



# Works & Reserves Committee Meeting

13 May 2014

## MINUTES



**MINUTES OF A WORKS & RESERVES COMMITTEE MEETING, HELD AT DOVENBY HOUSE, ON TUESDAY 13 MAY 2014, COMMENCING AT 6.35PM.**

**INDEX**

- W10. OPENING OF MEETING**
  - W10.1 Present*
- W11. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF COUNTRY**
- W12. WELCOME TO GALLERY**
- W13. APOLOGIES**
- W14. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**
- W15. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES**
  - W15.1 Minutes of Special Works & Reserves Committee Meeting – 26 March 2014*
- W16. ORDER OF BUSINESS**
- W17. BUSINESS**
  - W17.1 Foreshore Erosion Control Works*
  - W17.2 Footpath, Road and Kerb Replacement*
  - W17.3 Proposed Woodhouse Road Traffic Island Treatments  
Munro/Chauncy/Habgood Streets*
  - W17.4 40km Limit George Street*
  - W17.5 Crossover Policy Review*
  - W17.6 East Street Traffic Modification Proposals*
- W18. CONFIDENTIAL BUSINESS**
- W19. URGENT BUSINESS WITHOUT NOTICE BY PERMISSION OF THE MEETING**
- W20. CLOSURE OF MEETING**



**MINUTES OF A WORKS & RESERVES COMMITTEE MEETING, HELD AT DOVENBY HOUSE, ON TUESDAY, 13 MAY 2014, COMMENCING AT 6.35PM**

**W10. OPENING OF MEETING**

The Presiding Member opened the meeting.

**W10.1 Present**

Cr M Rico	Presiding Member
Mr J O'Neill	Mayor
Cr J Harrington	(From 7.00pm)
Cr S Martin	
Cr M McPhail	
Cr A Watkins	
Mr S Wearne	Chief Executive Officer
Mr L Mainwaring	Executive Manager Finance & Administration
Ms J May	Minute Secretary

**W11. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF COUNTRY**

*"On behalf of the Council I would like to acknowledge the Nyoongar people as the traditional custodians of the land on which this meeting is taking place."*

**W12. WELCOME TO GALLERY**

There was one member of the public present.

**W13. APOLOGIES**

Cr C Collinson  
Mr D Hatcher (Works Supervisor)

**W14. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME**

Nil.

**W15. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES**

**W15.1 Minutes of Special Works & Reserves Committee Meeting – 26 March 2014**

Cr Martin – Cr McPhail

That the Minutes of the Special Works & Reserves Committee Meeting held on 26 March 2014 be received and confirmed. CARRIED

**W16. ORDER OF BUSINESS**

Mayor O'Neill – Cr McPhail

That the order of business be changed to allow consideration of the Foreshore Erosion Control report while Ms Helen Congues from the Friends of East Fremantle Foreshore was in attendance. CARRIED

**W17. BUSINESS**

**Note:**

Pursuant to Council's decision regarding delegated decision making made on 10 December 2013, all decisions carried by this Committee are deemed determined, on behalf of Council, under delegated authority.

**W17.1 Foreshore Erosion Control Works**

By Stuart Wearne, CEO, on 9 May 2014

**BACKGROUND**

At the Special Works & Reserves Committee meeting on 26 March 2014 it was resolved:



*That Council:*

- 1. Undertake construction of the reno mattress option at an estimated cost of \$50,000 as outlined in MP Rogers & Associates proposal dated February 2014*
- 2. seek Swan River Trust Riverbank funding for total sand renourishment as outlined in MP Rogers & Associates proposal dated February 2014 at an estimated cost of \$150,000, in order to enhance the amenity of this area.*

## **REPORT**

Since that decision the following actions have occurred.

### Reno mattresses

MP Rogers have been commissioned to manage this installation. This will involve a cost of about \$16,000 – consistent with the proposal received and endorsed by elected members.

It is noted Council's resolution referred to "estimated cost of \$50,000" and failed to specifically include the implementation costs, which had been indicated as between \$10,000-\$20,000, ie in addition to the \$50,000 for the reno mattresses themselves.

Three quotes were not sought with regard to the project management costs as it was considered implicit in Council's decision that MP Rogers be appointed to this role.

At this point MP Rogers advise they are progressing the issue of obtaining the necessary permit from the Swan River Trust.

### Sand renourishment

An application for Riverbank funding was prepared and submitted within the closing date.

Riverbank funding applications are not straightforward, requiring significant research and information in order to conform with the application guidelines. Given the 26 March date of Council's decision, it was not easy to meet the 11 April submission deadline, nevertheless this occurred.

### Foreshore Plan

The CEO also submitted a Riverbank funding application in relation to the commissioning of a foreshore and adjacent areas management plan.

This involved a meeting with David Kaeshagen, from Ecoscape, who had produced Council's original foreshore management plan (albeit repealed by elected members in December 2010 for unspecified reasons in the context of a review of then existing planning policies).

The approach ultimately taken involved a review and update of that very comprehensive plan, rather than "reinvent the wheel".

### Other

The resolution adopted by elected members also failed to include the estimated cost of fencing (\$10,000) as contained in MP Rogers advice.

Council staff will carry out these works within the existing budget, or via a budget variation if necessary.

The financial aspects will be referred to the Finance Committee, as per Council's decision of 18 February 2014.

At that meeting Council also resolved:



*“That:*

4. *the CEO be requested to contact the City of Melville regarding works carried out at Point Walter including the scope of works, costings, problems they encountered and associated matters.”*

The CEO advises this contact occurred in addition to a site meeting with relevant staff.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

The information be received.

The CEO answered various questions regarding the Swan River Trust’s likely response time in relation to the reno mattress permit application and the Riverbank funding applications, in addition to his discussions with staff from City of Melville regarding erosion works at Point Walter.

**Cr Watkins – Cr Martin**

**That the information be received.**

CARRIED

**W17.2**

#### ***Footpath, Road and Kerb Replacement***

*By Stephen Gallagher, Operations Manager on 9 May 2014*

#### **BACKGROUND**

Council at its meeting held 27 November 2013 resolved that:

*“A report be prepared on the current status of footpath, roads, and kerb replacement. In particular footpath order of priority and progress across the 4 wards. Types of footpaths, cost, longevity, construction time. Comparing different materials of footpath construction ie concrete, laterite, and liquid limestone including skinning and total replacement longevity. Factors to include cost, replacement time, longevity and other related matters such as disabled access across paths to roads, tactile surfaces for vision impaired and the amount spent on the four wards on replacement so far in this year’s budget.”*

Prior to his departure, Kevin White had produced some information involving comparisons between different footpath materials.

This was tabled and discussed at the Committee meeting held on 26 March 2014. The Operations Manager was not able to be present at that meeting and it was advised further information would be provided by him, in due course.

#### **REPORT**

##### Program

The current status of the footpath, road and kerb replacement program for this financial year is as follows:

- Hubble St (George to Canning) eastern side kerb and footpath (complete)
- Hubble St (George to Marmion) both sides kerb and footpath (complete)
- Sewell St (George to Marmion) both sides kerb and footpath (complete)
- Preston Pt Rd (Fraser to Coolgardie) footpath (complete in May) (asphalt)
- Locke Cres (Chauncy to Habgood) footpath (complete)
- Various areas of footpath have been repaired when required.
  
- King St resurfacing (complete)
- Walter St resurfacing (complete in May)
- May St resurfacing (complete in May)

The order of priority has a number of governing factors, none of which are influenced by the issue of ward locations. Priority is essentially governed by a consideration of:



- assessment of condition
- consideration of degree of use (ie pedestrian, vehicle traffic volumes)
- consideration of any special factors eg school route, local aged person hostel.
- cost effectiveness issues eg economies of scale and operation in works involving a *whole* road or footpath – even if part of that road or footpath might be in better condition than part of a road or footpath elsewhere.

Based on these priorities the next financial year's works program currently planned to be put forward (ie this is subject to change) for Council approval is:

- Hubble St (George to Canning) west side kerb & footpath (limestone)
- Duke St (George to Marmion) both sides kerb and footpath (limestone)
- Glyde St (George to Canning) both sides kerb and footpath (limestone)
- King St (George to St Peters) both sides kerb and footpath (limestone)
- Pier St (Preston Pt to Parker) north side footpath (concrete)
- Walter St (south of Fraser 90m) east side footpath (asphalt)
- Oakover St (Millenden to Canning) east side footpath (asphalt)
  
- Hubble St (Marmion to Canning) asphalt resurfacing
- Locke Cres (Habgood to Woodhouse) asphalt resurfacing
- Habgood St asphalt resurfacing
- Chauncy St asphalt resurfacing
- Munro St asphalt resurfacing

#### Ward Issue

Prioritising of works is ward based because this compromises the priority of need principle.

In fact the CEO advises the keeping of ward based accounts in matters such as this is unlawful under the Local Government (Financial Management) Regulations 1996 which state, in part"

*Separate ward accounts not to be kept*

*A local government is to have regard to the needs of the inhabitants of the district as a whole and is not to —*

*(a) keep separate ward accounts*

At a practical level it could also be noted additional book keeping would be required and further, some roads involve more than one ward.

#### Materials

Separate to the prioritising of these works is the type of material that is used to construct the footpaths. There are a number of reasons as to why the different treatments are considered the most appropriate in the specific circumstances. This includes the issue of aesthetics.

Expressed in the simplest terms, as the Residential Design Guidelines state "*New footpaths and crossovers to match existing streetscapes*".

Hence the intent of the previous policy to ensure as much streetscape uniformity as possible, with "Precinct Standards" reflecting prevailing materials.

Although this would be a matter of opinion it is commonly thought that asphalt footpaths look better than concrete. The Town does not have concrete roads, for example.

Other issues are these:



**Cost:**

Concrete and Asphalt including a 100mm concrete flush kerb are comparable in price around \$50/m<sup>2</sup> each. Liquid limestone is slightly more expensive than the others coming in at around \$60m<sup>2</sup>.

**Lifespan:**

Out of three concrete has the longer lifespan 30-50 years followed closely by liquid limestone 30-40 years. Asphalt is last with a lifespan of 20-30 years. However maintenance on asphalt is the cheapest by far.

**Skimming:**

It is a low cost and simple process to apply a skin layer to asphalt if it is aged and cracking (approx. 25mm). However with concrete it is common to have to remove and replace any cracked or damaged sections as it has to be poured in such a thick layer (min 100mm).

**Construction restraints:**

With concrete and liquid limestone you block access for preparation and curing once it is laid. It can be up to 24 hours before pedestrian traffic is allowed. Asphalt paths can be utilised straight away with no curing time.

**Rideability:**

Both concrete and liquid limestone have construction joints so there is a break in the pavement. Asphalt in one continuous smooth surface with no joints.

**Disabled Access and Tactile Surfaces:**

In regards to the questions relating to disabled access and tactile surfaces for vision impaired each of the 3 treatments allow for this to occur so there is no benefit in using one or the other.

**RECOMMENDATION**

That the report be received.

*Cr Harrington entered the meeting at 7pm.*

The Operations Manager outlined the footpath and road program and answered various questions from elected members.

Mayor O'Neill advised of the previous practice of elected members being provided with a list of all the footpaths within the Town detailing the material, current condition, cost of repair and priority rating and sought advice on whether a similar report could be produced with the current data.

The Operations Manager advised that data was still being inputted into the system, however, believed that a report of this nature could be available for a future Works & Reserves Committee meeting.

*Cr Martin – Mayor O'Neill*

*That:*

- 1. the report be received.*
- 2. the CEO investigate with Main Roads WA the possibility of cost sharing for upgrades to sections of the footpath along Canning Highway*
- 3. a report be prepared for the next Works & Reserves Committee meeting regarding the status of the King Street footpath*

Amendment

**Cr McPhail – Cr Harrington**

**That the following become part 4 of the motion:**



*“a report be prepared for the next Works & Reserves Committee meeting giving a comparison rate of cost per m<sup>2</sup> for footpath replacement along Canning Highway as opposed to local roads.*

CARRIED

The substantive motion was put.

**Cr Martin – Mayor O’Neill**

**That:**

1. the report be received.
2. the CEO investigate with Main Roads WA the possibility of cost sharing for upgrades to sections of the footpath along Canning Highway
3. a report be prepared for the next Works & Reserves Committee meeting regarding the status of the King Street footpath
4. a report be prepared for the next Works & Reserves Committee meeting giving a comparison rate of cost per m<sup>2</sup> for footpath replacement along Canning Highway as opposed to local roads.

CARRIED

**W17.3 Proposed Woodhouse Road Traffic Island Treatments  
Munro/Chauncy/Habgood Streets**

*By Stephen Gallagher, Operations Manager on 9 May 2014*

Previous minutes refer.

This issue is currently under review. About 20 responses to the public advertising/temporary layout were received.

The responses indicated that most correspondents wanted traffic flow modifications to be implemented, however had concerns about the model trialled.

It is planned to produce a modified design, which takes the issues raised into consideration.

When completed, this will be referred back to the Committee.

**RECOMMENDATION**

That the information be received.

General discussion took place regarding this matter.

**Cr McPhail – Cr Martin**

**That the information be received.**

CARRIED

**W17.4 40km Limit George Street**

*By Stuart Wearne, CEO, on 9 May 2014*

The CEO has been in touch with Main Roads and had preliminary discussions.

Main Roads have agreed to a meeting, involving an appropriate officer, however this has not been possible to date due to regional commitments on that officer’s part.

It is hoped the meeting can be held in about two weeks time.

**RECOMMENDATION**

That the information be received.

**Cr Martin – Cr Harrington**

**That the information be received.**

CARRIED





**W17.5 Crossover Policy Review**  
*By Stuart Wearne, CEO on 9 May 2014*

**BACKGROUND**

At the 27 November 2013 meeting of the Committee the Mayor raised the following issue, as shown in the Minutes:

*“Mayor O’Neill voiced the need for a review of Council’s current requirements for crossovers within the Town and particularly within the Preston Point Ward.”*

This was not subject to an officer’s report and the minutes record no discussion on the issue.

The motion then moved by the Mayor, which was adopted, was:

*“That a report be prepared on crossover materials on offer and their suitability for the different wards, in particular insitu limestone in Preston Point Ward.”*

The then Operations Manager undertook to review Council’s “current requirements”, however despite periodic advice that this was underway, no report was produced at the time the officer left Council’s employ in January.

**REPORT**

Whilst the minutes of the 27 November 2013 meeting record no discussion under the crossover item raised by the Mayor, they do include the advice, with respect to an earlier item involving footpaths, also raised by the Mayor, that:

*“Discussion took place on Council’s Footpath and Crossover Policy which was now incorporated into the Residential Design Guidelines. Some elected members expressed the view that this Policy required review. The Manager Planning Services advised that there were no obstacles to reviewing this part of the Guidelines which could also encompass other areas of the document which could benefit from a review.”*

In short, elected members need to understand the Footpath and Crossover Policy which the Mayor is understood to have been referring to, was revoked by elected members in September 2012, with key elements of that former policy incorporated into the Residential Design Guidelines.

It would be improper for a standing Committee to have carriage of the issue of a review of a planning instrument (ie the Residential Design Guidelines) which is integral to the function of another standing committee.

Accordingly, this matter is now considered an issue for the Town Planning & Building Committee.

The CEO has discussed the issue with the Manager Planning Services, who will include the issue for discussion at the June meeting of the Town Planning & Building Committee.

**RECOMMENDATION**

That the CEO’s advice be received.

**Cr Martin – Cr Harrington**  
**That the CEO’s advice be received.**

CARRIED



**W17.6 East Street Traffic Modification Proposals**  
*By Stuart Wearne, CEO, on 9 May 2014*

**BACKGROUND**

Whilst resident concerns regarding East Street occurred periodically prior to 2012, a concerted and apparently organised campaign for traffic treatments commenced in mid May 2012.

This was characterised by:

- (i) the surprisingly aggressive approach taken by a number of individuals involved
- (ii) the widely varying perceptions of what the problems were ie what was seen as an issue by one East Street resident was not seen as an issue by other residents, etc.

The matter was reported on to elected members, in late 2012, as follows:

East Street

*The CEO reported that recently a number of concerns had been raised by local residents, and some City of Fremantle residents, regarding traffic issues in East Street – mainly citing traffic volumes, heavy traffic, speeds and accidents – actual or potential.*

*Interestingly, only one resident had cited what I would consider the main problem in East Street, which is the number of accidents at the intersection with Canning Highway.*

*With respect to traffic volumes, counts indicate that, if anything, traffic volumes are decreasing.*

*With respect to heavy traffic there has been a small increase of 2-3% in heavy vehicles, however this is not alarming and consistent with increases in traffic generally.*

*With respect to speeds, around 35% of vehicles travel between 50-60kph (50 being the speed limit) and another 8% between 60-70kph (figures can be higher or lower depending on the location).*

*This issue is currently being reviewed in terms of a possible option, which has been discussed with the City of Fremantle, following which a design is being drawn up by Council's consulting engineer with the City of Fremantle's endorsement. This design involves a slight narrowing of the road through reducing the width of the carriageway by 200mm either side (total 400m) and reducing the pedestrian refuge by 400mm, which will provide an extra 800mm for increased parking.*

*The City of Fremantle was opposed to traffic calming devices such as speed humps and both councils acknowledge there is very little room in the street to "play with" in terms of other alternatives such as chicanes.*

*The possibility of a raised plateau at the George Street intersection or speed cushions leading up to George Street, is also being considered.*

*Non enforceable speed advisory signs, which Council has only just learned are permissible and do not require Main Roads' approval, are also being considered.*

*One such sign has already been installed by the City of Fremantle at the Canning Highway intersection.*

*With respect to accidents, of 54 accidents in the last 5 years, between Canning Highway and Marmion Street (but not including the Marmion Street intersection), 43 occurred at the intersection with Canning Highway. Of the remainder, only 2 occurred at the intersection with George Street (despite some residents suggesting this is the most dangerous intersection) with 9 elsewhere in the street. Nearly all of these 11 accidents involved parked vehicles, hence that aspect of the design referred to above.*



*Currently a meeting is being sought with Main Roads in regard to the Canning Highway intersection.*

*However it is not expected Main Roads will wish to commit to any changes until the issue of the proposed new traffic bridge, planned to be built in the area, is resolved.*

*Further, Main Roads previously proposed a "solution", which they advised qualified for Black Spot funding, however Council had opposed this as it was considered it would significantly impact on Glyde Street. It is possible that in any meeting with Main Roads, this plan may be proposed again by Main Roads.*

## **REPORT**

Since that report, whilst meetings continued to be held between Council officers from the Town of East Fremantle and the City of Fremantle, and at times also involving Main Roads, the issue was in some ways academic at that time as the City of Fremantle made it clear there would be no funding in their 2012-13 and 2013-14 budgets for this issue. Council's response had accordingly, similarly been to not budget for the works.

In 2013 Council was advised by the City of Fremantle this would also be the case for 2014-15.

Recently however the Town was informed the City of Fremantle intend to put the project forward as a new initiative for consideration in the 2014-15 draft budget, although could not guarantee that it would be retained.

The CEO has advised the Mayor that, accordingly, he would request of the Executive Manager Finance & Administration that Council's proposed share of the estimated cost (\$166,000 of \$332,000) be included in Council's draft 2014-15 budget.

The CEO also advised the Mayor he would consider having the current plan tabled at the next Works & Reserves Committee meeting. This is attached.

The key elements of the plan are:

- reduced traffic lane width (intended to reduce speeds)
- increased on street parking width (to make it safer for parked vehicles, drivers and passengers)
- reinforcement of no standing zones.
- additional advisory signs for cyclists.

## **DISCUSSION**

Whilst staff may be able to satisfactorily address any queries regarding the plan, which is a slightly amended version of the plan originally drawn up by Kevin White, elected members may prefer other options such as a briefing from the Traffic and Design officer from the City of Fremantle who is primarily responsible for the project.

There is also an arguable case for deferring any substantive discussion, pending the Minister's "reform" announcement and/or Council's budget discussions.

On the other hand, elected members may wish to endorse the plan on the basis of a consideration of the plan at the meeting.

## **RECOMMENDATION**

The report be received and the issue discussed.

Considerable discussion ensued.

**Cr Martin – Mayor O'Neill**  
**That the report be received.**

**CARRIED**



**W18. CONFIDENTIAL BUSINESS**  
Nil.

**W19. URGENT BUSINESS WITHOUT NOTICE BY PERMISSION  
OF THE MEETING**  
Nil.

**W20. CLOSURE OF MEETING**  
There being no further business, the meeting closed at 8.17pm.

*I hereby certify that the Minutes of the special meeting of the **Works & Reserves Committee** of the Town of East Fremantle, held on **13 May 2014**, Minute Book reference **W10. to W20.** were confirmed at the meeting of the Committee on*

.....

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Presiding Member**