

CITY OF JOONDALUP

MINUTES OF SPECIAL ELECTORS MEETING HELD IN COUNCIL CHAMBER, JOONDALUP CIVIC CENTRE, BOAS AVENUE, JOONDALUP, ON TUESDAY, 11 JANUARY 2005

ATTENDANCES

CMR J PATERSON – Chairman

CMR M ANDERSON

Absent from 1950 to 1956 hrs

CMR S SMITH

Officers:

Acting Chief Executive Officer:

C HIGHAM

Director, Corporate Services and

Resource Management:

P SCHNEIDER

Director, Infrastructure & Operations:

D DJULBIC

Acting Director, Planning and Community

Development:

G HALL

Manager, Marketing Communications &

Council Support:

M SMITH

Manager, Approvals Planning &

Environmental Services:

C TERE LINCK

Co-ordinator, Urban Design & Policy:

G CATCHPOLE

Media Advisor:

L BRENNAN

Committee Clerk:

J HARRISON

Minute Clerk:

L TAYLOR

In Attendance

Mr Mike Allen, Acting Executive Director, State and Regional Policy, Department of Planning and Infrastructure

Mr Mike Mouritz, Executive Director, Urban Policy – Liveable Neighbourhoods, Department of Planning and Infrastructure

Mr Peter Camalleri, Planning Officer, Network City, Department of Planning and Infrastructure

APOLOGIES

Apologies: Cmr's Clough and Fox

There were 95 members of the public in attendance, of whom 76 signed the attendance register.
For Attendance lists, click here: [attendance smoe 110105.pdf](#)

The Chairman opened the meeting at 1900 hrs and welcomed members of the public.

PURPOSE OF MEETING

This meeting was called in accordance with the provisions of Section 5.28 of the Local Government Act 1995. The details of the matters to be discussed at the special meeting are:

- Network City – community planning strategy for Perth and Peel. What it means to every suburb in the City of Joondalup;
- Liveable Neighbourhoods – what it means to every suburb in the City of Joondalup;
- Community workshops funded by the State Government, when will these happen?
- The City of Joondalup's response and submission to the State Government on behalf of ratepayers, regarding Network City and Liveable Neighbourhood;
- Any other matter raised from the floor.

The meeting was advertised in The Wanneroo Times on Thursday 21 December 2004 and in The Joondalup Community Newspaper on Tuesday 4 January 2005 and Thursday 6 January 2005.

The Chairman advised that Dr Apthorpe and Mr Van Wonderen had submitted questions which did not relate to this evening's meeting. A response will be provided to these questions at the next Council meeting.

The Chairman advised that representatives of the Department of Planning and Infrastructure were present this evening and would give presentations in relation to Network City and Liveable Neighbourhoods, should that be the wish of the meeting.

PUBLIC QUESTION TIME/MOTIONS

MOVED Sue Hart, 32 Pullan Place, Greenwood SECONDED Don Carlos, 45 Swanson Way, Ocean Reef that the presentation as prepared by the Department of Planning and Infrastructure in relation to Network City be shown to the meeting.

The Motion was Put and

CARRIED

Mr Mike Allen, Acting Executive Director, State and Regional Policy, Department of Planning and Infrastructure gave an overview of the presentation in relation to Network City: Community Planning Strategy for Perth and Peel – Appendix 1 refers. *Click here: [Attach1min110105.pdf](#)*

Mr Michael Caiacob, 7 Rowan Place, Mullaloo (suspended Councillor of the City of Joondalup):

I thank the City of Joondalup for this opportunity and the members of the public for attending this evening in search of information, and thanks also to the Department of Planning and Infrastructure for providing a presentation and information.

The City has highlighted in its submission to the Western Australian Planning Commission (WAPC) many issues and areas of concern. Possibly one of the strongest and numerous points highlighted by the City is the lack of community consultation undertaken to this point in time. The area of most importance highlighted, not only by this City but by other municipalities including Wanneroo, was the lack of consultation with existing communities who will be most affected by this strategy. It is my concern that this lack of consultation when viewed with regard to the liveable neighbourhoods document and the pending R Code review timing and wording, indicates a strategy that has already been determined. Approximately 1,200 people from a population of 1.5 million is not representative in my mind. This equates to .0774% for strategies with such impact upon existing well-established communities.

The submission advises us all that the intent of the Network City is to increase density in the existing suburbs. The ways and means of achieving that are somewhat supported by the City and the community in its submission on Liveable Neighbourhoods and Network City. Whilst the City acknowledges the community position, there has been no consultation over Network City and Liveable Neighbourhoods. The City itself has raised many issues regarding the lack of detail, consultation, financial and human resourcing for the City, relationships mapping and the effects the Network City will have on existing communities. For those of us facing infill sewage, we can be guaranteed to be the first suburbs hit with this strategy.

Can the City advise which activity centres are to be actioned first, where these centres are to be located and whether any work on these centres has commenced? There is Mullaloo, Sorrento, Greenwood, Kingsley, Greenwood Rail Station areas etc that have all been targeted previously. I have previously shown Commissioners an old plan of Mullaloo that was obtained from the City of Joondalup which shows the tavern and the Mullaloo shops with a peripheral area.

- Lot 1 Oceanside Promenade, the 10 lots in Merrifield Place, are these areas defined as under-used as per the Network City to be developed to accord to Network City?;
- Issues such as parking on the grassed area of Tom Simpson Park and in the grassed areas of Northshore;
- Realignment of Oceanside Promenade to facilitate the tavern and additional parking;
- Higher density;
- The proximity and the continued access to the Mullaloo Surf Club and the community hall and the foreshore;

The above are all issues raised previously by the community on a continual basis, that may be subject to the actions resulting from the strategies within the Network City. There has been no consultation to indicate for better or for worse. There has been a previous Special Electors' meeting held in Mullaloo, should the Commissioners need reference, and also a motion by Councillor Baker that the status quo of the existing suburban areas should be retained until there has been comprehensive community consultation. The local and, in particular, the State Government needs to be upfront and honest and provide adequate detail and consultation prior to accepting this strategy on behalf of its constituents.

In support of the response of the City's recommendations CJ339-12/04 that the City advise the Western Australian Planning Commission that further community consultation is required and that a further submission following the Special Electors' meeting to be held in January 2005 to be made on Network City, I raise the following motions.

MOVED Michael Caiacob, 7 Rowan Place, Mullaloo, SECONDED Allison Walker, 27 Sweeney Way, Padbury that the City further add to its Network City submission to the Western Australian Planning Commission (WAPC) by:

- 1 including a copy of the transcript of this meeting;**
- 2 indicating that ratepayers of the City of Joondalup support the City's concerns expressed with regards to the lack of community consultation with their communities over the Network City strategy, the lack of detail provided in the documents, and the effects to the planning status quo of the existing residential areas.**

The Motion was Put and

CARRIED

MOVED Michael Caiacob, 7 Rowan Place, Mullaloo, SECONDED Sue Hart, 32 Pullan Place, Greenwood that the City further add to its Network City submission to the Western Australian Planning Commission (WAPC) by way of acknowledging that many existing landowners in the City of Joondalup have selected the density, amenity, and urban planning surrounding their properties and localities and they have selected these properties by way of informed choice.

The Motion was Put and

CARRIED

Ms Sue Hart, 32 Pullan Place, Greenwood (suspended Councillor of the City of Joondalup):

I refer to Chapter 3 – Network City: Community Planning Strategy for Perth and Peel. Network City advocates high and medium rise development. This will be possible anywhere as this would support Network City generally. The City advises it will consider increasing density to provide a face-lift to its existing suburbs – Sorrento, Ocean Reef, Hillarys no doubt are all listed. Will these consist of high or medium density? The community has not been informed and there has been no consultation on a local level. The issue of noise arises again with this strategy, increased density, increased population, reduction of open space, increased employment associated with Network City etc. Noise is a sensitive issue for those affected, as well as a nightmare to control from the City's perspective. This will make the situation worse for all concerned and detailed, enforceable comprehensive legislation is required urgently.

MOVED Sue Hart, 32 Pullan Place, Greenwood, SECONDED Ken Zakrevsky, 49 Korella Street, Mullaloo that the City of Joondalup be commended for accepting that the consultation undertaken by the State Government is less than adequate; .0774% of the community from Perth to Peel was totally inadequate for such a monumental project.

The Motion was Put and

CARRIED

Ms Hart referred to a motion moved by Cr Baker that the status quo remains unless there is clear and demonstrable community support for change.

For the record, I would advise this meeting that information given to ratepayers by former Mayor Bombak and the current Acting Chief Executive Officer was that precinct planning or revitalisation of the suburbs was merely an idea.

We now know through the Inquiry that precinct planning was indeed a corporate project, included on the CEO's performance criteria on which he would be assessed.

MOVED Sue Hart, 32 Pullan Place, Greenwood, SECONDED Allyn Bryant, 6B Stocker Court, Craigie that the City of Joondalup are open, honest and accountable to all ratepayers in the City by way of information and the big picture and advise us fully of any similar ideas and/or concepts associated with Network City or the like.

The Motion was Put and

CARRIED

Early in 2002, several motions were put at Special Electors' meetings that the City develop a detailed, comprehensive community consultation policy. Now almost three years later, there is no policy. Had a policy been developed after the workshops that were held in 2002, and were very well attended, possibly we would not be here this evening or be facing other major issues in the City, for example Mullaloo, the CSIRO site and Meath Care.

MOVED Sue Hart, 32 Pullan Place, Greenwood, SECONDED Don Carlos, 45 Swanson Way, Ocean Reef that a detailed, comprehensive community consultation policy be developed and advertised for 60 days. At the time staff consult with the community, the community's concerns and issues raised are recorded in reports to Council and Commissioners without editing or omission.

The Motion was Put and

CARRIED

MOVED Sue Hart, 32 Pullan Place, Greenwood, SECONDED Lyn Chilby, 4 Erica Court, Greenwood that the City of Joondalup accept and acknowledge that some aspects of Network City are dictatorial and paternalistic and we accept nothing less from the staff and the City than to protect our choices, our public open space, our amenity, and our lifestyle choices wholly.

The Motion was Put and

CARRIED

In the presentation earlier this meeting, the second slide was titled “Why a new planning strategy?” One of the points was add content to democracy. I don’t understand that and I would appreciate it if that could be explained.

Response by Mr Mike Allen, Department of Planning and Infrastructure: Basically what that means is to engage more fully with the community. It really is in addition to the slide which talked about moving from DAD (Decide on a course of action; Announce the decision; Defend the decision from ensuing protests) to PEP (Profile the community to know the people; Educate them about the issues and options; Participate with them in a process of mutual education and joint problem solving). It is much more about the participative arrangements that we want to see in place, as the details that will inevitably follow from the principles contained in Network City are actually worked up at the local level.

Mr W Cohen, 12a Troy Avenue, Marmion:

The City states that it supports the engagement of communities in decision-making as a means of developing a sense of place and identity, and as a way of reassuring communities that the quality of places they value will not be compromised or lost. Why then has there been no community consultation in relation to the CSIRO site in Marmion?

Response by Cmr Paterson: Since I have been Chairman there has been a number of presentations made to Commissioners, both for and against the site.

Response by the City: The developers for a time conducted their own process before the statutory process commenced. With the advertising period that has recently occurred, the City has received over 740 submissions; which to the administration’s mind indicate that there is an exchange of ideas in relation to CSIRO and those submissions are being processed for consideration by the Council in February.

Ms Mnique Moon, 6 Carew Place, Greenwood:

I refer to Chapter 2 – Implementation, Governance and Process.

Under this title it lists that planning provisions need to be made with all the region’s residents in mind and not just local residents. This is flawed because the local government and residents are in the best position to know the local community’s future hopes and what they consider liveable, loveable and likeable. Within the Network City documents, it states this is what is intended to be achieved – a liveable, loveable and likeable city. Who better to be in a position to know these community aspirations. Strategy 2:3 negates this in engaging champions to inspire and nurture the change and protect it from criticisms from stakeholders perceiving loss. Each stakeholder has a right to an opinion, whether this is considered a criticism by local government or State Government or not. It is not fair to set up one community member against another community member. State politicians and local government are the elected members that we should deal with, not champions. Strategy 2:6 institutionalises the engagement of the community in industry with government to implement the network strategy. This is not consultation on network strategy, this is just the implementation of network strategy. Network strategy only gauged the opinion of 0.7% of the population and not all of those were in agreement. It is clearly stated that the engagement or partnering is distinct from community consultation and will not be required for every project. A community consultation unit is also stated to support local and State Government industry in the implementation of this strategy. This is not a community consultation unit to consult with the community on this strategy, but only on its implementation.

MOVED Mnique Moon, 6 Carew Place, Greenwood, SECONDED Sue Hart, 32 Pullan Place, Greenwood that extensive community consultation is carried out in each municipality to ensure communities are aware of the implementation intent of Network City, and what it means for their areas; identify clearly through consultation:

- 1 each existing and proposed activity centre, activity road and transport road;**
- 2 what land uses can be expected to occur in each of the various sizes of activity centres from the local size to the regional size and activity roads and indicate in the strategy the hierarchy of these activity centres;**
- 3 identify what and how changes to existing residential, urban, and net residential densities will occur;**
- 4 ensure consultation occurs on this strategy to make the process accountable, open and honest.**

The Motion was Put and

CARRIED

MOVED Mnique Moon, 6 Carew Place, Greenwood, SECONDED Sue Hart, 32 Pullan Place, Greenwood that the State Government identifies what changes would need to occur to the Metropolitan Region Scheme, the Town Planning Schemes, 5AA State policies and planning framework prior to endorsing the Network City strategy. It is too late after the strategy is endorsed for communities to have input into the location of centres, the desirability for higher densities or changes to quiet streets becoming feeder roads, changes to open space and to voice environmental concerns not identified in this strategy.

The Motion was Put and

CARRIED

MOVED Mnique Moon, 6 Carew Place, Greenwood, SECONDED Allison Walker, 27 Sweeney Way, Padbury that where it is stated in the Strategy to provide a City plan that will be implemented and it states “will provide certainty and deliberate results” it ensures certainty for the community, just not reasonable certainty as stated under the title. What is reasonable certainty, reasonable to whom?

The Motion was Put and

CARRIED

Mrs M Zakrevsky, 49 Korella Street, Mullaloo:

When I have mentioned Network City recently to people, I just get a blank look because it has not been advertised or information given out by the City.

I am not one of the 8,000 residents who responded to the survey back in 2003 and I am not one of the 1,100 participants who took part in Fremantle on 13 September 2003. I have only recently looked at the Network City document and I am going to refer to that. The most important part, which is the dialogue information sheets, which is what came from the 1,100 participants, is at the very back of this book and I just feel that each sheet should be in front of the appropriate chapter because it is the dialogue that is the wishes of the people and their

vision and then the chapters are the strategies to implement that vision. Page 99 - sustainable development. There are nine dot points, of which I will mention 2. One was that people are concerned about the sustainable environment, particularly the increase in nutrification of the Swan/Canning rivers with the algal blooms; also the loss of native bushland and photochemical smog. Over the page it mentions it should be due for coastal planning. This is all about our environment and the main points that came out was that people believed that the environment and heritage were more important than anything else and that all the strategies, like the transport systems, higher density and all that, were to ensure that the environment and the sustainable development occurs and yet it is at the back of the book and in Chapter 5.

Strategy 5, chapter 5, Environment and Heritage. I have looked at the Strategies from 5.1 to 5.9 and it seems that all strategies appear to be in place already. I wonder whether it will make any difference reaffirming these. We value our coastal foreshores, wetlands, coastal beaches and yet some recent decisions, such as the fire station, have not gone in a built up area but has gone into Lilburne Reserve and one wonders whether the planners are listening to the people, that heritage, environment and open spaces are very important.

Urban growth boundaries were highly endorsed by most people that attended the Fremantle meeting and it has been removed and the wording is “the concept of the urban growth is that its significant and sensitive environment areas are excluded for urban development’. If the urban growth boundary was put in, then that would safeguard the water catchment areas and other important areas but by leaving this out it allows the developers to invade the areas that we want preserved and that is a shame. I encourage people to read that section on Urban Growth Boundaries.

On page 114, it says ‘the intention is to work with established market forces to guide them to where growth is most appropriate’ and I am concerned about this statement. I would ask the team that is writing the submissions for the City of Joondalup to take heed of some of the sentiments of the people here tonight and incorporate some of their ideas. I ask that Chapter 5 and the urban growth boundary be looked at more carefully.

Cmr Anderson left the Chamber at 1950 hrs.

MOVED Marilyn Zakrevsky, 49 Korella Street, Mullaloo SECONDED Ken Zakrevsky, 49 Korella Street, Mullaloo that the sentiments of all speakers at the Special Meeting of Electors be given consideration and included in the City of Joondalup’s submission on Network City.

The Motion was Put and

CARRIED

Mrs M Macdonald, 5 Mair Place, Mullaloo:

I wish to bring to the attention of the meeting the other document that is an integral part of the State’s push to create higher densities in Perth residential areas, called Liveable Neighbourhoods 3. This document has already been out for public comment and it pre-empts the approval of Network City. It appears that Liveable Neighbourhood 3 will have a statutory status and be the tool to implement much of Network City. The concepts in Network City are not new. We have had Precinct Planning, Precinct Action Planning and Liveable Neighbourhood documents before, so what is different about this push for higher density living? It is feared that Liveable Neighbourhoods 3 will remove any certainty we have now with respect to the R-Coding and the standards for development in our suburbs and allow

developers to bypass those understood planning tools using simplified site analysis and application requirements. The City's Strategic Plan quoted in a report to the City in 2002 had a vision to 'create local neighbourhood precincts which have their own distinct character, identity, community spirit, have easy access to high quality local services, neighbourhood design that encourages walking, cycling, jogging, where it is easy to get around and enjoy a healthy lifestyle'. That statement formed part of the justification for the approval of the new Mullaloo Beach development which is being built to accommodate 800 patrons in its first floor tavern and incorporate a 200 square metre bottleshop. One wonders how this development, based on the consumption of alcohol, could produce a liveable neighbourhood creating a healthy lifestyle and providing a high quality service to the community it serves. It appears that the words in these policy documents do not translate into the desired outcomes.

MOVED M Macdonald, 5 Mair Place, Mullaloo, SECONDED Sue Hart, 32 Pullan Place, Greenwood that we request that the City informs the State Government that the ratepayers of the City of Joondalup require more certainty with respect to the maintenance of their lifestyle and property values than Liveable Neighbourhood Policy 3 document will provide, and request that the document contain a clause to allow ratepayers a third party right of appeal with respect to future development approvals.

The Motion was Put and

CARRIED

Ms Katherine Woodmass, 25 Calbourne Way, Kingsley:

Given the terrible history that both State and Local Government have for being able to consult with the public, what makes them believe they are now magically overnight able to do this? Examples of this are Precinct Planning and Meath Care, where the public opinion was completely ignored.

Response by Mr Mike Allen, Department of Planning and Infrastructure: As far as Network City is concerned, we are at the beginning of the process and the presentation given earlier indicated how much more consultation will be undertaken, especially consultation at the local level. This is where we get back into the notion of partnerships with local government and using both local government and local communities to come up with solutions for local areas. There will be a great deal of consultation over many years to implement the principles of Network City. I cannot comment on the specific examples given, but in general, community consultation is very high on the agenda of the State Government and in particular the Planning and Infrastructure Minister, who has made a point of increasing community consultation, introducing new and innovative ways of engaging with the community. We are intent on increasing the level of community consultation and involvement and community empowerment.

Cmr Anderson entered the Chamber at 1956 hrs.

You said this is the beginning of the process. When we had Precinct Planning, we were told that it was the beginning of the process and I originally got involved with Council because on a planning proposal my house had disappeared. I have attended Council meetings for the last two years on a fairly regular basis and I have never been invited to anything to do with the City's planning or State Government planning. How do you choose who you consult with and who you don't? Is it because they have more money than we have or they are more important than we are?

Response by Mr Mike Allen, Department of Planning and Infrastructure: It has absolutely nothing to do with who you are or how much money you have. The idea is to be as inclusive as possible. I cannot answer for the City, I am talking on behalf of the State Government.

I live in Kingsley and there will soon be no vegetable store within a 15 minute drive of me thanks to the WA State Government but I was not told this. Where was the community consultation there?

Response by Mr Mike Allen, Department of Planning and Infrastructure: I cannot comment on the specifics of this example.

Accountability and transparency are nice words in the report, however we have yet to see an example of this. Shouldn't you gain public confidence in your ability to consult before you start doing this? Precinct Planning and Network City Community Planning Strategy for Perth and Peel sound very similar. To me it is just a blanket rezoning tool to allow planners to do what they wish, when they wish, to allow State and Local Government to make money on rates and remove lifestyle choices within the suburbs. I moved to Kingsley because it was quiet and not high density, it has a lot of open space and is a nice community. You are now telling me that you will make a different decision for me. I recently visited Subiaco and was shocked to see that a former grassed area is no longer there – is this what we can look forward to in the City of Joondalup? Are we going to lose our open space around the City?

Response by Mr Mike Allen, Department of Planning and Infrastructure: The short answer is no. The thrust of Network City says that where changes to the suburbs are to occur, they will not occur as a blanket across the suburbs. The idea is to concentrate change, particularly around centres and it is recognised there is a lot of work to do in terms of identifying and designating those centres, and along activity corridors. It should also be pointed out that it is not for Network City to change anything by way of zoning, and it is only by way of changes to zoning and R-Codes, which are initiated by local government, that change can occur. Nowhere in Network City does it say that open space will be built on.

Mr D Carlos, 45 Swanson Way, Ocean Reef:

How many groups from Joondalup were invited to the Fremantle meeting held on 13 September 2003 and how many attended that meeting?

Response by Mr Mike Allen, Department of Planning and Infrastructure: There was a random sample of 8,000 residents throughout the metropolitan region.

I was Mayor at that time and I was not approached to attend. There are 14 ratepayer groups in the City, and at least 20 committees, and I was not approached to provide people from interested groups to attend. I am wondering why you left out the second largest City to attend. I would like to hear of someone who attended that could speak for the City of Joondalup. We in the City of Joondalup have been left in the dark. I was concerned at the presentation given as there was no substance to the words and I would like to see some substance. The ratepayers came to live north of the City because they wanted to get away from high density living and now someone is trying to impose this on us. In 2002 we had a number of special meetings where thousands of people attended to oppose precinct planning. We thought this was made clear to the Government. You have changed the words but it doesn't look any different. I am not against development. I am against doing something

behind closed doors as we then do not get to hear about it. I believe ratepayers deserve something better and I would ask that you take that back to the Minister. I will meet with the Minister and give her the view of the ratepayers because we have got to be consulted. There are a lot of concerned people in the City who don't want decisions made by someone in the distance.

I was one of the elected representatives who was taken to see the Marmion site and we raised the question with CSIRO and Mr Higham as to why the land could not be handed back to the City. We were told by the representatives of CSIRO that the Commonwealth Government was going to sell it and that it would not be handed back to the Council. This I cannot understand but we continued to raise the question. I now find that there is a document available which says that if the CSIRO was not going to use the site it should be handed back to the City but this document has never been made available. I am concerned that we have been hoodwinked and I would like this matter to come before Council again because I think it is a disgrace that the ratepayers have not had the chance to be a party to this dreadful redevelopment. May I also say that I was at a briefing session on the night that the Chairman received a presentation from the developer and I asked to attend that session and was told it was to be behind closed doors. We have to have open and accountable government here and meetings should not be behind closed doors on matters that the general public and the press should have access to. Why were we not invited to that meeting.

Response by Cmr Paterson: That was a procedural mistake on my part, as I admitted at the next Council meeting. This meeting should have occurred at a briefing session and in future only strategy sessions will be closed.

Mrs C Edwardes, 8 Nadine Place, Woodvale:

I do not want any of my comments in any way to be reflective upon the officers from the Department of Planning and Infrastructure. I was one of the 1100 that attended the dialogue in Fremantle. I found it to be a very cynical exercise, particularly when the community response had to be within a framework laid down by the Minister, but more cynical subsequent to that meeting was when the sustainability policy released by the Premier several days later actually pre-empted the community's outcome. That is absolutely amazing and when we read the community's response in the back of the document, many of us are astounded as to how we actually came to that response. The urban growth boundary has been established in Oregon and we had a gentleman on that day at Fremantle talk to us about what a good thing it was – it hasn't worked in Oregon to the satisfaction of the community. Melbourne introduced it – it hasn't worked in Melbourne either to the satisfaction of the community. When you have in the document that 60% of all new dwellings – some 220,000 homes – be built in existing suburbs it is an extreme reaction to population growth and would fundamentally change a way of life that is held very dear by hundreds of thousands of Perth residents. The only way our existing suburbs could accommodate a 60% increase in new development is by building on the open spaces that make Perth, and the Northern suburbs, such a beautiful place to live. Forcing high density living on our suburbs means that children of the future will have a courtyard or a balcony for a backyard at a time when we are facing an obesity epidemic and should be planning to encourage and accommodate more physical activity by our children. Forcing higher density development on the City and restricting outer metropolitan land releases also would artificially inflate prices for new blocks which would impact on those who least can afford it – our new home buyers. Home ownership for most people means a house with a backyard big enough to kick a footy around, build a cubby house, climb a tree; where you can keep a dog or have a swimming pool. That is the way of life that makes our City so attractive to the people who live here and it must be protected and

Network City plan would see backyards replaced with courtyards and balconies, and suburbs with open spaces would be lost forever.

MOVED Cheryl Edwardes, 8 Nadine Place, Woodvale SECONDED Allison Walker, 27 Sweeney Way, Padbury that the Commissioners of the City of Joondalup advise the State Government that the ratepayers of the City of Joondalup:

- 1 have already voted overwhelmingly against any form of precinct planning that could threaten their current lifestyles;**
- 2 do not want to see open spaces lost forever;**
- 3 have already overwhelmingly rejected the concept of high density living in their area and any change to lifestyle should provide genuine choice and from the community up, not imposed by the State Government down.**

The Motion was Put and

CARRIED

Mr M Caiacob, 7 Rowan Place, Mullaloo:

I would like to go back to the question raised by Katherine Woodmass and the response that was given. We are continually told in the planning fraternity that we must look at the holistic approach and the holistic approach for Network City is the review of the R-Codes and Liveable Neighbourhoods document No 3. I will ask Katherine Woodmass' question again, and refer to the Liveable Neighbourhoods document and the concern expressed by the City of Joondalup, being the built form of 374 square metre blocks in R-20 areas, as well as 170 square metre blocks in R-40 areas and 136 square metre blocks in R-60 areas. Could I have a reply as to whether the density in the City of Joondalup is going to increase from the current R-20 areas that we currently live, reside and prosper in?

Response by the City: There is no proposal before the Council to increase density on any broad based strategy.

My question has been misinterpreted. I was not asking whether the City has any plans, this is through the Liveable Neighbourhoods document No 3 that the City has already put a submission to. Government submissions have now closed on that document and in that document submission by the City, the City states that it is concerned as to the built form that would arise should the State Government impose 374 square metre blocks in the current existing R-20 areas.

Response by Mr Mike Mouritz, Department of Planning and Infrastructure: Liveable Neighbourhoods document is primarily a subdivision code focused on new subdivisions, new greenfield areas. What you are eluding to is the types of densities that might be appropriate in some parts of new greenfields areas, but it is certainly not something that would be applied to existing residential areas in terms of changing any zoning in an R-20 area.

Ms Mnique Moon, 6 Carew Place, Greenwood:

Could I please ask that it be clarified that Liveable Neighbourhoods will not be applied anywhere in established areas, not even around activity centres, or activity roads or new development areas?

Response by Mr Mike Mouritz, Department of Planning and Infrastructure: Liveable Neighbourhoods code is primarily a subdivision code for new subdivisions. There are many principles in there that are applicable to areas under renewal or change.

So it would be applied in existing areas in those instances?

Response by Mr Mike Mouritz, Department of Planning and Infrastructure: Only in the context if the area was zoned or approved for a particular density would those principles be applied.

Ms Louisa Moussa, 28a Transom Way, Ocean Reef:

Ms Moussa queried how Network City will affect what facilities available for the community and raised concerns in relation to:

- the current health, education and employment system;
- Joondalup hospital, which she believes is substandard and does not provide an adequate service, in particular the emergency department;
- The community's views that are not being listened to;
- rail system and congestion on the freeway;
- environmental issues at Hillarys Boat Harbour.

Response by Mr Mike Allen, Department of Planning and Infrastructure: There is no doubt that when you have an expanding City there is a consequential requirement for increased infrastructure provision, both of a physical nature as well as community infrastructure such as hospitals and schools. I cannot give the precise details as to what might occur in the northern suburbs in the new growth areas but it is an undeniable fact that as the City expands those sorts of facilities will need to be budgeted for and provided in due course.

MOVED Sue Hart, 32 Pullan Place, Greenwood SECONDED Allyn Bryant, 6B Stocker Court, Craigie that the City of Joondalup seriously considers developments and rezoning applications along the coastline as was discussed at the workshop for Tourism to keep the status quo and to show nature at its best to the rest of the world.

The Motion was Put and

CARRIED

Mr Rob Newton, 23 Nottinghill Street, Joondalup:

Tonight there has been discussion about a 60% urban development target as part of Network City and there have been claims that this will take away our backyards and swimming pools and basically change the face of our suburbs. If this is true it is very concerning. For the record, currently what percentage of development occurs within the urban boundary of the metropolitan area?

Response by Mr Mike Allen, Department of Planning and Infrastructure: There are differing figures on this, and it would depend on the source of information used, but figures using Western Power connections indicate 61% of dwellings in existing urban areas are now being constructed.

Mrs Allison Walker, 27 Sweeney Way, Padbury:

I came here tonight to listen to what was being said and to hear all sides of the story. I am concerned that we are looking at 60% infill, but there is insufficient hospital and school facilities to cater for this. Craigie High School has been closed and the land sold, yet a much needed community centre could have been placed on that land. Roads are at capacity now, and there is a water problem

We have got to think about it. Joondalup has approximately 500 blocks left to build on but they are all sold. If we need more schools in Joondalup, where are we going to put them? We could increase numbers in classes, but how would that affect our children's education. These are the things we need to look at before we start looking at Network City as a proposition.

Mr Ken Zakrevsky, 49 Korella Street, Mullaloo:

All the points brought up this evening are extremely relevant, as well as the motions which should be taken on board and acted upon.

I am taking the opportunity tonight under the heading Other Matters, to raise this issue. I viewed the displays at Hillarys Boat Harbour today concerning the proposed tavern which is a relocation, as I understand it, of Breakwater Tavern. Submissions will be made to Council for this development as Council has involvement in the matter even though it is ultimately a government decision. The proposed tavern is, I understand, for patronage of 1,000 people, and that requires a certain number of car parks. I asked the speaker how many car bays would be required and was told 147 are to be provided, and I sought further clarification of the location of the car bays. 147 bays for 1,000 people will be the same proposal as for Mullaloo Tavern. If four people travel per car, what provisions are there for that? Through the lack of parking, why hasn't there been any compensation, and where will the compensation be in Hillarys? There have been articles in the newspapers that the shopkeepers will have to seriously consider paying to provide for multi-storey parking. In the past we were assured there would be no housing on Hillarys Boat Harbour, and yet now there is housing there. Full consultation is required, and then attention needs to be given to the submissions made. A label has been put on the public, which I think is abhorrent, and that is why people are very suspicious. Certain Councillors think they are very important and fall into a trap, and it is then capitalised on because they then accept and pass on delegated authority, into the form of becoming absolute authority. People are not being attended to, questions are not being fully

considered and answered, and the public has had enough of that attitude. Do not try to play off elected members or Commissioners against the public, and the public against those people. I expect a better performance from people who are supposed to be qualified and know their job.

Mr Zakrevsky raised issues in relation to sight lines, setbacks and parking issues at Mullaloo Tavern.

MOVED Ken Zakrevsky, 49 Korella Street, Mullaloo SECONDED Allison Walker, 27 Sweeney Way, Padbury that everything that is brought up by the community is given serious attention and not just “noted”.

The Motion was Put and

CARRIED

Ms Mnique Moon, 6 Carew Place, Greenwood:

In relation to Hillarys Boat Harbour and other attractors such as Yellagonga National Park, Lake Joondalup, and areas such as Mullaloo with its tavern, it specifically identifies specialised centres and says that these centres provide opportunities for diversification of land use into its surrounding areas. Surrounding Hillarys Boat Harbour we have rehabilitated dunes and swimming beaches. Now this states that the priority is to integrate these areas into the broader pattern of the activity centre. We continually hear that we are going to have consultation on these matters but this is a specific part of activity centres. It is also stated for activity centres that they take up area where there is now residential. People have a right, beforehand, to make comment and have input into their surrounding areas. Can I just clarify, was the statement made earlier that the State Government is already in the process of getting local governments to support the implementation of Network City?

Response by Mr Mike Allen, Department of Planning and Infrastructure: What I said was that the State Government and Local Government are working on a partnership agreement.

If our elected representatives in the State have not heard us, and you take on board our local representatives that are going to support you, what is the point of consultation? Could the comment be clarified about the community planning strategy?

Response by Mr Mike Allen, Department of Planning and Infrastructure: The Network City document was developed from the input of the community as occurred at the dialogue with the City forum. What happens after the dialogue with the City forum, is that it goes through the WA Planning Commission and went to Cabinet, but the point I am making is that the proposals that were contained in the document emanated from the community forum.

Whether the strategy is put forward by the community or comes directly from the State, it needs consultation, not the implementation of the strategy but the strategy itself needs to be out for consultation.

Response by Mr Mike Allen, Department of Planning and Infrastructure: It is out for public comment now.

We have not had consultation on it, you have not advised communities whether they are near an activity centre. Most people do not have the time or the inclination, or understanding of planning to read such a document or to connect it to Liveable Neighbourhoods, or even their town planning scheme or the Metropolitan Region scheme. You stated the local government will be implementing this. You are having changes to the MRS, but that is not a local initiative, that will come from the State. I really think the policy itself needs to be objective and the purpose of this policy need to go out for consultation, and if the strategy is accepted then the implementation process should come about. The only dialogue we are having is on the implementation.

Mr David, Davies, President of the City of Joondalup Associations Forum, 5 Lytham Mews, Connolly:

Tonight's meeting has been called partly because of the lack of trust and concern ratepayers have on some of the decisions, including planning decisions, being made by the City of Joondalup. Some of these concerns relate to the Mullaloo Tavern, Meath Care Hocking Road, the CSIRO site, proposed development at Marmion, Works Depot site acquisition, amongst others. To help the ratepayers of Joondalup be informed on these and other topical issues within the City of Joondalup, within the next two weeks the City of Joondalup Associations Forum will be launching its website with information for the public, information that will be plain speech and not planners terminology and will hopefully aid the public to make informed decisions. The website address is www.joondalup.asn.au.

I would like answers on the following issues:

- Under the Network City proposal, I believe shopping centres could or would be classified as public open space.
- a garbage disposal unit cannot be put in a sink because of the lack of diameter for the sewage system in Western Australia.

MOVED Katherine Woodmass, 25 Calbourne Way, Kingsley SECONDED Allison Walker, 27 Sweeney Way, Padbury that the Joint Commissioners prove that they are listening to the community by putting a motion to rescind the approval of the Meath Care facility until the impact of the excavations on the wetland and the surrounding areas is fully understood.

The Motion was Put and

CARRIED

MOVED Katherine Woodmass, 25 Calbourne Way, Kingsley SECONDED Sue Hart, 32 Pullan Place, Greenwood that the Strategy Sessions which currently occur behind closed doors become an open session so that the City's residents can know exactly what is going on.

The Motion was Put and

CARRIED

Mr Mike Norman, 8 Stockdale Avenue, Sorrento:

I often stand on the platform at Warwick train station and look at an Amazon River of cars going down the freeway every morning. I think we do need to live more sustainably and economically, but it needs to be done in a sensitive and intelligent way. Coming to the meeting tonight I hear there is a lot of mistrust because there has not been good consultation in the past on a number of issues. I think we need to tackle this subject intelligently, with full consultation and rebuild the level of trust. I put it to Council to look at ways that it can develop the trust and really respond to the residents and ratepayers when they raise issues. I have been on the receiving end of a number of issues over a number of years where I have had non-answers and very poor responses to very valid issues that I have raised and this is the sort of thing that causes a lack of trust and angst. I put it to the Commissioners and officers of the City that if we are really to progress these issues with consultation with the community, we will need to build the trust. We need to have our views seriously considered so that we can really work together to solve what are quite major problems that our community ultimately will have to address if we do not address it now.

Dr Marjorie Apthorpe, 69 Bacchante Circle, Ocean Reef:

The Chairman earlier indicated that the question I submitted was not related to Network City but I beg to differ and say that my questions and comment are related to Network City and I will place them now before the meeting.

My comments relate to the avalanche of cars proceeding towards the City down the Mitchell Freeway every morning and also back towards Joondalup at night, as I am in one of those cars. The reason I am in one of those cars is because there are no buses from the railway stations in the City of Joondalup after the early hour of 5.50 pm. The suburbs of Ocean Reef and Iluka are not served by bus services at all for the evening peak hour after 5.50 pm and that is the reason why so many of us use cars. In the ten years that the northern end of Ocean Reef has been a developed suburb, no one in the City of Joondalup has seen fit to discuss with Transperth to rectify this situation and I would like to know when the City of Joondalup will take some common sense measures to increase the bus services for commuters in its western beachside suburbs so that we may use public transport.

Response by the City: The City will direct this question to the transport authority with the request that it looks seriously at providing a better service.

Mr Ken Travers, Member for the North Metropolitan Region:

I would like to make some general comments. People have talked about the lack of consultation with the Network City document and part of the reason why I wanted to attend tonight was to hear those views, so that I can pass them back to the Government. I do want to recap and remind people about the process that is being followed, because I think in terms of developing the next stage of planning for the metropolitan area of Perth, we have had unprecedented consultation compared to the way it has been done in the past and compared to the way it has been done in other parts of the City. I remind people that this is a document that is out for public consultation, it is not a final Government strategy. We are seeking the input. Whereas in the past, documents such as Network City have been developed in-house by the Government, this time the Government went out and very clearly set about a strategy to ask the people of Perth where do we want to go as we grow into the future – how do we want

to manage the growth that we are facing. To do that we went through a process of asking over 8,000 people randomly selected across Perth for their views. We also engaged in a process by which we went to Channel 7 and the West Australian Newspaper. At the time, Channel 7 ran a programme as part of the dialogue with the City Forum to encourage community debate about the direction. Running concurrently with that there was a range of articles on a daily basis in the West Australian, along with some paid advertisements. At that time people were asked to indicate if they would like to participate in the dialogue with the City Forum in Fremantle. I apologise if Mr Don Carlos was not invited as the Mayor of the City of Joondalup because I understood that local governments were made aware of it and certainly at the dialogue there were many other community representatives. As part of the television programme, people were invited to put forward their own registration and most of those people were then able to attend.

Out of that process, the document that we have here tonight was produced, to be put back out to the public to ask where people want to go and ask if this is the general direction in which we want to take it. A number of speakers tonight spoke on the lack of detail in the document. The general strategic direction has to be established first before you can start to put the detail in. This document is about seeking to provide the strategic direction. The detail and the process by which we would fill in that detail will be established, if the strategic direction is accepted by the broader community. Issues such as amendments to the MRS and the planning schemes would come out of the further process but the high level strategic settings have to be established in the first instance. As this document makes clear, in terms of developing that detail the intention would be that you would continue to have a community interactive process where you go out to the communities on a local level and ask, within that strategic direction, how you want your local communities to look. Already the Government has provided \$1.5 million to assist local governments to look at developing, at their local community level, their views on how they would like their suburbs to look. If communities are of the view that they like the way that their suburbs are, then this document will not change that. If the community tells us they want to subdivide land and maximise the value of their land, then they will be allowed to do that as well. I would expect in suburbs such as the City of Joondalup you would see limited change but possibly in other parts of the metropolitan area where people might be keen to do that.

In respect to a number of the comments raised tonight about the problems we are having, they are not a problem of this document they are a problem of the current planning processes. People have talked about the closure of the fruit markets, that is a product of the planning strategy we have in place that was developed under the old system behind closed doors, in Government offices and then put out to the general community. Hopefully we will not see that as a part of this process.

In conclusion, can I welcome the City of Joondalup having this special meeting and say from the Government's point of view it is very important to obtain feedback from people like yourselves in terms of this strategy as to where you want to go, remembering this is a draft strategy and we are looking for a general picture of where the broader strategy is.

Ms Morag Davies, 7 Charlton Court, Kingsley:

I was previously the secretary of the South Ward Ratepayers and Electors Association. In that capacity I received a large envelope with a number of brochures about Network City strategy, giving the date for submissions. I received these brochures the day before the submissions closed. So much for community consultation.

Ms Katherine Woodmass, 25 Calbourne Way, Kingsley:

Can I ask how many persons at this meeting have seen this booklet before tonight – about 10%. So obviously it is understood why we are upset. You have consulted with local government to implement this – not to approve it or make sure it is ok with us but to implement it and very few people have seen it. An issue is that we have not been given this information. I personally do not read the West Australian newspaper, a lot of other people do not read the West Australian. It is well seen that it is an election year, as we have so many members of Parliament here tonight, but what these people need to understand is that there are a lot of people who do not read newspapers who would like this information and they are not getting it. We have told you this but we are not being listened to.

Mrs M Zakrevsky, 49 Korella Street, Mullaloo:

Just two facts that I would like to make quite clear. Ken Travers thanked the City of Joondalup for hosting this meeting, however it was the initiation of Sue Hart, and I want to make it quite clear it was not at the initiative of the City of Joondalup.

Secondly, when the Chairman asked Ken Travers not to turn around, my feeling all day was that I do not like having my back to the public in a public meeting. At previous meetings held in external venues we were able to talk to the public and not to just the Commissioners and staff. Maybe in future at public meetings we can change this system to allow a speaker to face the people.

Ms Louisa Moussa, 28a Transom Way, Ocean Reef:

If you wanted to know what the community wanted, why couldn't you have a notice board in shopping centres to let people know what is happening?

Mr M Sideris, 12 Page Drive, Mullaloo:

A couple of weeks ago I sent an email to the Acting CEO in relation to the article in the local community newspapers over a proposed tavern at Hillarys Boat Harbour. I asked whether a press release was issued, and why the Consultation area on the City's website was not active. I was advised this was to be corrected but there are no press releases as of September 2004 onwards. I find this difficult to accept, bearing in mind there was a press release issued over the proposed tavern at Hillarys Boat Harbour, otherwise how would the newspapers get the pictures which were printed in the local paper. When will this web link be updated with press releases from September 2004 onwards? The community is clearly trying to indicate that they would like to make community comment but there is nothing on the City's website that identifies to major issues, or a link to the State Government's website to enable information on Network City to be downloaded or any other information. Nor is there any link to community consultation, as was promised in the local newspaper, over the proposed tavern relocation at Hillarys Boat Harbour. Again I ask, when will you correct this matter?

Response by the City: It is acknowledged that this email was received. The public relations officer has been on leave until recently and will make the press release available on the website. The other issues will be addressed.

The important matter after tonight is that you identify on your new website a link process so that we can have community consultation. The previous website had capacity for people to identify those matters out for public comment, such as the proposed new depot, etc. That facility is not now available and it is difficult to provide public comment or community consultation if that access does not exist. Apart from that, I think the new website is reasonable.

Mr Mike Mouritz, Executive Director, Urban Policy – Liveable Neighbourhoods, Department of Planning and Infrastructure

Following a request from the public gallery, Mr Mike Mouritz gave a presentation overview and brief outline of the origin of liveable neighbourhood strategy – Appendix 2 refers. *Click here: [Attach2min110105.pdf](#)*

Mr Mouritz advised that the exhibition period in relation to this issue has been extended until February 2005, in response to submissions primarily from local government and the development sector.

Mrs Beth van der Linden, 35 Barridale Drive, Kingsley:

I believe this is just a repeat of what we had several years ago, in which we took an active part. We thought we had done a good job, but obviously we haven't. From what I can see from what has just been presented, we don't want our commercial areas integrated with our living space. We want our living space as living space and free of commercial ventures. In the last presentation, it showed precinct planning, where consideration will be given to commercial ventures integrated into where we live. I think that commercial areas should be in commercial areas and we don't have such a great problem with transport and with cars that we can't get into a car and go a few minutes away. We'd like to keep our houses with our trees and our suburbs just for living and not for commerce. I live between Hepburn Avenue and Whitfords Avenue. The Hepburn Avenue end was developed before Whitfords was and we have got a green belt area. It doesn't bring in any money, but it brings in a lot of fresh air and it helps with greening Australia and the greenhouse gas emissions because without trees we can't have clean air. At the end of Barridale Drive at the Whitfords' end there is a brick wall because it was more convenient for the developers to put a wall there so they could build the houses right up to Whitfords Avenue. There is no green belt up that end, just concrete. We don't need more concrete, we need more green belt areas and we don't want commerce mixed in with our living areas.

MOVED Beth van der Linden, 35 Barridale Drive, Kingsley, SECONDED Sue Hart, 32 Pullan Place, Greenwood that the green areas and trees be retained, keeping commercial areas separate to living areas, with living areas being accessible for healthy living and not for money-making ventures.

The Motion was Put and

CARRIED

Ms Munique Moon, 6 Carew Place, Greenwood:

I would like to respond to comments made earlier in the meeting by Mr Ken Travers, where he said this is something that if the community doesn't want it we really don't need to have it. Some areas may want it, the City of Joondalup may stay like this. But comment was made earlier that you're already making sure that our local government will implement this as a whole of government approach and you have also stated that this is a strategy that shall be implemented; not one that just won't work. To me that's conflicting. Can the City of Joondalup separate itself from this? Do we have the choice to stay how we are if our local government bands with the State Government to implement this policy?

Response by Mr Mike Mouritz, Department of Planning and Infrastructure: The Network City document outlines a whole range of high-level strategies that are out for consultation at present. What Mike Allen pointed out was that there was a notion of establishing partnerships between the State and local government for those things that are deemed to require or need to be implemented. If for example, as Ken Travers pointed out, various strategies are not applicable or are not accepted within the City of Joondalup, they would not be implemented. So there is the opportunity that you are asserting for very little change to happen in an area like the City of Joondalup.

Mr Trevor Prestage, 4 Northshore Drive, Mullaloo:

Under the Liveable Neighbourhood review, how would the public open spaces eg the CSIRO site stand?

Response by Cmr Paterson: As far as the CSIRO site is concerned, that is an issue the Commissioners will deal with when it is put before Council.

Will this liveable neighbourhoods protect our public open space eg the CSIRO site?

Response by Mr Mike Mouritz, Department of Planning and Infrastructure: I do not know the specifics of the CSIRO site, nor the zoning or even if it is public open space. If it is legitimate open space; then open space is protected. If it is freehold land that is available for development, then there is a range of sensible policies and provisions within Liveable Neighbourhoods that may be applicable to that particular location.

In the light of what the gentleman has just said that public open space will be protected, can you please explain why the public open space at CSIRO site has not been protected?

Response by Cmr Paterson: The CSIRO site was sold by the Federal Government to a developer.

There is a proposal at this point in time to undertake some development on the site, where does the Chairman stand in this?

Response by Cmr Paterson: You will find this out when you come to the meeting.

Are you not going to declare that you are going to protect public open space as this gentleman has just said that under Liveable Neighbourhoods, public open space is to be protected.

Response by Cmr Paterson: This will be determined once it is submitted to Council.

We have a Council that has been suspended now for approximately 14 months. When will that Council be reinstated? When will we get Councillors back, so we will have proper representatives, not part-time people. I rang the Chairman before Christmas several times and on each occasion I was told that he was not in the office, that Commissioners were only there part-time.

Response by Cmr Paterson: That is correct.

When will we be able to have people there to represent us full-time?

Response by Cmr Paterson: When the Inquiry is finished, and a report is handed down. That report will either say that the former Councillors be reinstated or that they be dismissed and if they are dismissed, then elections will be called.

Why can't we have our Mayor back? He was not elected by the Council, he was elected by the people. The Council was suspended; why was our Mayor suspended?

Response by Cmr Paterson: This question should be directed to the Minister.

Mr Michael Caiacob, 7 Rowan Place, Mullaloo (suspended Councillor of the City of Joondalup):

I would like to thank the Commissioners, the staff and speakers this evening, members of the public in particular and also the suspended Councillors. Thank you for the opportunity for this meeting.

CLOSE OF BUSINESS

There being no further business, the Chairman declared the meeting closed at 2140 hrs.