15. URGENT BUSINESS
(by permission of Council)

STAFF RECOMMENDATION AND COUNCIL RESOLUTION

535 Moved Cr R Mitchell Seconded Cr R Lawrence

That Council, in light of the consent of the Presiding Member, grant permission to present an item of Urgent Business to the minutes relating to - Central Maddington Outline Development Plan - Draft Development Contribution Plan Report - Outcomes of Consultation, to this Ordinary Council Meeting in accordance with Clause 4.14 of the City of Gosnells Standing Orders Local Law 2012.

CARRIED 10/0

FOR: *Cr W Barrett, Cr J Brown, Cr G Dewhurst, Cr D Goode, Cr R Hoffman, Cr R Lawrence, Cr R Mitchell, Cr O Searle, Cr P Yang and Cr D Griffiths.*

AGAINST: *Nil.*

15.1 CENTRAL MADDINGTON OUTLINE DEVELOPMENT PLAN - DRAFT DEVELOPMENT CONTRIBUTION PLAN REPORT - OUTCOMES OF CONSULTATION

Author:	S O'Sullivan	
Author's Declaration of Interest:	Nil.	
Application No:	PF13/00028	
Previous Ref:	OCM 9 July 2013 (Resolution 302)	
Appendices:	15.1A	Central Maddington Outline Development Plan
	15.1B	Draft Development Contribution Plan report (as advertised for public comment)
	15.1C	Question and Answer Information Brochure
	15.1D	Land Owner Survey Form
	15.1E	Schedule of Submitters' Properties
	15.1F	Schedule of Submitters' Concerns
	15.1G	Consultation Map
	15.1H	Schedule of Government and Servicing Authority Submissions
	15.1I	Roads/Precincts Plan
	15.1J	Draft Development Contribution Plan report (as proposed to be modified following consultation)

PURPOSE OF REPORT

For Council to consider the outcomes of consultation on a draft Development Contribution Plan (DCP) report associated with the Central Maddington Outline Development Plan (ODP).

Item 15.1 Continued

BACKGROUND

The ODP (see Appendix 15.1A) was approved by Council and the Western Australian Planning Commission (WAPC) in December 2011 to provide a framework for redevelopment of the ODP area.

The ODP provides a spatial plan for residential development at a range of densities, new road connections, public open space (POS) consolidation and various other infrastructure improvements.

The ODP is a unique project in the City. Although many other outline development plans and development contribution arrangements have been administered by the City in the past, most have occurred in greenfield situations, where large parcels of land held by a small number of owners have typically been assembled to achieve coordinated development. For the Central Maddington ODP area, the scenario is far more complex due to the high level of fragmentation of land ownership and the extent and pattern of existing development.

A funding mechanism is required to coordinate and facilitate infrastructure improvements given that there are approximately 500 individual land owners in the ODP area.

The City commissioned technical analysis of the land to identify infrastructure needs and associated costs, with the objective being to provide a contemporary standard of infrastructure for the area. This led to the production of a draft DCP report, which sets out the intended operation of the development contribution arrangement (DCA) for the ODP area, as contained in Appendix 15.1B.

The draft DCP report details the extent and estimated costs of required common infrastructure works (CIW) and POS and the method by which costs will be apportioned to land owners as contributions to be made at the time of subdividing or developing their land.

The draft DCP identifies the following CIW:

- Land acquisition for selected roads
- Construction of new roads and drainage
- Construction of shared paths
- Traffic infrastructure improvements
- Construction of sewer mains
- Construction of water mains
- Upgrade of existing stormwater drainage
- Installation of low voltage underground power and street lighting
- Installation of telecommunications
- Public open space development
- Administration of the DCA.

The total cost of providing these CIW has been estimated at $31,056,275.

Item 15.1 Continued

The draft DCP also sets out that contributions are to be collected to acquire approximately 5.7ha of land for POS with the objective of equalising the cost of assembling land for POS among land owners in the DCA. This cost has been estimated at $20,150,000.

Contribution rates for developing land owners have been calculated by apportioning the total CIW and POS costs to land in the ODP area that is anticipated to be developed, with adjustments made using a sliding scale based on the variable residential density codings that apply to land under the ODP. This has allowed rates to be set on a cost per/m^2 of land basis.

The following contribution rates for CIW apply:

- R20 - $222,769/ha ($22.28/m^2)
- R30 - $334,153/ha ($33.41/m^2)
- R40 - $445,538/ha ($44.55/m^2)
- R80 - $891,076/ha ($89.11/m^2).

The following contribution rates for POS apply:

- R20 - $160,596/ha ($15.90/m^2)
- R30 - $240,894/ha ($24.09/m^2)
- R40 - $321,192/ha ($32.12/m^2)
- R80 - $642,384/ha ($64.24/m^2).

Many complex considerations were made in preparing the draft DCP report, including:

- The planning policy context
- Cost estimates and allowances
- Land valuation
- Existing POS within the ODP area
- Previous POS contributions collected from historic subdivision in the ODP area
- Options for contribution calculations.

The draft DCP report provides more detail on the various considerations made and how they have translated into the proposed contribution requirements.

On 9 July 2013 Council resolved (Resolution 302) to advertise the draft DCP report for public comment.

Consultation commenced on 16 July 2013 and concluded on 26 August 2013 and occurred through the following means:

- Letters sent to all owners of land within the ODP area, which included an information brochure (as contained in Appendix 15.1C), a land owner survey (as contained in Appendix 15.1D) and a submission form
- Letters sent to various government and servicing authorities

Item 15.1 Continued

- Advertisements in the two local newspapers circulating in the ODP area
- Public displays of the draft DCP report at the City's Civic Centre and libraries and on the City's website.

There were 115 land owner submissions lodged, comprising 74 objections, 27 non-objections and 14 submissions providing comment. Four government and servicing authority submissions were received. A list of submitters' properties, a schedule of submitters' concerns and responses, a consultation map and a schedule of government and servicing authority submissions are contained in Appendices 15.1E, 15.1F, 15.1G and 15.1H respectively.

A 91-signature petition was also submitted during the consultation period, which read as follows:

> *"We the undersigned electors of the City of Gosnells request that the City of Gosnells Development Contribution Arrangement figure for the Central Maddington ODP be brought down by at least 50% based on the draft document 09.07.13 and all new roads removed and less POS for the following reasons - $ cost is too high and everyone should not have to pay for a few peoples new roads."*

The petition was presented to Council's meeting on 13 August 2013. The petition convenor was subsequently advised that the expressed concerns would be addressed as part of this report.

The land owner survey was undertaken to ascertain owners' intentions in respect to the development of their land, with the aim of helping plan for the timely and coordinated provision of the new infrastructure that is proposed to be funded by the DCA. There were 81 survey forms returned, representing a 16.27% response rate.

DISCUSSION

The consultation process and land owner survey gave rise to a significant amount of comment and feedback.

Consultation

A considerable level of objection has been raised through submissions made during the consultation period on the draft DCP report. Concerns with various elements of the proposed DCA have been expressed, with the following being the main sentiments:

- Contributions rates are too high and will impact on the financial viability of development and should be reduced
- The requirement to contribute to the cost of roads and related infrastructure that may be distant from certain land owners' properties is not equitable
- Scaled contribution fees, based on development potential, are unfair
- Other areas of the City receive road and park improvements without land owner contributions being made
- The proposed infrastructure and POS upgrades will benefit a broader area than is covered by the ODP

Item 15.1 Continued

- Consideration should be given to a precinct-based approach to the apportionment of infrastructure and POS costs
- City-owned land required for POS should be gifted to the DCA, rather than compensated for from contributions
- Allowance for the cost of administration of the DCA appears excessive
- Owners of land that had POS contributions made previously through earlier subdivision should not be required to provide additional POS contributions upon redevelopment
- The compensatory approach relating to land acquisition for new roads and POS is objected to by both those who are required to make contributions and those who consider they should be better compensated than is proposed
- Less POS and fewer new roads should be created to reduce costs
- The proposed contribution requirements in relation to underground power are inequitable.

Discussion on these matters is provided under the headings that follow.

<u>Financial Concerns</u>

The financial impact of proposed contribution requirements and approaches to compensation under the draft DCP report underpin most submissions of objection, in addition to the petition lodged during the consultation period.

The main sentiment expressed is that contribution rates are too high and will negatively affect the viability of developing land and potentially stifle development.

Many submissions also raised concern relating to a perception of a lack of equity and fairness with how the proposed DCA is to operate, with a range of alternative approaches suggested.

Some land owners expressed the view that the planned infrastructure upgrades will benefit the broader Maddington area and the costs should therefore be met by a broader area, rather than just by developers in the ODP area as is proposed. By contrast, some land owners feel that the infrastructure upgrades will benefit specific properties and costs should not be shared on as broad a basis as is proposed.

The proposed requirement to compensate land owners for the loss of land for roads and POS also attracted contrasting views between those who would have a contribution obligation and others who feel the proposed compensatory arrangements are insufficient, which exemplify how difficult it is to achieve a workable, fair and equitable approach to infrastructure provision.

The core objective of the proposed DCA is to fund the cost of providing key infrastructure that is required to support redevelopment within an existing urban context in a manner that is fair and equitable for both the land owners that undertake development and the broader community.

The proposed contribution rates are significant, due to the high costs involved in constructing infrastructure and acquiring land for public purposes in an infill development context, exacerbated by relatively low land values and potentially narrow development profit margins.

Item 15.1 Continued

The impact of development contributions on the viability of development was recognised in preparing the draft DCP report. Equally, it was recognised that developers need to meet a reasonable share of infrastructure costs through contributions to ensure that the cost burden of infrastructure provision is not unreasonably shifted onto the broader community.

Potential measures to reduce contribution rates are explored further in the discussion that follows.

Need for Infrastructure

Many submissions raised concerns about the ODP and its planned infrastructure arrangements and have advocated a reduced amount and standard of provision of new roads and POS.

The draft DCP report reflects a funding scenario to implement the road and POS requirements indicated on the approved ODP. The ODP was adopted by Council and the WAPC in 2011 following extensive stakeholder consultation and review. If the suggestions for a reduced level of infrastructure and POS were to be entertained, a major review of the ODP would need to be undertaken and considered by Council and the WAPC.

Reducing the amount of new roads or allowing them to be constructed to a lower standard would be contrary to the principles of State Government and Council planning strategies and policies that promote accessibility, attractive streetscapes and quality public realm.

In respect to POS, Council has required that sufficient provision of POS occur to cater for community recreation needs, particularly given the higher residential densities proposed and the likely increased population and smaller property sizes that would result from implementation of the ODP. Council sought to ensure as close to 10% of the ODP area as possible was set aside for POS, consistent with WAPC policy. Reduction of the amount of POS would be contrary to the principles of WAPC and Council planning strategies and policies that require sufficient space for public recreation. It would also potentially deprive the existing and future community in the ODP area from access to an important resource.

If Council wants to reduce costs by removing roads and POS from the ODP, then it should not adopt the draft DCP report at this time and instead defer any further consideration of proposed contribution arrangements pending a major review of the ODP.

The implications would likely include:

- A 12 to 18 month timeframe to undertake a review and finalise any resulting ODP modification, which would be problematic in terms of the development and subdivision applications that have already been approved in the ODP area with conditions relating to contribution obligations and how they should be addressed, in addition to potentially delaying future proposals from being favourably considered pending a review being completed
- Reduced development costs, but also a potentially poorer quality and less functional development outcome.

Item 15.1 Continued

Therefore a review of the ODP is not recommended.

<u>New Roads</u>

Approximately 6,200m of new roads and associated services are proposed to be constructed in the ODP area. The draft DCP report proposes that construction costs be met from contributions to be collected from land owners in the ODP area at the time of subdivision or development, with the following cost allowances made:

- Road and drainage works (including earthworks, surfacing, kerbing, footpaths, drains) - $9,597,600
- Sewer mains - $1,235,000
- Water mains - $496,000
- Underground power and street lighting - $1,240,000
- Telecommunications - $310,000.

These road-related infrastructure elements have an estimated cost of $12,878,600 (exclusive of administration and project management costs).

Construction of roads and services will not be possible without access to the land upon which the new roads are to be built. The draft DCP report recognises the following challenges:

- Some properties are significantly more affected than others in relation to the amount of land required for a new road and the proportion it bears to the total property area. In some instances, the land required for a new road significantly reduces the property's development potential, whereas in other circumstances the impact is relatively less
- WAPC policy usually requires new roads created as part of the subdivision of land to be given up free of cost, without payment of any compensation. The application of this approach to the DCA would be inequitable, given that the requirement for land for new roads varies significantly from property to property. A means to equalise the cost of acquiring land for new roads is therefore required
- Devising a fair, equitable and workable approach is complex, with a variety of possible options, including:
    - Compensation being paid to all owners of land required for new roads using funds collected from developer contributions in the ODP area (at a cost of approximately $31.01 million to the DCA for the 8.03ha of land required)
    - No compensation being paid to owners required to provide land for new roads (at no cost to the DCA, but impacting negatively on the affected land owners)
    - A balanced option involving compensation being paid to those land owners who are required to provide a substantial proportion of their property for new roads using funds collected from developer contributions in the ODP area.

Item 15.1 Continued

The draft DCP report recognises that there are pros and cons with each option, but concluded that the balanced option was the most appropriate alternative in the circumstances. This approach makes allowance to fund either all or a 50% portion of the cost of acquiring certain land (all or portion of 19 identified properties) to facilitate the construction of new roads and share the cost of doing so among DCA land owners in an equitable manner. This approach is based on the following considerations:

- Any owner required to provide up to 25% of the area of an individual property for a new road will receive no compensation for doing so
- Any owner required to provide between 25% and 40% of the area of an individual property for a new road will receive compensation for 50% of the value of the land provided
- Any owner required to provide between 40% and 100% of the area of an individual property for a new road will receive compensation for 100% of the value of the land provided
- Any land required for POS under the ODP is deducted from the area of the property for the purposes of calculating the proportion to be given up for the new roads
- Compensation is to be paid in accordance with the adopted land valuation basis applicable at the time the land is to be formally transferred
- Compensation will not be paid to an owner who subdivides land in a manner that results in a property being created with more than 25% of the area of the new lot being required for a new road
- The contribution arrangement will not retrospectively fund compensation payable to land owners within the DCA who may have previously provided land for new roads at the time of subdivision in the past.

Collectively, compensation will be paid for approximately 2.48ha of land for new roads, with the cost to be met by all land owners developing land for residential purposes within the DCA. The cost is estimated to be $6,059,925.

The following concerns have been expressed in submissions in respect to the road-related elements of the draft DCP report:

- Land owners who are not directly affected by the alignment of new roads should not be required to make contributions towards the cost of these roads and the associated services.
- Compensation should be paid for all road land and not just selected properties (as meeting the criteria outlined above).
- Some owners feel it is unfair that they are required to contribute to the cost of road construction and acquisition of other land for road purposes, but will receive no compensation themselves.
- Decommissioning of overhead powerlines and replacement with underground services in existing streets in the ODP area is not proposed to be funded by the DCA, yet it is proposed that the owners of land abutting existing streets must contribute to the cost of providing underground power as part of the construction of new roads yet will see no similar service upgrade in their street.

Item 15.1 Continued

- Some owners feel that it is unfair that commercial zoned land is proposed to be exempt from the requirement to contribute to road and associated servicing costs.
- Some owners advocate that fewer new roads be built to reduce contribution costs, or that costs to land owners be substantially reduced through funding from other sources.

The concerns in relation to financial implications of road and related servicing infrastructure contributions are acknowledged and are discussed further under the headings of Potential Council Subsidy of Infrastructure and POS Costs and Precinct-based Approach to Apportionment of Infrastructure and POS Costs.

<u>Public Open Space</u>

The provision of POS is a key component of the ODP. Approximately 7.5 ha of land is identified for various POS purposes, including recreation, conservation and drainage.

Land requirements for POS are not evenly distributed across the ODP area, as some owners will be required to provide a substantial proportion of their land for POS, whereas many others will not.

A key objective of the DCA is to equalise the cost of assembling land required for POS among the collective of ODP land owners. This will involve collecting contributions from owners who are able develop their land in accordance with the ODP to fund compensation payable to owners who are required provide land for POS.

The State Government has policies and practices that guide the City's approach to land valuation, compensation and POS contribution calculations in its operation of a DCA.

The draft DCP report sets out the following in respect to POS:

- Contributions for much of the land to be developed for residential purposes in the ODP are to fund the acquisition of 5.7 ha of the 7.5 ha land required for POS by the ODP. Acquisition costs have been estimated at $20,150,000, based on an assumed land value of $3,500,000/ha (or $350/m^2)
- POS contribution requirements can be met through the provision of land identified on the ODP for POS, a cash contribution in accordance with the defined contribution rates or a combination of these methods. Similar to CIW costs, contribution rates have been calculated by allocating a proportionate share of the total cost of POS to the total area of land within each density code shown on the ODP, to reflect the variability in development potential from R20 to R80
- Acquisition of the balance 1.8 ha of POS will be achieved by two means:
  - A 0.9ha Conservation Category Wetland (CCW) is to be set aside without payment of compensation from contributions, consistent with WAPC policy
  - 0.9ha is to be acquiring using funds generated from the disposal of several small existing POS reserves located within the DCA that were provided in the past through previous land subdivisions undertaken. These reserves are too small to function well for recreational use and

Item 15.1 Continued

suffer from poor surveillance and low amenity, hence their identification for disposal and redevelopment

- Land exempt from a requirement to make a contribution to POS includes:
  - Land required for various public purposes, including the Maddington Primary School, land reserved under the Metropolitan Region Scheme for Parks and Recreation along the Canning River foreshore and regional roads (Albany Highway, Kelvin Road and Olga Road) and land identified for local POS under the ODP
  - Land zoned for commercial purposes, which includes properties designated Highway Commercial and Mixed Business on the ODP, as the WAPC exempts commercial land from requirements to contribute land for POS
  - Land that has already been substantially developed, as it is not envisaged for redevelopment in the foreseeable future and therefore is unlikely to make a POS contribution
  - Land that has previously been subdivided and has provided an historical POS contribution at the time of subdivision
- A contribution is also required to undertake a basic level of work to develop the POS to a useable standard. However this cost is separate to the land cost and is allowed for in CIW cost estimates.

The following concerns have been expressed in submissions in respect to the POS-related elements of the draft DCP report:

- The primary concern relates to the financial impact of contribution requirements on land owners and the viability of developing their properties. Submissions have advocated that Council reduce the amount of new POS that is required in order to reduce contribution costs
- Owners suggest that it is unfair that they must pay contributions for POS for land already owned by the City (Weston Street Reserve - 4,646m^2 and Clifton Street Reserve - 3,614m^2), which represents a cost of approximately $2.9million in contributions
- A similar sentiment was expressed in respect to a Water Corporation pump station site (441m^2), which also forms part of the POS contribution requirement
- The WAPC and some owners advise that additional properties to those identified have previously contributed to POS and therefore should also be exempt from the requirement to make a new contribution
- The owner of the CCW objects to the proposal for no compensation to be paid from the DCA for the requirement to cede this land for POS.

Each issue is discussed in turn.

Item 15.1 Continued

Amount/Cost of POS

The requirement for subdividers to contribute 10% of developable land to POS is a long-established policy provision of the WAPC. The draft DCP report's POS contribution requirements fall within the standard 10% policy requirement.

The only option, aside from either not compensating land owners or reducing the ODP's POS requirement, would be to reduce the proportion of costs to be met from contributions and generate sufficient funds to meet the balance of costs from other unspecified sources which is most unlikely to be available.

Donation of City-owned land

The option exists for the City to donate the freehold land it owns in the ODP area (that is, the sites on Weston and Clifton Streets) to the DCA. This option would reduce costs to the ODP owners by approximately $2.9 million. However this land is a City-owned asset that effectively belongs to the broader community. If these sites were to be set aside as formal POS reserves as a cost to the DCA as proposed, the broader community would benefit by reinvestment of the compensation funds that the City would otherwise receive to create other community assets. Alternatively, Council may consider the donation of this land to the DCA and set it aside for POS without cost to the DCA. This could be done on the basis that it would reduce contribution costs and assist the viability of development and the potential achievement of Council's revitalisation objectives for the ODP area.

Given that the land in question has the potential to provide a community asset to this area, by virtue of its locations, it will be recommended that the draft DCP report be amended to remove the requirement for the DCA to compensate the City for the value of its Weston and Clifton Street properties to be set aside as POS.

Previous Subdivision and POS Contributions

The draft DCP report sets out that 9.53ha of the 115.94ha gross ODP area has previously made a POS contribution, either as land or cash-in-lieu, at the time of previous subdivision. As a consequence various properties are proposed to be exempt from the requirement to make an additional contribution to the new POS required by the ODP.

Further investigation has revealed several extra lots, collectively amounting to approximately 4,000m^2, which was previously subdivided and made a POS contribution.

The draft DCP report needs to be modified to reflect this adjustment to the net contribution area. The adjustment has the effect of increasing the base POS contribution rate from $160,596/ha to $161,588/ha (a $992/ha difference, without factoring in the impact of the potential donation of the City-owned land to the DCA as discussed under the preceding heading), as the extent of the contributing area is reduced.

Item 15.1 Continued

Exclusion of CCW land from Compensation

The owner of the CCW adjacent to Stokely Creek has objected to the proposal for no compensation to be paid from the DCA for the requirement to cede the CCW for POS.

The WAPC has previously advised in other similar instances that State Planning Policy 3.6 - Development Contributions for Infrastructure outlines items that local governments can seek developer contributions for. The acquisition of land containing regionally significant environmental assets, such as a CCW is not considered to be an item that should be levied in a DCA. This position is understood to have been adopted on the basis that environmentally constrained land, like a CCW, is not developable and should not receive compensation through a mandatory requirement imposed on a collective of owners developing their land nearby.

This does not preclude affected land owners pursuing other avenues to address financial concerns with wetland conservation requirements. These avenues may include actions such as submissions of claims for injurious affection or negotiating land acquisition outcomes with the relevant State Government authorities.

<u>Administration Costs</u>

The draft DCP report includes estimated costs to be incurred in administering the DCA and proposes that these costs be met through developer contributions. The allowance for the cost of administration is estimated to be $6,700,000 over the life of the development contribution arrangement.

The allowance for administration costs involves the following individual components:

- City administration (collection of contributions, landowner acquisition negotiations, assessment of claims for reimbursement on CIW and POS, maintenance of contribution reserve accounts, annual review of contribution rates, financial reporting and provision of customer information) - $900,000. *(representing 5% of the total capital cost of required CIW - that is, excluding the cost of land acquisition for new roads and arrangement administration)*
- Construction management of roads and service infrastructure (design and approvals, works programming, contractor procurement processes, contractor performance, site supervision, public consultation and stakeholder liaison) - $1,800,000 (*representing 10% of the total capital cost of required CIW*)
- Legal advice/action - $200,000
- Surveying - $100,000
- Valuations - $100,000
- Civil design - $150,000
- An environmental management plan to facilitate development of Stokely Creek into a recreation/conservation reserve - $50,000
- Works design and costing contingency - $900,000. This figure represents 5% of the total capital cost of required CIW
- Interest charges - assumes funds will have to be borrowed by the City to pre-fund the provision of CIW and POS - $2,500,000 *(assuming an average loan principal of $10,000,000 at an interest rate of 5% for 5 years*).

Item 15.1 Continued

These allowances are considered to be reflective of the likely costs to be incurred in operating the DCA given the size and complexity of the range of tasks involved.

For comparative purposes, the City has assessed a range of operational DCA's and the extent of administrative costs that have been applied in those instances. On that basis it is proposed to retain the allowance as is.

<u>Methodology for Contribution Calculations</u>

The draft DCP report recognises the variation in density codings in the ODP (between R20 and R80) and the variable lot yield generated as a result. It has the objective of sharing the cost of provision of CIW and POS in a manner that is reflective of the development potential of the land under those varied density codings.

Contribution rates have been calculated by allocating a proportionate share of the total cost of CIW to the total area of land within each density code shown on the ODP, to reflect the variability in development potential from R20 to R80. This means, for example, that owners of R30-coded land are to pay proportionately more contributions than for R20-coded land and owners of R40-coded land are to pay proportionately more than for R30-coded land and so on.

This approach involves setting a base contribution rate for R20-coded land and applying adjustments for higher residential density coded land.

Contribution calculations have also had to factor in land that is exempt from contributions, including public purpose land, commercial zoned land and properties that are already substantially developed and unlikely to be redeveloped (and therefore make a contribution) in the foreseeable future.

The following concerns have been expressed in submissions in respect to the POS-related elements of the draft DCP report:

- The scaled contribution calculation methodology is not equitable
- Charging contributions on land that contains an existing dwelling is unfair
- Commercial properties should not be exempt as they benefit from increasing population in the area.

Each issue is discussed in turn.

Scaled Contribution Calculation Methodology

A range of options were examined in respect to the apportionment of CIW and POS costs as development contributions.

Item 15.1 Continued

The following table provides a summary of the examined options:

Option	Pros	Cons
Land Area (division of costs by developable area)	Simple method Would encourage maximum development	Inequitable - penalises lower density land as for example, R20 land would pay the same as R80 land regardless of the number of dwellings or lots created.
Total Dwellings/Lots (division of costs by anticipated yield of dwellings or lots, with 25% yield reduction to account for likelihood that some properties may not be developed)	Simple method Contribution relates directly to the number of dwellings or lots created	May discourage take-up for higher density development opportunities. Method is based on a development yield assumption which could prove to be incorrect, leading to either a funds shortfall or surplus.
Capped Total Dwellings/Lots (division of costs by anticipated yield of dwellings or lots - again with 25% yield reduction, but capped at grouped dwelling potential)	Simple method Would encourage development of multiple dwellings (and therefore efficient use of land and potentially improved quality of built form)	Method is based on a development yield assumption which could prove to be incorrect, leading to either a funds shortfall or surplus.
Sliding Scale (base contribution rate determined by calculation of developable land areas and variable R-Codes)	Balanced approach to help avoid both penalising lower density development and discouraging higher density development.	Complex calculation formula.

As the above summary analysis indicates, all methods for determining contribution rates have advantages and disadvantages. The sliding scale option was chosen as, despite its complexity, it represents the most balanced approach.

It will be recommended that this approach be maintained, as proposed in the draft DCP report.

Inclusion of Existing Dwellings in Contribution Area.

This concern relates to a scenario where a property with a single dwelling is to be subdivided or developed with an additional dwelling or dwellings. The proposed contribution calculation method involves the multiplication of a property's total land area by the applicable contribution rate. Some submissions have advocated that this is unfair.

While very difficult to do, the option exists to calculate the collective land area occupied by each of the approximately 500 existing dwellings in the ODP area and exclude it from the net contributing area. This would however be impractical as it would not change the total CIW and POS costs. Instead these costs would be divided over a smaller net contributing area, meaning that while the area over which the contributions are applied would decrease, the contribution rates would increase and no difference in the actual contribution payable would result for the majority of properties in the ODP area.

Exemption of Commercial Properties from Contribution Requirements

Item 15.1 Continued

The exclusion of commercial zoned properties from the net contributing area is based on the following considerations:

- Most commercial-zoned land in the ODP area is already substantially developed
- Most of the funded CIW are some distance from the commercial-zoned land and therefore unlikely to provide any direct benefit to that land
- Commercial-zoned land is usually exempt from any POS requirement under WAPC policy. As such, a requirement is normally only applied to residential development.

However, the draft DCP report has not accounted for the prospect that some commercial-zoned land may ultimately be redeveloped in the longer term to incorporate a mixed use or residential element. If this was to occur, the residential element should make a contribution to POS.

While this could be applied through the normal development approval process regardless of whether a DCA is in operation or not, the draft DCP report could be improved by the inclusion of a notation that indicates that POS contributions will apply in the event of redevelopment of commercial-used land for residential use in the future.

<u>Potential Council Subsidy of Infrastructure Costs</u>

Financial concerns about the draft DCP report are recognised. Consideration has been given to a range of alternative scenarios and options to try to address these concerns.

Implementation of the ODP needs to deal with a unique set of challenges and equity considerations, unlike any other DCA within the City. These considerations arise because the subject area is already developed for suburban purposes to a partial degree. This was not the case when other DCA's were introduced in greenfield (often rural) areas.

The philosophy applied to infrastructure provision and maintenance between greenfield and infill development varies as follows:

- Greenfields - developers pay for infrastructure upgrades and this is factored into the price of land when sold. Infrastructure is typically maintained by the developer for a period of time and then handed to the responsible authority to maintain and renew assets as necessary over time. Costs are fixed or limited by the usual approach to DCA implementation and management, which typically involves full cost recovery from developers
- Infill development - The City's approach is typically to manage, maintain, and renew assets to retain their condition. Some renewal occurs to bring infrastructure to a higher new standard. Ad hoc proposals for infrastructure upgrades are funded through the normal budget and resource allocation model. The costs of providing the required CIW and POS in an infill development context are substantially higher than in a greenfield development situation.

The question arises as to why 100% cost recovery is sought and whether there are other methods to subsidise contributions, such as through rates or State Government funding.

Item 15.1 Continued

The observation made in some submissions is that other areas are upgraded by the City without the requirement for contributions and questions have been raised as to why this would not apply in the ODP area.

Key issues include:

- Under normal ODP conditions (where broad acre land is converted and serviced for urban use), the landowners share the costs of infrastructure provision through the DCA
- After a period of time, the maintenance and renewal of these assets becomes the responsibility of the local government, funded by Local Government revenue and in accordance with an asset management plan
- In this case some of the roads and infrastructure are reaching an age where renewal and maintenance are required. These would normally be maintained by the City
- There is difficulty in separating the asset management responsibilities of the City from the improvement and new services provision required to be funded by land owners through the DCA.

There is limited guidance from State Planning Policy on this matter.

The issue is made more complex by costing and coordination implications and the need to renovate and extend services within an existing populated area. Effective coordination and pre-planning will be needed to minimise disruption to residents. The costs of the work are also necessarily higher than any greenfield alternatives due to those complexities.

A number of options arise to deal with these challenges.

Development Contribution Arrangement Scenarios			
No.	**Option**	**Costs/Risks**	**Benefits**
1.	Traditional DCA Approach.	• Up-front costs to developing owners is significant. • Costs may reduce viability of plan, negating desired outcomes. • Ad hoc collection of funds may limit roll out of services and improvements.	• Financial exposure to City minimised. • Form of DCA is well practiced and implemented.
2.	DCA contributions reduced by the City subsidising some costs.	• City could borrow to pre-fund infrastructure provision in part. • Borrowings could be repaid by future rates of expanded population. • Scenario requires good modelling to prove viability.	• Services roll out could be simplified. • Up-front landowner costs reduced, thereby improving viability.
3.	Reduce standard of infrastructure required in the ODP area.	• Area is not upgraded to as high a standard as desired. • POS provision or similar reduced. • Unlikely to gain State Government support/approval	• Financial burden lifted to a degree. • Development potentially brought forwards.

Item 15.1 Continued

No.	Option	Costs/Risks	Benefits
		for works/plans.	
4.	Abandon DCA - City undertakes infrastructure upgrades.	• Infrastructure improvements slowed due to funding availability. • Delayed/spasmodic changes are disruptive and vision for quality redevelopment may not be achieved. • Development potential may be held in abeyance until services are upgraded by others.	• No DCA for landowners.

The above scenarios are based on generalised approaches, and there are various combinations of those which could be developed. However, the table summarises the various approaches and implications of each.

Given those implications, the second scenario has been explored in further detail, including the conduct of preliminary financial modelling to establish a basis for subsidisation. In theory, the City could provide a subsidy to the DCA at any level (from the total costs to a miniscule amount). Guidance is therefore needed to determine a basis for offering a subsidy.

In typical development scenarios, assets like roads and POS are funded by developers. The land upon which roads and parkland are constructed is usually set aside by land owners free of charge as a public reserve at the time of development and the infrastructure built upon it handed over to the relevant agency after an initial maintenance period for that agency to maintain thereafter and over time, renew.

Each of the CIW and POS items identified in the draft DCP report could be categorised in one of three ways in terms of their future asset management as set out in the following table:

Item 15.1 Continued

Item	Proposed Cost Allowance	Asset Classification
Land Acquisition - Roads	$6,059,875	Non-renewable & City-managed
Road Construction	$9,597,600	Renewable & City-managed
Shared Paths	$540,750	Renewable & City-managed
Traffic Devices	$215,000	Renewable & City-managed
Sewer Mains	$1,235,000	Renewable & Managed by others
Water Mains	$496,000	Renewable & Managed by others
Drainage Upgrade	$1,062,000	Renewable & City-managed
Underground Power	$1,240,000	Renewable & Managed by others
Telecommunications	$310,000	Renewable & Managed by others
Parkland Development	$3,564,000	Non-Renewable & City-managed
Administration	$6,700,000	N/A
POS Land	$20,150,000	Non-renewable & City-managed
Total	**$51,206,275**	
Nb: These figures were as they appeared in the advertised draft DCP report and do not reflect any modifications to cost allowances discussed elsewhere in this report.		

The highlighted renewable infrastructure items will ultimately be the responsibility of the City to maintain and renew.

These highlighted items have a collective cost allowance of $14,979,350, representing approximately 30% of the originally estimated total DCA cost, or 50% of the CIW component of costs (that is excluding land required for POS).

In general terms, the financial modelling indicates that development of the ODP area will provide substantially increased rates revenue, which could offset the costs of a partial City subsidy of the DCA.

The modelling indicates that at 75% build-out of the ODP area, $1,056,992 (in current dollar terms) annually will notionally be available for use (such as, to repay debt that may be incurred in pre-funding infrastructure works) having been generated from additional rates growth (after factoring in additional operating costs to service the new population).

	Now	After 75% Build-Out
Rates collected from residential properties in ODP area	$468,334	$2,736,099
Operating Cost allocated to residential properties in ODP area	$453,462	$1,679,107
Available to fund capital works	**$14,881**	**$1,056,992**
All figures are notional, based on average rates income and operating costs per dwelling.		

A principal amount of around $15 million could notionally be paid in approximately 15 years following 75% build-out of the ODP, however a subsidy to this level is considered to represent an unacceptable financial risk for the City and potentially create an undesirable precedent for similar infrastructure funding scenarios that may arise elsewhere in future.

A lesser amount of around $9,000,000 could notionally be repaid within 9 years, which represents a less significant financial risk and could be considered a reasonable investment of seed-capital to encourage development of a strategically important part of the City.

Item 15.1 Continued

In all likelihood the City would start repaying borrowings before a 75% level of build-out is reached, as additional rates income would be received almost immediately following subdivision and development occurring. Further, not all of the new infrastructure would be needed at once which would spread the cost of the subsidy over a number of years.

The modelling provides Council a basis upon which to consider subsidising a significant portion of the costs and therefore reduce contributions payable by developers.

Factoring in other recommended modifications to the draft DCP report, namely the donation of City-owned land in the ODP area to reduce POS costs and changes to the approach to road funding discussed in the following section, it will be recommended that Council subsidise CIW costs by one-third. A one-third subsidy to CIW costs will have a value of approximately $9,000,000 and the financial impact of the subsidy and other revisions to the funding approach discussed throughout this report is detailed in the Conclusion section.

Precinct-based Approach to Apportionment of Infrastructure and POS Costs

A key concern expressed in submissions relates to the proposed requirement for land owners to contribute to infrastructure works that are to be undertaken some distance from their own properties and will provide little or no perceived benefit to their own property. The primary example raised relates to land acquisition and construction costs for new roads and associated servicing works.

By contrast, some owners are aggrieved that they are required to contribute to land required for new roads or service upgrades on other properties but will receive no compensation for required road land that they are required to give up or will see no similar upgraded services occur in their streets.

It is recognised that the new infrastructure affects different properties in varying ways and the benefits in terms of improved access or development potential are also variable.

While the concerns are recognised, there is an argument in response that land owners who have no new roads indicated on their land should be appreciative of this fact and also be required to contribute to the cost of equalising the negative impact on those owners who are required to carry the burden of having new infrastructure located on their land.

It should also be noted that existing streets in the ODP area will ultimately be improved with services like underground power through renewal partnership programs.

Some have suggested, including the Department of Planning, that a precinct-based approach to the apportionment of the costs of infrastructure works should be examined so that there is a closer nexus between the contribution requirement and the works to be funded. Similar comments were made about the apportionment of POS costs, though not to the same level of concern.

Item 15.1 Continued

Various options for division of the ODP area and infrastructure and POS costs into precincts were examined in preparing the draft DCP report.

POS is relatively evenly distributed across the ODP area and will have a broad catchment. Apportionment of costs on a whole-of-ODP area is considered to be the most equitable.

Infrastructure works have a much smaller catchment or area of benefit and involve a more fine-grain level of detail in terms of distribution and cost. The division of the ODP area into precincts could potentially be done in a multitude of ways, albeit with a considerable degree of complexity involved.

Consideration was given in drafting the proposal to apportioning of costs over a single precinct (as proposed), two precincts (north and south of the Perth-Armadale railway) and ten precincts (using various existing roads as boundaries to create ten similarly sized precincts). The analysis revealed the following:

Precincts	**Contribution Rate/m^2**
1	$64.98
2	$60.62 - $68.60
10	$46.81 - $105.22
Assumes an average $/m^2 contribution rate, combined for POS and CIW	

The ten-precinct option involves calculation of works costs, developable areas and the properties to be excluded from contribution requirements at a precinct-by-precinct level, which is a detailed and complicated process. The analysis found it had the greatest variety in contribution rates of the three options, though apart from the rates at the lower and upper extreme, most precincts were between $52/m^2 and $69/m^2, which was similar to contribution rates that would apply under the single and two-precinct options. While it potentially may tighten the nexus between contribution requirements and the works to be funded by having a more proximate relationship between works and the properties that fund the cost, the benefits of this approach were outweighed by the complexity it would create, the limited variation in resulting contribution rates and the objective for a transparent, clear and understandable contribution approach.

The concerns expressed in submissions about the contribution requirements for new roads have warranted further consideration of the proposed approach set out in the draft DCP report.

While most of the new planned roads will provide a broad benefit to the development of land in the ODP area, some have been identified as providing a specific benefit to individual properties and only limited benefit to the broader area. These roads and the properties upon which they are to be located are indicated on the plan contained in Appendix 15.1I.

These roads are located on properties that are substantially larger than is typical in the ODP area. There is an argument for these roads to be excluded as a CIW cost from the DCA and instead be constructed at the cost of the individual owner at the time of subdivision or development, consistent with normal practice.

Item 15.1 Continued

Collectively these roads total 1.65km in length and the exclusion of the cost of construction (including allowances for related service extensions, but excluding the required land) would reduce the cost allowance by $3,260,058. The administration cost allowance would also be reduced by 15%, as portions of it are based on the CIW allowance.

If the cost of constructing these roads and related services is to be excluded from the DCA and met by the individual owners, then the properties upon which these roads are to be built should be exempt from the requirement to contribute to the cost of constructing roads and other services elsewhere in the ODP area. However, the exemption should not extend to the requirement to contribute to POS land acquisition and parkland development costs, shared use paths and a proportion of administration costs, as there is considered to be a strong nexus between the development of these properties and the requirement to contribute to these particular items.

This will necessitate the draft DCP report being modified to reflect the definition of two precincts and amended contribution parameters in relation to CIW. The first precinct will include most of the ODP area and will have the requirement to contribute to all CIW costs, generally as was set out in the advertised document but less the recommended cost reductions discussed above. The second precinct will reflect the area where individual land owners will be responsible for constructing roads at their own cost, with an exemption from the requirement to contribute to certain CIW costs elsewhere in the ODP area. This will involve making the following recommended changes to the draft DCP report:

- Creation of a separate CIW cost table for the two precincts
- Modification to the CIW contribution area map (Appendix G) to reflect the extent of the two precincts (as identified on the plan contained in Appendix 15.1I)
- Revised cost estimates and contribution rates to reflect the amended funding approach for road and associated servicing costs
- Other text changes as required to explain the amended approach.

A single precinct-approach should be maintained for POS contributions.

Although these modifications may be viewed as a significant change to the DCA for those few large-lot owners who are affected, the principle of having the responsibility return to the developers as their own development cost is normal practice in cases where an owner wishes to develop land. For that reason it is recommended that the change does not warrant re-advertising of the revised DCP report.

Valuations

Ordinarily an independent licensed valuer is appointed to provide land valuations to inform DCA cost estimates.

The draft DCP report has incorporated indicative land values based on individual property valuations obtained from and observations of recent sales evidence in the ODP area. The figure used is $3,500,000/ha (or $350/m^2) and has informed the cost estimates for required road and POS land.

The formal engagement of a valuer still needs to occur, so that a better defined land valuation basis can be used in support of the DCP report. It is considered necessary

Item 15.1 Continued

that the valuation exercise examine the various parcels of land throughout the area and consider the fact that land throughout the ODP area has a range of residential density codings from R20 to R80, with potential variety in values. It will be recommended that Council endorse the commencement of a process to formally engage a valuer and require a subsequent report to be prepared to reflect the valuation advice within a modified DCP report.

Staging and Timing of Implementation

It is anticipated that implementation of the ODP and the associated development contribution arrangement will occur in a staged manner. The rate of development will have a significant impact on the timing of implementation, with factors like land owner intentions and economic conditions critical in shaping when and to what extent development may occur.

The rate of development will impact on the City’s ability to ensure the timely provision of new roads and parkland in the DCA, as land owner contributions will be needed to fund the required work.

Accurately forecasting when land owners may undertake development and make their contributions is difficult. The uncertainty of when contributions may be made and how much income may be available at any given time can also make it difficult to devise a workable program for land acquisition and the roll-out of infrastructure.

Some submissions queried the City's intent in relation to the timing and staging of compensation payments and the construction of new roads and POS. In the circumstances no clear indication can be given to land owners in relation to these critical implementation issues.

The City is aware of the practical difficulties this level of uncertainty may create for individual land owners, such as those that may be affected by the alignment of a planned road or an area of required POS and would like to know when construction may occur or land may be acquired. More broadly, the City is also aware that the amenity of the DCA may be compromised by a situation where infrastructure works are incomplete and the timing for their completion is not defined.

The intention is to provide the required infrastructure in a well-planned and coordinated manner and make suitable and timely land acquisition arrangements with owners. This will likely involve borrowing funds to do this. Provision is made in the CIW estimates for the cost of interest that the City will incur on any borrowed funds.

The draft DCP indicated the intention to incorporate a CIW and POS staging plan to be prepared in future, as guided by the outcome of consultation with land owners, the identification of priorities for infrastructure works and land acquisition and analysis of the financial capacity of the City to source finance and service all debt.

Item 15.1 Continued

The land owner survey undertaken during the consultation process was intended to ascertain owners' intentions in respect to the development of their land, with the aim of helping plan for the timely and coordinated provision of the new infrastructure that is proposed to be funded by the DCA. There were 81 survey forms returned, representing a 16.27% response rate.

The first question of the survey asked land owners to indicate when, if ever, they intended to develop their land. A majority (41%) of respondents indicated that they had no intention of ever developing their land, 33% were unsure if or when they may develop and 26% indicated they would like to commence development either immediately or within the next three years.

The high proportion of owners with no development interest was surprising and potentially will have significant financial implications for operation of the DCA.

No discernible pattern or concentration of properties is apparent when the location of the properties whose owners are supportive of development was mapped. The implication is that there is no obvious item of infrastructure to construct first in order to encourage development in any particular location.

The second and final question of the survey asked those land owners who had indicated that they had no intention to develop their land or were unsure when they may develop to select the most applicable reason for why they made such a response.

Most (67%) indicated that their response was due to development costs. Some (18%) indicated that their property suited their lifestyle, while 7% indicated that they did not know what development involved. A small percentage (4%) had not considered the option of developing their land or did not want to subject themselves to the potential stress and hassle that may be involved. These responses reiterated the concerns that were expressed in submissions about the high costs involved.

An implementation staging plan remains as a necessary component of the DCA, however there are still too many variables to produce such a plan at this point in time. It will be necessary to produce this plan as the time for implementation approaches.

<u>Role of WAPC/Department of Planning</u>

As part of the City's referral of the draft DCP report to the Department of Planning, the question was asked as to whether either the Department or the WAPC considered that it has a formal approval role, as this is not evident from the provisions of either Town Planning Scheme No. 6, the Model Scheme Text or State Planning Policy 3.6.

The Department advised that neither it, nor the WAPC, has a formal approval role in respect to the draft DCP report, though it urged Council to consider its comments.

The Department's comments have been given thorough consideration in drafting this report and its recommendations.

Item 15.1 Continued

CONCLUSION

The draft DCP report is a complex proposal that has the intent of ensuring an equitable approach to the provision of new and upgraded infrastructure and POS in the Central Maddington ODP area. Consultation resulted in a large number of submissions, which have been carefully reviewed and considered resulting in a series of modifications that are reflected in an amended draft DCP report, as contained in Appendix 15.1J, and summarised in the following table:

Table of Recommended Modifications to the draft DCP report	
No.	**Modification**
1	Revised CIW contribution rates to reflect a Council subsidy of CIW of one-third.
2	Definition of two CIW contribution precincts, with amended costing and contribution parameters in respect to the exclusion of certain roads and associated services, with a reduction in the administration allowance to reflect the reduced costs involved in planning and overseeing construction of a reduced scope of works.
3	Revised net contribution area figures to capture additional properties that made POS contributions previously.
4	Revised net contribution area figures to capture additional properties that are too substantially developed to be likely to redevelop and therefore contribute in the foreseeable future.
5	Addition of a notation to indicate the requirement for any residential development within commercial-zoned land to contribute to POS.
6	Revised POS contribution rates to reflect the gifting of City-owned land on Weston Street and Clifton Street at no cost to the DCA.

These modifications substantially reduce CIW and POS contribution rates, as set out in the following tables.

Changes to CIW Contribution Rates resulting from Recommended Modifications		
Draft DCP Report (as advertised)	**Draft DCP (as modified) Precinct 1**	**Draft DCP (as modified) Precinct 2**
R20 - $222,769/ha ($22.28/m^2)	R20 - $140,993/ha ($14.09/m^2)	R20 - $50,877/ha ($5.09/m^2)
R30 - $334,153/ha ($33.41/m^2)	R30 - $211,363/ha ($21.14/m^2)	R30 - $76,315/ha ($7.63/m^2)
R40 - $445,538/ha ($44.55/m^2)	R40 - $281,805/ha ($28.18/m^2)	R40 - $101,753/ha ($10.18/m^2)
R80 - $891,076/ha ($89.11/m^2)	R80 - $563,610/ha ($56.36/m^2)	R80 - N/A

Changes to POS Contribution Rates resulting from Recommended Modifications	
Draft DCP Report (as advertised)	**Draft DCP (as modified)**
R20 - $160,596/ha ($16.06/m^2)	R20 - $137,740/ha ($13.77/m^2)
R30 - $240,894/ha ($24.09/m^2)	R30 - $206,593/ha ($20.66/m^2)
R40 - $321,192/ha ($32.12/m^2)	R40 - $275,480/ha ($27.55/m^2)
R80 - $642,384/ha ($64.24/m^2)	R80 - $550,773/ha ($55.08/m^2)

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Implementation of the draft DCP report will have significant financial implications for the City and land owners within the ODP area, as discussed throughout this report.

The adoption of the draft DCP report, with the recommended modifications, will significantly reduce the collective contribution liability for land owners in the ODP area, resulting in the reduction of contribution rates as detailed in the above tables.

Item 15.1 Continued

STATUTORY IMPLICATIONS

Town Planning Scheme No. 6 - Part 6 and Schedule 12.

VOTING REQUIREMENTS

Simple Majority required.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION (1 OF 4) AND COUNCIL RESOLUTION

536 Moved Cr R Mitchell Seconded Cr R Hoffman

That Council notes the Schedule of Submitters' Concerns and Schedule of Government and Servicing Agency Submissions, as contained in Appendices 15.1F and 15.1H respectively, and endorse the responses provided in these Schedules.

CARRIED 10/0

FOR: *Cr W Barrett, Cr J Brown, Cr G Dewhurst, Cr D Goode, Cr R Hoffman, Cr R Lawrence, Cr R Mitchell, Cr O Searle, Cr P Yang and Cr D Griffiths.*

AGAINST: *Nil.*

STAFF RECOMMENDATION (2 OF 4) AND COUNCIL RESOLUTION

537 Moved Cr R Mitchell Seconded Cr R Hoffman

That Council adopts the draft Development Contribution Plan report associated with the Central Maddington Outline Development Plan Development Contribution Arrangement, as modified following public consultation and contained in Appendix 15.1J, on an interim basis pending formal valuation advice.

CARRIED 10/0

FOR: *Cr W Barrett, Cr J Brown, Cr G Dewhurst, Cr D Goode, Cr R Hoffman, Cr R Lawrence, Cr R Mitchell, Cr O Searle, Cr P Yang and Cr D Griffiths.*

AGAINST: *Nil.*

STAFF RECOMMENDATION (3 OF 4) AND COUNCIL RESOLUTION

538 Moved Cr R Mitchell Seconded Cr R Hoffman

That Council requires a licensed valuer to be formally engaged to provide valuation advice for the purposes required for the Central Maddington Outline Development Plan Development Contribution Arrangement and a report to be presented to a future meeting of Council to consider the valuer's advice and any necessary revisions to the interim-adopted Development Contribution Plan report.

CARRIED 10/0

FOR: *Cr W Barrett, Cr J Brown, Cr G Dewhurst, Cr D Goode, Cr R Hoffman, Cr R Lawrence, Cr R Mitchell, Cr O Searle, Cr P Yang and Cr D Griffiths.*

AGAINST: *Nil.*

Item 15.1 Continued

STAFF RECOMMENDATION (4 OF 4) AND COUNCIL RESOLUTION

539 Moved Cr R Mitchell Seconded Cr R Hoffman

That Council informs all owners of land within the Central Maddington Outline Development Plan area of its decision.

CARRIED 10/0

FOR: *Cr W Barrett, Cr J Brown, Cr G Dewhurst, Cr D Goode, Cr R Hoffman, Cr R Lawrence, Cr R Mitchell, Cr O Searle, Cr P Yang and Cr D Griffiths.*

AGAINST: *Nil.*