

# CITY OF ARMADALE

## AGENDA

OF SPECIAL COMMUNITY SERVICES COMMITTEE TO BE HELD IN THE  
COMMITTEE ROOM, ADMINISTRATION CENTRE, 7 ORCHARD AVENUE,  
ARMADALE ON MONDAY, 14 NOVEMBER 2005 AT 5.30 PM

---

**PRESENT:**

**APOLOGIES:**

**OBSERVERS:**

**IN ATTENDANCE:**

---

**DISCLAIMER**

The Disclaimer for protecting Councillors and staff from liability of information and advice given at Committee meetings to be read by the Chairman.

**DECLARATION OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS**

---

**QUESTION TIME**

---

**BUSINESS OF THE MEETING**

---

**The issue of the Performing Area at the Former Kelmscott Site at Rushton Park**

**INDEX**

**SPECIAL COMMUNITY SERVICES COMMITTEE**

14 November 2005

---

**RECREATION**

REDEVELOPMENT OF FORMER KELMSCOTT POOL SITE – PERFORMING SPACE ..... 3-8

***REDEVELOPMENT OF FORMER KELMSCOTT POOL SITE – PERFORMING SPACE***

WARD River  
FILE REF: A178691  
DATE 9 November 2005  
REF PGQ  
RESPONSIBLE Executive Director  
MANAGER Community Services

**In Brief:**

This report:

- responds to recent discussions at the Community Services Committee and Council and in particular, Council’s Resolution C101/10/05 which in part states:

*“b. recommit the issue of the performing area at the earliest possible date, to a Special Meeting of the Community Services Committee.”*

Recommends that Council:

- a. rescind part of Council Resolution C76/7/05 of 1 August 2005 relating to the performance structure design contained within the draft Concept Plans for the redevelopment of the former Kelmscott Pool Site and foreshore area at Rushton Park.
- b. consider and approve an alternative design for an outdoor shade structure at the former Kelmscott Pool site at Rushton Park similar to the gazebo recently installed at Kuhl Park;
- c. endorse the Chief Executive Officer or his delegate to approve the final design and installation of an outdoor shade structure at the former Kelmscott Pool site at Rushton Park.

**Tabled Items**

Nil

**Officer Interest Declaration**

Nil

**Strategic Implications**

Relates to Council’s aim to maintain and upgrade physical infrastructure for the economic and physical well being of the local community.

**Legislation Implications**

Nil

**Council Policy/Local Law Implications**

Nil

**Budget/Financial Implications**

Funds allocated in Council’s 2005/06 budget for the overall redevelopment of the site together with grant funds secured for this project are sufficient to cover the scope of works proposed.

### **Consultation**

- Extensive consultation with the local community following the closure of the Kelmscott Pool.
- Western Australian Planning Commission
- Swan River Trust
- Dept of Environment
- Technical Services Staff
- Recent workshops at Kelmscott Hall and Primary School for Story Wall project.
- Private Meeting (by invitation only) held at Kelmscott Primary School on 2 November 2005

### **BACKGROUND**

Following the decision to close Kelmscott Pool in May 2003, an amount of \$10,000 was allocated in Council's 2003/04 budget to undertake community consultation and prepare concept plans for the redevelopment of the site. A Reference Group was established to oversee the study and present the draft concept plans to Council.

Strategic Leisure Planning was appointed to undertake the study and an extensive consultation process was followed to seek the views of local residents as to how the site might best be developed. Although a number of people used the consultation process to express their disappointment with Council's decision to close the pool, the people that participated in the process put forward a range of positive and worthwhile ideas on the future development of the site.

The draft concept plan was presented for Council's initial consideration via the December 2003 Community Services Committee Meeting, and it was subsequently resolved that the plans be released for a six week public comment period.

The draft plans were put on display at the Kelmscott Library, advertisements were placed in local newspapers and letters sent to those people who had participated in the consultation process, inviting their comment. A total of 21 responses were received by the closure of the public comment period, with the majority being supportive. The final Consultant's Report and Concept Plan was presented for Council's consideration in March 2004.

Previous reports to Council have outlined the proposed redevelopment of the former Kelmscott Pool Site and foreshore area at Rushton Park and planning for the project has been completed with approvals obtained from both the Western Australian Planning Commission and Swan River Trust. The upgrade of the foreshore area will include new pathways, playground equipment, lighting, barbeques, eating and picnic tables. The redevelopment of the pool site will include concourse paving, outdoor shade structure, (capable of being used for performances), historic story wall (recording the history of the Kelmscott pool), lighting and refurbishment of the public toilets and changerooms. The aim is to create a family-oriented space that will record the history of the site, have a number of uses including the potential for community performances and functionis and will encourage people to use the Park for picnics, barbeques and family visits. A number of grants have been received in support of this project.

A report presented to the October 2005 Community Services Committee Meeting advised of recent correspondence received from two residents outlining some concerns with the former Kelmscott Pool site redevelopment. Following considerable discussion on this matter, the Community Services Committee recommended (C101/10/05) that Council reaffirm its previous resolution in relation to the redevelopment of the former Kelmscott pool site and foreshore area at Rushton Park in line with the approved concept plans.

Approximately 50 people attended a private meeting (by invitation only) held at the Kelmscott Primary School on 2 November 2005 with discussion taking place on the various aspects of the proposed redevelopment. Councillors Butterfield and Zelones, the Acting Chief Executive Officer and the Manager Recreation Services were in attendance at that meeting. The meeting passed a motion requesting that Council defer works at the site to allow further consultation to occur.

The matter was again discussed at the Ordinary Council Meeting held on 7 November and Council Resolved as follows:

*“That Council:*

- a. Reaffirm its previous resolution in relation to the redevelopment of the former Kelmscott pool site and foreshore area at Rushton Park in line with the approved concept plans.*
- b. Recommit the issue of the performing area at the earliest possible date to a special meeting of the Community Services Committee.*
- c. Administratively advise the two residents who have written to the City accordingly.”*

This report responds to part (b) of the above Council resolution and presents some options regarding the proposed performance facility for further consideration.

## **DETAILS OF PROPOSAL**

The Concept Plan, approved by Council, promotes the development of the site as a quality passive open space that seeks to make best use of the natural attraction and historical significance of the site. The key elements of the Concept Plan include: an outdoor covered area, (capable of being used for functions); historic story wall (recording the history of the pool); toilets and changerooms; paving delineating the former pool area; pathways and lighting; playground; picnic and barbeque facilities.

The consultation that followed the closure of the Kelmscott Pool identified that there was no suitable venue or facility in Kelmscott where outdoor concerts, performances and functions could be held. The view was expressed that all events of this nature currently take place in Armadale and general support was expressed for the idea of creating a suitable complementary and alternative space for small outdoor functions as part of the redevelopment of the site.

A “Music Shell” was included on the original concept plan and although a small number of residents expressed some concerns about possible noise problems, there was general support for such a facility to be included in the overall redevelopment of the site. A grant of \$110,000

(inclusive of GST) was secured from the Commonwealth Department of Transport and Regional Services (DOTARS) for the proposed structure and Story Wall.

In researching possible designs for the proposed structure, it became evident that the cost to design and construct a Music Shell with high acoustic qualities would be well in excess of the funding available for this project. It was not Council's intention that this redevelopment would seek to replace the need for a quality performing arts facility within the City, but rather provide an outdoor venue capable of supporting functions at an existing site. It was also acknowledged that given the nature of the site, most if not all of the concerts, performances or functions likely to be held at the site, would require amplified sound.

The consultant's Brief was to produce a design for a performance space that was:

- Aesthetically attractive and complemented the ambience of the site;
- A feature of the site rather than just one of a number of elements;
- Low maintenance and did not create any hidden areas at the back;
- Provided a covered stage area of approximately 80m<sup>2</sup> with three phase power supply and lighting; and
- Within budget.

Preliminary plans and artist impression drawings of the structure were presented to the July 2005 Community Services Committee Meeting as part of the overall concept plan for the site, and were subsequently endorsed by Council.

In light of recent concerns expressed by a few members of the community and Council's recommittal of that element of the redevelopment (covered area capable of being used for outdoor key functions), the following options are presented for consideration:

1. Retain the approved design
2. Prepare an alternative design
3. Purchase and install a Gazebo type structure
4. Not proceed with a Performance Facility on the site, but include a paved area together with access to a power source.
5. Not proceed with a Performance Facility or any associated works.

## COMMENT

### Analysis

The following brief comments are made regarding the above options:

- The purpose of the structure was to provide a covered area capable of being used for outdoor functions which was multi-functional in design and provide access to power and lighting, as well as provide weather proofing for both rain and sunny conditions.

- The current design was approved by Council at its meeting held on 1 August 2005, and notwithstanding the concerns expressed by a few members of the community, the design is not considered inappropriate and Council may be happy to proceed as planned.
- If Council does wish to consider an alternative design for an outdoor shade structure, it could request the Consultant Architect to further research this matter and come back with alternative concepts. Some additional costs would be incurred if this were the preferred option as well as some time lost through briefing, design and recovering of the Committee.
- An alternative reduced cost option would be to install a Gazebo structure in lieu of the proposed structure. There are a range of different designs available and Council could choose an “off the shelf” product or have a Gazebo specifically designed for the site. Some examples of different Gazebo designs, as well as the previously approved design, will be available for viewing at the meeting. Should this be the preferred option consideration will need to be given as to whether the purpose of the grant could be amended and clarification on this matter will need to be sought. It is possible that some of the grant funds may need to be returned and Council may need to fully fund a Gazebo from its own resources.
- Option 4 would allow Council the opportunity to provide a paved area and access to an appropriate power source but without a covered structure to identify it. As with the above comment, it is likely that if this is the decision of Council, then some of the grant funds will need to be returned.

### Options

As outlined above.

### Conclusion

The critical issues for Council to determine are:

1. Whether it wishes to proceed with the proposed outdoor shade structure or not;
2. Whether it wishes to undertake any further consultation on the matter.

Based on the consultation that has occurred to date, if Council believes that the community is generally supportive of an outdoor shade structure being provided at the site, then it comes back to a decision on the design and size of the facility. Unless Council has changed its view with regard to the approved design, option 1 would be recommended.

If Council wishes to further consult with the community on the issue of an outdoor shade structure, it could do so by way of a simple survey to local residents. This could be done relatively quickly (within 6 weeks) for a cost of approximately \$1,500 (postage costs).

Given recent discussions at both the Community Services Committee and Council, there is a view that the current proposed design for the structure is not universally acceptable and as a consequence, Council may wish to consider a variation to that design. Based upon the proposed



uses of the Park and in particular this space, it is the officer's view that a structure of some type should be installed, as opposed to no structure. Should Council determine to select an alternative gazebo-style design, similar to recent installations at Kuhl Park and Bernice Hargraves Reserve, the potential cost will be determined by both the size and design selected, together with any associated works related to lighting, seating, power supply and paving and Council will need to provide an indication of its requirements. In addition, and as outlined above, it is possible that a change in design may affect the grant conditions and as a consequence, some of the grant funds may need to be returned and Council may need to fully fund a structure from its own resources.

Council is advised that it has previously endorsed the draft Concept Plans for the Rushton Park Redevelopment including the performance structure and as a consequence it will need to rescind part of its previous resolution (C76/7/05) if the intention is to approve an alternative design related to that structure. For ease of reference Resolution C76/7/05 states:

- "1. *That Council:*
- a. *endorse the draft concept plans for the redevelopment of the former Kelmscott Pool site and foreshore area at Rushton Park as attached to these Minutes at Attachment "A-3".*
  - b. *endorse the radiating paving design for the former pool and concourse area of the site as attached to these Minutes at Attachment "A-3";*
2. *That the detailed design for the Story Wall be circulated to Councillors for comment prior to the installation of the wall and artwork."*

### **RECOMMEND**

#### **That Council:**

- a. **rescind part of Council Resolution C76/7/05 of 1 August 2005 relating to the performance structure design contained within the draft Concept Plans for the redevelopment of the former Kelmscott Pool Site and foreshore area at Rushton Park.**
- b. **consider and approve an alternative design for an outdoor shade structure at the former Kelmscott Pool site at Rushton Park similar to the gazebo recently installed at Kuhl Park;**
- c. **endorse the Chief Executive Officer or his delegate to approve the final design and installation of an outdoor shade structure at the former Kelmscott Pool site at Rushton Park.**

**Moved**

**MOTION CARRIED/LOST ( )**