



TOWN OF
MOSMAN PARK

**AGENDA FORUM NOTES
TUESDAY 16 FEBRUARY 2021**





Contents

1.	DECLARATION OF OPENING	3
2.	RECORD OF ATTENDANCE	3
3.	RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS PUBLIC QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE.....	3
4.	PUBLIC QUESTION TIME	4
5.	DEPUTATIONS	5
6.	DECLARATION OF INTEREST	7
7.	APPLICATION FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE.....	7
8.	ANNOUNCEMENTS BY PRESIDING MEMBER WITHOUT DISCUSSION.....	7
9.	MINUTES OF ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETINGS, SPECIAL MEETINGS & COMMITTEES..	7
10.	REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.....	7
11.	REPORTS OF OFFICERS.....	8
12.	QUESTIONS OF WHICH DUE NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN.....	8
13.	MOTIONS OF WHICH PREVIOUS NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN	8
14.	NEW BUSINESS OF AN URGENT NATURE INTRODUCED BY ELECTED MEMBER / OFFICER BY DECISION OF MEETING	8
15.	MATTERS BEHIND CLOSED DOORS.....	8
16.	NEXT MEETING DATE.....	8
17.	MEETING CLOSURE	8

1. DECLARATION OF OPENING

The Presiding Member declared the meeting open at 6:01pm.

2. RECORD OF ATTENDANCE

Elected Members:

Mayor	B. Pollock
Councillor	Z. Johnson
Councillor	P. Shaw
Councillor	G. Carey
Councillor	A. Baird
Councillor	J. Ledgerwood

Officers:

Chief Executive Officer	C. Bywater
Executive Officer	C. Markovic
Manager Parks and Environment	B. Moorman

Press:

David Hudleston	Post Newspaper
-----------------	----------------

Leave of Absence (previously approved):

Apologies – Elected Members

Deputy Mayor	A. Maurice
--------------	------------

Apologies – Officers

Director Planning and Operations	A. Nancarrow
----------------------------------	--------------

3. RESPONSE TO PREVIOUS PUBLIC QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE

Nil.

4. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

Andrew Outhwaite, 10/50 Wellington Street, Mosman Park – Item 11.3.1

Mayor Pollock asked these questions on behalf of Mr Outhwaite.

1. Roughly how many kilometres of roads in Mosman Park are laneways, and what percentage is this of the total roads in Mosman Park? Who is responsible for their maintenance?

Context: Since moving to Mosman Park last year I've enjoyed exploring the neighbourhood while running, particular linking together different laneways. It got me wondering about them as an "asset" - to be used as part of a transport network, but also considering the cost of looking after them.

A1. The Town has approximately 10km of laneways, this makes up 20% of the entire road network in Mosman Park. The Town is responsible for maintenance of laneways.

2. In future budgets and financial reports, under 'Transport' can expenditure on pathways specifically for walking and cycling be split out from that dedicated to Road and Parking? And, can it be shown what percentage is from rates vs. grants and other sources?

Context: It was a topic of discussion and recommendation from the SCP consultation to improve walking and cycling infrastructure, including leveraging grants. Showing this in the budget would enable transparency and tracking change in expenditure over time. An example is the Federal LRCI funding - it's unclear where that shows up in the budget.

A2. The Statutory format for the budget and financial statements are at the program level, which includes all related income and expenditure under the 'transport' heading. This classification cannot be amended.

However, in relation to the monthly reports to Council, a breakdown showing these service types may be provided. Changes required to effect this, may be made as part of developing the 2021/22 Budget.

3. Please provide further explanation of the scope of the Strategic Transport Projects, specifically "Strategic bicycle network planning"? Will this include walking and is consideration given to public transport, shared vehicles, electric vehicles?

Context: I understand that there were some previous work along these lines but it wasn't adopted? I get the impression from SCP that there's strong support for better walking, cycling, public transport infrastructure, route designation and signage. I'm concerned that Mosman Park is missing out on State funding to help accelerate this. Personally, I also find the experience of cycling and walking pretty poor e.g. disconnected and dangerous along Wellington St, poorly interfacing with PSP at Grant St, and low standard / poorly integrated into designs of private developments like shopping centres and apartments.

A3. In the near future the Town will engage the community on the strategic bike network plan. This plan considers other means of non-vehicle traffic i.e. walking. Please keep an eye out on the Town's social media and Your Say portal.

Trevor Ellis, 30 St Leonards Street, Mosman Park – Item 11.1.3

1. In light of the DAP decisions to approve a 9-storey development in Glyde Street, where approval was given to 3 additional storeys based on the developer meeting all 11 development incentives in the LLP15 Development Standards for Multiple Dwellings, Mixed-use development and Non-residential developments, when will Council review these the LLP15 development incentives?

1A. The Town can review Local Planning Policies whenever a need is identified, typically if a policy is not getting the outcomes intended or if policies need to be adapted to legislative changes etc.

Currently, the planning team is at full capacity, and any strategic and policy work will be considered and programmed as resources permit.

5. DEPUTATIONS

Trevor Ellis, 30 St Leonards Street, Mosman Park – Item 11.1.3

I wish to make the following points with respect to the petition submitted to Council on 12 October 2020.

1. Point 1 relates to the proposal to relocate traffic lights from Glyde Street to St Leonards Street. Deflecting traffic flow from Glyde Street to St Leonards Street would create a traffic flow nightmare. St Leonards Street ends in a T-junction virtually at the entrance of Coles Shopping Complex whereas Glyde Street is a direct thoroughfare between Stirling Highway and the Swan River. St Leonards Street is much narrower than Glyde Street. St Leonards Street meets Stirling Highway at a more acute angle and has a successful commercial precinct on that corner.
2. Point 2 relates to changes proposed to Centenary park in the draft Town Centre Plan. This park is an overflow area for storm water and the pond has the potential to be dangerous for young children. Alterations to the pool style fencing around the pond and the perimeter of the park are required to reduce the associated risks. Also, some petitioners living in the vicinity of the park have reported the park is used at night for alcohol and drug consumption and it would be counter-productive to have solid fencing (including bushes) blocking light and shielding activities within the park.

Additionally, the proposal in the draft Town Centre Plan to block the section of Ecclesbourne Street adjacent to the park and somehow incorporate it into Centenary Park would be very expensive in terms of underground services.

Referring to point 1, with the increased number of residences being proposed on the southern side of Glyde Street, with vehicles that will drive into Waite Lane, and then to Ecclesbourne, it would be madness to restrict them to only turn North into Ecclesbourne and then into Glyde Street if that section of Ecclesbourne Street was blocked off.

Howard Knight, 32A Bay View Terrace, Mosman Park – Item 11.4.1

I would like to see the laneway reinstated to its natural ground level. The report doesn't indicate what will happen to Memorial Drive and Whittaker Mews. Pedestrian access should connect Memorial Drive and Whittaker Mews to allow visitors to park in Memorial Drive. Some residents have safety and security concerns, however, I don't believe that additional pedestrian access will increase the probability of break-ins.

Susan Parker, 3 Frances Terrace, Mosman Park – Item 11.4.1

We wish for Council to consider the views of the residents of Whittaker Mews in their deliberations on this item.

Whittaker Mews provides vehicle access to our garage and residence at 3 Frances Terrace. As such we have a proximity interest in the proposed treatment options being considered as a result of unapproved works being carried out at Lot 15 and 5 Frances Terrace.

We do not support the Officer Recommendation. We do not support the creation of any current or future 'thoroughfare' pedestrian or vehicle access through Whittaker Mews to Memorial Drive.

We do not support Council funding to the value of \$29,000 (or other) for rectification of the unapproved works being carried out on Lot 15 and 5 Frances Terrace.

We do support the first of the two options discussed in the Details section of the Agenda Item.

Further we believe that if there has been unapproved works and/or assumed acquisition of land at the southern end of Whittaker Mews, then forced purchase or rectification costs should be dealt with between the Council and the owner(s) of Lot 15 and 5 Frances Terrace.

Paul and Jan French, 126 Glyde Street, Mosman Park – Item 11.4.1

Mayor Pollock read this deputation on behalf of Mr and Mrs French.

We are the owners of 126 Glyde Street property and our vehicle access is on Whittaker Mews. We wish to express a view on the planned laneway works.

We are strongly opposed to creation of any type of access to Whittaker Mews from Memorial Drive, whether it be vehicle or pedestrian.

Practical arrangements that existed prior to the development of lot 15 and 5 Francis terrace should continue. Recognising that the original closure of the laneway may have been unapproved, the Council should deal with this as a separate issue, without changing current access.

Creation of a thoroughfare from Memorial Drive to Whittaker Mews is unnecessary and costly. The current access to the seven properties is adequate.

We understand a pedestrian gate on Memorial Drive has also been mooted. This poses an increased security risk for these properties. (Since living here, we have had occasions when intruders have jumped our back fence and sought to enter the house via back bedrooms. This occurred when a vacant block existed between the laneway and Bay View). With the Memorial Drive end of Whittaker closed off, the only entry/exit is via Glyde Street. This acts as a disincentive to any intruders. A gate, even with a lock, on Memorial Drive would certainly not discourage such activity.

Please consider the increased security exposure with foot traffic through the laneway due to completely unnecessary changes to the current access arrangements. There can be little cause for complaint from any party if the status quo is maintained and the Memorial Drive end of Whittaker Mews is simply closed off by the Council.

We support option 1 as outlined in the Details section of the Engineering Investigation (page 44).

6. DECLARATION OF INTEREST

Nil.

7. APPLICATION FOR LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Nil.

8. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY PRESIDING MEMBER WITHOUT DISCUSSION

Nil.

9. MINUTES OF ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETINGS, SPECIAL MEETINGS & COMMITTEES

Nil endorsement of Minutes at the Agenda Forum.

10. REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

Information, questions and changes relating to the Reports of Committees are identified in blue text and contained in the Ordinary Council Meeting Agenda for the meeting to be held on the 22 February 2021.

11. REPORTS OF OFFICERS

Information, questions and changes relating to the Officers' Reports are identified in blue text and contained in the Ordinary Council Meeting Agenda for the meeting to be held on the 22 February 2021.

12. QUESTIONS OF WHICH DUE NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

Nil.

13. MOTIONS OF WHICH PREVIOUS NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

Nil.

14. NEW BUSINESS OF AN URGENT NATURE INTRODUCED BY ELECTED MEMBER / OFFICER BY DECISION OF MEETING

Nil.

15. MATTERS BEHIND CLOSED DOORS

Nil.

16. NEXT MEETING DATE

The next Agenda Forum will be held on 16 March 2021.

17. MEETING CLOSURE

There being no further business, the meeting closed at 6.56pm.