

10.18 Leschenault Inlet Masterplan (was listed as item 10.5.1 on the meeting agenda)

File Ref:	A05205
Applicant/Proponent:	Internal
Author:	Geoff Klem, Director Strategic Integration
Executive:	Geoff Klem, Director Strategic Integration
Attachments:	Appendix DSI-1 , DSI-2 , DSI-3

Summary

The purpose of this report is to inform Council of the process and status of the Leschenault Inlet Masterplan project and to request approval to advertise the draft plan for public comment until the end of January 2013.

Council Committee Recommendation

That Council resolves to:

1. Adopt the Leschenault Inlet draft report for the purposes of advertising for public submissions, and
2. Advertise the Leschenault Inlet draft report for public comment from the 18 December 2012 until the end of January 2013.

Background

At the Ordinary Council meeting held 29 November 2011 Council Decided (285/11):

“That Council

1. *Note the formation of a Project Management Group to progress the development of the Leschenault Inlet Masterplan;*
2. *Endorse the Leschenault Inlet Masterplan report as the basis for the calling of Expressions of Interest (EOI) to prepare a draft Masterplan for consideration by Council prior to public comment;*
3. *Appoint the Mayor, David Smith and the following Councillors:*
 - *Deputy Mayor Cr Stephen Craddock*
 - *Councillor Karen Steele*
 - *Councillor Sam Morris**as Council members of the Project Management Group;*
4. *The Project Management Group to provide quarterly reports to Council and complete the project within twelve (12) months.”*

In accordance with the above resolution, the Project Management Group has meet nine times over the past year (meetings and workshops) and comprehensive progress notes have previously been provided for Council review as Items to be Noted, with more being referred to Council at this time. Updates have also been provided at formal Council briefing sessions. The draft report has been completed within the 12 month period required by Council.

The project area has been divided into 10 precincts that reflect the unique physical (built and natural) characteristics of each area (**attached** at Appendix [DSI-1](#)). The precincts are:

1. Koombana North
2. Koombana South

3. City Square
4. Queen's Gardens
5. Frank Buswell Foreshore
6. The Quays
7. Inlet Entrance
8. Mangrove Conservation
9. Koombana Tourism
10. Koombana Mixed Use.

In addition to the Masterplan concept designs for the precincts, Council agreed to fund additional detailed concept work for Koombana South (Water Playground) and Queen's Gardens (Friendship Gardens for the Sister Cities of Setagaya and Jiaying). Media coverage of the launches of the Friendship Gardens is **attached** at Appendix [DSI-2](#).

During the preparation of the draft Masterplan, extensive consultation has been undertaken with the general public, special interest groups (including the local Noongar people) and relevant Government Agencies. A report on the public consultation is **attached** at Appendix [DSI-3](#).

Currently there is no overall vision for the foreshore areas that can inform a strategy to achieve the development of a park of national and international quality. Further, the aforementioned precincts have developed without the benefit of a plan and strategy that integrates and connects key elements as well as coordinating management effort to achieve overall objectives for the Inlet foreshore.

Council Policy Compliance

The project is consistent with the following Council Policies.

- Council Policy DWS-4 Provide Diverse Range of Activities and Facilities for Residents and Visitors states:
"To enhance the quality of life for visitors and residents of Bunbury through the provision of a diverse range of high quality and cost effective recreational; activities and/or facilities."
- Council Policy DCS-4 Integrated Planning states:
"Council is committed to achieving best practice and legislative compliance in its Integrated Planning performance in which activities and services delivered by the City of Bunbury are aligned with community expectations and objectives."
- Council Policy CEO-5 Economic Development states:
"To promote Greater Bunbury's regional advantage and support the necessary conditions for sustained investment, growth and employment generation."

Legislative Compliance

Under the Planning and Development Act (2005) the Western Australian Planning Commission (WAPC) has responsibility for the administration of the Greater Bunbury Region Scheme (GBRS). As the majority of the Inlet is reserved for Regional Open Space under the GBRS, the WAPC through the Department of Planning has both endorsed the preparation of the Masterplan and participated in the planning process. In addition, the Ministerial Taskforce for the Waterfront project has endorsed the preparation of the Masterplan.

Officer Comments

There has been a history of planning, development and management around the Leschenault Inlet being undertaken in an *ad hoc* manner which has militated against key nodes/locations being connected both functionally and aesthetically. In addition, the true potential of this important natural resource on the door step of the City has not been realised because of a lack of a clear vision and a comprehensive plan to achieve that vision.

With the development of the BREC expansion underway and the commencement of Stage 1 of the Waterfront Project (Koombana North), the timing is right to integrate the planning of the Inlet foreshore areas with major new projects that will change the face of the City.

The importance of the Masterplan has been recognized by the Ministerial Taskforce (Ministers Castrilli, Day and Grylls) for the Waterfront Project which endorsed the preparation of the plan as a joint effort with the Department of Planning on behalf of the WAPC. The involvement of the Department of Planning is necessary as the majority of the land, the subject of the plan, is reserved as Regional Open Space under the Greater Bunbury Region Scheme.

During the course of the preparation of Masterplan, there have been several key events and statements of community preference that have occurred. These include strong public support for a water playground on the foreshore opposite the Entertainment Centre, a commitment to plan and develop sister city gardens for Setagaya and Jiaying and major interest in the marine archaeology on the north shore. These matters have all been addressed in the planning process.

The final draft plan has been designed to be implemented in manageable components over time as resources become available.

Analysis of Financial and Budget Implications

The financial and budget impact of the full implementation of the Masterplan is substantial and beyond the resources of the City alone to achieve. Hence, it is essential that there is State and Commonwealth Government financial support for the implementation.

The first step in progressing the implementation of the plan will be to provide the necessary funds to prepare the detailed designs for selected precincts (e.g. Precincts: 2 – Water Playground; 3 – Bicentennial Square; and 4 – Friendship Gardens). In this regard, proposals for this work will be included in the 10 year financial plan and 2013/14 budget for consideration by Council.

An important consideration in the process of design and development will be the assessment of the cost to Council of ongoing maintenance of improvements and asset management. Clearly the high standard of amenity envisaged in the Masterplan can only be achieved with an appropriate level of management and maintenance.

Community Consultation

A report on community consultation is **attached** at Appendix [DSI-3](#).

Councillor/Officer Consultation

Over the past 12 months, there have been nine meetings of the Project Management Group which has included the Mayor, Deputy Mayor, Cr Steele, Cr Morris, the City's

Landscape Architect, the Team Leader of Strategic Planning (on behalf of Mr Karaszewych) and the City Engineer (or his nominee).

Minutes of Project Management Group meetings have previously been included with Council Agendas, and further Minutes are included this round. Council has been briefed on progress at formal Briefing sessions. The public consultation process also provided several opportunities for Councillors and staff to obtain information on the project and/or contribute to the Masterplan development.

Strategic Relevance

The draft Masterplan is consistent with the following Strategic Objectives and Strategies:

1. *Strategic Objective 4* is to Implement the City Vision Strategy. The Action Plan states;

“Allocate sufficient resources for the planning and development of the Leschenault Inlet Regional Park so that the area is established as a major tourist and recreation attraction.”

The City Vision Strategy also provided a clear preference for civic, cultural and tourist orientated uses and for any development to be low impact.
2. *Strategic Objective 5* is to Promote Ecological Sustainable Development of the City's Built Environment. The Masterplan places a high emphasis on the conservation of the natural values of the Inlet and improving the water quality in the Inlet. The Masterplan also promotes the integration of management effort through the rationalization of management orders and vestings.
3. *Strategic Objective 6* is to Develop Social Capital. There has been comprehensive community engagement in the planning process and the recommended strategies for implementation are designed to foster a sense of community.

Economic, Social, Environmental and Heritage Issues

Economic

The economic impact of the Masterplan when implemented is expected to be extremely positive as the City will have major new attractions for tourism and recreation as well as opportunities for development investment. In addition the viability of CBD retailing will be enhanced with improved amenity and increased visitations generated by new attractions.

Social

A primary objective of the Masterplan is to provide accessible, family friendly open space and public amenities with opportunities to undertake a variety of recreational activities. This contributes to healthier and more cohesive communities.

Environmental

A strong theme that emerged through the public and stakeholder consultation was the need to conserve the natural values of the Inlet and improve the water quality. Key areas such as the white mangrove colony have been designated for conservation and nature based tourism and recreation. In addition nutrient stripping and waste trapping facilities have been incorporated in the design.

Heritage

Running concurrently with the Masterplan study has been the maritime archaeological survey and excavations covering Lots 881, 882 and 883 Koombana Drive. Although incomplete at this point in time, there has been several significant finds which will make a major contribution to our knowledge of the early whaling industry that prospered in and around Koombana Bay 200 years ago.

The Masterplan makes explicit recommendations for the conservation and interpretation of the marine archaeology in Precinct 9.

Outcome – Council Committee Meeting 4 December 2012

The Executive recommendation (as printed) was moved Cr Kelly, seconded Cr Cook.

The Mayor put the motion to the vote and was adopted to become the Committee's recommendation on the matter.

It was requested that the UNANIMOUS vote in favour of the recommendation be recorded.

Outcome – Council Meeting 11 December 2012

The recommendation (as printed) from the Council (Standing) Committee was moved Cr Kelly, seconded Deputy Mayor Cr Craddock.

The Mayor put the motion to the vote and was adopted to become the Council's decision on the matter.

Council Decision 380/12

That Council resolves to:

- 1. Adopt the Leschenault Inlet draft report for the purposes of advertising for public submissions, and***
- 2. Advertise the Leschenault Inlet draft report for public comment from the 18 December 2012 until the end of January 2013.***

CARRIED

9 votes "for" / 1 vote "against"

It was requested that the votes be recorded as follows:

For: Mayor D Smith, Deputy Mayor Cr Craddock, Cr Jones, Cr Leigh, Cr Steele, Cr Kelly, Cr McNeill, Cr Cook, Cr Morris
Against: Cr Steck