

COMMUNITY REFERENCE GROUP MEETING MINUTES

HELD IN THE FUNCTION ROOM OF THE CITY OF BELMONT CIVIC CENTRE,
215 WRIGHT STREET, CLOVERDALE
MONDAY, 19 MARCH 2015, COMMENCING AT 6:00PM.

ATTENDANCE & APOLOGIES

Attendance:

Corrine Macrae – Chairperson
Neville Deague – City of Belmont
Jarrod Ross – City of Belmont
Dean Pettit – City of Belmont
Murray Ralph – City of Belmont
Glen Finn – Department of Planning
Dave Thomas – Public Transport Authority
Jamie Mullins – Public Transport Authority
Elizabeth Jones – Public Transport Authority
Ian Barker – Perth Airport Pty Ltd
Monika Anderson – Perth Airport Pty Ltd
Karen Hyde – Taylor Burrell Barnett
Antony Johnstone – Aurecon

Community Reference Group Members

Amanda Ridge
Amos Machlin
Bella Scharfenstein
Emilie Hethey
George Homsany
Helen Allison
Richard Foster (Proxy for Margaret Elkington)
Seleana Powell – departed 7:34pm
Stephanie Clarke
Susan McLaren
Thomas Whiting

Apologies:

Juliette Hammah – City of Belmont
Louise Round – Public Transport Authority
Ben De Marchi – Taylor Burrell Barnett
Michael Vujcich – BG&E
Lindsay Broadhurst – Main Roads WA
Sarah Bellow – Community Reference Group
Margaret Elkington – Community Reference Group

Abbreviations

Chair	Chairperson (i.e. Corrine MacRae)
COB	City of Belmont
CRG	Community Reference Group
DA6	Development Area 6
DOP	Department of Planning
GEH	Great Eastern Highway
MRWA	Main Roads WA
PAPL	Perth Airport Pty Ltd
PTA	Public Transport Authority
TBB	Taylor Burrell Barnett

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Ref	Speaker	Discussion
1.1	C MacRae (Chair):	Noted Juliette Hammah is an apology. Asked whether there were any further comments on the Minutes from the last meeting. There were not, and the Minutes were adopted. Introduced Neville Deague, Director Community & Statutory Services for the City of Belmont.

2.0 COMMUNITY OPEN DAY FEEDBACK

Jarrold Ross from City of Belmont provided a summary of the DA6 Community Open Day held 7 March 2015 at Redcliffe Primary School.

- Project Steering Group considered that the Community Open Day was reasonably successful.
- Approximately 150 local community members and interested persons attended to discuss the project, ask questions and provide feedback.
- Feedback forms were distributed to attendees with a request to return completed forms to the City of Belmont.
- All information, including feedback forms and boards, are now available on the City's website.
- The City has requested feedback forms be returned by Monday 23rd March.
- Feedback received will be collated into a Feedback Summary Report which will be provided to community members via the City's website.
- Key questions that came out of the open day were:
 - When is **Brearley Avenue closing** and how will traffic be managed?
 - When are you **rezoning our properties** and why cant this be done immediately?
 - When and how will the **train station** be delivered?
 - How do we continue to **keep informed** on the project?
 - Specific questions relating to individual properties and **development potential**.
- Project officers responded to each of the questions, and noted that more information will be made available via the City's website and non-web based communication.

Ref	Speaker	Discussion
2.1	S Clarke (CRG)	Event went very well. Councillors and others expressed themselves well.
2.2	S McLaren (CRG)	Concurred with Stephanie's comment.
2.3	G Homsany (CRG)	Good display. Although I think a lot of people who went there are not aware of the finer points, and were only looking at presentations. Need to

		consider the feedback received from the community.
2.4	H Alison (CRG)	Went well. There was an opportunity to speak one on one with Officer, give further ideas, which will hopefully be taken on board. The devils in the detail. Posters only give an impression of the project.
2.5	A Machlin (CRG)	Was disappointed he couldn't get there.

3.0 **PRESENTATIONS BY CRG MEMBERS**

Helen Allison, George Homsany, Richard Foster and Bella Scharfenstein each gave presentations. Matters covered included:

H Alison (CRG) presentation:

- Apparent lack of coordination in planning between DA6 and adjacent districts for example:
 - The Swan River is acknowledged as a key recreational feature but no provision has been made for pedestrian and cyclist to cross Great Eastern Highway.
 - No account in traffic modelling made for residents in Ascot crossing Great Eastern Highway to get to the Train station and peak traffic times.
 - In the current design there is no integration in the design for how pedestrians arriving by train will walk to their work places.
- Excluding the bushland and wetland areas within Perth Airport, minimal natural vegetation remains within the City of Belmont- less than 2% of the original extent.
- Every attempt should be made to retain and rehabilitate the small remnants that remain. All large trees are important and should be retained if possible.
- Southern Main Drain. Consideration to the creation of a designed wetland, to enhance biodiversity values and act as a compensating basin, in DA6 would be a great idea - as opposed to the straight line drain it currently is.

Discussion:

Ref	Speaker	Discussion
3.1	R Foster (CRG)	Commented on the closure of Brearley Avenue. Traffic in the area currently now is horrific. Need to upgrade GEH first, before closing Brearley.

George Homsany (CRG) presentation:

- The concept proposal to design a large enough roundabout at the GEH intersection @ Brealey Ave to ease traffic congestion, which is possible due to the large area available adjacent to the proposed roundabout as depicted in the slide. The concept also depicted closing off the south side carriageway of Brealey Ave, leaving the north

side of Brealey Ave open modifying it to a 2 way street and realigning it to GEH to create a safer entry & intersection point into the roundabout. The advantages were to allow local residents to gain safe access and egress from that area & for others to access the train station and the greater part of Belmont. The concept of the total closure of Brealey Ave may reduce traffic congestion marginally on GEH in the future but the south bound traffic off Tonkin that filters onto GEH will still need traffic lights therefore I & others within the CRG do not understand what will be achieved with the closure of Brealey.

- The train station location, in regards to Northing and Easting positioning, should be as close as possible to the roundabout at Dunreath Rd with the advantages being less distance for commuters to walk to the airport terminals as well as minimising the impact of its location on the residence's and the current area availability. The proposed station foot print is too large and should be reduced to a modest size with the proposed alternative concept presented consisting of a North & South wing connected with an outdoor alfresco area that are elevated above both sides of Brealey Ave which are to remain open adjacent to the Brealey Ave & Dunreath Rd Roundabout. The advantages of this proposal is the creation of a covered area for drop offs and pickups, low impact to the area due to it being on structural columns, minimum vegetation and tree removal as they will be incorporated within the alfresco area. The closure of the south side of Brealey Ave from GEH to Second St creates an area on the open section of road from Dunreath Rd to Second St with a no through Rd for a Station car park. A small 3 way roundabout should be installed at the intersection of Second St and Brealey Ave allowing a smooth & safe traffic flow for residents and people from the greater part of Belmont to access the future infrastructures.
- The current proposed area designated for the Station car park requires the total removal of the few remaining endemic trees and vegetation in the Belmont area. As presented on the slide showing the existing car parks, there is so much area already allocated to existing car parks in close proximity to the proposed station location, the recommendation is to approach the Corporate Bodies who manage these car park facilities and create an agreement so those underutilised car park areas can be used for commuters using the train service. If a agreement can be made then the proposed Station car park wouldn't be required & the current car parks can continue to be utilised ensuring a sustainable income for the corporations who manage these facilities which will then ensure the preservation of the ecology of the area.
- The existing wet land area and open drainage system adjacent to the proposed station location should be preserved and enhanced with the reintroduction of endemic native flora and native trees which will in turn will encourage the return of endemic marsupials and birds within this area. The advantages of this being the recreation of a once thriving ecosystem which will provide a natural environment for people to enjoy and children to learn & can be driven by the local community inviting school children to help plant out, design and enhance.

Richard Foster (CRG) presentation:

The size constraints of Development Area 6

- The Vision Plan proposes too much vehicle traffic flow through such a small area. (up to 2,500 vehicle movements/day, just for the Train/Bus Station)

The Community Open Day

- Ref: Board 11A and its propositions: these will have a negative impact on Redcliffe DA6 and the SAFETY of residents entering their suburb. The closure of Brearley Avenue will direct local traffic to enter via Coolgardie Avenue traffic lights where there is no right hand turn.

Reinstating the road grid and traffic flow management

- There is a logical argument for Brearley Avenue to remain open with simple modifications made to the Great Eastern Highway intersection.
- There is evidence that impact on Redcliffe DA6 has not been thought through by the traffic movement consultants. The safety issues of having the Coolgardie Avenue intersection as the ONLY access point off GEH to the suburb have been ignored and argued against without acknowledging this will create a traffic hazard.

The Train/Bus Station - Critique of the Design as Presented in the Vision

- The station footprint is too large and is disproportionate to the size of the DA6 area.
- The Vision's design for traffic to flow around the train station will create a gridlock.
- Vehicle/pedestrian/bicycle traffic to be 'interwoven' at the train station will create a nexus of conflict.
- There is no allowance for parking for a shopping precinct.
- The proposed Station is surrounded by 'busy' roads. Unless underpasses or overpasses are provided, this will create a hazard for Pedestrian/bicycle users who have been ignored in the design.
- No exit to Dunreath provided for vehicles that have entered the train station precinct from Dunreath. Traffic will have to exit via Coolgardie, Boulder, Central and Bulong through the suburb further reducing the chance of a pedestrian/bicycle friendly 'village' atmosphere and creating an internal 'rat run' of traffic movement.

The Timeline for the different phases of Development Area 6

- The upgrade of Great Eastern Highway from Tonkin Hwy to the GEH Bypass is crucial to accommodate the increased traffic being directed into and out of the DA6 area (to access the train station) and cope with an exponential increase in residents from 300 to 3000.
- MRWA plans to upgrade GEH, is unfunded until at least 2035.
- Why is it unfunded when it is a major component of a major transport orientated development?
- Concern raised that the Gateway Project starts/finishes at GEH.
- One lane entrance off GEH from the City to Tonkin Hwy and Gateway Project, which WILL carry the MOST traffic to the Airport from the City - Brearley Avenue had 2 lanes to access ONLY the Domestic Terminal.
- Congestion on GEH area and safety.

Community Involvement (that is listened to) before 'boards 'concepts are presented to the general public.

- There is no evidence that the ideas/recommendations of the community have been adopted or even acknowledged. The consultation process needs to be shown to be meaningful, but the adoption of the resident's proposals.

Ref	Speaker	Discussion
3.2	A Machlin (CRG)	<p>Made a number of comments which included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brearley Avenue is the main link for residents and business people in the area • If the road was closed, traffic would filter through to the quiet streets, which would be disturbing to those residents. • MRWA's main reason for the closure is the traffic signal at the intersection (Brearley/GEH/Tonkin) delays traffic on GEH. How about other streets that feed off GEH? Epsom, Moreing etc. Will they too be closed one day? • A key issue is the traffic signals on GEH are not linked. This should be the first priority of MRWA. Believes MRWA are negligent to this area, and need to solve GEH first. • Not until all other options are exhausted, should the closure of Brearley Avenue be considered. • States the CRG should oppose Brearley closure.
3.3	E Hethey (CRG)	<p>Made a number of comments on the presentations which included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the DA6 workshops held in 2013, people wanted to retain the public open space. This was done in adopted vision plan. • This open space has now been removed in the CRG options presented. • 30,000 jobs by 2029 will be located in the area. That's why the station is located where it has been proposed • There are currently about 600 residents. If there will be 30,000 people visiting the area in the future, we shouldn't make it easier for them to get through the area. The CRG slides presented don't show how we will address this. • If you take the traffic lights away at GEH/Brearley, and include a round-a-bout, this will cause issues.

3.4	R Foster (CRG)	Reinforced points Amos made. Also commented that Bulong is proposed to be a major road out of the area.
3.5	E Hethey (CRG) J Ross (CoB) C MacRae (Chair)	Previously advised cul-de-sacs were going to remain closed onto GEH. These will stay closed until QANTAS leaves, then will be reviewed to see whether there is an opportunity and benefit to opening them as left in / left out. Confirmed Jarrod's point, and stated modelling will be done to consider whether opening the cul-de-sacs is justified at that point.
3.6	G Homsany (CRG) E Hethey (CRG)	Responded to Emilie's comments and stated that there are ways to control large vehicles. Companies can control employee traffic routes. Closing Brearley Avenue will offset the future increase in vehicles that will use the area

B Scharfenstein (CRG) presentation:

- The current planning framework, at a Residential (R20) zoning remains in effect and single storey residences have been approved and continue to be constructed in the area. Yet, this seems to contradict the objectives of the Vision Plan and creates confusion. We understand that until the next stage of DA6 is implemented existing regulations must remain in effect, however, continuing to let residents labour under a misapprehension runs the risk of meeting with resistance and protest when the land assembly process is initiated, despite the (an unsubstantiated promise) of realising handsome returns on their properties through rezoning.
- The Stakeholders need to provide all residents a clear written explanation of the objectives of DA6 in relation to the transformation of the area with a uniform high density multi storey residences, clearly indicating that existing residents will be required to either amalgamate blocks with neighbours and redevelop their properties themselves to specific and rigorous design guidelines or relinquish their land to developers.
- Specifically inform the residents :
 - Of the anticipated time frames in relation to construction of new high density housing in the area.
 - How long residents can expect to remain living in their existing residences after their properties have been rezoned.
 - How the land assembly process will unfold.
 - As to whether Council or WAPC will facilitate introduction of residents to potential developers, and how this will occur.
- Protect residents from bearing the higher council rates because of the rezoning.

- Incentivize, positively not punitively: offers for resident's land needs to be sufficient to encourage them to leave.

Have a series of formal meetings with residents on the above, include representatives from the development industry.

The best possible outcome – to have a smooth and expeditious transition to realise the DA6 Vision - would be achieved by eliciting the complete and informed cooperation of the residents and that can only occur with their full comprehension of what will be expected of them.

Ref	Speaker	Discussion
3.7	T Whiting (CRG) R Foster (CRG)	If Brearley Avenue closes at First Street, everyone will have access to their property. People need access to the residential area Agrees. People won't need access to the airport
3.8	S Clarke (CRG) E Hethey (CRG)	Stated she will be collating photos of the orchids on the airport land, and writing a report on the impact to the area. She will submit to CoB and PAPL. Has many photos which may assist Stephanie.
3.9	A Ridge (CRG)	Questioned the open space and green space shown on the slides at the Community Open Day. The extent needed was not shown. This should be considered now. Regarding the staging of the project, stage one shows two areas, but one is a little area which would be well used as a wetland. This should be reconsidered. Also, as the residential development will not have any/much of backyard, there is a real need for well sized usable open spaces.
3.10	E Hethey (CRG)	Raised a number of questions and made comments which included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will Dunreath Drive and Tonkin Highway lights remain? • Will there be a cloverleaf intersection at Leach Highway and Horrie Miller Drive? • Will Boulder Avenue open into Dunreath Drive (Susan also queries this)? • Compensating basins to wetlands. 75% has already been lost from the Swan Coastal Plain. Retaining wetlands in the area is crucial. Get local indigenous plants into the design. Get difference in species which are unique to the

		<p>area. Revegetate those areas that will be lost with local species.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rooftop gardens should be considered, to add more green space. This will cool the area down. • Consider forming a community group to facilitate the change in DA6. There are only 315 residences in the area, so the group could door knock and speak to community members. Emilie stated she would be happy to be involved in this process.
3.11	S McLaren (CRG)	<p>Commented on the 'movement street characteristics' slides at the Community Open Day. There was an annotation that said there was a possibility Boulder Avenue would extend into the airport land. Queried where this came from. Concerned that this will be used as a rat-run.</p>

Seleana Powell departed the meeting at 7:34pm and did not return

3.12	H Alison (CRG)	<p>Pedestrian and environmental are her main concerns. Stated that Ascot is about 800-900m from the proposed train station. What consideration has been given to how those people west of GEH will access the station? Has an under or over pass been considered?</p>
3.13	<p>B Scharfenstein (CRG)</p> <p>J Ross (CoB)</p>	<p>How will the queries raised in this meeting be addressed?</p> <p>Some the group can discuss now, others will take away the information presented and provide a response afterwards.</p> <p>Jarrold also responded to Bella's presentation and made a number of comments, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agrees the community won't understand all aspects of the project, as urban redevelopment is very complex and it is difficult to fully understand the mechanics. • All steering group members are available at all times to speak with any community member about any issue regarding the project. If there are questions from community members, we will answer them. • The Steering Group, however, is not a decision making body, and we must clarify that our opinions are recommendations are just that – they are not final decisions. Council and the WAPC will make the final decision based on the information before them. • The timing of works and rezoning are two elements that the steering group are not able to

	<p>B Scharfenstein (CRG)</p> <p>G Finn (DoP)</p> <p>B Scharfenstein (CRG)</p> <p>J Ross (CoB)</p> <p>G Finn (DoP)</p> <p>C MacRae (Chair)</p> <p>B Scharfenstein (CRG)</p> <p>J Ross (CoB)</p>	<p>confirm, as they require a decision of the Council and the WAPC. We can give indicative timeframes based on our experience, but cannot give definitive timeframes.</p> <p>Appreciates Jarrod's comments – agrees that one-on-one consultation as Emilie suggested would be great. The WAPC should take this on board</p> <p>Acknowledges the request. Whenever new information is available it will be provided. There are decisions that have been made (Brearley Avenue closing by MRWA). It was clear at the Open Day, people want to understand what is happening to them specifically. Reiterated when more information is available it will be provided.</p> <p>Could another timeframe, when it is produced, be made available?</p> <p>Yes, we will look to provide indicative timeframes to community members.</p> <p>This is an ongoing process. This is still an early stage. There are many more steps after this. Throughout this process there will be more opportunities for community feedback to be provided.</p> <p>There are complications of the planning system. It needs to be made clear what, and how it happens.</p> <p>Queried whether a chart outlining the steps and milestones could be provided.</p> <p>CoB will work to provide this over the next two weeks.</p>
3.13	G Homsany (CRG)	<p>Why not do a trial period of the closure of Brearley Avenue? See how people respond and use the area after closure. Do the research first before committing to closing it.</p>
3.14	<p>C MacRae (Chair)</p> <p>A Johnstone (Aurecon)</p> <p>K Hyde (TBB)</p> <p>C MacRae (Chair)</p> <p>K Hyde (TBB)</p>	<p>Anything pressing project team wishes to answer?</p> <p>No testing has been done regarding the connection of Boulder Avenue to Dunreath Drive.</p> <p>All roads will be subject to further study.</p> <p>It should be made clearer that Boulder Avenue will not connect.</p> <p>In the 2013 DA6 workshops, through-traffic was a major concern raised. Brearley Avenue closure</p>

		released traffic of additional vehicles, and was supported at this time. Also, the green spine to host markets and encourage a public realm was supported. The current work being done is a review to test the 2013 adopted vision plan; test those ideas and values are still consistent.
3.15	<p>C MacRae (Chair)</p> <p>J Mullins (PTA)</p> <p>C MacRae (Chair)</p> <p>J Mullins (PTA)</p> <p>G Homsany (CRG)</p> <p>J Mullins (PTA)</p> <p>H Alison (CRG)</p> <p>J Mullins (PTA)</p>	<p>Can a status update on the station design be provided?</p> <p>Certain things are decided including the tunnel and vents.</p> <p>Is there an option to move the station location at all?</p> <p>Explained the location of station and the reason for its current location.</p> <p>Does it have to be as big?</p> <p>Can explain in more detail at a future meeting/stage the finer aspects of the station size.</p> <p>Thought the vision was for an Esplanade type station design. Details on what is on top of the station needs to be provided.</p> <p>This can be explained at the next meeting.</p>
3.16	<p>C MacRae (Chair)</p> <p>J Ross (CoB)</p> <p>G Finn (DoP)</p>	<p>How will implementation of Brearley closure work?</p> <p>Acknowledges it is a big topic which needs to be worked out in the coming months. As further information becomes available it will be presented to the CRG for feedback.</p> <p>Need to produce a sequencing diagram, so people can get a clear picture of how the project will progress.</p>
3.17	<p>C MacRae (Chair)</p> <p>A Johnstone (Aurecon)</p> <p>R Foster (CRG)</p> <p>A Johnstone (Aurecon)</p> <p>D Thomas (PTA)</p>	<p>Have any of the ideas presented by the CRG in the presentation been considered?</p> <p>Key issue of Brearley Avenue and GEH is the Tonkin Highway off-ramp. Queuing onto Tonkin needs to be avoided, and there needs to be a control in place. Streamlined signals would not provide much additional overall benefit (e.g. 5% improvement).</p> <p>Provided an example on Kooyong Avenue</p> <p>The situation is only going to get worse, not better, if it isn't changed.</p> <p>Commented on CRG's proposal to remove one</p>

	<p>T Whiting (CRG)</p> <p>A Johnstone (Aurecon)</p> <p>R Foster (CRG)</p> <p>A Johnstone (Aurecon)</p> <p>G Finn (DoP)</p>	<p>green phase, and how this will not improve the situation.</p> <p>When the train station goes in, traffic will reduce.</p> <p>Responded to Emilie's traffic questions. Also stated that drivers by nature will want to avoid traffic lights, and will use Tonkin as a result.</p> <p>People will use GEH and cut through. It is a shorter distance.</p> <p>May be shorter, but not quicker</p> <p>The community will need to accept that MRWA will close Brearley Avenue. The traffic modelling is compelling in support of this. We need to move beyond this topic</p>
3.18	<p>S McLaren (CRG)</p> <p>J Mullins (PTA)</p> <p>D Thomas (PTA)</p> <p>J Ross (CoB)</p>	<p>What is the timeframe for Dunreath/Tonkin intersection opening?</p> <p>End of 2016 whole project. Might be staging to open areas.</p> <p>Recommend looking at the Gateway WA website.</p> <p>CoB will send out the link to CRG members.</p>

4.0 NEXT STAGES

4.1	<p>C MacRae (Chair)</p> <p>A Machlin (CRG)</p>	<p>Any further comments?</p> <p>Wants his comments regarding Brearley Avenue on the record.</p>
4.2	<p>J Ross (CoB)</p> <p>C MacRae (Chair)</p> <p>J Ross (CoB)</p> <p>K Hyde (TBB)</p> <p>E Hethey (CRG)</p> <p>J Ross (CoB)</p>	<p>Next CRG meeting is scheduled for 20 April. No agenda has been set yet, but there may be more arising from the information coming out of this meeting. There will be more information on the Open Day and some on implementation of the vision plan. If any members have more suggestions please send them through.</p> <p>Will there be an updated vision plan available?</p> <p>Don't believe so. Information on implementation and possible staging.</p> <p>Planning processes information also to be provided.</p> <p>Will environmental built form considerations be included as a component of the Vision Plan?</p> <p>That is more detailed then the vision plan will go</p>

	<p>H Alison (CRG)</p> <p>J Ross (CoB)</p>	<p>into. That consideration would be incorporated into design guidelines once produced (a future step).</p> <p>Could it be included as an overall principle?</p> <p>Yes.</p>
4.3	<p>C MacRae (Chair)</p> <p>J Ross (CoB)</p>	<p>Can the CRG presentation material be placed onto the CoB website?</p> <p>Could each presenter please forward a dot point summary to Dean for recording in the Minutes document.</p>

Meeting closed 8:15pm

ACTION ITEMS:

CoB to follow up to obtain copy of CRG presentation to upload onto CoB website.