



BRRAG

Belmont Resident and Ratepayer Action Group Inc.

“To provide an effective voice for the people of Belmont”

26 May 2020

Mayor and Councillors
City of Belmont

Dear Mayor and Councillors

We have previously written to you regarding inconsistencies in the documentation provided by Officers in the agenda items that you will subsequently vote on. We bring to your attention item 12.4 at tonight's Ordinary Council Meeting - Disposal of Interest in Land.

Inconsistency in the number of dwellings at 16 Marina Drive:

1. Page 45 Ordinary Council Meeting (OCM) AGENDA 26 May 2020 reports 90 dwellings
2. Page 48 OCM AGENDA 26 May 2020 reports 91 dwellings
3. Page 46, Minutes of the ORDINARY COUNCIL MEETING 25 February 2020 Item 12.3. reports 91 dwellings

So a fair question to ask is how many dwellings is there 90 or 91?

Inaccuracy determining whether an easement for the drain pipe is required.

1. On page 46, OCM 25 February 2020 Item 12.3 – The City reports ‘notwithstanding the proposed easement for the public art piece, there is a minor intrusion into the airspace lot from a PVC drainage pipe affixed to the underside of the balcony slab. There is concern that the drain pipe will adversely impact on the aesthetics of the building facade and public art-piece. It is therefore necessary to architecturally treat the drainage pipe and also formalise this intrusion through an easement’. Here the City reports the protrusion needs to be formalised.
2. On page 51 OCM 25 February 2020 Item 12.3 – The City reports the drainage easement is considered minor in nature. There is no other drainage infrastructure from the development protruding into the public domain. The encroachment is necessary due to the overhang of the balcony and the requirements under the National Construction Code for drainage infrastructure to comply with stormwater flow rates’. Here it is indicated the drainage is for the balcony above the easement.
3. On page 48 OCM AGENDA 26 May 2020, Item 12.4 – The City notes ‘In addition to the easement for the public artwork, the developer initially installed a minor drainage pipe on the southern wall of the development. This drainage pipe has since been removed by the developer and an easement is no longer required. A copy of the updated Deposited Plan is contained as Attachment 13’. This is inaccurate because anything that intrudes on public space owned by the City of Belmont, requires an easement.

Regarding these three inconsistencies which one if any is correct?

Inaccuracy of owners' details

For historical purposes identification of the owner(s) is necessary.

1. Page 47, OCM 25 February 2020 Item 12.3, Figure 1: states owner is 16 Marina Drive Ascot Pty Ltd, and
2. Page 44 OCM AGENDA 26 May 2020 states owner is 16 Marina Drv Pty Ltd

It would be a fair question to ask who is the owner?

Inaccurate reporting of width of the multi-use paving at the locations of the public artwork infrastructure

1. Figure 6 Page 52, OCM AGENDA 26 May 2020 reports the western Boardwalk to be 4.4 meters wide. This is inaccurate. it is 4.3 meters from the solid boundary wall to the water's edge.
2. Figure 6, Page 52, 26 OCM AGENDA 26 May 2020 omission from the figure of the street lights and safety bollards protruding into the multi-use shared path width of 4.3 meters by 500-650 millimetres to accurately assess the available space for shared use access is not detailed and amounts therefore to 3.0 meters not the stated 3.5 meters.
3. Page 51, OCM Agenda 26 May 2020 omission of detail to accurately assess the width of the Boardwalk because the artwork, protrudes 0.5 meters impacts the Boardwalk. The true Boardwalk width by only 2.8 meters at the narrowest section of the boardwalk on the eastern side, 2.9 meters on the southern side and 2.93 meters on the western side, allowing for street light posts and safety bollards. On the western side the distance from the solid wall to the inner side of the bollard and street light posts is 2.93 meters and does not, please note, include space for the green waste bins.
4. Page 51, OCM Agenda 26 May 2020). The City states that 'a standard pathway in the City of Belmont starts at a width of 1.5 metres and a principal shared used pathway is approximately 3.5 metres in width, the encroachment of the artwork is not considered to impact significantly on the width of the boardwalk'. The latter part of this statement does not accurately reflect the actual circumstance.

We have four choices with this one. So what is the width of the paving at the location of the artwork?

The reason this needs to be brought to your attention, is because these reports should be accurate and consistent. Any decisions you make on this, or any other item that comes before council, if inaccurate could affect any decision you make. The expectation of the community is that our councillors will make the best decisions on any items that come before them. This can only be done on the assumption that what you receive from Officers is correct and accurate.

Please be advised this letter and your response will go on the BRRAG website for the purpose of transparency for the residents of Belmont.

Lisa Hollands
President BRRAG

