

COMMUNITY REFERENCE GROUP MEETING NOTES

HELD IN THE FUNCTION ROOM OF THE CITY OF BELMONT CIVIC CENTRE,
215 WRIGHT STREET, CLOVERDALE
MONDAY, 18 MAY 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
Lauren Aitken – Department of Planning
Jamie Mullins – Public Transport Authority
Elizabeth Jones – Public Transport Authority
Dave Thomas – Public Transport Authority
Louise Round – 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

Helen Allison
Sarah Bellow
Stephanie Clarke
Margaret Elkington
Emilie Hethey
George Homsany
Amos Machlin
Susan McLaren
Amanda Ridge
Bella Scharfenstein
Thomas Whiting
Richard Foster – Proxy for Seleana Powell

Apologies:

Juliette Hammah – City of Belmont
Glen Finn – Department of Planning
Ben De Marchi – Taylor Burrell Barnett
Michael Vujcich – BG&E
Seleana Powell – Community Reference Group

Abbreviations

Chair	Chairperson (i.e. Corrine MacRae)
COB	City of Belmont
CRG	Community Reference Group
D&C	Design and Construction
DA6	Development Area 6
DOP	Department of Planning
GEH	Great Eastern Highway
PAPL	Perth Airport Pty Ltd
POS	Public Open Space
PTA	Public Transport Authority
TBB	Taylor Burrell Barnett

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Ref	Speaker	Discussion
1.1	C MacRae (Chair)	<p>The Chair opened the meeting at 6:05pm. Noted apologies of Glen Finn (Lauren Aitken in place), Juliette Hammah from CoB, Ben De Marchi from TBB, Michael Vujcich (BG&E Drainage consultant) and Seleana Powell from the CRG (Richard Foster as proxy).</p> <p>Asked whether there were any comments on the notes from the last CRG meeting held 20 April 2015. Moved as an accurate record by Stephanie Clarke, seconded by Susan McLaren.</p>
1.2	C MacRae (Chair)	Chair asked for business arising from the previous meeting.
	H Allison (CRG)	Has emailed Jarrod some queries in relation to the Notes. In relation to Item 3.5, queried the dewatering process, and how the question was deferred to Paul Monaghan from PTA.
	J Ross (CoB)	As part of PTA's future community consultation an information pamphlet will be forwarded to the community.
	J Mullins (PTA)	Community forums to be held in the next few months which will cover environmental issues.
	E Jones (PTA)	Haven't sorted out the format, but will likely be an open forum.
	H Allison (CRG)	Apology from Michael Vujcich. Would he be able to address the dewatering issues?
	D Thomas (PTA)	No, Michael's role is surface drainage.
	J Mullins (PTA)	All dewatering advice will come under Paul Monaghan.
	D Thomas (PTA)	D&C contractor will seek the relevant licences. More detailed information will be available once the contractor is appointed. Making the community aware of this matter is certainly in our minds. The preferred proponent will be appointed in February 2016, and the Forrestfield station will be focussed on first.
	B Scharfenstein (CRG)	Will there be letters sent out to community advising of the works?
	E Jones (PTA)	Have done that before and that will be considered.

	B Scharfenstein (CRG)	Letters would be preferred as some areas don't get the Southern Gazette (newspaper).
	D Thomas (PTA)	There was an emailing list established from the early stages of the project which will also be used.
	B Scharfenstein (CRG)	Yes, although letters are the most reliable, as some people don't have computers.
1.3	A Machlin (CRG)	Concern was raised as to which authority will be responsible if ground water table drops and impacts properties. Who will be accountable for these costs?
	D Thomas (PTA)	PTA is carrying out the work, so we are responsible. PTA are ensuring the D&C contractor carries out pre-condition surveys of houses in the area, and will do post construction surveys for those who want that to occur. Steps/safeguards will be put in place to minimise impact to residents.
1.4	H Allison (CRG)	Queries item 3.6 of the Notes from the last meeting relating to the level of environmental protection assessment.
	J Mullins (PTA)	Paul should have addressed that in his response to the questions.
	D Thomas (PTA)	EPA is assessing the proposal now. Advertised to 25 May. Haven't set a level at this stage. To be assessed with the proponents information.
	H Allison (CRG)	Notes it is a Category A, and is only out for comment for a further one week. If any members want that information she can email it to them. Has been advertised since November 2014.
	J Mullins (PTA)	Checked the information and agrees was advertised from 1 November 2014.
	H Allison (CRG)	Encourages those to put together a submission to EPA. She can assist.
1.5	H Allison (CRG)	Outcomes report (attachment to the Notes from the last CRG meeting). The exercises undertaken asked what people liked to do (i.e. activities), and the aspects of movement and character. The conclusion section in the report used the term "values" however the group was not asked about their values. Why was the word values stated?
	K Hyde (TBB)	A certain judgment was applied to the responses provided by the members. If preferred, it can be removed.
	H Allison (CRG)	If you infer what the values are, they might be misrepresented.

	C MacRae (Chair)	May be best to choose a different word as opposed to “values.”
	H Allison (CRG)	Quoted a part of the report. Not sure if the group made that comment/gave that impression.
	K Hyde (TBB)	Was working off of comments she received at the meeting. Happy to change the report. Asked what the preference is.
	H Allison (CRG)	Puts it to the group.
	S McLaren (CRG)	I thought the values were inherent in what they were saying during the exercises. Not unhappy about the use of the term.
	C MacRae (Chair)	Karen, perhaps can put a suggestion forward.
	K Hyde (TBB)	If drawing conclusions is the issue, we can just state facts.
	B Scharfenstein (CRG)	Half the CRG members weren't there so it is difficult to discuss. Would like to discuss what people's values are.
	C MacRae (Chair)	Asks members who is happy with the word “values” and who is not. Hands were raised for not happy; therefore the word will be removed.
	G Homsany (CRG)	Believes Helen means we don't want our values to be interpreted. It needs to be transparent.
	K Hyde (TBB)	Helen, how would you like to amend the report?
	H Allison (CRG)	End at “technical working group.” This will require some deletion of text.
	K Hyde (TBB)	Will change the report and submit to CoB.
1.6	T Whiting (CRG)	Margaret covered a lot in her questions sent to the Steering Group, and the responses provided. Would like it recorded that his concern relates to safety which has not be adequately covered. Happy with the responses provided recently, and will leave it at that.
	J Ross (CoB)	Some of the presentation will cover this topic in more detail.
	M Elkington (CRG)	Thanks to Jarrod for answering her questions.
	J Ross (CoB)	Apologises for the length of time it took to respond.

ACTION ITEMS:

- TBB to amend Outcomes Report from 20 April 2015 CRG meeting and send to CoB
- CoB to distribute amended report to the CRG.

2.0 PLANNING PROCESS – NEXT STAGES

Jarrold Ross from the City of Belmont outlined the anticipated planning process for the Development Area 6 project:

- Outlined that the planning process is not fixed, and is subject to change as the relevant considerations and approvals are progressed throughout the life of the project.
- Information contained within the presentation is intended to provide the CRG with an understanding of the general process, and should not be relied upon for individual decision making.
- Timeframes are indicative only, and are highly likely to shift as the project progresses.
- Development Area 6 requires a comprehensive planning framework that goes from high level strategic planning through to detailed statutory and policy planning, including:
 - **Vision Plan and Implementation Strategy:** Broad plan outlining key elements;
 - **Detailed Planning Stages:** Road network design; drainage design; utility infrastructure requirements; environmental management; land use planning
 - **Legislative Change & Development Contributions:** Changes to zoning; residential coding; land use permissibility; development standards
 - **Detailed Design Guidelines:** Individual development standards and requirements such as building design and public realm.
- Stage 1 involves the preparation of the Vision Plan and Implementation Strategy – which will be publicly advertised in the second half of 2015 after consideration by Council.
- Stage 2 involves the more detailed planning work for infrastructure requirements, drainage design, land use and development, and will likely occur during 2016.
- Stage 3 involves the preparation of legislative changes and a development contributions plan, and this will likely occur during 2016/2017
- Stage 4 involves the preparation of design guidelines, and this will likely occur during 2016/2017.
- Anticipated that the planning framework will become operational before 2017.
- Substantial redevelopment cannot occur until such time as the planning framework is in place as:
 - **The types of development would not be adequately controlled** – resulting in poor quality outcomes for surrounding neighbours and the streetscape;
 - **Infrastructure is unlikely to be in place** – resulting in sub-standard development;
 - **Development contributions would not be acquired** – resulting in an increased liability on remaining landowners/developers.

Discussion:

Ref	Speaker	Discussion
2.1	<p>E Hethey (CRG)</p> <p>J Ross (CoB)</p> <p>E Hethey (CRG)</p> <p>J Ross (CoB)</p>	<p>Is there any scope for a different concept for development guidelines? For example, in a recent Adelaide development high sustainability levels were mandatory. Can these be incorporated into guidelines for DA6?</p> <p>Clarified whether the question related to an incentive based system, or a requirement due to a density bonus being applied for.</p> <p>One which reduces the development footprint.</p> <p>At those detailed planning stages there is that opportunity to include an environmental design requirement.</p>
2.2	<p>M Elkington (CRG)</p> <p>J Ross (CoB)</p>	<p>Will DA6 go to Council in July 2015?</p> <p>It is intended to be presented in July, but that is subject to us being able to finalise a draft vision plan by this time, which is a work in progress.</p>
2.3	<p>R Foster (CRG)</p> <p>J Ross (CoB)</p> <p>J Mullins (PTA)</p> <p>R Foster (CRG)</p> <p>J Ross (CoB)</p>	<p>What can be developed now until 2016?</p> <p>What the current Scheme allows for under the Residential R20. The construction of station will begin also.</p> <p>Wouldn't start tunnelling until early 2017.</p> <p>Coolgardie Avenue upgrades are required, as Brearley Avenue will be closed.</p> <p>The next slides will cover infrastructure</p>
2.4	<p>G Homsany (CRG)</p> <p>J Ross (CoB)</p> <p>C MacRae (Chair)</p> <p>J Ross (CoB)</p> <p>L Aitken (DoP)</p>	<p>When will the community be able to attend the Council meetings?</p> <p>Believes the City of Belmont Agenda Briefing Forum is held one week prior to the Council meeting. Can confirm dates and email out to the group. There will be an opportunity for members to review the documents being presented.</p> <p>A timeline showing key events and dates would be beneficial to be created and circulated.</p> <p>Some of the next slide will touch on that.</p> <p>There are a number of processes the WAPC have to go through, that may impact the City's timelines. The City can only control what they can. The State also has things they need to do.</p>

2.5	A Machlin (CRG)	Raised the recent State Budget. Stated a comment was made it must be cut back. This project could be a casualty.
	D Thomas (PTA)	The rest of the money required for the project was included in last week's budget. There has been no indication from Government at any level the project won't go ahead. PTA is going ahead with their processes.

ACTION ITEMS:

- CoB to confirm Council meeting dates and forward to the CRG.

3.0 CONCEPTUAL DEVELOPMENT STAGING AND IMPLEMENTATION

Jarrold Ross from the City of Belmont outlined the anticipated planning process for the Development Area 6 project:

- This staging plan is intended to be **indicative only**.
- The project team have provided the current draft staging plan for the **purpose of feedback and input**.
- The staging plan is **subject to change** throughout the project as State and local government approvals, detailed planning, financing and construction occurs.
- Community members should **not rely on the timeframes or works proposed in this presentation** for the purpose of individual development planning.
- Key Project stages:
 - **Stage 1:** Brearley Avenue closure and associated pre-works;
 - **Stage 2:** Public infrastructure delivery and planning implementation;
 - **Stage 3:** Ultimate public and private development.
- **Stage 1 – Brearley Avenue closure and associated pre-works:**
 - Brearley proposed to be closed during 2016 – planning for this closure is underway.
 - Project Steering Group considers the following works are required to facilitate the closure of Brearley:
 - Fauntleroy/GEH intersection requires upgrade to facilitate airport traffic and bus movements;
 - Coolgardie/GEH intersection requires upgrade to facilitate resident movements;
 - New road connection Kanowna and Boulder avenue north of First Avenue needs to be constructed to allow access to Boulder Avenue;
 - Central Avenue requires connection to Dunreath Drive to permit bus movements from Second Street. The construction works will include piping the Southern Main Drain from the Perth Airport boundary, up

Central Avenue to the current intersection of Central Avenue and Brearley Avenue.

- **Stage 2 – Public Infrastructure Delivery and Planning Implementation (2017-2020)**
 - Construction precinct for the ‘Airport West’ station will be received by contractor, and PTA will construct the station, surrounding piazza, new connection road between Central Avenue and Bulong Avenue and the Park and Ride.
 - Public Open Space likely to be developed in a staged manner, with some temporary infrastructure likely to be installed until such time as the Southern Main Drain realignment is confirmed.
 - Intended to realign the Southern Main Drain into a meandering living stream north of train station precinct – but this is subject to detailed design feasibility.
 - The delivery of the planning framework during this period may allow some development to occur prior to completion of the train station – but this is subject to the timeframes discussed in the planning process presentation.
- **Stage 3 – Additional Roads and Full Development**
 - From 2020 it is anticipated that full development of the area may commence subject to landowner decisions with respect to their property holdings.
 - Road upgrades to manage traffic and improve streetscape would occur on a staged basis.
 - Public space and community facility development would occur as new development progressed.

Discussion:

Ref	Speaker	Discussion
3.1	R Foster (CRG)	Regarding the Boulder Ave slide. Confirms the access proposed and states that this will cause a rat-run.
	E Hethey (CRG)	A rat-run would be nothing new. People do it currently when leaving the Airport. Due to the level of parking along Boulder Avenue vehicles can't move through the area fast.
	R Foster (CRG)	Concern was raised about accessing the funeral parlour.
3.2	S Clarke (CRG)	Will Kanowna Avenue be used as a rat- run, to access through the area?
	A Johnstone (Aurecon)	There will be no need for people to do that. When the congestion from Brearley Avenue goes.
	C MacRae (Chair)	Time will tell as to how the traffic eventuates,

		although Antony's point is relevant.
3.3	S McLaren (CRG)	Between Brearley Avenue to Kanowna Avenue, the proposed new road should be a slow zone to deter people from using it for rat-running.
	C MacRae (Chair)	The design for this section of road will need to happen soon. Whose responsibility is that?
	J Ross (CoB)	Still to be determined. It is a project the various agencies are working through.
	J Mullins (PTA)	Working together to find a solution. Funding is required
3.4	B Scharfenstein (CRG)	Questions what the dark green area on the plan is. Is the road proposed in the area suitable for access to the commercial properties?
	J Ross (CoB)	Doesn't know at this stage. The plan is indicative. MRWA do have a strategic access plan for GEH, and will require a public access easement (like a laneway) upon redevelopment.
	B Scharfenstein (CRG)	Will land resumption be required?
	J Ross (CoB)	No. An access easement doesn't take the land. Rather just identifies it for public use as a condition of a development approval.
3.5	A Machlin (CRG)	Why would you close Brearley at GEH? What is the purpose?
	J Ross (CoB)	With respect, the decision has been made by Main Roads and the role of the Project Team is to progress a plan on this basis.
	A Machlin (CRG)	If GEH signals and traffic made more efficient, would not need to close Brearley. This would have cost savings.
	R Foster (CRG)	Can MRWA consider this?
	J Ross (CoB)	I can't speak for Main Roads.
	A Machlin (CRG)	Need to maintain access to the area.
	C MacRae (Chair)	Important to note the closure of Brearley Avenue creates the POS, not the other way around.
	J Ross (CoB)	I understand and appreciate that several CRG members are opposed to the Brearley Avenue closure. At this start of the CRG meetings we identified that there were a number of fixed parameters to the project that we were working within – including the closure of Brearley Avenue and the delivery of a train station. We recognise that

	<p>A Machlin (CRG)</p> <p>J Ross (CoB)</p> <p>B Scharfenstein (CRG)</p> <p>J Ross (CoB)</p>	<p>there is concern with the closure of Brearley Avenue, but the Project Steering Group is not in a position to change the decision. We have been given a task to plan for the closure and the delivery of the station.</p> <p>Has the City raised any objections on the closure of Brearley Avenue?</p> <p>City officers are supportive of the closure of Brearley Avenue provided that suitable access and traffic management measures can be undertaken. Council endorsed the original DA6 Vision Plan, which also included the closure of Brearley Avenue.</p> <p>Can a copy of that slide be made available?</p> <p>Yes. The presentation will be made available.</p>
3.6	<p>M Elkington (CRG)</p> <p>A Johnstone (Aurecon)</p> <p>M Elkington (CRG)</p> <p>A Johnstone (Aurecon)</p>	<p>Is the Fauntleroy Avenue/GEH intersection to be upgraded? At a previous CRG meeting it said it wasn't. Will there be traffic congestion here?</p> <p>Up to 2021 the model indicates the traffic works well (Brearley closed and right turn pocket introduced). By 2031, modelling has been done for two, three-way lanes up to GEH bypass</p> <p>What is stopping the congestion happening?</p> <p>Outlined that the removal of the Brearley Avenue intersection with Great Eastern Highway removed time dedicated to moving in and out of Brearley Avenue, and thus gave more time to vehicles coming off the Tonkin Highway and moving east and west along Great Eastern Highway.</p>
3.7	<p>M Elkington (CRG)</p> <p>J Ross (CoB)</p> <p>M Elkington (CRG)</p> <p>J Ross (CoB)</p>	<p>Queries the new connection road shown on the Central Avenue slide.</p> <p>Intention is to construct Central Avenue to a boulevard standard from Dunreath to Second Street, with the upgrade from Second to First Avenue to be staged.</p> <p>Believes it to be more sensible to implement a grid pattern of local roads if Brearley is removed. Seems like vehicles will be going around in circles.</p> <p>The majority of the plan does reinstate the grid with the exception of Second Avenue (due to the Train Station) and Boulder Avenue (due to the Public Open Space). If you connect Boulder Avenue all the way through you will lose the main POS. Privately owned land to the south restricts shifting the POS in that direction. Reducing the size of the POS would compromise the function of the area.</p>

3.8	M Elkington (CRG) J Ross (CoB)	Commented that the train station design from an access point of view is clumsy. Gave an explanation of the plan showing the train station precinct.
3.9	G Homsany (CRG) J Ross (CoB) G Homsany (CRG) J Ross (CoB)	When Brearley Avenue closes Coolgardie Avenue should be upgraded. Doesn't instil confidence when the word "should" is used. Uses the word "should" as ultimately its upgrade is out of the control of the Steering Group, and is subject to works and budgetary approval by the State Government. Wants the group to recognise the safety issue. Acknowledges safety is the most important issue. There are other issues too which impact Coolgardie Avenue, if good high density development is to be achieved. This includes the need for good access. Therefore there is an economic argument for the road upgrade.
3.9	J Ross (CoB)	Stated that although this is the last organised meeting, CRG members can email members of the Steering Group any time should they have queries.
3.10	T Whiting (CRG) J Ross (CoB) T Whiting (CRG) J Ross (CoB) C MacRae (Chair)	Asked Jarrod to confirm that when Brearley Avenue closes Coolgardie Avenue will be upgraded. I cannot make a guarantee as I am not a decision maker. The Project Steering Group will recommend that the upgrade occurs, but it is then subject to formal decisions by the State Government. Where will the traffic go? How will residents get in? There will be more traffic going into the grid. Who will be responsible? Who will we sue? There has to be a duty of care. Stated that a mistake is being made. MRWA is responsible for GEH and Brearley Avenue. Jarrod will report to Council, that the closure of Brearley Avenue is supported depending on Coolgardie Avenue being upgraded. Councils do have a fair bit of clout in matters such as this.
3.11	S Clarke (CRG) J Ross (CoB)	Regarding Central Avenue, is there a timeline for the construction through to Dunreath Drive? Construction is intended to start in the next 12-18 months, and consultation with affected residents will occur prior to this.
3.12	A Machlin (CRG)	How will the funeral parlour be accessed?

	J Ross (CoB)	U-turn required on GEH at Coolgardie Avenue (if left in / left out onto GEH provided), or would be accessed via the new Kanowna/Boulder connection road.
	A Machlin (CRG)	Seems like a ludicrous access arrangement.
3.13	B Scharfenstein (CRG)	Council previously gave consent for Brearley Avenue closure. If the community wanted to protest the closure of Brearley before Coolgardie Avenue is upgraded, will Council's previous endorsement impede this?
	J Ross (CoB)	No, this vision plan revises the original.
	E Hethey (CRG)	Is there a process that community can go through to give the vision plan more of a voice.
	C MacRae (Chair)	When advertising during the consultation phase (*note, this is the pre-consultation phase), the community will get a further say
	B Scharfenstein (CRG)	Reiterated previous comments that a timeline of events is needed.
3.14	R Foster (CRG)	Queried access options for the eastern end of Central Avenue.
	I Barker (PAPL)	PAPL is building a round-a bout at Central Avenue and Dunreath Drive.
	R Foster (CRG)	Have to fix Coolgardie Avenue safety issues first.
	A Johnstone (Aurecon)	May be surprised by the amount of traffic that is pulled out of the area through the closure of Brearley and the opening of Tonkin/Dunreath interchange.
3.15	A Ridge (CRG)	Do MRWA normally allow u-turns on major roads (e.g. GEH)?
	A Johnstone (Aurecon)	Yes, they can do. This is permitted elsewhere on GEH.
	A Ridge (CRG)	Three lanes on GEH should be pushed for earlier, rather than constructing a u-turn.
	G Homsany (CRG)	Raised a safety concern regarding the u-turn.
	A Johnstone (Aurecon)	Stated that all other traffic signals are red so it protects the vehicle doing a u-turn, and provides for a safe movement.
3.16	A Ridge (CRG)	Currently resurfacing Second Street. Why is this occurring when the road may be removed in the near future as part of these works?
	M Ralph (CoB)	Understands the section of road was showing signs

	A Ridge (CRG)	of wear, and needs to be maintained.
	M Ralph (CoB)	Queried whether it is worthwhile doing this? Possible waste of Rates money.
	M Ralph (CoB)	Acknowledges the fair point made. The train station has been formally confirmed only in the last few months. Unfortunately there is some cross over with works which already have budget approval from last year.
	M Ralph (CoB)	Might be a safety issue, and will look into it.
3.17	A Ridge (CRG)	Concerned the POS areas are not usable or close enough for the increased number of people that will use the area.
	J Ross (CoB)	The larger areas are a 5-10min walk. There are also public areas all around the station
	A Ridge (CRG)	Queried the POS areas close to the station. There needs to be some passive green space.
	K Hyde (TBB)	Stated that there needs to be a balance. Is a good point to have it within walking distances. When it comes down to the detailed design, there needs to be a good component of usable open space.
	A Ridge (CRG)	Does CoB have an aim for POS for high density development?
	K Hyde (TBB)	There are State policies which apply.
	J Ross (CoB)	10% of subdivisible area as per State policy.
	A Ridge (CRG)	What does that include?
	J Ross (CoB)	The area must be "usable."
	L Aitken (DoP)	It does allow for a certain percentage to be drainage areas within the 10%.
	M Elkington (CRG)	Asked whether the 10% refers to the specific area, or the whole of Belmont?
	J Ross (CoB)	Of the subdividable area.
	M Elkington (CRG)	How much is there now? Expected that it would be more currently than what will remain after development.
	J Ross (CoB)	Would have to do a calculation to be able to comment.
3.18	G Homsany (CRG)	Points to the map and concerned the area just south of Brearley which is native trees (Melaleucas) is to be developed for residential.

3.19	M Elkington (CRG)	What would POS percentage in CoB be now? If more than 10%, then why does this area need to provide 10%?
	J Ross (CoB)	The area itself needs to provide it
	L Aitken (DoP)	In a structure plan area, that area must comply with 10%. The POS policy has been in place since 1950.
3.20	R Foster (CRG)	Comment made regarding the 4.2 hectares of existing POS in the area.

ACTION ITEMS:

- CoB to produce a timeline of events
- CoB to investigate recent/current upgrades to Second Street
- CoB to provide a calculation of existing Public Open Space in the DA6 area

***8:10pm Amos Machlin left the meeting and did not return**

4.0 PUBLIC INFRASTRUCTURE EXERCISE

Karen Hyde from Taylor Burrell Barnett provided a presentation regarding the potential for community gardens to be developed within the DA6 area, inclusive of advice on funding opportunities through community grants.

As the group showed a keen interest in these activities, and the community could start organising these immediately to be undertaken during the initial stages of the Development Area 6 work, it is considered relevant to understand the context and procedures of the public infrastructure activities.

Discussion:

Ref	Speaker	Discussion
4.1	A Ridge (CRG)	A community garden would not be useful as we live on 700m ² lots that have enough space for gardens. There are also existing areas that are dog friendly.
	C MacRae (Chair)	Perhaps a community garden is a bit premature to be discussing for the area.
	N Deague (CoB)	There are City Officers who are involved in the identification of community garden areas now.
	A Ridge (CRG)	Believes the exercise would be irrelevant to go through.
	E Hethey (CRG)	Does not believe it is irrelevant. A community garden is a place to share and do things together as a group.
	K Hyde (TBB)	Stated that not all the information is required to be finalised before submitting for the grant application.

J Ross (CoB)	If preferred, we can circulate the information to the CRG members who can then provide comments should they wish.
S McLaren (CRG)	Is passionate about a fenced dog park. This can be blended into the area.
K Hyde (TBB)	Stated that these two topics were raised, following on from those received at the last CRG meeting. Happy to take any comments on board.
C MacRae (Chair)	Recommends community gardens. They can provide wonderful outcomes for the community. There is a lot of effort in establishing them, but for a lot of reward.

ACTION ITEMS:

- TBB to forward information regarding proposed group exercise to CRG members. Comments requested.

5.0 ADDITIONAL MATTERS

The Chair noted that feedback forms have been provided to members to complete. Dean will take notes, but asks members to put in written responses and these will be circulated to Councillors. Each CRG member was given the opportunity to make some comments on the consultation process.

Discussion:

Ref	Speaker	Discussion
5.1	B Scharfenstein (CRG)	Interesting process. Not sure if things CRG stated along the way have been taken on board. Comments have been made, but not sure where they went. Comments/suggestions were countered with reasons why they can't be done. Is not sure whether the process was inclusive. Hopes it hasn't been a 'tick the box' exercise. *Hands out sheet to the group, showing an alternative road/traffic design which keeps Brearley Avenue open.
	C MacRae (Chair)	Dean to table this document in the Notes. Asks Bella to email through the document in Word/PDF format.
5.2	T Whiting (CRG)	Up until Margaret's questionnaire was answered, he didn't feel the process was inclusive.
5.3	A Ridge (CRG)	Feels the Steering Group has been freely available.
	B Scharfenstein (CRG)	Comments that Jarrod has been fantastic. Queries how the questions/answers will be incorporated into

	C MacRae (Chair)	the vision plan? Perhaps something that could be incorporated in a report to Council
5.4	S Bellow (CRG)	Has seen a lot of questions answered and it's been great that the Steering Group has been available.
5.4	H Allison (CRG)	Good experience in many ways. In the initial times though there were some deficiencies (copies of presentations not provided, material can't read), this didn't build trust.
5.5	M Elkington (CRG)	Agrees with Helen. Conflicting information which caused confusion. Did not have all the relevant stakeholders at the initial meeting. Also pointed out that a couple of the members of the Project Steering Group had been on their phones for the majority of the night and it had not be the first time it had been noted.
5.6	E Hethey (CRG)	Closure of Brearley Avenue took a long time to move on from. If that was made clear earlier, the group could have advanced the discussions further and achieved more in the meetings. Is aware of the legal/legislative constraints. The opportunity to be a spokesperson was fantastic. To have the Council listen and consultants work with us on issues was great.
5.7	S McLaren (CRG)	First time on such a group. Made her feel part of the community. Has a lot of respect for Jarrod. It has been a really good experience.
5.8	S Clarke (CRG)	Echoes Emilie and Susan's comments. Thanks to all parties involved for the opportunity to put thoughts forward.
5.9	G Homsany (CRG)	Experienced frustration and disappointment, mainly on the lack of upfront information presented. Hats off to those who presented. Working together for one goal needs to be kept in mind. Continue to be honest and transparent. Trust is the most important thing. Never will agree (infers Brearley Ave closure). Hopes concerns are met for the future, as they are legitimate safety concerns.
5.10	C MacRae (Chair)	Amos has left. Feedback forms will be put on the record.
	J Ross (CoB)	Stated that the forms will not be made publically available.
5.11	C MacRae (Chair)	The Council meeting on 28 July 2015 is a tentative booking at this stage. What will be presented when the item is taken to Council?
	J Ross (CoB)	Request permission to publically advertise the revised vision plan. If Council resolves to, then will publically advertise.
	M Elkington (CRG)	Will the matter go through Council again after that?

	J Ross (CoB)	Yes, with a copy of all the feedback received from the advertising period. Council will then consider the options and endorse. It will depend on the number/content of submissions received.
	C MacRae (Chair)	Then will be forwarded to WAPC to endorse.
5.12	M Anderson (PAPL)	PAPL have a public consultation period also coming up. Notification of this will be made in the newspaper and the PAPL website when scheduled for.
	C MacRae (Chair)	Reminds members about the environmental assessment which is out for comment.
	H Allison (CRG)	If people want to forward comments to her they can, but also encourages individuals to lodge own submission.
5.13	J Ross (CoB)	The City is looking to facilitate the developer presentation as suggested by Bella. The timing of any future presentation is being carefully considered. Will keep CRG informed.
5.14	M Elkington (CRG)	Before the item is taken to Council for final adoption, will more information be sent out?
	J Ross (CoB)	Yes, more advertising will take place.
5.15	C MacRae (Chair)	Made some reflection comments on the process. A train station is a huge investment in an existing residential area in Perth. Brearley Avenue changes are significant. Credit to the group to seeing the process through. There are many further steps; this is just the beginning. More opportunities to get into the detail. Those that have attended have come together because they care for the community.

ACTION ITEMS:

- B Scharfenstein to forward CoB a copy of handout provided to the group.
- CoB to include CRG feedback in report to Council.

Meeting closed 8.46pm.