



Agenda

Strategic Planning and Transport Committee

Wednesday, 18 March 2020 6.00pm

CITY OF FREMANTLE
NOTICE OF A STRATEGIC PLANNING AND TRANSPORT
COMMITTEE MEETING

Elected Members

A Strategic Planning and Transport Committee meeting of the City of Fremantle will be held on **Wednesday, 18 March 2020** in the North Fremantle Community Hall, located at 2 Thompson Road, North Fremantle commencing at 6.00 pm.



Russell Kingdom
Acting Director Strategic Planning and Projects

13 March 2020

Table of Contents

Contents	Page
1. OFFICIAL OPENING, WELCOME AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT	1
2. ATTENDANCE, APOLOGIES AND LEAVES OF ABSENCE	1
3. DISCLOSURES OF INTERESTS	1
4. RESPONSES TO PREVIOUS QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE	1
5. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME	1
6. PETITIONS	1
7. DEPUTATIONS	1
8. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES	2
9. ELECTED MEMBER COMMUNICATION	2
10. REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	3
10.1 COMMITTEE DELEGATION	3
SPT2003 - 1 WEST END CONSERVATION AREA POLICY REVIEW – REVISED DRAFT	3
SPT2003 – 2 DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT’S DRAFT PERTH LONG TERM CYCLE NETWORK	10
10.2 COUNCIL DECISION	15
SPT2003 - 3 KNUTSFORD STREET PUBLIC REALM: AN URBAN DESIGN PLAN TO SUPPORT THE EVOLUTION OF A PRECINCT	15
11. MOTIONS OF WHICH PREVIOUS NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN	21
12. URGENT BUSINESS	21
13. LATE ITEMS	21
14. CONFIDENTIAL BUSINESS	21
15. CLOSURE	21

CITY OF FREMANTLE

Strategic Planning and Transport Committee

Agenda

1. OFFICIAL OPENING, WELCOME AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We would like to acknowledge this land that we meet on today is the traditional lands of the Whadjuk people and that we respect their spiritual relationship with their country. We also acknowledge the Whadjuk people as the Traditional Owners of the greater Walyalup area and that their cultural and heritage beliefs are still important to the living Whadjuk people today.

2. ATTENDANCE, APOLOGIES AND LEAVES OF ABSENCE

nil

3. DISCLOSURES OF INTERESTS

Elected members must disclose any interests that may affect their decision-making. They may do this in a written notice given to the CEO; or at the meeting.

4. RESPONSES TO PREVIOUS QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE

There are no responses to public questions taken on notice at a previous meeting.

5. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

Members of the public have the opportunity to ask a question or make a statement at council and committee meetings during public question time.

Further guidance on public question time can be viewed [here](#), or upon entering the meeting.

6. PETITIONS

Petitions may be tabled at the meeting with the agreement of the presiding member.

7. DEPUTATIONS

7.1 Special deputations

A special deputation may be made to the meeting in accordance with the City of Fremantle Meeting Procedures Policy 2018.

NIL

7.2 Presentations

Elected members and members of the public may make presentations to the meeting in accordance with the City of Fremantle Meeting Procedures Policy 2018.

8. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

That the minutes of the Strategic Planning and Transport Committee meeting dated 12 February 2020 be confirmed.

9. ELECTED MEMBER COMMUNICATION

Elected members may ask questions or make personal explanations on matters not included on the agenda.

10. REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

10.1 COMMITTEE DELEGATION

SPT2003 - 1 WEST END CONSERVATION AREA POLICY REVIEW – REVISED DRAFT

Meeting Date:	18 March 2020
Responsible Officer:	Manager Strategic Planning
Decision Making Authority:	Committee
Agenda Attachments:	1. Draft Local Planning Policy 3.21 ‘West End Heritage Area’
Additional information:	1. Current Fremantle West End Conservation Area Policy DGF14 2. Examples of new additions showing subtle vs more stark contrast in architecture

SUMMARY

The Fremantle West End Conservation Area Policy DGF14 (‘West End Policy’) was prepared in 1990 and last reviewed in 1992. A number of changes have occurred to the statutory and strategic context since that time necessitating review of the policy. A report recommending review of the policy and some key direction on the preparation of a revision was considered and endorsed by the Strategic Planning and Transport Committee on 20 June 2018.

Preliminary consultation has been undertaken with a number of key stakeholder groups to discuss the reasons for the review and the proposed approach recommended to be taken, and to invite early input on key issues and concerns. The outcomes of this consultation are summarised in this report and generally align with the direction set by the Committee in 2018. The report recommends that Council notes the feedback received and endorses the revised draft policy provided in Attachment 1 to the report for the purposes of public consultation.

The report also recommends concurrent preliminary consultation on a scheme amendment to remove the requirement for additional storeys above the third storey / 11m height to be set back from the main building façade (but retaining other assessment criteria), consistent with Council’s previous resolution.

BACKGROUND

The Fremantle West End Conservation Area Policy (‘West End Policy’) was prepared in 1990 and last reviewed in 1992. The Strategic Planning and Transport Committee considered a report on the policy on 20 June 2018 and resolved to:

1. *Endorse the preparation of a revised West End policy based on the following direction:*
 - a) *The policy is to operate as a Local Planning Policy under the provisions of Local Planning Scheme No. 4.*
 - b) *The policy to apply to the area listed as ‘West End of Fremantle’ on the state Register of Heritage Places, west of Market Street.*
 - c) *The policy combine conservation, character protection and planning considerations and incorporate a greater degree of guidance on design.*

- d) *The policy apply to development requiring approval under Local Planning Scheme No. 4.*
 - e) *The policy be concise and provide clear direction (including graphics) on the desired outcomes (design objectives), complemented by ‘design criteria’ where possible, on which assessment of new applications will be based.*
 - f) *In addition to maintaining the consistent design elements apparent throughout buildings in the area, the policy recognise the variation which exist in sub-areas, and promote preservation of this through an acknowledgement of a hierarchy of streets, and a requirement for new proposals to respond to this.*
 - g) *The policy promote consideration of context in the formulation and assessment of designs but frame this within the parameters of what is permitted by the LPS 4.*
 - h) *The policy incorporate greater direction on the scale, proportions and detailing of building façades and the importance of these in enabling new development to integrate harmoniously within existing streetscape.*
 - i) *The policy preclude mansard roof forms where visible from the adjoining street(s).*
 - j) *The option of including an additional storey where not visible from the adjoining street provided for in the planning scheme be reviewed in the revised policy.*
 - k) *The policy include reference to the roofscape characteristics of the area and direction on integration of above-roof/fourth storey additions with this as well as design composition to assist in integration with the streetscape.*
 - l) *The policy promote continuation of streetscape rhythm and building grain within new development consistent with context.*
 - m) *The policy incorporate requirements for new development to look distinctly contemporary yet respond in detail to adjoining buildings through the choice of materials, decorative detailing and architectural proportions where visible from the street to enable them to harmonise with their context.*
 - n) *Consideration of oblique views of buildings when considering presentation to the street, and inclusion of depth in façade design and detail consistent with the traditional architectural style be incorporated.*
 - o) *The policy incorporate those elements of DGF22 (Sadlier Building 36 Henry Street, Fremantle) and DGF15 (High Street Conservation Area (west of Fremantle Town Hall) – Shopfronts of Historical and Heritage Interest) warranting retention not already addressed in more general provisions of the West End Policy and Heritage List, and that those policies be listed for deletion.*
2. *The Committee notes that the areas outside the proposed revised policy area (i.e. the West End as included on the State Heritage Register) will continue to enjoy the existing statutory protection provided by their inclusion within the heritage area under Local Planning Scheme No. 4. This protection includes the requirement that all demolition requires development approval, and heritage assessments being required for all major development proposals. (SPT1806-2)*

The report indicated that subject to Council's agreement on the policy review approach and direction, the next steps would be to:

1. Engage with key stakeholders to obtain early input into the review;
2. Report feedback on review following engagement to Council; and

3. Prepare a revised policy and present to Council for approval to advertise.

Preliminary engagement with key stakeholders on the reasons for and proposed approach to the review has been undertaken. The purpose of this report is to outline the outcomes of this, and submit the revised draft policy subsequently prepared for approval to advertise this for formal public comment.

OFFICER COMMENT

In accordance with the process detailed in the June 2018 report, the City wrote to the following key stakeholder groups to invite their early input into the review, including on the direction endorsed by council and other elements of interest and / or concern:

- Design Advisory Committee
- Fremantle Society
- City Precinct Group
- Chamber of Commerce
- Fremantle Inner City Residents Association
- Heritage Council

No response was received from the Fremantle Society or City Precinct Group and no formal response was received from the Chamber of Commerce, though the then CEO noted the need for any planning policy and city-initiatives to take into account the needs of the business community, allow flexibility in the reuse of buildings and avoid disruptions or excessive delays. She also indicated that the Chamber recognise the value of the West End's heritage and character.

Follow up discussions were held with:

- Design Advisory Committee (workshops 10-9-18 and 12-8-19)
- Department of Planning, Lands & Heritage (meeting 26-9-18)
- Fremantle Inner City Residents Association (meeting 1-11-18)
- Heritage Council (meeting 8-3-19)

Key points of feedback received are summarised as follows:

Design Advisory Committee:

1. DAC wishes to maintain focus on quality design. This is usually best achieved through the employment of good designers.
2. DAC wishes to ensure that flexibility for nuanced design responses is provided in the new policy (rather than specifying overly prescriptive controls) but appreciates the need for clear direction to be provided. Context is key and should be addressed through a robust analysis. Uniform codified approaches should be avoided.
3. Some DAC members reflected on examples of good design policy, and noted the benefits of quality illustrations and diagrams.
4. DAC expressed varying views on the success of recent developments in the West End.
5. DAC noted that use of a 3D model might help test concepts, with the City of Melbourne providing a very good example.
6. DAC suggested that intrusive elements should be identified.

7. DAC members suggested that storey height and the integrity of the original building should be retained rather than hidden and indicated that finishes are integral.
8. DAC wished to be involved early in the planning process for new development rather than providing input only on completed designs. Greater use of design review panels and / or design competition was promoted, as the design process was seen as providing the best method for determining appropriate responses to each site. The need to keep costs down and reduce risk through a clearly defined process and efficient assessment process was also recognised.
9. DAC later provided comment on draft principles and key elements.

Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage (Heritage Office)

10. Department of Planning, Lands & Heritage staff indicated an understanding of and support for the intent of the policy review, an appreciation of the issues identified, and a strong interest in commenting on the draft revision to be developed. Alignment between the City's policy and Heritage Council's position on the West End was recognised as desirable, as was the opportunity for the Heritage Council to either note or endorse the revised policy produced.
11. The Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage confirmed that management of interiors should be addressed through the assessment individually listed buildings are subject to rather than covered in the area policy, and that street and public works would be addressed individually.
12. The Department of Planning, Lands & Heritage recommended presentation to a meeting of the Heritage Council to allow it to provide direct, early input.

Fremantle Inner City Residents Association

13. Fremantle Inner City Residents Association (FICRA) acknowledged the reasons for the review and expressed a strong interest in commenting on the draft revision to be developed.
14. FICRA indicated that some development which has occurred under the current policy is very good but some is of concern. The new policy needs to take greater account of context and provide stronger requirements in relation to this.
15. FICRA queried the revised policy boundary and indicated that Arthur Head should retain the highest level of heritage protection available.
16. FICRA indicated that greater residential presence in the West End was desirable and that this should include a higher proportion of owner-occupiers who would appreciate and care for the place. Development should be designed to a standard which would encourage owner-occupiers, rather than build-to-rent. Policy should promote quality contemporary architecture (acknowledging that this can be hard to define).
17. FICRA outlined recent development examples attendees considered good (including Bread in Common), and a several considered bad.
18. FICRA identified bulk and scale a potential problem for substantial new developments (citing early plans for Customs House).

Heritage Council

19. The Heritage Council supported the intent and approach taken to the policy review.
20. The Heritage Council acknowledged the challenge in providing clear direction whilst also maintaining sufficient flexibility to allow contextual and creative responses.

21. The difficulties in communicating intent of subjective but key terms such as ‘contextually appropriate’ and ‘sensitive response’ were acknowledged.
22. Differences of views regarding the appropriateness of strongly (as opposed to more subtly) contemporary new development and the challenge of ‘hero architecture’ were noted.
23. The importance of grain, context and detailing were all discussed.
24. The use of diagrams and examples from outside the area was supported.
25. The Heritage Council expressed a strong interest in providing comment on the draft policy.

The feedback received generally aligns with the approach to the revised policy development recommended, with the key challenges posed (including around differing interpretation of successful contextual responses) reflecting those previously identified by staff. The revised policy has consequently been prepared in accordance with the direction set by the Committee albeit with additional detail explaining background and rationale included to improve comprehension of the policy direction, creating a much longer document than originally anticipated.

The format of the policy is similar to that of the Design WA Apartment Design Code, outlining context, design principles and design guidance. It indicates that demonstrated alignment with design principles is required, with design guidance assisting in interpretation of this.

The policy is divided in 6 elements, based on those used by CABA in its urban design guidelines. These are:

1. Urban Structure
2. Land Use Mix and Density
3. Massing and Height
4. Roofscape, Views and Skyline
5. Facades
6. Building Type
7. Details and Materials

Introductions to each section have been included (further adding to the length of the document) to provide context to the principles and guidance. This seeks to increase understanding of the basis of requirements and the place itself, important to successful design responses.

Formulation of the policy has considered both current policy requirements and the analysis and direction provided in the Local Identity Source and Design Code received by Council in May 2009. The revised policy area is broadly consistent with Area 001 of the Design Code with both documents recognising that:

- The character of the West End stems from its existing structure and buildings, and both the similarities and variations these present;
- Character is reinforced by the ‘dialogue’ between buildings and spaces, with new development needing to listen to and respond to the language of the existing architecture;
- Small differences between new buildings and old is appropriate providing that the overall likeness of the prototype (core elements) is maintained;
- Consistency in urban wall, façade attributes and building height and proportions are notable within the West End, but with some degree of variation / ‘vibration’.

Contemporary Design

A key challenge in drafting the policy has been in designing the degree in contrast sought between new and existing development: Council endorsed the principle that new development be distinctly contemporary, consistent with the Burra Charter which states that new additions should be “*readily identifiable as such*”.

Article 22. New work

22.1 New work such as additions or other changes to the *place* may be acceptable where it respects and does not distort or obscure the *cultural significance* of the place, or detract from its *interpretation* and appreciation.

22.2 New work should be readily identifiable as such, but must respect and have minimal impact on the *cultural significance* of the *place*.

New work should respect the significance of a place through consideration of its siting, bulk, form, scale, character, colour, texture and material. Imitation should generally be avoided.

New work should be consistent with Articles 3, 5, 8, 15, 21 and 22.1.

Discussion with the Design Advisory Committee and Heritage Council considered the degree of contrast appropriate, with the police station / National Bank at 88 High Street providing a contentious example. Whilst not universally agreed, the position taken in the policy is that whilst the basic structural elements of height, scale and proportion of this building are appropriate, the street interface and detailing is not, leading to an overly stark contrast. The policy consequently seeks to promote new development which is readily identifiable as contemporary when directly looked at, but which does not ‘leap’ to the eye from the streetscape when broadly viewed in context. This degree of differentiation may be subject to debate. Further examples are provided in the Additional Information to assist with this.

Building Height and Setbacks

Resolution (j) from Council’s previous direction can only be advanced through modification to the local planning scheme to remove the requirement that new development above the third storey or 11m in height be set back out of the deemed line of sight of the street. This reflects the view of the Heritage Coordinator and Design Advisory Committee that this requirement has not been successful in many instances, and reflects a building form inconsistent with that traditional in the West End. Removal of the clause would still retain the requirements of the scheme for any fourth storey or height above 11m to be:

1. limited to a total of 14m;
2. consistent with the predominantly height pattern of adjoining properties and the locality generally;
3. Not detrimental to the amenity of adjoining properties or the locality;
4. Consistent with.... Conservation objectives for the site and locality generally; and
5. Consistent with any other matters outlined in Council’s local planning policies.

The draft new local planning policy for the West End proposes that new development reflects the building height *and* proportions characteristic of the West End with the design guidance provided indicating that:

- Upper storey additions should be designed to read as part of a coherent whole
- New development should tie into or reflect the existing floorplates of traditional buildings.

- New development should consider how the proportions of the building relate to the adjoining buildings and streetscape, as well as how the overall height sits within its precinct context.

Preliminary engagement on the amendment in accordance with Local Planning Policy 1.3 is recommended to occur in conjunction with consultation on the draft policy.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Nil

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

The policy operates as a Local Planning Policy under the Deemed Provisions of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015*.

CONSULTATION

Preliminary input from key stakeholder groups has been sought on the policy review. Further formal consultation is recommended in accordance with the requirements of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015* and Council policy (LPP1.3).

Concurrent preliminary consultation on the associated planning scheme amendment is also recommended to occur, consistent with Council policy.

VOTING AND OTHER SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS

Simple majority.

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

Council:

- 1. Notes the preliminary feedback received from key stakeholder groups on the review of the West End Conservation Area Policy.**
- 2. Endorses the revised Local Planning Policy 3.21 West End Heritage Area as included at Attachment 1 for the purposes of consultation in accordance with the procedures set out in clause 4 of the deemed provisions in schedule 2 of the Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015 and the City of Fremantle Local Planning Policy 1.3 Public Notification of Planning Proposals.**
- 3. Undertakes preliminary consultation in accordance with Local Planning Policy 1.3 Public Notification of Planning Proposals on a potential amendment to the City of Fremantle Local Planning Scheme No. 4 to:-**

Amend clause 6.7, Schedule 7, Local Planning Area 1 sub-clause 1.3.1 to delete requirement (a) “the upper level being sufficiently setback from the street so as to not be visible from the street(s) adjoining the subject site” and renumber requirements b and c accordingly.

SPT2003 – 2 DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT'S DRAFT PERTH LONG TERM CYCLE NETWORK

Meeting Date:	18 March 2020
Responsible Officer:	Manager Strategic Planning
Decision Making Authority:	Committee
Agenda Attachments:	1. Map of the Department of Transport draft Long Term Cycle Network 2. Comparison Maps and description of the draft Long Term Cycle Network and City's Bike Plan
Additional Information:	1. Department of Transport referral of draft Long Term Cycle Network & Request for Endorsement

SUMMARY

The Department of Transport (DoT) drafted a metropolitan Long Term Cycle Network (LTCN) plan in 2016 to support the *Perth and Peel @ 3.5 Million* planning initiative. However it was recognised the initial draft did not involve the input of local government, and DoT has subsequently been consulting with local government across the region to refine the plan. The DoT is now seeking support from Councils on the revised LTCN. The LTCN seeks to provide a long term plan for cycling routes across Perth and Peel and will also link to the annual DoT cycling infrastructure grant process.

The purpose of this report is to consider the draft Perth Long Term Cycle Network and to determine Council's position on this. The Network plan is generally consistent with the City's Bike Plan (adopted August 2019), excepting seven additional cycling routes and five variations to the Bike Plan, as described in the Officer Comment section and attachment to this report. Whilst officers maintain a preference for the route alignments outlined in the Bike Plan (and have been liaising with DoT staff on this over the last year), the variations are acknowledged to be minor.

This report consequently recommends that Council:

1. Notes the Department of Transport's draft Perth Long Term Cycling Network as provided in Attachment 1 and the variations it proposes to the City's Bike Plan outlined in Attachment 2.
2. Endorses the Department of Transport's draft Perth Long Term Cycling Network as an aspiration long term plan but advise the Department that consideration should be given in the development and delivery of the network to the alternative routes identified along Thompson Road, Marine Terrace and Forsyth Street through community engagement on the Bike Plan.

BACKGROUND

The Department of Transport (DoT) has written to the City requesting Council's endorsement of the Long Term Cycle Network (LTCN) it has developed (refer Additional Information 1).

The LTCN aims to improve connectivity of the current cycling network and ensure future projects are delivered in a coherent manner. Once complete, the LTCN will provide a

complete cycling network for the Perth and Peel region. The project objective is to develop a cycling network which provides safe and attractive cycle routes, with the focus being on providing continuous routes along major corridors establishing links between Perth's various strategic, secondary, district, specialised activity centres and public transport services.

The plan applies a route hierarchy consisting of:

- Primary routes – high demand corridors connecting major destinations forming the 'spine' of the network; fully separated, uninterrupted paths e.g. Principal Shared Paths (PSP).
- Secondary routes – lower demand routes providing connections between Primary routes and shopping/industrial/major health, education, sporting and civic activities; combination shared paths, protected on and off road paths.
- Local routes – local residential routes connecting into secondary and primary routes and locations; shared paths, protected bike lanes and low speed and low traffic volume shared streets. May involve Safe Active Street treatment and bike friendly Local Area Traffic Management (LATM) treatments. Can utilise existing quiet local streets and include wider footpaths.

This hierarchy was used in the development of the City's Bike Plan.

The DoT note the LTCN will represent the aspirational ('ultimate') cycling network across Perth and Peel. It will not constitute a firm commitment from local governments or DoT to deliver the identified network or identify prioritisation or any particular timelines for the delivery, but it will inform planning and design, and grant allocation. It should be considered a 'live' network and subject to refinements and changes as required.

Council's endorsement of the plan is sought in acknowledgement of the ongoing collaboration necessary between state and local government in delivery of an upgraded network.

OFFICER COMMENT

The draft LTCN is broadly consistent with the City's Bike Plan, officers having collaborated in the development of both documents. The LTCN does, however, propose seven additional routes and five variations to the City's adopted Bike Plan, as outlined in the following table and Attachment 2. Numbers and route description correlate with the maps in the second attachment to this report:-

LTCN <i>additional</i> routes to the Bike Plan		DoT Rationale for inclusion in LTCN
1	Local route from existing separated path along Port Beach Road, North Mole Drive, Kooringa Place and Rous Head Road to Rous Head ferry terminal. Bike Plan did not include due to conflict with port freight traffic and consultation with Fremantle Ports (Local route typology does not necessarily include fully separated paths which would be required to ensure a safe and comfortable ride).	DoT long term planning is to retain the Local route to Rous Head in the LTCN, given the nature of the public ferry services that operate from Rous Head, and to provide access to these services.

2	<p>Primary Route from North Fremantle train station along Queen Victoria Street, Stirling Highway, Stirling Bridge to Local route at Sewell Street (East Fremantle).</p> <p>Bike Plan identifies a Duke Street (in East Fremantle) Stirling Bridge route as a Local route, with preference for the Primary route to be across Fremantle Traffic Bridge connection into Perth to Fremantle PSP.</p>	<p>The LTCN will retain the Primary route from King Street/Canning highway to North Fremantle train station as it is on the major road network and important river crossing and will require a future separated path.</p>
3	<p>Local route from East Fremantle along George Street, Dorothy Street to Tuckfield Street</p> <p>Bike Plan identifies the east-west Local route to be along Forrest Road, connecting to a future Secondary route at East Street and Ellen Street.</p>	<p>The LTCN will retain this additional Local route along George Street as a connection from the activity area in East Fremantle to the Fremantle Local route network (Town of East Fremantle).</p>
4	<p>Local route from East Street along Vale and Finnerty Street to connect to Ord Street Secondary route.</p> <p>Bike Plan does not identify this as a Local route.</p>	<p>The LTCN will retain these additional Local routes along Finnerty Street and Vale Street to connect the Secondary routes of Marmion Street/East Street and to Ord Street, adjoining origin/destination areas of the high school, Fremantle Arts Centre and Leisure Centre.</p>
5	<p>Local route from James Street Secondary route along Tuckfield Street to Canning Highway connecting to Fremantle Traffic Bridge and river Primary routes.</p> <p>Bike Plan does not identify this as a Local route.</p>	<p>The LTCN will retain the Local route along Tuckfield Street to Canning Highway to connect from the Secondary route of James Street to public open space (Cantonment Hill) and existing and future Primary routes at Fremantle traffic bridge.</p>
6	<p>Local route along Peter Hughes Drive.</p> <p>The Bike Plan did not include due to the route being within Fremantle Port Authority land and could be closed at any time, and to reiterate the importance of a Primary route along Beach Street in the future (to connect to the future Perth/Fremantle PSP).</p>	<p>The LTCN will retain the Local Route along Peter Hughes Drive as this path already exists.</p>
7	<p>Continues the Attfield Local route from Stevens Street through Fremantle Hospital to connect to the Fremantle Prison and Fothergill Street/Fairbairn Street to Parry Street.</p> <p>Bike Reference Group discussion recommended the prison was not a bike destination (and lack of permeability through the hospital) though this could change long</p>	<p>The LTCN will retain the Local Route along Attfield Street and Fothergill Street to show a long term aspiration for local connectivity through these corridors if the Fremantle Hospital or Fremantle Oval sites are redeveloped in the future.</p>

	term if/when the hospital and Fremantle Oval is redeveloped.	
LTCN and Bike Plan <i>differences</i>		DoT rationale for omission in LTCN
8	Bike Plan includes an alternative Local route from the northern river PSP, Thompson Road, Stirling Highway crossing to Harvest Road, North Fremantle town centre to Fremantle Traffic Bridge. Identified as a route through community consultation.	The LTCN will show the main route identified in the City’s Bike Plan (Rule Street) and will not show alternate routes (Thompson Road) as it is considered a duplicate route.
9	Bike Plan includes a Local route from Stirling Bridge to Marmion Street along Duke Street rather than King Street (Town of East Fremantle). The King Street route was considered in the development of the Bike Plan, but route/crossing analysis and community consultation identified a more convenient route along Duke Street. Note this is within the Town of East Fremantle.	This Local route is located in the Town of East Fremantle and the LTCN will reflect the Town’s preference for the King Street route.
10	LTCN does not include Marine Terrace as a Secondary route. Bike Plan includes Marine Terrace as a Secondary route for more confident/faster cyclists and alternative route parallel to the coastal PSP and Local route of South Terrace.	The LTCN avoids identifying parallel routes in close proximity, which are duplicate LTCN routes. As such the LTCN will show the Primary Route along the coast and Local route along South Terrace but will not include a Secondary Route along the Marine Terrace corridor.
11	Bike Plan includes an alternative Local route from the Secondary route of Carrington Street, Forsyth Street, Stock Road (LTCN future Primary route) to Boon Street (Willagee, City of Melville) with an alternative Local route on Garling Street. Alternative route identified via discussion with City of Melville officers and community engagement.	The LTCN will retain the main route identified in the City’s Bike Plan (Sainsbury Street) and will not show the alternative route of Forsyth Street due to duplication. Garling Street is identified as a Local route in the LTCN.
12	Bike Plan includes the Hollis Park route (separated path in South Fremantle from South Beach to Rockingham Road/Cockburn Road/Hampton Road intersection) as a Primary Route: as it connects into the Primary coastal path and future Rockingham Road route (City of Cockburn)	The LTCN will identify this route as a Secondary route (rather than a Primary route) given the Secondary route classification of Rockingham Road and Clontarf Road.

The City's Bike Plan utilises the DoT LTCN three route typologies of Local, Secondary and Primary routes, but recognises the urban environment of the city centre would require a different treatment to a standard typology due to interfaces with the West End, Round House, Fishing Boat Harbour and the 'low speed core' principle for the city centre.

The additional routes proposed on the LTCN to the City's Bike Plan build on the cycling network within and outside the municipal boundaries and so are supported.

The differences of cycle routes described in sections 8-12 in the table, whilst in officers views not always the best alternative, are neither considered particularly problematic or of major significance. It is noted the DoT advise that the LTCN is 'live' network and will be subject to refinements as required, subject to further liaison as planning on each route progresses. On this basis, it is recommended that Council confirm its support for the planned network.

City officers will continue to liaise with DoT on the LTCN and other cycling projects and funding opportunities.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

From July 2020, the Perth Bike Network (PBN) grant funding will only be issued to projects that form part of the agreed LTCN (albeit with potential for minor refinement).

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

Nil.

CONSULTATION

DoT has undertaken consultation with 33 local governments, including route mapping and meetings with City officers (in conjunction with the development of the City's Bike Plan). The City undertook extensive community engagement in the development of the Bike Plan including on-line surveys and mapping, Bicycle Reference Group workshops and community feedback at events.

VOTING AND OTHER SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS

Simple Majority

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

That Council

- 3. Notes the Department of Transport's draft Perth Long Term Cycling Network as provided in Attachment 1 and the variations it proposes to the City's Bike Plan outlined in Attachment 2.**
- 4. Endorses the Department of Transport's draft Perth Long Term Cycling Network as an aspiration long term plan but advise the Department that consideration should be given in the development and delivery of the network to the alternative routes identified along Thompson Road, Marine Terrace and Forsyth Street through community engagement on the Bike Plan.**

10.2 COUNCIL DECISION

SPT2003 - 3 KNUTSFORD STREET PUBLIC REALM: AN URBAN DESIGN PLAN TO SUPPORT THE EVOLUTION OF A PRECINCT

Meeting date:	18 March 2020
Responsible officer:	Russell Kingdom, Manager City Design and Projects
Decision making authority:	Committee
Agenda attachments:	1. Knutsford Public Realm Plan - panels
Additional information:	1. Knutsford Public Realm Plan Study

SUMMARY

The area around Knutsford Street is now entering a transition period whereby land uses – other than industrial – are now supported to create a sustainable inner city precinct. In particular, land uses now include residential as well as creative industries. The vision is that this evolving mix of uses, together with key sustainability initiatives, over time will redefine the area as a livable and creative precinct that still values its working industrial character.

One of the physical attributes of Knutsford Street is a wide road reserve, originally engineered to support the vehicle movements and parking demands of an industrial precinct. With the changing nature of the street, this now presents an opportunity to add a connected network of pedestrian paths; street trees; and a potential to support new place activation initiatives on wide verges from a transitioning community.

The purpose of this report is to present a strategic approach to streetscape design, and identify key priorities for Knutsford Street, for Council approval.

This report recommends that Committee approves the Knutsford Street Public Realm plan (including 3 panels dated 9 March 2020) to guide infrastructure planning and upgrading.

BACKGROUND

Urban design aspects of Knutsford Street – in particular, the design of the public realm - have been discussed over several years through various design enquiries, including:

- *'Knutsford Research Project'* by the Australian Urban Design Research Centre (AUDRC), and
- *'Knutsford Street Precinct Green Spine'* by Josh Byrnes and Associates (JBA).

Development WA has approved plans for Lot1819 in Knutsford Street and has indicated its support to reinforce Knutsford Street as a 'green spine' as well as connecting the pedestrian path networks.

In anticipation of further developments – as well as responding to a growing interest within the community to be more engaged with the changes happening, it is now considered timely that the Council establishes a strategic framework to guide future improvements to the public realm in Knutsford Street.

OFFICER COMMENT

Previous Studies – Establishing A Vision

Design proposals for Knutsford Street by Australian Urban Design Research Centre (AUDRC) and Josh Byrne & Associates (JBA) draw on the industrial heritage of the Knutsford precinct and try to utilise the opportunities in the precinct - such as wide road reserve - to create an engaging and activated public domain. In addition, the proximity of Knutsford Street to major green spaces such as Booyeembara Park, golf course and Monument Hill reinforces the idea of a green corridor that increases the amount of flora/vegetation and improves biodiversity.

Although AUDRC and JBA proposals use different approaches - flexible space versus fixed space - both schemes adopt Knutsford Street as a central spine of activity within the precinct. Neither proposal has been developed in consideration of the extent of practical requirements of changes to infrastructure, services, funding or sequencing of works.

The previous schemes share two broad concepts that underpin a future vision for the area:

- *Green Spine* – street tree and vegetation planting.
- *Community Areas* – creating flexible spaces within the public realm that can be used for various functions / activities as the precinct evolves.

Urban Design Analysis of Existing Conditions

A summary of the urban design analysis that was undertaken in preparation of the Knutsford Street Public Realm plan is available as Additional Information, appended to this report. Essentially, the key findings of the existing conditions are:

- Disconnected footpath network
- Poor / inconsistent tree canopy
- Disorganised verge parking (hindering pedestrian movements)
- Constraints regarding existing services, especially overhead power.
- Uncertainty regarding development timelines.

Current 'Policy Gap' regarding Active Verges

The City has previously adopted various policies in regards to design, use and maintenance of road reserves/ verge areas and streetscapes. These include:

- Street and Reserve Tree Policy: Outlines how the city will plant, prune, maintain and remove trees under management and care of the City of Fremantle.
- Verge Garden Policy: Outlines the City's approach to the verge preparation assistance scheme, mulch, plant subsidy scheme and verge garden maintenance.

- **Crossover Policy:** Controls the number and widths of crossovers on residential streetscape in order to minimize the impact of hardstands.
- **Parklet Policy:** Encourages the temporary use of portion of a road reserve (parking bays) for community-driven activities, with a clear city-centre focus.

Although these policies are partially relevant, none fully address an objective of encouraging ‘active verges’ in a mixed residential / industrial area. It is considered that Knutsford Street would be an ideal ‘model street’ to develop a comprehensive policy that encourages active uses on wide verges. If successful, such an approach may lend itself to other areas in Fremantle.

Knutsford Street Public Realm Plan – Key Principles

The following principles have been developed for the Knutsford Street Public Realm plan:

<i>Walkability and Active Transport</i>	Provide safe, legible, connected and attractive pedestrian pathways through the precinct. Paths should be wide enough to also cater for slow-speed recreational cyclists.
<i>Landscape Improvements</i>	Introduce more street trees and verge planting to create a green, shady spine. Existing landscape should be conserved and added too, wherever possible.
<i>Flexible Street Design</i>	An overarching objective should be to ‘calm’ traffic speeds; improve on-road cycling in a shared environment; and develop innovative ways to encourage more active uses on verges.

Key Priorities and Short-Term Actions

The Knutsford Street Public Realm Plan (Attached) proposes that the following key priorities and actions shall become the City’s focus for the precinct in terms of public realm improvements:

Key Priorities

- 1 Path Network
Provide safe, legible, connected and attractive path network throughout the precinct.

Actions

- 1.1 Extend the pedestrian path network through conditions on land subdivisions.
- 1.2 Seek funding through the City’s Capital Works Program to complete any remaining gaps in the footpath network.
- 1.3 Pursue formalising of car parking on verge areas through developing a pedestrian path network plan.

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>2 <u>Street Trees</u>
<i>Provide a dense and continuous shade canopy for pedestrians and to establish Knutsford Street as a ‘green spine’.</i></p> | <p>2.1 Pursue infill street tree planting through conditions on land subdivisions.</p> <p>2.2 Seek funding through the City’s Capital Works Program to complete any remaining gaps in the street tree canopy.</p> |
| <p>3 <u>Cycle Friendly Street</u>
<i>Add street art and BAS signage to road at key areas along the Knutsford Street to slow vehicles and identify the street as shared space for cycling.</i></p> | <p>3.1 Engage with stakeholders to develop ideas around community art and designs for applying colour / images to the road surface.</p> |
| <p>4 <u>Active Verge Policy</u>
<i>Preparation of a guiding policy for design, approval, implementation and management of ‘active verge’ treatments.</i></p> | <p>4.1 Commence community consultation to prepare a guiding policy for creating and managing ‘active verge areas, in the Knutsford precinct.</p> |

Long-Term Options

The following items could be pursued subject to funding availability as well as sustained community involvement, as the precinct evolves in the future:

1. Traffic Calming and Place Activation

Opportunities to further calm the traffic in the street by introducing verge build-outs and/or other infrastructure changes to physically narrow the street at key locations. These interventions would also allow for the expansion of ‘active verge’ initiatives.

2. Infill Planting

Additional greening through infill tree planting and vegetation planting could be introduced in relation to the public realm (additional space on build-outs) as well as private open spaces that impact on the quality of the public realm within the new developments.

Alignment with Existing Strategic Documents

The Knutsford Street Public Realm plan is consistent with the City’s following key Strategic Documents:

- Greening Fremantle: Strategy 2020
- Urban Forest Strategy
- Integrated Transport Strategy 2015
- Fremantle Bike Plan 2019-24

It is noted that the recently adopted Bike Plan clearly identifies Knutsford Street as part of the local cycling network. This means that cyclists will share the road space with vehicles in a low-speed, low volume environment. In addition, slow speed cycling - particularly for the non-confident rider or children - will be able to share the footpaths with pedestrians.

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

Short-Term

There are no immediate financial implications to this report.

It is anticipated that most enhancements to verges will be funded over time through upgrading works as part of land development.

In addition, the City has an ongoing tree-planting program and footpath construction program which could be directed towards this precinct as part of the City's annual works. In particular, these programs could be targeted at existing gaps in the streetscape where redevelopment is unlikely to occur in the foreseeable future.

One short-term action that will require specific funding consideration is the application of cycling BAS symbols and community art to the road surface. The potential cost of these actions could range from \$15,000 to \$100,000. It is therefore suggested to work with the community on design options in 20/21 and, depending upon results, seek funding in the follow year's annual budget.

Long-Term

The longer-term options that might include infrastructure modifications of the road carriageway – especially in the already established sections of Knutsford Street – are currently unlisted in the City's 10 year Financial Plan. These works will require further funding considerations as the overall changes in the precinct take place.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

Nil

CONSULTATION

Various community engagements have occurred in the Knutsford area over the past few years including structure planning, workshops and surveys. In the past nine months the City has facilitated a joint workshop with a range of community members and stakeholders, and participated in research within the area bordered by Stevens, Swanbourne, High and Montreal Streets.

The proposed guiding principles of the Knutsford Street Urban Realm Plan will be used as a guide for future improvements to the street and are consistent with the general vision for sustainable urban development of the Knutsford area. The recent research (October 2019) showed both high community awareness of, and support, for this vision. The principles are also consistent with existing work such as the Urban Forest Plan and Bike Plan 2019-24 which involved wide community engagement.

This plan will be shared with the Knutsford area community at the next available engagement opportunity. The following two actions will provide tangible opportunities to engage with the community on specific matters:

- Developing a new policy on Active Verges;
- Developing community art ideas for applying colour / painted images (and BAS symbols) to the road surface to reset the perception of how the street is shared.

VOTING AND OTHER SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS

Simple Majority Required.

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

Council approves the Knutsford Street Public Realm plan (including 3 panels dated 9 March 2020) to guide infrastructure planning and upgrading, noting that the key priorities are:

- 1. ensure development sites along Knutsford street contribute to the overall vision – in terms of upgrading works to the road / verge;**
- 2. applying where possible, City's infrastructure programs for tree planting and footpath construction to target the 'gaps' that are unlikely to be fixed in the short-term through land redevelopment;**
- 3. working with the community on:**
 - a. the development of an Active Verge Policy;**
 - b. design ideas for applying community art to the road surface to reset the perception of how the street should be shared.**

11. MOTIONS OF WHICH PREVIOUS NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

A member may raise at a meeting such business of the City as they consider appropriate, in the form of a motion of which notice has been given to the CEO.

12. URGENT BUSINESS

In cases of extreme urgency or other special circumstances, matters may, on a motion that is carried by the meeting, be raised without notice and decided by the meeting.

13. LATE ITEMS

In cases where information is received after the finalisation of an agenda, matters may be raised and decided by the meeting. A written report will be provided for late items.

14. CONFIDENTIAL BUSINESS

Members of the public may be asked to leave the meeting while confidential business is addressed.

15. CLOSURE