



Additional information

Finance, Policy, Operations
and Legislation Committee

Wednesday 8 February 2023 - 6pm



Table of Contents

FPOL2301-5 PARKLET POLICY REVIEW 2



FPOL2301-5 PARKLET POLICY REVIEW

Parklet Policy Review – Community Feedback

The parklet policy review was put out for public comment in November 2022 in accordance with Council resolution, and was promoted on 'My say Freo, for a period of three weeks. Four responses were received from 23 visitations. They were as follows:

Respondent No 1

Why has Section 2 of the old Parklet Policy been removed?? The most pertinent section 2.8 involved whom is taking responsibility for the Parklet, it requires the proponent to carry public liability insurance. If this is not a requirement then surely the Liability falls on the City of Fremantle, and therefore the Ratepayers. Also by removing this section does it remove the requirement for a design and management plan?? Does it therefore remove all oversight by the City of Fremantle, it is very odd that this section has been removed.

Respondent No 2

If the Esplanade Park was made more friendly with shady trees & better seating people would gather there in groups rather than isolate in small areas dotted around.

Respondent No 3

I have made a number of suggestions regarding the upgrade of the Mills & Wares Biscuit Factory Park, between Wardie and Jenkin Streets, to Kavi Gupta from the C of F and drawn a suggested plan that has had general approval through consultation with local residents. in meeting with Kavi a few month ago, he was very impressed with the plan. Please contact Kavi who can provide the plan and suggestions for the park. Lee ALLAN President Wardie Street (South) Laneway Association

Respondent No 4

Nice idea, hope it takes off

Officer Comment: In relation to the specific policy concerns raised in the comments above I offer the following:

Section 2.1 – is included in the new Parklet Procedure section 1.1. as it was considered a further interpretation of the existing policy purpose and objective that perhaps should have been included as an objective. The existing policy and purpose have been revised into the new policy scope.



Section 2.2 – is included in revised section 1.7, however is better defined with the inclusion of “hours of operation”, which is the most contentious issue.

Section 2.3 – is implied but difficult to determine as the diversity and use is dependent entirely upon the applicant and use. It would also be difficult to refuse a permitted use even if it duplicated a nearby use, and as such has been removed.

Section 2.4 – is included in revised section 1.3 and 1.4.

Section 2.5 – was quite prescriptive in nature without consideration of the site and has therefore been included in the new Parklet Procedure section 1.5, as the size will depend upon the location and available parking spaces.

Section 2.6 – is included in revised section 1.4, and further defined in Parklet Procedure section 1.6.

Section 2.7 – is included in revised section 1.5

Section 2.8 – was vague in the existing policy but has better defined in revised section 1.6.