160 dwellings) located in the southern portion of the sites, adjacent to the Canning River Parks and Recreation reservation.*
- A total of 141 medium-density grouped dwellings, located in the northern portion of the sites.*
- A private road network only, with no public access to the Parks and Recreation reservation.*

Item 13.5.2 Continued

The draft ODP has identified the subject area as Residential R20, acknowledging that it is not located within 800m of the Maddington Railway Station. Notwithstanding, given the area is located within 800m of the Maddington Commercial Centre, it is considered appropriate to increase the proposed residential density to R30. The modification will maintain the low density nature of the area and contribute to an appropriate graduation of density between the existing R30 development (Arcadia Waters) and the proposed R20 development east of River Avenue.”

The previous report erroneously stated that the draft advertised ODP designated the area bound by River Avenue, Phillip Street and the Canning River Parks and Recreation Reservation as being coded Residential R20. The draft advertised ODP actually designated the abovementioned area as Residential R30 and as such, the summarised submission and response should read as follows:

6. Submissions No. 63 and 64 suggest that the area bound by River Avenue, Phillip Street and the Canning River Parks and Recreation Reservation should be identified as R40 and R80 rather than R30.

Response: The submitter provided two conceptual development plans (contained as Appendices 13.5.2P and 13.5.2Q) to support the requested increase in density. The concept plans indicate the following:

- Two separate five-storey multiple dwelling buildings (providing a total of 160 dwellings) located in the southern portion of the sites, adjacent to the Canning River Parks and Recreation reservation.
- A total of 141 medium-density grouped dwellings, located in the northern portion of the sites.
- A private road network only, with no public access to the Parks and Recreation reservation.

The draft ODP has identified the subject area as Residential R30, acknowledging that while it is not located within 800m of the Maddington Railway Station, it is located within 800m of the Maddington Commercial Centre. The R30 density coding will maintain the low density nature of the area and contribute to an appropriate graduation of density between the existing R30 development (Arcadia Waters) and the proposed R20 development east of River Avenue. As such, it is not considered appropriate to modify the draft ODP to provide for a density of greater than Residential R30 in the subject location.

“7. *Submission No. 65 suggests that Lot 26 River Avenue and Lot 808 Albany Highway should be identified as R30 and R40 rather than R20.*

Response: *The submitter provided a conceptual ODP (contained as Appendix 13.5.2R) to support the requested increase in density. The ODP indicates the following:*

Item 13.5.2 Continued

- *Two separate areas of Residential R30 coded land, located either side of Stokely Creek.*
- *An area of Residential R40 coded land, located in the eastern portion of Lot 808.*
- *Two separate areas of Local Open Space, generally along Stokely Creek*
- *An indicative road layout that provides for some, but not total, road frontage to the Local Open Space associated with Stokely Creek.*

The draft ODP has identified the subject area as Residential R20, effectively acknowledging that it is not located within 800m of the Maddington Railway Station or the Maddington Town Centre, nor is it located with a 400m walkable distance of Albany Highway. Furthermore, it is considered appropriate to maintain the proposed Residential R20 coding to assist in providing a range of housing types within the ODP area and to limit the potential number of dwellings that will be located in close proximity to the existing railway line.

8. *Submission No. 68 suggests that Lot 28 Clifton Street should be identified as Residential R60 rather than R30, and states that the subject site was previously identified as Residential R60 by TPS 21.*

Response: Contrary to the submitter's assertion, the subject site was not identified as Residential R60 by the former draft Town Planning Scheme No. 21, but rather, was identified as Residential R30.

Notwithstanding the above, the draft Central Maddington ODP, as advertised, identified the subject site as being required, in its entirety, for the purposes of Local Open Space. Further discussion on the provisions of Local Open Space is contained in the Discussion section under the heading of Local Open Space.

If Council resolve to adopt a plan that does not require the subject site in its entirety as Local Open Space, it would be recommended that the ODP designate the developable portions of the subject lot as Residential R30 as such a coding would effectively acknowledge that the site is located within 800m of the Maddington Railway Station, consistent with WAPC's Liveable Neighbourhoods Policy. However, given that the site is not located within 400m of the Station (as prescribed by the City's Local Housing Strategy) the submitter's suggestion to provide a residential density greater than R30 is not supported.

9. *Submission No. 91 suggests that the southern portions of Lots 111, 188, 189 and 190 Albany Highway should be designated as Residential R100 rather than Residential R60.*

Response: A modification to the draft ODP to provide for a residential density of R80 (rather than R100 as suggested by the submitter) for the abovementioned lots as well as Lots 11, 12 and 15 Olga Road and

Item 13.5.2 Continued

Lots 23 and 24 Attfield Street, is considered appropriate for the following reasons:

- *The higher density coding is considered consistent with the provisions of the WAPC's Liveable Neighbourhoods document which states:*

"In strategic areas close to higher order centres and railway stations, significantly higher residential densities will usually be expected."

- *All the applicable lots are located within 300m of the Maddington Railway Station and/or the Maddington Regional Centre. As such the proposal would be consistent with the "Density Based on Accessibility" principle of Council's adopted Local Housing Strategy, which is based on areas with the highest levels of access to public transport services, local shops, community facilities and public open space having the greatest potential to accommodate increased residential density.*
- *The increase in residential density would, pursuant to the provisions of the Residential Design Codes, actively promote the development of Mixed Use Multiple Dwellings, in accordance with Council's Maddington Town Centre Development Policy. As such the proposal would be consistent with the "Promotion of Diverse Housing Options" principle of Council's adopted Local Housing Strategy, which advocates a variety of dwellings types and sizes.*
- *The R80 density coding is consistent with the maximum residential density that can be contemplated for commercial-zoned land under TPS 6.*

10. *Submission No. 92 suggests that proposed densities should be reduced so that less public space is required.*

Response: Whilst it is acknowledged that Open Space contributions are not normally required for subdivisions creating five lots or less, Clause 3.1.5 of the WAPC's Policy No. DC 2.3 – Public Open Space in Residential Areas states that a contribution can be required if the land is subject to an approved structure plan.

In any event, the submitter's suggestion is not supported as it would be inconsistent with the following stated objectives of the ODP:

- *To facilitate medium density residential development generally within 800m of the Maddington Railway Station; and*
- *Provide for additional areas of public open space to meeting the needs of the existing and additional residents.*

11. *Submission No. 93 suggests that the lots on Clifton Street should be identified as Residential R40 or Residential R60 rather than R30.*

Item 13.5.2 Continued

Response: Whilst the option is available to Council to modify the draft ODP to increase the residential density of properties along Clifton Street, such a modification is considered inappropriate for the following reasons:

- The vast majority of land on Clifton Street that has not previously been identified as R40 or R60, is not located within 400m of the Maddington Railway Station or the Maddington Commercial Centre, thereby not warranting any increase in residential density beyond the R30 previously proposed.
- The content of the submission is not a universally expressed view, and there is little evidence of landowner support for such a modification to the ODP.

Area Subject to Further Detailed Planning

The draft advertised ODP identified an area to the southeast of River Avenue as "Subject to Further Detailed Planning". This was due to the precinct, at the time the ODP was considered by Council (12 February 2008), being the only portion within the Central Maddington area that was zoned Urban Deferred under the MRS and for which an application to transfer the land to the Urban zone had not been made.

Since the preparation and consideration of the draft ODP, Council, at its meeting of 11 November 2008, considered a number of proposals relating to the subject area and resolved (Resolutions 551 and 552) to support proposals to:

- lift the Urban Deferment status under the MRS, that currently applies to the area southeast of River Avenue; and
- automatically rezone the land to Residential Development under TPS 6.

Given that Council supported the abovementioned proposals, it is considered appropriate to modify the ODP to reflect the ultimate intended development outcomes for the land, including the designation of a residential zoning and an internal road network. In this regard, the Swan River Trust has requested that the plan be modified to show an indicative road layout, including a Parks and Recreation road interface where possible. As such, it will be recommended that the draft advertised ODP be modified to remove the "Subject to Further Detailed Planning" designation and provide for a residential coding of R20 and a road connection between Serenity Court and River Avenue adjacent to the Parks and Recreation reservation.

Local Open Space

In the report presented to Council's meeting of 12 February 2008, it was recommended that Council adopt the draft ODP which incorporated the provision of 8.2% Local Open Space, however, Council resolved (Resolution 24) to require the draft ODP to be modified prior to advertising to incorporate at least 10% Local Open Space so as to accord with the WAPC's Liveable Neighbourhoods document. As such, the draft ODP, as advertised,

Item 13.5.2 Continued

identified approximately 9ha of Local Open Space, which equated to approximately 10.9% of the developable area within the ODP.

Numerous landowner submissions received by the City raised concerns with the amount and location of Local Open Space proposed by the draft ODP, with many objecting to the designation of open space on their particular property or properties.

In reviewing the proposed Local Open Space provision, it was considered appropriate to investigate the option of reducing the amount, and modifying the location, of Local Open Space indicated on the ODP, so as to in turn reduce the number of directly affected properties and to minimise the overall cost of the future development contribution arrangement.

The draft modified ODP (as contained as Appendices 13.5.2S and 13.5.2T) provides for 6.6ha of Local Open Space, compared to the 9ha proposed by the draft advertised ODP. Justification for such a reduction is as follows:

- All lots within the ODP area are located within one kilometre of one or a number of other district parkland areas including the Maddington Primary School ovals, Maddington Oval, Gibbs Park and the Canning River foreshore "Parks and Recreation" reservation. Whilst it is acknowledged that these reserves are not intended to fulfil the role of Local Open Space, they nonetheless provide areas for recreational opportunities for those residing within the Central Maddington area.*
- Almost all of the ODP area (approximately 95%) is located within 400m of an existing or proposed neighbourhood park, in accordance with the provisions of the WAPC's Liveable Neighbourhoods document. It should be noted however, that the areas not within 400m of an existing or proposed neighbourhood park are located within 500m of such a park and also within 100m of the Canning River foreshore "Parks and Recreation" reservation, which as detailed above, does provide some recreational opportunities.*
- A reduced amount of Local Open Space (2.4ha less than the draft ODP, as advertised) reduces the considerable, potentially prohibitive, financial burden for many of the developing landowners, one that may otherwise compromise the timely implementation of the Central Maddington ODP.*
- A reduced amount of Local Open Space (2.4ha less than the draft ODP, as advertised) reduces the financial risk to the City, who will ultimately be responsible for administering a proposed cost sharing arrangement to fund the cost of acquisition of land from private landowners.*
- A reduced amount of Local Open Space in conjunction with a modified distribution requires the acquisition of only one dwelling, whereas the draft ODP, as advertised, requires the acquisition of six dwellings. Such a reduction in dwelling acquisitions represents a significant financial and social benefit for the ODP, its developing landowners and the City.*
- The modified distribution does not provide for any Local Open Space along the open drain that runs between Yule Street and Westfield Street. This exclusion is considered appropriate as the drain provides no public amenity, represents a possible safety risk and its incorporation*

Item 13.5.2 Continued

into an area of Local Open Space was not supported by a number of nearby landowners.

- The modified distribution of Local Open Space provides for the rationalisation of the 2,876m² area of Local Open Space located on Newenden Street (Gordon Graham Park). Gordon Graham Park is not considered to be an appropriate area of Local Open Space for the following reasons:

- * The reserve is smaller than the minimum 4,000m² preferred by the City.

- * The reserve is bound by fencing on three sides, which limits opportunities for passive surveillance and is inconsistent with the objectives of the City's Safe City Urban Design Strategy.

- * The reserve is located in close proximity (i.e. within 150m) to a proposed 1.4ha area of Local Open Space.

The benefit of rationalising the reserve is that it can be disposed of for residential purposes, with the option that any funds generated by the disposal being able to be used towards the acquisition and development of other, more appropriate, Local Open Space sites within the ODP area.

- Ultimately, it will reduce the number of properties affected by Local Open Space from 30 to 20.
- A reduced amount of Local Open Space in conjunction with a modified distribution will be equivalent to 10% of the total area of only those lots that can achieve a minimum of six lots/dwellings pursuant to the density coding provided by the draft ODP. In this regard, the WAPC's Liveable Neighbourhoods Policy states as follows:

"R39 For subdivision of five lots or less or pre-1956 subdivisions, the WAPC may not always require a public open space contribution providing the contribution is not required under a town planning scheme or approved structure plan where:

- the subdivider, with advice from the local government, demonstrates that there is sufficient public open space in the locality and the cumulative effect of other potential small subdivisions will not generate the demand for additional public open space."

Given that the Central Maddington ODP area will be appropriately and sufficiently served by Local Open Space, as detailed above, the provision of Local Open Space equivalent to 10% of only those lots which will have the potential to develop a minimum six lots or dwellings, is considered consistent with the WAPC's Liveable Neighbourhoods Policy.

Item 13.5.2 Continued

Further to the issue of Local Open Space provision, it is considered appropriate to investigate the option of introducing an additional planning mechanism(s) to control development that is proposed to be located immediately adjacent a Local Open Space and/or Parks and Recreation reservation. In accordance with the provisions of the City's Safe City Urban Design Strategy, it is important to ensure that all development abutting the public realm effectively contributes to the amenity and enhances the safety of the public space.

Therefore, it will be recommended that the draft ODP text be modified so as in the event where development is proposed to be located immediately adjacent a Local Open Space or Parks and Recreation reservation, a Detailed Area Plan will be required as a condition of subdivision approval to clearly articulate relevant built form controls to ensure appropriate surveillance of and interface with, the public realm.

Proposed Internal Road Network

The draft ODP, as advertised for public comment, is a thoroughly comprehensive structure plan which provides for numerous road connections, traffic management devices and areas of Local Open Space, all of which will likely contribute to a quality urban form, promoting a high level of vehicle and pedestrian accessibility. However, numerous landowner submissions received by the City raised concerns with the proposed internal road network indicated by the draft ODP, with many objecting to the designation of a road(s) on their particular property or properties.

There is a need to provide an improved and expanded local road network in the ODP area. Upon detailed analysis, the advertised ODP appeared to introduce more roads than may be necessary to achieve a permeable, accessible and well-structured urban area. As a result, the draft modified ODP (as contained as Appendices 13.5.2S and 13.5.XT) provides for fewer roads and a modified road configuration, with justification for such modification as follows:

- The modified road network would result in a reduction in road construction (in the order of 2,800 linear metres) and land acquisition (in the order of 3ha). Such a reduction in the provision of road infrastructure reduces the considerable, potentially prohibitive, financial burden for developing landowners, one that may otherwise compromise the timely implementation of the Central Maddington ODP.*
- The reduced number of road extensions has subsequently reduced the number of four-way intersections, which generally require some form of traffic management device. As such, the internal road network provided by the draft modified ODP requires only one roundabout, whereas the draft ODP, as advertised, requires six. Given that roundabouts are generally costed at least approximately \$100,000 each, the reduction represents a considerable financial benefit for the ODP, its developing landowners and the City.*
- The modified plan provides for an additional 380m of road frontage to the southern side of the existing Maddington Primary School. The benefits of such a road include the following:*

Item 13.5.2 Continued

- * *It will provide greater pedestrian and vehicular permeability within the ODP area.*
- * *It will provide for passive surveillance of the school and its associated recreation areas.*
- * *It is supported by the Department of Education and Training.*

- *The modified plan provides for a proposed road adjacent the existing Perth – Armadale Railway Line. The benefits of such a road include the following:*

- * *It will provide greater physical separation between dwellings and the railway line, thus assisting in noise attenuation.*
- * *It will provide for passive surveillance of the railway line, the Dual Use Path abutting the railway reservation and properties on the eastern side of the railway reservation.*
- * *It will remove the need for a sound wall along the railway reservation, which would likely be subject to graffiti and detrimentally affect the amenity of the local area.*
- * *The submission from the owner of Lot 808 Albany Highway (the site located adjacent the railway line) included a draft 'recommended' ODP for the subject site which specifically indicated a road reserve being located adjacent the railway reservation. Therefore, it is considered that such a modification is consistent with the landowner's desired outcome for the site.*

- *Ultimately it will reduce the number of properties affected by new roads and/or road extensions from approximately 140 to approximately 120.*

Potential Link to Proposed Main Street/Boulevard

Internal review of the various options for progressing the ODP identified the opportunity to provide a modified road layout between Brabourne Street and Kelvin Road, so as to provide a strong pedestrian link between the Central Maddington ODP area and the proposed Maddington Town Centre Boulevard/Main Street that is to be located east of Kelvin Road and north of the existing railway station (the area currently occupied by the City's Operations Centre). It is considered that such a road configuration (as depicted by the plan contained as Appendix 13.5.2U), which was a concept that resulted from the 2004 Maddington Town Centre Enquiry by Design workshop, would provide for a high level of accessibility to the proposed boulevard and would benefit the Maddington Town Centre by encouraging passive surveillance, providing access to facilities and promoting community integration.

Whilst such a connection (between Brabourne Street and Kelvin Road) could be considered advantageous for the proposed Boulevard/Main Street, in determining the appropriateness of such a link, Council must consider the following matters:

Item 13.5.2 Continued

- *It has not yet been determined what mix of uses may be accommodated in the Main Street precinct in the future, and whether those uses actually warrant or require an improved pedestrian linkage from the Central Maddington ODP area.*
- *A proposed link would require the acquisition and removal of at least three (3) existing residential dwellings. The acquisition of land accommodating existing dwellings represents a considerable implementation challenge for the City as well as having significant social implications for affected landowners.*
- *A proposed link between Brabourne Street and Kelvin Road would require the acquisition of at least 2,700m² of additional land for public purposes. Traffic management measures would also be needed to avoid uncontrolled four-way intersections. In the event that Council, in the future, resolves to adopt a Development Contribution Plan to share the costs of communal infrastructure costs and works, the abovementioned land and traffic management measures would represent an additional financial burden for the developing landowners within the ODP and the City (who would ultimately be responsible for administering such an arrangement). Such a burden may ultimately compromise the timely implementation of the Central Maddington ODP, thereby reducing the potential residential catchment surrounding the railway station and the town centre. Ultimately, by attempting to encourage greater accessibility to the proposed boulevard, the plan may actually contribute to a reduced residential catchment, thus being counter-productive to the original objectives of the link.*

Whilst it may be desirable to achieve a continuous link between the northern half of the ODP area and the potential Boulevard/Main Street precinct, east of Kelvin Road, it is considered that such a link would, in the established, fragmented context of the Central Maddington ODP area, be difficult to achieve and impact detrimentally on the timely implementation of subdivision and development throughout the entire ODP area. As such, it will not be recommended that Council modify the draft advertised plan to incorporate the abovementioned link.

Detailed Area Plans

The draft advertised ODP was, at the time, purposefully designed in a generalised manner. Whilst a proposed road network and areas of Local Open Space were identified on the plan, exact dimensions, sizes and locations were not, as such matters were intended to be refined through the preparation and adoption of Detailed Area Plans (DAPs) for each of the nine identified precincts.

Such an approach may be considered to have merit insofar as it provides for a degree of flexibility within the ODP and allows Council to adopt a broad structure plan and establish a framework for landowners to undertake the more detailed planning on a more specific, precinct basis. The advantage of such an approach being the reduction of the burden on the City's limited planning resources. However, the above approach effectively defers consideration of a number of detailed planning matters and ultimately adds another layer of planning control, effectively delaying the achievement of desired development and conservation outcomes.

Item 13.5.2 Continued

Based on the above, it is considered appropriate to modify the draft ODP to no longer prescribe a blanket requirement to prepare DAPs for each precinct, but rather, to specifically identify the locations, dimensions and sizes of Local Open Space and internal roads.

The justification for such a modification is as follows:

- Such an approach would provide greater certainty for affected landowners;*
- Such an approach would assist in the preparation of a Development Contribution Plan as it would allow more accurate estimation of the areas of land required for public purposes.*
- It would assist in streamlining the planning for the Central Maddington ODP area by removing an additional layer of planning control (unless a DAP was required to address a specific built form or interface issue).*
- Such an approach would be consistent with other adopted ODPs for areas involving fragmented land parcels in separate, unconsolidated ownership, including the West Canning Vale, Southern River Precinct 1B, Southern River Precinct 1C, Southern River Precinct 1F, Yule Brook Precinct 1, West Martin Precinct 1, West Martin Precinct 2 and Chamberlain Street ODPs.*

Further to the above, it is appropriate that Council still require DAPs where it is considered necessary to articulate built form/public realm controls and/or to coordinate subdivision/development in particularly fragmented areas.

It will be recommended that Council modify the draft advertised ODP (both text and map) to remove all references to the requirement for precinct-based DAPs prior to subdivision and development and to introduce a requirement for DAPs to be prepared to guide built form outcomes where development is abutting the public realm, as detailed in the Discussion section under the heading of Local Open Space.

Funding of Internal Roads

The draft ODP, as advertised, incorporated a number of new and extended roads as well as other additional infrastructure. In showing the abovementioned roads, the Justification Report stated:

“All new roads proposed by the ODP will be ODP funded. This means that the costs associated with the acquisition of land, demolition of existing development and construction of roads will be funded by the ODP through a developer contribution arrangement”.

The above approach was deemed to be appropriate as it would effectively equalise what, in some cases, was expected to be an inequitable requirement to provide road infrastructure. Following review of the proposed road network and the potential significant financial and administration implications for any cost sharing arrangement, it is now considered appropriate that only some proposed roads will be ODP funded. It is anticipated that an assessment as to

Item 13.5.2 Continued

which specific roads will be ODP funded (and which will be normal subdivisional roads) will be undertaken as part of the preparation of a Development Contribution Plan.

Whilst the above approach may lead to subdivision and development being restricted in some areas until road access becomes available (that is, it will not provide the City with the ability, in all cases, to complete roads prior to landowners developing their properties), it will effectively relieve the proposed cost sharing arrangement and therefore, developing landowners and the City, of a significant and potentially prohibitive infrastructure cost.

It will be recommended that the ODP text be modified to remove all references stating that all new proposed roads will be ODP funded.

Urban Water Management

The draft ODP, as advertised, referred to a 2001 Drainage and Nutrient Management Plan (DNMP) prepared by consultants Brown and Root to provide guidance on drainage matters and specifically, the important issue of water quality.

The DNMP was developed as part of a strategy to assist in protecting the Canning River and Stokely Creek (formerly the Helm Street Main Drain) from potential water quality impacts associated with increased residential densities. The three key areas detailed in the DNMP are:

- Retaining Stokely Creek (located East of River Avenue) as a conservation/open space reserve.*
- Identifying suitable material for inclusion in a community education program directed towards reducing the input of pollutants and nutrients into the stormwater system (i.e. source control).*
- Identifying stormwater treatment options for sub-catchments within the area.*

The draft ODP also referred to a City-wide drainage study that was undertaken in 2005 by (then) Cardno BSD, which recommended various drainage upgrades for the Central Maddington ODP area, based on the residential densities proposed by the former draft Town Planning Scheme No. 21 (TPS 21). Given that the advertised draft ODP differs somewhat from draft TPS 21 in terms of the road network, the location and size of Local Open Space areas and residential densities, the recommended drainage upgrades of 2005 may now not be suitable for the Central Maddington ODP.

To address this situation, it is planned to engage engineering consultants to review the proposed Central Maddington ODP and determine whether any modification(s) to the drainage upgrades recommended in 2005 are required. If it is concluded that modifications to the proposed drainage network are required, the consultants will be asked to prepare a revised drainage plan for the area.

Item 13.5.2 Continued

It was envisaged, at the time the draft ODP was prepared, that following the abovementioned drainage review, the City would engage consultants to review the 2001 DNMP in light of any changes to the proposed drainage network. The consultants would be required to:

- Make changes to and/or adapt the DNMP to the revised drainage plan.*
- Investigate further opportunities for water quality enhancement.*

Whilst the above approach was considered reasonable as it drew on existing information readily available to the City and would attempt to address issues of water quality, both the Swan River Trust and the Department of Water have specifically recommended that the draft ODP should be supported by a Local Water Management Strategy (LWMS), that addresses the following water management matters:

- Proposed development.*
- Pre-development environment.*
- Design Criteria.*
- Water Sustainability Initiatives.*
- Stormwater and groundwater management strategy.*
- Monitoring.*
- Implementation at subdivision and Urban Water Management Plans.*

Given the significant changes in water management paradigms since the preparation of the 2001 DNMP, it is considered appropriate to prepare a LWMS for the ODP area (rather than review the 2001 DNMP), in accordance with State Planning Policy 2.9 (Water Resources), Liveable Neighbourhoods and the WAPC's Better Urban Water Management document. It is expected that the 2001 DNMP would be utilised to help inform the preparation of an LWMS.

Whilst it is considered appropriate to prepare a LWMS to support the ODP, there is an outstanding issue of at what point in the planning process the LWMS would be prepared. As detailed above, both the Swan River Trust and the Department of Water advocate the preparation of such a strategy prior to the adoption of the ODP. However, it should be noted that the draft Central Maddington ODP is seeking to provide a suitable framework for subdivision and development in an established, brownfields area, one which is currently served by an existing drainage system. It is considered unreasonable to prevent the progression of the draft ODP through the statutory process based on non-compliance with a recently introduced State Planning Policy that focuses primarily on urban water management in new, greenfields areas. As such, it is considered appropriate to adopt a pragmatic approach to the issue of urban water management within the subject area, involving the preparation of an LWMS based on, and being guided by, the urban form provided by an adopted ODP. It is anticipated that the LWMS would seek to maintain current water quality levels, whilst also investigating opportunities for some water quality improvement over time.

Item 13.5.2 Continued

It will therefore be recommended that the draft ODP be modified to remove various references to the requirements to review the 2001 DNMP and replace them with reference to the requirement to prepare an LWMS.

Environmental Issues

A small number of submissions raised concerns with the likely effects of urban development on the Canning River, Stokely Creek and various wetlands within the ODP area.

The Department of Environment and Conservation's Geomorphic Wetlands Swan Coast Plain dataset identifies both the Canning River and Stokely Creek as Conservation Category Wetlands, and as such, their protection from development-related pressures is seen as a high priority.

Based upon this information, Brown and Root (2001) recommended a "conservation/open space reserve", which is identified on the ODP Map as part of a "Local Open Space" area surrounding Stokely Creek. The extent of the proposed reserve is based on the Conservation Category Wetland area, with some rationalisation to better accommodate the fringing native vegetation and buildings adjacent to the watercourse.

The Environmental Protection Authority recommends a minimum 50m buffer between Conservation Category Wetlands and residential development. Due to the infill nature of future development and extent of development that has already occurred within and in close proximity to the wetland however, the provision of a 50m buffer may not be achievable. In response to this situation, the ODP proposes a balanced and considered response which is envisaged to have a net environmental benefit, potentially greater than that provided by a standard 50m buffer.

Present rural land uses surrounding the wetland, including orchards, vineyards, market gardens, and other small-scale rural/agricultural pursuits are in all likelihood considerable contributors of pollutants to both surface and ground water. Well-planned land use change from rural to residential in this instance would significantly reduce nutrient (nitrogen and phosphorus) contamination. The subsequent improvement in surface and groundwater quality will likely assist in protecting and enhancing the ecological value and function of the wetland. The provision of a controlled drainage system with infrastructure to improve water quality will also aid in this.

To expedite this change in land use, the potential to develop rural land for residential purposes must be made more attractive and viable. In some instances, the provision of a 50m buffer could significantly compromise or preclude such positive land use change.

As the width of the buffer is considered constrained, it is recognised that there is a need to supplement the degree of protection afforded to the wetland. The ODP achieves this by:

- Supplementing and buffering the recommended conservation/open space reserve with additional provision of public open space.*

Item 13.5.2 Continued

- *Creating a “hard edge” between the conservation/open space areas and residential development where practical given the existing development in the area, the topography of the land and the desire to retain riparian vegetation.*

Furthermore, it is envisaged that a Wetland Management Plan will be prepared at a future stage in the planning process. Such a management plan would likely seek to protect and enhance the ecological value and function of the wetland by:

- *Specifically defining the wetland boundary and buffer (where applicable).*
- *Setting methods to protect ecological values and functions.*
- *Identifying revegetation and rehabilitation requirements.*
- *Identifying compatible and non-compatible recreational activities and facilities.*
- *Defining access points.*
- *Identifying methods to maintain hydrological regime and water quality.*
- *Developing a monitoring program, implementation program and contingency actions.*

Whilst the area identified in the ODP to protect the wetland is not entirely consistent with the Environmental Protection Authority’s recommended 50m buffer, it is believed to respond practically to the conditions of the subject site and present a balanced and considered response with potential net environmental benefits.

At most stages in the planning and development process, it is envisaged that discussions with the Water Corporation, Swan River Trust and the Department of Environment and Conservation will be required in relation to the creek, wetland boundaries and buffers.

Primary School Site (Maddington Primary School)

The draft ODP, as advertised, provided for the Maddington Primary School site to be retained as per its current configuration with the adjacent 120 (Lot 33) Attfield Street, Maddington, being designated as Residential R30.

Lot 33 is a privately owned, 2,023m² portion of land that effectively protrudes into the existing school site by approximately 70m. The Department of Education and Training has advised the City that it has previously entered into negotiations with the owner of Lot 33 and will, in the near future, be purchasing the northern half of the site and amalgamating it with the existing school site.

Therefore it is considered appropriate to modify the draft ODP to designate the northern half of Lot 33 as a Local Reserve (Public Purpose), as indicated on the plan contained at Appendix 13.5.2V, to accurately reflect the future use of the land.

Item 13.5.2 Continued

Recommended Modifications to the Draft ODP

The following table lists a number of modifications that will be recommended be made to the draft (advertised) ODP map and text. The draft (advertised) ODP map incorporating the following changes is contained at Appendix 13.5.2S with the draft (advertised) ODP text incorporating the following changes is contained at Appendix 13.5.2T.

With respect to item 5 below the previous report erroneously stated that the draft advertised ODP designated the area bound by River Avenue, Phillip Street and the Canning River Parks and Recreation Reservation as being coded Residential R20 and recommended that the draft advertised ODP be modified to provide for a density of R30. As the subject area was previously designated as R30, the table has been modified to delete reference to that specific recommended modification.

“

No.	Recommended Modification	Reason(s)
Map		
1.	To modify the provision of internal roads and Local Open Space throughout the ODP area.	See comments in the Discussion section under the heading of Local Open Space and Proposed Internal Road Network.
2.	To extend the proposed Highway Commercial zoning on the south side of Albany Highway to the east so as to include the strip of land abutting the highway, west of the existing Maddington Primary School.	See comments in the Discussion section under the heading of Commercial Zoning.
3.	To increase the density code of the two proposed R60 coded areas to R80.	See comments in the Discussion section under the heading of Residential Density.
4.	To increase the density code of the proposed R20 coded area (bound by River Avenue, Lot 26 River Avenue and the proposed LOS) to R40.	See comments in the Discussion section under the heading of Residential Density.
5.	To increase the density code of the proposed R20 coded area (south of Phillip Street) to R30.	See comments in the Discussion section under the heading of Residential Density.
6.	To remove the “Subject to Further Detailed Planning” designation over the area to the southeast of River Avenue and replace it with a specific residential development outcome, incorporating an extended road network and a Residential R20 coding.	See comments in the Discussion section under the heading of Area Subject to Further Detailed Planning.

Item 13.5.2 Continued

No.	Recommended Modification	Reason(s)
7.	<p>To remove the following notations from the plan:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>“The exact locations, dimensions and sizes of Local Open Space are to be determined in the preparation of precinct-level Detailed Area Plans”</i></p> <p>and</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>“The exact location and widths of proposed roads are to be determined in the preparation of precinct-level Detailed Area Plans”</i></p>	<p>See comments in the Discussion section under the heading of Detailed Area Plans.</p>
8.	<p>To introduce a ‘Heritage Place’ designation into the Legend and apply that designation to 24 (Lot 159) Phillip Street, Maddington.</p>	<p>To specifically identify the subject lot, which, by its inclusion on the TPS 6 Heritage List, is deemed to have heritage significance that may affect the development potential of the site.</p>
9.	<p>To remove the Maddington Town Centre boundary from the ODP.</p>	<p>For the purposes of mapping clarity. It must be noted that the removal of the Maddington Town Centre boundary from the ODP will not in any way compromise the application of the Council adopted Policy.</p>
10.	<p>To remove the following notation from the plan:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;"><i>“The landowner/developer of 1993 (Lot 808) Albany Highway, Maddington will be responsible for the construction of, and all costs associated with the crossing over the Helm Street Main Drain”</i></p>	<p>For the purposes of mapping clarity. The text is not required on the plan itself, as such matters (i.e. identification of what infrastructure will be communally funded and what will be the responsibility of individual developers) will be determined through the preparation of a Development Contribution Plan.</p>
11.	<p>To designate the northern portion of 120 (Lot 33) Attfield Street (north of the proposed road), as a Local Reserve (Public Purpose).</p>	<p>See comments in the Discussion section under the heading of Primary School Site (Maddington Primary School).</p>
12.	<p>To provide for a Dual Use Path link between Burslem Drive and River Avenue.</p>	<p>To provide for an improved bicycle and pedestrian movement network within the ODP area.</p>
Text		
13.	<p>To insert specific subdivision and development requirements into Part 1 of the ODP text relating to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roads • Dual Use Paths • Wetland Management Plan • Public Interface • Detailed Area Plans; and • Development Contributions 	<p>To specify and/or clarify relevant controls for subdivision and development within the ODP area. The specific matters are all addressed earlier in this report.</p>

Item 13.5.2 Continued

No.	Recommended Modification	Reason(s)
14.	<i>To remove various references to the requirement to review the 2001 Drainage and Nutrient Management Plan and replace them with the requirement for the preparation of a Local Water Management Strategy.</i>	<i>See comments in the Discussion section under the heading of Urban Water Management.</i>
15.	<i>To delete section 6.3 (Area Subject to Further Detailed Planning).</i>	<i>See modification 6 above.</i>
16.	<i>To modify Table 2 (Central Maddington Outline Development Plan Local Open Space Provision), the Discussion section relating to Local Open Space and Figure 5 (Public Open Space Walkable Catchment Map).</i>	<i>To reflect the modification to the provision of Local Open Space throughout the ODP area, as provided by modification 1 above.</i>
17.	<i>To modify section 6.10.3 – Traffic Management Measures to refer to only one (1) proposed roundabout.</i>	<i>See modification 1 above.</i>
18.	<i>To update the ODP map as contained within the ODP text.</i>	<i>To reflect changes made to the plan as identified as modifications 1 – 12 above.</i>
19.	<i>To refer to the R80 density code rather than the R60 density code.</i>	<i>See modification 3 above.</i>
20.	<i>To remove various references to the requirement for precinct-based Detailed Area Plans to be prepared to determine the specific sizes and locations of internal roads and Local Open Space.</i>	<i>See modification 7 above.</i>
21.	<i>To remove Figure 1 (Detailed Area Plan Precincts).</i>	<i>See modification 7 above.</i>
22.	<i>To remove 6.10.2 – Helm Street Main Drain Crossing.</i>	<i>See modification 10 above.</i>
23.	<i>To remove / modify various references stating that all new proposed roads will be ODP funded.</i>	<i>See comments in the Discussion section under the heading of Funding of Internal Roads.</i>
24.	<i>To replace references to Helm Street Main Drain with Stokely Creek.</i>	<i>To refer to the correct place name.</i>
25.	<i>To update Figures 3 (MRS Zoning) and 4 (TPS 6 Zoning).</i>	<i>To reflect amendments to each of the schemes that have occurred since the preparation of the ODP Text.</i>
26.	<i>To include the applicable lot numbers of sites listed within the City's Municipal Heritage Inventory.</i>	<i>To more accurately refer to the applicable sites.</i>
27.	<i>To remove reference to the Environmental Protection (Swan and Canning Rivers) Policy 1997 and include reference to the Swan and Canning Rivers Management Act 2006.</i>	<i>To accurately refer to the current legislation and policy considerations that apply to the proposal. The Environmental Protection (Swan and Canning Rivers) Policy 1997 has been superseded by the Swan and Canning Rivers Management Act 2006.</i>

Item 13.5.2 Continued

No.	Recommended Modification	Reason(s)
28.	<i>To introduce reference to State Planning Policy SPP 2.10 – Swan-Canning River System (SPP 2.10).</i>	<i>To accurately refer to the current legislation and policy considerations that apply to the proposal. The policy contains guiding principles for future land use and development and a policy statement for different parts of the river. Amongst other matters the policy seeks to ensure that activities, landuse and development maintain and enhance the health, amenity and landscape values of the river, including its recreational and scenic values.</i>

CONCLUSION

The progression of the Central Maddington ODP and associated planning tasks is a significant milestone in planning for the Central Maddington area. The proposed ODP framework will facilitate the sustainable regeneration of the Maddington area.

The draft advertised plan presents a number of significant implementation challenges, generally associated with the cost sharing and property acquisition issues. Ultimately, the plan incorporates many of the features and attributes of a large-scale greenfields subdivision however, there are concerns that it does not realistically allow for implementation in the established, brownfields context. It will therefore be recommended that Council:

1. *Note the submissions received in response to the advertising of Amendment No. 89 to TPS 6 and the draft Central Maddington ODP and endorse the comments in response to those submissions.*
2. *Adopt the draft ODP, subject to a number of modifications and forward it to the WAPC.*
3. *Seek comment from landowners in respect to the modifications incorporated into the adopted ODP, and forward any comments received directly to the WAPC.*
4. *Finally adopt Amendment No. 89 to TPS 6.”*

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION SUBSEQUENT TO ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING 26 MAY 2009

Minor Modification to Recommended Plan

The report to Council’s 26 May 2009 meeting recommended that a draft modified ODP (as contained in Appendix 13.5.2S) be adopted. Further review of that draft ODP indicated that the proposed road network (as it relates to the land located southeast of River Avenue) would require the removal of a number of existing dwellings. As such, it is considered appropriate to modify the recommended plan to provide for the retention of the previously affected dwellings. The above change (as incorporated into the plan contained as Appendix 13.5.2W dated 1 July 2009) is particularly minor and does not substantially affect any other component of the plan.

Item 13.5.2 Continued

Based on the above, it will be recommended that Council adopt the road layout shown on the modified plan contained in Appendix 13.5.2W.

Councillor Workshop

The workshop held on 17 June 2009 discussed the details of the proposed ODP and the following key issues arose:

- Appropriateness of high-density residential codings.
- Provision (quantity, distribution and usability) of Local Open Space.
- Built form controls and likely outcomes in terms of the quality of development.
- Proposed cost sharing arrangements.

Local Open Space

On 26 May 2009, it had been recommended that Council adopt the draft modified ODP (Appendix 13.5.2S) which provided for 6.6ha of Local Open Space, compared to the 9ha proposed by the draft advertised ODP. There was some contention about the potential impacts and benefits of providing more or less Local Open Space.

To assist Council with its determination of the matter, two additional draft plans have been prepared, both of which provide for a minimum 10% Local Open Space (equivalent to 8.98ha of the total ODP area), as follows:

Alternative Plan No. 1

Alternative Plan No. 1 (as contained as Appendix 13.5.2X) provides for 8.9875ha of Local Open Space consistent with the advertised draft ODP and it incorporates all the other modifications as contained within the draft recommended ODP that was presented to Council's 26 May 2009 meeting (Appendix 13.5.2S) and the modified road layout proposed earlier in this additional information section.

Importantly, plan 13.5.2X has the following implications:

1. The plan would place a comparatively greater funding burden on the ODP landowners than would arise in other options, estimated to be approximately \$22.5 million.
2. The plan provides increased opportunities for useable and convenient local parks than is allowed by other options. The main increases are:
 - The provision of a 1.2ha area located between Westfield and Yule Streets.
 - Retention on an existing 2,876m² area on Newenden Street.
 - An increase of 6,000m² for the Local Open Space area on Clifton Street.
 - An increase of 2,000m² for the Local Open Space area on Weston Street.

Item 13.5.2 Continued

- An increase of 4,000m² for the Local Open Space area west of River Avenue.

Alternative Plan No. 2

Alternative Plan No. 2 (as contained in Appendix 13.5.2Y) provides for the same quantity of Local Open Space as the advertised draft ODP (i.e. 10.1% of the total landholding), however, distributes it differently so that it avoids, where practical, existing improvements in the area (such as dwellings). The proposal would also add useable and potentially active space to Regional Parks and Recreation reservation adjacent to the Canning River to create a consolidated area of potential high aesthetic, recreation and conservation value.

This plan also incorporates all the other modifications as contained within the draft recommended plan that was presented to Council's 26 May 2009 meeting as well as the proposed modified road layout as discussed above. The plan also makes provision for R40 development opposite the Local Open Space area proposed adjacent to the land reserved by the Canning River for Parks and Recreation. The proposed R40 density coding is considered to be an appropriate planning outcome in that it would be located in close proximity to a potentially high aesthetic, recreation and conservation value area adjacent to the Canning River Parks and Recreation reservation. It is also considered that the provision of a marginally higher residential density will effectively offset the burden on the affected lots in providing additional Local Open Space.

Importantly, plan 13.5.2Y has the following implications:

1. The plan would place a comparatively greater funding burden on the ODP landowners than would arise in other options, estimated to be approximately \$22.5 million.
2. The plan provides increased opportunities for useable and convenient local parks that is allowed by other options. The main increases are:
 - The provision of a 1.1ha area south of Phillip Street adjacent to the Parks and Recreation reservation.
 - An increase of 4,000m² for the Local Open Space located along Stokely Creek.
 - An increase of 2,600m² for the Local Open Space area on Clifton Street.
 - An increase of 3,500m² for the Local Open Space area on Weston Street.
 - An increase of 2,400m² for the Local Open Space area west of River Avenue.
3. The plan would involve the acquisition of one dwelling.

Item 13.5.2 Continued

A comparison of the various options presented to Council, in relation to the provision of Local Open Space, is contained in the table below:

	Total LOS Provided (ha)	Total LOS Provided (%)	Dwellings to be demolished	Lots Entirely Affected	Lots Partially Affected
Draft ODP as advertised Appendix 13.5.2A	8.9875	10.09	6	8	21
Draft ODP as modified (recommended) Appendix 13.5.2W	6.6	7.41	1	2	18
Alternative Plan No. 1 Appendix 13.5.2X	8.9875	10.09	6	8	21
Alternative Plan No. 2 Appendix 13.5.2Y	9.0	10.1	1	2	23

There is a significant difference in the financial implications between requiring 6.6ha and 8.98ha of Local Open Space. Assuming a land value of \$2,500,000 per hectare (an estimated figure only based on recent observations of advertised property prices within the ODP area), acquiring the greater area of Local Open Space would represent an additional financial cost of approximately \$5,000,000.

Whilst it will be recommended that Council adopt the ODP as contained in Appendix 13.5.2W, (which provides for 6.6ha of Local Open Space and a series of other modifications), in the event that Council determines that additional open space is required, it is suggested that Alternative Plan No. 2 (Appendix 13.5.2Y) is the preferred option. This is because the resulting location, distribution and extent of Local Open Space is considered to represent a better planning and social outcome.

Residential Density

All of the options presented have included the introduction of higher densities of development near the Maddington Town Centre. The introduction of such densities will have broad position outcomes, on a larger scale, including:

1. The reinforcement of the Maddington Town Centre area as a service hub for the district.
2. The provision of housing choice and convenience within the City.
3. The provision of a more sustainable and efficient urban form than is currently provided.

The plan does present a range of detailed challenges about the means by which quality development can be achieved. The quality of development and its contribution to streetscapes and the public realm all need to be guided by the provision of built form guidelines. It is recommended that such guidelines be developed and presented for adoption as a Council policy in the future.

The guidelines also provide opportunities for related goals to be met as follows:

1. Lots could be consolidated into large parcels by the application of split codings to ensure that development sites are of a viable size. For example, development within the proposed R80 area at a density of more than R40 could be subject to the consolidation of land into parcels of at least 3,000m².

Item 13.5.2 Continued

2. Building height could be regulated to minimise adverse impacts.
3. Communal open space within development sites could be provided to complement POS that is provided by the ODP. For example, a site of 3,000m² developed to an R80 standard would require 60% (or 1,800m²) of the site to be provided as communal open space.

Proposed Roads Abutting the Canning River Parks and Recreation Reservation

After Council considered final adoption of the draft ODP at its meeting of 26 May 2009, three separate owners of the following portions of land have made approaches to the City regarding the proposed road configuration as it relates to the Canning River Parks and Recreation reservation, as delineated by the MRS:

- Lots 32, 33 and 34 Phillip Street;
- Lots 14 and 15 Phillip Street and Lot 8 River Avenue
- Lots 40 and 401 River Avenue

The comments raised by each of the landowners are substantially similar insofar as they all advocate a reduction in the extent, or removal of, the public roads proposed to be located adjacent the Canning River Parks and Recreation reservation, in favour of residential development immediately abutting the reserve. As part of the formal advertising process and the subsequent discussions with the City, three separate concept plans have been submitted for the above areas, with these plans contained as Appendices 13.5.2P, 13.5.2Q (from 26 May 2009) and Appendix 13.5.2Z.

The principle of providing a public road adjacent a public space is enshrined in state and local government policy, as follows:

- **State Planning Policy 2.10 – Swan-Canning River System**

The purpose of the policy is to, among other things, ensure that activities, land use and development maintain and enhance the health, amenity and landscape values of the river, including its recreational and scenic values. Specifically, Clause 7.1.3 of the policy states that “*public access to the river and its foreshores should be maintained and enhanced while protecting the river*” (emphasis added). Clause 7.4.14 of the policy further states that “*in the case of subdivision, private development should be separated from foreshore reserves by a public road*”.

- **Development Control Policy DC 2.2 – Residential Subdivision**

The policy states that where residential subdivisions include or adjoin public uses, such as schools and open spaces, it is generally preferable to separate the residential lots and public uses by the road system.

- **Liveable Neighbourhoods**

Liveable Neighbourhoods is an operational policy for the design and assessment of structure plans and subdivision for new urban areas. Requirement 12 of Element 4 of the policy states that “*the location, layout and design of subdivision and development surrounding public open space should*

Item 13.5.2 Continued

minimise potential problems relating to personal security, property security, vandalism and poor visual amenity in relation to the park and its boundaries. Usually this should be achieved by bounding public open spaces with streets and ensuring adjacent buildings front and overlook both the street and open spaces.”

Liveable Neighbourhoods makes allowance for residential development to directly abut open space, but only in instances where the length of direct frontage is relatively short. A desirable maximum length of 80m of direct frontage to open space is suggested.

- **City of Gosnells Safe City Urban Design Strategy**

The Urban Design Strategy sets out a series of design requirements to result in quality urban form outcomes which in turn reduce the opportunity for criminal activity within the City of Gosnells. The strategy advocates the provision of a public road to separate public and private areas as well as a means to provide increased passive surveillance of public spaces.

Further, the Swan River Trust (the authority responsible for managing the Swan and Canning river systems) has advised that it supports the separation of land reserved for Parks and Recreation from zoned land by means of a road reserve, as per the abovementioned WAPC's Development Control Policy DC 2.2.

In the event that Council is prepared accept one of the landowners' suggestions, that is, to modify the draft ODP to provide for residential development immediately abutting the Parks and Recreation reserve, arguably, it would then be equitable to accept all three of the landowners' suggestions. If this was to occur, it would result in approximately 1,200m of foreshore reserve between Burslem Drive and Lot 8 River Avenue being provided with only one point of access, that being the cul-de-sac head at the southern end of River Avenue. Such an outcome is considered inappropriate as it would significantly limit public access to the river environment, would compromise opportunities for creating a river-side parkland with high amenity and reduce passive surveillance of the public realm. As such, it will be recommended that Council adopt the draft plan contained as Appendix 13.5.2W, without any further modification.

CONCLUSION

The progression of the Central Maddington ODP and associated planning tasks is a significant milestone in planning for the Central Maddington area. The proposed ODP framework will facilitate the sustainable regeneration of the Maddington area.

The draft advertised plan presents a number of significant implementation challenges, generally associated with the cost sharing and property acquisition issues. Ultimately, the plan incorporates many of the features and attributes of a large-scale greenfields subdivision however, there are concerns that it does not realistically allow for implementation in the established, brownfields context. It will therefore be recommended that Council:

Item 13.5.2 Continued

1. Note the submissions received in response to the advertising of Amendment No. 89 to TPS 6 and the draft Central Maddington ODP and endorse the comments in response to those submissions.
2. Adopt the draft ODP, subject to a number of modifications and forward it to the WAPC.
3. Seek comment from landowners in respect to the modifications incorporated into the adopted ODP, and forward any comments received directly to the WAPC.
4. Finally adopt Amendment No. 89 to TPS 6.
5. Introduce new guidelines to provide standards for the development of the future Residential R80 land.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

There are a number of lots owned by the City in freehold (fee simple) and currently serving a recreational function, that the Central Maddington ODP designates as being required for the purpose of Local Open Space. Adoption of the draft ODP will result in no residential development potential for these sites, ultimately resulting in the 'loss' of these freehold assets.

Council, as part of the consideration of a future Development Contribution Plan (DCP) for the ODP, will need to consider how it wishes to deal with the issue of compensation for City-owned land required for a Public Purpose. In considering which of the above options to pursue, Council will need to consider how, and for what specific purpose, the above sites were acquired. It is anticipated that any future report to Council to consider a draft DCP will address such matters.

Costs associated with progressing the Central Maddington ODP and proposed Scheme Amendment through statutory processes can be met from the City Growth operational budget.

The proposed development contribution arrangement will provide for Council to be reimbursed for these costs.

STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS

In accordance with clauses 7.4.7(a) and (b) of TPS 6, the following options are available to Council in progressing the draft (advertised) Central Maddington ODP:

- Adopt the advertised ODP (attached in Appendices 13.5.2A and 13.5.2B of the OCM Agenda 26 May 2009) without modification.
- Adopt the advertised ODP with modifications.
- Refuse to adopt the advertised ODP.

It will be recommended that Council adopt the advertised ODP with modifications (as contained in Appendices 13.5.2W and 13.5.2T), and in accordance with the Scheme, forward the adopted ODP to the WAPC for determination.

Item 13.5.2 Continued

Furthermore, whilst not specifically provided for by the Scheme, it will be recommended that Council seek comment from landowners in respect to the abovementioned modifications incorporated into the advertised ODP, with any comments received being forwarded directly to the WAPC to assist with its determination of the ODP, pursuant to Clause 7.4.10 of the Scheme. This course of action is considered appropriate as it will provide an indication of landowner opinion on the modifications whilst not substantially delaying the progression of the ODP through the normal statutory process.

It is also recommended that Council resolves to prepare Built Form Guidelines and to consider these in future, with a view to adoption in the ODP area.

VOTING REQUIREMENTS

Simple majority.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION (1 of 8) AND COUNCIL RESOLUTION**338 Moved Cr W Barrett Seconded Cr R Hoffman**

That Council, pursuant to clause 7.4.7 of Town Planning Scheme No. 6 note the submissions received in respect of the proposed Central Maddington Outline Development Plan and endorse the staff comments in response to those submissions, as contained in Appendix 13.5.2E.

CARRIED 10/0

FOR: Cr D Griffiths, Cr B Wiffen, Cr S Iwanyk, Cr J Brown, Cr R Hoffman, Cr C Fernandez, Cr W Barrett, Cr T Brown, Cr R Mitchell, and Cr O Searle.

AGAINST: Nil.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION (2 of 8) AND COUNCIL RESOLUTION**339 Moved Cr W Barrett Seconded Cr R Hoffman**

That Council, pursuant to Clause 7.4.7(a) of Town Planning Scheme No. 6, adopt the proposed Central Maddington Outline Development Plan with modifications, as contained in Appendices 13.5.2W and 13.5.2T.

CARRIED 10/0

FOR: Cr D Griffiths, Cr B Wiffen, Cr S Iwanyk, Cr J Brown, Cr R Hoffman, Cr C Fernandez, Cr W Barrett, Cr T Brown, Cr R Mitchell, and Cr O Searle.

AGAINST: Nil.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION (3 of 8) AND COUNCIL RESOLUTION**340 Moved Cr W Barrett Seconded Cr R Hoffman**

That Council, pursuant to Clause 7.4.9 of Town Planning Scheme No. 6, forward the duly modified Central Maddington Outline Development Plan to the Western Australian Planning Commission for approval.

CARRIED 10/0

FOR: Cr D Griffiths, Cr B Wiffen, Cr S Iwanyk, Cr J Brown, Cr R Hoffman, Cr C Fernandez, Cr W Barrett, Cr T Brown, Cr R Mitchell, and Cr O Searle.

AGAINST: Nil.

Item 13.5.2 Continued

STAFF RECOMMENDATION (4 of 8) AND COUNCIL RESOLUTION

341 Moved Cr W Barrett Seconded Cr R Hoffman

That Council seek comment from landowners, for a period of not less than 21 days, in respect to the modifications incorporated into the adopted Central Maddington Outline Development Plan, as contained in Appendices 13.5.2W and 13.5.2T, by means of letters to all landowners within the Outline Development Plan area.

CARRIED 10/0

FOR: Cr D Griffiths, Cr B Wiffen, Cr S Iwanyk, Cr J Brown, Cr R Hoffman, Cr C Fernandez, Cr W Barrett, Cr T Brown, Cr R Mitchell, and Cr O Searle.

AGAINST: Nil.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION (5 of 8) AND COUNCIL RESOLUTION

342 Moved Cr W Barrett Seconded Cr R Hoffman

That Council, at the conclusion of the 21 day landowner comment period on modifications to the Central Maddington Outline Development Plan, forward any comments received to the Western Australian Planning Commission.

CARRIED 10/0

FOR: Cr D Griffiths, Cr B Wiffen, Cr S Iwanyk, Cr J Brown, Cr R Hoffman, Cr C Fernandez, Cr W Barrett, Cr T Brown, Cr R Mitchell, and Cr O Searle.

AGAINST: Nil.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION (6 of 8) AND COUNCIL RESOLUTION

343 Moved Cr W Barrett Seconded Cr R Hoffman

That Council, pursuant to Regulation 17(1) of the Town Planning Regulations 1967, note the submissions received in respect to Amendment No. 89 to Town Planning Scheme No. 6 and endorse the prepared responses to those submissions, as contained in Appendix 13.5.2D.

CARRIED 10/0

FOR: Cr D Griffiths, Cr B Wiffen, Cr S Iwanyk, Cr J Brown, Cr R Hoffman, Cr C Fernandez, Cr W Barrett, Cr T Brown, Cr R Mitchell, and Cr O Searle.

AGAINST: Nil.

Item 13.5.2 Continued

STAFF RECOMMENDATION (7 of 8) AND COUNCIL RESOLUTION

344 Moved Cr W Barrett Seconded Cr R Hoffman

That Council pursuant to Regulation 17(2)(a) of Town Planning Regulations 1967, adopt Amendment No. 89 to Town Planning Scheme No. 6 for the purpose of rezoning part of the Central Maddington ODP area to Residential Development (as depicted in Appendix 13.5.2C), establishing the Central Maddington ODP area as a developer contribution area and generally setting out common infrastructure works and costs for which developer contributions will be collected.

CARRIED 10/0

FOR: Cr D Griffiths, Cr B Wiffen, Cr S Iwanyk, Cr J Brown, Cr R Hoffman, Cr C Fernandez, Cr W Barrett, Cr T Brown, Cr R Mitchell, and Cr O Searle.

AGAINST: Nil.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION (8 of 8) AND COUNCIL RESOLUTION

345 Moved Cr W Barrett Seconded Cr R Hoffman

That Council resolve to prepare Built Form Guidelines for the proposed R80 component of the Outline Development Plan, with the draft guidelines to include the creation of suitable built form outcomes, and additional open spaces and sound urban design objectives.

CARRIED 10/0

FOR: Cr D Griffiths, Cr B Wiffen, Cr S Iwanyk, Cr J Brown, Cr R Hoffman, Cr C Fernandez, Cr W Barrett, Cr T Brown, Cr R Mitchell, and Cr O Searle.

AGAINST: Nil.