

Cr Jones declared a financial interest in Item 3.8 by virtue of a business relationship between his employer and interested parties in this development. Cr Jones left the Chamber at 6.45pm and was absent during the whole of the debate on Item 3.8 and did not speak or otherwise participate in the decision making process.

3.8 VALE VILLAGE 'A' DETAILED SITE PLAN - LOT 9011 GNANGARA ROAD, AVELEY

(Ellenbrook) (Development Services)

KEY ISSUES

- The Vale Structure Plan (ODP 50) discusses two village centres (Village A and B).
- Village A is included in the first Development Plan Area (ODP 73).
- ODP 73 requires a Detailed Site Plan for Village A. This is also a requirement of a subdivision approval.
- The issues which the Detailed Site Plan must address are discussed in the City's Neighbourhood Planning Policy (POL-C-103), Commercial Centres Strategy (POL-C-083) and Outline Development Plan 73.
- The Detailed Site Plan as submitted does not adequately address the criteria given in the above policies and the approved Outline Development Plan 73.

Approval should not be granted until these issues are adequately addressed. Deferral is recommended. Subject to the matters raised being satisfactorily addressed the proposed Detailed Site Plan be determined under delegated authority by the Principal Planner.

AUTHORITY/DISCRETION

Appendix 6 of Town Planning Scheme No. 9 permits the City to require a Detailed Site Plan where desirable in this zone to elaborate and expand the planning proposals or provisions contained within a Structure Plan or Development Plan on a lot by lot basis.

Detailed Site Plans can be dealt with under delegated authority; however, given the history of this proposal and Council's consideration of the development application for the adjacent Swanleigh School, it is considered prudent for this item to be presented to Council for determination.

BACKGROUND

Applicant:	Chappell Lambert Everett Town Planners (Directors - Peter Chappell, Tony Lambert, Ian Everett)
Owner:	Multiplex Acumen Vale Landowner Pty Ltd (Directors - Michael Hodgetts, Robert McCuaig, Peter Morris, Ian O'Toole, Rob Rayner)
Zoning:	TPS - Special Purpose Zone MRS - Urban
Strategy/Policy:	Commercial Centres Strategy (POL-C-083) Neighbourhood Planning Policy (POL-C-103)
Development Scheme:	Town Planning Scheme No. 9
Existing Land Use:	vacant
Lot Size:	ODP indicates village superlot to be 2.0895ha
Area:	
Use Class:	N/A application is for a Detailed Site Plan

DETAILS OF THE PROPOSAL

The proposal is for a Detailed Site Plan (DSP) for Village A of the Vale estate. The applicant has also lodged associated design guidelines which should be read in conjunction with the DSP.

DESCRIPTION OF SITE

The site is bounded by roads on all sides, except the west which is the Aged Housing site (and will be the subject of a separate DSP).

The road to the east is Egerton Drive, the main entry point to the Vale estate. The road on the southern boundary is Swanleigh Parade which separates the village from the Swanleigh School. To the north is Flecker Promenade which separates the village from the north south linear wetland public open space area and the tavern site.

Egerton Drive is a 'Main Neighbourhood Connector' road as shown on the approved ODP. Flecker Promenade is an 'Other Neighbourhood Connector' and Swanleigh Parade is an 'Important Local Road'.

The site's prominence in terms of an 'entry' to the estate and the function of the village in terms of its surroundings has warranted the need for a Detailed Site Plan for this land parcel.

SITE HISTORY/PREVIOUS APPROVALS

- 23 March 2005: Revised ODP 50 (Structure Plan) and ODP 73 (Development Plan 1) for the Vale adopted by Council, subject to modifications.
- 17 June 2005: WAPC issued subdivision approval to create Stages 2 and 3 (including the village superlot), subject to a Detailed Site Plan being submitted and approved.
- 21 February 2006: First draft DSP lodged with the City.
- 20 April 2006: Following staff review, meeting held with applicant to identify issues requiring further detail, justification, etc.
- 26 June 2006: Revised DSP received for staff assessment.
- 5 July 2006: City receives subdivision plan referral from WAPC to subdivide proposed village superlot into 3 lots.
- 11 July 2006: City recommends deferral to WAPC (under delegated authority) pending the consideration of the DSP.
- 25 September 2006: WAPC allows deferral until 23 October 2006 to resolve the DSP and provide response to related subdivision proposal.

OTHER RELEVANT PREVIOUS DECISIONS OF COUNCIL

2 March 2005, Ordinary Meeting of Council (Item 3.6) planning approval, subject to conditions, was issued for the Swanleigh School immediately south of the village superlot.

No reciprocal parking arrangements between the school site and the village are in place as a result of this approval.

APPLICANT'S SUBMISSION

Elected members should refer to copies of the DSP and Village A guidelines provided.

(Note: a copy of the Detailed Site Plan has been forwarded to each elected member under separate cover).

PUBLIC CONSULTATION

N/A for a Detailed Site Plan.

CONSULTATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES AND/OR CONSULTANTS

N/A

REPORT

Neighbourhood Planning Policy (POL-C-103):

Section 3.4.3 of the Neighbourhood Planning Policy requires the DSP to address:

- Land use mix and permissibility;
- Street block layout, built form and character;
- Landscaping and public infrastructure, signage;
- Integration of civic and/or community uses and spaces;
- Integration of residential uses;
- Pedestrian and cycle movement, vehicle parking and access, integration of public transport services;
- Infrastructure servicing, development staging and relationship to surrounding land uses; and
- Integration with social and economic development strategies as outlined in any Community and Economic Development Plan relevant to the Structure Plan area.

Where these aspects have not been adequately addressed, they will be dealt with further in the 'Report' section of this item.

Commercial Centres Strategy (POL-C-083):

Sections 1, 4 and 5 of the Commercial Centres Strategy detail visions and objectives for commercial centres as well as criteria for neighbourhood centres.

Appendix 1 - Floor Space requirements

Where these aspects have not been adequately addressed, they will be dealt with further in the 'Report' section of this item.

Outline Development Plan 73:

The ODP requires the DSP to address the following items:

- Land use precincts and proposed commercial mix;
- Built form guidelines;
- Setbacks;
- Ancillary features and landscaping;
- Integration with community facilities;
- Car parking, traffic management and access;

- Integration of mixed use residential (neighbourhood centres);
- Pedestrian linkages.

Where these aspects have not been adequately addressed, they will be dealt with further in the 'Report' section of this item.

Matters to be addressed:

Land use mix and permissibility:

While the need for flexibility is acknowledged, the DSP needs to be more specific in terms of nominating particular land for particular land uses. It is important to ensure that stand alone residential uses are not permitted.

The applicant has indicated 46% (9940m²) of the village superlot to be a 'retirement village'. This is effectively stand alone residential (grouped housing) development. The guidelines refer to residential development and infer that this may be developed on its own. This is not supported given that almost the whole of the land area of the centre is required to accommodate the range of commercial land uses envisaged for the centre under the City's Commercial Centres Strategy.

Any residential uses should be limited to mixed use developments, with residential uses being located on the upper floors. This will ensure that sufficient floorspace is set aside for commercial land uses to meet the needs of the community whilst also providing for residential land uses to support and increase the viability of the commercial uses, to create additional activity and passive surveillance opportunities and to create diversity and more affordable housing options through the provision of smaller housing. The co-location of commercial and residential land uses also provides benefits in terms of reducing the demand for travel and associated energy use.

The guidelines have included a schedule of permitted uses (section 3.2.1). This is considered a duplication of the approved ODP land uses and should be removed.

Floor Space requirements/land area requirements for commercial uses:

The City's Commercial Centres Strategy includes a hierarchy of commercial centres including a size range based on net leasable area (NLA) of shop/retail floor space. The applicant has argued for reclassification of the village from a Medium (3500-4500m² NLA) to Small (1500-3500m² NLA) Neighbourhood Centre. This notion is supported by City staff as the revised projected demand (based on revised populations projections in the review of Vale's Centre's Strategy - July 2006 which are lower than those originally projected) at both the catchment and estate levels are able to be met.

Reference in the guidelines (section 3.2.2) will need to be included to the size classification and that it is now identified as a Small Neighbourhood Centre, as defined in the City's Commercial Centres Strategy. Outline Development Plan 73 notates Village A as a maximum retail NLA of 4800m². This will need to be updated to reflect the Detailed Site Plan and it is recommended that this be dealt with under delegated authority as a minor change to the ODP.

There is a need to ensure that sufficient land is set aside to accommodate a range of shop/retail floor space (80%) and other commercial floor space (20%) envisaged for a Small Neighbourhood Centre to ensure a vibrant centre which provides the community

with good access to a range of local goods, services and employment. Based on the guidelines contained in the WAPC's Guidelines for the Preparation of Local Structure Plans for Urban Release Areas, City staff have calculated that between 0.75 - 2.19ha of land area would be required to accommodate the projected floor space for Village A.

In order to satisfy the projected demand within the catchment and the estate, centres will generally be required to be developed to the upper limit for their size range, which is 1500-3500m² NLA for this centre. This being the case, 2.19ha in land area should be set aside for commercial uses within the centre.

The whole of the superlot land parcel (2.159ha) would be required to accommodate the anticipated range of shopping and commercial uses. According to the approved ODP 73, the village superlot was intended to be 2.0895ha. The submitted plan for further subdivision of the village superlot indicates a total area of 2.159ha with only 9310m² (0.93ha) apportioned to some retail uses. This is not acceptable and compromises the intent of the Commercial Centres Strategy.

With the floor space issues in mind, the applicant should seriously consider a plot ratio variation above what the scheme would normally permit (which is quite low) this has been mentioned previously and not heeded. However, increased plot ratio will allow a balance between sufficient onsite car parking provision, ground level shop/retail and upper floor office and residential uses resulting in more efficient use of land, sufficient commercial floorspace (to accommodate a range of local goods, services and employment) and residential floorspace and well articulated (multi-storey) buildings which provide a presence, legibility and focus for the community.

Built Form

The City's Commercial Centres Strategy requires multi-storey buildings and the City's Neighbourhood Planning Policy requires minimum two-storey mixed use development in Neighbourhood Centres. The DAP requires a mandatory two storey development on the corner of Egerton Drive and Flecker Boulevard. It is considered however that further two storey development, at least along the proposed main street (Egerton Drive), should be provided within the centre to provide the benefits associated with multi-storey mixed use development outlined above, including sufficient provision of commercial and residential floorspace and buildings which act as a landmark for the community.

Pedestrian linkages:

The approved ODP 73 indicates dual use paths on one side of the road for the northern road and the eastern road. Footpaths to both sides of the southern road are required, as well as footpaths on both sides of the access way between the village superlot and the aged housing superlot to the west. These pedestrian links on the DSP have not been included sufficiently and require updating.

Vehicle parking and access

The manner in which parking has been addressed in the Guidelines is problematic. A specific table has been included quoting car parking ratios under the current Town Planning Scheme. To ensure the document is robust and will still be relevant when the new scheme is gazetted or if scheme parking requirements are updated, this table should be considered for removal.

The table is included as an 'example' of indicative bay requirements only, however it is not considered useful unless it can be specifically related to proposed land use mix. This point has been mentioned above; the land use mix needs to be more specific. Also of note is that a variation to scheme parking requirements has not been proposed (which is one of the purposes of a DSP) which is a further reason why the table is unnecessary.

Reciprocity of car bays is mentioned in the table with the assumption this will apply for 10% of the development. This is also not considered useful until land use mix is more specific. Requirements concerning reciprocal or joint use of car parking are already covered in the City's scheme and this should be referred to, rather than the broad statement 'subject to negotiation' which has been included in the Guidelines.

The provision of cash in lieu is discussed; however, this is considered to be inappropriate. The scheme is quite clear that this only applies to the Midland Regional Centre where the acquisition of public parking reserves is possible.

The guidelines discuss on-street parking and assume a 100% credit for such parking. This principle is lifted from the Liveable Neighbourhoods document. Further details should be included to ensure it is very clear that if on-street parking is provided, the construction and maintenance costs should be borne by the developer and be to the City's standards. Furthermore, location of on-street parking should not impinge upon other important details including, but not limited to, pedestrian crossing points, bus stops, and safe vehicular access.

The Design Guidelines refer to the principle in the City's Commercial Centres Strategy with respect to the consolidation and shared use of vehicular access and car parking facilities however then requires car parking to be dispersed around the site wherever possible, rather than grouped together in one large area. This is considered contrary to the principle in the City's Commercial Centres Strategy and should be deleted.

Integration of public transport services:

Figure 13 of the approved Outline Development Plan 73 indicates a preferred bus route along the northern boundary road (Flecker Promenade). The Guidelines acknowledge that a future bus stop on this road is likely, however, they are dismissive in stating location and design will be subject to detailed discussion with the Public Transport Authority when the service is established.

A similar comment is made in the Guidelines concerning a taxi rank. Both features are regarded as being located on Flecker Promenade.

Some refinement of guiding principles for both a bus stop and taxi rank should be undertaken. Element 7 of the Liveable Neighbourhoods document discusses facilitation and encouragement of the use of public transport. The 'Trial and Evaluation Version' of the WAPC's Transport Assessment Guidelines for Development (August 2006) goes into much further detail concerning public transport access. Unless there are some particular guiding principles established it could become difficult to 'retro fit' these important features at a later stage. In particular, reference should be made to section 8.20 of Volume 4 (Individual Developments) and Element 7 of the Liveable Neighbourhoods document to create guiding principles.

With specific regard to the taxi rank, City staff would require this to be located within the village site, not in the road reserve. This should be noted on the DSP, however,

the physical location and detailed design would be required at development application stage.

It is important that these issues are addressed as the centre is likely to act as a key public transport hub for the southern part of the estate, particularly given the nearby high school.

Infrastructure servicing, development staging and relationship to surrounding land uses:

The DSP indicates the use of 'Schools in shops' similar to what has occurred in the Ellenbrook estate. Recent discussions with the Department of Education and Training and the applicant has indicated that the 'Schools in shops' scenario is unlikely to occur on this site and planning is progressing for site handover mid 2007 and the school to open in early 2008. Section 1.4 (staging) will require updating with this in mind.

Signage:

Signage is proposed to be addressed through a Signage Masterplan. There is some concern that there would be no statutory control for the City through this method. This proposal has been compared to the comparatively recent consideration by Council of the Ellenbrook Town Centre. While this was a Development Plan, it included not only objectives and guiding principles for signs, but specified a 'signage zone' as a horizontal strip on notional elevations, recommended materials, minimum and maximum heights (unless otherwise approved on a DSP).

If a Development Plan provided that level of detail, it is reasonable to expect a Detailed Site Plan such as this application to incorporate the same, if not further level of detail. Accordingly, the guidelines should be updated to provide further detail. If the developer wishes to expand upon the DSP later with a Signage Masterplan then they will still be able to do this as an Appendix to a revised version of the DSP.

Landscaping and public infrastructure:

A schedule of suggested plant species has been included in the guidelines. This includes the species *Platanus orientalis digitata* (Oriental Plane Tree) which City staff do not support in any circumstances. This species should be deleted from the guidelines.

Reference to City's Town Planning Scheme:

Section 1.2 needs updating to ensure the document is read in conjunction with the City's Town Planning Scheme.

Multiplex Approvals

Section 1.3 of the Vale Village Centre Design Guidelines document indicates that any development within the village centre must be submitted to Multiplex for endorsement prior to being submitted to the City for approval. It also indicates that *"the City of Swan shall not process any Development Application for the village centre unless it is in receipt of a set of plans stamped and endorsed by Multiplex Living."*

This requirement is unacceptable as it makes the City's authority for determination of development applications subservient to Multiplex. This provision needs to be modified or deleted.

OPTIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Option 1: The City can endorse the Detailed Site Plan either with or without modifications. Approval, subject to modification is not recommended.

Implications: This will mean the village superlot can be created as per the 17 June 2005 subdivision approval. It will also allow the WAPC to determine the pending subdivision application to subdivide the village superlot into 3 new lots (which are consistent with the lot sizes indicated in the draft DSP).

There is a possibility the applicant could not provide the required updates/modifications within the specified time frame. Unfortunately this has been the case on several occasions with the Vale development. For example, the last Council consideration for ODP 73 (23 March 2005) was supported on the basis details of the existing aviary and detailed monitoring programs as described in the Drainage and Nutrient Management Program being provided within 6 months. They were provided in December 2005 and July 2006 respectively (following repeated requests from City staff).

Option 2: The City can refuse the application (reasons would need to be given).

Implications: The applicant cannot create the village superlot until a DSP is approved by the City (it is a condition they need to have cleared prior to a title being issued). If the superlot is not created, the further subdivision of the lot into 3 smaller lots should not be able to occur. It is quite possible that the WAPC could approve the further subdivision regardless.

Option 3: The City could defer consideration and resolve that they may support a DSP subject to particular changes being included. The updated DSP could then be dealt with under delegated authority. This is the recommended option.

Implications: The applicant would not formally receive an approval until they satisfactorily updated the DSP and guidelines. Therefore, they would not be able to obtain clearance for the village superlot. With regard to the proposed further subdivision of the lot into three, the City would have to recommend refusal given the applicant has asked for the WAPC to determine the application by 23 October 2006. The City could not support the subdivision plan as it is predicated on land use mix the City does not support and its approval could compromise the approval of a revised DSP.

CONCLUSION

The Detailed Site Plan (DSP) requires some significant modifications. These should be incorporated before the DSP is formally approved.

City staff are strongly in favour of this work being done first and not issuing an approval on the basis of changes being incorporated. This has been done in the past for the Vale development and unfortunately, despite specific timeframes being resolved by Council, the resolutions have been largely ignored.

An application for subdivision for the proposed village superlot has also been submitted to the WAPC. The City originally requested a deferral till the DSP was resolved; however, the applicant has asked the WAPC to make a decision by 23 October 2006. Accordingly, the decision on the DSP will influence the response City staff provide on the subdivision proposal. As noted in the body of this report, that subdivision proposal is considered by City staff to be premature and predicated on a lot layout and land use mix which would compromise the DSP. Councillors need to be mindful of this pending subdivision application, as it is a reason which explains why the applicant will be anxious to have the DSP approved.

On balance, Councillors should also be mindful that this DSP will be an important planning tool for the final outcome of this commercial centre. The City has an obligation to the future community of the Vale estate to provide them with an attractive, functional and safe village with an appropriate level and mix of retail and other commercial uses, that facilitates and encourages public transport, as well as catering sufficiently for car parking and pedestrians. With due regard to City and State policies, City staff are of the opinion that this DSP will not fulfil that obligation.

ATTACHMENTS

- Locality Plan
- Draft Detailed Site Plan

STRATEGIC IMPLICATIONS

- Commercial Centres Strategy (POL-C-083)
- Neighbourhood Planning Policy (POL-C-103)

The Vale developers have set up a Sustainability Partnership with Murdoch University however the DAP in its current form clearly ignores basic sustainability principles such as housing density, diversity and affordability and the provision of adequate local commercial goods, services and employment.

STATUTORY ENVIRONMENT

- Town Planning Scheme No.9
- Outline Development Plan 50 (Vale Structure Plan)
- Outline Development Plan 73 (Vale Development Plan 1)

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Nil

RECOMMENDATION

That the Council resolve to:

- 1) Defer consideration of the Detailed Site Plan and associated guidelines for the Vale Village A (DSP44) until the following items are addressed:
 - a. Modification to Outline Development Plan 73 to reclassify Village A from a 'Medium Neighbourhood Centre' to a 'Small Neighbourhood Centre' with a maximum retail NLA of 3500m².
 - b. Clarification in Guidelines (section 3.2.2) of centre classification and acknowledgement of the link to the Commercial Centres Strategy definition.
 - c. Stronger nomination of land use mix, specifically expansion of the retail component and genuine integration of residential uses (stand alone residential use will not be supported within the village). The centre will need to be developed at the upper limit for this centre classification (3500m²) with approximately an 80% component for shop/retail floor space and 20% component for other commercial floor space. Any residential component will need to be accommodated on upper floor levels, not ground level.
 - d. Consideration of plot ratio variation rather than simply scheme requirements.
 - e. Update pedestrian linkages to reflect those approved in Outline Development Plan 73.
 - f. Remove reference to 'cash in lieu' of providing car parking.
 - g. Provide further clarification regarding on street car bays especially in terms of cost, maintenance and construction standard as well as guiding principles for location.
 - h. Removal of statements in Guidelines referring to 'subject to negotiation' reciprocal use of car bays.
 - i. Inclusion of reference to reciprocal/joint use of car parking as detailed in the City's Town Planning Scheme.
 - j. Possible removal of car parking table example (dependant upon whether it can be shown to be useful following clearer nomination of land use mix).
 - k. Removal of the land use permissibility schedule from the DSP.
 - l. Refinement of guiding principles for integration of public transport with the centre with specific regard to Element 7 of Liveable Neighbourhoods and

the 'Trial and Evaluation Version' of the WAPC's Transport Assessment Guidelines (August 2006).

- m. Notation of a taxi rank to be incorporated within the village site (physical location and detailed design at development application stage).
 - n. Removal of reference to 'Schools in shops' as this is now outdated.
 - o. Refinement of guiding principles and objectives for signage. Consideration of a 'signage zone' similar to that approved in Ellenbrook. A signage 'masterplan' may be incorporated as an appendix also.
 - p. Deletion of the species *Plantanus orientalis digitata* (Oriental Plane Tree) from the species list.
 - q. Update Section 1.2 to note document is also to be read in conjunction with the City's Town Planning Scheme.
 - r. Modify or delete Section 1.3 - Multiplex Approvals relating to the City's authority to determine development applications prior to receipt of endorsement by Multiplex Living.
 - s. Require further minimum two storey development, at least along the main street (Egerton Drive), within the centre to ensure sufficient provision of commercial and residential floorspace and buildings which act as a landmark for the community.
 - t. Deletion of sub-clause 6.2.1 (c) which requires car parking to be dispersed around the site wherever possible.
- 2) Following the above items being addressed, the City will reassess the proposed Detailed Site Plan under delegated authority.

REVISED STAFF RECOMMENDATION

The applicant has requested reconsideration of some of the items outlined in the Recommendation. As a result of discussions with the applicant and their consultants, staff have revised the Recommendation on the basis of agreeing to some issues and not on others.

A copy of the applicant's request for changes was tabled at the meeting.

The proposed changes relate only to amending Recommendation 1 by rewording item (c), deleting items (m) and (o), and rewording item (s) and renumber the items accordingly; and rewording of Recommendation 2. The revised Recommendation to read as follows:

That the Council resolve to:

- 1) Defer consideration of the Detailed Site Plan and associated guidelines for the Vale Village A (DSP44) until the following items are addressed:

- a. Modification to Outline Development Plan 73 to reclassify Village A from a 'Medium Neighbourhood Centre' to a 'Small Neighbourhood Centre' with a maximum retail NLA of 3500m².
- b. Clarification in Guidelines (section 3.2.2) of centre classification and acknowledgement of the link to the Commercial Centres Strategy definition.
- c. Clarification and justification of land area and floor space required to support development of retail and non-retail commercial floor space that meets the objectives of a Small Neighbourhood Centre (maximum retail NLA of 3500m²) as adopted in the City of Swan Commercial Centre Strategy.
- d. Consideration of plot ratio variation rather than simply scheme requirements.
- e. Update pedestrian linkages to reflect those approved in Outline Development Plan 73.
- f. Remove reference to 'cash in lieu' of providing car parking.
- g. Provide further clarification regarding on street car bays especially in terms of cost, maintenance and construction standard as well as guiding principles for location.
- h. Removal of statements in Guidelines referring to 'subject to negotiation' reciprocal use of car bays.
- i. Inclusion of reference to reciprocal/joint use of car parking as detailed in the City's Town Planning Scheme.
- j. Possible removal of car parking table example (dependant upon whether it can be shown to be useful following clearer nomination of land use mix).
- k. Removal of the land use permissibility schedule from the DSP.
- l. Refinement of guiding principles for integration of public transport with the centre with specific regard to Element 7 of Liveable Neighbourhoods and the 'Trial and Evaluation Version' of the WAPC's Transport Assessment Guidelines (August 2006).
- m. Removal of reference to 'Schools in shops' as this is now outdated.
- n. Deletion of the species *Plantanus orientalis digitata* (Oriental Plane Tree) from the species list.
- o. Update Section 1.2 to note document is also to be read in conjunction with the City's Town Planning Scheme.
- p. Modify or delete Section 1.3 - Multiplex Approvals relating to the City's authority to determine development applications prior to receipt of endorsement by Multiplex Living.

- q. Appropriate integration of residential development to meet the objectives of a Small Neighbourhood Centre as adopted in the City of Swan Commercial Centre Strategy.
 - r. Deletion of sub-clause 6.2.1 (c) which requires car parking to be dispersed around the site wherever possible.
- 2) Following the above items being satisfactorily addressed, the City will determine the proposed Detailed Site Plan under delegated authority to the Principal Planner.
- 3) Record the reason for changing Staff recommendation is to accommodate the discussions held with the applicant.

MOTION that the Revised Recommendation be adopted.

(Cr Congerton - Cr Alban)

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY TO:

- 1) Defer consideration of the Detailed Site Plan and associated guidelines for the Vale Village A (DSP44) until the following items are addressed:
- a. Modification to Outline Development Plan 73 to reclassify Village A from a 'Medium Neighbourhood Centre' to a 'Small Neighbourhood Centre' with a maximum retail NLA of 3500m².
 - b. Clarification in Guidelines (section 3.2.2) of centre classification and acknowledgement of the link to the Commercial Centres Strategy definition.
 - c. Clarification and justification of land area and floor space required to support development of retail and non-retail commercial floor space that meets the objectives of a Small Neighbourhood Centre (maximum retail NLA of 3500m²) as adopted in the City of Swan Commercial Centre Strategy.
 - d. Consideration of plot ratio variation rather than simply scheme requirements.
 - e. Update pedestrian linkages to reflect those approved in Outline Development Plan 73.
 - f. Remove reference to 'cash in lieu' of providing car parking.
 - g. Provide further clarification regarding on street car bays especially in terms of cost, maintenance and construction standard as well as guiding principles for location.
 - h. Removal of statements in Guidelines referring to 'subject to negotiation' reciprocal use of car bays.

- i. Inclusion of reference to reciprocal/joint use of car parking as detailed in the City's Town Planning Scheme.
 - j. Possible removal of car parking table example (dependant upon whether it can be shown to be useful following clearer nomination of land use mix).
 - k. Removal of the land use permissibility schedule from the DSP.
 - l. Refinement of guiding principles for integration of public transport with the centre with specific regard to Element 7 of Liveable Neighbourhoods and the 'Trial and Evaluation Version' of the WAPC's Transport Assessment Guidelines (August 2006).
 - m. Removal of reference to 'Schools in shops' as this is now outdated.
 - n. Deletion of the species *Plantanus orientalis digitata* (Oriental Plane Tree) from the species list.
 - o. Update Section 1.2 to note document is also to be read in conjunction with the City's Town Planning Scheme.
 - p. Modify or delete Section 1.3 - Multiplex Approvals relating to the City's authority to determine development applications prior to receipt of endorsement by Multiplex Living.
 - q. Appropriate integration of residential development to meet the objectives of a Small Neighbourhood Centre as adopted in the City of Swan Commercial Centre Strategy.
 - r. Deletion of sub-clause 6.2.1 (c) which requires car parking to be dispersed around the site wherever possible.
- 2) Following the above items being satisfactorily addressed, the City will determine the proposed Detailed Site Plan under delegated authority to the Principal Planner.
- 3) Record the reason for changing Staff recommendation is to accommodate the discussions held with the applicant.

Cr Jones returned to the Chamber at 6.46pm.