

Iluka Homeowners' Association Inc.

Minutes of Committee Meeting

Meeting Date: 06/06/2017

Venue: Satterley's Land Sales Office, 3 Romano Crescent, Iluka

In Attendance & Apologies

As per attendance sheet

1. Welcome

- a) The meeting commenced at 7.05pm. SD welcomed Committee Members and requested that all attendees record their attendance in the Register of visitors.
- b) IM proposed a resolution in relation to Item 9.4. It was unanimously agreed to commence meeting with Item 9.4 on the Agenda
- c) Committee were introduced to visitors
- d) A quorum was declared once Item 9 amended May 2017 Minutes proposed for adoption by SD accepted BG and seconded by MK

2. Matters Arising from Previous Minutes

Nil

3. Social Events

- a) Halloween will be on October 31 between 5 and 7pm McCusker Park is booked
- b) The animal farm, the gym bus and coffee van needs to be booked. SD to email MM with contact details
- c) SD noted Ocean Reef Lions' Club is no longer in operation and that it had amalgamated with another Lions Club This being so, they could be approached to run a sausage sizzle at the Halloween event.

4. Correspondence

- a) COJ emailed information about their positive ageing program, the substance of which SD briefly outlined.
- b) Resident DP enquired about the Coastal Development, but MK's reply bounced back,
- c) Residents M and D enquired about their TV reception. SD had a response for them, after contacting Satterleys, and would communicate accordingly.
- d) British Bistro offered their venue for our meetings on Monday or Tuesday evenings. MK will send a non-committal courtesy reply.
- e) A resident reported their daughter had lost her iphone, the resident has been directed to our website for progress.
- f) A member of a newly-formed Homeowners Association has asked for advice on starting a website. He was directed to SDr.
- g) An invoice for hosting the IHOA's Website has been received and passed on to SDr for approval, after which payment will be made
- h) A resident requested permission to paint their fence and SD advised that it has to be cream until such time as the covenant expires.

5. Financial Report

- a) Three property settlements for the month of May
- b) Invoice paid for Website hosting
- c) Account balances tabled.

6. Maintenance

- a) SD received an email from NJ of COJ regarding new plants and where they are being planted. Need to check location of Cook Island Pines on Shenton Ave. Need to rethink the use of grasstrees, as their success rate is not good.
- b) COJ liaising with Satterleys for handover of Blackpool Park
- c) 2 year extension of maintenance contract has been arranged
- d) Turf renovations scheduled for July to be completed in September
- e) Some discussion took place regarding bushland in McCusker Park needing attention AJ said COJ will be looking at it in early spring

7. Capital Works

- a) SD reported she is still awaiting feedback regarding CoJ's five-year Capital Works Program and will advise accordingly.

8. Restrictive rules/covenants

- a) Need to consider whether to issue more letters to residents regarding caravans/boats etc., being parked in front yards. This will be discussed at next meeting.

9. General Business

9.1 Lions Club Centenary Project (seats update)

Seats have been installed. SJ has taken photos for next newsletter
The afternoon tea was great despite the rain.

9.2 AGM date

The date for the AGM will be 7pm pm, 17th July, 2017 at Currambine Recreation Centre, access for set up from 6.30pm

9.3 Newsletter

Portfolio administered by SJ

SJ reported that the front page will have information regarding the committee and subcommittees. SJ will communicate with SD and then it will go to the committee for approval. Expected to be printed at the end of June and delivered in the first week of July.

9.4 OP Properties Proposed Development Update

The group of approximately 100 concerned residents attending the meeting were introduced to the Committee members. The residents were asked to make sure they had registered their names. Resident #1 asked if there was any objection to the meeting being recorded. The IHOA committee referred to IM for a decision. IM registered an objection, on behalf of the IHOA, to any recording of the meeting. A number of other committee members including SJ and MK along with some residents also expressed concerns about the meeting being recorded. Resident #1 also asked if the committee would use his web site "xxx" as the official IHOA website. The committee rejected his request because the IHOA already has a fully functioning website which was very effective

BG noted he was unsure if this was the correct process to follow but recognises the grievance and wants to address the issue and explain the process of registering development plans with the City of Joondalup. BG summarised the development process.

The land in question was part of the 2001 structure plan which had earmarked two sites both zoned for commercial (mixed) use. The current zoning requires that a formal structure plan be prepared for one or both commercial sites in order to progress any proposal to develop them. Whoever wants to develop these lots needs to lodge an application with the COJ addressing all requirements for structure plan applications. COJ advertises the proposed application to internal & external departments / agencies and embarks on a public consultation process. A recommendation on the application / proposal is then made to the Western Australian Planning Commission (WAPC) as the decision-making body. Advertising usually takes the form of site notices, press notices, CoJ webpage notification and individual letters sent to all residents / occupiers in the surrounding area

This process has not been started other than a conceptualisation of an idea. There have been no documents lodged with COJ.

A number of residents stated that they had purchased their blocks in part because they were told by the seller (Satterleys) that the two large vacant blocks were going to be developed for housing. Some residents stated that they were shown a plan that confirmed this. Some stated that they were unaware the two large lots were zoned for commercial / mixed-use purposes.

BG said that there was always an onus on a purchaser to undertake a due diligence investigation when purchasing property and that this must include a visit to the CoJ to verify the rights attached to properties that could be a cause for concern. There has never been any ambiguity in the plans at COJ. . A resident tabled a plan he had been given when he purchased, which showed residential lots on the two large commercial blocks in question. A Committee member, backed-up by a visiting resident advised that this issue may best be progressed by engaging Satterleys.

TD said no one in the group seemed to know it was zoned commercial, however the commercial zoning of that land had been known by everyone he had ever discussed it with. Resident #5 said IHOA could have passed it on. BG noted that it was in his experience, even as an urban planner, he didn't know things that he should be asking about properties, plans and developments.

TD continued to say he has had many discussions over the last 7 or so years and everyone involved knew the zoning however, this is not to say all the residents would know this

A resident who had been to many planning meetings advised that there has been lots of pushbacks from the Ward Councillors and Mayor. The developers had been told to expect this kind of backlash from residents. Developers can start a process but it is only a concept until formal documentation / application(s) are lodged with the respective authorities. AJ advised residents to go to beaumarisprecinct.com which is the website that will show the plans. COJ will listen and consult with residents but may not be prepared to engage until a formal application process is underway.

A resident asked AJ that if the developers have discussed the proposal with the CoJ, could they have access to the Minutes to get the facts. AJ said Minutes were not taken at these meetings, as they were just preliminary discussions.

There was a general discussion about family connections between Satterley and developers and other agencies. It was stated by the committee of the IHOA that this is not relevant to the discussion.

IM said IHOA has objected to things in the past but given that the subject under discussion is still merely a concept the IHOA could not form an opinion either way.

A resident noted the issue is with Satterleys and asked if Satterleys can be invited to a meeting or if a special meeting can be set up. SD said she will approach Satterleys and advise of response on our official website.

A resident asked if there should be a meeting with COJ as well. SD asked if this should be at the same time and he said probably not. There was a general agreement in this regard. Another resident said the residents need to be represented if any such meetings take place.

Another resident stated that his property value declined as soon as the proposal went up. IM noted that IHOA have always worked with the community and intend to continue to. Every resident needs to look at what will benefit the suburb as a whole. Another resident said MJR was a product that is usually aimed at investment and queried how this would benefit the suburb as a whole. IM said IHOA represents the community when there is an issue but they need information.

BG reiterated that until there is a qualitative application put into COJ, one can only speculate on its contents. Another resident commented that there are many people very concerned and 1) is it possible to arrange a meeting with the senior town planner (COJ) and 2) is it possible to arrange a meeting with Satterleys. It would need to be separate times and hopefully consecutive meetings.

Following a unanimous vote by the residents SD said she will request a meeting with both parties and note the responses on our website.

A resident stated it is because of the advertising, it has caused this fear.

TM introduced herself to the group as a Committee member and as an interested resident who comes along to the meetings and asks questions. It was IHOA who assisted in putting out the information which is why the residents were informed of this. IHOA works very hard and advised caution when using social media etc. TM said the energy in the room is great and should be harnessed. TM also advised that IHOA cannot say what all residents want as they are all different.

A resident requested that the committee live stream meetings on Facebook. The committee declined.

A resident asked what actions will be taken to object to the proposal. SD reiterated the plan was to ask for two separate meetings and will put information on the website.

AJ encouraged residents to go to the OP Development website and make comments. BG suggested a spokesperson to make calls to the CoJ regarding finding out if any proposals had been submitted.

A resident introduced himself as someone who works for REIWA. He believes the average consumer is rarely aware of plans changing. 1) There has been misrepresentation from some developers in other land releases and 2) the community was not notified. There has been successful blocking of proposals. There is a certain responsibility for residents to keep up to date. Plans are subject to change from time to time. But there has been nothing submitted as yet. Consumer Protection can be useful here.

Another resident asked if feedback to the OP Development website will only go to OP Development. AJ said yes. The resident then asked if the feedback should be copied and pasted to the website. AJ said not yet as it is likely to get lost because there is no formal application at the City to which correspondence can be attributed.

It was agreed that there was no more to discuss and residents were reminded to put their names on the register and invited to stay for the remainder of the meeting for the other Agenda items. SD will contact Satterleys and COJ and ask for individual meeting with each. SD will put response and any potential meeting dates on IHOA website.

9.5 Webpage

Nothing to Report

9.6 TV Reception

SD received a response regarding the TV reception which acknowledged the issues and encouraged emails and phone calls from people affected. M & DP said emails and phone calls are not responded to. SD asked for M & DP's email so she could forward the email to them. M & DP said it seems to be specific to their street and can map it out. SJ noted he can put it in the newsletter and ask if other Iluka residents have the same issue.

Discussion regarding ongoing issues and it is difficult to know who to contact. Many different companies involved and it is unclear who owns lines, equipment etc and if it is privately owned or Telstra and who it is contracted to.

10 Round Table

- a. It was mentioned that there is an increase of dog excrement in the area and people not picking up after their dogs. Suggestion that there might not be enough bins.
- b. MM raised her disappointment about the Foreshore play equipment as it has no wheelchair access or accessible equipment. Disappointed that the DAIP has not been considered for this development. SJ said this is something the committee can support to have a swing installed.

11 Meeting Closure

The meeting closed at 9:23pm

Next Meeting

The next meeting will be at 7pm on 4th July 2017.