



Minutes

Strategic Planning and Transport Committee

Wednesday, 16 May 2018, 6.00pm

Table of Contents

| Contents | Page |
|---|-------------|
| 1. Official opening, welcome and acknowledgement | 1 |
| 2.1. Attendance | 1 |
| 2.2. Apologies | 1 |
| 2.3. Leave 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 | 2 |
| 8. Confirmation of minutes | 2 |
| 9. Announcements by presiding member | 2 |
| 10. Questions or personal explanations by members | 2 |
| 11. Reports and recommendations | 2 |
| SPT1805 -1 CROSSOVER STANDARDS - ISSUES PAPER | 2 |
| SPT1805 -2 REPLACEMENT OF TWO MORTON BAY FIG TREES, KINGS SQUARE | 6 |
| SPT1805 -4 MUNICIPAL HERITAGE INVENTORY AND HERITAGE LIST ANNUAL UPDATE 2018 | 8 |
| SPT1805 -3 HOTEL AND TAVERN APPLICATIONS IN CITY CENTRE ZONES POLICY | 11 |
| SPT1805 -5 SUBMISSION ON WAPCS DRAFT POSITION PAPER FOR HOUSING ON LOTS LESS THAN 100 SQM | 14 |
| 12. Motions of which previous notice has been given | 19 |
| 13. Urgent business | 19 |
| 14. Late items | 19 |

15. Confidential business 19

16. Closure of meeting 19

Minutes Attachments 1

| Attachment | Page |
|---------------------|------|
| Minutes Attachments | 1 |

STRATEGIC PLANNING AND TRANSPORT COMMITTEE

Minutes of the Strategic Planning and Transport Committee Meeting
held in the North Fremantle Community Hall
on **16 May 2018** at 6.00 pm.

1. OFFICIAL OPENING, WELCOME AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The Presiding Member declared the meeting open at 6.00 pm.

2.1. ATTENDANCE

| | |
|----------------------|---|
| Dr Brad Pettitt | Mayor |
| Cr David Hume | Beaconsfield Ward / Presiding Member |
| Cr Bryn Jones | North Ward |
| Cr Rachel Pemberton | City Ward / Deputy Presiding Member |
| Cr Jeff McDonald | Hilton Ward |
| Cr Jenny Archibald | East Ward |
| Mr Philip St John | Chief Executive Officer |
| Mr Glen Dougall | Director City Business |
| Mr Russell Kingdom | Acting Director Strategic Planning and Projects |
| Mr Graham Tattersall | Director Infrastructure and Project Delivery |
| Ms Phillida Rodic | Manager Strategic Planning |
| Ms Kayla Beall | Senior Administration Officer |

There were approximately 4 members of the public in attendance.

2.2. APOLOGIES

Cr Jon Strachan

2.3. LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Nil

3. DISCLOSURES OF INTERESTS

Nil

4. RESPONSES TO PREVIOUS QUESTIONS TAKEN ON NOTICE

Nil

5. PUBLIC QUESTION TIME

Nil

6. PETITIONS

Nil

7. DEPUTATIONS

Nil

8. CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

COMMITTEE DECISION

Moved: Cr Dave Hume

Seconded: Cr Jenny Archibald

That the minutes of the Strategic Planning and Transport Committee dated 21 March 2018 as listed in the Council agenda dated 28 March 2018 be confirmed as a true and accurate record.

Carried: 6/0

Mayor, Brad Pettitt, Cr Jenny Archibald, Cr Bryn Jones,
Cr Rachel Pemberton, Cr Jeff McDonald, Cr Dave Hume

9. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY PRESIDING MEMBER

Nil

10. QUESTIONS OR PERSONAL EXPLANATIONS BY MEMBERS

Nil

11. REPORTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Committee delegation

SPT1805 -1 CROSSOVER STANDARDS - ISSUES PAPER

Meeting Date: 16 May 2018

Responsible Officer: Manager Strategic Planning

Decision Making Authority: Committee

Agenda Attachments: 1 – City of Fremantle Crossover Guidelines
2 – Residential Design Code Extract – Vehicular Access

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

Moved: Cr Dave Hume

Seconded: Cr Jenny Archibald

The Strategic Planning and Transport Committee acting under delegation 1.1:

1. Confirms that the primary concern of Council in relation to current crossover regulation relates to the impact excessive numbers and widths of new crossovers have on residential streetscapes.
2. Endorses the principle of pursuing greater restrictions on residential crossover widths through reduction in the default permissible maximum width to 4.5m and the

default permissible number of crossovers per property to 1 (or nil where access via a shared access way is available).

3. Requests the preparation of a further report proposing draft mechanisms to mitigate against the impact of excessive crossover numbers and widths on residential streetscapes based on the principle defined in (2) above, including:
 - a) A new Local Planning Policy (or modification to existing Local Planning Policy) restricting the width of access ways and hard stand within the front setback of lots
 - b) Modifications to the Crossover Guidelines which:
 - i. Introduce a further statement which more explicitly states Council's desire to restrict the impact of crossover hard stand on the street.
 - ii. Introduce a further statement that crossovers will only be provided or their retention supported where they provide access to approved driveways / parking areas within lots (i.e. not to create verge parking, or at a width wider than or additional to the approved driveway).
 - iii. Restricts the number of crossovers per lot to 1, excepting for very large frontages or corner lots where the crossover represents a small percentage of the frontage, or where two crossovers are necessary to allow vehicle circulation for developments involving 5 or more units.
 - iv. Reduce the default double crossover width from 6m to 4.5m, with 6m only permitted as a variation.
 - v. Make provision for alternative crossover design specifications which restrict the extent of hard stand (eg 'strips' rather than fully paved widths, or 'grasscrete') where proposed by an owner as a method of achieving a better access without compromising streetscape values, and where an appropriate design and maintenance regime is proposed.
 - c) Modification to the Hilton Garden Suburb Precinct Heritage Area Local Planning Policy clarifying that where access from a shared driveway is available, that vehicle access should be taken from this in preference to creation of a separate additional crossover to the street.

4. Request officers to discuss with the Western Australian Planning Commission the detrimental impact excessive driveway and crossover widths can have on residential streetscape and, specifically:

- a) the circumstances in which narrow front-loaded lots will be approved;
- b) potential modifications to the Residential Design Codes promoting use of shared access legs to provide vehicular access to lots, where available;
- c) potential modifications to the Residential Design Codes restricting the width of access ways and hard stand within the front setback of lots.

AMENDMENT 1

Moved: Cr Dave Hume

Seconded: Cr Jeff McDonald

Amend recommendation 3 b) i to state the following

- i. **Introduce a further statement that Council recognises the valuable green space that verges can provide and promotes verge planting in accordance with its policies.**

Amendment carried: 6/0

Mayor, Brad Pettitt, Cr Jenny Archibald, Cr Bryn Jones,
Cr Rachel Pemberton, Cr Jeff McDonald, Cr Dave Hume

COMMITTEE DECISION SPT1805 -1

The Strategic Planning and Transport Committee acting under delegation 1.1:

- 1. Confirms that the primary concern of Council in relation to current crossover regulation relates to the impact excessive numbers and widths of new crossovers have on residential streetscapes.**
- 2. Endorses the principle of pursuing greater restrictions on residential crossover widths through reduction in the default permissible maximum width to 4.5m and the default permissible number of crossovers per property to 1 (or nil where access via a shared access way is available).**
- 3. Requests the preparation of a further report proposing draft mechanisms to mitigate against the impact of excessive crossover numbers and widths on residential streetscapes based on the principle defined in (2) above, including:**
 - a) A new Local Planning Policy (or modification to existing Local Planning Policy) restricting the width of access ways and hard stand within the front setback of lots**
 - b) Modifications to the Crossover Guidelines which:**
 - i. Introduce a further statement that Council recognises the valuable green space that verges can provide and promotes verge planting in accordance with its policies.**
 - ii. Restricts the number of crossovers per lot to 1, excepting for very large frontages or corner lots where the crossover represents a small percentage of the frontage, or where two crossovers are necessary to allow vehicle circulation for developments involving 5 or more units.**
 - iii. Reduce the default double crossover width from 6m to 4.5m, with 6m only permitted as a variation.**
 - iv. Make provision for alternative crossover design specifications which restrict the extent of hard stand (eg 'strips' rather than fully paved widths, or 'grasscrete') where proposed by an owner as a method of achieving a better access without compromising streetscape values, and where an appropriate design and maintenance regime is proposed.**
 - c) Modification to the Hilton Garden Suburb Precinct Heritage Area Local Planning Policy clarifying that where access from a shared driveway is available, that vehicle access should be taken from this in preference to creation of a separate additional crossover to the street.**
- 4. Request officers to discuss with the Western Australian Planning Commission the detrimental impact excessive driveway and crossover widths can have on residential streetscape and, specifically:**

- d) the circumstances in which narrow front-loaded lots will be approved;**
- e) potential modifications to the Residential Design Codes promoting use of shared access legs to provide vehicular access to lots, where available;**
- f) potential modifications to the Residential Design Codes restricting the width of access ways and hard stand within the front setback of lots.**

Carried: 6/0

**Mayor, Brad Pettitt, Cr Jenny Archibald, Cr Bryn Jones,
Cr Rachel Pemberton, Cr Jeff McDonald, Cr Dave Hume**

Council decision

SPT1805 -2 REPLACEMENT OF TWO MORTON BAY FIG TREES, KINGS SQUARE

TITLE SPT Meeting Standard

Meeting Date: 16 May 2018
Responsible Officer: Kings Square Project Director
Decision Making Authority: Council
Agenda Attachments: Minor Adjustment to Public Realm Concept Design Health and Condition Report, *Ryder*, 4 April 2018
Tree Risk Inspection Report, *QTRA Ltd*, 16 April 2018

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

Moved: Cr Dave Hume

Seconded: Cr Jenny Archibald

Council:

1. Adopts a revision to the Kings Square Public Realm Concept Design, as illustrated on attached drawing dated 4 May 2018, for the purpose of community consultation on the removal and replacement of two additional trees in Kings Square.
2. Communicates these proposed changes to the community over a minimum period of 21 days, including the technical reasons for removal as well as their replacement with mature trees.
3. Refers the proposal to the State Heritage Office.
4. Requests a further report be presented to council for a final determination, following the conclusion of items 2 and 3 above.

AMENDMENT 1

Moved: Cr Jenny Archibald

Seconded: Cr Dave Hume

The following additional words be added to recommendation 1.

It is proposed to replace Moreton Bay Fig Tree No 4 (Christmas Tree) with an advanced Moreton Bay Fig Tree and replace Moreton Bay Fig Tree No 5 with an advanced Plane Tree.

Amendment carried: 6/0

Mayor, Brad Pettitt, Cr Jenny Archibald, Cr Bryn Jones,
Cr Rachel Pemberton, Cr Jeff McDonald, Cr Dave Hume

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION SPT1805-2

Council:

- 1. Adopts a revision to the Kings Square Public Realm Concept Design, as illustrated on attached drawing dated 4 May 2018, for the purpose of community consultation on the removal and replacement of two additional trees in Kings Square. *It is proposed to replace Moreton Bay Fig Tree No 4 (Christmas Tree) with an advanced Moreton Bay Fig Tree and replace Moreton Bay Fig Tree No 5 with an advanced Plane Tree.***
- 2. Communicates these proposed changes to the community over a minimum period of 21 days, including the technical reasons for removal as well as their replacement with mature trees.**
- 3. Refers the proposal to the State Heritage Office.**
- 4. Requests a further report be presented to council for a final determination, following the conclusion of items 2 and 3 above.**

Carried: 6/0

**Mayor, Brad Pettitt, Cr Jenny Archibald, Cr Bryn Jones,
Cr Rachel Pemberton, Cr Jeff McDonald, Cr Dave Hume**

SPT1805 -4 MUNICIPAL HERITAGE INVENTORY AND HERITAGE LIST ANNUAL UPDATE 2018

TITLE SPT Meeting Standard

Meeting Date: 16 May 2018
Responsible Officer: Manager Strategic Planning
Decision Making Authority: Council
Agenda Attachments: 1. Landowner submission on 136 Holland Street, Fremantle
 2. Heritage Assessment – 136 Holland Street, Fremantle
 3. Landowner submission on 6 Curedale Street, Beaconsfield
 4. Heritage Assessment – 6 Curedale Street, Beaconsfield

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION SPT1805-4

Moved: Cr Dave Hume

Seconded: Cr Jenny Archibald

Council:

- 1. Approve the following modifications to the Municipal Inventory of Heritage Places (MHI) and Heritage List:**

| Place | Municipal Inventory of Heritage Places | Heritage List | Reason |
|--------------------------------------|--|---------------|--|
| 11 and 11A Stevens Street, Fremantle | Remove | Remove | Historic Limestone Features not present |
| 195 Hampton Road, South Fremantle | Remove | Remove | Historic Limestone Features not present |
| 3 Delamere Lane, Beaconsfield | Remove | Remove | Subdivided portion of originally listed site (30 Hale Street): of no heritage significance itself and does not contribute to heritage significance of original site. Subdivided portion of originally listed site (30 Hale Street): of no heritage significance itself and does not contribute to heritage significance of original site. |
| 136 Holland Street, Fremantle | Historical Record Only | Remove | The representative qualities and distinguishing features of the house and setting have been lost and degraded to the point where the place is not able to provide |

| | | | |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------|--|
| | | | useful information explaining the reasons for its significance either through the fabric and appearance of the building or through its setting. The information that the place is likely to yield could be more completely and accurately obtained from documentary sources. |
| 6 Curedale Street, Beaconsfield | Retain as Management Category 3 | Retain | Although some of the original elements of the house at 6 Curedale Street have been altered or modified, these changes do not detract from the overall contribution made by the distinguishing aesthetic characteristics of this common house type, in terms of its classically influenced composition, proportions, scale, and materials. This ensures that it continues to add to the quality of its setting and sits well within the streetscape of Curedale Street, which includes other houses that share these aesthetic characteristics. |
| 8 Douglas Street, Fremantle | Remove | Remove | The existing house has been extensively modified and extended in ways that have led to its distinguishing features being either lost, or irreversibly degraded to the extent that it is of little cultural heritage significance, and does not make a positive contribution to the broader cultural heritage significance and character of the locality in which it is located. Demolition of the property has been approved. |

2. Consult the owners of 5 Delamere Lane, Beaconsfield on the proposed removal of their property from the MHI and Heritage List on the basis of the inapplicability of the statement of significance for 30 Hale Street to their site, following its subdivision and independent development and, in the event of their support for this recommendation, that this property be removed from both. In the event of the landowners objection to the proposed removal of their property from the MHI and Heritage List, or their non-response to

consultation, it is recommended that the property be retained pending a more comprehensive review.

Carried: 6/0

**Mayor, Brad Pettitt, Cr Jenny Archibald, Cr Bryn Jones,
Cr Rachel Pemberton, Cr Jeff McDonald, Cr Dave Hume**

**SPT1805 -3 HOTEL AND TAVERN APPLICATIONS IN CITY CENTRE ZONES
POLICY**

Meeting Date: 16 May 2018
Responsible Officer: Manager Strategic Planning
Decision Making Authority: Council
Agenda Attachments: Attachment 1 – Council resolution N1712-1
Attachment 2 – Liquor Licencing Process (Summary)
Attachment 3 – Existing Council Policies relating to
Licenced Premises
Attachment 4 – Existing approved Hotel and Tavern
uses in Fremantle City Centre zone

OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATION

Moved: Cr Dave Hume

Seconded: Cr Jeff McDonald

Council:

1. Approve the draft Local Planning Policy 2.22- Hotel and Tavern Applications within the City Centre zone for the purposes of advertising 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:

CITY OF FREMANTLE

LOCAL PLANNING POLICY 2.22

HOTEL AND TAVERN APPLICATIONS WITHIN THE CITY CENTRE ZONE

ADOPTION DATE: XX/XX/XXXX

AUTHORITY: LOCAL PLANNING SCHEME NO.4

STATUTORY BACKGROUND

Under the provisions of the *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015* (the Regulations), the Deemed Provisions contained in Schedule 2 of the Regulations are applicable to all local planning schemes, whether or not they are incorporated into the local planning scheme text. Accordingly, these provisions are applicable to the City of Fremantle Local Planning Scheme No. 4 (LPS4).

This Local Planning Policy has been prepared under the provisions of Part 2 of the Deemed Provisions of the Regulations.

APPLICATION

This policy applies to development applications for Hotel and Tavern land uses within the City Centre zone.

In the event that there is a conflict between this policy, and a provision contained within a Local Area Planning Policy, the most specific policy provision shall prevail.

PURPOSE

Applications for discretionary land uses will be assessed against the objectives of the Scheme, the objectives of the applicable zone and any applicable local planning policies, taking into account those matters to be considered outlined within in the Deemed Provisions of the Regulations.

The purpose of this policy is to provide additional guidance on the assessment and determination of tavern and hotel applications in relation to how they contribute to specific objectives of the scheme.

POLICY

Development within the City Centre zone should contribute towards its function as an attractive urban centre offering a full range of functions and land uses that collectively serve both local and regional catchments. Development involving Hotel and Tavern land uses should contribute to this objective by ensuring that the type and scale of the venue are suitable to their location and avoid concentration of alcohol related entertainment to the point that this undermines balanced mixing of land uses.

1. Specifically, Hotel and Tavern establishments of 400m² licenced NLA or greater within the City Centre zone shall demonstrate how the proposal contributes to land use diversity through the provision of a mix of other compatible land uses on the site. This may be demonstrated by the inclusion in the same development application of floor area for other uses equal to or greater than the floor area proposed for tavern or hotel use, or evidence of how other existing uses on the same site can operate alongside the proposed use in a complimentary manner that contributes to diversity and activation in the city centre.
2. Council may, at its discretion, vary 1, above:
 - a. For small sites with limited physical opportunity to provide land use diversity on site, where it is satisfied an appropriate land use mix and diversity is maintained in the immediate locality (namely the street block).
 - b. In cases where a proposal involves reuse of a heritage listed building where:
 - The building was designed and traditionally operated for the land use sought; or
 - The 400m² licenced NLA criteria is marginally exceeded in response to the existing building layout.

3. In assessing development applications involving the serving of alcohol, Council seeks to avoid duplications of the assessment of matters undertaken by the Director of Liquor Licencing or the Liquor Commission as part of the liquor licencing approval process under the *Liquor Control Act 1989* (including hours of operation, patron capacity and public interest).

Adopted:

Reviewed:

PROCEDURAL MOTION

At 6.57 the following procedural motion was moved:

COMMITTEE DECISION

Moved: Mayor, Brad Pettitt

Seconded: Cr Bryn Jones

The item be deferred for a decision to the Strategic Projects and Transport Committee on 20 June 2018.

Carried: 6/0
Mayor, Brad Pettitt, Cr Jenny Archibald, Cr Bryn Jones,
Cr Rachel Pemberton, Cr Jeff McDonald, Cr Dave Hume

SPT1805 -5 SUBMISSION ON WAPCS DRAFT POSITION PAPER FOR HOUSING ON LOTS LESS THAN 100 SQM

Meeting Date: 16 May 2017
Responsible Officer: Manager Strategic Planning
Decision Making Authority: Council
Agenda Attachments: 1. Draft position statement: housing on lots less than 100m²
 2. Terrace Housing National Market Survey

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION SPT1805-5

Moved: Cr Dave Hume

Seconded: Cr Jeff McDonald

Council retrospectively endorse City of Fremantle officer’s submission to the Western Australian Planning Commission on the draft Position Statement for Housing on Lots Less than 100m² as follows:

1. General Comments

- a. The WAPC state the housing type accommodated under the position statement can assist housing affordability, create dwelling diversity and choice, and facilitate ‘downsizing’ opportunities.
 - These are all objectives of which the City is supportive.
- b. The City undertook the Freo Alternative based on similar principles, seeking to provide an alternative housing typology for affordable and diverse housing within its suburbs. The associated amendment and local planning policy are currently with the WAPC for approval. The Freo Alternative seeks to accommodate small housing typologies in established suburbs and so has a slightly different context and focus than the draft position statement, which is considering structure plan areas which are traditionally larger scale green or brownfield development sites. However, the City’s research and conclusions provide some information worthy of consideration in the position statement. They also highlight the different approaches necessary in planning for suburban infill when compared with greenfield sites. The primary point of difference appears to be with the greater emphasis on affordability and site efficiency advanced in the draft statement, compared with the stronger emphasis on open space, amenity and sustainability advanced under Freo Alternative. This is directly reflective of the differing contexts they are addressing, and the different priority placed on the informing values underpinning them.
- c. It is worth noting that, if adopted, the position statement could allow introduction of microlots within several development areas within the City which meet the criteria of the statement. Within these, the development standards of the position statement would apply.
 - Clarification in the statement of the extent to which LDPs can vary the appendix 2 development standards in order to tailor them to the specific context of development zones is recommended.

- d. It is also worth noting that, whilst not anticipated by the statement, structure plans can be required for land not zoned Development.
- Clarification of intended application (or not) in non-Development zones within the Location Criteria is recommended to remove any ambiguity.

2. Specific Comments

- a. Through the process of developing the Freo Alternative, the City learnt what its community would like to see in smaller infill housing within Fremantle. The eight community-derived themes of the Freo Alternative are used as the structure for specific comments included in the City's submission, as set out below. Whilst these themes or values are likely to find support much more broadly, it is arguable that some of them may be less applicable in some new development areas than within established suburbs. The extent to which they should be reflected in the draft position statement is therefore partially influenced by the location of a development site and its surrounding context and partially by the weight to be given to these considerations, against others informing the new standards, of which affordability is likely to rate very highly.

Location

- b. Part 4 states that a structure plan and subsequent local development plan are required to provide this development type. Appendix 1 Locational Criteria (refer to discussion in background) then provides areas for consideration of this development type including:
- Structure plan areas.
 - Areas around district centres.
e.g. North Fremantle town centre
 - Areas around neighbourhood centres (comprising 1500m² or greater of retail floorspace such as South Fremantle shopping centre).
 - In 'transitional areas' between high density and low density residential areas.
 - Close to public open space.
 - Confirmation that all locational criteria are to apply to each site is necessary.
- c. Overall the City supports potential for inclusion of <100 sqm lot development types within master planned greenfield and brownfield areas, but questions the applicability of the position statement to established predominantly low density areas.
- The statement should provide greater guidance on the inclusion (or not) of this housing type within smaller infill sites, and potential interface with areas outside the Development zone.
- d. Interface is referenced in clause 3 of the statement which indicates that this form of development "needs to be integrated with the streetscape and surrounding development" however a corresponding statement is not included in the locational criteria which only state that it is to be "used as an integrating housing type between high density (urban) and low density (suburban) development".

- Inclusion of an additional location criterion, or modification of that referencing its interface role is recommended, as there are likely to be contexts where this form of development is not a suitable interface between a development site and a low density existing residential setting, which could be construed through reference to the location criteria in isolation.

e. In addition to the above, the City questions the completeness of the locational criteria. The information in the Terrace Housing National Market Survey notes a driver for this form of development is ‘connected’ (within close proximity to a train station or high frequency bus routes) and ‘high amenity’ (development close to shopping centres, town centres or high quality public open space). However proximity to public transport is not a consideration of locating development under the policy statement.

- It is presumed that this is deemed to be covered in broader planning policies discussing the allocation of density (which promote high density near public transport) however it is desirable to clarify this within the statement to remove any uncertainty. By contrast, access to both public open space and activity centres (which are also routine considerations in density allocation) are specified as necessary.

f. Additional locational questions that need clarifying are:

- If an existing structure plan has a density coding of R80 can <100 sqm lots be considered or does the structure plan have to be amended to specify <100 sqm lot development?
- Can areas coded R80 be considered for <100 sqm lots regardless of a structure plan being adopted or the locational criteria?

Retention/planting of trees

g. Trees contribute to the local environment and ecology, while creating a varied, interesting and attractive landscape that builds on the character of the place. Significant loss of urban tree canopy, due to private development, is an increasing focus of community concern.

h. The standards proposed within the position statement make no provision for tree retention or planting for microlots, promoting much more urban form (with up to 100% site cover) and assuming the provision of green space and landscaping off site. This is not unreasonable given the impracticality of developing such small lots and also retaining/planting trees with sizeable canopies at maturity within individual lots of this size.

- However the importance of extensive high quality tree planting within road reserves to compensate for lack of opportunity for planting within microlots should be given greater emphasis within the position statement.

i. This highlights the different approaches necessary in achieving suburban infill where a clearly established character and values exist, in contrast to larger scale masterplanning.

Open space

- j. The position statement does not have an open space requirement, however does have an outdoor living area requirement: one balcony of minimum dimension of 2.4m and a minimum area of 16 sqm (may be reduced to 10 sqm for single bedroom dwelling), directly assessable from a habitable room, balcony to face the street, at least 70% uncovered.
- The City suggests that, as this is the only open space provided for the development, the balcony area be increased so as to be effective and comfortable for occupants of this development type. Whilst the scale and proportions are debatable, appropriate solar orientation is recommended as a mandatory requirement.
- k. The dense built form promoted by the standards also warrant specific attention to the provision of street trees to provide green relief, shade and cooling (as referred to under g above), and to the avoidance of large concentrations of this form of development.
- Whilst this is alluded to and the location criteria state that this development form must not be predominate in any street form, it is desirable to more explicitly state expectations on the minority role of this form of development in product mix.

Sustainability

- l. In the feedback on the Freo Alternative, the theme of sustainability came up in many forms including specific elements in the design of buildings (e.g. solar panels and rainwater tanks) and the broader concept of housing that should be more sustainable (and affordable) to occupy and run.
- m. While the Freo Alternative's sustainability requirements may be deemed excessive for this new development type with its strong focus on affordability, the City suggests:
- that sustainable building initiatives should, as a minimum, be encouraged, recognising that cost of living is a longer term contributor to housing affordability. Orientation of lots to provide openings along the northern elevation is also recommended.

Built form

- n. The quality of design and built form becomes increasingly critical in more dense environments. Design quality is indirectly flagged through the reference to the Design Principles of SPP 7.1 Design WA however it is recommend that it be reflected more directly in an aspirational / objective statement within the position statement.
- o. More specifically, the terrace housing national market survey recognises a higher internal ceiling height in this development type, "provide a greater sense of space within the home". In the City's experience with small secondary dwellings (Freo's "granny flat" scheme amendment) small housing and ancillary dwelling, many applications propose an increased floor to ceiling height for this reason also. The WAPC's Design WA – draft apartment design requirements also propose a higher floor to ceiling height for habitable rooms in apartments.

- The City therefore suggests that this be incorporated as a requirement for this type of development.
- p. The City also has experience in applications for multiple dwelling developments where internalised bedrooms are proposed. The City considers this an undesirable outcome and, overall, poor design. It is recommended that that statement preclude internalised bedrooms, consistent with the WAPC's Design WA draft Apartment Design code (objective 4.1.2 - every habitable room to have a window).
- It is also recommended that the relationship between the LDP required for each site (which is required to address the principles of Design WA) against the apparent 'Deemed to Comply' standards of appendix 2 be clarified.

Community

- q. Bringing a sense of community back into the way housing is provided came through strongly in the engagement on the Freo Alternative. The interaction of a private development internally between residents and externally between the existing neighbourhood and street is important to improve safety and enhances social interactions of residents and the wider community.
- r. The Freo Alternative includes the requirement for a communal area to be provided in developments where more than three houses are built. As the position statement applies to single house lots, and not strata lots, incorporating communal spaces is unfeasible.
- As an alternative, the City supports design which addresses and promotes potential interaction between the development and the public realm through, for example, the placement of balconies or major openings to habitable rooms overlooking the street.
- This is promoted through the R-Codes and could, it is understood, be reinforced through the LDPs required for each site.

Car parking

- s. The car parking requirements in the position statement are a minimum one on-site car bay for two bedroom dwellings or less and one on-street visitor bay for every two dwellings.
- These standards are considered reasonable where within walking distance of amenities and public transport.

Carried: 6/0

Mayor, Brad Pettitt, Cr Jenny Archibald, Cr Bryn Jones,
Cr Rachel Pemberton, Cr Jeff McDonald, Cr Dave Hume

12. MOTIONS OF WHICH PREVIOUS NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

Nil

13. URGENT BUSINESS

Nil

14. LATE ITEMS

Nil

15. CONFIDENTIAL BUSINESS

Nil

16. CLOSURE OF MEETING

The Presiding Member declared the meeting closed at 7.08 pm.



MINUTES ATTACHMENTS

Strategic Planning and Transport Committee

Wednesday, 16 May 2018, 6.00 pm

