

Assess No.	Response	Officer Comments
A6543	<p>Object to the new proposed rate based on the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The City in January 2017, recommended council accept a rate review of \$29.79/m². This action was taken despite the City being made aware by the Woodsome Management consultants that an incorrect costing in excess of \$5.5m for Western Power service relocations remained in the DCP costings. 2. The City Executive explained it was necessary to expedite the rate review as like the previous review, the City faced failing to meet the requirements of the State Planning Policy 3.6 (SPP3.6) to complete the review in the nominated period of 12 months. Once again we are placed in the same position. 3. During 2017 at the expense of the Forrestfield Industrial Stage One, the fund financed the completion of the Woodsome Management consultant review. Based on inputs supplied by the City the consultant further confirmed the Western Power service relocation costs were incorrect and together with other adjustments declared the new rate to be \$18.70/m² as part of their final analysis of the DCP. 4. The new rate was presented to council for consideration in September 2017 and again presented to council for endorsement at the OCM held on the 30th October 2017. It was at this stage councillors deferred the item to further investigate the City Planning staffs costings requiring explanation for the \$11 per square metre rate variance. (\$5.5m reduction in estimates). 5. Clearly the reduction resulted due to unsubstantiated costs included in the rate calculation relating to the Western Power service relocations and the subsequent over cost to land owners 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The January 2017 review of the Development Contribution Plan (DCP) highlighted the need for the City to undertake a comprehensive review of utility cost estimates. This was undertaken in the subsequent review and presented to Council for public advertising. 2. The DCP review has been prepared to account for development and works until 30 June 2017. 3. Noted. 4. The item was deferred to allow detailed designs and geotechnical investigations to progress for the Nardine / Ashby Close connection and various intersection upgrades. Another contributing factor was development compliance relating to drainage issues being experienced in the general area. 5. Previous reviews were based on the best information available to the City at that point in time. Cost estimations were received from Western

	<p>who made contributions, including those incorrect costings. The reason for these inclusions have yet to be satisfactorily clarified by the City.</p> <p>6. The executive have now decided to dismiss the findings and rate evaluation of Woodsome Management consultants and excluding them from the re-assessment of the rate review.</p> <p>7. The resultant rate provided by the City staff being \$20.92 presented to council for advertising in March 2018 for advertising. This increase in rate, relates to increased costs of approximately \$850,000 above costs provided to the consultants by City staff in late 2017. Once again the review has been changed at the last minute and once again the validity of the costings are in dispute, with the inclusion of costs not related to the DCA.</p> <p>8. The City's inability to provide an accurate rate has once again stalled the development of this area, with developer's understandably delaying the payment of contributions, being aware of the \$110,000 per hectare over cost due to the release of the rate indicated by the consultant. (Current rate payable \$29.79/m2.)</p> <p>9. The Woodsome Management evaluation provided for the rate review to be delivered on time and in accordance with the provisions of SPP3.6. Once again the City's late intervention has</p>	<p>Power and other utility providers with contingencies included within the estimates.</p> <p>6. Woodsome were not engaged to review the DCP Report since Council's deferral on 30 October 2017. The timing of the delivery of infrastructure estimates did not provided sufficient time for an external review. Woodsome have assisted the City with a final review of the documentation, inputs and calculations and have provided the City an outcomes report.</p> <p>7. The increase in costs primarily relate to revisions to infrastructure estimates in response to more detailed geotechnical investigations, pavement assessments and design.</p> <p>8. Noted, the City is working to finalise the DCP Report review at the earliest opportunity.</p> <p>9. Comments are noted, Council deferred the rate adoption for the purposes of advertising because of issues that arose during construction.</p>
--	--	---

	<p>delayed the progression of the development by once again likely to deliver the new rate six months late.</p> <p>10. Scrutiny of the increased costs not established in the initial assessment and those not related to this DCA will need to be and can be conducted prior to establishing the final rate and prior to endorsement by the council.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Drainage issues on intersection of City roads Berkshire and Ashby Close. b) Extension of Road 2A no longer necessary with WAPC decisions on internalization with the removal of lot size reduction. <p>c) Increase administration costs beyond contracted percentage.</p> <p>d) Review of municipal costs charged to the Trust account.</p> <p>11. The prime objective of the administrator of the trust is to establish the true cost to deliver this project in a fair, transparent, timely and accountable process and that is what is expected.</p>	<p>10.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Noted. The City is currently working with the owners of Lot 7 Ashby to address the matter of onsite drainage. b) The proposed design of Road 2A ending in a cul-de-sac ensures an equitable outcome, with all properties within the LSP area achieving at minimum RAV 4 access. The Road 2A cul-de-sac also ensures the separation of residential traffic from the industrial area heavy vehicle traffic. While it is acknowledged that the urbanisation of Forrestfield North will increase traffic in the area generally it is also of equal benefit to the industrial area to avoid the residential traffic utilising RAV access routes to reduce conflicts and improve freight efficiency. c) Administration costs are based on projected estimates only. d) The DCP is not run as a Trust it is a restricted Reserve fund. <p>11. The 2016-17 annual review included a \$20,000 allowance for staff time and project management costs. Until the 30 June 2017, approx. \$60,000 in</p>
--	---	--

		<p>staff time had been incurred with only \$20,000 estimated and thus recovered. It is recommended that Council include \$70,000 for staff time and project management costs in the 2017-18 review to ensure these costs are recovered. This is an estimate and the actual cost of staff time is only ever recovered from the DCP.</p>
A189555	<p>Part 1 of submission</p> <p>Object to the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 2.2.1 Berkshire Rd. There is no reason to replace this 700m of concrete path. It is in excellent condition, and while not 2.5m wide (app 1.8m), it is offset from the road and will need to be replaced with any medium term upgrade of Berkshire Rd associated with increased traffic from the station and FFN. Land owners that are, and have developed recently, have replaced damaged sections of the path as they were. It would be irresponsible to dig these up again to widen by ½m. There are overhead power lines remaining to only 2 properties on Berkshire Rd. All other owners have paid for their own underground feeds so this item should be removed. 2. 2.2.7 Sultana Rd West. Widen carriageway on 1 side only as this item still refers to a "50% contribution". It would be much simpler, more accurate and less confusing to have description and costings of upgrade to one side of the road only and drop the 50% reference. 3. 2.2.11 Bush Forever. This site was purchased by Bush Forever in 1999. It has been fenced, maintained and managed by them for 14 years before this LSP and DCP were endorsed. Their guide 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Advice received has indicated that widening of a shared path is an acceptable practice and accordingly the estimates have been updated to allow for widening of the existing paths to 2.5m. Overhead lines will remain as it is dependent on the timing of upgrades. 2. The DCP report is required to be consistent with the infrastructure items listed in Schedule 12 of the Local Planning Scheme No. 3, which refers to a "50% contribution" of Sultana Road West. 3. The matter regarding Bush Forever fencing has been discussed with the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage and it is their expectation that

	<p>lines suggest contribution schemes can only be required to pay for fencing if an area is to be set aside for Bush Forever during subdivision. This existing, owned and fenced site does not meet their criteria and therefore does not require our DCP to pay for a fencing upgrade.</p> <p>4. 2.3 Land for Road Reserve. Land acquired from Lot 60 Milner Rd for the required RAV 7 turning at the Nardine / Milner intersection amounts to a truncation of approx. 15m or 112m² in total. Land to be purchased from Lots 16 and 17 Berkshire Rd for the same turning requirement for Road 1 are listed as 300m² each which is a truncation of approx. 24.5m. Land from lot 547 Berkshire Rd for Road 1 is listed as 2 x 239.5m² which equates to 21.9m truncation for the same RAV 7 turning requirements. If 112m² was sufficient for the RAV 7 turning corner at Lot 60 (Nardine / Milner), then why are we buying an extra 629m² at \$220 = \$138,380 for Road 1?</p> <p>5. As lot 50 Sultana Rd will not be sub-divided the road reserve will not be required beyond the turning circle on lot 51. This will reduce land purchase requirement of 69m x 20m = 1360m² x \$220 = \$299,200 plus any road construction costs that have been included.</p>	<p>the DCP repay the cost of the fencing. This infrastructure item is also included in Schedule 12 (I) of the Local Planning Scheme No. 3.</p> <p>4. The intersection at Nardine/Milner may not be a fair comparison – it is a compromised design to avoid land impacts and relocation of transformer. Since the DCP report was advertised the draft designs for Bonser Road have been developed and indicate a need for 132m² for Lot 16 and 76m² for Lot 17. The DCP report has been updated accordingly.</p> <p>5. In October 2018 the Western Australian Planning Commission advised the City that it would support criteria to enable subdivision with minimum lot size of 3,000m² and composite development provisions for Lot 50 Sultana Road West. In regard to Road 2a, the spur from the cul-de-sac at the end of the road will no longer be included as an item in the DCP, reducing the land acquisition area by approximately 1,185m². In the event that Lot 50 is subdivided, the spur may be required to be constructed and ceded through the subdivision process and at the cost of the subdivider.</p>
--	---	---

	<p>6. Supply and install street trees. There is provision for \$141,300 for street trees. This amount should be removed from the DCP. With a 10m wide road, a footpath of 2.5m offset from the road and swale drains there is insufficient room to install street trees except in the bottom of the swale. There is no sense in placing trees in Milner Rd because just as they are reaching maturity, someone else will have to pay to remove them for future planned road widening. As this is a transport and logistics area, street trees would become a grave safety issue for truck drivers exiting properties. As is the case in areas such as Subiaco and Dalkeith, truck drivers are not able to see approaching traffic under tree canopies as car drivers can. This means that the truck driver must protrude into the carriageway in order to see past the trees. Of all of the properties developed since the start of the DCP 5 years ago, the owners have all installed and maintained their own verge landscapes.</p>	<p>6. Following a review of all roads in the DCP area, the following updated street tree items have been applied:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Berkshire Road – No changes. b) Milner Road – remove all trees given constraints associated with the location of utilities. c) Nardine/Ashby (Road 2a) – no changes. d) Bonser Road (Road 1) – 24 trees. e) Sultana Road West – 51 trees. <p>Regarding the sightlines required for truck drivers, this will depend on the selection of a suitable species of tree. The details of tree species are yet to be determined.</p>
	<p>7. Maintenance of street trees and verges for 2 years. State Planning Policy 3.6 states; “The <i>contributions are for the initial capital requirements only and not for ongoing maintenance and/or operating costs of the infrastructure.</i>” When does the 2 year period start from? Owners have been maintaining their own verges since completion of their developments during the last 5 years. CoK has not contributed in any way. The amount of \$53,860 listed for verge maintenance should be removed from the schedule.</p> <p>8. Replacement of existing pavement at Berkshire / Milner intersection. As Berkshire Rd is already a MRWA RAV 7 route, CoK, as owner of Berkshire Rd, would have had to authorise and approve such usage. This authorisation means that CoK deemed the road and pavement suitable for RAV 7 use. If the existing pavement of Berkshire Rd at this intersection needs maintenance</p>	<p>7. Schedule 12 (k) of the Local Planning Scheme No. 3 includes the provision of maintenance. Where trees are required to be installed (see point 6 above), it is an established practice that landscaping is maintained for a minimum period of two years to optimise survival rates. The two-year period commences at the time of planting.</p> <p>8. Review of this item has concluded that the existing pavement at this intersection is estimated to be due for replacement in approximately 5 years. The City and consulting engineers involved with infrastructure upgrades to the Forrestfield / High</p>

	<p>or replacement, then that cost should not be borne solely by the DCP but by the normal CoK road maintenance process.</p> <p>9. Appendix 8.1 Berkshire Rd. 3.4 Dem & dispose redundant footpath --- rate should be <\$20/ m ie 700m x \$20 = \$14,000. There is no reason to replace this 700m of concrete path. It is in excellent condition, and while not 2.5m wide (app 1.8m), it is offset from the road and will need to be replaced with any medium term upgrade of Berkshire Rd associated with increased traffic from the station and FFN. Land owners that are, and have developed recently, replaced damaged sections as they were. It would be irresponsible to dig these up again to widen by ½m.</p> <p>10. 8.2 Milner Rd.</p> <p>a) 3.4 Dem & dispose redundant footpath --- rate should be <\$20/ m ie 1490m x \$20 = \$29,800.</p> <p>b) 3.5 Dem & dispose redundant kerbing --- Should be only 570m x \$2.73 = \$1556. As only 1 side of the road is being widened, the total length is only 700m approx. less 50m approx. costed in appendix 8.7 Nardine intersection and 80m approx. costed in appendix 8.8 Berkshire intersection.</p> <p>c) 5.1 Supply & install 220mm limestone --- Should be 1.5m x 700m x 220mm = 231m³</p> <p>d) 5.2 Supply & install 100mm road base--- Should be 700m x 1.5m x 100mm = 105m³</p>	<p>Wycombe Industrial area have advised that a full reseal will be required.</p> <p>9. See comment 1 above regarding the need to replace footpath. Regarding the rate for demolishing and disposing of redundant footpath, a review of more recent costings shows rates are typically <\$20/m². The rate has been amended to suit.</p> <p>10.</p> <p>a) A review of more recent costings shows rates are typically <\$20/m². The rate has been amended to suit.</p> <p>b) Costings have been reviewed and based on widening of both sides to 10m total width. It is understood that the perceived discrepancy is due to an incorrect reference being made to the road being widened to only 8m wide in the DCP report. The road width changed from 8m to 10m in 2013.</p> <p>c) Refer to 10 (b) above.</p> <p>d) Refer to 10 (b) above.</p>
--	--	---

	<p>e) 5.3 Supply & install 7mm primer --- Should be 700m x 1.2m = 840m² (minus the area of Nardine and Berkshire intersections which are costed separately)</p> <p>f) 5.4 Supply & install 30mm AC10 ---- 700m x 1.2m = 840m² (minus the area of Nardine and Berkshire intersections which are costed separately)</p> <p>g) 5.6 Supply & install 1600m SMK ---. (see comment 10 above) --- Should be 570m x \$20.48 + \$11,673.60</p> <p>h) 7.3 Supply and install trees --- (See comments 6) ---- Remove 75 x \$450 = \$33,750.</p> <p>i) 7.4 Maintenance trees & verges. (See comment 7) --- Should be removed, but note \$22,707.50 for 700m (1 side of road) is almost twice the rate for Road 1. (2 sides x 350m)</p> <p>j) 7.6 Relocate light poles. Should be removed as it is covered by item 7.2 Supply and install street lighting x 700m.</p> <p>11. 8.4 Road 1. 7.4 Supply and install trees. (See comment 6). Remove 175 x \$450 = \$78,750</p> <p>12. 7.5 Maintenance trees & verges. (See comment 7). Remove \$12,457.50</p>	<p>e) Refer to 10 (b) above.</p> <p>f) Refer to 10 (b) above.</p> <p>g) Refer to 10 (b) above.</p> <p>h) This item has been removed given constraints associated with the location of utilities.</p> <p>i) See response 7 above.</p> <p>j) This item has been deleted as it is included under item 7.2 Supply and Install Street Lighting.</p> <p>11. The number of trees has been reduced to 24 following review.</p> <p>12. Schedule 12 (k) of the Local Planning Scheme No. 3 includes the provision of maintenance. Where trees are required to be installed (see point 6 above), it is an established practice that landscaping is maintained for a minimum period of two years to optimise survival rates. The two-year period commences at the time of planting.</p>
--	--	---

	<p>13. 8.5 Road 2A. GST should not be included. Remove \$95,000 As lot 50 Sultana Rd will not be sub-divided the road reserve will not be required beyond the turning circle on lot 51. This will reduce land purchase requirement of 69m x 20m = 1360m² x \$220 = \$299,200 plus any road construction costs that have been included.</p> <p>The construction costs appear to be about 30% higher than Road 1 which is around the same length, but as there are no details in the appendix it is impossible to compare the costings!!</p> <p>14. 8.6 Sultana Rd.</p> <p>a) 5.1 Supply & install 220mm limestone - Should be 220mm x 1.5m x 850m = 280m³ not 682m³.</p> <p>b) 5.2 Supply & install 100mm roadbase - Should be 100mm x 1.5m x 850m = 127.5m³.</p> <p>c) 5.3 Supply & install 7mm primer. ---Should be 850m x 1.2m = 1020m²</p> <p>d) 5.4 Supply & install 30mm AC10. ----Should be 850m x 1.2m = 1020m²</p> <p>e) 5.7 Supply & install 6 pram ramps. Only 2 pram ramps required. (Milner and Brae corners)</p>	<p>13. GST should not be included. This has been removed. In regard to Road 2a, the spur from the cul-de-sac at the end of the road will no longer be included as an item in the DCP. In the event that Lot 50 is subdivided, the spur will be required to be constructed and ceded through the subdivision process and at the cost of the subdivider.</p> <p>The construction costs have undergone a detailed review and have been adjusted accordingly.</p> <p>14.</p> <p>a) Costings have been reviewed and based on widening of both sides to 10m total width. It is understood that the perceived discrepancy is due to an incorrect reference being made to the road being widened to only 8m wide in the DCP report. The road width changed from 8m to 10m in 2013.</p> <p>b) See 14 (a) above.</p> <p>c) See 14 (a) above.</p> <p>d) See 14 (a) above.</p> <p>e) Review has confirmed the requirement for 6 pram ramps.</p>
--	---	---

	<p>f) 6.1 Remove & replace culvert---- Remove --The only culvert is at corner of Smokebush Pl, not within our area of upgrade.</p> <p>g) 7.2 Supply & install street lighting. ---Should be 425m x \$110 which is ½ of 850m.</p> <p>h) 7.3 Supply and install trees. (See comment 6). Remove 64 x \$450 = \$28800</p> <p>i) 7.4 Maintenance trees & verges. (See comment 7). Remove \$18,696.05</p> <p>j) 7.5 Supply & install select fill for swales. Based on Road 1 figures this should be 162m³</p> <p>k) 7.8 Relocation of power pole at Milner Rd. This estimate should be based on the Nardine /Milner quote as that is a much closer comparison considering 1 pole was removed and 3 new ones were installed as a result. This Milner Rd pole is at the end of its useful life and I would hope that a pro-rata rebate could be obtained from Western Power. Even without a rebate it is assumed a price estimate would be closer to \$100,000 allowing for the extra complexity on this pole against the Nardine pole.</p> <p>15. 8.7 Nardine / Milner intersection.</p> <p>a) 3.2 Dispose of redundant footpath. Should be 80m x \$20m² = \$1600</p>	<p>f) This item has been removed.</p> <p>g) This item has been removed</p> <p>h) Following a review of all roads in the DCP area, there is considered to be capacity for Sultana Road to accommodate 51 street trees. The spreadsheet has been updated accordingly.</p> <p>i) This item has been updated to account for the revised number of trees (see (h) above).</p> <p>j) This item has been removed from the estimates.</p> <p>k) The additional cost has been reviewed and is unchanged. This relocation is substantially more complex than Nardine/Milner.</p> <p>15.</p> <p>a) A review of more recent costings shows rates are typically <\$20/m². The rate has been amended to suit.</p>
--	---	---

	<p>b) 3.3 Dem & dispose redundant kerb. Should be approx. 180m x \$2.73 = \$491.14.</p> <p>c) 5.1-5.5 Roadworks for this corner seem to be for an excessive area, 2110m². Considering the existing roads are 10m in Nardine and 7m in Milner this equates to rebuilding close to a 150m length of Milner Rd.</p> <p>d) 5.7 Supply & install SMK ---- Should be closer to 200m x \$20.48 = \$4096 (refer 3.3 above)</p> <p>e) 7.2 Western Power infrastructure. --- As this has already been completed and paid for, the item should not be included for the percentage calculations for items 1.1, 2.1, 8.1 and 8.3.</p> <p>16. 8.8 Berkshire / Ashby intersection.</p> <p>a) 3.1 Clear large trees. -----There are only 2 stumps at the intersection.</p> <p>17. 8.8 Berkshire / Milner intersection.</p> <p>a) 5.6 Supply & install SMK --- Should be no more than approx. 550m, considering only 485m is being removed.</p> <p>b) 5.9 Supply & install pram ramps. --- Only 2 required as there are no other paths.</p>	<p>b) The revised quantity has been based on the most recent design drawings for the Nardine/Milner intersection.</p> <p>c) The revised quantity has been based on the most recent design drawings for the Nardine/Milner intersection.</p> <p>d) The revised quantity has been based on the most recent design drawings for the Nardine/Milner intersection.</p> <p>e) This comment is correct. Preliminaries and allowances have now been removed from the calculations for the Western Power infrastructure relocations.</p> <p>16.</p> <p>a) This item has been updated to remove costs for clearing.</p> <p>17.</p> <p>a) The revised quantity has been based on the most recent design drawings for the Berkshire/Milner intersection.</p> <p>b) The revised quantity has been based on the most recent design drawings for the Berkshire/Milner intersection. This has identified a requirement for 4 pram ramps.</p>
--	---	--

	<p>c) 7.2 Western power --- As this is separate works quoted, designed managed and carried out by Western Power, the cost should not be used in the percentage calculation of items 1.1, 2.1, 8.1 and 8.3.</p>	<p>c) This comment is correct. Preliminaries and allowances have now been removed from the calculations for the Western Power infrastructure relocations.</p>
	<p>Part 2 of submission</p> <p>1. 8.8 Appendix I - Berkshire / Milner / Dundas intersection. LSP Amendment 88 removed the Dundas Rd upgrade from the LPS because it was not relevant to Stage 1.</p> <p>Design drawings dated Feb 2018 show a substantial rebuilding of approximately 130m of Dundas Rd. This is at a cost of in excess of \$53,000 + percentage lines (ie traffic management, mobilisation, design and superintendence, etc.) The industrial traffic that uses Dundas and Berkshire Rds is derived almost entirely from areas outside Stage 1. All costs for upgrading Dundas Rd must be removed from the DCP.</p> <p>Compared cost schedules and drawings for this intersection from Dec 2016 (RAV 7 option), Oct 2017 draft and Mar 2018 (current). Construction costs have escalated from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • \$107,050 (RAV 7) in Dec 2016 • \$213,835 (RAV 7) in Oct 2017 (+199%) • \$430,717 (RAV 7) in Mar 2018 (+402%) <p>How is this possible, in just 16 months when the basic requirements have not changed, and the same consultants have drawn and priced the upgrade on each occasion?</p>	<p>1. Due to a revised road layout and reinstatement of the intersection at Milner / Berkshire Road there is no longer a requirement to upgrade Dundas Road. While Dundas Road itself is not specifically included, the upgrades to the intersection of Berkshire / Milner Roads does necessitate road upgrades over the Dundas Road section of the general intersection and is a reasonable inclusion to facilitate the movements at Milner / Berkshire.</p> <p>Regarding the Forrestfield Airport Link contribution, the contribution offered by the Joint Venture was reduced given the vehicles which were proposed to be used for the FAL project were changed to 'as of right' vehicles which would not require RAV 4 network status. Therefore, the FAL project does not directly generate a need there is not a direct need for the intersection upgrade.</p>

	<p>Note also that in Sept 2016, the FAL contribution was to be 90% of the cost of Berkshire / Milner intersection upgrade.</p> <p>This contribution was subsequently reduced to \$80,000 which equates to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sep 2016 90% of \$107,050 construction costs. • Dec 2016 75% of \$107,050 construction costs • Oct 2017 37% of \$215,835 construction costs • Mar 2018 15% of \$535,044 construction costs <p>Berkshire Rd and Dundas Rd are both MRWA designated RAV 7 routes. As part of the MRWA RAV approval process, the road owner (in this case CoK), must agree that the road structure is suitable to service the RAV route.</p> <p>If the road surface has deteriorated due to this existing approval and its use by traffic external to Stage 1, then replacement of this surface should be treated as normal CoK maintenance. Any road reconstruction costs, apart from widening of the intersection, must be removed from the DCP.</p> <p>Costs of this upgrade should be apportioned to the DCP in accordance with the actual requirements and needs by the Stage 1 landowners. The rest of the cost needs to be covered by CoK under their normal maintenance and upgrading programmes.</p> <p>2. 7.2 Western Power relocation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oct 2017 Western Power quote (including 30% contingencies \$380,000.) • Mar 2018 Western Power quote \$430,717 <p>This is an increase of \$50,717 or 13% in just 5 months. How can this be justified as they are both listed as quotes?</p>	<p>2. The \$380,000 figure erroneously indicated that this included 30% contingency, however the intent was actually to state "excluding 30% contingency".</p>
--	--	--

	<p>Why was this job not carried out at the \$380,000 quoted price in Sept 2017, at the same time as W/P services were relocated at the Milner / Nardine intersection, which was invoiced and paid for in Sept 2017.</p> <p>Notified by the CoK, prior to Sept 2017 that an order had been supplied to W/P for the works at Berkshire / Milner intersection.</p> <p>This \$50,717 increase cost cannot be charged to the DCP as it is caused by poor management of the scheme by CoK or their Consultants. Landowners cannot be expected to pay for this increase.</p> <p>3. 8.3 Appendix C Nardine / Asby Cl. Street lighting.</p> <p>In June 2017 a representative of Shawmac Pty Ltd stated that they had received a quote from an electrician to install street lighting for the Nardine / Ashby construction project and were ready to proceed. Costing in the Oct 2017 schedule list: Street lighting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Portion A \$68,832 • Portion B \$51,630 • Total \$120,462 <p>The current Mar 2018 schedule lists this total as \$196,771.96. This is an increase of \$76,310 or 63% in just 5 months. How can this increase be justified, especially when a quote had been received in June 2017 and there was no reason the job couldn't have been scheduled for July / Aug 2017 as it was not dependant of any other components of the construction project?</p>	<p>3. The additional \$76,310 includes Western Power's commissioning charge, administration of the installation, additional material and traffic management costs. These were not included in the original \$120,462 figure.</p>
--	--	--

	<p>This additional amount of \$76,310 should be removed from the DCP as it is only there because of mismanagement.</p> <p>4. Any DCP needs to be managed in a professional, responsible and totally accountable manner.</p> <p>5. Comments in this submission relate primarily to what is a lack of responsibility and errors in managing the DCP. It appears that no one is prepared to take on the responsibility, monitor the costs and act in the best interest of the landowners.</p> <p>6. As previously pointed out in submission 1, regarding this DCP review, these cost schedules have contained basic errors from day 1 that have been perpetuated and continue to cause increasing distortion at each review. Each error then costs the DCP extra to correct. This cannot be allowed to continue.</p> <p>7. This DCP is not an endless supply of cash that can be just milked at will or "because we can".</p>	<p>4. Noted.</p> <p>5. The review of the DCP is undertaken using the latest and best information available. The City is responsible for the review of the DCP.</p> <p>6. This is noted, the City is acutely aware of the need to facilitate a detailed and accurate review of the estimates.</p> <p>7. Noted.</p>
<p>A6836</p>	<p>Comments</p> <p>1. Requests a review of the Development Contribution liability on property at 253 Berkshire Rd Forrestfield (Lot 13 on the Structure Plan).</p>	<p>1. The independent review of the DCP by Woodsome Management in September 2017 concluded that the DCP is compliant with the guiding principles under State Planning Policy 3.6.</p> <p>The City has met with the landowner regarding the process of the review under clause 6.5.11.6 of the Local Planning Scheme No. 3. Following Council's adoption of the revised cost contribution relevant to their property. The process will involve an</p>

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. There is very little benefit to my property if any at all from the proposed infrastructure that the Development Contribution is financing. 3. The key principle of a Development Contribution Fund is that the 'beneficiary' pays relative to need. I question whether this fund passes the equity test when it comes to my property as the disparity is excessive. Uplift to properties on Berkshire Rd will be minor and nowhere near the dollar value of the contribution compared to most other properties in the development, where the uplift in value and useability will fare exceed the contribution dollar value. 4. I realise that the funds need to come from somewhere and that I should pay something. However the way things are set up at the moment I am required to part with a significant amount of hard earned money to fund others. I have been advised that in these circumstances it is possible to divide the contribution area in to payment precincts. 5. I propose that the properties fronting Berkshire Rd become a precinct in their own right with a Development Contribution amount relevant to the benefits, particularly since the upgrade to Berkshire Rd has now been removed from the Development scope. I would welcome an independent assessment and be bound by the outcome. I am happy to discuss contributing to costs of any independent assessment. 	<p>appropriately qualified person to undertake a review at the owner's expense.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Contributions are levied uniformly across all developments within the DCP area. Berkshire Road benefits from RAV 7 intersection upgrades with Milner Road and Ashby Close, and connection to Bonser Road and footpath upgrades. 3. The current arrangement requires contributions to be levied uniformly across all developments within the DCP area. The owner is entitled to formalise a review of the apportionment of development contributions in accordance with the Local Planning Scheme No. 3. 4. The idea of 'contribution precincts' is noted in State Planning Policy 3.6. This concept may be considered within the scope of a future review of the DCP. 5. The City has met with the landowner regarding the process of the review under clause 6.5.11.6 of the Local Planning Scheme No. 3. Following Council's adoption of the revised cost contribution relevant to their property. The process will involve an appropriately qualified person to undertake a review at the owner's expense.
--	--	---

<p>A212986</p>	<p>Comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Both consultants and owners have met with the CEO, Mayor, Councillors and planning staff on 4 April 2018. 2. Prior to that meeting Councillors have met with the owners and have understood the personal and emotional stress that has been endured as a result of the transition occurring in the area. 3. Advice received in April 2018 was that the City can consider pre-funding the construction of Road 2A within the industrial area to connect to the boundary of Lot 51. The owners desperately want to achieve road access to their lot this year so they can sell the land and move out of the area. 4. As the financial year is approaching this item is brought to the attention of Councillors to seek support for pre-funding of the road construction to be included in the 2018/2019 budget review. 5. The owners have suffered extreme stress and frustration over ongoing management issues associated with the project, to the extent where it has placed strain on their health and personal circumstances. 6. Council has an opportunity to take positive action as part of the 2018/2019 budget review, and to provide the owners a clear exit strategy and timeframes so they can move forward with their lives. The owners have been affected by lack of certainty and shifting timeframes over 5 years and therefore Council support is sought to resolve this situation. 7. It is clear that the management of the project in the past has been flawed. The City now has a chance to reassure the owners concerns have been heard and that the City values them as long-term residents. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted. 2. Noted. 3. The City has agreed to pre-funding the road and will be initiating a tender process to deliver the infrastructure. 4. See response 3 above. 5. The City understands that the project has provided landowners significant stress over recent years. The City has been working hard to rectify any issues of the past and improve the efficiency in which the project is delivered. 6. See response 3 above. 7. See response 3 above.

	<p>8. The owners have spent the last 5 years living in a family home that cannot be invested in, that cannot be renovated, and may ultimately get demolished to make way for industrial development.</p> <p>9. By supporting their reasonable request Council will change their lives and give them a chance to move on and purchase a new house where they can live with security and certainty.</p> <p>10. The City is urged to take secure positive steps forward to deliver road construction and progress achievable and concrete timeframes.</p> <p>11. Support from all Councillors is urgently sought.</p>	<p>8. Noted.</p> <p>9. See response 3 above.</p> <p>10. See response 3 above.</p> <p>11. See response 3 above.</p>
--	--	--