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## 1. Declaration of Opening

The Chairman declared the Planning Services Committee Meeting open at 4.00 pm and welcomed all present.

## 2. Record of Attendance/Apologies/Approved Leave of Absence

### 2.1 Councillors

- Cr Richard Smith  Chairperson
- Cr Deb Hamlin (arrived 4.01pm)
- Cr Leigh Liley
- Cr Allan Hill

### 2.2 Executive

- Mr Andrew Hammond  Chief Executive Officer
- Mr Bob Jeans  Director Planning and Development Services
- Mr Peter Ricci  Project Manager Keralup
- Mr Brett Ashby  Manager Strategic Planning and Environment
- Mr Richard Rodgers  Manager Building Services (until 4.07pm)
- Mr Mike Ross  Manager Statutory Planning
- Mr Rod Fielding  Manager Health Services (until 4.07pm)
- Ms Melinda Wellburn  PA to Director Planning and Development Services

**Members of the Public:** 1

**Press:** 1

### 2.3 Apologies:

- Cr Chris Elliott

### 2.4 Approved Leave of Absence:

- Nil

## 3. Responses to Previous Public Questions Taken on Notice

- Nil

## 4. Public Question Time

- Nil
5. **Confirmation of Minutes of the Previous Planning Services Committee Meeting**

Moved Cr Liley, seconded Cr Hill:

That Council **CONFIRM** the Minutes of the Planning Services Committee Meeting held on 19 March 2012, as a true and accurate record.

Committee Voting – 3/0

4.01pm - Cr Deb Hamlin arrived at the Planning Services Committee meeting.

6. **Matters Arising from the Previous Planning Services Committee Meeting Minutes**

Nil

7. **Announcement by the Presiding Person without Discussion**

The Chairman announced to all present that decisions made at Committees of Council are recommendations only and may be adopted in full, amended or deferred when presented for consideration at the next Council meeting.

8. **Declarations of Members and Officers Interests**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Proposed Amendment to Planning Policy 6.3 - Local Commercial Strategy - ‘Waikiki Village’ Shopping Centre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 8.1  | Councillor/Officer: Mr B Jeans  
Type of Interest: An Impartiality Interest  
Nature of Interest: Impartiality via Association  
Extent of Interest (if applicable): My daughter works for the proponent - Dynamic Planning and Developments |

9. **Petitions/Deputations/Presentations/Submissions**

Nil

10. **Matters for which the Meeting may be Closed**

Nil

11. **Bulletin Items**

**Planning Services Information Bulletin – April 2012**

**Health Services**

1. Health Services Team Overview
2. Human Resource Update
3. Project Status Reports
   - 3.1 FoodSafe
   - 3.2 Industrial and Commercial Waste Monitoring
   - 3.3 Community Health & Wellbeing Plan
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.4</th>
<th>Health Promotion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>North Rockingham Industrial Noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Ocean Water Sampling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Information Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.1</th>
<th>Mosquito-Borne Disease Notifications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Food Recalls - March 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Food Premises Inspections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Public Building Inspections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Outdoor Public Event Approvals - March 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>After Hours Noise &amp; Smoke Nuisance Complaint Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>Complaint - Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>Building Plan Assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>Septic Tank Applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>Demolitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>Swimming Pool Samples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>Rabbit Processing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>Hairdressing &amp; Skin Penetration Premises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>Family Day Care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>Kwinana Airshed Study Advisory Group (KASAG) Report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Building Services**

1. Building Services Team Overview
2. Human Resource Update
3. Project Status Reports
4. Information Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.1</th>
<th>Legislation Update - Building Act 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>Private Swimming Pool and Spa Inspection Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>Monthly Building Licence Approvals - (All Building Types)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>Certificates of Classification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Demolition Licence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>Community Sign Approvals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>Temporary Sign Licence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>Building Approval Certificates for Unauthorised Building Works</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>Provisional Approvals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>Monthly Caravan Park Site Approvals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Strategic Planning and Environment**

1. Strategic Planning and Environment Team Overview
2. Human Resource Update
3. Project Status Reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.1</th>
<th>Policy Manual Review (LUP/1265)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>Local Planning Strategy (LUP/1352)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>Amendment No.114 - Developer Contribution Plan No.2 (LUP/909)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3.5</th>
<th>Local Biodiversity Strategy Review (EVM/22)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>Karnup District Water Management Strategy (EVM/136)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Statutory Planning

1. Statutory Planning Team Overview
2. Human Resource Update
3. Project Status Reports
   - 3.1 CouncilsOnline (Planning Products via the Web) formerly eDA
4. Information Items
   - 4.1 Affordable Housing - Golden Bay and Settlers Hills
   - 4.2 Land Use – Planning Enforcement
   - 4.3 Subdivision/Development Approvals and Refusals by the WAPC
   - 4.4 Notifications and Gazettals
   - 4.5 Subdivision Clearances
   - 4.6 Subdivision Survey Approvals
   - 4.7 Delegated Development Approvals
   - 4.8 Delegated Development Refusals
   - 4.9 Delegated Building Envelope Variations
   - 4.10 Subdivision/Amalgamation Approved
   - 4.11 Subdivision/Amalgamation Refused
   - 4.12 Development Assessment Panels – Development Applications

### Director Planning and Development Services

1. Director Planning and Development Services Team Overview
2. Human Resource Update
3. Project Status Reports
   - 3.1 Administration Building Refurbishment/Fitout
   - 3.2 Rockingham Strategic Metropolitan Centre – Infrastructure Development Strategy
   - 3.3 Rockingham Primary Centre Infrastructure - Business Case
   - 3.4 Smart Village 1 Masterplan
   - 3.5 Keralup
   - 3.6 Karnup Station Transit Oriented Development
4. Information Items
   - 4.1 Liveable Cities Grant

### Appendices
Committee Recommendation

That Councillors acknowledge having read the Planning Services Information Bulletin – April 2012 and the contents be accepted.

Committee Voting – 4/0

4.07pm - Mr Rod Fielding, Manager Health Services and Mr Richard Rodgers, Manager Building Services left the Planning Services Committee meeting.
### 12. Agenda Items

#### Strategic Planning and Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference No &amp; Subject:</th>
<th>SPE-006/12 Proposed Activity Centre Structure Plan for the Baldivis District Town Centre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>File No:</td>
<td>LUP/862-08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proponent/s:</td>
<td>Urbis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author:</td>
<td>Mr Ross Underwood, Senior Planning Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Contributors:</td>
<td>Mr Jeff Bradbury, Coordinator Strategic Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Brett Ashby, Manager Strategic Planning &amp; Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Committee Meeting:</td>
<td>16th April 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously before Council:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure of Interest:</td>
<td>Executive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Council’s Role in this Matter:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site:</td>
<td>Various sites in Baldivis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Area:</td>
<td>72.55ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Zoning:</td>
<td>District Town Centre (north of Safety Bay Road) and Development (south of Safety Bay Road)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRS Zoning:</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachments:</td>
<td>1. Location Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. IDGP (Adopted June 1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. IDGP (Adopted September 2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. IDGP (Adopted February 2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. IDGP (Adopted May 2010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. IDGP (Adopted May 2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Proposed IDGP (Considered by Council in November 2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Precinct Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. Proposed Baldivis Activity Centre Structure Plan Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. Movement Diagram Showing Bus Routes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **Purpose of Report**

To consider a proposed Activity Centre Structure Plan for the Baldivis District Town Centre (or Baldivis Activity Centre), incorporating the area shown on Figure 1.

![Figure 1. Location Plan](image)

2. **Background**

The South West Corridor Structure Plan of 1993 identified a major commercial/institutional, employment centre and a mixed business area on the north-east corner of Nairn Drive and Safety Bay Road. In 1996, an Indicative Development Guide Plan (IDGP) was prepared for the Baldivis Town Centre to guide the future development of the site.

In 1997, the Council initiated an amendment to Town Planning Scheme No.1 to rezone land north of Safety Bay Road to ‘Baldivis Town Centre’ and to introduce Scheme provisions appurtenant to the new zone. The Scheme Amendment was gazetted in February 2000. The new provisions, which have been incorporated into Town Planning Scheme No.2 (TPS2), require an IDGP to be prepared to guide subdivision and development of land within the Town Centre (now zoned District Town Centre).

A Planning Policy for the Baldivis Town Centre (BTC Policy) was prepared in conjunction with the IDGP and Scheme Amendment, to guide the creation of an integrated town centre that is based around ‘main street’ principles (where mixed use developments front directly onto streets). The IDGP and BTC Policy were adopted by the Council in June 1999 (refer to Figure 2).

In September 2005, the Council adopted a modified IDGP to facilitate the development of Stage 1 of the Baldivis Shopping Centre, amongst other things. The main change to the IDGP was the western relocation of the main street (Settlers Avenue) to provide a larger, consolidated mall (Refer to Figure 3). Minor amendments to the BTC Policy were also adopted.

In February 2009, the Council adopted major modifications to the IDGP to modify the street network east of the linear park (Refer to Figure 4). Major amendments to the BTC Policy were also adopted.

In May 2010, the Council adopted further modifications to the IDGP to facilitate the development of a large-scale hardware of home goods showroom development (Masters Home Improvement) (Refer to Figure 5).
In May 2011, the Council adopted a modification to the IDGP to facilitate a variation to the building envelope of the Baldivis Shopping Centre to facilitate the development of built form fronting the linear park (Refer to Figure 6).

In November 2011, the Council resolved to publish a notice that the City has received an application to amend the IDGP for public comment, subject to a number of matters being addressed prior to the proposal being advertised.

The application proposes to alter the street network over Lot 9001, being the northwest quarter of the Baldivis Town Centre, and facilitate the development of 2,500m² of shop/retail floorspace on Lot 9001 along an extended Settlers Avenue (See Figure 7). The proposal is yet to be advertised for comment as the matters identified by Council as requiring addressing prior to advertising have not yet been satisfied.

Figure 2. IDGP (Adopted June 1999)
Figure 3. IDGP (Adopted September 2005)

Figure 4. IDGP (Adopted February 2009)
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Figure 5. IDGP (Adopted May 2010)

Figure 6. IDGP (Adopted May 2011)
3. Details

The City has received a proposed Activity Centre Structure Plan for the Baldivis District Town Centre (BACSP), to facilitate the expansion of the shop/retail floorspace of the Centre beyond the 25,000m² maximum allocated to the Centre in the City’s Planning Policy 6.3 – Local Commercial Strategy (LCS).

The BACSP is intended as a strategic planning document that provides a strategic framework for the Centre and informs and guides modifications to the statutory planning framework including TPS2, the IDGP, the BTC Policy and the Settlers Hills East Structure Plan.

The BACSP includes the following vision for the Baldivis District Town Centre, or Baldivis Activity Centre (the Centre):

"In 2031, the Baldivis Activity Centre will have a mixture of housing, office, shops, dining, community, entertainment and recreational uses that together create a harmonious and vibrant centre that is a community focal point for social interaction and effectively services the urban needs of the Baldivis locality."

The proposed boundary of the Centre extends beyond the existing boundaries of the District Town Centre zone to incorporate part of the Settlers Hills East Structure Plan area, south of Safety Bay Road. The extension to the Centre boundary incorporates land that functions as part of the activity centre and is within the walkable catchment of the core of the Centre.

The Centre is proposed to be divided into five precincts, to acknowledge their differing nature of intensity and land use. These precincts largely reflect the existing precincts that are identified on the IDGP. These precincts are identified in Figure 8, and are described as follows:-

- Core Precinct – Comprises the major shopping and community facilities.
- Transition Precinct – Provides for a mix of land uses, including small-format retail in mixed-use configurations, commercial, and residential dwellings in an urban setting.
- Northern Precinct – Predominately residential in character; intended to link the urban housing form within the Transitional Precinct and retail/commercial core to the more traditional suburban housing product within the adjacent residential developments to the north.

- Eastern Precinct – Strategically located to provide for businesses that, due to their size or nature, are more car-orientated.

- Southern Precinct – Residential in nature; provides a range of living choices.

The BACSP also considers the Centre’s context, the movement network, activity, built form and resource conservation against relevant requirements. The BACSP includes an implementation section, which proposes the following:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Changes Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IDGP</td>
<td>Update precinct boundaries, precinct names, street layouts and building envelopes in accordance with the BACSP and the current proposed IDGP amendment before the Council.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BTC Policy</td>
<td>Update precinct names, preferred precinct land uses (to reflect changed boundaries) and insert reference to the strategic document guidance from the BACSP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LCS</td>
<td>Increase permissible shop/retail floorspace within the Baldivis Town (District) Centre to 35,931m² NLA.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The recommendations of the BACSP are represented in a spatial form in a Structure Plan Map (see Figure 9). The Map incorporates the proposed changes to the IDGP that were considered by Council in November 2011, as well as the layout of the Settlers Hills East Structure Plan.
4. Implications to Consider

a. Consultation with the Community

Given the nature of the document, it is proposed that the BACSP be advertised for public comment to affected owners and occupiers of residential land in or near the Centre and owners of commercial-zoned land that would be affected by the proposal. It is considered that 30 days is a suitable period for public consultation.

b. Consultation with Government Agencies

The BACSP will be referred to relevant government agencies for comment, including the Department of Planning, Main Roads Western Australia, Public Transport Authority and service providers.

Under State Planning Policy 4.2 – Activity Centres for Perth and Peel (SPP4.2), the responsible authority for endorsing an activity centre structure plan for a district centre with shop/retail floorspace that exceeds 20,000m² is the Western Australian Planning Commission (WAPC). The City will forward the BACSP to the WAPC for endorsement following the consideration of any submissions received during the consultation period.

c. Strategic

Community Plan

This item addresses the Community’s Vision for the future and specifically the following Aspiration contained in the Community Plan 2011:-

**Aspiration 11:** Planning for population growth to ensure that future development and land-uses contribute to a sustainable city that provides for a genuinely desirable lifestyle
State Planning Policy 4.2 – Activity Centres for Perth and Peel was gazetted in August 2010. Its main purpose is to specify broad planning requirements for the planning and development of new activity centres and the redevelopment and renewal of existing activity centres in Perth and Peel. It is mainly concerned with the distribution, function, broad land use and urban design criteria of activity centres, and with coordinating their land use and infrastructure planning.

‘Activity Centres’ are community focal points; they include activities such as commercial, retail, higher-density housing, entertainment, tourism, civic/community, higher education and medical services. Activity Centres vary in size and diversity and are designed to be well-serviced by public transport.

The Baldivis Town Centre is identified as a ‘district centre’ under SPP4.2. District Centres have a greater focus of servicing the daily and weekly needs of residents. Their relatively smaller-scale catchment (20,000 – 50,000 persons) enables them to have a greater local community focus and provide services, facilities and job opportunities that reflect the particular needs of their catchments.

SPP4.2 requires an activity centre structure plan to be prepared for a district centre prior to major development being approved to ensure the centre’s development is integrated, cohesive and accessible. ‘Major development’ includes building for shop/retail purposes where the proposed building is more than 10,000m² or extension is more than 5,000m². Stockland intend to apply for an extension of the Baldivis Shopping Centre that exceeds 5,000m², and therefore an activity centre structure plan must be prepared under SPP4.2.

SPP4.2 sets out the requirements for an activity centre structure plan, and includes performance indicators. The following table sets out the performance indicators of SPP4.2, and the City’s assessment of the BACSP against the performance criteria.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Indicators</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Context</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Consistency with the role and typical functions for a district centre, as set out in Table 3 of SPP4.2</td>
<td>The BACSP facilitates the development of a discount department store, supermarkets, small-scale comparison shopping, speciality shops, offices, professional services and bulky retail. These uses are consistent with the typical retail types for a district centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local context</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Responsive to the area’s natural, cultural and historical heritage.</td>
<td>The BACSP and Structure Plan Map integrates well with the surrounding area, and takes advantage of the environmental values of the adjacent Tamworth Hill Swamp. Given the greenfield setting, there is little cultural or historical heritage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Integration with the surrounding area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Public transport infrastructure</strong></td>
<td>The BACSP notes that six future bus routes will service Baldivis (based on the Public Transport Authority’s future route planning), and includes a movement diagram showing five of the six future bus routes servicing the Centre. A bus rapid transit system is identified between Settlers Avenue and Warnbro Train Station via Safety Bay Road. Bus stops are identified generally within 250m of all parts of the Centre. The movement diagram provides a good basis for public transport infrastructure planning in and near the Centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Prioritisation of public transport.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Walking and cycling access

4.1 Provision for end-of-trip facilities.
4.2 Improved access and facilities for pedestrians and cyclists.

The provision of end-of-trip facilities is addressed in the City’s Planning Policy 3.3.14 – Bicycle Parking and End-of-Trip Facilities.

The BACSP notes that improvement to pedestrian and cycle infrastructure will be considered as part of subdivision and development approval processes. This is considered satisfactory given the Centre is not fully developed.

Traffic assessment and freight servicing

5.1 Improved access by all modes, including freight vehicles.

A transport assessment has been provided which demonstrates that the Centre can operate in a functional and efficient manner, subject to some minor intersection treatments and the completion of the road network.

The BACSP notes that there is a strong aspiration to provide a four-way intersection at the junction of Safety Bay Road / Settlers Avenue / Abington Avenue in the long-term, to meet the urban design objective of improving permeability through the Centre. The transport assessment notes that this is not desirable due to queuing lengths impacting on the level of service of the Safety Bay Road / Nairn Drive roundabout intersection. The BACSP recommends that the suitability of the four-way intersection be continuously reviewed, particularly if the Safety Bay Road / Nairn Drive roundabout is converted to a signalised intersection.

Centre parking strategy

7.1 Provides for upper limits and common-use of car parking.

Maximum car parking rates are already applied under TPS2. The requirement for public access easements for parking and access can be included in the BTC Policy for consideration at the subdivision and development approval stage.

Estimated employment

8.1 Number, range and density of jobs.

The BACSP predicts that the Centre will employ 1,408 persons by 2014 and 2,627 persons by 2031. The majority will be employed in the retail sector, with the remainder being employed in office, bulky goods, medical/community and entertainment/restaurant sectors.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Floorspace estimate by land use</strong></th>
<th>The BACSP predicts an ultimate total floorspace of 35,931m² of shop/retail and 38,262m² of non-retail (including office, community, medical, showrooms, etc). This represents a 48% mix of land uses which exceeds the minimum 30% target set by SPP4.2. Plans are progressing for the construction of a library, community centre and outdoor space on Settlers Avenue.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.1 The mix of land uses’ floorspace target.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.2 Provision of community, civic and cultural facilities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing density target</strong></td>
<td>The BACSP provides indicative residential densities based for the short-term and the long-term. It demonstrates that the Centre can accommodate 999 dwellings in the short-term, based on full development using the existing densities set out in the BTC Policy and the Settlers East Structure Plan. This equates to a density of 13.8 dwellings per gross hectare (d/gha), which fails to achieve the minimum 20d/gha or desirable 30d/gha targets set by SPP4.2. Increases to the density requirements of the BTC Policy or the Structure Plan are not proposed. The BACSP proposes a long-term density that exceeds 20d/gha based on the redevelopment of various sites (carparks and buildings) on Settlers Avenue and the northern side of Safety Bay Road, to facilitate 518 additional dwellings. Redevelopment to facilitate the long-term density is not able to be achieved in the short-term because of economic constraints and requires owners of various sites to voluntarily redevelop existing sites to accommodate this aspirational residential development, and accordingly amendments to the BTC Policy and the IDGP are not proposed. Because the long-term densities will not be implemented, it is not suitable for assessing the BACSP against the density targets of SPP4.2. The existing densities of the BTC Policy and the Settlers Hills East Structure Plan were based on the density targets of Liveable Neighbourhoods. Given these density targets are now superseded by SPP4.2, there is an opportunity to review the existing density controls for undeveloped sites in the context of the density targets of SPP4.2. It is recommended that the issue of density be further investigated in liaison with the Department of Planning during the public consultation phase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.1 Housing density target.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retail sustainability assessment</strong></td>
<td>The proposal is accompanied by a Retail Sustainability Assessment (RSA) which concludes that there is significant unmet market demand for retail facilities in Baldivis, the assessed impact on any one centre is manageable, and the proposed extension would not be expected to adversely impact the role, function and viability of other activity centres. The City’s retail consultant, MacroPlanDimasi, has undertaken a preliminary review of the RSA and has not identified any major concerns. The RSA will be subject to a more thorough review during the consultation period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.1 Retail scale justified in the context of catchment and centre classification.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Street interface

14.1 Ratio of external, street-oriented to internal (mall-based) tenancies.
14.2 Passive surveillance of streets and public spaces.
14.3 Active uses at ground floor.

SPP4.2 sets no target for ratios of street-front and mall tenancies. The City’s estimate is that while the current ratio of street-front to mall tenancies is 53%, at full development the ratio could fall to around 47%. This represents development in accordance with the existing IDGP (with no changes proposed), and there is minimal opportunity to increase the ratio of street-front tenancies at this stage.

The current provisions of the BTC Policy provide for passive surveillance of streets and public spaces and active uses at ground floor.

### Public spaces and landscaping

15.1 Quality of public and open spaces.

A minimum 10% of public open space has been provided through the Centre as identified on the IDGP and Settlers Hills East Structure Plan. It is expected that parks and public spaces within the Baldivis District Town Centre will be developed to a high standard.

### Energy and water conservation

17.1 Demonstrated energy-efficient building orientation and design.
17.2 Provision for water saving and re-use of water in landscaping and buildings.

The BACSP references the requirements of the Building Code of Australia, where energy-efficiency controls are set out. It also requires waterwise plants to be incorporated into all landscape designs.

### Collaboration, staging and monitoring, use of conditions, and planning obligations and incentives

18.1 Demonstrated collaboration with local government and with transport and other relevant infrastructure agencies.
18.2 Effective strategy and coordination arrangements for staged implementation of the structure plan.

Collaboration has been limited, but it is acknowledged that more detailed collaboration will occur at the subdivision and development stages.

Under the BACSP, changes are required to the BTC Policy, the IDGP and the LCS to reflect the recommendations and precinct changes proposed by it. The City will be responsible for implementing these changes, and will proceed by:

- Incorporating precinct changes via modifications to the IDGP;
- Modifying the BTC following adoption of the BACSP; and
- Incorporating the recommendations of the BACSP within the review of the LCS for Baldivis which is currently being undertaken by the City.

The BACSP also identifies improvements to intersections on safety Bay Road that will be required by 2031 to maintain a high level of service. The BACSP notes that the City will be responsible for managing the timing of the upgrades and will assess whether contributions to the upgrading is warranted for any particular development or subdivision application.

As well as the above performance indicators, SPP4.2 requires activity centre structure plans to include the requirements of its ‘Model Centre Framework’ in Appendix 2. The BACSP incorporates the requirements of the Model Centre Framework.

### Directions 2031 and Beyond

The WAPC’s Directions 2031 and Beyond is a high-level spatial framework and strategic plan that establishes a vision for future growth of the metropolitan Perth and Peel region; it provides a framework to guide the detailed planning and delivery of housing, infrastructure and services necessary to accommodate a range of growth scenarios. The BACSP is consistent with the objectives of Directions 2031 and Beyond.

---

As confirmed at a Planning Services Meeting held on Monday, 14 May 2012, the above performance indicators, SPP4.2 requirements, and collaboration, staging, and monitoring, use of conditions, planning obligations, and incentives are essential for the development of the Baldivis District Town Centre.
Liveable Neighbourhoods

The WAPC’s *Liveable Neighbourhoods* is an operational policy for the design and assessment of structure plans (regional, district and local) and subdivision for new urban (predominately residential) areas in the metropolitan area and country centres, on greenfield and large urban infill sites. It also provides guidance on delivery and design of centres, strengthening main street development, achieving walkable centres and delivery of jobs and employment.

The BACSP incorporates the requirements of *Liveable Neighbourhoods*, including a main-street structure, provision of sites for mixed business, incorporation of industrial and warehousing, street layout and parking requirements, integration with public transport and community safety.

Planning to Support Transit Use and Transit Oriented Development

Objectives of the WAPC’s Development Control Policy 1.6 - *Planning to Support Transit Use and Transit Oriented Development* include promoting and facilitating the use of public transport, ensuring the optimal use of land within transit-oriented precincts and ensuring that opportunities for transit-supportive development are realised. The recommendations of the BACSP are consistent with the requirements of *Planning to Support Transit Use and Transit Oriented Development*.

Baldivis Town Centre

The BTC Policy addresses many of the requirements of SPP4.2. Some changes will be required to the BTC Policy if the BACSP is adopted, including changing precinct names, modifying preferred uses and incorporating a number of new provisions.

Local Commercial Strategy

The LCS promotes the development of a hierarchy of centres which are viable, sustainable and which provide maximum benefit to the community. It identifies a number of local and neighbourhood centres in Baldivis supported by the Baldivis District Town Centre. The LCS allocates a maximum shop/retail floorspace of 25,000m² to the Centre.

The City has recently commenced a review of the LCS as it applies to Baldivis, which will be informed by the BACSP.

Residential Design Codes

Recent changes to State Planning Policy 3.1 – *Residential Design Codes* include the introduction of AC Codes which apply to multiple dwellings within mixed use development and activity centres. The recommendations of the *Residential Design Codes* do not need to be incorporated into the BACSP, but may be considered upon the review of the BTC Policy.

e. Financial

Nil

f. Legal and Statutory

There are no legal or statutory requirements relating to an activity centre structure plan; content and procedural requirements are set out in SPP4.2.

5. Comments

The BACSP largely addresses the requirements for an activity centre structure plan under SPP4.2 and other policies, and is considered suitable for determining the strategic direction for the Baldivis District Town Centre. It is recommended that the BACSP be progressed by inviting comment on the proposal from affected owners, occupiers and relevant authorities. The issue of density targets will be further investigated during the public consultation period.

6. Voting Requirements

Simple Majority
7. **Officer Recommendation**

That Council *ENDORSE* advertising of the proposed Activity Centre Structure Plan for the Baldivis District Town Centre.

8. **Committee Recommendation**

That Council *ENDORSE* advertising of the proposed Activity Centre Structure Plan for the Baldivis District Town Centre.

Committee Voting – 4/0

9. **The Committee's Reason for Varying the Officer's Recommendation**

Not applicable

10. **Implications of the Changes to the Officer's Recommendation**

Not applicable
### Planning Services
#### Statutory Planning Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference No &amp; Subject:</th>
<th>SP-014/12 Proposed Home Occupation (Furniture Restoration)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>File No:</td>
<td>28/6423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proponent/s:</td>
<td>Mr Anthony Aliphon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author:</td>
<td>Mr John-Paul MacDonagh, Planning Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Contributors:</td>
<td>Mr Dave Waller, Coordinator Statutory Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Mike Ross, Manager Statutory Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Committee Meeting:</td>
<td>16th April 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously before Council:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure of Interest:</td>
<td>Tribunal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Council’s Role in this Matter:</td>
<td>Tribunal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Site:                   | Lot 581 (No.6) Sellafield Bend, Waikiki                   |
| Lot Area:               | 572m²                                                     |
| LA Zoning:              | Residential (R20)                                         |
| MRS Zoning:             | Urban                                                     |
| Attachments:            | Schedule of Submissions                                  |
| Maps/Diagrams:         | 1. Location Plan                                         |
|                        | 2. Vehicle Photo                                         |
|                        | 3. View of property from Sellafield Bend                 |
|                        | 4. Workshop Photo                                        |
|                        | 5. Consultation Plan                                      |

This Item was withdrawn at the request of the applicant.
1. Purpose of Report

To consider nominating a Councillor on the Metropolitan South-West Joint Development Assessment Panel (SWJDAP), as Cr Allan Hill has resigned his appointment on the SWJDAP.

2. Background

In 2011 the State Government introduced legislation to introduce Development Assessment Panels (DAPs) in Western Australia. DAPs came into effect on the 1st July 2011.

A DAP is an independent decision making body that determine certain types of development instead of Council and/or the WAPC. DAPs are comprised of three technical experts and two elected local government representatives.

Certain Development Applications received by the City are determined by the SWj DAP. The SWj DAP includes the following local governments:-

- Rockingham
- Cockburn
- East Fremantle
Local Government members will rotate on and off meetings of the SWJDAP, so that the JDAP application within each Local Government is represented by the relevant Local Government Member.

In October 2011, Council nominated Cr Allan Hill and Cr Richard Smith as its representatives on the SWJDAP. Alternate Members were not considered. Cr Joy Stewart retains her position as an Alternate Member (via the Council's original nomination in April 2011), however, a replacement was required for the position held formerly by Cr Les Dodd.

In December 2011, Council nominated Cr Elliott as its Alternate Member on the SWJDAP, to the Minister for Planning. At the time of writing this report, the DAP Ministerial Liaison Unit was expediting Cr Elliott's appointment by the Minister.

On 8th February 2012, Cr Allan Hill advised the Acting CEO, Mr Chris Thompson that he was resigning his membership of the SWJDAP.

The current SWJDAP Local Government Members include:
1. Cr Richard Smith, appointed by the Minister
2. Vacant. Formerly Cr Allan Hill, appointed by the Minister

The following Alternate Members are proxy members that may attend in the absence of one or both Local Government Members, as follows:
1. Cr Joy Stewart, appointed by the Minister
2. Cr Chris Elliott, subject to appointment by the Minister

The SWJDAP Specialist Members include:
1. Mr Neil Foley, Presiding Member
2. Ms Rachel Chapman, Deputy Presiding Member
3. Mr Robert Nicholson, Specialist Member

Accordingly, there are five members of the SWJDAP.

3. Details

The Council is required to nominate a second Local Government Member on the SWJDAP, for appointment by the Minister for Planning, as Cr Allan Hill has resigned his appointment on the SWJDAP.

4. Implications to Consider

a. Consultation with the Community
   Not applicable

b. Consultation with Government Agencies
   Not applicable

c. Strategic
   Community Plan
   This item addresses the Community's Vision for the future and specifically the following Aspiration contained in the Community Plan 2011:-
   
   **Aspiration 11:** Planning for population growth to ensure that future development and land-use contribute to a sustainable city that provided for a genuinely desirable lifestyle.

d. Policy
   Not applicable
e. **Financial**

Not applicable

f. **Legal and Statutory**

The *Planning and Development (Development Assessment Panels) Regulations 2011* (Regulations), which establish the operational framework for Development Assessment Panels requires relevant local government to nominate four elected members of the Council, comprising two Local Members and two Alternate Members to sit on the SWJDAP.

Councillors are appointed by the Minister for Planning for a two year term.

Local Government elections may result in a change to a Local DAP membership if current nominated Councillors, who are DAP Members, are not re-elected. In this instance the deputy Local DAP Members will take the place of the former local DAP members. If both the Local and Alternative (deputy) Local Members are not re-elected, the Council would need to renominate and the Minister to reappoint.

**Training of DAP Members**

The DAP regulations prevent a SWJDAP member from attending a meeting without first completing mandatory training. Any SWJDAP member who successfully completes training is entitled to the payment of $400 from the Department.

**Fees and Allowances for DAP members**

A SWJDAP member who attends a SWJDAP meeting is entitled to be paid the fee set out in Schedule 2 item 1 and 2 of the Regulations, as follows:-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schedule 2 – Fees for DAP Members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Fee for presiding member per meeting to determine development applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Fee for any other member per meeting to determine development applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Fee per meeting for presiding member to determine applications to amend or cancel determination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Fee per meeting for any other member to determine applications to amend or cancel determination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Fee for presiding member attending proceeding in State Administrative Tribunal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Fee for any other member attending proceeding in State Administrative Tribunal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Fee for training</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Appeals**

An applicant who is aggrieved by a determination of the SWJDAP to refuse an application; or any conditions imposed by a DAP in the determination of the application; or a deemed refused SWJDAP application may apply to the State Administrative Tribunal for a review of the decision. The SWJDAP will be required to defend its decision at the State Administrative Tribunal. Therefore the DAP will be the respondent in SAT proceedings regarding its determinations. The local government SWJDAP member fee is $400 to attend SAT.

5. **Comments**

The recommendation leaves the Councillor nominee blank, to enable Council to nominate a Local Government Member on the SWJDAP, to the Minister for Planning.
6. **Voting Requirements**

Simple Majority

7. **Officer Recommendation**

That Council *NOMINATE* Cr __________ as the City of Rockingham Local Government Member on the Metropolitan South-West Joint Development Assessment Panel, to the Minister for Planning, in response to the resignation of Cr Allan Hill on the Metropolitan South-West Joint Development Assessment Panel.

8. **Committee Recommendation**

That Council *NOMINATE* Cr Liley, as the City of Rockingham Local Government Member on the Metropolitan South-West Joint Development Assessment Panel, to the Minister for Planning, in response to the resignation of Cr Allan Hill on the Metropolitan South-West Joint Development Assessment Panel.

Committee Voting – 4/0

9. **The Committee's Reason for Varying the Officer's Recommendation**

Not applicable

10. **Implications of the Changes to the Officer's Recommendation**

Not applicable
### Planning Services
#### Statutory Planning Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference No &amp; Subject:</th>
<th>SP-016/12 Proposed Home Occupation (Dog Grooming)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>File No:</td>
<td>28/6443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proponent/s:</td>
<td>Ms Monika Termann</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author:</td>
<td>Ms Erika Barton, Senior Planning Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Contributors:</td>
<td>Mr Dave Waller, Coordinator Statutory Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Committee Meeting:</td>
<td>16th April 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously before Council:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure of Interest:</td>
<td>Tribunal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Council’s Role in this Matter:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site:</td>
<td>Lot 739 (No. 82) Montoro Drive, Port Kennedy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Area:</td>
<td>550m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Zoning:</td>
<td>Development (R20/40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRS Zoning:</td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachments:</td>
<td>Schedule of Submissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maps/Diagrams:</td>
<td>1. Location Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Consultation Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Site Plan – Proposed Grooming Salon</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Location Plan – Lot 739 (No. 82) Montoro Drive, Port Kennedy

1. **Purpose of Report**

To consider an application seeking planning approval for a Home Occupation (Dog Grooming) at Lot 739 (No. 82) Montoro Drive, Port Kennedy.

2. **Background**

Not Applicable

3. **Details**

The proponent seeks approval to operate a dog grooming business from the premises. The proponent is the occupier of the dwelling and the sole operator of the business. Dog grooming activities will be performed in an existing shed at the rear of the dwelling.

The proposed hours of operation are 8:00am to 5:00pm Wednesday to Friday (inclusive) and 8:00am to 12 noon Saturdays. The Home Occupation proposes a maximum of eight clients per day, with a maximum of two clients attending the property at any one time.

There is no signage proposed as part of the application.
3. Site Plan – Proposed Grooming Salon
4. Implications to Consider

a. Consultation with the Community

In accordance with clause 6.3.3 of Town Planning Scheme No. 2 (TSP2) and Planning Procedure 1.3 – Community Consultation, the application was referred to 22 nearby land owners for comment for a period of 14 days.

At the close of the advertising period, three submissions objecting to the proposal were received from the owners of No. 84 Montoro Drive and No. 67 San Sebastian Boulevard, and the occupier of No. 65 San Sebastian Boulevard. The submissions raised the following objections:

(i) The howling/barking of the applicant’s own dogs. Concerns were raised that this will be exacerbated with client’s dogs attending the property;

(ii) Increased traffic as a result of the development and the conflict with children playing and walking in the area, especially with the school and park in close proximity;

(iii) An understanding that no businesses could be carried out in this area; and

(iv) The peaceful environment will be adversely affected with the development proceeding.

2. Consultation Plan

b. Consultation with Government Agencies

Not Applicable

c. Strategic

Community Plan

This item addresses the Community’s Vision for the future and specifically the following Aspiration contained in the Community Plan 2011:-

Aspiration 11: Planning for population growth to ensure that future development and land-uses contribute to a sustainable city that provides for a genuinely desirable lifestyle.
**d. Policy**

Planning Policy 3.3.10 – Home Occupations and Home Businesses (the Policy) sets out policy objectives and provisions which the Council must have regard to in the assessment and determination of applications for planning approval for Home Occupations and Home Businesses.

The objectives of the Policy are as follows:

“(a) To promote the orderly and proper development of land by making suitable provisions to guide applicants who wish to operate a Home Occupation or a Home Business from a dwelling;

(b) To secure the amenity, health and convenience of the neighbourhood through appropriate development requirements; and

(c) To provide for economic growth and employment opportunities by facilitating the development of home based businesses.”

The Policy assessment criteria include the:-

(i) Method of Operation – The operation of the Home Occupation must not cause injury to or adversely affect the amenity of the neighbourhood.

(ii) Scale of Operation – The Home Occupation:

- does not employ any person not a member of the occupier's household;
- does not occupy an area greater than 20m²; and
- does not involve the use of an essential service of greater capacity than normally required in the zone.

(iii) Traffic Generation – The traffic generated by the Home Occupation must not have the potential to adversely affect the amenity of the neighbourhood. All visits to the site must be controlled i.e. by appointment only. If the Home Occupation is likely to have an adverse impact on the existing nature of the street or its amenity, the Council is unlikely to approve the proposal.

(iv) Car Parking – The Home Occupation must not result in the requirement for a greater number of parking facilities than normally required for a single dwelling.

(v) Advertising Signs – The maximum permitted signage size is 0.2m² for a Home Occupation and no more than one sign is permitted on the land.

(vi) Health Requirements – Where commercial food is prepared the provisions of the Health (Food Hygiene) Regulations 1993 apply.

The proposed Home Occupation was assessed against the above Policy and is considered to be complaint. In relation to point (b), noise concerns are addressed in the comments section below. The shed has an area of 30m², however use of the shed for the occupation is to be restricted to 20m² in accordance with the Policy.

**e. Financial**

Not applicable

**f. Legal and Statutory**

In the Development Zone, the permissibility of a Home Occupation is to be determined in accordance with the relevant structure plan. In this instance, the site is zoned Residential R20 under the St Michel Structure Plan. Pursuant to clause 4.2.9.3 of TPS2 a Home Occupation is a (D) use, that is not permitted unless the Council has exercised its discretion by granting planning approval.

TPS2 defines a Home Occupation as follows:-

“Home Occupation means an occupation carried out in a dwelling or on land around a dwelling by an occupier of the dwelling which:

(a) does not employ any person not a member of the occupier’s household;
Clause 4.16.1 of TPS2 similarly states that Council will only permit the operation of a Home Occupation within a dwelling or property, when it is satisfied that the operation:

“(i) does not employ any person not a member of the occupier’s household;
(ii) will not cause injury to or adversely affect the amenity of the neighbourhood;
(iii) does not occupy an area greater than 20 square metres.
(iv) does not display a sign exceeding 0.2 square metres;
(v) does not involve the retail sale, display or hire of goods of any nature;
(vi) in relation to vehicles and parking, does not result in parking facilities normally required for a single dwelling;
(vii) does not involve the use or an essential service of greater capacity than normally required in the zone.”

The proposed Home Occupation was assessed against the above TPS2 requirements and is considered to be complaint.

Noise Controls

Noise from dogs is controlled by the Dog Act 1997 (the Act), which is enforceable by the City’s Ranger Services. Section 38(2b) of the Act states that a dog shall be taken to be a nuisance if:-

“… it creates a noise, by barking or otherwise, which persistently occurs or continues to a degree or extent not normally habitual in dogs and has a disturbing effect on the state of reasonable, physical, mental, or social well-being of a person”.

Noise from dogs would be controlled by dogs being groomed in the shed and the proponent agreeing to control dog behaviour at all times and not agreeing to customers returning their dogs if they present a noise problem.

Formal complaint can be made to the City’s Ranger Services for persistent barking.
If the clients’ dogs prove to be a nuisance in terms of barking, clients will be required to restrain their dogs during appointments. If the dogs continue to be a noise nuisance, the proponent is to ensure that those dogs do not return. Clients will access the site via a new gate to the west of the existing dwelling. The proponent has installed a fence and gates to isolate the shed and access to it from the remainder of the back yard, thus ensuring there is no interaction between her dogs and the clients.

As previously mentioned, noise from dogs will be controlled by grooming occurring only within the shed. A condition of approval is recommended requiring the shed door to be closed at all times, whilst the Home Occupation is operating, to further minimise any noise impact. The proponent has advised that the shed will be lined with acoustic bats and plasterboard to provide for sound insulation.

Given the small scale of the proposal, any impacts on residential amenity are considered to be minimal. Given the concerns raised by the neighbours, it is recommended the approval be limited to a period of 12 months. A renewal of Planning Approval will be considered based upon there being no adverse impacts on the amenity of neighbours.

(ii) Traffic
Concern was raised as to the traffic impact of the proposal. Sufficient area exists on site for the parking of client vehicles. The minor nature of traffic generated by the proposal is not considered to have an adverse impact on the safety or functioning of the street network. It is recommended that any approval be conditioned to require clients to make appointments before visiting, which is a Policy requirement.

(iii) Businesses in Area
Home occupations may be approved by the Council in the Development zone under TPS2, where Policy compliant.

(iv) Amenity of Locality
The potential impacts can be appropriately mitigated to ensure the amenity of the locality is not adversely affected.

Conclusions
The proposal is consistent with the Home Occupation requirements of TPS2 and the Policy. On balance of the issues raised in the submissions and the merits of the proposal, it is recommended that Council approve the application for a Home Occupation (Dog Grooming), subject to a 12 month time limit.

6. Voting Requirements

Simple Majority

7. Officer Recommendation

That Council APPROVE the application for a Home Occupation (Dog Grooming) at Lot 739 (No.82) Montoro Drive, Port Kennedy, subject to the following conditions:-

1. This Approval (where development has substantially commenced) is only valid for a period of twelve months from the date of issue. Planning Approval must be obtained for continuation of the development past this date.

2. The Home Occupation must only be operated from the shed, and the shed door must remain closed when grooming/washing dogs.

3. Clients must not be permitted to attend the premises, except by appointment and with an interval of at least 15 minutes between clients.

4. Client appointments must only occur between the hours of 8:00am to 5:00pm, Wednesdays to Fridays (inclusive), and 8:00am to 12 noon on Saturdays.

5. There shall be no more than one client dog on site at any one time.
6. The occupier's dogs must be restrained within the backyard and dwelling when clients attend the premises.
7. All clients attending the premises must park on the driveway of the premises.
8. All dogs attending the premises must be restrained at all times, when entering and leaving the premises.
9. All wastewater must be disposed of into the Water Corporation’s sewer.
10. All materials and/or equipment used in relation to the Home Occupation must be stored within the residence, shed and/or rear yard, behind property fences, at all times.
11. The Home Occupation must comply with all of the standards and requirements of City Planning Policy 3.3.10 – Home Occupations and Home Businesses, at all times.

8. Committee Recommendation

That Council APPROVE the application for a Home Occupation (Dog Grooming) at Lot 739 (No.82) Montoro Drive, Port Kennedy, subject to the following conditions:-

1. This Approval (where development has substantially commenced) is only valid for a period of twelve months from the date of issue. Planning Approval must be obtained for continuation of the development past this date.
2. The Home Occupation must only be operated from the shed, and the shed door must remain closed when grooming/washing dogs.
3. Clients must not be permitted to attend the premises, except by appointment and with an interval of at least 15 minutes between clients.
4. Client appointments must only occur between the hours of 8:00am to 5:00pm, Wednesdays to Fridays (inclusive), and 8:00am to 12 noon on Saturdays.
5. There shall be no more than one client dog on site at any one time.
6. The occupier's dogs must be restrained within the backyard and dwelling when clients attend the premises.
7. All clients attending the premises must park on the driveway of the premises.
8. All dogs attending the premises must be restrained at all times, when entering and leaving the premises.
9. All wastewater must be disposed of into the Water Corporation’s sewer.
10. All materials and/or equipment used in relation to the Home Occupation must be stored within the residence, shed and/or rear yard, behind property fences, at all times.
11. The Home Occupation must comply with all of the standards and requirements of City Planning Policy 3.3.10 – Home Occupations and Home Businesses, at all times.

Committee Voting – 4/0

9. The Committee's Reason for Varying the Officer's Recommendation

Not applicable

10. Implications of the Changes to the Officer's Recommendation

Not applicable
### Reference No & Subject:

**File No:** SP-017/12

**Proponent/s:** Proposed Building Envelope Modification (Golden Bay)

**Author:**

**Other Contributors:**

**Date of Committee Meeting:** 16th April 2012

**Previously before Council:**

**Disclosure of Interest:**

**Nature of Council’s Role in this Matter:**

**Site:** Lot 501 (No. 2) Goodman Place, Golden Bay

**Lot Area:** 2,001m²

**LA Zoning:** Special Residential

**MRS Zoning:** Rural

**Attachments:**

1. Location Plan
2. Building Envelope Modification
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1. Location Plan – Lot 501 (No.20) Goodman Place, Golden Bay

1. Purpose of Report

To consider an application seeking planning approval to expand the existing Building Envelope for Lot 501 (No.2) Goodman Place, Golden Bay.

2. Background

In November 2011, Council resolved to amend Planning Policy No.3.3.17 - Variations to Building Envelopes (the Policy).

The intent of the amendment was to:-

(i) state that in the case of the Golden Bay and Singleton Special Rural and Special Residential Zones, the location of building envelopes was specifically intended to maintain the rural attributes and appearance of the land, looking westward from Mandurah Road and looking to the east from the townsites of Singleton and Golden Bay; and

(ii) require that applications to vary building envelopes in the Golden Bay and Singleton Special Rural and Special Residential Zones be referred to the Council for determination.

In February 2012, Council amended Planning Procedure 1.1 - Delegated Authority to reflect the abovementioned amendments to the Policy.

3. Details

The proponent seeks approval to extend the Building Envelope on the south eastern end of the existing Building Envelope. The modification would result in an increase in the area of the Building Envelope by 75m². The purpose of the extension is to facilitate the development of a new shed in this location.
2. Building Envelope Modification

4. Implications to Consider

a. Consultation with the Community

In accordance with Clause 6.3.3 of Town Planning Scheme No.2 (TPS2) and the Policy, Building Envelopes may be varied at the discretion of the Council, only after consultation with the owners of affected or adjoining properties. The application was referred to two nearby land owners and occupiers for comment, for a period of 14 days, as shown on the Consultation Plan. At the close of the public comment period, no submissions were received.

b. Consultation with Government Agencies

Not Applicable
c. Strategic

Community Plan

This item addresses the Community’s Vision for the future and specifically the following Aspiration contained in the Community Plan 2011:-

Aspiration 11: Planning for population growth to ensure that future development and land-uses contribute to a sustainable city that provides for a genuinely desirable lifestyle.

d. Policy

Planning Policy 3.3.17 – Variations to Building Envelopes (the Policy) applies to the application. The Policy requires Building Envelopes to be located based upon environmental conditions, landform and vegetation characteristics, the possible form of residential development and the impact of future development on the visual amenity of the locality. The Policy also provides that unless otherwise approved by the Council, only minor increases to the size of Building Envelopes will be considered to a maximum of 10% of the area of the original Building Envelope. All Building Envelopes are also required to be of a regular shape and comprise a single contiguous area. The proposal is considered to be compliant with the intent and objectives of the Policy.

e. Financial

Not Applicable

f. Legal and Statutory

The proposed Building Envelope variation was assessed against the provisions applying to the Golden Bay Special Rural Zone in TPS2. The objective of the Special Residential zone is to ensure that the rural landscape and amenity is conserved and the natural environment is enhanced. The proposal is consistent with the rural landscape and amenity of the area. There are no adverse environmental impacts associated with the proposed Building Envelope extension, as it is within an area where there is no existing vegetation.

5. Comments

The required community consultation of affected or adjoining properties was undertaken by the City and there were no objections raised to the proposal by adjoining owners.

The City’s Environmental Services identified that the area outside of the Building Envelope area needs to be revegetated. There has been some vegetation clearing outside of the Building Envelope, which is inconsistent with the landscape objectives of the Special Rural Zone.

It is recommended that a condition of approval be imposed requiring revegetation works, and having regard to the required 20m Building Protection Zone (low fuel area) around the buildings. The revegetation must be provided within 60 days of the construction of the shed.

The proposed Building Envelope modification complies with TPS2 and the Policy. It is recommended that the proposed Building Envelope variation be approved.

6. Voting Requirements

Simple Majority

7. Officer Recommendation

That Council APPROVE the planning application to vary the Building Envelope on Lot 501 (No.2) Goodman Drive, Golden Bay subject to the area outside of the Building Envelope being revegetated with species endemic to and suitable for the area. Revegetation shall ensure a 20m Building Protection Zone (low fuel area) is provided around the buildings, including maintaining side access for the dwelling. The revegetation must be undertaken within 60 days of the construction of the shed.
8. **Committee Recommendation**

That Council *APPROVE* the planning application to vary the Building Envelope on Lot 501 (No.2) Goodman Drive, Golden Bay subject to the area outside of the Building Envelope being revegetated with species endemic to and suitable for the area. Revegetation shall ensure a 20m Building Protection Zone (low fuel area) is provided around the buildings, including maintaining side access for the dwelling. The revegetation must be undertaken within 60 days of the construction of the shed.

Committee Voting – 4/0

9. **The Committee's Reason for Varying the Officer's Recommendation**

Not applicable

10. **Implications of the Changes to the Officer's Recommendation**

Not applicable
**Planning Services**

**Statutory Planning Services**
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| Attachments:            | Schedule of Submissions                                                                                      |
| Maps/Diagrams:         | 1. Location Plan  
|                         | 2. Indicative Development Plan                                                                               |
|                         | 3. Aerial Photograph of Centre                                                                               |
|                         | 4. Advertising Location Plan                                                                                 |
1. **Purpose of Report**

To consider a proposed amendment to Planning Policy 6.3 - Local Commercial Strategy (LCS) to increase the maximum shop/retail floorspace of the 'Waikiki Village' Shopping Centre, following the completion of public advertising.

2. **Background**

In December 2009, Planning Approval was granted for a Medical Centre, which at the time did not fall into retail use and as such, did not compromise the retail floorspace maximum. The development didn’t proceed and the same location is now the subject of the proposal included in this report.

In November 2011, Council resolved to endorse the advertising of an amendment to Planning Policy 6.3 - LCS to increase the maximum shop/retail floorspace of the 'Waikiki Village' Shopping Centre from 6,963m² Net Leasable Area ('NLA') to 8,662m² NLA.

3. **Details**

The proponent seeks to increase the maximum shop/retail floorspace of the 'Waikiki Village' Shopping Centre from 6,963m² Net Leasable Area ('NLA') to 8,662m² NLA. The proponent has provided the following information in support of the proposal:-

1. Retail Impact Analysis;
2. Traffic Impact Statement (TIS); and
3. Indicative Development Plan.
4. Implications to Consider

a. Consultation with the Community

The proposal was advertised for comment in accordance with clause 8.9.4 of TPS2 advertised for a period of 39 days (taking into consideration the Christmas period), concluding on the 10th January 2012.
This included the publishing of a notice in the Weekend Courier on the 2nd and 9th December 2011, and written notice being given to 156 affected landowners as shown on the advertising plan below:

![Figure 4 - Advertising Location Plan](image)

At the conclusion of the advertising period, a total of eight submissions were received, with seven submissions objecting to the proposal, one submission in support of the proposal and one submission of conditional support to the proposal. The concerns raised by the objectors are summarised as follows:-

- The proposal has the potential to increase crime;
- The proposal has the potential to increase noise levels;
- Development of additional floorspace could result in damage to surrounding buildings due to earthworks;
- Increase in traffic on Gnangara Drive and traffic safety concerns;
- Decrease in property values;
- Development of additional floorspace overshadowing adjacent properties; and
- Dust issues occurring during earthworks.

The conditional support from one submission expressed a concern about cracking to walls when the original shopping centre was built, and a concern regarding more damage associated with the new proposal.

This report should be read together with the attached Schedule of Submissions.

b. Consultation with Government Agencies

Not applicable

c. Strategic Community Plan

This item addresses the Community’s Vision for the future and specifically the following Aspiration contained in the Community Plan 2011:-
Aspiration 11: Planning for population growth to ensure that future development and land-uses contribute to a sustainable city that provides for a genuinely desirable lifestyle.

d. Policy

The LCS identifies the Waikiki Shopping Centre as a 'Neighbourhood Centre' with an allocated maximum shop/retail floorspace of 6,963m² NLA.

In relation to increasing retail floor space the LCS, states:-

"Wherever a new centre or expansion of an existing centre is proposed beyond the shop/retail floor areas which are recommended below, it should be in accordance with an approved Centre Plan as contemplated in Section 5.6 and Appendices 1.1.3 and 1.1.4 of the Metropolitan Centres Policy (2000). The onus should be on the proponent to demonstrate to Council's satisfaction, that the proposal to increase beyond the recommended floor areas would not have a significant adverse impact on any other existing or planned centres."

Clause 6.5.2(4) of State Planning Policy 4.2 - Activity Centres for Perth and Peel (ACPP) requires a Retail Sustainability Assessment (RSA) when a Local Commercial Strategy includes an indicative amount of shop/retail floorspace and a significant increase to this shop/retail floorspace is proposed. A RSA assesses the potential economic and related effects of a significant retail expansion on the network of activity centres in a locality.

The proponent engaged a Retail Consultant to prepare a RSA which considers the market demand and potential for the extra retail floorspace. The Retail Consultant concluded that:

"even if Waikiki Village is expanded as now proposed, total retail sales for other trade area retailers are forecast to increase in real terms."

The City’s Retail Economic Consultants reviewed the retail assessment and concluded that:

"additional retail floorspace is required in the catchment and no concerning economic impacts would result. Hence, the Pitney Bowes assessment represents an accurate account of the potential impacts of the proposed development. The large degree of escape expenditure from the catchment indicates there to be an economic, community and environmental need for the expansion of retail floorspace within the catchment."

e. Financial

Nil

f. Legal and Statutory

Clause 4.6.6 of TPS2 states the Council may modify the LCS, provided that it is satisfied that such modification is in the interest of proper and orderly planning and will not detract from the amenity of the locality. The City has complied with the advertising requirement for amending the Policy, in accordance with Clause 8.9.4 of TPS2.

5. Comments

Response to Submissions

Crime

There is no evidence to suggest an increase in retail floorspace will increase the rate of crime. The proposed increase in floorspace would ‘round off’ the development of the site and could increase activity and casual surveillance of the centre. Two adjacent properties also directly adjoin a Pedestrian Access Way and not the Shopping Centre. The City will assess a future application for planning approval to ensure that Crime Prevention through Environmental Design principles are applied. The proponent can be advised separately regarding the submission suggestion to install security cameras behind Rebel Sport or the future development.
Noise

One submission was concerned that an increase in people using the shopping centre would result in more noise, which would adversely affect the amenity of the adjacent residential area. The increase in noise from any development of the site would be considered negligible, and will be considered in detail when an application to develop the land is received. Noise from any development must comply with the Environmental Health (Noise) Regulations 1997.

Earthworks

Concerns were raised that future development of the site may result in damage to nearby buildings due to earthworks. The City can request a Construction Management Plan to address such issues as dust, hours of construction and storage as part of a future application for planning approval to develop the site. Carrying out of earthworks for a development is the responsibility of the developer and thus any damage to nearby buildings that occur as a result of earthworks or construction is a private matter between the developer and the affected landowner.

Traffic

A major concern raised by a number of submissions was the impact the development could have on traffic volumes, pedestrian safety and access on Gnangara Drive. The proponent engaged a Traffic Consultant to prepare a Traffic Impact Statement (TIS) to address these issues. The TIS concluded that:

"The traffic impacts of the additional retail floorspace at the Waikiki Village are considered acceptable as volumes to/from retail land uses at the centre are expected to increase by only 10% daily and during the weekday peak hour, distributed across five existing access points. On the boundary roads, this represents an increase to traffic volumes in the order of 1.6% (Read Street) and 5% (Gnangara Road).

The public consultation comments have indicated that capacity problems may be experienced at the intersections of Gnangara Drive with Read Street, Castlerock Avenue and Colville Street. The small increase in weekday peak hour traffic resulting from the proposed expansion, distributed over five access driveways means that these concerns are unfounded and little change if any, in the level of service of these intersections will be detected as a result of the traffic increases".

A site inspection of the centre was undertaken by City Officers during the peak hours of 2:00pm to 4:00pm on a Thursday, when it was accepted that traffic distributed over five access driveways, would result in a small change in the level of service provided by roads and intersections to the centre. The City also considers that the extra retail traffic would be comparable to the traffic generated by a Medical Centre, which was approved in the same location, as shown on Figure 2 - Indicative Development Plan.

The City's Engineering Services have reviewed the TIS and agree with the report findings. It was also advised that the City proposes to upgrade the full length of Gnangara Drive into a boulevard with a central median strip, which will assist in improving traffic and pedestrian safety and traffic flow. These works are scheduled to occur from 2014 to 2016.

Property Values

The impact of the development on property values is not a relevant planning consideration.

Overshadowing

Any future development of the site would have no overshadowing impacts as there is no north facing properties within the vicinity the future development. Any overshadowing that may occur on June 21 at noon, would appear to overshadow a future car park and will not adversely impact on the amenity of adjoining residential properties.

Dust Nuisance

The purpose of this report is to consider the application to increase the retail floorspace of the Waikiki Shopping Centre under the LCS, and not at this stage to consider a proposed development. Impacts of dust created by earthworks can be considered as part of the assessment of a Construction Management Plan for building works.
Conclusion

In light of the above, it is recommended that the Council proceed with the proposed amendment to Planning Policy 6.3 - Local Commercial Strategy to increase the maximum shop/retail floorspace of the 'Waikiki Village' Shopping Centre from 6,963m² NLA to 8,662m² NLA, on the basis that the proposal will not have a significant adverse impact on any other existing or planned retail centres in the area. The concerns raised by the submissioners raise matters that have been satisfactorily addressed in this report.

6. Voting Requirements

Simple Majority

7. Officer Recommendation

That Council ADOPT the proposed amendment to Planning Policy 6.3 - Local Commercial Strategy to increase the maximum shop/retail floorspace of the 'Waikiki Village' Shopping Centre from 6,963m² Net Leasable Area ('NLA') to 8,662m² NLA.

8. Committee Recommendation

That Council ADOPT the proposed amendment to Planning Policy 6.3 - Local Commercial Strategy to increase the maximum shop/retail floorspace of the 'Waikiki Village' Shopping Centre from 6,963m² Net Leasable Area ('NLA') to 8,662m² NLA.

Committee Voting – 4/0

9. The Committee's Reason for Varying the Officer's Recommendation

Not applicable

10. Implications of the Changes to the Officer's Recommendation

Not applicable
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### Statutory Planning Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference No &amp; Subject:</th>
<th>SP-019/12 Proposed Motor Cycle Detailing and Storage and Party Promotions Showroom</th>
</tr>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>File No:</td>
<td>28/5446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proponent/s:</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Contributors:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Committee Meeting:</td>
<td>16th April 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously before Council:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure of Interest:</td>
<td>Tribunal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Council's Role in this Matter:</td>
<td>Tribunal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site:</td>
<td>Lot 410, Strata Lot 2 (No.3) Toynbee Way, Port Kennedy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Area</td>
<td>1,678m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Zoning</td>
<td>Port Kennedy Business Enterprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRS Zoning</td>
<td>Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachments:</td>
<td>Site and Elevation Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maps/Diagrams:</td>
<td>Location Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Location Plan - Lot 410, Strata Lot 2 (No.3) Toynbee Way, Port Kennedy

1. **Purpose of Report**

To consider an application seeking Planning Approval for a Motor Cycle Detailing & Storage and Party Promotions Showroom at Lot 410, Strata Lot 2 (No.3) Toynbee Way, Port Kennedy, in light of further information provided by the proponent.

2. **Background**

In April 2010, the City received a complaint from the WA Police that the Industrial Unit was being occupied by the Outlaw Motorcycle Club (Club).

In May 2010, the City wrote to the Club advising that Planning Approval pursuant to Town Planning Scheme No.2 (TPS.2) had not been granted to occupy the unit as a 'Club Premises' and instructed the operators to cease the activity.

In July 2010, the City's solicitors wrote to the owner of the property (A.C.N 069 744 823 Pty Ltd) advising that a prosecution would be commenced for undertaking a change of use without having obtained Planning Approval first.

In December 2010, City Officers, with support of the WA Police, conducted a site inspection of the property which revealed that it was being used as a Club Premises.

In March 2011, a Direction Notice pursuant to section 214 (2) of the Planning and Development Act (the Act) was issued to the owners, instructing them to immediately cease the Club use of the unit and not to recommence the use.

In April 2011, the owner's solicitor advised that the Unit was no longer being used and that the activity had ceased. Information provided by the WA Police confirmed that the activity has not recommenced.

In May 2011, the City received an application seeking Planning Approval for a Motor Cycle Detailing & Storage and Party Promotions Showroom.
In February 2012, Council resolved to defer the application for Motor Cycle Detailing & Storage and Party Promotions Showroom, to allow Officers to consider later information received on the application and the matter being presented to the ordinary Meeting of Council on the 27th March 2012.

3. Details

The additional details provided by the proponent via facsimile on the 28th February 2012 are as follows:

“I have been instructed to provide the following information that you require:-

1. I confirm that the premises will not be occupied by the Outlaws Motorcycle Club. I also confirm that all club paraphernalia has been removed; and
2. The activity and or business that will be run from the site are Black and White Party Promotions and Black and White Motorcycle Derailing and Storage; and
3. The premises itself will not be hired out to host parties or functions; and
4. The business will hire out tables, chairs pool tables and jukeboxes; and
5. The detailing of motorcycles is polishing only, no maintenance will be undertaken from the site; and
6. The fridges have been removed from the premises; and
7. The business hours at the premises will be 10:30am – 1:30pm and by appointment only; and
8. Currently one employee at the premises with intentions to increase the number of staff; and
9. The goods that will be stored or displayed are aforementioned and will also include motorbikes and associated parts. Polishes will also be displayed.

I have been further instructed that a representative from the Council can make an appointment to view the premises to confirm what I outlined above.”

The City contacted the proponent several times to arrange a site investigation, before a response was received confirming that an inspection had been arranged for Friday, 30th March 2012. This inspection was subsequently cancelled by the proponent at late notice.

4. Implications to Consider

a. Consultation with the Community
   Not Applicable

b. Consultation with Government Agencies
   Not Applicable

c. Strategic
   Community Plan
   This item addresses the Community’s Vision for the future and specifically the following Aspiration contained in the Community Plan 2011:-

   **Aspiration 11:** Planning for population growth to ensure that future development and land-uses contribute to a sustainable city that provides for a genuinely desirable lifestyle.

d. Policy
   Nil

e. Financial
   Nil
f. Legal and Statutory

Land Use

Town Planning Scheme No.2 (TPS2) defines a Club Premises as “premises used or designed for use by a legally constituted club or association or other body of persons united by a common interest”. A ‘Club Premises’ is a (‘X’) use that is not permitted in the Port Kennedy Business Enterprise zone.

The proponent has now provided written advice that the premises will not be occupied by the Outlaw Motorcycle Club. The City, however, has been unable to undertake a site inspection to confirm that sufficient interior modifications to the existing building have been undertaken to adequately demonstrate that the application is for a bona fide use and will not be used as a Club Premises.

5. Comments

The City has been unable to undertake a site inspection to confirm that sufficient modification to the existing building has been undertaken, to adequately demonstrate that the application is for a bona fide use and will not be used as a Club Premises.

Given that a ‘Club Premises’ is a land use which cannot be legally approved within the Port Kennedy Business Enterprise zone, the Council must be satisfied that the proposal complies with TPS2. It is therefore recommended that the application be deferred to enable City Officers to undertake a site inspection.

6. Voting Requirements

Simple Majority

7. Officer Recommendation

That Council DEFER the application seeking planning approval for a Motor Cycle Detailing and Storage and Party Promotions Showroom at Lot 410, Strata Lot 2 (No.3) Toynbee Way, Port Kennedy, to enable City Officers to undertake a site inspection of the premises.

8. Committee Recommendation

That Council DEFER the application seeking planning approval for a Motor Cycle Detailing and Storage and Party Promotions Showroom at Lot 410, Strata Lot 2 (No.3) Toynbee Way, Port Kennedy, to enable City Officers to undertake a site inspection of the premises.

Committee Voting – 4/0

9. The Committee’s Reason for Varying the Officer’s Recommendation

Not applicable

10. Implications of the Changes to the Officer’s Recommendation

Not applicable
## Planning Services

### Statutory Planning Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference No &amp; Subject:</th>
<th>SP-020/12 Proposed Building Envelope Variation - Golden Bay</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>File No:</strong></td>
<td>28/6287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proponent/s:</strong></td>
<td>Mr W Lilleyman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Author:</strong></td>
<td>Mr Regan Travers, Planning Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Contributors:</strong></td>
<td>Mr David Waller, Coordinator Statutory Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mr Mike Ross, Manager Statutory Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date of Committee Meeting:</strong></td>
<td>16th April 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Previously before Council:</strong></td>
<td>28th February 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disclosure of Interest:</strong></td>
<td>Tribunal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nature of Council’s Role in this Matter:</strong></td>
<td>Tribunal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site:</strong></td>
<td>Lot 804 (No.16) Figtree Lane, Golden Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lot Area:</strong></td>
<td>5,993m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LA Zoning:</strong></td>
<td>Special Residential</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MRS Zoning:</strong></td>
<td>Urban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attachments:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maps/Diagrams:</strong></td>
<td>1. Location Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Building Envelope Plan (Original Plan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Building Envelope Plan (Revised Plan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Elevation Plan – Looking West (Revised Plan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. 3D Model – Looking East (Revised Plan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Elevation – Looking West (Revised Plan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. 3D Model – Looking West (Revised Plan)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Location Plan - Lot 804 (No.16) Figtree Lane, Golden Bay

1. Purpose of Report

To consider an application seeking Planning Approval to vary the location of the Building Envelope for Lot 804 (No.16) Figtree Lane, Golden Bay.

2. Background

In October 2007, Amendment No.4 to Town Planning Scheme No.2 was gazetted rezoning Lots 200 and 300 Dampier Drive, Golden Bay from ‘Special Rural’ to ‘Special Residential’, which facilitated the creation of the subject site and the introduction of a Building Envelope.

In February 2012 the Council resolved to defer an application to vary the existing Building Envelope to enable the proponent the opportunity to submit a revised Building Envelope plan, in consultation with City Officers and for the matter to be presented to the ordinary Meeting of Council on the 24th April 2012.

3. Details

The proponent submitted revised plans on the 29th March 2012. City Officers have not yet been able to undertake an assessment of the revised proposal.

It is noted that the revised plans show the Building Envelope in a different location, further towards the base of the dune, as well as having a modified cut-fill cross section.
2. Building Envelope Plan (Original Plan Request – 16th May 2011)
3. Building Envelope Plan (Revised Plan – 29th March 2012)
4. Elevation – Looking West (Revised Plan – 29th March 2012)

5. 3D Model – Looking West (Revised Plan – 29th March 2012)

7. 3D Model - Looking East (Revised Plan – 29th March 2012)

4. Implications to Consider

a. Consultation with the Community

In accordance with clause 6.3.3 of Town Planning Scheme No.2 (TPS2) and Planning Policy 3.3.17 – Variations to Building Envelopes, in the Golden Bay Special Residential Zone, Building Envelopes may be varied at the discretion of the Council, only after consultation with the owners of affected or adjoining properties. The original application was referred to four nearby owners and occupiers for comment for a period of 14 days. At the close of the submission period, no submissions were received.

The City considers that the revised Building Envelope Plans do not require further advertising because the location of the revised Building Envelope is generally between the existing Building Envelope and the earlier proposed location, which was advertised by the City.

b. Consultation with Government Agencies

Not Applicable
c. **Strategic**

**Community Plan**

This item addresses the Community’s Vision for the future and specifically the following Aspiration contained in the Community Plan 2011:-

**Aspiration 11:** Planning for population growth to ensure that future development and land-uses contribute to a sustainable City that provides for a genuinely desirable lifestyle.

d. **Policy**

**Planning Policy 3.3.17 – Variations to Building Envelopes**

*Planning Policy 3.3.17 – Variations to Building Envelopes* (BE Policy) applies to the application. The BE Policy requires Building Envelopes to be located based upon environmental conditions, landform and vegetation characteristics, the possible form of residential development and the impact of future development on the visual amenity of the locality.

In the Assessment Criteria of the BE Policy it notes that:-

“The Council will consider variations to existing Building Envelopes only where it can be demonstrated by the Proponent that there is no adverse environmental impact and where then Council’s objectives for the locality are realised; and

The Council may also require a report from a qualified and experienced Environmental Consultant substantiating that there is no adverse environmental impact.”

The revised proposal is still not supported by an Environmental Report or supplementary letter prepared by an Environmental Consultant demonstrating that the relocation of the Building Envelope is unlikely to result in any adverse environmental impact. It is unknown what impact future development will have on the dune both during and after construction.

**Planning Policy 3.3.6 - Development Guidelines for Special Residential Zones**

*Planning Policy 3.3.6 - Development Guidelines for Special Residential Zones* (SR Policy) also applies to the application. The SR Policy guides development of lots with the Special Residential zones that are affected by steep topography by the implementation of special housing design requirements, which are necessary to minimise the amount of site earthworks to protect the landscape character of each lot.

e. **Financial**

Nil

f. **Legal and Statutory**

The objective of the Special Residential zone under TPS2 is to ensure that the rural landscape and amenity is conserved and the natural environment is enhanced.

Under TPS2 the following requirements apply:-

Clause 19 of Schedule No.5 - Planning Unit No.3

“All buildings and outbuildings are to be sympathetic in design, materials and colour to complement surrounding landscape elements and be sited away from focal points and located where screening vegetation or landform can be utilised.”

Clause 20 of Schedule No.5 - Planning Unit No.3

“Any development on those lots marked 'S’ on the Subdivision Guide Plan, which includes the subject site, are subject to special housing design requirements as specified in the Council’s SR Policy. These requirements are necessary in order to minimise the amount of site earthworks to protect the landscape character of each lot.”

While the submission of a revised Building Plan is acknowledged, the proponent is still required to demonstrate that the proposal will comply with the Special Residential zone objectives in TPS2.
5. Comments

The revised plans provided on the 29th March 2012 were discussed with the City prior to submission, but are yet to be assessed by City's Officers. Further information is needed from the proponent to demonstrate that the proposal will not result in an adverse environmental impact.

This is required before the Officer assessment can commence. The proponent has been reluctant to engage a consultant due to the costs involved.

It is recommended that Council defer its decision on the proposed Building Envelope until an Environmental Report is submitted and the Officer assessment is completed.

6. Voting Requirements

Simple Majority

7. Officer Recommendation

That Council DEFER the application to vary the Building Envelope on Lot 804 (No.16) Figtree Lane, Golden Bay until the proponent has submitted an Environmental Report and the Officer assessment has been completed.

8. Committee Recommendation

That Council DEFER the application to vary the Building Envelope on Lot 804 (No.16) Figtree Lane, Golden Bay until the proponent has submitted an Environmental Report and the Officer assessment has been completed.

Committee Voting – 4/0

9. The Committee's Reason for Varying the Officer's Recommendation

Not applicable

10. Implications of the Changes to the Officer's Recommendation

Not applicable
1. Purpose of Report

For Council to adopt a position on applications to rezone land to 'Special Rural' and 'Special Residential', where the land is identified as 'future urban'.

2. Background

In July 2010, the Minister for Planning advised the City that proposed Amendment No.92 to Town Planning Scheme No.2 (TPS2), which sought to rezone Lot 100 (No.876) Eighty Road, Baldivis from 'Rural' to 'Special Rural' to facilitate the subdivision of the land into 2ha lots, was refused for the following reasons:

"1. The proposal is not consistent with the State Government level planning objectives of Directions 2031, the Southern Metropolitan and Peel Sub-Regional Structure Plan, the South West Corridor Structure Plan and the Urban Expansion Plan for the Metropolitan Region on the basis that the proposal has the potential to unduly fragment this locality and hinder the long term planning objectives for urban development of this area."
2. Rezoning of this land to permit subdivision for ‘Special Rural’ is contrary to the long term objectives of the current Rockingham Rural Land Strategy and the Western Australian Planning Commission statement regarding Rural Settlement and Land Use and will set an undesirable precedent for further ad-hoc rezoning proposals for other adjacent lots.

The Minister advises Council that any future proposals to rezone land in this locality should be appropriately justified within the context of a Local Planning Strategy or revised Rural Strategy adopted by the Council.”

3. Details

The basis of the Council considering a future Scheme Amendment for rural-residential purposes, in an area identified as future urban, needs to be reviewed in the context of State Planning Policy 3 – Urban Growth and Settlement (SPP 3) for rural-residential development to avoid future urban areas.

SPP3 states that:

“Planning for rural-residential development should avoid future urban areas or areas particularly suitable for urban development in terms of their characteristics and proximity to urban services.”

The above position is not reflected in the City’s Planning Policy 5.2 – Rural Land Strategy (RLS).

Future urban areas are identified in the South West Corridor Structure Plan of 1993. Future urban and urban investigation areas are also identified in the draft Southern Metropolitan Sub-Regional Structure Plan, which was advertised for public comment in June 2009.

The RLS is scheduled to be reviewed as part of the preparation of a Local Planning Strategy. In the interim, it is considered appropriate for the Council to adopt a position reflecting the requirements of SPP3, to not initiate any Scheme Amendments seeking to rezone land to ‘Special Rural’ and ‘Special Residential’ to TPS2 in areas identified as future urban.

4. Implications to Consider

a. Consultation with the Community
   Not applicable

b. Consultation with Government Agencies
   Not applicable

c. Strategic
   Community Plan
   This item addresses the Community’s Vision for the future and specifically the following Aspiration contained in the Community Plan 2011:

   Aspiration 11: Planning for population growth to ensure that future development and land-uses contribute to a sustainable city that provides for a genuinely desirable lifestyle.

   d. Policy
   The proposed interim position is consistent with SPP3 as outlined above.

e. Financial
   Nil

f. Legal and Statutory
   Nil

5. Comments

The proposed interim position provides owners and developers with more certainty, and provides for a more consistent approach with the Department of Planning by maintaining future planning options for land identified and ‘future urban’.
6. Voting Requirements

Simple Majority

7. Officer Recommendation

That Council NOT SUPPORT any future proposals to rezone land to ‘Special Rural’ and ‘Special Residential’, where the land is identified as ‘future urban’ or ‘urban investigation’ in the Western Australian Planning Commission’s draft Southern Metropolitan Sub-Regional Structure Plan until the Rural Land Strategy has been reviewed.

8. Committee Recommendation

That Council NOT SUPPORT any future proposals to rezone land to ‘Special Rural’ and ‘Special Residential’, where the land is identified as ‘future urban’ or ‘urban investigation’ in the Western Australian Planning Commission’s draft Southern Metropolitan Sub-Regional Structure Plan until the Rural Land Strategy has been reviewed.

Committee Voting – 4/0

9. The Committee’s Reason for Varying the Officer’s Recommendation

Not applicable

10. Implications of the Changes to the Officer’s Recommendation

Not applicable
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### Site:
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- LA Zoning: Waterfront Village, Residential R20, Residential R30, Residential R40, Community Purposes, Special Commercial and Service Commercial
- MRS Zoning: Urban, Central City Area

### Attachments:
- Maps/Diagrams:

### Purpose of Report

To consider granting Final Approval to Amendment No.113 to Town Planning Scheme No.2 to introduce the planning framework for the Waterfront Village and Smart Village Sectors of the Centre Plan for the Rockingham Strategic Metropolitan Centre, as adopted by Council in September 2009.

### Background

In September 2009 Council endorsed the Final Strategic Planning Reports (Volumes 1 and 2) as the Centre Plan for the Rockingham Strategic Regional Centre Plan. The Western Australian Planning Commission endorsed the Final Reports in November 2009.
Council directed that City Officers prepare any necessary changes to the existing Policy framework, Town Planning Scheme and Metropolitan Region Scheme.

Amendment No.113 has been prepared to introduce the planning framework for the Waterfront Village and Smart Village Sectors of the Centre Plan. In October 2011 the Council resolved to initiate Amendment No.113.

The City undertook concurrent advertising of the Scheme Amendment, together with the Smart Village and Waterfront Village Development Policy Plans (DPP’s).

### 3. Details

At the conclusion of the advertising period, eleven (11) submissions on the Town Planning Scheme Amendment had been received. Each submission has been assessed by the City and its City Centre Structure Plan Consultant.

### 4. Implications to Consider

#### a. Consultation with the Community

Amendment No.113 was advertised for public comment in accordance with the Town Planning Regulations 1967 for a total of 54 days from 12th December 2011 until 3rd February 2012, with advertising being undertaken in the following manner:-

(i) a notice was published in the Public Notices section of the Weekend Courier newspaper on the 16th and 23rd December 2011;

(ii) an advertisement was placed on the City’s website for the entire advertising period; and

(iii) six hundred and sixty eight (668) landowners and key stakeholders were notified in writing of the proposal.

#### b. Consultation with Government Agencies

The Amendment was referred to the Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) for assessment under the Environmental Protection Act 1986. The EPA advised that the Amendment should not be assessed under the Act, and that it was not necessary to provide any environmental advice or recommendations on the Amendment.

The following Government Agencies were also consulted:-

- Main Roads WA
- Department of Transport
- Department of Education
- Department of Housing
- Rockingham Kwinana Development Office
- Public Transport Authority
- Department of Planning

#### c. Strategic Community Plan

This item addresses the Community’s Vision for the future and specifically the following Aspirations contained in the Community Plan 2011:-

**Aspiration 6**: Civic buildings, public places and transport infrastructure of contemporary design, constructed and maintained using best practice principles.

**Aspiration 11**: Planning for population growth to ensure that future development and land-uses contribute to a sustainable city that provides for a genuinely desirable lifestyle
d. **Policy**

Development Policy Plans for the Smart Village and Waterfront Village Sectors have been prepared to detail the planning objectives and requirements for development in these areas. Refer to Reports DPD-003/12 and DPD-004/12.

e. **Financial**

Nil

f. **Legal and Statutory**

In accordance with the Town Planning Regulations 1967, the Council is required to consider all submissions made within 42 days of the publication of the advertisement and submit to the Western Australian Planning Commission, for recommendation to the Minister for Planning, its decision to proceed or not proceed with the Amendment.

5. **Comments**

The submissions are set out in the Schedule of Submissions, together with recommendations. In summary:-

- The submissions from the Department of Transport, Department of Education, Department of Planning and Main Roads WA were for noting only.
- The submissions from the Rockingham Kwinana Development Office and Murdoch University were supportive.
- The submission from LandCorp was generally supportive of the Scheme Amendment and associated Development Policy Plans. With respect to the Amendment, Landcorp provided comments and suggestions on:-
  - The permissability of the Use Class of ‘Nursing Home’ in the Zoning Table.
  - Listing ‘Preferred Uses’ in the Scheme, rather than the DPP’s
  - Potential changes to the cash-in-lieu payment provisions.

The balance of the Landcorp submission dealt with Smart Village and Waterfront Village DPP’s.

- The balance of the submissions received were more related to the content within the DPP’s; they have been dealt with as a part of the assessment of the DPP’s.

As a result of the assessment process, City Officers have identified several minor editorial corrections to the documents, which are proposed to be incorporated (shown in bold).

Given that the issues raised in the submissions did not challenge the intent or the purpose of the proposed Amendment, it is recommended that the Council adopt the Scheme Amendment, with minor modifications, and request the Hon Minister for Planning grant Final Approval.

6. **Voting Requirements**

Simple Majority

7. **Officer Recommendation**

That Council:

1. **ADOPT** for Final Approval Amendment No.113 to Town Planning Scheme No.2, subject to the following modifications to the clauses listed below (in bold):-

   "7. Clause 4.3.5 is amended:-
   
   (a) in paragraph (a) of subclause (5) by deleting “subclause (5)(a) or subclause (7)” and inserting instead “subclause (4)(a) or subclause (6)”; and
   
   (b) in paragraph (b) of subclause (5) by deleting “subclause (5)(b) or subclause (7)” and inserting instead “subclause (4)(b) or subclause (6)”; and
(c) in subclause (6) by deleting “subclause (5)” and inserting instead “subclause (4).

8. …

4.3B.2 Residential Design Codes
(a) Where residential development is proposed the R-AC0 density code of Residential Design Codes is to apply.

(b) In order to encourage residential development within the Primary Centre Waterfront Village Zone, consistent with the urban design objectives for individual Precincts set out in the Policy or other adopted Policies, the Council may exercise its discretion in respect of the Residential Design Codes provisions.

4.3C.2 Residential Design Codes
(a) Where residential development is proposed the R-AC0 density code of Residential Design Codes is to apply.

(b) In order to encourage residential development within the Primary Centre Urban Village Zone, consistent with the urban design objectives for individual Precincts set out in the Policy or other adopted Policies, the Council may exercise its discretion in respect of the Residential Design Codes provisions.

19. Immediately after Plan No.7 insert a new plan entitled “Plan No.8 Car Parking Areas for Primary Centre Waterfront Village Zone (Under Clause 4.15.6.2)”.

20. The Scheme Maps are amended:
(a) by rezoning certain land within the Waterfront Village Zone, the Residential R20 Zone, the Residential R30 Zone, the Residential R40 Zone, the Community Purpose Zone, the Special Commercial Zone and the Service Commercial Zone to the Primary Centre Waterfront Village Zone as shown on the amended Scheme Maps;

(b) by rezoning certain land within the Community Purposes Zone to Primary Centre Urban Village Zone as shown on the Amended Scheme Maps;

(c) by amending the broken black line around the “Primary Centre” in accordance with the amended Scheme Maps;

(d) by deleting the notation “A7” on Lot 959 Ray Street Rockingham in accordance with the amended Scheme Maps; and

(e) by modifying the legend to the Scheme Maps as shown on the amended Scheme Maps.

2. ADOPT the recommendations contained within the Schedule of Submissions.

8. Committee Recommendation

That Council:
1. ADOPT for Final Approval Amendment No.113 to Town Planning Scheme No.2, subject to the following modifications to the clauses listed below (in bold):

"7. Clause 4.3.5 is amended:

(a) in paragraph (a) of subclause (5) by deleting “subclause (5)(a) or subclause (7)” and inserting instead “subclause (4)(a) or subclause (6)”;

(b) in paragraph (b) of subclause (5) by deleting “subclause (5)(b) or subclause (7)” and inserting instead “subclause (4)(b) or subclause (6)”;

(c) in subclause (6) by deleting “subclause (5)” and inserting instead “subclause (4)."
8. ... 

4.3B.2 Residential Design Codes

(a) Where residential development is proposed the R-AC0 density code of Residential Design Codes is to apply.

(b) In order to encourage residential development within the **Primary Centre** Waterfront Village Zone, consistent with the urban design objectives for individual Precincts set out in the Policy or other adopted Policies, the Council may exercise its discretion in respect of the Residential Design Codes provisions.

4.3C.2 Residential Design Codes

(a) Where residential development is proposed the R-AC0 density code of Residential Design Codes is to apply.

(b) In order to encourage residential development within the **Primary Centre** Urban Village Zone, consistent with the urban design objectives for individual Precincts set out in the Policy or other adopted Policies, the Council may exercise its discretion in respect of the Residential Design Codes provisions.

19. **Immediately** after Plan No.7 insert a new plan entitled “Plan No.8 Car Parking Areas for Primary Centre Waterfront Village Zone (Under Clause 4.15.6.2)”.

20. The Scheme Maps are amended:-

(a) by rezoning certain land within the Waterfront Village Zone, the Residential R20 Zone, the Residential R30 Zone, the Residential R40 Zone, the Community Purpose Zone, the Special Commercial Zone and the Service Commercial Zone to the Primary Centre Waterfront Village Zone as shown on the amended Scheme Maps;

(b) by rezoning certain land within the Community Purposes Zone to Primary Centre Urban Village Zone as shown on the Amended Scheme Maps;

(c) by amending the broken black line around the “Primary Centre” in accordance with the amended Scheme Maps;

(d) by deleting the notation “A7” on Lot 959 Ray Street Rockingham in accordance with the amended Scheme Maps; **and**

(e) by modifying the legend to the Scheme Maps **as shown on the amended Scheme Maps.**

2. **ADOPT** the recommendations contained within the Schedule of Submissions as follows:-

CITY OF ROCKINGHAM

AMENDMENT NO.113 TO TOWN PLANNING SCHEME NO.2

SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBMISSION</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No.1 – Mr T Radford, Senior Transport Planner, Department of Transport, 140 William Street, Perth WA 6000</td>
<td>Thanks for the opportunity to review and comment on the City’s Waterfront and Smart Village Policies. The Department of Transport has no comment on these Policies or the proposed TPS Amendments.</td>
<td>Noted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSION</td>
<td>COMMENT</td>
<td>RECOMMENDATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No.2 – Mr J Leaf, A/Director General, Government of Western Australia, Department of Education, 151 Royal Street, East Perth WA 6004</strong>&lt;br&gt;Thank you for your letter dated the 12th December 2011 regarding the proposed Planning Policy No.3.2.5 - Development Policy Plan - Waterfront Village Sector and proposed Planning Policy No.3.2.2 - Development Policy Plan - Smart Village Sector Amendment No.113 to Town Planning Scheme No.2. The Department of Education has reviewed the Development Policy Plans for the Waterfront and Smart Village Sectors. The Department has evaluated the approximate number of dwellings expected in the development area and the potential increase in student yield that this development will generate. The Department advises that the existing schools in the immediate vicinity have adequate capacity to accommodate the expected additional students. The Department therefore has no objection to the proposed Amendment.</td>
<td>Noted</td>
<td>That the submission be noted.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **No.3 – Mr G & Mrs W Atherden, Nautilus Apartments, 37/17 Rockingham Beach Road, Rockingham WA 6168**<br>Firstly, we appreciate the invitation to submit any ideas we have associated with the proposed Scheme Amendment. We would like to acknowledge all the work that has been undertaken by the Rockingham City Council in the 3 years we have owned property here, in particular the maintenance and cleanliness associated with the Churchill Park area. We own an apartment in the Nautilus block (5th floor) on the Rockingham Beach Rd side of the building. I have downloaded many pages from the City website and feel the following suggestions comply with many of the aims outlined on Page 10 - 2.2.2. Access and Parking, 2.2.3 Public Domain and 2.2.4 Land Uses. The aspects I will comment on are as follows – 1. Interested to note the proposal to redevelop the Rockingham Hotel site – such an eyesore and appalling use of valuable beachfront land. | The comments contained within this submission are not relevant to the consideration of the proposed Town Planning Scheme Amendment. The comments are dealt with as a part of the assessment of the Development Policy Plan for the Waterfront Village Sector. |

<p>| <strong>No.4 – Ms C. Martin, 22 Rokeby Road, South Perth WA 6151</strong>&lt;br&gt;Thank you for your letter dated 12th December 2011 regarding the proposed Planning Policy No.3.2.5 - Development Policy Plan - Waterfront Village Sector and proposed Planning Policy No.3.2.2 - Development Policy Plan - Smart Village Sector Amendment No.113 to Town Planning Scheme No.2. The Department of Education has reviewed the Development Policy Plans for the Waterfront and Smart Village Sectors. The Department has evaluated the approximate number of dwellings expected in the development area and the potential increase in student yield that this development will generate. The Department advises that the existing schools in the immediate vicinity have adequate capacity to accommodate the expected additional students. The Department therefore has no objection to the proposed Amendment. | Noted | That the submission be noted. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBMISSION</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The beaches are so beautifully and suited, in particular to young children and the older person. If a 4-5 * hotel was built on this site and it was skilfully aimed at the more affluent older tourist, the whole sector would benefit enormously. Also, in the event that the Wanliss St marina is built, affluent Perth boat owners would be encouraged to come ashore and enjoy 1-2 nights in a 4-5 * hotel, with obvious benefits.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Eliminate the Night Clubs on Kent St (Main St). We are witness to the vomiting, noise and urinating in Churchill Park in the early hours of the morning. It does not present an image that is appreciated by either locals or tourists. We can never have any windows open on “Night Club days”.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. When our Nautilus building was being planned, all vehicle access had to be from Kent Street so Rockingham Beach Rd could be turned into a pedestrian area. I note encouraging high levels of pedestrian activity, is one of the Council’s aims. This is a tremendous plan and would give so much scope for a commercial landscape firm, to turn it into a World class area. All the retail shops would benefit enormously. The design would need to ensure service vehicles could access the area early in the morning plus Police/Ambulance, were not excluded.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The bus route I note in the proposed planning, could be altered. Bring the bus down Kent Street, turn right into Railway Terrace to a bus stop on the beachfront near the restaurants then return up Railway Terrace and back along Kent St. Eliminate any parking down in that cul-de-sac and transform it with trees, paving and benches.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Have a passenger drop-off point at the beachside end of Flinders Lane to enable families etc. to unload their picnic eskies etc. then the driver parks in designated areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Put attractive multi-storey parking in the land behind the newsagent etc. on Rockingham Beach Rd and have landscaped wide access through to the beachfront. Charges would have to apply. Security cameras would need to be installed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSION</td>
<td>COMMENT</td>
<td>RECOMMENDATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. We appreciate the knowledgeable planning of building wall set-backs on Kent St to enable sunlight penetration. It's a pity that planner wasn't around when St. Georges Terrace was evolving.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. <strong>Something</strong> has to be done to eliminate the white cockatoo mobs from Churchill Park. Both Busselton and South Perth Councils have faced the same problem and had to act on the destructive habits and appalling noise. We watch in despair as they tear up the lawns in Churchill Park.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sincere Invitation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We would like to invite concerned Planning staff to our apartment on a Sunday afternoon at approximately 6.30pm to sit out on the balcony, share a drink and witness the mayhem of birds, motor bikes and hoons which make speech impossible. We travel extensively and have never encountered such a cacophony of noise, even in places like New York, Hawaii, London etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many thanks for inviting rate payers to submit their ideas for the Rockingham Waterfront Village.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No.4 – Mr P Higgins FIEAust CPEng MPD CMDR RANR, 15 Fontenay Court, Port Kennedy WA 6172</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was alerted to the opportunity to review and provide public comment to the cities proposals for the Rockingham Strategic Metropolitan Centre under the Activity Centre Plan in an advertisement in the 21 December 2011 Weekend Courier.</td>
<td>The comments contained within this submission are not relevant to the consideration of the proposed Town Planning Scheme Amendment. The comments are dealt with as a part of the assessment of the Development Policy Plan for the Smart Village and Waterfront Village Sectors.</td>
<td>That the submission be noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One key concern with the proposals is the way in which the information is made available for public comment. With the demographics clearly defined as predominantly of poor education standard, the documents have been written in a manner that is designed for town planning experts to understand.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This means that both the consultant and/or the City were never really interested in public comment, which is disturbing, and a matter I shall take up with my local member.

Please consider my comments and take the appropriate action to improve the planning for these key development areas of the City.

Attachment:
Public Comment To The Proposal For The Rockingham Strategic Metropolitan Centre.

Definition of a Plan:
The Documents provided for comment are referred to a plan yet they do not provide any information relating to scope, schedule or budget. Effectively, the documents provide a background and strategy for development.

Basis for the Plan:
The references used throughout the plan are somewhat dated; some go as far back as 15 years. While the plan does agree that some of the data used is flawed, it nevertheless still uses this data. Surely one would have expected that key demographic data would have been updated through newly commissioned studies….

Safety and security principles:
These principles MUST take account of the implications that will arise from the upcoming deregulation of shopping hours. Despite what the City may think or feel about this, deregulation will happen within the next 3 years so the plan must account for this.

In addition, the principles must account for the types of commercial activity and supporting services that may occur within the development areas. This then leads to concerns of whether or not some commercial activities should be specifically excluded from the multi user concept.

Main Street:
I believe that I am not the only person who is alarmed at the definition of ‘Main Street’. Main Street surely requires a minimisation of street parking not a maximising as informed throughout the documents.

If the city needs a good example to prove my point the Hay Street in Perth city is a good case study.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBMISSION</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street parking is a constant joke with double parking of commercial vehicles and constant congestion of private motor vehicles competing for main street car parking despite the availability of off street high rise car parks. I have personally witnessed untold near misses between vehicles, vehicles and bicycles and vehicles and pedestrians. Some commercial vehicles have taken to parking on pedestrian pathways.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is the 21st century. We should expect no private motor vehicles in these main street areas and good public transport support. How does the City expect to meet its Environmental and Sustainability KPI’s if it supports maximising street parking?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A good example of public transport is Perth cities CAT bus services.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use – Section 2.2.4</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is clearly too strategic a view to be of any use in planning. The guiding principles are too vague and one could effectively argue to allow any mix of residence and commercial entity. You could argue to have apartments next door to red light industry and associated night clubs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>These principles must be narrowed to ensure that plans for multi-use areas that include residential excludes anything that could be associated with contributing to antisocial behaviour.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A very good example of existing poor town planning is represented on the current Rockingham foreshore. There are a number of high density residential properties going in with some key commercial entities that are appropriate mixed with existing commercial entities (Liquids, Zeldas and the Rockingham Hotel) which contribute to significant antisocial behaviour, and present a significant risk to families who have to tread carefully through adjacent pathways and parkland strewn with broken beer bottles.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Street Types</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The section that defines street types pushed for motor vehicle access but skips briefly over pedestrian access.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The fundamental flaw in the argument for the TOD is that there will be a light rail.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSION</td>
<td>COMMENT</td>
<td>RECOMMENDATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is generally understood that this will never eventuate, particularly while Rockingham and Brand remain Labour Party dominated. The public service entity and both sides of government do not support the light rail.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It took 100 years to get a railway to Rockingham. The supply of a light rail will only ever occur if Rockingham and/or Brand become swinging seats or retrospectively when the numbers and demographics demonstrate the clear need for it (possibly around 2030 from the demographic data presented).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The TOD proposal reflects comparisons between Subiaco and Rockingham.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who are you kidding?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Completely different demographic.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Rockingham’s ‘city of bogans’ label needs to be turned around if this plan is to succeed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Residential planning is flawed. Perth city has a significant oversupply of apartments. The ‘build it and they will come’ philosophy of the property market is a constant failure but it’s not their money that they are gambling. Town planning entities should recognise this and not use related data to support proposals/strategies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 3.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refers to maximising street parking. This is not sound town planning if the City is seriously considering a modern development strategy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One could argue how much of the work provided by the consultant is being influenced by imported ‘talent’ needed to fill the consultants resourcing shortfalls.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Arts Centre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please refer to the demographic information you have. The city has more than 50% of the population who are trades, labourers, clerical and admin which is a demographic most unlikely to support the proposed arts centre. The Gary Holland Centre is already a white elephant; we don’t need another.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockingham Railway Station</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The references fail to recognise the need to continue expanding the car park. While this is the responsibility of state government, it needs to be clearly recognised by local government.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSION</td>
<td>COMMENT</td>
<td>RECOMMENDATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.5 – Mr R &amp; Mrs M Richardson, 90 Harrison Street, Rockingham</td>
<td>We purchased 90 Harrison Street, complete with an old brick and tile home in February 2007. Since then we have had a two storey brick and colorbond house built with the rear of the block, which was completed in late October 2011. We always thought it was an ideal location with the beach, park, shops and restaurants all within a short walking distance, a great place for retirement.</td>
<td>The comments contained within this submission are not relevant to the consideration of the proposed Town Planning Scheme Amendment. The comments are dealt with as a part of the assessment of the Development Policy Plan for the Waterfront Village Sector.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We never expected to have the prospect of an eight to ten storey block of apartments built right next to use or in a close proximity. To live in the shadow of such a tall building would be like living in a concrete jungle, with no privacy in our backyard area, as well as all the extra noise from the people and their cars who would be living so close to us. The tranquillity of the place would be lost forever.

In the last 6-8 years a number of new modern two storey homes and town houses have been completed in the block bounded by the Esplanade, Val St, Harrison St and Florence St, and it would seem a terrible waste of resources so see these newly constructed modern homes being demolished to make way for concrete apartment blocks. We are not against progress and modernisation, but feel that this proposal and planning change should have been done many years ago before you gave approval to people to build their new storey homes and town houses.

For these reasons **we strongly object to the planned change from R40 to “Waterfront Village”**. We feel sure that if any people on your planning team had a nice home and garden area, they would not want to be over shadowed by a big noisy concrete apartment block. We would appreciate a response from the council about our concerns.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBMISSION</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No.6 - Messrs K &amp; D &amp; Ms V Chatley, 160 Parkin Street, Rockingham WA 6168</td>
<td>Further to the currently advertised draft Planning Policy No.3.2.5 and accompanying scheme amendment please find attached our submission as a key stakeholder and affected landowner within the Rockingham Waterfront Village special development zone.</td>
<td>The comments contained within this submission are not relevant to the consideration of the proposed Town Planning Scheme Amendment. The comments are dealt with as a part of the assessment of the Development Policy Plan for the Waterfront Village Sector.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Generally, we would like to offer our support of the key initiative of the proposed amendments, being the identified need to create a larger critical-mass through increased density within the Waterfront village zone, in order to truly capture the potential of Transit Oriented Development.

More-over, the ability to create a vibrant urban environment that can adequately support the viability of the retail and commercial offerings necessary to truly transform Palm Beach, hinges in the main on ensuring the village-centre is an “active plan” all year round through a greater density of residential population.

With respect to some of the specific “requirements” outlined within the Planning Policy, that looks to modify the opportunities and constraints of individual landholdings within the Patterson West Precinct, there are several key factors that we wish to raise our concern to, if not objection. Whilst the potential increase in density is positive, the need to agglomerate properties to achieve the desired development form combined with some overly idealistic design requirements places un-realistic strain on the viability of development within the short to medium term. Some of these concerns are outlined below:-

- The onerous application of solar permeation as a blanket rule. Indeed it is a positive principle, however the idea that properties on the southern side of the street must have full solar access to midday sun for 365 days of the year is overly idealistic.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBMISSION</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Palm Beach Rockingham is primarily a &quot;summer destination&quot;, and it is unfeasible that the properties on one side of the street be idealized to the detriment of the development potential of the other is not fair and reasonable, especially when the 'protected' properties are not earmarked for a retail activated street-front.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It is more reasonable that for the majority of Winter and the Spring/Autumn shoulder, there is a performance based assessment of the neighbouring building's impact, ie for 2-3 weeks in the mid of winter, some solar-shadowing may be permitted, in fact, the positive benefit of south-facing zero-lot multi-storey developments creating a shaded pedestrian zone on the northern side of a street during summer, should be considered to balance a draconian view of 365 day solar access to the south side. If you take account of the seasonal increased incidence of residents and tourism, and naturally pedestrian movements, within the summer period (vs negligible attraction during winter), the solar access angle requirements should be relaxed, allowing higher development closer to the southern boundary of properties on the street's north side.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Height restrictions. Given the proximity to the waterfront of the properties bound between Harrison/May/Parkin streets, the restrictions of height to 8 storeys whilst other properties along the foreshore are permitted to 10 storeys is not correct. These properties are within 200m walk to the proposed transit-node, beach and cafes and should be promoted for much higher density potential and maximised capture of views of the ocean. Furthermore, the ability of this block to accommodate higher parking requirements with a majority residential usage should be optimized. With careful planning, this sector of the Waterfront village could easily accommodate developments heights of 15 storeys.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There is seemingly a miss-match between the “courtyard” style development indicated on the vision masterplan renderings, as well as within the white-block models, versus the cross-sectional requirements reflecting setback limits and heights.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSION</td>
<td>COMMENT</td>
<td>RECOMMENDATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It is not reasonable to overly ammenitise residents on the south side of the street, whom already have the potential for north-facing water-views, by restricting the potential for developments on the north side of the street to incorporate high amenity internal podium courtyards that maximise developable perimeter buildings frontage as well as allowing northern sun to the internal rear-residential building face. The rendered plans and massing models actually show the correct development form.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Setbacks. It should be clarified that where the “side” of a potential development is in fact a secondary street frontage (ie corner block) that the setback should not be 4m, but rather more reflective of a zero-lot-line scenario. In fact, with the case of the Eastern Side of May street, any development that effectively faces West, should indeed permit a zero-lot line scenario as there can be no impact overshadowing to properties to the south. Furthermore, the clear objective of creating enhanced parking arrangements through the Proposed Planning Policy 3.2.5, is jeopardised by the blanket impost of 2m setbacks (or 4m side setback), and the further impost of cl 4.5.4 (i) (that no car-parking is permitted between road reserve and building façade) makes it even more critical to maximise potential for rear “courtyard” (or podium) parking, by minimizing the need for setbacks wherever possible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Providing access gateway to the west. There is no recognition of the existing experience of Parkin Street acting as the key gateway from the western end of Palm Beach, back into the Waterfront Village Centre. This will be even more apparent with the proposed development of the Marina at Mangles Bay/Point Peron creating a key driver for growth westward of the Waterfront Village Centre.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Accordingly, the properties fronting Parking Street in Patterson West Precinct should have the potential to accommodate “Liner” retail and commercial mixed-use product at street level. Furthermore, the properties at the junction of May/Parkin are ideally situated for iconic architecture forming a “western gateway” to the Waterfront precinct, particularly requiring zero-lot line for all floors, “framing” building massing and increased height limits to 15 storeys.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSION</td>
<td>COMMENT</td>
<td>RECOMMENDATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increasing commercial viability to encourage quicker development response. Whilst the pursuit of “ideals” in urban design guidelines is understandable, the conservative overlay of every principle as a “required element” is an unrealistic expectation that will inevitably hamstring the potential to reach the higher densities indicated within the macro-strategy to achieve a successful and activated TOD style development at Rockingham Waterfront. Clearly, financial feasibility must be part of a development requirement to achieve true sustainability (not just environmental).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The reference to principals that have succeeded in East Perth and Subiaco (inner city locations), must be tempered with the proximal location of Rockingham, and with it, the intrinsically lower unit value of finished property, and thus the ability for Rockingham developers to incorporate all of the “required ideals” within financial realities, in order to see the vision for Rockingham Waterfront to come to fruition.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thank you for the opportunity to comment and we would be more than happy to form part of any active stakeholder inters group now or in the future.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No.7 – Ms K Schmidt, Director, Commercial Services Murdoch University, South Street, Murdoch WA 6150

This letter is to confirm Murdoch University’s support for the City of Rockingham’s proposed Scheme Amendment and two draft Planning Policies outlined.

We are enthusiastic about the activity these new precincts will generate for the University and for Rockingham. The proposed developments are very sympathetic to the existing landscape, are in line with our environmental sustainability practices and will provide further integration with Rockingham Town Centre. The 2km distance separating our campus from the proposed developments also means that it will not impact negatively on our University operations.

We would further like to highlight our continued support for the intensification of Rockingham’s public transport network linking the University with the City Centre and Rockingham foreshore.

<p>| | Noted | That the submission be noted. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBMISSION</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Should you have any further queries, please do not hesitate to contact Roslyn Retallick, Manager Campus Planning on 9360 2700.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No.8 - L Broadhurst, Manager, Road Planning, Main Roads Western Australia, PO Box 6202, East Perth WA 6892</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thank you for your letter dated 12 December, requesting Main Roads comments on the above proposal.</td>
<td>Noted</td>
<td>That the submission be noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Roads has no objections to the proposal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you require any further information please contact Ron Tolliday on (08) 9323 4536, quoting reference file no 04/6857-05 (D12#31137).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No.9 – Mr L Willcock, General Manager, Metropolitan, LandCorp, Locked Bag 5 Perth Business Centre WA 6849</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the proposed amendments to the City of Rockingham Town Planning Scheme No.2 (TPS2) currently being advertised by the City as well as the associated new Planning Policy 3.2.5, Development Policy Plan <em>Waterfront Village Sector</em>, and Planning Policy 3.2.2, Development Policy Plan <em>Smart Village Sector</em>.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We appreciate working with the City of Rockingham and value our partnership, through the Rockingham Kwinana Development Office, on the planning of the Rockingham Strategic Metropolitan Centre (RSMC).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The RSMC is an important activity centre and we are pleased to see these elements of the planning framework and its regulatory implementation components, are now open to public comment. We look forward to its Gazettal and the certainty it will provide, which is anticipated will support development.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LandCorp is generally supportive of the proposed amendments and is pleased to provide the following comments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Amendment 113, City of Rockingham Town Planning Scheme No.2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Zoning Table</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The amendment is essentially creating two new zonings into the zoning table and adds statutory weight to the development controls over the <em>Waterfront</em> and <em>Smart Village</em> Sectors.</td>
<td>The inclusion of a Nursing Home as a ‘D’ use within the proposed ‘Primary Centre Waterfront Village’ is to reflect the existing Nursing Home complex which is located within this Zone.</td>
<td>That this part of the submission be noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSION</td>
<td>COMMENT</td>
<td>RECOMMENDATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The deemed land uses in each of the zonings are ultimately the same with the exception of a ‘Nursing Home’ which is proposed to be an ‘X’ use under the ‘Primary Centre Urban Village’ Zone. Despite the similarity of discreitional land uses, each of the two zonings has distinctive objectives for their respective precinct.</td>
<td>There are already plans to redevelop and expand this complex. A “D” land use is an appropriate response to these existing plans.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To further clarify, both the Primary Centre Waterfront Village Zone and the Primary Centre Urban Village Zone articulate their objectives through a list of preferred and contemplated land uses. Having the preferred and contemplated land uses helps guide Council discretion when considering proposals for each of the precincts. In due course this will influence development in each of the two zones to meet the overall objectives.</td>
<td>The ‘preferred uses’ framework is an existing approach used and proven to be successful in land use control for the Primary Centre City Centre Zone.</td>
<td>That this part of the submission be not upheld.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently the controls over the preferred and non-preferred uses are referenced in the Village Sector Policies through a listing of preferred uses with a general comment that “Other permissible uses listed under the Scheme are not preferred”. Comments or notations of this nature when placed within a town planning scheme policy provisions does not carry the same weight as one which is embed within the TPS2 itself.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is suggested that you consider the clauses 4.3B and 4.3C have additional sub clauses added to reflect the intent of the objective. We note that the Stirling City Centre Local Town Planning Scheme has contemplated the incorporation of provisions to address this matter.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash-In-Lieu of Parking Provisions</td>
<td>Timing of the payment of cash-in-lieu is dealt with through the provisions of the Waterfront Village Policy. The City’s current practice is to require payment of the cash-in-lieu prior to the issue of a Building Licence, which is reflected in the wording of the Policy. The City notes that with the introduction of the new Building Act on the 2nd April 2012, payment of cash-in-lieu will be required prior to the application for a Building Permit.</td>
<td>That this part of the submission be not upheld.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With the potentially large numbers of applications that will be received by the City requesting cash-in-lieu parking concessions, it is suggested that item No.13 in Amendment 113 in relation to Clause 4.15.6.2 should comprise a level of protection for the Council in the event of any delays in the required cash-in-lieu payment. The RSMC development is reliant on the provision of visual signs of development and servicing infrastructure and a protracted delay in developer contributions should therefore be avoided when possible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We offer the following two points as examples that may offer some security for the Council:

- The cash-in-lieu payment shall be payable in such a manner and at such time as Council determines; and
- The cash-in-lieu payment shall be payable prior to the issue of the Building Licence.

The abovementioned points could be used for Clause 4.15.6 as a whole and not just Clause 4.15.6.2 alone.

It is further noted that the Primary Centre Urban Village has spatially planned for parking but there appears to have no specific Clause for cash-in-lieu parking. It may therefore need to apply the requirements of Clause 4.15.6.1. Due to the proposed density of the Sector and its similarity to the Primary Centre Waterfront Village, it is suggested that a similar control on the cash-in-lieu contributions be specified to ensure the cost of the compensating parking can be credited. This may come in the form of either on street parking bays or a decked structure.

### Murdoch University Campus

Reference is made in the Scheme Report (Figure 4), and at various points within Planning Policy No.3.2.2, that a portion of the Smart Village Sector Indicative Development Plan contains “Eastern Murdoch University Campus”. This statement is only valid for the area east of Dowling Street. Figure 4 in the accompanying Scheme Amendment Report shows extension to the existing Murdoch University Campus building that expands over the area west of Dowling Street. LandCorp recommends the retentions of Dowling Street as shown in Figure 2.3 – *Adopted Movement Network* in Planning Policy No.3.2.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBMISSION</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>RECOMMENDATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We offer the following two points as examples that may offer some security for the Council:</td>
<td>The wording of the Policy will be amended to reflect this change. To date, the City has not experienced difficulties with this process.</td>
<td>That this part of the submission be not upheld.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is further noted that the Primary Centre Urban Village has spatially planned for parking but there appears to have no specific Clause for cash-in-lieu parking. It may therefore need to apply the requirements of Clause 4.15.6.1. Due to the proposed density of the Sector and its similarity to the Primary Centre Waterfront Village, it is suggested that a similar control on the cash-in-lieu contributions be specified to ensure the cost of the compensating parking can be credited. This may come in the form of either on street parking bays or a decked structure.</td>
<td>The Town Planning Scheme and proposed Waterfront Village Policy deal with the provision of payment of cash-in-lieu. The additional provisions for the Waterfront Village Zone are due to the existence of two public carparks on Kent Street, extensive street parking and public carparks adjacent to the foreshore. There are no plans for dedicated public carparks within the Primary Centre Urban Village Zone.</td>
<td>That this part of the submission be not upheld.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murdoch University Campus</td>
<td>Descriptions and captions on relevant figures in the documents refer to a minor westward adjustment to the area of the university campus following the planned re-alignment of Dowling Street to connect with Crocker Street. This re-alignment was identified through the Centre Plan process.</td>
<td>That this part of the submission be not upheld.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSION</td>
<td>COMMENT</td>
<td>RECOMMENDATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The existing university campus within the Smart Village Precinct is well positioned to provide a crucial demographic diversity that will contribute to the liveliness of the Precinct. It should be noted that further expansion of the campus to the west of Dowling Street is questionable at this time and would be better suited as mixed use development as with the rest of the Precinct. Priority should be given to ensure there is a high level of connectivity between the existing University Campus and the Smart Village Precinct.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensuring a high level of access between the two precincts will sequentially complement one another and enhance the attractiveness of the region as a whole.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is critical that Scheme Amendment Report and any associated figures in Planning Policy No.3.2.2 be changed to reflect the current land use/ownership of Murdoch University with the retention of Dowling Street as a local road connector to Dixon Road.</td>
<td>Comments as per above.</td>
<td>That this part of the submission be not upheld.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning Policy 3.2.2, Development Policy Plan Smart Village Sector</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murdoch University Campus</td>
<td>The comments contained within this part of the submission are not relevant to the consideration of the proposed Town Planning Scheme Amendment. The comments are dealt with as a part of the assessment of the Development Policy Plan for the Smart Village Sector.</td>
<td>That this part of the submission be noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the foregone section we have noted the need to clarify and rectify the issue of the extension of the Murdoch University Campus beyond Dowling Street. A review of all figures in this policy is recommended to ensure consistency.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts Centre</td>
<td>It is noted that Key 7 in Figure 3.1 Smart Village indicative Development Plan defines this area for use as Arts Centre *or residential over public car park. This may be overly prescriptive and we would suggest a more flexible labelling such as Integrated Cultural/Residential with Public Car Parking. We place great importance on place-making for RSMC and an open and flexible label for this particular precinct will provide a more robust land use outcome.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Residential Density</td>
<td>It is noted that Figure 3.2 Residential Density sets an aspirational residential target of 80/160 and 100-200 dwellings per hectare for particular precincts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSION</td>
<td>COMMENT</td>
<td>RECOMMENDATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is likely that the design outcome and building typology will be more influential on densities than the colour coding as set out in Figure 3.2. We are conscious of the interface components, in particular the aspiration representation of 80-160 dwellings per hectare fronting onto existing lower density built form, may be counterproductive to gaining community acceptance. It is additionally noted that these aspiration targets may also not be consistent with Figure 3.4 Frontage Types for the Type 2 and 4 setbacks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash-In-Lieu of Landscaping Provisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similar to the comments above concerning the Cash-In-Lieu for Parking, considerations of guidelines and policies may need to be made for payments for landscaping in order to ensure that these elements can be provided as early as possible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Percent of Capital Cost of Building To Be Set Aside For Integrated Arts Component</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A one percent arts allocation would seem to be very high for a development area trying to market super lot sales in a possibly highly competitive mixed use land development market.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>However LandCorp would see value in maintaining this approach provided that appropriate guidelines are developed and adopted immediately upon gazettal of the scheme changes. These guidelines would seek to integrate the components of soft and hard landscaping, built form legibility and the arts components are used in both structural and interpretative manners.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The potential developers of this built form would need to be assured that this “levy” is delivered by the development process and form part of the place making and marketing initiatives which would differentiate RSMC.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LandCorp would be happy to assist in the development of these policies – Planning Policy 3.2.5, Development Policy Plan Waterfront Village Sector. The foregoing comments for the Smart Village sector are also general comments applicable for the Waterfront Village Sector.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We thank you for the opportunity to comment and commend Rockingham's persistence with its vision.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 10 - Mr S Proud, Director, Rockingham Kwinana Development Office, Unit 2, First Floor, 18 Civic Boulevard, Rockingham WA 6168</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBMISSION</strong></td>
<td><strong>COMMENT</strong></td>
<td><strong>RECOMMENDATION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thank you for the opportunity to provide comment on the above.</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
<td>That the submission be noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Rockingham Kwinana Development Office (RKDO) has worked closely with the City in the planned revitalisation of the Rockingham City Centre. It therefore welcomes the City’s progression of the statutory requirements to enable this revitalisation to occur.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The advertised documents accord with the discussions and preparatory work in which the RKDO participated. In particular, the application of the R-AC0 residential density code to proposed residential development is noted. This will provide the statutory flexibility to ensure appropriate development in accordance with the relevant Development Policy Plans.</td>
<td>Noted.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This office looks forward to further implementation of the City Centre Revitalisation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please contact John Di Rosso at the RKDO should you have any queries.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| No. 11 – Mr N Cox, A/Planning Manager, Schemes, Strategies & Amendments, Department of Planning, Locked Bag 2506 Perth WA 6001 |
|---|---|---|
| **SUBMISSION** | **COMMENT** | **RECOMMENDATION** |
| Thank you for the opportunity to provide comment on the above. | Noted. | That the submission be noted. |
| The Department of Planning through the Rockingham Kwinana Development Office (RKDO) has worked closely with the City in the planned revitalisation of the Rockingham City Centre. It therefore welcomes the City’s progression of the statutory requirements to enable this revitalisation to occur. |  |
| The advertised document accords with the discussions and preparatory work in which the Department / RKDO participated. Two specific comments are made: |  |
| • the application of the R-AC0 residential density code to proposed residential development is noted. This will provide the statutory flexibility to ensure appropriate development in accordance with the relevant Development Policy Plan (DPP). | Noted. |  |
### Submission

- **Section 3.7 - Frontage Types** of the DPP is not clear as to the degree of flexibility given to developers with regard to forms of frontage. The section details four different frontage types and gives the impression of being overly-prescriptive. The intent of these requirements is supported but it is felt that some degree of flexibility should be made clear so as to encourage proposals which may generally be in-keeping with this intent but do not meet the specific requirements.

### Comment

This is not relevant to the proposed Town Planning Scheme Amendment. This comment has been dealt with as part of the assessment of the Development Policy Plan for the Waterfront Village.

### Recommendation

The Department will await the future receipt of the amendment for assessment for final approval. A comprehensive assessment will be undertaken at that time. Please contact John Di Rosso at the RKDO should you have any queries.

### Committee Voting – 4/0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9. The Committee’s Reason for Varying the Officer’s Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10. Implications of the Changes to the Officer’s Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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1. Purpose of Report

To consider adoption of Planning Policy No.3.2.2 - Development Policy Plan - Smart Village Sector, following completion of the public advertising period.

2. Background

In September 2009 Council endorsed the Final Strategic Planning Reports (Volumes 1 and 2) as the Centre Plan for the Rockingham Strategic Regional Centre Plan. The Western Australian Planning Commission endorsed the Final Reports in November 2009.

Council also directed that City Officers prepare any necessary changes to the Policy framework, Town Planning Scheme and Metropolitan Region Scheme.

In light of the above, a Development Policy Plan was prepared for the Smart Village Sector, consistent with the layout of the adopted Development Policy Plan for the City Centre Sector. The Policy is consistent with the principles outlined for the Smart Village Sector, contained in the endorsed Centre Plan.
In October 2011 Council resolved to advertise Planning Policy No.3.2.2 - Development Policy Plan - Smart Village Sector for public comment.

3. Details

At the conclusion of the advertising period, nine (9) submissions had been received. Each submission has been assessed by City Officers and the City Centre Structure Plan Consultant.

4. Implications to Consider

a. Consultation with the Community

The Policy was advertised for public comment from 12th December 2011 until 3rd February 2012 (54 days), with advertising being undertaken in the following manner:-

(i) a notice was published in the Public Notices section of the Weekend Courier newspaper on the 16th and 23rd December 2011 and the 13th January 2012;

(ii) an advertisement was placed on the City's website for the entire advertising period; and

(iii) Twenty six (26) landowners and key stakeholders were notified in writing of the proposal.

b. Consultation with Government Agencies

The following Government Agencies were also consulted:-

- Main Roads WA
- Department of Transport
- Department of Education
- Department of Housing
- Rockingham Kwinana Development Office
- Public Transport Authority
- Department of Planning

c. Strategic

Community Plan

This item addresses the Community’s Vision for the future and specifically the following Aspirations contained in the Community Plan 2011:-

**Aspiration 6:** Civic buildings, public places and transport infrastructure of contemporary design, constructed and maintained using best practice principles.

**Aspiration 11:** Planning for population growth to ensure that future development and land-uses contribute to a sustainable city that provides for a genuinely desirable lifestyle

d. Policy

The draft Planning Policy No.3.2.2 for the Smart Village Sector has been prepared and advertised in accordance with Clause 8.9 (Planning Policies) of Town Planning Scheme No.2. Planning Policy No.3.2.2 has also been prepared in accordance with the approved Centre Plan framework, in accordance with State Planning Policy 4.2 - “Activity Centres for Perth and Peel” (August 2010).

e. Financial

Nil

f. Legal and Statutory

Under the provisions of section 8.9 of Town Planning Scheme No.2, the Council may prepare, modify or revoke a Planning Policy.
5. Comments

The following commentary is provided on the submissions received:-

- The submissions from the Department of Transport, the Department of Education and Main Roads WA are acknowledgement letters and raise no issues.
- The submission received from Murdoch University provides general support.
- The submission received from the Rockingham Kwinana Development Office provides general support.
- The submission received from LandCorp is generally supportive, however, it provides commentary in respect of suggested changes to the cash-in-lieu provisions of the Policy, the extent of the Murdoch University Campus, possible site for the Contemporary Arts Centre, preferred residential densities and the suggested public art contribution. Responses to these issues have been documented in the Schedule of Submission (attached).
- A comprehensive submission was received in respect of the Smart Village Masterplan (Indicative Development Plan) raising various comments and/or suggestions in respect of Public Open Space, community uses, building height and land ownership. These are dealt with in the Schedule of Submissions.
- The Rockingham and Districts Netball Association lodged a submission objecting to the removal of the netball courts, relocation of the Aquatic Centre and the removal of the general sporting fields. Community Infrastructure Planning has provided the following comments:-
  - Provisions have been made within the City's Community Infrastructure Plan, adopted at the ordinary Council Meeting in May 2011, to develop a new district sporting complex in Baldivis. Given the potential for outdoor sports courts to be lost over time through the Smart Village Development, the proposed District Sporting Complex includes an indoor recreation centre comprising four courts, as well as eighteen outdoor courts.
  - The City's Community Infrastructure Plan identifies the redevelopment/relocation of the Rockingham Aquatic Centre in response to the projected residential development, and increased residential densities, within the Rockingham City Centre.
  - On this basis, an Aquatic Facilities Strategy is currently being prepared to guide such community infrastructure provision and the City Business Plan includes an allocation of $15.4 million in 2018/19 for the redevelopment/relocation of an aquatic centre within the Rockingham City Centre.

Minor Modifications

Minor changes are proposed to be made to the Planning Policy, both as a result of comments raised in the public advertising period and an internal review by Officers.

Conclusion

The submissions received during the advertising period did not raise any substantial issues which provide cause for not adopting the proposed Planning Policy. As such, it is recommended that Council adopt Planning Policy No.3.2.2, subject to minor modifications of the advertised Policy (as highlighted in red).

The proposed Smart Village Development Policy Plan will ensure consistency with the adopted Centre Plan for the Rockingham Strategic Metropolitan Centre.

The Policy is also consistent with Scheme Amendment No.113 to Town Planning Scheme No.2. In this regard, the Policy cannot be adopted until such time as Scheme Amendment No.113 is granted Final Approval by the Hon Minister for Planning.

6. Voting Requirements

Simple Majority
7. Officer Recommendation

That Council ADOPT Planning Policy No.3.2.2 - Development Policy Plan - Smart Village Sector, subject to modifications to the advertised policy (changes to Policy are highlighted in red) and Amendment No.113 to Town Planning Scheme No.2 being granted Final Approval by the Hon Minister for Planning.

8. Committee Recommendation

That Council ADOPT Planning Policy No.3.2.2 - Development Policy Plan - Smart Village Sector, subject to the following modifications to the advertised policy (changes to Policy are highlighted in red) and Amendment No.113 to Town Planning Scheme No.2 being granted Final Approval by the Hon Minister for Planning:-
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1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

The Smart Village Sector is one of a number of defined development sectors within the planning envelope of the endorsed Centre Plan for the Rockingham Strategic Metropolitan Centre. Under the Centre Plan, the Smart Village Sector is referred to as 'Smart Village (South)'.

This Planning Policy provides a more detailed planning vision and policy framework for the Sector, based on the concept of a sustainable, medium to high density urban village arranged around a central, high frequency transit spine. A logical policy area boundary has been defined within which the land use and townscape characteristics of individual precincts are described and illustrated.

1.2 Centre Plan Status - Strategic Metropolitan Centre

Under its Statement of Planning Policy 4.2 (Activity Centres for Perth and Peel), the Western Australian Planning Commission requires the City of Rockingham to prepare and maintain an
endorsed Activity Centre Structure Plan (Centre Plan) to guide the development of public and private property within the Rockingham Strategic Metropolitan Centre.

The City commissioned a review of its endorsed 1995 Centre Plan with the goal of producing a new Centre Plan that would cover the full extent of the area to be serviced by the Rockingham City Centre Transit System (RCCTS). The scope of the Centre Plan project covers an area of almost 600 hectares between the Rockingham Train Station and Rockingham Beach and includes the area covered by the existing Central City Area zone in the Metropolitan Region Scheme, within which the Smart Village Sector is located.

Stage 1 of the Centre Plan Review was advertised for public comment in December 2007. It laid down an overall Concept Plan that addressed the priority issues of: a better connected access and movement network; and a land use pattern based on contemporary ‘Main Street’ and ‘Transit Oriented Development’ principles. A Framework Plan translated the Concept Plan into a general arrangement of legible street blocks, built form and public space.

The overall Centre Plan area was divided into 11 Sectors (refer to figure 1) as follows:-

- City Centre
- Waterfront Village
- Smart Village (South)
- Smart Village (North)
- Northern Gateway
- Campus
- Eastern
- Leeuwin
- Northern Waterfront
- Southern Gateway
- Rockingham Station

In February 2008, following a review of stakeholder and public submissions, the City of Rockingham endorsed the long term planning framework and transport network recommendations for the Strategic Metropolitan Centre, as proposed in the Stage 1 Report.

Stage 2 of the Centre Plan Review updated the Development Policy Plan for the City Centre sector, with a revised Indicative Development Plan and related Precinct Policies and Guidelines. The Council endorsed the Stage 2 Final Reports at its ordinary Meeting held on the 22nd September 2009.

On the 10th November 2009, the WAPC Statutory Planning Committee considered the Stage 2 Final Reports on the Review of the Rockingham Strategic Metropolitan Centre and resolved to endorse the documents as an appropriate Centre Plan to guide future planning and development.

2. STRATEGIC METROPOLITAN CENTRE PLANNING FRAMEWORK

2.1 Vision for the Strategic Metropolitan Centre

The following vision has been endorsed in the endorsed Centre Plan for the Rockingham Strategic Metropolitan Centre:-

*The vision is for a modern, distinctly coastal centre offering a wide range of mixed uses including retail, commercial, office, civic, residential, education and recreation within an accessible and highly inter-connected, urban-scaled townscape, comprising a major activity centre and related urban villages based on ‘Main Street’ principles.*

This vision builds on the principles of the Network City (2004) regional planning framework and the objectives and concepts of the adopted 1995 Rockingham City Centre Development Policy Plan. It has a wider scope to encompass higher education campuses and urban villages along the route of the Rockingham City Centre Transit System through to Rockingham Beach.
Development in the Rockingham Strategic Metropolitan Centre will be defined and characterised by:-

- Medium to high density development based on activated, 'Main Street' principles.
- A configuration of generally contiguous streetfront buildings and a mix of uses that generate high levels of pedestrian activity and a sense of vitality.
- A street-based transit system, with closely spaced stops.
- A permeable network of streets, laneways, arcades and public spaces that provide high quality linkages, particularly for pedestrians, to Centre activities from transit stops, street and off-street car parking and from the surrounding walkable catchment.
- An identifiable City Centre hub to provide major CBD functions.
- Connected urban villages between the City Centre and Rockingham Beach along the route of the transit system. The new urban villages will make provision for mixed and consolidated education (university), technology, commercial and medium to high density residential development, based on sustainable planning principles and design criteria.

2.2 Planning and Development Principles

The following planning and development principles apply across the Strategic Metropolitan Centre:-

2.2.1 Built Form & Urban Design Principles:
- Develop in accordance with ‘Main Street’ design principles.
- Incorporate a diversity of activities and human scale in streetfront development.
- Develop local areas in accordance with specific precinct design and development guidelines and controls.
- Locate and configure buildings to address the street and progressively facilitate continuous and contained streetscapes which provide interest and interaction between buildings and pedestrians at street level.
- Make public buildings and spaces universally accessible.
- Design buildings and public spaces that contribute to a comfortable pedestrian environment, providing opportunities for weather protection, including shelter from prevailing strong wind conditions.
- Minimise any detrimental impacts on neighbouring properties.
- Encourage a gradual stepping up of the built form at the interface of low and high rise development.

2.2.2 Access & Parking Principles:
- Make walking the most important mode of transport within the Smart Village. Streets, public places and adjacent development should be designed to provide a safe, secure, stimulating and pleasant walking environment.
- Link the major regional and sub-regional road system to the Smart Village by a range of direct and legible street connections.
- Ensure that the Smart Village and related activity centre street networks are ‘fine grained’ to provide a multiple choice of routes for pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles.
- Integrate the street-based central transit system to link the Smart Village with Rockingham Beach, the City Centre and the Rockingham railway station.
- Ensure that appropriate land uses are located adjacent to the transit route.
- Adopt an integrated urban design and traffic management approach within the Smart Village to deliver a low speed traffic environment and a high level of interest and amenity.
• Manage provision of adequate parking facilities and encourage integration of car parking with adjoining sites which are convenient, safe and sustainable.
• Locate parking areas to minimise adverse impacts on the streetscape.
• Control new development so that access ways and parking facilities do not visually dominate the public realm or create obstructions to the pedestrian environment and minimise potential pedestrian/vehicle conflicts.
• Avoid semi-basement car parking solutions where they would impact negatively on the ground level activation of adjoining streets.

2.2.3 Public Domain
Principles:-
• Integrate different precincts through the use of a simple and consistent palette of vegetation, paving, signage and street furniture.
• Design new development so as to contribute to the quality of the public domain and the framing and activation of the public space network.
• Provide for well-designed and integrated toilets, seating, lighting and public art within the public domain.

2.2.4 Land Uses
Principles:-
• Ensure that new uses support and enhance the role of the Strategic Metropolitan Centre as the primary 'Main Street' activity centre in the South West Perth Region.
• Reinforce the ‘Main Street’ model for the Centre by giving priority to active street-oriented land uses.
• Encourage land uses and developments that employ and attract high numbers of people, and have the potential to activate the central spine of the Smart Village by day and night along the route of the principal, street based public transport system. Such uses should include medium to high density residential, short stay accommodation, retail, civic and community facilities, educational and cultural facilities, cafes, restaurants, hotels, offices and other intensive employment uses.
• Avoid land uses and developments that generate high volumes of cars and trucks and have low employment intensities.
• Encourage and promote a diverse mix of uses in preference to mono-functional land uses on larger sites.
• Enhance the activity appeal of the Smart Village to both local and regional visitors.
• Encourage attractive and safe alfresco dining facilities to foster a lively streetscape.
• Promote appealing and distinctive retail uses reflecting the coastal nature and lifestyle of Rockingham and its community.
• Ensure that residential uses are integrated with the retail, commercial and hospitality potential of the Smart Village.
• Encourage the aggregation of facilities along 'Main Street' corridors, pedestrian links and major public spaces that are characterised by high levels of pedestrian activity during normal shopping hours.
• Encourage new development to provide options for future flexibility and changes in land use.

2.2.5 Safety & Security
Principles:-
• Design buildings to provide a safe environment for all users, contribute positively to the enhancement of public safety, and minimise the need for intrusive surveillance technologies.
• Incorporate unobtrusive security measures into building design that is in keeping with the building’s architectural style and materials.
• Design public spaces to facilitate safe pedestrian use and create a sense of public ownership.

2.2.6 Sustainability
Principles:-
• Ensure timely and efficient provision of physical and social infrastructure to enable the Centre to service its strategic functions.
• Promote environmentally sustainable practices, including resource efficiency (energy, water, waste, air quality, material selection), at all stages of development – planning, subdivision design, building construction and maintenance.
• Provide sufficient land for employment opportunities and to support local and regional economic growth.
• Expand sustainable and efficient transport options while creating opportunities to reduce single occupancy vehicle trips.
• Ensure timely provision of services and facilities that are equitable, durable, accessible, of a high-quality and that promote community well-being and health.
• Promote a range of housing choices (densities, floor area, ownership patterns, price and building types) to ensure a diverse population can be housed, including designing buildings to be adaptable over time.

2.3 Concept Plan
An overall Concept Plan for the Strategic Metropolitan Centre was developed in conjunction with the preparation of an access and movement network (refer to Figure 2.1).
The Plan makes provision for improved road connectivity and a more legible road network with particular emphasis given to improved north-south connectivity. Moreover, the Plan makes the local transit system the focus of an intensified corridor of mixed use development between the City Centre, education campuses and the beachfront.
The foundation of the Plan is the ongoing development of land within the existing City Centre Zone, with the expectation that development will consolidate around the commercial and civic core of the City, with progressive expansion along streetfronts, to the north.
Between the designated City Centre and the Waterfront Village, there are opportunities to develop two new activity centres north and south of Dixon Road, along the route of the local transit system. The vacant land south of Dixon Road presents an opportunity to integrate the western end of the Murdoch University campus with other mixed uses (including residential) in a consolidated, ‘Main Street’ configuration.
Between Dixon Road and Patterson Road, an opportunity exists to extend the ‘Main Street’, activity corridor to directly connect with Victoria Street and the fast redeveloping Rockingham Waterfront.
Further expansion of the Waterfront Village is envisaged, particularly to the west of Patterson Road. An intensification of residential development to the east of the Waterfront Village would follow the coastal route of the transit system.
Figure 1 divides the Strategic Metropolitan Centre into sectors and overlays them on the Concept Plan base to provide a convenient means of describing and further detailing the strategy. While the boundaries are indicative, they are consistent with the boundaries of existing zones, Policy areas and Precincts within the Town Planning Scheme.

2.4 Framework Plan
A Framework Plan (refer to Figure 2.2) has been prepared over the Strategic Metropolitan Centre to illustrate a generalised arrangement of built form, movement networks and public and private spaces consistent with the strategic arrangement of functions illustrated in the Concept Plan.
The Plan is also consistent with the potential for Transit Oriented Development (TOD) described in Section 2.5 and builds on the adopted access and movement network described in Section 2.6.
The Framework Plan illustrates a long term (i.e. greater than 10 years) view of development and redevelopment potential. While the Plan shows possible new road links over privately owned property, it is acknowledged that such improvements would be subject to the agreement and cooperation of affected property owners.

The Framework Plan provides a platform for more detailed conceptual planning, urban design and planning policy within each of the Centre Plan Sectors.

Consistent with the scope of the Centre Plan, the Framework Plan focuses its detail on areas where there is the greatest potential and/or priority for integrated development or redevelopment in the near term, including land in the City Centre, in the Waterfront Village and along the route of the City Centre Transit System.

Outside of the more detailed parts of the Plan, existing residential and service commercial areas have been simply shaded in yellow and purple tones consistent with the strategic intent of the Concept Plan. These areas are likely to undergo change on a site-by-site basis over an extended period. Development in these areas will be guided by separate Sector Development Policy Plans and relevant guidelines.

2.5 Transit Oriented Development

2.5.1 Background

The RCCTS connects the Rockingham Train Station with the City Centre, education campuses and the beachfront. The route of the street-based transit system is being developed initially in shuttle-bus mode with the understanding that it will be upgraded to an electric streetcar or light rail operation once a more supportive level of development has been achieved along the route.

The City of Rockingham is committed to achieving the vision of a fixed route, streetcar transit system as the focus of a corridor of high intensity, mixed use development between the train station and the beachfront.

Accordingly, a review of the Centre Plan was commissioned on the understanding that it would demonstrate the application of sustainable development principles with a particular emphasis on TOD.

2.5.2 TOD Policy Background

It is important to understand the TOD policy background to the Centre Plan.

Network City (2004)

The Network City document set out a strategic foundation for TOD implementation in the Perth region.

Strategy 1.1 sought to foster land use and transport integration to form a Network city, by:-

“Encouraging mixed use development in activity centres, including higher density residential developments and employment generators, especially where centres are well served by public transport and have high amenity, walkable catchments.”

In a key action to support the strategy, Network City proposed demonstration projects in Activity Centres to promote TOD, mixed use and higher density residential projects, and to demonstrate best practice in design and implementation. The Rockingham Activity Centre between the Rockingham Train Station and the foreshore was one of several locations nominated for a major TOD demonstration project. The Smart Village site provides a rare opportunity to integrate an intensive land use mix with the development of a new, high frequency transit service.

Development Control Policy DC 1.6 – Planning to Support Transit Use and Transit Oriented Development

The amended Development Control Policy 1.6 was adopted by the WAPC in 2005 to reflect the Government’s vision for a sustainable future as outlined in the Network City and the State Sustainability Strategy.

The Policy notes that:-
“As the public transport system is further refined and extended, there will be emerging opportunities for new development that is focused upon, and maximizes the benefits derived from significant new public investments in transit infrastructure.”

The Policy has direct application to the planning and development of property along the route of the RCCTS.

Policy measures include:-

• Transit-supportive development patterns
• Land use to support transit
• The public domain in transit oriented precincts
• Transit supportive design
• Integrating transit infrastructure
• Precinct planning

2.5.3 TOD Catchment

The TOD catchment encompasses land within a walkable distance of the transit system. At Rockingham the catchment follows the route of the City Centre Transit System between the train station and the beachfront. It is approximately 600 metres wide (each side) along the transit route (to service a future tram or streetcar system).

2.5.4 Land Use Distribution and Development Intensity

The following land use assumptions were generated in conjunction with the draft Concept Plan, the modelling of transport network options and the selection of a preferred transport network.

A mix of active, high intensity uses are appropriate for land within the walkable catchment of the transit route. The intensity and mix of uses should reflect local characteristics along the activity corridor.

The City Centre and the Waterfront Village are established Activity Centres which have to date been planned to accommodate the bulk of retail, office, hospitality and higher density residential development. The 2009 Centre Plan allows for a more balanced distribution of activity-generating uses along the transit corridor where there are significant opportunities for sustainable TOD.

Retail floorspace has been notionally allocated as follows:-

• City Centre 85,000m²
• Waterfront Village 18,000m²
• Smart Villages 12,000m²

Office floorspace has been notionally allocated as follows:-

• City Centre 60,000m²
• Waterfront Village 8,000m²
• Smart Villages 32,000m²

The majority of office floorspace allocated to the Smart Villages should be situated in a mixed use, 'Main Street' environment close to the transit spine and its intersection with Dixon Road.

Residential land use is typically a major component of mixed use TOD. Given that the Waterfront Village project has demonstrated a demand for high amenity, urban-scaled residential development, it has been assumed that medium to high density residential development will be a major driver of the TOD process. It has the capacity to shape and populate the desired activity corridor.

Within the defined TOD catchment, existing residential densities match the suburban norm of Rockingham with the exception of pockets of higher density along the Rockingham beachfront (200+ dwellings per hectare along Rockingham Beach Road and up to 100 dwellings per hectare in the adjoining Waterfront Village) and in clusters of group housing around the City Centre (typically 50 dwellings per hectare).
Over recent years, the City has received proposals for medium rise, multi-residential apartment developments on City Centre zoned land. This has been driven by strong sales in the Waterfront Village and the realisation that the elevated apartment building model in central Rockingham could achieve expansive views around the entire Rockingham coastline. There appears to be latent potential for higher rise, multi-residential apartment development beyond the coastal fringe.

The advent of the TOD concept along the transit corridor provides the planning and amenity context for an orderly arrangement and distribution of medium to higher density residential development.

Since the late 1980's there has been an international consensus among researchers and transit operators that the gross average residential density threshold for light rail transit is approximately 50 persons per hectare. More recently, planners have also recognised that a greater intensity and massing of development is needed to create the urban context for successful TOD.

TOD's at Subiaco are being planned to achieve an average residential density of 120 dwellings per hectare with a net yield of 60 to 200 dwellings per hectare on defined blocks. Similar TOD densities are being implemented in Government fostered development projects at Leighton, Cockburn Central and Murdoch.

In the case of the Rockingham TOD, residential densities could range between 60 and 200+ dwellings per hectare (as is currently being developed in parts of the Waterfront Village).

It has been assumed that car parking generated by various land uses and activities will be self-contained within the relevant traffic zones to avoid an over-concentration in any one sector.

2.5.5 Urban Design and Built Form

While the overall TOD concept is for a consolidated, generally contiguous corridor of development along the transit route, it is essential that TOD at Rockingham has a varied and geographically appropriate character that offers multiple choices in lifestyle and convenience.

TOD with a commercial content will range from the expanded shopping centre that will be sleeved to connect with streetfront tenancies and an adjacent entertainment complex, through to individual mixed use developments on freehold sites.

A variety of residential dwelling types and tenures will be encouraged, including traditional streetfront townhouses, contemporary row houses, mews housing, low rise apartment blocks and medium to high-rise multiple apartments with a lifestyle focus ranging in height from three to ten or more storeys, subject to precinct-specific guidelines. Drawing on recent good practice, a range of urban-scaled dwelling sizes will also be encouraged (and possibly mandated) to ensure that a wide spectrum of household types and levels of affordability can be accommodated.

Particular emphasis will be given to shaping the form of development along the edge of the transit route and around transit stops. In particular, there is a need for design measures to optimize the safety and amenity of stops along the route, including achieving adequate levels of activation and passive surveillance from adjoining properties.

2.5.6 Residential Yields

Estimates of residential potential within the RCCTS catchment (600 metres) each side of the transit route) vary according to density assumptions.

Without TOD intervention, the overall area of the Strategic Metropolitan Centre (about 580 hectares) would yield approximately 6,000 dwellings (at a gross average 10 dwellings per hectare) and a population of approximately 12,000 based on a household occupancy of 2.0. This allows for continued intensification in and around the Waterfront Village, but no significant residential consolidation in the City Centre and along the transit route.

With TOD intervention and average net block densities of 100 dwellings per hectare applied along the activity spine, the subject area could yield approximately 20,000 dwellings and a population of 36,000 (based on 1.8 persons per household) at a gross average density of 62 persons per hectare. This scenario could achieve the light rail transit threshold density of 50 persons per hectare.

With TOD, there is the potential to ultimately triple the anticipated population within the walkable catchment of the RCCTS.

Within the Smart Village South, there is a TOD potential for approximately 1500 residential units, housing around 2,700 people.
2.6 Adopted Access and Movement Network

A preferred movement network has been adopted by the City. Particular attention has been given to the TOD potential of the Strategic Metropolitan Centre and traffic modelling outputs which indicate that there is more than sufficient street capacity on the proposed fine grained network within the centre.

2.6.1 Street Types

A number of different street types are commonly found in city centres, mixed use urban villages and on access streets to, through and around these centres.

Street types relevant to the development of the Strategic Metropolitan Centre include:-

**Major Traffic Routes** - the main traffic carrying roads in the area. They include Ennis Avenue, Patterson Road, Dixon Road, Read Street and Rae Road. They are dual carriageways designed to carry high volumes of traffic and do not penetrate the City Centre or adjoining mixed use town or village centres.

**Transit Street and Transit Priority Streets** - custom designed to provide priority for public transport along major transit routes and avoid undue delay to public transport services. Transit priority is proposed along significant sections of the RCCTS route. The design varies to meet local design constraints. Access for other traffic is permitted within the street reservation, but this is not always the case. They are designed to provide for safe, convenient pedestrian movement.

**City and Town Centre Streets** - pedestrian movement and circulation is very important on these streets. Design permits two-way traffic movement but at a slow speed to provide for safe pedestrian movement. Kerbside parking is normally permitted. A central median is sometimes provided to improve the streetscape, but is not mandatory.

**Green Parking Streets** - to be constructed around the periphery of the City Centre and on sections of Patterson Road near the foreshore. Their function is to assist with the provision of public parking whilst allowing the street to function normally for both pedestrian and vehicular access. Right angle median and parallel kerbside parking is normally permitted. An example of this type of street exists along part of Patterson Road near the foreshore. Streets of this type are quite common in areas of Melbourne (eg Carlton).

**Connector Streets** - provided outside the major activity nodes to link areas within and adjacent to the City Centre. They can pass through areas with different land uses (eg residential, business or education). Indented kerbside parking and appropriately designed pedestrian crossing areas would normally be incorporated into the design.

**Access Streets** - found outside of the highly trafficked areas of city, town and village centres. The primary purpose of these streets is to provide access to properties for motorists, pedestrians and cyclists. In light industrial and commercial areas (and in residential areas on an infrequent basis) they also cater for delivery vehicles.

**Pedestrian Malls/Accessways** - provide essential pedestrian connectivity in areas where the street network is not well-connected. An internal network of pedestrian malls exists within the Rockingham shopping centre. A major purpose of such pedestrian malls is to provide a sheltered and controlled retail environment. Beyond the private domain of the shopping centre, pedestrian laneways and pathways through public space connect a wide array of mixed uses.

2.6.2 The Adopted Network

The adopted access and movement network is illustrated in Figure 2.3. It includes a wide range of street types which enable different functions to be undertaken in different areas in and around the Strategic Metropolitan Centre.

The network has been developed around the modified route of the street based public transport system, connecting the City Centre to Rockingham Beach. Key aspects of the network include:-

- The street network provides well connected linkages through the proposed Smart Villages between the City Centre and the Rockingham foreshore.

- The street network in the City Centre and in the proposed Smart Villages is fine grained and highly connected, providing a high degree of robustness and flexibility for future planning.
2.6.3 Traffic Modelling and Traffic Predictions
Traffic modelling has been undertaken by Uloth and Associates.

One of the key findings from the traffic modelling was:

- Long term estimated traffic volumes on the surrounding arterial road network (Ennis Avenue, Read Street and Patterson Road) are high. This is due to an impermeable street network on approach to the Rockingham Metropolitan Centre, especially from the south. Traffic volumes on the fine grained street network within the Metropolitan Centre are fairly low.

2.6.4 Public Transport Network Planning
There are three main elements to public transport network planning in Rockingham:

- The principal custom designed street based public transport system (the RCCTS), linking the train station with the City Centre, Murdoch University and the Rockingham foreshore. This is the major linking element through the City Centre supporting the proposed transit oriented development.
- The Rockingham/Fremantle principal transit service (the 920 service). This high frequency service would either enter Rockingham through the educational precinct and travel through the City Centre, terminating at the railway station, or enter the city through the railway station, terminating in the education campus sector (near the TAFE).
- Services from the south entering the City Centre via Read Street and Central Promenade. These services could proceed through the City Centre to the train station. Some peak hour services could travel in a more direct route via Read Street and Rae Road to the train station.

The potential public transport network is shown in Figure 2.4.

Figure 2.5 shows the walking catchment around the proposed stops along the principal street based public transport system, linking the railway station, the City Centre, the University and the foreshore. The outer line is based on a 750 metre walking distance (depicted by a 600 metre radius) applicable to a streetcar or very high frequency bus service. The inner shaded area depicts a walking catchment within the City Centre and adjacent Smart Villages for retail and entertainment uses within a vibrant, mixed use centre. This is based on a 500 metre walking distance (depicted by a 400 metre radius).

Figure 2.6 shows the walking catchment for the proposed combined major transit services for Rockingham. It can be seen that the Strategic Metropolitan Centre will be very well served by high frequency transit. This level of coverage by high frequency services means that Rockingham could be described as a 'Transit City' rather than a city with transit.

2.6.5 Parking Policy and Principles
In city and town centres and TOD's, it is important that a balance is achieved between meeting the access and parking needs for vehicles and the movement needs of pedestrians in the context of overall urban design.

The distribution of car parking in the Smart Village should be based on the following principles:

- Where possible provide public parking in preference to private parking.
- Maximise the amount of on-street, short term parking, subject to traffic and pedestrian safety, and other urban design considerations.
- Provide a range of off-street public parking facilities within easy walking distance of commercial, retail entertainment and other facilities, but limit vehicle access to car parks where such traffic would be in conflict with high levels of pedestrian movement.

2.7 Endorsed Sector Planning Guidelines for the Smart Village
Section 10.3 in Volume 1 of the endorsed Centre Plan sets out broad Sector Planning Guidelines within which more detailed planning of the Smart Village South Sector should be undertaken in accordance with the adopted Planning Framework for the Strategic Metropolitan Centre. The following text is an extract from the Centre Plan:
“Desired Future Character

The 24 hectare site, which is vested in the City of Rockingham, represents a strategic TOD opportunity at the junction of the transit route and Dixon Road. A contemporary mixed use, higher density development will embody sustainable development principles and high quality urban design. It will build on the market profile and amenity foundation of the nearby Waterfront Village and will include a village Main Street and central park around which the higher density TOD will be assembled. Contemporary residential apartments and offices will be situated over street front retail in a built form that ranges from 2 to 20 plus storeys.

Preferred Uses

- Appropriate TOD uses lining the Transit Route
- Streetfront mixed uses of urban scale including offices & commercial
- Local service retail
- University-related uses
- Medium to high density residential
- Possible Contemporary Arts Centre
- Passive Parkland

Elements

- Plan and design the sector as part of a generally contiguous, transit-oriented development bridge between the City Centre, Campus and Waterfront sectors.
- Facilitate the priority construction of a more direct access and movement corridor between Dixon Road and the City Centre.
- Establish a commercial gateway and commercially activated village ‘Main Street’ immediately south of the junction of the transit route and Dixon Road.
- Retain community recreation buildings for as long as necessary.
- Develop a central, linear park along the transit route spine as an amenity focus for the development of high density residential apartments and offices.
- Examine opportunities to locate landmark civic buildings along the transit route as part of the place-making agenda.
- Design the interface between the village Main Street and the Campus Sector to allow for a generally seamless transition in built form.
- Provide a legible and well connected arrangement of streets, laneways and public spaces.
- Frame street blocks with generally contiguous, urban scaled buildings of high architectural quality.
- Develop a distinct and appealing townscape with high levels of amenity and interest for pedestrians.
- Grade and arrange the height of buildings to visually define the transit route, orient movement towards the activity spine and exploit expansive views of the coastal landscape.
- Ensure that all new development is planned in accordance with the sustainability principles listed in Section 3.1.6 (Centre Plan Vol.1) and designed in detail to meet any applicable sustainability Key Performance Indicators endorsed by the City of Rockingham.”
3. SMART VILLAGE INDICATIVE DEVELOPMENT PLAN

3.1 The Indicative Development Plan

The Smart Village Indicative Development Plan (IDP) (refer to Figure 3.1), illustrates a more detailed interpretation of the planning framework described and illustrated in Section 2. While the Smart Village IDP has been derived from the overall Framework Plan, it includes modifications and refinements that demonstrate how the Centre Plan could be expected to evolve within particular sectors and precincts, consistent with the endorsed Sector Planning Guidelines listed under Section 3.2 below.

The street network has been modified as necessary: to improve road geometries; to better align the street grid with the layout of the existing Murdoch University campus; to accommodate new development (including a possible aquatic facility) around the existing indoor recreation centre; and to make provision for a wide range of development types, from tall residential apartment towers on podiums to pockets of terrace housing on the periphery.

The IDP incorporates a strong, central spine of mixed use development along the transit route and it is envisaged that a lively pedestrian environment will be fostered by significant investment in high amenity place-making.

Central Park will be the spatial focus of the Smart Village and the road network has been carefully laid out to radiate out from this green heart to provide direct and legible connections with the surrounding urban context. The formally landscaped park will provide a fitting setting for the development of high density residential and office buildings around its perimeter. Accommodation in these buildings around the park could conceivably be related to the functions and users of the University, including possible partners in research and development (e.g. marine science, resources, defence). Taller towers to possibly 20 or more storeys could be located along the western flank of the park where they would not cast morning shadows over the space.

Consistent with the intent of the adopted Access and Movement Network in the Centre Plan, the Smart Village ‘High Street’ has been planned as a prominent, yet human-scaled node of development that will draw traffic from Dixon Road through the business core of the Smart Village and then through to the City Centre a northerly extension of Chalgrove Avenue. This will satisfy the need for improved access to the City Centre from Dixon Road as well as providing an essential stream of traffic to sustain street front commerce.

A secondary link to the City Centre via an easterly extension of Market Street will pave the way for a visual connection between the proposed Central Park and the existing City Park. The central transit system will follow this Market Street link and it is envisaged that development sites along both sides of this route will be developed at high density, with landmark residential apartment and office towers taking advantage of the amenity and proximity to a wide range of central area facilities.

Midway along the proposed ‘High Street’, an east-west cross street will visually and physically connect the existing Murdoch University campus with a redeveloped recreation centre. The IDP shows how a new main entry to the recreation centre could be created in conjunction with the development of new community and commercial accommodation, with a possible, predominantly indoor aquatic facility on the northern side of the entrance lobby and a possible gymnasium and fitness centre on the south side.

This arrangement of public spaces and built form between the existing University campus and the existing recreation centre at the northern end of the Smart Village will allow for a seamless integration of the various functions, with a critical mass of development and activity that makes each of the components more likely to be viable. The strategy embodies the beneficial and enduring characteristics of historic University towns in many parts of the world.

 Provision has been made on the eastern side of the Smart Village ‘High Street’ for a range of possible mixed use developments, including retail, commercial, office and education tenancies. The plan also illustrates a site option for a possible Contemporary and Performing Arts Centre (CAPAC). While the development of a CAPAC in the Smart Village is considered unlikely at this stage, it is nonetheless important to show how such a facility could be sleeved with other tenancies to satisfy the street framing and activation requirements of the planning framework for the Village. The development of a CAPAC in this location could bolster the physical development and identity of the Smart Village, with the University as a key user and possible funding contributor.
Within the scope and meaning of the Planning and Development Principles listed in Section 2, there is scope for flexibility in the interpretation of the DPP requirements that could result in acceptable alternative development configurations to those illustrated in the IDP, particularly in relation to the scale and configuration of individual developments.

3.2 Relevant Residential and Mixed Use Building Typologies

The endorsed Centre Plan provides the planning framework that governs more detailed planning for the City Centre and the urban villages (including the Smart Village). This framework requires a medium to high density TOD outcome that has much in common with inner-city development and urban regeneration projects in other parts of metropolitan Perth and elsewhere in Australia.

To ensure that the types of development proposed within the Centre Plan area are based upon relevant development models and building typologies, the characteristics of a representative range of residential and mixed use developments were surveyed, with a particular focus on Activity Centre locations where Government development agencies such as Landcorp are involved. Developments include completed and proceeding projects in Midland, Cockburn Central, Northbridge, Floreat, Melbourne and Rockingham Beach.

Characteristics relevant to the detailed planning and urban design of the Smart Village are summarised as follows:-

**Development Forms/Typologies**

- Medium density residential developments should take the form of 2-4 storey multiple dwellings. A smaller component of narrow frontage, 2-3 storey terrace housing could be incorporated in peripheral locations.
- High density residential developments (including mixed use) should predominantly take the form of street framing ("doughnut") developments with internal landscaped courtyards located over basement and/or off-street car parking areas. Developments over 4 storeys in height should be sited on 3-4 storey podiums, with upper floors setback from the street front building line of the podium and set back from the adjoining lot boundaries.

**Subdivision Design**

- Lots should be of sufficient area with dimensions to permit a feasible, functional development. The dimensions of multiple dwelling and mixed use lots should permit conventional car parking layouts. Typically, this requires a minimum lot width of 38-40 metres.
- Multiple dwelling and mixed use development lots should generally be a minimum of 2,500m² in area.
- New multiple dwelling and mixed use development lots should be provided with vehicular access (public roads, laneways) on a minimum of two sides.

3.3 Other Considerations

**Retention of Indoor Recreation Centre**

The Smart Village site was developed and used as a district recreation centre until 2008 when the existing outdoor sporting fields and related facilities were relocated to the 270 hectare Lark Hill Sportsplex.

The existing indoor recreation centre, associated outdoor netball courts and paved car park have been retained in the north-west corner of the Smart Village site. The indoor facilities are likely to be retained in this location in one form or another for the foreseeable future. It is anticipated that the number of outdoor netball courts will be reduced as the Smart Village develops and will be replaced by more intensive development in the medium term. It is anticipated that an upgraded indoor recreation centre will be integrated with the urban design of the remainder of the new Smart Village.

**Possible Aquatic Facility**

The existing Rockingham Aquatic Centre on Council Avenue is located on the proposed alignment of an extended Goddard Street. This alignment was selected on the expectation that the Aquatic Centre would likely be either decommissioned or relocated, once it reached the end of its service life (i.e. when a major re-construction was needed).
A modern, predominantly indoor aquatic facility could be located within the proposed Smart Village in the vicinity of the existing indoor recreation centre buildings where it could share common infrastructure and management. With a contemporary, consolidated design befitting the planning context, the project could act as a catalyst to further, complementary street front urban development, including inner-city offices and apartments.

Key urban design assumptions:-

- The facility would be a more compact, essentially indoor facility, with an outdoor water playground, integrated with the planning framework and street oriented urban design principles of the overall Centre Plan and Smart Village South Sector Guidelines.
- There are potentially two alternative site options adjoining the indoor complex that could accommodate a new Aquatic Facility, with one site adjoining Dixon Road to the east of the indoor complex and a second site adjoining Goddard Street to the south west.
- The design should be functionally integrated with the indoor complex, with potentially shared entrance, kiosk and related amenities.
- The development should be planned and designed to mark an important gateway to the City following significant street upgrades. The architecture of the development should also serve to mask, articulate and activate the blank, box-like presence of the existing structures.
- Relevant models of contemporary Aquatic Facility design include the indoor section of the new East Victoria Park (Somerset) aquatic centre, the Kwinana Leisure complex (including indoor pool) and the new Balga Pool Leisure Park, each of which fits within a planning envelope of between 75m X 75m and 100m X 100m. The Kwinana indoor pool is a relevant case study because it was integrated with an existing recreation centre which has subsequently undergone a major re-build and upgrade.
- The project could act as a catalyst to further, complementary urban development, including inner-city offices and apartments.
- Car parking should be located and arranged behind a generally contiguous line of buildings that address the street.

Analysis of Alternative Aquatic Centre Locations in Smart Village

Site Option 1 – Goddard Street (adjoining southern side of existing indoor arena)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conveniently located next to the existing entrance, kiosk and amenities.</td>
<td>Relatively remote and visually fragmented from the investment core of the village.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Located adjacent to the current (interim) route of the central transit system.</td>
<td>Relatively remote from the route of final route of the central transit system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well serviced by existing car parking.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good site exposure.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would complement the upgrading of this section of Goddard Street to dual carriage-way status.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would help to mask the box-like appearance of the existing Mike Barnett (MB) complex from Goddard Street.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development of this site would preserve Dixon Road sites for predominantly mixed use development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitates an economical staging of development around the MB complex, including subsequent mixed use building infill around the perimeter of the street block.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Threats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Day and night time activity (particularly in the water playground), lighting and traffic could impact on nearby residential amenity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial development would reduce the number of bays available in the existing car park.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Site Option 2 – Dixon Road Eastern (adjoining eastern side of existing indoor arena)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Places a high calibre public building close to the core of the village where significant development is anticipated.</td>
<td>• If the site is to address Dixon Road, integration with the existing entry, kiosk and amenities will be more tenuous.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Located close to the final route of the central transit system.</td>
<td>• Relatively remote from existing car parking area – relies on patrons having access through the existing MB complex.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Preserves existing public car parking on the western side of the MB complex.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Threats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The new building has the potential to screen the box-like presence of the existing MB complex and provide an activated outlook to Dixon Road.</td>
<td>• Reliant on site subdivision and part construction of a north south access from Dixon Road.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following consideration of the two site options by project officers and consultants involved in both the Smart Village DPP and the Aquatic Facility projects, the Dixon Road site on the eastern side of the indoor recreation centre was selected as the preferred Smart Village option. A final decision by the Council on a redevelopment strategy for the Aquatic Centre will need to consider the merits of a Smart Village site versus the consequences of any decision to retain and upgrade the existing facility on Council Avenue.

Interface with Murdoch University

The Smart Village site was formerly seen as the area into which the adjoining, embryonic Murdoch University campus would grow, with the expectation that the campus would eventually become a land use bridge between the City Centre Sector and the Waterfront Village.

After its initial development phase more than 10 years ago, further growth of the University campus has stalled. A more pragmatic and ultimately more likely transit oriented development model for this strategic land was devised in conjunction with the master planning of the high frequency central transit system. This TOD driven development strategy was further refined, described and illustrated through each phase of preparing the new Centre Plan for the Strategic Metropolitan Centre.

Under the endorsed Centre Plan, the Smart Village will play a crucial role in consolidating development between the City Centre and the Waterfront Village. It also has the potential to deliver a significant proportion of the development intensity needed to support the operation of a light rail system between the Rockingham Station and the Waterfront Village. This form of development could complement the development of the University.

The strategy is to plan and develop a high density, mixed use urban village into which the University campus can seamlessly grow. This could be accomplished through joint venture development of buildings and/or the leasing of floorspace alongside a diverse array of other public and private sector tenancies.

Site Option for Contemporary and Performing Arts Centre (CAPAC)

The sites in the Smart Village and Waterfront Village have been evaluated in the course of preparing a feasibility study into the development of a Contemporary and Performing Arts Centre at Rockingham. In October 2010, the Final Report of the consultant Feasibility Study illustrated costed planning scenarios for each of the site options.

The conceptual plans in the CAPAC feasibility study positioned the complex on the nominated site at the south west end of the Smart Village High Street. The CAPAC was configured so that it would address the section of curved street frontage facing the proposed linear park to the south with an entry foyer, box office and cafe. Various blank walls, car parking and service docks were arranged along the remaining street boundaries. Such an outcome would not comply with the planning and urban design principles that underpin the Centre Plan.
While there has been no subsequent action taken by the State Government or the City of Rockingham to proceed with further detailed design work or to fund the implementation of the CAPAC on either of the alternative sites, it is understood that there is a strategic preference amongst stakeholders for the Waterfront Village site option.

The City generally concurs with this sentiment but nevertheless understands the need to demonstrate how such a facility could be better integrated with the Smart Village and adjoining land uses to cover the unlikely event that a decision is taken to build such a facility in the Smart Village. This option should not be left open indefinitely because protecting a vacant site of this size could stymie urban consolidation in a critical part of the village.

Important factors to be addressed in any re-working of the 2010 CAPAC conceptual design for the Smart Village include:-

- Re-siting the facility to the east of the Village High Street spine where it could perhaps be integrated with and partly funded in capital and operational terms by the University.
- Providing off-street car parking within public car parking stations that are shared and partly funded by other land uses in the vicinity.
- Sleeving any servicing or big box elements such as the auditorium with street activating tenancies.

3.4 Residential Density

Figure 3.2 illustrates a Residential Density overlay to the Smart Village IDP which is designed to manage the density of development in general accordance with the planning principles and the adopted TOD model described and illustrated in Section 2.

The distribution of residential density in the Smart Village responds to the particular functions, amenity and levels of mixed use activity anticipated in the Sector. In general, high density residential development should be located within 250 metres of the Central Transit route, with particular concentrations around the Central Park and links to the City Centre Sector.

The urban design intent of the residential density framework is reflected and refined as necessary in the IDP and in more detailed Precinct Concept Plans and Guidelines described and illustrated in Section 4.

Where residential development is proposed, the R-AC0 density code of State Planning Policy 3.1 – Residential Design Codes (as amended) (R-codes) will apply.

3.5 Building Height

Figure 3.3 illustrates a Building Height Overlay to the Smart Village IDP, with permitted building heights rising as development gets closer to the Central Transit route and activity generators.

3.6 Frontage Types

The Framework Plan, as it applies to the Smart Village Sector, has been formulated in accordance with consolidated ‘Main Street’ development principles that require buildings to frame, address and activate an interconnected, hierarchical street network.

Figure 3.4 illustrates an orderly arrangement of ‘Frontage Types’ in ‘Main Street’ and mixed use areas based on the common principle that building frontages to all streets, major laneways and public spaces should be activated.

At least four ‘Frontage Types’ are envisaged, with building frontages positioned and managed according to the desired level of level of street activation and streetscape character as follows:-

Type 1 – High Level of Activation, Nil Setback

A highly activated frontage with retail and commercial uses at ground level and a 2 to 3 storey, contiguous facade positioned at the streetfront boundary. At the ground level, buildings should address the street with a primary business entrance and a shopfront façade that is transparent over at least 75% of the area of the façade.
Type 2 – Medium Level of Activation, Nil Setback

A medium level of frontage activation with secondary retail, customer oriented offices, inner-city commercial tenancies and residential lobbies at ground level and a 2 to 3 storey façade positioned at the streetfront boundary. At the ground level, buildings should address the street with a primary business entrance and a commercial façade that is transparent over at least 60% of the area of the façade.

Type 3 - Moderate Level of Activation, 2 Metre Setback

A moderate level of frontage activation with a mix of inner-city commercial tenancies and residential apartments at ground level and a 2 to 3 storey façade positioned behind a 2 metre, green landscaped setback. At the ground level, the facades of mixed use buildings would address the street with a commercial shopfront, primary business entrance and/or residential entry lobby that is transparent over at least 60% of the area of the façade. The ground level of inner-city residential units would address the street with a façade that is transparent over at least 30% of its area.

Type 4 – Moderate Level of Activation, 2-3.5 Metre ‘green’ Setback

A moderate level of frontage activation with a mix of inner-city commercial tenancies and residential apartments at ground level and a 2 to 3 storey façade positioned behind a 2-3.5 metre, green landscaped setback. At the ground level, the facades of mixed use buildings would address the street with a commercial shopfront, primary business entrance and/or residential entry lobby that is transparent over at least 60% of its facade. Ground level inner-city residential units would address the street with a façade that is transparent over at least 30% of its area.

3.7 Car Parking

In addition to Section 2.6.5, the management of carparking distribution and its impact on townscape quality is an important issue addressed in the Policy Statement.

To facilitate contiguous streetfront development and to limit the visual impact of carparks, parking areas shall be consolidated and located behind generally contiguous buildings or an appropriate colonnade or structural screening device (other than a blank wall). Such devices are intended to maintain street facade continuity and in general should not comprise more than 25% of the length of any individual street frontage.

Where individual Precinct development standards allow for some variation to this principle parking areas should be screened from the street by an appropriate structural screening device (other than a blank wall), hedge or planting of an appropriate urban character.

Where restructuring of existing streets or the provision of new streets is possible, provision for on-street parking embayments should be made.

The number of crossovers and driveways serving a development will be limited by the City to maintain streetscape continuity.

4. PRECINCT POLICIES

An important objective of the planning and development process is to encourage mixed use development and diversity within the Smart Village. Diversity and administrative flexibility will continue to be facilitated by dealing with property in the Smart Village Sector under a single zone in the Scheme.

Ongoing planning and development will be controlled by reference to the IDP and the framework plans relating to Density and Building Height and 'Frontage Types' (referred to in Section 3) and the following Precinct Policies and Sub-Precinct Design Guidelines and any supplementary development guidelines and related Policy Statements, which Council may adopt from time to time.

The Smart Village Sector has been divided into five Precincts, comprising:-

- Village Centre
- Dixon South
- Central Park
- Smart Village East
- Smart Village West
The Smart Village Precincts are based on areas where a particular geographic identity, activity mix and/or townscape character is envisaged. The location and boundaries of the Precincts are illustrated in Figure 4.1.

The desired future character, preferred uses and required elements of development within each of these Precincts are further described in the following sections.

4.1 Village Centre Precinct Policy

4.1.1 Application

This Policy applies to the Village Centre Precinct as defined in the Precinct Plan (refer to Figure 4.1). The Village Centre Precinct encompasses properties bounded by Dixon Road, proposed Crocker Street (south), proposed Leeuwin Parade (east) and the proposed north/south road to the east of the indoor recreation complex.

4.1.2 Desired Future Character

The Village Centre will be developed around contemporary ‘Main Street’ townscape characteristics as a consolidated hub of street oriented activity that complements and merges the commercial and residential functions of a high density urban village and the education functions of an adjoining inner-city University campus.

The Dixon Road edge to the Precinct will be framed by high calibre, gateway architecture that responds to the prominence of a Dixon Road address and the civic context of the adjoining University campus.

The scale, density and levels of activity in new development should reflect the opportunity afforded by proximity to a high frequency, street-based transit system and convenient road access.

4.1.3 Preferred Uses

Within the Village Centre Precinct the preferred uses are:-

- retail
- entertainment
- eating and drinking places
- offices and commercial
- education
- short-stay accommodation
- recreation
- multiple dwellings/residential

Other permissible uses listed under the Scheme are not preferred.

4.1.4 Required Elements – Village Centre Precinct

The IDP (refer to Figure 3.1) and the Village Centre Precinct Concept Plan (refer to Figure 4.2) show the general location and pattern of development envisaged by the City and preferred under this Policy. Within the scope and meaning of the planning and development principles listed in Section 2.2, there is scope for further flexibility in the interpretation of the Centre Plan in relation to the scale and configuration of particular developments. Notwithstanding the indicative intent of these plans, development is to be required to incorporate and maintain the following elements, as applicable:-

(a) The Precinct is to be developed as a high quality, mixed use area, framed by generally contiguous, street front buildings which address the street with a mix of tenancies in a manner consistent with a contemporary ‘Main Street’ townscape discipline.

(b) Buildings are to be located, configured and activated to frame and address street frontages, laneways and other public spaces in a way that is generally consistent with the Precinct Concept Plan, relevant ‘Frontage Types’ as indicated in Section 3.6.
(c) Buildings shall be designed to achieve an appropriate use profile along the designated 'Main Street' spine of the precinct, with an active, ground floor street frontage to retail tenancies, cafes, restaurants and similar uses. Offices, education accommodation, short-stay and student accommodation, multiple dwellings, function rooms, arts and community purposes are preferred upper floor uses.

(d) Consistent with Figure 3.2 'Density', in Section 3.4, residential development within the Precinct is to be developed to accommodate a balanced mix of dwelling sizes at preferred densities ranging from 100 to 200 dwellings per hectare, with a minimum density of 80 dwellings per hectare in any development which includes a residential component.

(e) Consistent with Figure 3.3 'Building Height', in Section 3.5, buildings are to present a minimum 2 storey or equivalent parapet height to the street or relevant public space subject to the maintenance of a 12.5 metre height limit along street frontages, with any additional height to be setback a minimum of 3.5 metres. The scale and massing of buildings are to be designed to minimise any overshadowing of adjoining properties and public spaces.

(f) Podium level courtyard gardens may provide private open space over car parks located behind streetfront buildings. Examples of this form of development are located at Rockingham Beach, Mandurah Marina, Joondalup City Centre, Subi-Centro Subiaco and in Northbridge over the Graham Farmer Freeway.

(g) Car parking is to be provided in accordance with Table 3 of Town Planning Scheme No.2, refer to Appendix 1.

(h) Car parking is not to be permitted between the road reserve boundary and building frontages.

(i) Semi-basement car parks are to be avoided wherever a medium to high level of frontage activation is indicated on the 'Frontage Types' plan in Section 3.6.

(j) To complement the City's townscape objectives for the Smart Village, the massing, articulation and facade treatments of all development will be required to adhere to a quality, urban townscape aesthetic.

(k) The frontage of any building is to incorporate and maintain the required area of transparent facade with suitably glazed shopfronts, windows and doors, consistent with the applicable 'Frontage Types' set down in Section 3.6.

(l) Variety and high design standards will be encouraged in the fit-out, awning treatments, signage and private street furniture attached to individual premises. Where appropriate, the City will encourage businesses to use the public footpaths for streetside dining, subject to private street furniture meeting design and quality standards acceptable to the City.

(m) Any subdivision application is to be prepared in conjunction with an Integrated Development Guide Plan (IDGP), to be prepared by or on behalf of the land owner. The IDGP shall illustrate building envelopes, indicative building configurations, setbacks, pedestrian and vehicular access, indicative car parking layouts and any rights of way or access easements required. In general, a rectilinear subdivision pattern will be preferred with a minimum lot size of 2500m$^2$ to allow for a simple and cohesive layout.

(n) In lieu of the normal landscaping requirements of the Scheme, developers may be required to contribute to the cost of streetscape and/or landscape works within the public domain in the general vicinity of their development site.

4.2 Dixon South Precinct Policy

4.2.1 Application

This Policy applies to the Dixon South Precinct as defined in the Precinct Plan (refer to Figure 4.1). The Dixon South Precinct encompasses properties bounded by Goddard Street, Dixon Road, proposed Leeuwin Parade (east) and the proposed north/south road to the east of the indoor recreation complex.
4.2.2 Desired Future Character

The Precinct will be developed around the nucleus of the existing indoor recreation centre with new, mixed use development framing and activating the street edges of the Precinct and masking the box-like appearance of the existing, off-street buildings with articulated buildings and attractive streetscapes.

The Dixon Road and Goddard Street edges to the Precinct will be framed by substantial, high calibre buildings that respond to the prominence of a prestigious distributor road address and the civic context of the nearby University campus. The scale, density and levels of activity in new development should reflect the opportunity afforded by proximity to a high frequency, street-based transit system and convenient road access.

4.2.3 Preferred Uses

Within the Dixon South Precinct the preferred uses are:-

- offices and commercial
- education
- short-stay accommodation
- recreation
- multiple dwellings/residential

Other permissible uses listed under the Scheme are not preferred.

4.2.4 Required Elements – Dixon South Precinct

The IDP (refer to Figure 3.1) and the Dixon South Precinct Concept Plan (refer to Figure 4.3) show the general location and pattern of development envisaged by the City and preferred under this Policy. Within the scope and meaning of the planning and development principles listed in Section 2.2, there is scope for further flexibility in the interpretation of the Centre Plan in relation to the scale and configuration of particular developments. Notwithstanding the indicative intent of these plans, development is to be required to incorporate and maintain the following elements, as applicable:-

(a) The Precinct is to be developed as a high quality, mixed use area, consistent with a contemporary urban townscape discipline.

(b) Buildings are to be located, configured and activated to frame and address street frontages, laneways and other public spaces in a way that is generally consistent with the Precinct Concept Plan, relevant 'Frontage Types' as indicated in Section 3.6.

(c) Buildings shall be designed to achieve an appropriate use profile with active, ground floor retail tenancies and commercial tenancies. Offices, education accommodation, short-stay and student accommodation, multiple dwellings, function rooms, arts and community purposes are preferred upper floor uses.

(d) Consistent with Figure 3.2 ‘Density’, in Section 3.4, residential development within the Precinct is to be developed to accommodate a balanced mix of dwelling sizes at preferred densities ranging from 80 to 200 dwellings per hectare, with a minimum density of 80 dwellings per hectare in any development which includes a residential component.

(e) Consistent with Figure 3.3 ‘Building Height’, in Section 3.5, buildings are to present a minimum 2 storey or equivalent parapet height to the street or relevant public space subject to the maintenance of a 12.5 metre height limit along street frontages, with any additional height to be setback a minimum of 3.5 metres. The scale and massing of buildings are to be designed to minimise any overshadowing of adjoining properties and public spaces.

(f) Podium level courtyard gardens may provide private open space over car parks located behind streetfront buildings. Examples of this form of development are located at Rockingham Beach, Mandurah Marina, Joondalup City Centre, Subi-Centro Subiaco and in Northbridge over the Graham Farmer Freeway.

(g) Car parking is to be provided in accordance with Table 3 of Town Planning Scheme No.2, refer to Appendix 1.
(h) Car parking is not to be permitted between the road reserve boundary and building frontages.

(i) Semi-basement car parks are to be avoided wherever a medium to high level of frontage activation is indicated on the 'Frontage Types' plan in Section 3.6.

(j) To complement the City’s townscape objectives for the Smart Village, the massing, articulation and facade treatments of all development will be required to adhere to a quality, urban townscape aesthetic.

(k) The frontage of any building is to incorporate and maintain the required area of transparent facade with suitably glazed shopfronts, windows and doors, consistent with the applicable ‘Frontage Types’ set down in Section 3.6.

(l) Variety and high design standards will be encouraged in the fit-out, awning treatments, signage and private street furniture attached to individual premises. Where appropriate, the City will encourage businesses to use the public footpaths for streetside dining, subject to private street furniture meeting design and quality standards acceptable to Council.

(m) Any subdivision application is to be prepared in conjunction with an Integrated Development Guide Plan (IDGP), to be prepared by or on behalf of the land owner. The IDGP shall illustrate building envelopes, indicative building configurations, setbacks, pedestrian and vehicular access, indicative car parking layouts and any rights of way or access easements required. In general, a rectilinear subdivision pattern will be preferred with a minimum lot size of 2500m² to allow for a simple and cohesive layout.

(n) In lieu of the normal landscaping requirements of the Scheme, developers may be required to contribute to the cost of streetscape and/or landscape works within the public domain in the general vicinity of their development site.

4.3 Central Park Precinct Policy

4.3.1 Application

This Policy applies to the Central Park Precinct as defined in the Precinct Plan (refer to Figure 4.1). The Central Park Precinct encompasses properties bounded the proposed Leeuwin Parade (east) and the proposed loop road extension of Crocker Street to the south.

4.3.2 Desired Future Character

This Precinct, which is at the core of the Smart Village will feature high density Transit Oriented Development around the place-making nucleus of an attractive park with recognisably urban landscape characteristics.

The scale, density and quality of building design should reflect the opportunity afforded by proximity to a high frequency, street-based transit system and convenient road access. It is anticipated that residential apartment buildings will be a significant driver of development, with elevated towers on low rise podiums taking advantage of coastal views.

4.3.3 Preferred Uses

Within the Central Park Precinct the preferred uses are:-

- offices and commercial
- education
- short-stay accommodation
- recreation
- multiple dwellings/residential

Other permissible uses listed under the Scheme are not preferred.
4.3.4 Required Elements – Central Park Precinct

The IDP (refer to Figure 3.1) and the Central Park Precinct Concept Plan (refer to Figure 4.4) show the general location and pattern of development envisaged by the City and preferred under this Policy. Within the scope and meaning of the planning and development principles listed in Section 2.2, there is scope for further flexibility in the interpretation of the Centre Plan in relation to the scale and configuration of particular developments. Notwithstanding the indicative intent of these plans, development is to be required to incorporate and maintain the following elements, as applicable:

(a) The Precinct is to be developed as a high quality, mixed use area, consistent with a contemporary urban townscape discipline.

(b) Buildings are to be located, configured and activated to frame and address street frontages, laneways and other public spaces in a way that is generally consistent with the Precinct Concept Plan, relevant ‘Frontage Types’ as indicated in Section 3.6.

(c) Buildings shall be designed to achieve an appropriate use profile with active, ground floor retail tenancies and commercial tenancies. Offices, education accommodation, short-stay and student accommodation, multiple dwellings, function rooms, arts and community purposes are preferred upper floor uses.

(d) Consistent with Figure 3.2 ‘Density’, in Section 3.4, residential development within the Precinct is to be developed to accommodate a balanced mix of dwelling sizes at preferred densities ranging from 100 to 200 dwellings per hectare, with a minimum density of 100 dwellings per hectare in any development which includes a residential component.

(e) Consistent with Figure 3.3 ‘Building Height’, Section 3.5, buildings are to present a minimum 2 storey or equivalent parapet height to the street or relevant public space subject to the maintenance of a 12.5 metre height limit along street frontages, with any additional height to be setback a minimum of 3.5 metres. The scale and massing of buildings are to be designed to minimise any overshadowing of adjoining properties and public spaces.

(f) Podium level courtyard gardens may provide private open space over car parks located behind streetfront buildings. Examples of this form of development are located at Rockingham Beach, Mandurah Marina, Joondalup City Centre, Subi-Centro Subiaco and in Northbridge over the Graham Farmer Freeway.

(g) Car parking is to be provided in accordance with Table 3 of Town Planning Scheme No.2, refer to Appendix 1.

(h) Car parking is not to be permitted between the road reserve boundary and building frontages.

(i) Semi-basement car parks are to be avoided wherever a medium to high level of frontage activation is indicated on the ‘Frontage Types’ plan in Section 3.6.

(j) To complement the City’s townscape objectives for the Smart Village, the massing, articulation and facade treatments of all development will be required to adhere to a quality, urban townscape aesthetic.

(k) The frontage of any building is to incorporate and maintain the required area of transparent facade with suitably glazed shopfronts, windows and doors, consistent with the applicable ‘Frontage Types’ set down in Section 3.6.

(l) Variety and high design standards will be encouraged in the fit-out, awning treatments, signage and private street furniture attached to individual premises. Where appropriate, the City will encourage businesses to use the public footpaths for streetside dining, subject to private street furniture meeting design and quality standards acceptable to Council.

(m) Any subdivision application is to be prepared in conjunction with an Integrated Development Guide Plan (IDGP), to be prepared by or on behalf of the land owner. The IDGP shall illustrate building envelopes, indicative building configurations, setbacks, pedestrian and vehicular access, indicative car parking layouts and any rights of way or access easements required. In general, a rectilinear subdivision pattern will be preferred with a minimum lot size of 2500m² to allow for a simple and cohesive layout.
In lieu of the normal landscaping requirements of the Scheme, developers may be required to contribute to the cost of streetscape and/or landscape works within the public domain in the general vicinity of their development site.

4.4 Smart Village West Precinct Policy

4.4.1 Application

This Policy applies to the Smart Village West Precinct as defined in the Precinct Plan (refer to Figure 4.1). The Smart Village West Precinct encompasses properties bounded by Goddard Street, the proposed Leeuwin Parade (east) and the proposed loop road extension of Crocker Street and the proposed Chalgrove Avenue (north) extension.

4.4.2 Desired Future Character

This Precinct, which forms the western edge of the Smart Village will feature medium to high density development along the main north-south road corridor through the Strategic Metropolitan Centre. The scale, density and quality of building design should reflect the opportunity afforded by proximity to a formally landscaped dual carriageway. It is anticipated that commercial and residential apartment buildings will be a significant driver of development, with elevated towers taking advantage of coastal and City Park views.

4.4.3 Preferred Uses

Within the Smart Village West Precinct the preferred uses are:-

- offices and commercial
- education
- short-stay accommodation
- recreation
- multiple dwellings/residential

Other permissible uses listed under the Scheme are not preferred.

4.4.4 Required Elements – Smart Village West Precinct

The IDP (refer to Figure 3.1) and the Smart Village West Precinct Concept Plan (refer to Figure 4.5) show the general location and pattern of development envisaged by Council and preferred under this Policy. Within the scope and meaning of the planning and development principles listed in Section 2.2, there is scope for further flexibility in the interpretation of the Centre Plan in relation to the scale and configuration of particular developments. Notwithstanding the indicative intent of these plans, development is to be required to incorporate and maintain the following elements, as applicable:-

(a) The Precinct is to be developed as a quality, mixed use area, consistent with a contemporary urban townscape discipline.

(b) Buildings are to be located, configured and activated to frame and address street frontages, laneways and other public spaces in a way that is generally consistent with the Precinct Concept Plan, relevant ‘Frontage Types’ as indicated in Section 3.6.

(c) Buildings shall be designed to achieve an appropriate use profile with active, ground floor retail tenancies and commercial tenancies. Offices, education accommodation, short-stay and student accommodation, multiple dwellings, function rooms, arts and community purposes are preferred upper floor uses.

(d) Consistent with Figure 3.2 ‘Density’, in Section 3.4, residential development within the Precinct is to be developed to accommodate a balanced mix of dwelling sizes at preferred densities ranging from 80 to 200 dwellings per hectare, with a minimum density of 60 dwellings per hectare in any development which includes a residential component.
(e) Consistent with Figure 3.3 ‘Building Height’, Section 3.5, buildings are to present a minimum 2 storey or equivalent parapet height to the street or relevant public space subject to the maintenance of a 12.5 metre height limit along street frontages, with any additional height to be setback a minimum of 3.5 metres. The scale and massing of buildings are to be designed to minimise any overshadowing of adjoining properties and public spaces.

(f) Podium level courtyard gardens may provide private open space over car parks located behind streetfront buildings. Examples of this form of development are located at Rockingham Beach, Mandurah Marina, Joondalup City Centre, Subi-Centro Subiaco and in Northbridge over the Graham Farmer Freeway.

(g) Car parking is to be provided in accordance with Table 3 of Town Planning Scheme No.2, refer to Appendix 1.

(h) Car parking is not to be permitted between the road reserve boundary and building frontages.

(i) Semi-basement car parks are to be avoided wherever a medium to high level of frontage activation is indicated on the ‘Frontage Types’ plan in Section 3.6.

(j) To complement the City's townscape objectives for the Smart Village, the massing, articulation and facade treatments of all development will be required to adhere to a quality, urban townscape aesthetic.

(k) The frontage of any building is to incorporate and maintain the required area of transparent facade with suitably glazed shopfronts, windows and doors, consistent with the applicable ‘Frontage Types’ set down in Section 3.6.

(l) Variety and high design standards will be encouraged in the fit-out, awning treatments, signage and private street furniture attached to individual premises. Where appropriate, the City will encourage businesses to use the public footpaths for streetside dining, subject to private street furniture meeting design and quality standards acceptable to Council.

(m) Any subdivision application is to be prepared in conjunction with an Integrated Development Guide Plan (IDGP), to be prepared by or on behalf of the land owner. The IDGP shall illustrate building envelopes, indicative building configurations, setbacks, pedestrian and vehicular access, indicative car parking layouts and any rights of way or access easements required. In general, a rectilinear subdivision pattern will be preferred with a minimum lot size of 2500m² to allow for a simple and cohesive layout.

(n) In lieu of the normal landscaping requirements of the Scheme, developers may be required to contribute to the cost of streetscape and/or landscape works within the public domain in the general vicinity of their development site.

4.5 Smart Village East Precinct Policy

4.5.1 Application

This Policy applies to the Smart Village East Precinct as defined in the Precinct Plan (refer to Figure 4.1). The Smart Village East Precinct encompasses properties bounded by the proposed Leeuwin Parade (east), Leghorn Street, the proposed loop road extension of Crocker Street and the proposed Chalgrove Avenue (north) extension.

4.5.2 Desired Future Character

This Precinct, which forms the south eastern edge of the Smart Village will feature medium to high density development along the former Leghorn Street road reserve which backs onto an existing single storey Residential R20 housing area.

The northern end of the Precinct adjoins the Murdoch University campus and development should reflect the opportunity that lies in accommodating land uses that will complement the civic qualities, physical design and functions of the institution.

The southern end of the Precinct lies at the interface between the Smart Village and City Centre Sectors and it is envisaged that mixed use development fronting the Chalgrove Avenue extension will contribute to the activation of pedestrian pavements in the vicinity.
4.5.3 Preferred Uses

Within the Smart Village East Precinct the preferred uses are:-

- offices and commercial
- education
- short-stay accommodation
- recreation
- multiple dwellings/residential

Other permissible uses listed under the Scheme are not preferred.

4.5.4 Required Elements – Smart Village East Precinct

The IDP (refer to Figure 3.1) and the Smart Village West Precinct Concept Plan (refer to Figure 4.6) show the general location and pattern of development envisaged by the City and preferred under this Policy. Within the scope and meaning of the planning and development principles listed in Section 2.2, there is scope for further flexibility in the interpretation of the Centre Plan in relation to the scale and configuration of particular developments. Notwithstanding the indicative intent of these plans, development is to be required to incorporate and maintain the following elements, as applicable:-

(a) The Precinct is to be developed as a high quality, mixed use area, consistent with a contemporary urban townscape discipline.

(b) Buildings are to be located, configured and activated to frame and address street frontages, laneways and other public spaces in a way that is generally consistent with the Precinct Concept Plan, relevant 'Frontage Types' as indicated in Section 3.6.

(c) Buildings shall be designed to achieve an appropriate use profile with active, ground floor retail tenancies and commercial tenancies. Offices, education accommodation, short-stay and student accommodation, multiple dwellings, function rooms, arts and community purposes are preferred upper floor uses.

(d) Consistent with Figure 3.2 ‘Density’, in Section 3.4, residential development within the Precinct is to be developed to accommodate a balanced mix of dwelling sizes at preferred densities ranging from 80 to 160 dwellings per hectare, with a minimum density of 60 dwellings per hectare in any development which includes a residential component.

(e) Consistent with Figure 3.3 ‘Building Height’, in Section 3.5, buildings are to present a minimum 2 storey or equivalent parapet height to the street or relevant public space subject to the maintenance of a 12.5 metre height limit along street frontages, with any additional height to be setback a minimum of 3.5 metres. The scale and massing of buildings are to be designed to minimise any overshadowing of adjoining properties and public spaces to the satisfaction of the City.

(f) Podium level courtyard gardens may provide private open space over car parks located behind streetfront buildings. Examples of this form of development are located at Rockingham Beach, Mandurah Marina, Joondalup City Centre, Subi-Centro Subiaco and in Northbridge over the Graham Farmer Freeway.

(g) Car parking is to be provided in accordance with Table 3 of Town Planning Scheme No.2 a copy of which is set out in Appendix 1.

(h) Car parking is not to be permitted between the road reserve boundary and building frontages.

(i) Semi-basement car parks are to be avoided wherever a medium to high level of frontage activation is indicated on the 'Frontage Types' plan in Section 3.6.

(j) To complement the City’s townscape objectives for the Smart Village, the massing, articulation and facade treatments of all development will be required to adhere to a quality, urban townscape aesthetic.
(k) The frontage of any building is to incorporate and maintain the required area of transparent facade with suitably glazed shopfronts, windows and doors, consistent with the applicable 'Frontage Types' set down in Section 3.6.

(l) Variety and high design standards will be encouraged in the fit-out, awning treatments, signage and private street furniture attached to individual premises. Where appropriate, the City will encourage businesses to use the public footpaths for streetside dining, subject to private street furniture meeting design and quality standards acceptable to Council.

(m) Any subdivision application is to be prepared in conjunction with an Integrated Development Guide Plan (IDGP), to be prepared by or on behalf of the land owner. The IDGP shall illustrate building envelopes, indicative building configurations, setbacks, pedestrian and vehicular access, indicative car parking layouts and any rights of way or access easements required. In general, a rectilinear subdivision pattern will be preferred with a minimum lot size of 2500m² to allow for a simple and cohesive layout.

(n) In lieu of the normal landscaping requirements of the Scheme, developers may be required to contribute to the cost of streetscape and/or landscape works within the public domain in the general vicinity of their development site.

5. SUPPLEMENTARY POLICIES
5.1 Central Arts Policy
5.1.1 Objective

The objective of the Central Arts Policy is to integrate the arts and culture into the built fabric and the day-to-day functioning of the Strategic Metropolitan Centre.

5.1.2 Aspects of the Policy

- The Central Arts Policy will foster ongoing development of an arts culture through the provision of facilities, the programming of arts and cultural activities and the incorporation of an arts component into the planning, development and operation of the Strategic Metropolitan Centre.

- A public art component is to be incorporated into major public building and townscape commissions.

- The City will facilitate the execution of public art beyond the familiar stand-alone sculpture or painting to encompass integral contributions to the form and aesthetics of public spaces, building facades, landscape and street furniture.

- Public art may act as significant landmarks at key entry points to the City or specific spaces and buildings or it may be employed to reinforce localised identity as has, for example, already occurred in the City Square, in the forecourt of the Justice complex and more recently at the gateway to the Waterfront Village.

- An ongoing programme of arts and cultural activities and community involvement will be pursued by Council to ensure that a wide cross section of interests and age groups is catered for in the development and functioning of the City Centre.

- Arts and community festivals will provide opportunities for periodic expression and the enlivenment of the public domain.

5.1.3 Funding of Public Art

A diverse range of funding options is to be pursued for the ongoing development of arts facilities, the running of arts programmes and the incorporation of public art within development.

One percent of the capital cost of public buildings and other appropriate public works is intended to be set aside for the integration of an arts component.

Council will work with other tiers of Government and the private sector to achieve similar funding for public art.

5.2 Security Policy
5.2.1 Objective
The objective of the Security Policy is to integrate a passive approach to crime prevention through appropriate planning and environmental design measures to minimise both the actual and perceived incidence of crime.

5.2.2 Passive Security Principles

In assessing planning and development proposals, the City will have regard for the incorporation of the following passive security principles:-

- Incorporate residential occupation into as much of the Smart Village as possible to provide extended hours, low key surveillance of public space and buildings.
- Activate the ground or street level of the Smart Village as much as possible.
- Avoid grade separated movement networks which remove pedestrian activity from the streets.
- Frame streets, pedestrian routes and public spaces with active building frontages to minimise the area of exposed, blank walls and the prevalence of pockets of unclaimed space.
- Give priority to ground floor building tenancies (usually retail) which generate people movement and incorporate glazed shopfronts etc with a minimum of blank wall surface.
- Encourage commercial and community occupation of public pedestrian pavements - whether it be in the form of outdoor restaurants, cafes, charity stalls, buskers or street theatre.
- Make public spaces, pedestrian pavements and parks and gardens attractive, comfortable and well lit.
- Orient residential development towards public streets and laneways such that the outlook oversees the public domain and a defensible pattern of built form and space is established.
- Select durable and easily cleaned materials and finishes where public contact is envisaged.

6. DELEGATION

The Council has the authority to delegate the determination of any application for planning approval. An applicant wishing to know whether the Council or one of the City's officers will determine an application should contact the City.

7. ADOPTION AND OPERATION

This Planning Policy was adopted by the Council at its ordinary Meeting held on the 24th April 2012. This Planning Policy is to come into operation at the same time that Amendment No.113 to the Scheme comes into operation.
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## APPENDICES

A 1 Car Parking

### TABLE A.1
CAR PARKING REQUIREMENTS / ALLOWANCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USE</th>
<th>MINIMUM PARKING REQUIREMENT (AND MAXIMUM PARKING ALLOWABLE - IN BRACKETS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>The provisions of the Residential Design Codes are taken to apply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cinema, Theatre</td>
<td>1 bay per 8 (6) seats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting Rooms</td>
<td>3 (4) bays per consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast Food Outlet</td>
<td>1 bay per 14 (11) m² NLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Studio</td>
<td>1 bay per 20 (15) m² NLA available to the public, including swimming pools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>1 bay per 60 (40) m² NLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Recreation, Restaurant, Reception Centre</td>
<td>1 bay for every 8 (6) persons the building is designed to accommodate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop</td>
<td>1 bay per 22 (17) m² NLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showroom, Warehouse</td>
<td>1 bay per 80 (60) m² NLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel, Motel, Tavern</td>
<td>1 bay per bedroom plus 1 bay for every 5 (4) m² of bar and public areas including lounges, beer gardens and restaurants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care Premises</td>
<td>1 bay per employee and 1 bay per eight children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Assembly, Public Worship</td>
<td>1 bay per 8 (6) seats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Stay Accommodation</td>
<td>The provisions of the Residential Design Codes with respect to multiple dwellings are taken to apply</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A2 Interpretations

Active or Interactive Frontages

Refers to street frontages where there is an active visual and physical engagement between people in the street and those on the ground floors of buildings. This quality is assisted where the building facades include the main entrances, and the ground floor uses (such as shops, cafes, offices and residential dwellings) face and open towards the street. Refer to Section 4.4, for an explanation of the various levels of activation related to 'Frontage Types'.

Amenity

Means all those factors which combine to form the character of an area and includes the present and likely future amenity.

Articulation

An element of building design which means the breaking up of a façade into individual elements to provide a modulated effect aimed at enhancing individual building identity, variety and interest. This can be achieved through the use of such elements as window projections, balconies, awnings, minor recesses and/or projections of walls or parts of walls to provide visual interest, and to enhance the 'fine grained' scale of development.

Building Envelope

Means an area of land within a lot marked on a plan approved by the responsible authority, within which all buildings must be contained.

Built Form

The configuration of the aggregate of all buildings, structures, etc., which make up a town or city.

Bulk

The size or mass of a building, referring to structures which in their context appear relatively large.

Character

Character is essentially the combination of the public and private domains. Every property, public place or piece of infrastructure makes a contribution, whether large or small. It is the cumulative impact of all these contributions that establishes Precinct or neighbourhood character.

Centre Plan

Means the Rockingham Strategic Metropolitan Centre - Centre Plan, Volumes 1 and 2 as adopted by Council on the 22nd September 2009 and the Western Australian Planning Commission on the 10th November 2009.

City Centre

Means the major retail, commercial, civic and mixed use activity centre and the major social and employment hub of the Strategic Metropolitan Centre. In this instance, the existing extent of the City Centre Sector is defined in Figure 3.2.

Façade

Means the exposed face(s) of a building towards roads or open space, or the frontal outward appearance of a building.

Fine Grain

Refers to horizontal strips of development broken into a vertical rhythm by individual shop fronts and windows. This is usually a reflection of the original subdivision pattern of narrow lot frontages. A similar visual effect can be created for new, wide frontage development if the building is broken up into narrow modules by the use of architectural detailing and different colours.
Height
Means the measurement taken from the natural ground level immediately in front of the centre of the face of the building to a level at the top of the ridge, parapet, or flat roof, whichever is the highest, but does not include any lift plant, water tower or similar utility or service, not exceeding 3 metres in height, or any architectural feature or decoration (other than a freestanding sign) not used for any form of accommodation, which may be approved by the Council.

Human Scale
Buildings of a size or comprising a range of architectural elements which are of a magnitude and proportion related to our bodily dimensions.

Laneway
Means a narrow or very narrow local 'street', usually paved without a verge, located along the rear and/or side property boundary. Might be used exclusively by pedestrians, or shared by both pedestrians and vehicles, depending upon the circumstances.

Legibility
Is where the design of a street system provides a sense of direction and connection, giving clear signals regarding the spatial layout and geography of an area.

Light Rail or Streetcar
A modern electric tram system which usually runs on-street, but may also be capable of being segregated from road traffic.

'Main Street'
Means mixed land use developments fronting a street in a manner whereby pedestrian access to the majority of individual businesses can be achieved directly from the street, and/or where customer car parks on private property do not separate the road reserve boundary from the front of a building.

Massing
The size and volume of a building.

Mixed Use Development
Good mixed use development involves the 'fine grain' mixing of compatible land uses in a balanced blend, integrated in close proximity to each other. Physically it includes both vertical and horizontal mixing of uses. No single use should dominate other uses, although residential use is often the major component. Good mixed use development has the potential to improve the efficiency and amenity of neighbourhoods, reduce travel demand, increase walkability, and make more efficient use of available space and buildings.

Precinct
Means a local area defined for the purposes of describing and managing the preservation and/or development of specific urban characteristics.

Public Realm or Public Domain
Means spaces that are physically accessible to the public, and those aspects of other spaces that are visible from physically accessible spaces. It incorporates features such as streets, parks, shops, community buildings and the street facades of other buildings.

Scale
The size of a building and its relationship with its surrounding buildings or landscape.

Sector
Means a distinct geographic area within a Centre that may reflect an established local identity, coordinated ownership, zoning and/or policy characteristics. A sector may be comprised of one or a number of precincts.
Smart Village
Means the area defined in Figure 3.2 and it includes the land formerly used for the sporting grounds on Dixon Road.

Strategic Metropolitan Centre
Means the area as defined by the Centre Plan as the Rockingham Strategic Metropolitan Centre. The boundary is defined in Figure 3.2.

Street Alignment
Means the common boundary between the land comprising a street (i.e. the road reserve), and the land abutting it.

Street Setback
Means the horizontal distance between the street alignment and a building, measured at right angles to the street alignment. The 'street setback area' is the area between the street alignment and the street setback line.

Streetscape
(a) means the total visual impression gained from any one location within a street including the natural and man-made elements; and
(b) is made up of the appearance of, and the relationships between, buildings in terms of design, scale, materials, colours, finishes, signs, external furniture, paving materials for roads, footpaths and landscaping.

Surveillance
Means the presence of passers-by or the ability of people to be seen in public spaces from surrounding windows, decks, balconies or the like. 'Casual surveillance' means "eyes on the street" provided by local people going about their daily activities.

Sustainability
Is meeting the needs of current and future generations through an integration of environmental protection, social advancement and economic prosperity.

Sustainable Development
Means development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.

Traffic Calming
Means the introduction of physical traffic management measures or techniques into a road or street aimed at reducing the impact of traffic on that road or street.

Transit Oriented Development (TOD)
Means a compact, mixed use community within the walkable catchment of a transit place, blending housing, shopping, employment and public uses in a pedestrian-friendly environment that makes it convenient and practicable for residents and employees to travel by public transport instead of by private car.

Urban Form
Means the broad shape and structure of an urban community and the distribution of its major features.

Walkability
Means the ease with which a person can walk in an area.

Walkable Catchment
Means the actual area served within a 600m (5 to 10 minute) walking distance along the street system from a central transit system stop or an 800m walking distance from the City Centre.” (Policy ends)
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Figure 4.1 - Precinct Boundaries

Figure 4.2 - Village Centre Precinct Concept Plan

1. Central Park with high amenity place-making
2. "Main Street" mixed use development
3. Seamless development interface with University
4. Existing indoor arena & recreation centre
5. Possible future aquatic centre, gym & mixed uses
6. Main entrance to consolidated recreation centre
7. Integrated Cultural/Residential with Public Car Parking
8. High density mixed use development
9. Terrace style medium density residential
10. Preferred street-framing development model
11. Infill development to frame street block
12. Shared carpark
13. Major streetscape enhancement
14. Linear park along underused road reserve
15. Rockingham City Centre Transit System route
Figure 4.2.1 - Village Centre Cross Section

Figure 4.3 - Dixon South Precinct Concept Plan

1. Central Park with high amenity place-making
2. "Main Street" mixed use development
3. Seamless development interface with University
4. Existing indoor arena & recreation centre
5. Possible future aquatic centre, gym & mixed uses
6. Main entrance to consolidated recreation centre
7. Integrated Cultural/Residential with Public Car Parking
8. High density mixed use development
9. Terrace style medium density residential
10. Preferred street-framing development model
11. Infill development to frame street block
12. Shared carpark
13. Major streetscape enhancement
14. Linear park along unmade road reserve
15. Rockingham City Centre Transit System route
Figure 4.4 - Central Park Precinct Concept Plan

1. Central Park with high amenity place-making
2. ‘Main Street’ mixed use development
3. Seamless development interface with University
4. Existing indoor arena & recreation centre
5. Possible future aquatic centre, gym & mixed uses
6. Main entrance to consolidated recreation centre
7. Integrated Cultural/Residential with Public Car Parking
8. High density mixed use development
9. Terrace style medium density residential
10. Preferred street-framing development model
11. Infill development to frame street block
12. Shared carpark
13. Major streetscape enhancement
14. Linear park along unmade road reserve
15. Rockingham City Centre Transit System route

Figure 4.4.1 - Central Park Cross Section
Figure 4.5 - Smart Village West Precinct Concept Plan

1. Central Park with high amenity place-making
2. 'Main Street' mixed use development
3. Seamless development interface with University
4. Existing indoor arena & recreation centre
5. Possible future aquatic centre, gym & mixed uses
6. Main entrance to consolidated recreation centre
7. Integrated Cultural/Residential with Public Car Parking
8. High density mixed use development
9. Terrace style medium density residential
10. Preferred street-framing development model
11. Infill development to frame street block
12. Shared carpark
13. Major streetscape enhancement
14. Linear park along unmade road reserve
15. Rockingham City Centre Transit System route

Figure 4.5.1 - Smart Village West Cross Section
The Committee’s Reason for Varying the Officer’s Recommendation

Not applicable

Implications of the Changes to the Officer’s Recommendation

Not applicable
1. **Purpose of Report**

To consider adoption of Planning Policy No.3.2.5 - Development Policy Plan - Waterfront Village Sector, following completion of the public advertising period.

2. **Background**

In September 2009 Council endorsed the Final Strategic Planning Reports (Volumes 1 and 2) as the Centre Plan for the Rockingham Strategic Metropolitan Centre. The Western Australian Planning Commission endorsed the Final Reports in November 2009.

Council directed that City Officers prepare any necessary changes to the existing Policy framework, Town Planning Scheme and Metropolitan Region Scheme.
The revised Policy was prepared by City Officers, in conjunction with the City Centre Consultant Team. The Policy is named ‘Planning Policy No.3.2.5 - Development Policy Plan Waterfront Village Sector’, consistent with the other Planning Policies for Sectors in the Strategic Metropolitan Centre.

In revising the Waterfront Village Policy, it was necessary to review the 2004 Car Parking Strategy and the 2003 Building Height Model.

In October 2011 Council resolved to advertise Planning Policy No.3.2.5 - Development Policy Plan - Waterfront Village Sector for public comment.

3. Details

At the conclusion of the advertising period, fourteen (14) submissions had been received. Each submission has been assessed by City Officers and the City Centre Structure Plan Consultant.

4. Implications to Consider

a. Consultation with the Community

The Policy was advertised for public comment from 12th December 2011 until 3rd February 2012 (54 days), with advertising being undertaken in the following manner:-

(i) a notice was published in the Public Notices section of the Weekend Courier newspaper on the 16th and 23rd December 2011 and the 13th January 2012;
(ii) an advertisement was placed on the City's website for the entire advertising period; and
(iii) six hundred and sixty eight (668) landowners and key stakeholders were notified in writing of the proposal.

b. Consultation with Government Agencies

The following Government Agencies were also consulted:-
- Main Roads WA
- Department of Transport
- Department of Education
- Department of Housing
- Rockingham Kwinana Development Office
- Public Transport Authority
- Department of Planning

c. Strategic Community Plan

This item addresses the Community’s Vision for the future and specifically the following Aspirations contained in the Community Plan 2011:-

Aspiration 6: Civic buildings, public places and transport infrastructure of contemporary design, constructed and maintained using best practice principles.

Aspiration 11: Planning for population growth to ensure that future development and land-uses contribute to a sustainable city that provides for a genuinely desirable lifestyle

d. Policy

The draft Planning Policy No.3.2.5 for the Waterfront Village Sector has been prepared and advertised in accordance with Clause 8.9 (Planning Policies) of Town Planning Scheme No.2. Planning Policy No.3.2.5 has also been prepared in accordance with the approved Centre Plan framework, in accordance with State Planning Policy 4.2 – “Activity Centres for Perth and Peel” (August 2010).
e. **Financial**

Nil

f. **Legal and Statutory**

Under the provisions of section 8.9 of Town Planning Scheme No.2, the Council may prepare, modify or revoke a Planning Policy.

---

### 5. **Comments**

The following commentary is provided on the submissions received:-

- The submissions from the Department of Transport, Department of Education and Main Roads WA are acknowledgement letters and raise no issues.

- The submission received from Murdoch University provides general support.

- The submission received from the Rockingham Kwinana Development Office provides general support.

- The submission received from the Department of Planning provided general support and comment with respect to residential density.

- The submission received from LandCorp is generally supportive, however, it provides commentary in respect of suggested changes to the cash-in-lieu provisions of the Policy. LandCorp’s comments were generally directed towards the Smart Village Development Policy Plan, specifically the extent of the Murdoch University Campus, possible site for the Contemporary Arts Centre, preferred residential densities and the suggested public art contribution. LandCorp advised, however, that its comments could also be applied to the Waterfront Village Development Policy Plan. Responses to these issues have been documented in the Schedule of Submission (attached).

- **Building Height**

Several submissions were received from landowners objecting to the proposed building heights as set out within the Development Policy Plan.

The height limit proposed in the Policy is considered appropriate to the location in the context of the revised building height strategy. The revision to the Building Height Model was reviewed by the City Centre Consultant team in light of current practices and consideration of the specific locational features, including a north facing beach and foreshore reserve.

- **Minimum Lot Size**

Two submissions were received objecting to the proposed Policy requirement for a 2,200m² minimum lot size for redevelopment.

A minimum site size is critical to achieving desired development typologies, orderly vehicle access and coherent, activated streetscape outcomes. The minimum of 2,200m² was derived from a detailed Building Typologies Study conducted by the City Centre Consultant team, having due regard to development in other Strategic Metropolitan Centres.

### Minor Modifications

Minor changes are proposed to be made to the Planning Policy, both as a result of comments raised in the public advertising period and an internal review by Officers.

### Conclusion

The submissions received during the advertising period did not raise any substantiated matters which would provide cause for not adopting the proposed Planning Policy. As such, it is recommended that Council adopt Planning Policy No.3.2.5, subject to minor modifications of the advertised Policy (as highlighted in red).

The proposed Waterfront Village Development Policy Plan will ensure consistency with the adopted Centre Plan for the Rockingham Strategic Metropolitan Centre.
The Policy is also consistent with Scheme Amendment No.113 to Town Planning Scheme No.2. In this regard, the Policy cannot be adopted until such time as Scheme Amendment No.113 is granted Final Approval by the Hon Minister for Planning.

6. Voting Requirements

Simple Majority.

7. Officer Recommendation

That Council ADOPT Planning Policy No.3.2.5 - Development Policy Plan - Waterfront Village Sector, pursuant to clause 8.9.5 of Town Planning Scheme No.2 subject to modifications changes to advertised Policy (changes to Policy are highlighted in red) and Amendment No.113 to Town Planning Scheme No.2 being granted Final Approval by the Hon Minister for Planning.

8. Committee Recommendation

That Council ADOPT Planning Policy No.3.2.5 - Development Policy Plan - Waterfront Village Sector, pursuant to clause 8.9.5 of Town Planning Scheme No.2 subject to the following modifications changes to advertised Policy (changes to Policy are highlighted in red) and Amendment No.113 to Town Planning Scheme No.2 being granted Final Approval by the Hon Minister for Planning:-
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PLANNING POLICY 3.2.5

Development Policy Plan - Waterfront Village Sector

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

The Waterfront Village Sector, which is the subject of this Planning Policy is one of a number of defined development Sectors within the planning envelope of the endorsed Centre Plan for the Rockingham Strategic Metropolitan Centre (Refer to Figure 1).

The beachfront park and commercial area at Rockingham Beach has for many years relied on the shelter afforded by Cockburn Sound and a rare north easterly aspect to become a favourite seaside destination for families from all over the State.

As the town gradually matured into a more permanent community throughout the 1950’s and early 1960’s, the future of the beachfront commercial area as a local town centre seemed assured. Rockingham was, however, experiencing unprecedented residential growth and the scale of certain forms of car dominated retail development led to the State and Local Government agreeing to the setting aside of a new City Centre, on privately owned land, some 2 kilometres south east of the Rockingham Beachfront.

For many years, the wisdom of this decision was quietly questioned. The beachfront still had a civic and community presence which had yet to be replicated in the new Centre. The regular street grid and streetfront shops of the beachfront certainly felt like ‘town’ and the affordable rentals and multiplicity of land tenure provided opportunities which had not been available in the suburban-scaled development pattern of the inland City Centre.

Without some clarification of strategic planning roles and more intensive management of townscape quality, neither the beachfront area nor the inland City Centre seemed likely to achieve their real potential.

The City responded by properly defining the complementary roles of both centres within an overall City Centre Planning context. It recognised that massive population growth within the South West Corridor would see a catchment population (Rockingham and its surrounds), of approximately 250,000 some time after the year 2020.

The City Centre would continue to expand to meet this demand but the City also determined that it should provide a full spectrum of commercial, civic, cultural and employment functions. This approach was adopted by Council and a comprehensive plan to achieve that goal and to make the City Centre recognisable as such, in terms of its townscape character and general amenity, was commenced.

This enabled the future of the historic beachfront centre to be confidently clarified. Clearly there was little point in the beachfront centre attempting to duplicate the higher order retail and other commercial functions of the City Centre. The beachfront centre should primarily fulfil the function of an urban village within the Metropolitan Centre, providing a rare urban waterfront lifestyle opportunity in much the same way as South Fremantle complements the Fremantle City Centre and City North has been planned to complement the Joondalup City Centre. In addition, the beachfront centre should continue to play a secondary role as a District Centre servicing the social, commercial and community needs of its local catchment.

While there may have been little scope for retail floorspace expansion beyond that recommended for the Centre, there was scope for additional tourist and leisure related shops (e.g., dive and surf shops, recreational clothing, etc), restaurants, markets, galleries and offices which could take advantage of the proximity of Cockburn Sound. The City also recognised the appropriateness of attracting more urban-scaled residential and short stay visitor accommodation to the area.
In 1993 the Rockingham Beach Townscape Study was completed and the streetscape components of the adopted Townscape Master Plan were progressively implemented.

In 1997, the Council adopted Statement of Planning Policy No.8.2 - Rockingham Beach Waterfront Village Policy (Waterfront Village Policy). The Policy sought to compliment the upgrade of the public infrastructure through the Townscape Policy, to provide guidance to developers for the redevelopment of the private landholdings.

Within the private domain, several major developments and a number of smaller building refurbishments have responded to the City's objectives.

In 2003, the Policy was amended to introduce the recommendations of the Building Height Model (BHM). The BHM guided the height and massing of buildings mainly along the narrow coastal strip behind the foreshore, generally between Rockingham Beach Road and Kent Street. The findings of the BHM were informed by case studies of comparable coastal locations in other parts of Australia and sought to balance expanded development potential with protecting the public domain.

In 2004, the Policy was amended again to introduce new cash-in-lieu parking controls that mandated an element of cash-in-lieu. The Policy adopted a shared parking approach where a substantial proportion of parking is provided through public parking (the cash-in-lieu contribution), which reduced the overall statutory requirement for non-residential parking by 25 percent.

This Planning Policy provides a more detailed planning vision and policy framework for the Sector based on the concept of a sustainable, medium to high density urban village arranged around a central, high frequency transit spine. A policy area boundary has been defined within which the land use and townscape characteristics of individual precincts are described and illustrated.

1.2 Centre Plan Status - Strategic Metropolitan Centre

Under its Statement of Planning Policy 4.2 (Activity Centres for Perth and Peel), the Western Australian Planning Commission (WAPC) requires the City of Rockingham to prepare and maintain an endorsed Activity Centre Structure Plan (Centre Plan) to guide the development of public and private property within the Rockingham Strategic Metropolitan Centre.

The City commissioned a review of its endorsed 1995 Centre Plan with the goal of producing a new Centre Plan that would cover the full extent of the area to be serviced by the Rockingham City Centre Transit System (RCCTS). The scope of the Centre Plan project covers an area of almost 600 hectares between the Rockingham Train Station and Rockingham Beach and includes the area covered by the existing Central City Area zone in the Metropolitan Region Scheme.

Stage 1 of the Centre Plan Review was advertised for public comment in December 2007. It laid down an overall Concept Plan that addressed the priority issues of: a better connected access and movement network; and a land use pattern based on contemporary 'Main Street' and 'Transit Oriented Development' principles. A Framework Plan translated the Concept Plan into a general arrangement of legible street blocks, built form and public space.

The overall Centre Plan area was divided into 11 Sectors (refer to Figure 1) as follows:-

- City Centre
- Waterfront Village
- Smart Village (South)
- Smart Village (North)
- Northern Gateway
- Campus
- Eastern
- Leeuwin
- Northern Waterfront
- Southern Gateway
- Rockingham Station
In February 2008, following a review of stakeholder and public submissions, the City endorsed the long term planning framework and transport network recommendations for the Strategic Metropolitan Centre, as proposed in the Stage 1 Report.

Stage 2 of the Centre Plan Review updated the Development Policy Plan for the City Centre Sector, with a revised Indicative Development Plan and related Precinct Policies and Guidelines. The Council endorsed the Stage 2 Final Reports at its ordinary Meeting held on the 22nd September 2009.

On the 10th November 2009, the WAPC Statutory Planning Committee considered the Stage 2 Final Reports on the Review of the Rockingham Strategic Metropolitan Centre and resolved to endorse the documents as an appropriate Centre Plan to guide future planning and development.

2. STRATEGIC METROPOLITAN CENTRE PLANNING FRAMEWORK

2.1 Vision for the Strategic Metropolitan Centre

The endorsed Centre Plan for the Rockingham Strategic Metropolitan Centre is guided by the following vision:-

The vision is for a modern, distinctly coastal centre offering a wide range of mixed uses including retail, commercial, office, civic, residential, education and recreation within an accessible and highly inter-connected, urban-scaled townscape, comprising a major activity centre and related urban villages based on 'Main Street' principles.

This vision builds on the principles of the Network City (2004) regional planning framework and the objectives and concepts of the adopted 1995 Rockingham City Centre Development Policy Plan. It has a wider scope to encompass higher education campuses and urban villages along the route of the Rockingham City Centre Transit System through to Rockingham Beach.

Development in the Rockingham Strategic Metropolitan Centre will be defined and characterised by:

- Medium to high density development based on activated, 'Main Street' principles.
- A configuration of generally contiguous streetfront buildings and a mix of uses that generate high levels of pedestrian activity and a sense of vitality.
- A street-based transit system, with closely spaced stops.
- A permeable network of streets, laneways, arcades and public spaces that provide high quality linkages, particularly for pedestrians, to Centre activities from transit stops, street and off-street car parking and from the surrounding walkable catchment.
- An identifiable City Centre hub to provide major CBD functions.
- Connected urban villages between the City Centre and Rockingham Beach along the route of the transit system. The new urban villages will make provision for mixed and consolidated education (university), technology, commercial and medium to high density residential development, based on sustainable planning principles and design criteria.

2.2 Planning and Development Principles

The following planning and development principles apply across the Strategic Metropolitan Centre:-

2.2.1 Built Form & Urban Design

Principles:-

- Develop in accordance with 'Main Street' design principles.
- Incorporate a diversity of activities and human scale in streetfront development.
- Develop local areas in accordance with specific precinct design and development guidelines and controls.
- Locate and configure buildings to address the street and progressively facilitate continuous and contained streetscapes which provide interest and interaction between buildings and pedestrians at street level.
- Make public buildings and spaces universally accessible.
• Design buildings and public spaces that contribute to a comfortable pedestrian environment, providing opportunities for weather protection, including shelter from prevailing strong wind conditions.
• Minimise any detrimental impacts on neighbouring properties.
• Encourage a gradual stepping up of the built form at the interface of low and high rise development.

2.2.2 Access & Parking

Principles:-
• Make walking the most important mode of transport within the Waterfront Village. Streets, public places and adjacent development should be designed to provide a safe, secure, stimulating and pleasant walking environment.
• Link the major regional and sub-regional road system to the Waterfront Village by a range of direct and legible street connections.
• Ensure that the Waterfront Village and related activity centre street networks are 'fine grained' to provide a multiple choice of routes for pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles.
• Integrate the street-based central transit system to link the Waterfront Village with the Smart Villages, the City Centre and the Rockingham railway station.
• Ensure that appropriate land uses are located adjacent to the transit route.
• Adopt an integrated urban design and traffic management approach within the Waterfront Village to deliver a low speed traffic environment and a high level of interest and amenity.
• Manage provision of adequate parking facilities and encourage integration of car parking with adjoining sites which are convenient, safe and sustainable.
• Locate parking areas to minimise adverse impacts on the streetscape.
• Control new development so that access ways and parking facilities do not visually dominate the public realm or create obstructions to the pedestrian environment and minimise potential pedestrian/vehicle conflicts.
• Avoid semi-basement car parking solutions where they would impact negatively on the ground level activation of adjoining streets.

2.2.3 Public Domain

Principles:-
• Integrate different precincts through the use of a simple and consistent palette of vegetation, paving, signage and street furniture.
• Design new development so as to contribute to the quality of the public domain and the framing and activation of the public space network.
• Provide for well-designed and integrated toilets, seating, lighting and public art within the public domain.

2.2.4 Land Uses

Principles:-
• Ensure that new uses support and enhance the role of the Strategic Metropolitan Centre as the primary 'Main Street' activity centre in the South West Perth Region.
• Reinforce the 'Main Street' model for the Centre by giving priority to active street-oriented land uses.
Encourage land uses and developments that employ and attract high numbers of people, and have the potential to activate Waterfront Village by day and night along the route of the principal, street based public transport system. Such uses should include medium to high density residential, short stay accommodation, retail, civic and community facilities, educational and cultural facilities, cafes, restaurants, hotels, offices and other intensive employment uses.

Avoid land uses and developments that generate high volumes of cars and trucks and have low employment intensities.

Encourage and promote a diverse mix of uses in preference to mono-functional land uses on larger sites.

Enhance the activity appeal of the Waterfront Village to both local and regional visitors.

Encourage attractive and safe alfresco dining facilities to foster a lively streetscape.

Promote appealing and distinctive retail uses reflecting the coastal nature and lifestyle of Rockingham and its community.

Ensure that residential uses are integrated with the retail, commercial and hospitality potential of the Waterfront Village.

Encourage the aggregation of facilities along 'Main Street' corridors, pedestrian links and major public spaces that are characterised by high levels of pedestrian activity during normal shopping hours.

Encourage new development to provide options for future flexibility and changes in land use.

2.2.5 Safety & Security
Principles:-

- Design buildings to provide a safe environment for all users, contribute positively to the enhancement of public safety, and minimise the need for intrusive surveillance technologies.

- Incorporate unobtrusive security measures into building design that is in keeping with the building’s architectural style and materials.

- Design public spaces to facilitate safe pedestrian use and create a sense of public ownership.

2.2.6 Sustainability
Principles:-

- Ensure timely and efficient provision of physical and social infrastructure to enable the Centre to service its strategic functions.

- Promote environmentally sustainable practices, including resource efficiency (energy, water, waste, air quality, material selection), at all stages of development – planning, subdivision design, building construction and maintenance.

- Provide sufficient land for employment opportunities and to support local and regional economic growth.

- Expand sustainable and efficient transport options while creating opportunities to reduce single occupancy vehicle trips.

- Ensure timely provision of services and facilities that are equitable, durable, accessible, of a high-quality and that promote community well-being and health.

- Promote a range of housing choices (densities, floor area, ownership patterns, price and building types) to ensure a diverse population can be housed, including designing buildings to be adaptable over time.
2.3 Concept Plan

An overall Concept Plan for the Strategic Metropolitan Centre was developed in conjunction with the preparation of an access and movement network (refer to Figure 2.1).

The Plan makes provision for improved road connectivity and a more legible road network with particular emphasis given to improved north-south connectivity. Moreover, the Plan makes the local transit system the focus of an intensified corridor of mixed use development between the City Centre, education campuses and the beachfront.

The foundation of the Plan is the ongoing development of land within the existing City Centre Zone, with the expectation that development will consolidate around the commercial and civic core of the City, with progressive expansion along streetfronts, to the north.

Further expansion of the Waterfront Village is envisaged, particularly to the west of Patterson Road. An intensification of residential development to the east of the Waterfront Village would follow the coastal route of the transit system.

Between the designated City Centre and the Waterfront Village, there are opportunities to develop two new activity centres north and south of Dixon Road, along the route of the local transit system. The vacant land south of Dixon Road presents an opportunity to integrate the western end of the Murdoch University campus with other mixed uses (including residential) in a consolidated, ‘Main Street’ configuration.

Between Dixon Road and Patterson Road, an opportunity exists to extend the ‘Main Street’, activity corridor to directly connect with Victoria Street and the fast redeveloping Rockingham Waterfront.

Figure 1 divides the Strategic Metropolitan Centre into sectors and overlays them on the Concept Plan base to provide a convenient means of describing and further detailing the strategy. While the boundaries are indicative, they are consistent with the boundaries of existing zones, Policy areas and Precincts within the Town Planning Scheme.

2.4 Framework Plan

A Framework Plan (refer to Figure 2.2) has been prepared over the Strategic Metropolitan Centre to illustrate a generalised arrangement of built form, movement networks and public and private spaces consistent with the strategic arrangement of functions illustrated in the Concept Plan.

The Plan is also consistent with the potential for Transit Oriented Development (TOD) described in Section 2.5 and builds on the adopted access and movement network described in Section 2.6. The Framework Plan illustrates a long term (i.e. greater than 10 years) view of development and redevelopment potential. While the Plan shows possible new road links over privately owned property, it is acknowledged that such improvements would be subject to the agreement and cooperation of affected property owners.

The Framework Plan provides a platform for more detailed conceptual planning, urban design and planning policy within each of the Centre Plan Sectors.

Consistent with the scope of the Centre Plan, the Framework Plan focuses its detail on areas where there is the greatest potential and/or priority for integrated development or redevelopment in the near term, including land in the City Centre, in the Waterfront Village and along the route of the City Centre Transit System.

Outside of the more detailed parts of the Plan, existing residential and service commercial areas have been simply shaded in yellow and purple tones consistent with the strategic intent of the Concept Plan. These areas are likely to undergo change on a site-by-site basis over an extended period. Development in these areas will be guided by separate Sector Development Policy Plans and relevant guidelines.

2.5 Transit Oriented Development

2.5.1 Background

The RCCTS connects the Rockingham Train Station with the City Centre, education campuses and the beachfront. The route of the street-based transit system is being developed initially in shuttle-bus mode with the understanding that it will be upgraded to an electric streetcar or light rail operation once a more supportive level of development has been achieved along the route.
The City of Rockingham is committed to achieving the vision of a fixed route, streetcar transit system as the focus of a corridor of high intensity, mixed use development between the train station and the beachfront.

Accordingly, a review of the Centre Plan was commissioned on the understanding that it would demonstrate the application of sustainable development principles with a particular emphasis on TOD.

2.5.2 TOD Policy Background

It is important to understand the TOD policy background to the Centre Plan.

Network City (2004)

The Network City document set out a strategic foundation for TOD implementation in the Perth region.

Strategy 1.1 sought to foster land use and transport integration to form a Network city, by:-

“Encouraging mixed use development in activity centres, including higher density residential developments and employment generators, especially where centres are well served by public transport and have high amenity, walkable catchments.”

In a key action to support the strategy, Network City proposed demonstration projects in Activity Centres to promote TOD, mixed use and higher density residential projects, and to demonstrate best practice in design and implementation. The Rockingham Activity Centre between the Rockingham Train Station and the foreshore was one of several locations nominated for a major TOD demonstration project.

Development Control Policy DC 1.6 – Planning to Support Transit Use and Transit Oriented Development

The amended Development Control Policy 1.6 was adopted by the WAPC in 2005 to reflect the Government’s vision for a sustainable future as outlined in the Network City and the State Sustainability Strategy.

The Policy notes that:-

“As the public transport system is further refined and extended, there will be emerging opportunities for new development that is focused upon, and maximizes the benefits derived from significant new public investments in transit infrastructure.”

The Policy has direct application to the planning and development of property along the route of the RCCTS.

Policy measures include:-

- transit-supportive development patterns;
- land use to support transit;
- the public domain in transit oriented precincts;
- transit supportive design;
- integrating transit infrastructure; and
- precinct planning.

2.5.3 TOD Catchment

The TOD catchment encompasses land within a walkable distance of the transit system. At Rockingham the catchment follows the route of the City Centre Transit System between the train station and the beachfront. It is approximately 600 metres wide (each side) along the transit route (to service a future tram or streetcar system).

2.5.4 Land Use Distribution and Development Intensity

The following land use assumptions were generated in conjunction with the draft Concept Plan, the modelling of transport network options and the selection of a preferred transport network.
A mix of active, high intensity uses are appropriate for land within the walkable catchment of the transit route. The intensity and mix of uses should reflect local characteristics along the activity corridor.

The City Centre and the Waterfront Village are established Activity Centres which have to date been planned to accommodate the bulk of retail, office, hospitality and higher density residential development. The 2009 Centre Plan allows for a more balanced distribution of activity-generating uses along the transit corridor where there are significant opportunities for sustainable TOD.

Retail floorspace has been notionally allocated as follows:-

- City Centre: 85,000m²
- Waterfront Village: 18,000m²
- Smart Villages: 12,000m²

Office floorspace has been notionally allocated as follows:-

- City Centre: 60,000m²
- Waterfront Village: 8,000m²
- Smart Villages: 32,000m²

Residential land use is typically a major component of mixed use TOD. Given that the Waterfront Village project has demonstrated a demand for high amenity, urban-scaled residential development, it has been assumed that medium to high density residential development will be a major driver of the TOD process. It has the capacity to shape and populate the desired activity corridor.

Within the defined TOD catchment, existing residential densities match the suburban norm of Rockingham with the exception of pockets of higher density along the Rockingham beachfront (200+ dwellings per hectare along Rockingham Beach Road and up to 100 dwellings per hectare in the adjoining Waterfront Village) and in clusters of group housing around the City Centre (typically 50 dwellings per hectare).

Over recent years, the City has received proposals for medium rise, multi-residential apartment developments on City Centre zoned land. This has been driven by strong sales in the Waterfront Village and the realisation that the elevated apartment building model in central Rockingham could achieve expansive views around the entire Rockingham coastline. There appears to be latent potential for higher rise, multi-residential apartment development beyond the coastal fringe.

The advent of the TOD concept along the transit corridor provides the planning and amenity context for an orderly arrangement and distribution of medium to higher density residential development.

Since the late 1980's there has been an international consensus among researchers and transit operators that the gross average residential density threshold for light rail transit is approximately 50 persons per hectare. More recently, planners have also recognised that a greater intensity and massing of development is needed to create the urban context for successful TOD.

TOD's at Subiaco are being planned to achieve an average residential density of 120 dwellings per hectare with a net yield of 60 to 200 dwellings per hectare on defined blocks. Similar TOD densities are being implemented in Government fostered development projects at Leighton, Cockburn Central and Murdoch.

In the case of the Rockingham TOD, residential densities could range between 60 and 200+ dwellings per hectare (as is currently being developed in parts of the Waterfront Village).

It has been assumed that car parking generated by various land uses and activities will be self-contained within the relevant traffic zones to avoid an over-concentration in any one sector.

2.5.5 Urban Design and Built Form

While the overall TOD concept is for a consolidated, generally contiguous corridor of development along the transit route, it is essential that TOD at Rockingham has a varied and geographically appropriate character that offers multiple choices in lifestyle and convenience.

TOD with a commercial content will range from the expanded shopping centre that has been sleeved to connect with streetfront tenancies and an adjacent cinema complex, through to individual mixed use developments on freehold sites.
A variety of residential dwelling types and tenures will be encouraged, including traditional streetfront townhouses, contemporary row houses, mews housing, low rise apartment blocks and medium to high-rise multiple apartments with a lifestyle focus ranging in height from three to ten or more storeys, subject to precinct-specific guidelines. Drawing on recent good practice, a range of urban-scaled dwelling sizes will also be encouraged (and possibly mandated) to ensure that a wide spectrum of household types and levels of affordability can be accommodated.

Particular emphasis will be given to shaping the form of development along the edge of the transit route and around transit stops. In particular, there is a need for design measures to optimize the safety and amenity of stops along the route, including achieving adequate levels of activation and passive surveillance from adjoining properties.

2.5.6 Residential Yields

Estimates of residential potential within the RCCTS catchment (600 metres) each side of the transit route) vary according to density assumptions.

Without TOD intervention, the overall area of the Strategic Metropolitan Centre (about 580 hectares) would yield approximately 6,000 dwellings (at a gross average 10 dwellings per hectare) and a population of approximately 12,000 based on a household occupancy of 2.0. This allows for continued intensification in and around the Waterfront Village, but no significant residential consolidation in the City Centre and along the transit route.

With TOD intervention and average net block densities of 100 dwellings per hectare applied along the activity spine, the subject area could yield approximately 20,000 dwellings and a population of 36,000 (based on 1.8 persons per household) at a gross average density of 62 persons per hectare. This scenario could achieve the light rail transit threshold density of 50 persons per hectare.

With TOD, there is the potential to ultimately triple the anticipated population within the walkable catchment of the RCCTS.

2.6 Adopted Access and Movement Network

A preferred movement network has been adopted by the City. Particular attention has been given to the TOD potential of the Strategic Metropolitan Centre and traffic modelling outputs which indicate that there is more than sufficient street capacity on the proposed fine grained network within the centre.

2.6.1 Street Types

A number of different street types are commonly found in city centres, mixed use urban villages and on access streets to, through and around these centres.

Street types relevant to the development of the Strategic Metropolitan Centre include:-

Major Traffic Routes - the main traffic carrying roads in the area. They include Ennis Avenue, Patterson Road, Dixon Road, Read Street and Rae Road. They are dual carriageways designed to carry high volumes of traffic and do not penetrate the City Centre or adjoining mixed use town or village centres.

Transit Street and Transit Priority Streets - custom designed to provide priority for public transport along major transit routes and avoid undue delay to public transport services. Transit priority is proposed along significant sections of the RCCTS route. The design varies to meet local design constraints. Access for other traffic is permitted within the street reservation, but this is not always the case. They are designed to provide for safe, convenient pedestrian movement.

City and Town Centre Streets - pedestrian movement and circulation is very important on these streets. Design permits two-way traffic movement but at a slow speed to provide for safe pedestrian movement. Kerbside parking is normally permitted. A central median is sometimes provided to improve the streetscape, but is not mandatory.

Green Parking Streets - to be constructed around the periphery of the City Centre and on sections of Patterson Road near the foreshore. Their function is to assist with the provision of public parking whilst allowing the street to function normally for both pedestrian and vehicular access. Right angle median and parallel kerbside parking is normally permitted. An example of this type of street exists along part of Patterson Road near the foreshore. Streets of this type are quite common in areas of Melbourne (e.g. Carlton).
Connector Streets - provided outside the major activity nodes to link areas within and adjacent to the City Centre. They can pass through areas with different land uses (e.g. residential, business or education). Indented kerbside parking and appropriately designed pedestrian crossing areas would normally be incorporated into the design.

Access Streets - found outside of the highly trafficked areas of city, town and village centres. The primary purpose of these streets is to provide access to properties for motorists, pedestrians and cyclists. In light industrial and commercial areas (and in residential areas on an infrequent basis) they also cater for delivery vehicles.

Pedestrian Malls/Accessways - provide essential pedestrian connectivity in areas where the street network is not well-connected. An internal network of pedestrian malls exists within the Rockingham shopping centre. A major purpose of such pedestrian malls is to provide a sheltered and controlled retail environment. Beyond the private domain of the shopping centre, pedestrian laneways and pathways through public space connect a wide array of mixed uses.

2.6.2 The Adopted Network

The adopted access and movement network is illustrated in Figure 2.3. It includes a wide range of street types which enable different functions to be undertaken in different areas in and around the Strategic Metropolitan Centre.

The network has been developed around the modified route of the street based public transport system, connecting the City Centre to Rockingham Beach. Key aspects of the network include:-

- The street network provides well connected linkages between the City Centre and the Rockingham foreshore via the proposed Smart Villages.
- The street network in the City Centre and urban villages is fine grained and highly connected, providing a high degree of robustness and flexibility for future planning.

2.6.3 Traffic Modelling and Traffic Predictions

Traffic modelling has been undertaken by Uloth and Associates.

One of the key findings from the traffic modelling was:-

- Long term estimated traffic volumes on the surrounding arterial road network (Ennis Avenue, Read Street and Patterson Road) are high. This is due to an impermeable street network on approach to the Strategic Metropolitan Centre, especially from the south. Traffic volumes on the fine grained street network within the Strategic Metropolitan Centre are fairly low.

2.6.4 Public Transport Network Planning

There are three main elements to public transport network planning in Rockingham:-

- The principal custom designed street based public transport system (the RCCTS), linking the train station with the City Centre, Murdoch University and the Rockingham foreshore. This is the major linking element through the City Centre supporting the proposed transit oriented development.
- The Rockingham/Fremantle principal transit service (the 920 service). This high frequency service would either enter Rockingham through the educational precinct and travel through the City Centre, terminating at the railway station, or enter the city through the railway station, terminating in the education campus sector (near the TAFE).
- Services from the south entering the City Centre via Read Street and Central Promenade. These services could proceed through the City Centre to the train station. Some peak hour services could travel in a more direct route via Read Street and Rae Road to the train station.

The potential public transport network is shown in Figure 2.4.

Figure 2.5 shows the walking catchment around the proposed stops along the principal street based public transport system, linking the railway station, the City Centre, the university and the foreshore. The outer line is based on a 750 metre walking distance (depicted by a 600 metre radius) applicable to a streetcar or very high frequency bus service.
The inner shaded area depicts a walking catchment within the City Centre and Smart Villages for retail and entertainment uses within a vibrant, mixed use centre. This is based on a 500 metre walking distance (depicted by a 400 metre radius).

Figure 2.6 shows the walking catchment for the proposed combined public transport system for central Rockingham. It can be seen that the Strategic Metropolitan Centre will be very well served by high frequency transit. This level of coverage by high frequency services means that Rockingham could be described as a 'Transit City' rather than a city with transit.

2.6.5 Parking Policy and Principles

In city and town centres and TOD's, it is important that a balance is achieved between meeting the access and parking needs for vehicles and the movement needs of pedestrians in the context of overall urban design.

The distribution of car parking in the Waterfront Village should be based on the following principles:-

- Where possible provide public parking in preference to private parking.
- Maximise the amount of on-street, short term parking, subject to traffic and pedestrian safety, and other urban design considerations.
- Provide off-street public parking facilities within easy walking distance of commercial, retail entertainment and other facilities, but limit vehicle access to car parks where such traffic would be in conflict with high levels of pedestrian movement.

2.7 Endorsed Sector Planning Guidelines for Waterfront Village

Section 10.2 in Volume 1 of the endorsed Centre Plan sets out broad Sector Planning Guidelines within which more detailed planning of the Waterfront Village Sector should be undertaken in accordance with the adopted Planning Framework for the Strategic Metropolitan Centre. The following text is an extract from the Centre Plan:-

"Desired Future Character

Port Rockingham was once the busiest port in the State by tonnage of goods shipped through the jetties at the end of Railway Terrace. The associated beachfront and coastal settlement was subsequently transformed into one of the State's most popular holiday and day trip destinations.

While many of Rockingham's commercial and civic functions moved further south to the new Regional Centre in the early 1970's, the historic waterfront settlement retained a compact townscape character well suited to the demands of a contemporary urban lifestyle.

The emerging Waterfront Village will continue with its transformation, with further rationalisation and redevelopment of under-utilised public and private properties. The Waterfront Village represents a strategic TOD opportunity of regional significance. An attractive mix of medium to high density residential and short stay apartments, hospitality-focussed retail, offices and urban waterfront recreation uses will continue to make the Village a priority destination on the Rockingham coastline.

Preferred Uses

- Appropriate TOD uses lining the Transit Route
- Mixed use, urban-scaled development
- Residential (medium to high density)
- Serviced apartments
- Entertainment/hospitality
- Possible Contemporary Arts Centre
- Restaurants, small bars and cafes
- Local convenience retailing
- Public car parks
• Passive Parkland

Elements
• Continue with the transformation of the historic beachfront centre into a contemporary waterfront residential, commercial and recreational activity node servicing local residents and regional visitors.
• Prepare an updated sector Development Plan with relevant changes to residential density codings to guide the progressive urban consolidation and transformation of the area consistent with its TOD context.
• Respond to the rare combination of a northerly coastal aspect, sheltered beach and shady parkland with appropriate land uses, in detailed urban design and with site responsive architecture.
• Consolidate development within the walkable catchment of the transit system.
• Facilitate continued infill of residential and short stay apartments along central section of Rockingham Beach Road and along south western side of Railway terrace through to Read Street intersection.
• Retail and enhance activated commercial frontages to Rockingham Beach Road, central Kent Street, Flinders Lane (north of Kent Street) and Railway Terrace (north of Kent Street).
• Update and expand the application of the existing building height policy consistent with an adopted sector improvement plan.
• Ensure that all new development is planned in accordance with the sustainability principles listed in Section 3.1.6 and designed in detail to meet any applicable sustainability Key Performance Indicators endorsed by the City of Rockingham.

3. WATERFRONT VILLAGE INDICATIVE DEVELOPMENT PLAN

3.1 Indicative Development Plan
The Waterfront Village Indicative Development Plan (IDP) (refer to Figure 3.1), illustrates a more detailed interpretation of the planning framework described and illustrated in Section 2 of the Centre Plan. In addition, it is an updated version of the IDP adopted under the current Policy and it encompasses a larger planning envelope. While the IDP has been derived from the overall Framework Plan, it includes modifications and refinements that demonstrate how the Centre Plan could be expected to evolve within particular sectors and precincts, consistent with the endorsed Sector Planning Guidelines listed under Section 3.2 above. Figures 3.1.1 and 3.1.2 illustrate indicative cross sections through possible development in the area between Rockingham Beach and Patterson Road. The cross sections demonstrate the varied height and massing of mixed use, TOD development that is envisaged by the Waterfront Village DPP.

The IDP builds on successive improvements that have been made to the townscape, built form and general amenity of the Sector, guided by the existing Waterfront Village Policy. These improvements have been complemented since 2005 by more substantial place-making and urban renewal initiatives to the south of Kent Street. New medium to high density mixed use development has been attracted to the Rockingham Beach Road strip and to sites along Kent Street and Flinders Lane.

Provision has been made for an off-shore marina development at the beach front end of Wanliss Street. If the marina is constructed, it will stimulate further investment in nearby development. It could also act as a catalyst for urban renewal along the length of Wanliss Street. The IDP demonstrates that there is significant scope for further complementary development in the adjoining precincts.

Further development consolidation is anticipated within the street blocks of the historic Rockingham Beach townsite. The Rockingham Hotel property encompasses nearly half a street block and the redevelopment of the site with appropriately activated infill development along the Rockingham Beach Road frontage is acknowledged as a priority ‘place-making’ project.
The IDP shows how the western flank of the Village Green could be developed to accommodate a mix of uses. Development scenarios could include a possible Contemporary Arts Centre and/or offices, residential apartments and related commercial tenancies on top of the existing public car park. An elevated pedestrian promenade could overlook the Village Green with connections to Kent Street, the Village Square and Patterson Road.

The landscape transformation of the Village Green and Flinders Lane and the visually impressive architecture of the adjoining Gary Holland Community Centre have combined to add significant depth to the Waterfront Village and create the setting for further urban renewal in properties with identified TOD potential to the south and west of the Village Green and Patterson Road. These properties, extending through to Florence, Langley and Houston Streets, fall within the walkable catchment of the transit system and the core recreation and hospitality attractions of the Waterfront Village.

The IDP illustrates how the area could be redeveloped in an integrated way over time based on the preferred street framing, mixed use development typology described in Section 3.2. Variants to this form of development could range from 2-3 storey terrace housing at the periphery through to medium rise tower on podium developments in nominated street blocks closer to Patterson Road and Railway Terrace. Properties along the southern side of Patterson Road between Read Street and Thorpe Street are strategically well suited to more intensive, tower on podium redevelopment, at a scale that provides a fitting visual backdrop to the Village Green.

The southern extent of the Waterfront Village has been extended to Greene Street to encompass the Challenger Lodge Aged Care facility. It is anticipated that the facility will undergo a staged redevelopment within a medium density building configuration and a significantly enhanced urban landscape.

Existing service commercial properties on the eastern side of Read Street have also been incorporated into the fold of the Waterfront Village with an expectation that they will progressively be redeveloped for higher density mixed use as existing service commercial tenancies consolidate further to the east and south in Rockingham.

The IDP illustrates how Wanliss Street could be upgraded to dual carriageway ‘Boulevard’ status in conjunction with formal landscaping and street lighting to properly define the eastern flank of the Waterfront Village.

To meet the TOD objectives of the Centre Plan along the route of the central transit system, further urban consolidation would be desirable along the western side of Wanliss Street. This applies to properties between the gateway corner of Patterson Road and Wanliss Street through to Smythe Street, as well as under-utilised space around the lawn bowls and tennis club facilities.

The IDP illustrates one way that this could be achieved by integrating residential apartments with new club facilities around the rinks and courts in a manner consistent with the urban consolidation intent of the Centre Plan. The illustrated scheme is indicative only and would not preclude the evaluation of a range of alternative revitalisation options for this part of the Village.

The three nominated sites for public car parks (ie: adjacent to Patterson Road; Kent Street between the museum and tennis club; and on the corner of Harrison Street and Val Street) have been depicted on the IDP as having development potential above the decked car parking level(s). It has been assumed that such development potential on these sites would be subject to the satisfactory accommodation of the planned car parking capacity.

The IDP makes provision for street car parking wherever possible in the Waterfront Village to service visitor parking needs close to adjoining land uses, to distribute traffic as widely as possible and to slow vehicle speeds. The installation of favoured angled median and parallel kerbside parking in Patterson Road between Read Street and Kent Street and on the eastern side of the Waterfront Village in Wanliss Street, could make a significant contribution to each of these outcomes.

Within the scope and meaning of the Planning and Development Principles listed in Section 2.2, there is scope for further flexibility in the interpretation of the DPP requirements that could result in acceptable alternative development configurations to those illustrated in the IDP, particularly in relation to the scale and configuration of individual developments.
3.2 Site Option for Contemporary and Performing Arts Centre (CAPAC)

In October 2010, the Final Report of a Feasibility Study into the development of a Contemporary and Performing Arts Centre short-listed sites in the City Centre, Smart Village and Waterfront Village. The Study illustrated and costed various planning scenarios for each of the site options.

For the Waterfront Village option, the Study explored the feasibility of developing the complex on the site of the existing public car park, on the western side of the Village Green. The CAPAC was configured so that it would frame and address the edge of the Village Green with an entry forecourt accessed from a curved pedestrian promenade. Secondary pedestrian connections to Kent Street were proposed via the existing car park. Various blank walls, car parking and service docks were positioned along the Patterson Road boundary.

While there has been no subsequent action by the State Government or the City to proceed with the implementation of the CAPAC on any of the alternative sites, it is understood that there is a strategic preference amongst stakeholders for the Waterfront Village site option. For this reason, more detailed planning of the Waterfront Village needs to demonstrate how the functions and basic building envelope of the CAPAC could be more effectively integrated with the future development of the Village.

Important factors to be addressed in any re-working of the 2010 CAPAC conceptual design for the Waterfront Village include:-

- Re-siting and reconfiguring the facility to allow for a more credible pedestrian interface with the 'Main Street' streetscape of Kent Street and the Village Square.
- Ensuring that planning for the CAPAC, off-street public car park and any other contemplated uses on the site can be accommodated above the existing high water table.
- Sleeving any servicing or big box elements such as the auditorium with street activating tenancies, including suitably scaled development along the Patterson Road frontage.

3.3 Relevant Residential and Mixed Use Building Typologies

The endorsed Centre Plan provides the planning framework that governs more detailed planning for the City Centre and each of the inter-connected urban villages (including the Waterfront Village). This framework requires a medium to high density TOD outcome that has much in common with inner-city development and urban regeneration projects in other parts of metropolitan Perth and elsewhere in Australia.

To ensure that the types of development proposed within the Centre Plan area are based on relevant development models and building typologies, the characteristics of a representative range of residential and mixed use developments were surveyed, with a particular focus on Activity Centre locations where Government development agencies are involved. Surveyed developments include completed and proceeding projects in Midland, Cockburn Central, Northbridge, Floreat, Melbourne and Rockingham Beach.

Characteristics relevant to the detailed planning and urban design of the Waterfront Village are summarised as follows:-

**Development Forms/Typologies**

- Medium density residential developments should take the form of 2-4 storey multiple dwellings. A smaller component of narrow fronted, 2-3 storey terrace housing could be incorporated in peripheral locations.
- High density residential developments (including mixed use) should predominantly take the form of street framing developments, preferably with internal landscaped courtyards located over basement and/or off-street car parking areas. Developments over 4 storeys in height should generally be sited on 2-3 storey podiums, with upper floors setback from the street front building line of the podium and set back from the adjoining lot boundaries.
Subdivision Design

- Lots should be of sufficient area with dimensions to permit a feasible, functional development. The dimensions of multiple dwelling and mixed use lots should permit conventional car parking layouts and convenient vehicle circulation. Typically, this requires a minimum lot width of 35-40 metres.
- Multiple dwelling and mixed use development lots should generally be 2,500 $m^2$ in area, with a minimum of 2,200$m^2$.
- New multiple dwelling and mixed use development lots should be provided with vehicular access (public roads, laneways) on a minimum of two sides.

3.4 Residential Design Codes

Where residential development is proposed, the R-AC0 density code of State Planning Policy 3.1 – Residential Design Codes (as amended) (R-codes) will apply.

3.5 Residential Density

Figure 3.2 illustrates a Residential Density overlay to the Waterfront Village IDP which is intended to manage the density of development in general accordance with the planning principles and the adopted TOD model described and illustrated in Section 2.

The distribution of residential density in the Waterfront Village responds to the particular functions, amenity and levels of mixed use activity anticipated in the Sector. In general, high density residential development should be located within 250 metres of the Central Transit route, with particular concentrations around planned stops at Railway Terrace, Flinders Lane and Wanliss Street.

The urban design intent of the residential density framework is reflected and refined as necessary in the IDP and in more Detailed Precinct Concept Plans and Guidelines described and illustrated in Section 4.

3.6 Building Height

Figure 3.3 illustrates a Building Height Overlay to the Waterfront Village IDP, with permitted building heights generally rising with proximity to the route of the RCCTS and proximity to activity generators.

The Building Height Overlay supersedes the ‘Building Height Model’ component of the previous Waterfront Village Policy, which was adopted by Council in 2003, over a more confined area of Rockingham Beach. The updated building height provisions of the DPP are generally consistent with the wider TOD based density and height provisions set down in Section 9.2 and 9.3 of the endorsed 2009 Centre Plan. The Centre Plan, with its height and density provisions, was the subject of two rounds of public advertising before it was adopted by the City and subsequently endorsed by the WAPC in 2009.

The Building Height Overlay will generally result in less elevated residential development at the western margin of the Waterfront Village than was envisaged in Figure 9.5 in Volume 1 of the Centre Plan. Variations to the Figure 9.5 of the Centre Plan which could theoretically result in additional building height have generally been confined to locations that are more than 300 metres from the coastline and would not be affected by the State’s Coastal Planning Policy (SPP 2.6). Under SPP 2.6, a maximum height of eight (8) stories or 32 metres is permitted, subject to public support.

The updated building height provisions for the Waterfront Village balance the urban sustainability advantages of high density, mixed use development with the orderly management of the height and massing of buildings, within the following parameters:-

(a) Maintain a 2 to 3 storey building profile to a maximum height of 12.5 metres along all street frontages with building height above 3 storeys to be setback as specified in the Precinct Policies.
(b) Locate development over 19.0 metres (5 storeys) in height on 2-3 storey podiums, with upper floors setback a minimum of 6.0m from the street front building line of the podium and separated from adjoining buildings to maintain vistas, solar access and an appropriate level of visual permeability.

(c) Limit the height of buildings to permit winter sun (mid-day, June 21) penetration to the main kerb line of the footpath along the southern side of Kent Street between Railway Terrace and Wanliss Street. This will protect the winter amenity of ‘Main Street’ tenancies, including sidewalk cafes and restaurants.

(d) Maintain a maximum 10 storey building height limit on properties with that designation in the 2003 Building Height Model. Extend the 10 storey building height limit to the relevant street boundaries of Railway Terrace, Rockingham Beach Road and Flinders Lane property boundaries, subject to the requirements of (a), (b) and (c) above.

(e) Ensure that new development is designed to allow solar access to neighbouring properties.

(f) Locate development over 32.0 metres (10 storeys) in height more than 300 metres from the coastline as generally indicated on Figure 3.3. In this context, development over 32.0 metres in height on properties to the west of Patterson Road should be confined to a maximum depth of 50 metres from the Patterson Road street frontage.

(g) Ensure that new development falls within the maximum building height limits depicted on Figure 3.3, subject to (a), (b), (c), (d), (e) and (f) above.

(h) For the purposes of this Policy, building height means the measurement taken from the natural ground level immediately in front of the centre of the face of the building to a level at the top of the ridge, parapet, or flat roof, whichever is the highest, but does not include any lift plant, water tower or similar utility or service, not exceeding 3 metres in height, or any architectural feature or decoration (other than a freestanding sign) not used for any form of accommodation, which may be approved by the City.

3.7 Frontage Types

The Framework Plan, as it applies to the Waterfront Village Sector, has been formulated in accordance with consolidated ‘Main Street’ development principles that require buildings to frame, address and activate an interconnected, hierarchical street network.

Figure 3.4 illustrates an orderly arrangement of ‘Frontage Types’ in ‘Main Street’ and mixed use areas based on the common principle that building frontages to all streets and major public spaces should be activated.

Four 'Frontage Types' are envisaged, with building frontages positioned and managed according to the desired level of level of street activation and streetscape character as follows:-

**Type 1 – High Level of Activation, Nil Setback**

A highly activated frontage with retail and small scale commercial uses at ground level and a 2 to 3 storey, contiguous facade positioned at the streetfront boundary. At the ground level, buildings should address the street with a fine grained tenancy pattern, and activated shopfronts that are transparent over at least 75% of the area of the facade.

**Type 2 – Medium Level of Activation, Nil Setback**

A medium level of frontage activation with secondary retail, customer oriented offices, small scale commercial tenancies and residential lobbies at ground level and a 2 to 3 storey façade positioned at the streetfront boundary. At the ground level, buildings should address the street with a primary business entrance and a commercial façade that is transparent over at least 60% of the area of the facade.

**Type 3 - Moderate Level of Activation, 2 Metre Setback**

A moderate level of frontage activation with a mix of small scale commercial tenancies and residential apartments at ground level and a 2 to 3 storey façade positioned behind a 2 metre, green landscaped setback. At the ground level, the facades of mixed use buildings would address the street with a commercial shopfront, primary business entrance and/or residential entry lobby that is transparent over at least 60% of the area of the facade. The ground level of Village residential units would address the street with a façade that is transparent over at least 30% of its area.
**Type 4 – Moderate Level of Activation, 2-3.5 Metre ‘green’ Setback**

A moderate level of frontage activation with a mix of small scale commercial tenancies and residential apartments at ground level and a 2 to 3 storey façade positioned behind a 2-3.5 metre, green landscaped setback. At the ground level, the facades of mixed use buildings would address the street with a commercial shopfront, primary business entrance and/or residential entry lobby that is transparent over at least 60% of its facade. Ground level inner-city residential units would address the street with a façade that is transparent over at least 30% of its area.

For the purposes of this Policy, setbacks are the distance measured from the relevant property boundary to the start of any balcony or wall (in the absence of a balcony).

### 3.8 Car Parking

The management of carparking distribution and its impact on townscape quality is an important issue addressed in the Policy Statement. The City is keen to ensure that, where appropriate, statutory carparking standards should not become an impediment to successful urban townscape reconstruction.

#### 3.8.1 Car Parking Requirements

The parking ratios appear within Appendix 1 and are in accordance with Table 4 of Town Planning Scheme No.2. The following requirements applied for the assessment of car parking are in accordance with the requirements of the Scheme:

- In the case of residential development, the cash-in-lieu contribution shall be the visitor allocation as per the Residential Design Codes.
- In the case of commercial or non-residential development, the cash-in-lieu contribution shall be a minimum of 60 per cent of the total number of parking spaces required.
- The number of parking spaces provided on-site may be reduced by the number of parking spaces provided through the cash-in-lieu.
- In the case of development on land within Area A (defined in Figure 3.5), the cash-in-lieu payment shall be not less than the estimated cost to the owner or developer of providing and constructing the parking bays in the form of a decked structure (including full civil works, lighting, signage, line marking and landscaping), for that area of land which would have been occupied by the parking spaces and manoeuvring area as estimated by a qualified civil engineer approved by the Council.

In the case of development on land within Area B (defined in figure 3.5), the cash-in-lieu payment shall not be less than the estimated cost of the owner or developer of providing and constructing the parking bays in the form of on-street parking bays (including full civil works, lighting, signage, line marking and landscaping), for that area of land which would have been occupied by the parking spaces and manoeuvring area as estimated by a qualified civil engineer approved by the Council.

- The applicant will be responsible for submitting to the City, an itemised quotation for these works, prepared by a qualified Civil Engineer, for approval by the City.

Where cash-in-lieu is to be paid, consideration regarding the amount shall be approved by the Director, Planning and Development Services, prior to the application for a Building Permit.

These parking standards relate primarily to new construction and the City may exercise discretion in determining applications for a change of use for existing commercial tenancies.

#### 3.8.2 General Car Parking Standards

In addition to Section 2.6.5, to facilitate contiguous streetfront development and to limit the visual impact of carparks, parking areas shall be consolidated and located behind generally contiguous buildings or an appropriate colonnade or structural screening device (other than a blank wall). Such devices are intended to maintain street facade continuity and in general should not comprise more than 25% of the length of any individual street frontage.

Where individual Precinct development standards allow for some variation to this principle parking areas should be screened from the street by an appropriate structural screening device (other than a blank wall), hedge or planting of an appropriate urban character.
Where restructuring of existing streets or the provision of new streets is possible, provision for on-street parking embayments should be made.

The number of crossovers and driveways serving a development will be limited by the City to maintain streetscape continuity.

4. PRECINCT POLICIES

An important objective of the planning and development process is to encourage mixed use development and diversity within the Waterfront Village. Diversity and administrative flexibility will continue to be facilitated by dealing with property in the Waterfront Village Sector under a single zone in the Scheme.

Ongoing planning and development will be controlled by reference to the IDP and the framework plans relating to Density, Building Height and 'Frontage Types' (referred to in Section 3) and the following Precinct Policies and Design Guidelines and any supplementary development guidelines and related Policy Statements, which Council may adopt from time to time.

The Waterfront Village Sector has been divided into seven Precincts, comprising:

- Foreshore
- Village Green
- Village East
- Village West
- Patterson West
- Patterson East
- Village South

The Waterfront Village Precincts are based on areas where a particular geographic identity, activity mix and/or townscape character is envisaged. The location and boundaries of the Precincts are illustrated in Figure 4.1.

The desired future character, preferred uses and required elements of development within each of these Precincts are further described in the following sections.

4.1 Foreshore Precinct Policy

4.1.1 Application

This Policy applies to the Foreshore Precinct as defined in the Precinct Plan (refer to Figure 4.1). The Foreshore Precinct extends along the foreshore reserve from Val Street through to Wanliss Street and incorporates Churchill and Bell Parks and properties between Rockingham Beach Road, Railway Terrace, Kent Street and Wanliss Street.

4.1.2 Desired Future Character

The visual and economic revitalisation of the Waterfront Village area will be pivotal to the future prospects of the overall Policy Area.

The Precinct has a proud history as a timber port, former district centre and tourist destination. Development along this 'promenade strip' should be designed to imaginatively respond to the opportunity presented by the rare combination of a stimulating ocean outlook, a safe family beach and well-shaded, waterfront parkland.

The Precinct should aim to achieve a lively, mixed use character with an emphasis on land uses which will generate interest and pedestrian activity within the public domain.

A contemporary waterfront aesthetic of varied, yet unified, architectural style (similar to the newer architecture of East Perth and Subiaco) is seen as more appropriate than resorting to a superficially themed (e.g. 'colonial', 'Federation' etc) building appearance.

4.1.3 Preferred Uses

Within the Foreshore Precinct the preferred uses are:

- retail
• entertainment
• eating and drinking places
• short-stay accommodation
• offices and commercial
• recreation
• multiple dwellings/residential

Other permissible uses listed under the Scheme are not preferred.

4.1.4 Required Elements - Foreshore Precinct

The IDP (refer to Figure 3.1) and the Foreshore Precinct Concept Plan (refer to Figure 4.2) show the general location and pattern of development envisaged by the City and preferred under this Policy. Within the scope and meaning of the planning and development principles listed in Section 2.3, there is scope for flexibility in the interpretation of the Centre Plan in relation to the scale and configuration of particular developments. Notwithstanding the indicative intent of these plans, development will be required to incorporate and maintain the following elements, as applicable:-

(a) The Precinct is to be developed as a quality, mixed use area, framed by generally contiguous, streetfront buildings which address the street with a mix of tenancies in a manner consistent with contemporary ‘Main Street’ principles.

(b) Buildings are to be located, configured and activated to frame and address street frontages, laneways and other public spaces in a way that is generally consistent with the Precinct Concept Plan and relevant ‘Frontage Types’, as indicated in Section 3.7.

(c) The City will encourage private landowners to bring about a satisfactory infilling of streetfront buildings along the Rockingham Beach Road frontage between Railway Terrace and Wanliss Street.

(d) Buildings shall be designed to achieve an appropriate use profile along Rockingham Beach Road, with an active, ground floor street frontage incorporating festive, convenience or recreation related retail, entertainment, cafes, restaurants and similar uses. Short-stay accommodation, multiple dwellings, offices, function rooms, etc are the preferred upper floor uses.

(e) The City acknowledges that the most likely form of short stay accommodation in the Precinct will be serviced, residential scale apartments. The City will encourage such development, provided that it occurs in a mixed use arrangement with the ground floor allocated to an appropriately activated retail or commercial use.

(f) Consistent with Figure 3.2 ‘Residential Density’, residential development within the Precinct is to be developed to accommodate a balanced mix of dwelling sizes at preferred densities ranging from 100 to 200 dwellings per hectare, with a minimum density of 80 dwellings per hectare in any development which includes a residential component.

(g) Building height, upper level setbacks, side setbacks etc are to be determined by reference to Sections 3.4 - 3.7 and 4.1.5, Figures 3.3 and 3.3.1 - 3.3.4 and are to present a minimum 2 storey (6.0m) or equivalent parapet height to the street or relevant public space. The scale and massing of buildings are to be designed to minimise overshadowing of adjoining residential properties and public spaces.

(h) Lots 500 and 505 Railway Terrace and Harrison Street contain a mixed use development with a maximum height of 4 storeys, with 2 storey development along the beach front promenade. The City considers the current scale of development to be appropriate given the strategic location and environmental attributes of the location. Lot 1 Val Street contains the Cruising Yacht Club premises and while any proposals to redevelop the site will be assessed on its merits, the scale of development should be consistent with that of existing development on the adjoining Lots 500 and 505 Railway Terrace and Harrison Street.

(i) Notwithstanding the constraints imposed by the high water table, ground floor levels should match the adjacent level of public footpath wherever a medium to high level of frontage activation is indicated on the ‘Frontage Types’ plan in Section 3.7.
Car parking is to be provided in accordance with Clauses 4.15, 4.16 and Table 4 of Town Planning Scheme No.2, refer to Appendix 1.

Car parking is not permitted between the road reserve boundary and building frontages.

To complement the City's townscape objectives for the Waterfront Village, the massing, articulation and facade treatments of all development will be required to adhere to a quality, urban waterfront aesthetic. The basic building finishes should favour materials which complement the colours and textures of the Rockingham coastal landscape to the satisfaction of the City.

Corrugated steel (whether painted or not) or similar wall cladding, face brickwork, reflective glass and curtain-walling will not be permitted.

The frontage of any building is to incorporate and maintain the required area of transparent facade with suitably glazed shopfronts, windows and doors, consistent with the applicable 'Frontage Types' set down in Section 3.7.

Variety and high design standards will be encouraged in the fit-out, awning treatments, signage and private street furniture attached to individual premises. Where appropriate, the City will encourage businesses to use the widened and upgraded public footpaths for street side dining, subject to private street furniture meeting design and quality standards acceptable to the City.

Any subdivision application is to be prepared in conjunction with an Integrated Development Guide Plan (IDGP), to be prepared by or on behalf of the land owner. The IDGP should illustrate three dimensional building envelopes, indicative building configurations, setbacks, pedestrian and vehicular access, indicative car parking layouts and any rights of way or access easements required. In general, a rectilinear subdivision pattern will be preferred with a minimum lot size of 2,200m² to allow for a simple and cohesive layout.

In lieu of the normal landscaping requirements of the Scheme, developers may be required to contribute to the cost of streetscape and/or landscape works within the public domain in the general vicinity of their development site.

4.1.5 Building Height Development Controls - Foreshore Precinct

To be applied in conjunction with Sections 3.4 to 3.7 and Figures 3.3 and 3.3.1 - 3.3.4.

Rockingham Beach Road

Street front:-

Minimum 6.0m/2 storeys, maximum 12.5m/3 storeys within 3.5m street setback, 19.0m between 3.5m and 6.0m street setback, thereafter to either 30.0m or 32.0m high in accordance with Figure 3.3 and Figures 3.3.1 - 3.3.4 and subject to Section 4.1.5 (b), (c), (d) & (e).

Rear of site (other than Rockingham Hotel property):-

Nil from centre-line of street block to 4.0m setback. Variable maximum 19.0m to 32.0m, north of the 4.0m setback.

Ground floor to first floor:-

Minimum 3.6m with a minimum floor to ceiling height of 3.0m.

Kent Street, Flinders Lane, Railway Terrace, Wanliss Street

Street front:-

Minimum 6.0m/2 storeys, maximum 12.5m/3 storeys within 3.5m street setback, 19.0m between 3.5m and 6.0m street setback, thereafter to 32.0m in accordance with Figure 3.3 and Figures 3.3.1 - 3.3.4 and subject to Section 4.1.5 (b), (c), (d) & (e).
Rear of site (other than Rockingham Hotel property):-
   Nil from centre-line of street block to 4.0m setback. Maximum 19.0m between 4.0m and 6.5m setback. Maximum 30.0m thereafter.

Ground floor to first floor:-
   Minimum 3.6m with a minimum floor to ceiling height of 3.0m.

(b) Front and Rear Setbacks:-
Rockingham Beach Road:-
Street front:-
   Nil setback for development to 12.5m high, 3.5m setback for development from 12.5m to 19.0m high, 6.0m setback thereafter.
Rear of site (other than Rockingham Hotel property):-
   Minimum 4.0m setback from centre-line of street block to development from ground level to 19.0m high, height thereafter setback in accordance with R-codes.

Kent Street, Railway Terrace, Flinders Lane and Wanliss Street:-
Street front:-
   Nil setback for development to 12.5m high, 3.5m setback for development thereafter, subject to Kent Street solar height plane (lowest angle of sun at noon on 21 June to reach main footpath/road kerb line on southern side of street).
Rear of site (other than Rockingham Hotel property):-
   Minimum 4.0m setback from centre-line of street block for development from ground level to 19.0m high, height thereafter setback minimum 6.5m.

(c) Side Setbacks:-
Rockingham Hotel site:-
   Side (western) boundary:-
      Nil to 2 or 3 storey podium height. Minimum 4.0m above podium height to 19.0m high, minimum 40.0m thereafter.
Rockingham Beach Road (other than Rockingham Hotel):-
   Side boundary:-
      Nil to 2 or 3 storey podium height. Minimum 4.0m above podium height.

(d) Visual Separation:-
Landmark (Rockingham Hotel) site:-
   Buildings over 19.0m in height not to exceed 70.0m in site width.
Other sites:-
   Buildings over 19.0m in height not to exceed 45.0m in site width.

(e) Site Dimensions:-
   Minimum 25.0m site width for any building over 19.0m high.

4.2 Village Green Precinct Policy
4.2.1 Application
This Policy applies to the Village Green Precinct as defined in the Precinct Plan (refer to Figure 4.1). The Village Green Precinct extends from Patterson Road in the west/south, along Kent Street, to Empress Court/Roscoe Turn in the east and back to Patterson Road.
4.2.2 Desired Future Character

In recent years the Village Green has been transformed into an attractive urban park and entry statement to the Waterfront Village. It will continue to be an amenity catalyst for urban renewal around its perimeter.

The transformation of properties along the eastern side of Flinders Lane will continue with high density residential apartments being developed on sites close to the Village Square. Consistent with the intent of the original Waterfront Village Concept Plan, the IDP has made provision for two new buildings to be added to the southern and eastern flanks of the Square. These buildings could accommodate suitably activated community, arts and/or commercial tenancies.

There is significant scope for further development consolidation in the area bounded by the Village Green, Patterson Road and Kent Street. The existing public car park has been constructed at a lower level than Kent Street to allow for a second level of public car parking in the future.

The IDP has demonstrated that this site could accommodate mixed use development on top of a two level car park. Development options cover a mix of short stay and residential apartments, retail and community uses including a Contemporary Arts Centre. The IDP has explored how these elements could be properly connected to the Village Square, Kent Street and Patterson Road if redevelopment is done in conjunction with the development of the Contemporary Arts Centre (former St John’s Ambulance Station site).

The remaining wedge of property between the car park site and the corner of Patterson Road and Kent Street warrants redevelopment to a higher density that is commensurate with its strategic proximity to the main attractions of the Waterfront Village. Ideally, redevelopment of these properties would be integrated with development of the public car park site to ensure that building massing, access and frontage activation is optimised.

4.2.3 Preferred Uses

Within the Village Green Precinct the preferred uses are:-

- retail
- arts and entertainment
- eating and drinking places
- short-stay accommodation
- offices and commercial
- recreation
- multiple dwellings/residential
- civic and community
- leisure

Other permissible uses listed under the Scheme are not preferred.

4.2.4 Required Elements - Village Green Precinct

The IDP (refer to Figure 3.1) and the Village Green Precinct Concept Plan (refer to Figure 4.3) show the general location and pattern of development envisaged by the City and preferred under this Policy. Within the scope and meaning of the planning and development principles listed in Section 2.3, there is scope for flexibility in the interpretation of the Centre Plan in relation to the scale and configuration of particular developments. Notwithstanding the indicative intent of these plans, development is required to incorporate and maintain the following elements, as applicable:-

(a) The Precinct is to be developed as a quality, mixed use area, framed by generally contiguous, streetfront buildings which address the street with a mix of tenancies in a manner consistent with contemporary ‘Main Street’ principles.

(b) Buildings are to be located, configured and activated to frame and address street frontages, laneways and other public spaces in a way that is generally consistent with the Precinct Concept Plan and relevant ‘Frontage Types’ as indicated in Section 3.7.
(c) Building frontages are to be activated in all cases and the preferred ground floor uses along Kent Street are retail or commercial.

(d) Consistent with Figure 3.2 ‘Residential Density’, residential development within the Precinct is to be developed to accommodate a balanced mix of dwelling sizes at preferred densities ranging from 100 to 200 dwellings per hectare, with a minimum density of 80 dwellings per hectare in any development which includes a residential component.

(e) Building height, upper level setbacks, side setbacks etc are to be determined by reference to Sections 3.4 - 3.7 and 4.2.5, Figures 3.3, 3.3.1 and 3.3.3 and are to present a minimum 2 storey (6.0m) or equivalent parapet height to the street or relevant public space. The scale and massing of buildings are to be designed to minimise overshadowing of adjoining residential properties and public spaces.

(f) Notwithstanding the constraints imposed by the high water table, ground floor levels should match the adjacent level of public footpath wherever a medium to high level of frontage activation is indicated on the ‘Frontage Types’ plan in Section 3.7. In other situations, ground floor levels should not exceed 1.0m in height above the level of the adjacent public footpath.

(g) Car parking is to be provided in accordance with Clauses 4.15, 4.16 and Table 4 of Town Planning Scheme No.2, refer to Appendix 1.

(h) Car parking is not permitted between the road reserve boundary and building frontages.

(i) Off-street car parking is to be located behind, under or over ground floor, streetfront buildings or alternatively, no closer than 20 metres to the streetfront boundary in the case of land identified in the IDP for future building development.

(j) To complement the City's townscape objectives for the Waterfront Village, the massing, articulation and facade treatments of all development will be required to adhere to a quality, urban waterfront aesthetic. The basic building finishes should favour materials which complement the colours and textures of the Rockingham coastal landscape to the satisfaction of the City.

(k) Corrugated steel (whether painted or not) or similar wall cladding, face brickwork, reflective glass and curtain-walling will not be permitted.

(l) The frontage of any building is to incorporate and maintain the required area of transparent facade with suitably glazed shopfronts, windows and doors, consistent with the applicable ‘Frontage Types’ set down in Section 3.7.

(m) Variety and high design standards will be encouraged in the fit-out, awning treatments, signage and private street furniture attached to individual premises. Where appropriate, the City will encourage businesses to use the widened and upgraded public footpaths for streetside dining, subject to private street furniture meeting design and quality standards acceptable to the City.

(n) Any subdivision application is to be prepared in conjunction with an Integrated Development Guide Plan (IDGP), to be prepared by or on behalf of the land owner. The IDGP should illustrate three dimensional building envelopes, indicative building configurations, setbacks, pedestrian and vehicular access, indicative car parking layouts and any rights of way or access easements required. In general, a rectilinear subdivision pattern will be preferred with a minimum lot size of 2,200m$^2$ to allow for a simple and cohesive layout.

(o) In lieu of the normal landscaping requirements of the Scheme, developers may be required to contribute to the cost of streetscape and/or landscape works within the public domain in the general vicinity of their development site.
4.2.5 Building Height Development Controls – Village Green Precinct

To be applied in conjunction with Sections 3.4 to 3.7 and Figures 3.3, 3.3.1 and 3.3.3.

(a) Building Height:-
    Street front:-
        Minimum 6.0m or 2 storeys, maximum 12.5m or 3 storeys within 3.5m street setback, maximum 19.0m between 3.5m and 6.0m street setback.
    Remainder of site:-
        Maximum 30.0m within 300m of coastline and 45.0m or 12 storeys beyond 300 metres from coastline - subject to Sections 4.2.5 (b), (c) and (d).
    Ground floor to first floor:-
        Minimum 3.6m with a minimum floor to ceiling height clearance of 3.0m.

(b) Front Setbacks:-
    Nil at streetfront to 12.5m high, 3.5m thereafter to 19.0m high, 6m thereafter. Refer to R-codes for solar access to properties on the southern side of Patterson Road.

(c) Side Setbacks:-
    Nil to 2 or 3 storey podium height. Minimum 4.0m above podium height.

(d) Visual Separation:-
    Minimum 40% north-south site permeability above 19.0m height.

4.3 Village East Precinct Policy

4.3.1 Application

This Policy applies to the Village East Precinct as defined in the Precinct Plan (refer to Figure 4.1). The Village East Precinct from the Empress Court/Roscoe Turn in the west, Patterson Road to the south, Wanlliss Street to the east and to Kent Street to the north.

4.3.2 Desired Future Character

This Precinct will contain a mix of land uses that will result in a vibrant, diverse and multi-functional Waterfront Village, including recreation uses, such as the Bowling and Tennis Clubs. The Precinct should continue to accommodate premises and facilities for a range of recreation, social and community groups, subject to such facilities being sensitively consolidated where feasible.

Where appropriate, well designed and landscaped infill development could be considered for pockets of the Precinct to add life and to bring a more satisfactory urban profile to the eastern flank of the Waterfront Village.

The addition of compatible short stay and residential apartments and commercial tenancies would reflect the urban consolidation objectives of the Centre Plan and the strategic proximity of these sites to the route of the central transit system and other facilities and attractions. Any new buildings or facilities should be well designed to integrate with the desired townscape character of the larger Waterfront Village.

4.3.3 Preferred Uses

Within the Village East Precinct the preferred uses are:-

- multiple dwellings/residential
- short stay accommodation
- civic and community
- office and commercial
- professional consulting rooms
eating and drinking places
Other permissible uses listed under the Scheme are not preferred.

4.3.4 Required Elements – Village East Precinct

The IDP (refer to Figure 3.1) and the Village East Precinct Concept Plan (refer to Figure 4.4) show the general location and pattern of development envisaged by the City and preferred under this Policy. Within the scope and meaning of the planning and development principles listed in Section 2.3, there is scope for flexibility in the interpretation of the Centre Plan in relation to the scale and configuration of particular developments. Notwithstanding the indicative intent of these plans, development is required to incorporate and maintain the following elements, as applicable:-

(a) The Precinct is to be developed as a mixed use area conforming to an urban townscape discipline.

(b) To ensure that this highly visible edge to the Waterfront Village does not detract from the townscape character of the area, the City will work with individual community groups and leaseholders to examine enhanced development options and to progressively upgrade the visual appearance of the Precinct.

(c) The City will investigate the potential for supplementary streetscape and landscape works to bolster the structural definition of the eastern edge of the Village.

(d) Buildings are to be located, configured and activated to frame and address street frontages, laneways and other public spaces in a way that is generally consistent with the Precinct Concept Plan and relevant 'Frontage Types' as indicated in Section 3.7.

(e) Building frontages are to be activated in all cases and the preferred ground floor uses along Kent Street are retail or commercial.

(f) Consistent with Figure 3.2 ‘Residential Density’, residential development within the Precinct is to be developed to accommodate a balanced mix of dwelling sizes at preferred densities ranging from 80 to 160 dwellings per hectare, with a minimum density of 60 dwellings per hectare in any development which includes a residential component.

(g) Building height, upper level setbacks, side setbacks etc are to be determined by reference to Sections 3.4 - 3.7 and 4.3.5, Figure 3.3 and are to present a minimum 2 storey (6.0m) or equivalent parapet height to the street or relevant public space. The scale and massing of buildings are to be designed to minimise overshadowing of adjoining residential properties and public spaces.

(h) Notwithstanding the constraints imposed by the high water table, ground floor levels should match the adjacent level of public footpath wherever a medium to high level of frontage activation is indicated on the 'Frontage Types' plan in Section 3.7. In other situations, ground floor levels should not exceed 1.0m in height above the level of the adjacent public footpath.

(i) Street framing development with podium level courtyard gardens over car parks will be the preferred infill development model. Examples of this form of development are located at Rockingham Beach, Midland, Mandurah Marina, Joondalup City Centre, Subi-Centro Subiaco and in Northbridge over the Graham Farmer Freeway.

(j) Car parking is to be provided in accordance with Clauses 4.15, 4.16 and Table 4 of Town Planning Scheme No.2, refer to Appendix 1.

(k) Car parking is not permitted between the road reserve boundary and building frontages.

(l) Off-street car parking is to be located behind, under or over ground floor, streetfront buildings or alternatively, no closer than 20 metres to the streetfront boundary in the case of land identified in the IDP for future building development.

(m) To complement the City's townscape objectives for the Waterfront Village, the massing, articulation and facade treatments of all development will be required to adhere to a quality, urban waterfront aesthetic. The basic building finishes should favour materials which complement the colours and textures of the Rockingham coastal landscape to the satisfaction of the City.
(n) Corrugated steel (whether painted or not) or similar wall cladding, face brickwork, reflective glass and curtain-walling will not be permitted.

(o) The frontage of any building is to incorporate and maintain the required area of transparent facade with suitably glazed shopfronts, windows and doors, consistent with the applicable ‘Frontage Types’ set down in Section 3.7.

(p) Variety and high design standards will be encouraged in the fit-out, awning treatments, signage and private street furniture attached to individual premises. Where appropriate, the City will encourage businesses to use the widened and upgraded public footpaths for streetside dining, subject to private street furniture meeting design and quality standards acceptable to the City.

(q) Any subdivision application is to be prepared in conjunction with an Integrated Development Guide Plan (IDGP), to be prepared by or on behalf of the land owner. The IDGP should illustrate three dimensional building envelopes, indicative building configurations, setbacks, pedestrian and vehicular access, indicative car parking layouts and any rights of way or access easements required. In general, a rectilinear subdivision pattern will be preferred with a minimum lot size of 2,200m² to allow for a simple and cohesive layout.

(r) In lieu of the normal landscaping requirements of the Scheme, developers may be required to contribute to the cost of streetscape and/or landscape works within the public domain in the general vicinity of their development site.

4.3.5 Building Height Development Controls – Village East Precinct

To be applied in conjunction with Sections 3.4 to 3.7 and Figure 3.3.

(a) Building Height:-

   Street front:-
   Minimum 6.0m or 2 storeys, maximum 12.5m or 3 storeys between 2.0m and 4.5m street setback, maximum 19.0m between 4.5m and 7.0m street setback, thereafter to maximum 30.0m or 8 storeys, subject to Sections 4.3.5(b), (c) & (d).

   Ground floor to first floor:-
   Minimum 3.6m with a minimum floor to ceiling height clearance of 3.0m.

   Rear of site:-
   Maximum 7.0m over 4.0m setback

(b) Front Setbacks:-
   2.0m landscaped setback for development to 12.5m high, 4.5m setback for development from 12.5m to 19.0m high, 7.0m setback for development from 19.0m to 30.0m high.

(c) Side Setbacks:-
   Nil to 2 or 3 storey podium height. Minimum 4.0m above podium height.

(d) Visual Separation:-
   Minimum 40% north-south site permeability above 19.0m height.

4.4 Village West Precinct Policy

4.4.1 Application

This Policy applies to the Village West Precinct as defined in the Precinct Plan (refer to Figure 4.1). The Village West Precinct extends from the Florence Street, in the west, Langley Street to the south, Houston, May and Val Streets to the east and the foreshore to the north.

4.4.2 Desired Future Character

This Precinct forms part of the western boundary of the Rockingham Strategic Metropolitan Centre. Medium to high density residential development is preferred.
The interface with existing, predominantly single storey residential development beyond should be carefully managed with the massing and scale of buildings stepped down where appropriate to the 2 storey minimum height of the Precinct.

4.4.3 Preferred Uses

Within the Village West Precinct the preferred uses are:-

- multiple dwellings/residential
- office and commercial
- professional consulting rooms
- serviced accommodation

Other permissible uses listed under the Scheme are not preferred.

4.4.4 Required Elements – Village West Precinct

The IDP (refer to Figure 3.1) and the Village West Precinct Concept Plan (refer to Figure 4.5) show the general location and pattern of development envisaged by the City and preferred under this Policy. Within the scope and meaning of the planning and development principles listed in Section 2.3, there is scope for flexibility in the interpretation of the Centre Plan in relation to the scale and configuration of particular developments. Notwithstanding the indicative intent of these plans, development is to be required to incorporate and maintain the following elements, as applicable:-

(a) The Precinct is to be developed as a mixed use area conforming to an urban townscape discipline.

(b) The City will investigate the potential for supplementary streetscape and landscape works to bolster the structural definition of the western edge of the Village.

(c) Buildings are to be located, configured and activated to frame and address street frontages, laneways and other public spaces in a way that is generally consistent with the Precinct Concept Plan and relevant 'Frontage Types' as indicated in Section 3.7.

(d) Consistent with Figure 3.2 ‘Residential Density’, residential development within the Precinct is to be developed to accommodate a balanced mix of dwelling sizes at preferred densities ranging from 80 to 160 dwellings per hectare, with a minimum density of 60 dwellings per hectare in any development which includes a residential component.

(e) Building height, upper level setbacks, side setbacks etc are to be determined by reference to Sections 3.4 - 3.7 and 4.4.5, Figures 3.3 and 3.3.6 and are to present a minimum 2 storey (6.0m) or equivalent parapet height to the street or relevant public space. The scale and massing of buildings are to be designed to minimise overshadowing of adjoining residential properties and public spaces.

(f) For redevelopment of the land within the Village West Precinct a minimum development site size of 2,200m$^2$ is required to allow for development which addresses the required development elements.

(g) Notwithstanding the constraints imposed by the high water table, ground floor levels should not exceed 1.0m in height above the level of the adjacent public footpath.

(h) Street framing development with podium level courtyard gardens over car parks will be the preferred infill development model. Examples of this form of development are located at Rockingham Beach, Midland, Mandurah Marina, Joondalup City Centre, Subi-Centro Subiaco and in Northbridge over the Graham Farmer Freeway.

(i) Car parking is to be provided in accordance with Clauses 4.15, 4.16 and Table 4 of Town Planning Scheme No.2, refer to Appendix 1.

(j) Car parking is not permitted between the road reserve boundary and building frontages.

(k) Off-street car parking is to be located behind, under or over ground floor, streetfront buildings or alternatively, no closer than 20 metres to the streetfront boundary in the case of land identified in the IDP for future building development.
(l) To complement the City's townscape objectives for the Waterfront Village, the massing, articulation and facade treatments of all development will be required to adhere to a quality, urban waterfront aesthetic. The basic building finishes should favour materials which complement the colours and textures of the Rockingham coastal landscape to the satisfaction of the City.

(m) Corrugated steel (whether painted or not) or similar wall cladding, face brickwork, reflective glass and curtain-walling will not be permitted.

(n) The frontage of any building is to incorporate and maintain the required area of transparent facade with suitably glazed shopfronts, windows and doors, consistent with the applicable 'Frontage Types' set down in Section 3.7.

(o) Variety and high design standards will be encouraged in the fit-out, awning treatments, signage and private street furniture attached to individual premises. Where appropriate, the City will encourage businesses to use the widened and upgraded public footpaths for streetside dining, subject to private street furniture meeting design and quality standards acceptable to the City.

(p) Any subdivision application is to be prepared in concert with an Integrated Development Guide Plan (IDGP), to be prepared by or on behalf of the land owner. The IDGP should illustrate three dimensional building envelopes, indicative building configurations, setbacks, pedestrian and vehicular access, indicative car parking layouts and any rights of way or access easements required. In general, a rectilinear subdivision pattern will be preferred with a minimum lot size of 2500m² to allow for a simple and cohesive layout.

(q) In lieu of the normal landscaping requirements of the Scheme, developers may be required to contribute to the cost of streetscape and/or landscape works within the public domain in the general vicinity of their development site.

4.4.5 Building Height Development Controls – Village West Precinct

To be applied in conjunction with Sections 3.4 to 3.6 and Figures 3.3 and 3.3.6.

(a) Building Height:-

Street front:-

Minimum 6.0m or 2 storeys, maximum 12.5m or 3 storeys between 2.0m and 4.5m street setback or to the mid block of western perimeter sites as indicated on Figure 3.3.

Remainder of site:-

Maximum 19.0m, subject to Sections 4.4.5(b), (c) & (d).

Ground floor to first floor:-

Minimum 3.2m with a minimum floor to ceiling height clearance of 3.0m.

Rear of site/laneway:-

Maximum 7.0m over 4.0m setback.

(b) Front Setbacks:-

2.0m landscaped setback to building frontage, 4.5m setback for development from 12.5m to 19.0m high

(c) Side Setbacks:-

Nil to 2 or 3 storey podium height. Minimum 4.0m above podium height.

4.5 Patterson West Precinct Policy

4.5.1 Application

This Policy applies to the Patterson West Precinct as defined in the Precinct Plan (refer to Figure 4.1). The Patterson West Precinct extends from the rear of the lots fronting Patterson Road in the west, encompassing the properties on Benjamin Court to the south, Patterson Road to the north and the Cessnock Way/Commodore Drive lots to the east.
4.5.2 Desired Future Character

The band of properties that runs along the south western flank of Patterson Road and Railway Terrace from Read Street through to Harrison Street is significantly under-developed in its current state, given the proximity of these properties to the facilities and attractions of Rockingham Beach and the Waterfront Village.

The endorsed Centre Plan recognised the potential for urban renewal across this Precinct and this has been factored into the endorsed TOD planning model, with an appropriate allocation of high density mixed use. The Waterfront Village IDP illustrates a variety of development forms and typologies including the favoured street framing model (refer to Section 3.2).

Sculptural built forms have also been illustrated on landmark sites and it is envisaged that such developments would incorporate residential and/or office towers on street framing podiums to create an attractively articulated townscape backdrop to the Village Green that is reflective of the maritime context of the Waterfront Village.

Developments alongside Patterson Road and Railway Terrace should be encouraged to incorporate a ground level retail or commercial component. Cafes and restaurants could be expected to occupy some of that floorspace, particularly between Thorpe Street and Harrison Street.

Development on properties further to the west, including those fronting Ray, Houston and May Streets should be stepped down in scale but should still be configured according to the preferred street framing model. This may require property amalgamations to meet the desired urban design and townscapes objectives of the Policy.

Benjamin Reserve is a poorly integrated public open space that could be reconfigured and enhanced in concert with the provision of a road link to connect Read Street to Ray Street. With a simple landscape makeover to match the planting palette of the Village Green, surrounding properties would be more likely to attract and support an appropriate standard of mixed use development.

4.5.3 Preferred Uses

Within the Patterson West Precinct the preferred uses are:-

- retail
- arts and entertainment
- eating and drinking places
- offices and commercial
- multiple dwellings/residential
- short stay accommodation

Other permissible uses listed under the Scheme are not preferred.

4.5.4 Required Elements - Patterson West Precinct

The IDP (refer to Figure 3.1) and the Patterson West Precinct Concept Plan (refer to Figure 4.6) show the general location and pattern of development envisaged by the City and preferred under this Policy.

Within the scope and meaning of the planning and development principles listed in Section 2.3, there is scope for flexibility in the interpretation of the Centre Plan in relation to the scale and configuration of particular developments. Notwithstanding the indicative intent of these plans, development is required to incorporate and maintain the following elements, as applicable:-

(a) Patterson Road and Railway Terrace are to be developed as highly activated, urban scaled streets framed by generally contiguous, streetfront buildings which address the street with a mix of tenancies in a manner consistent with contemporary ‘Main Street’ principles.

(b) Buildings are to be located, configured and activated to frame and address street frontages, laneways and other public spaces in a way that is generally consistent with the Precinct Concept Plan and relevant ‘Frontage Types’ as indicated in Section 3.7.
(c) Consistent with Figure 3.2 ‘Residential Density’, residential development within the Precinct is to be developed to accommodate a balanced mix of dwelling sizes at preferred densities ranging from 100 to 200 dwellings per hectare, with a minimum density of 80 dwellings per hectare in any development which includes a residential component.

(d) Building height, upper level setbacks, side setbacks etc are to be determined by reference to Sections 3.4-3.7 and 4.5.5, Figures 3.3, 3.3.4, 3.3.5, 3.3.7 and 3.3.8 and are to present a minimum 2 storey (6.0m) or equivalent parapet height to the street or relevant public space. The scale and massing of buildings are to be designed to minimise overshadowing of adjoining residential properties and public spaces.

(e) Notwithstanding the constraints imposed by the high water table, ground floor levels should match the adjacent level of public footpath wherever a medium to high level of frontage activation is indicated on the ‘Frontage Types’ plan in Section 3.7. In other situations, ground floor levels should not exceed 1.0m in height above the level of the adjacent public footpath.

(f) For redevelopment of the land within the Patterson West Precinct a minimum development site size of 2,200m² is required to allow for development which addresses the required development elements.

(g) Street framing development with podium level courtyard gardens over car parks will be the preferred infill development model. Examples of this form of development are located at Rockingham Beach, Midland, Mandurah Marina, Joondalup City Centre, Subi-Centro Subiaco and in Northbridge over the Graham Farmer Freeway.

(h) Car parking is to be provided in accordance with Clauses 4.15, 4.16 and Table 4 of Town Planning Scheme No.2, refer to Appendix 1.

(i) Car parking is not permitted between the road reserve boundary and building frontages.

(j) Off-street car parking is to be located behind, under or over ground floor, streetfront buildings or alternatively, no closer than 20 metres to the streetfront boundary in the case of land identified in the IDP for future building development.

(k) To complement the City's townscape objectives for the Waterfront Village, the massing, articulation and facade treatments of all development will be required to adhere to a quality, urban waterfront aesthetic. The basic building finishes should favour materials which complement the colours and textures of the Rockingham coastal landscape to the satisfaction of the City.

(l) Corrugated steel (whether painted or not) or similar wall cladding, face brickwork, reflective glass and curtain-walling will not be permitted.

(m) The frontage of any building is to incorporate and maintain the required area of transparent facade with suitably glazed shopfronts, windows and doors, consistent with the applicable ‘Frontage Types’ set down in Section 3.7.

(n) Variety and high design standards will be encouraged in the fit-out, awning treatments, signage and private street furniture attached to individual premises. Where appropriate, the City will encourage businesses to use the widened and upgraded public footpaths for streetside dining, subject to private street furniture meeting design and quality standards acceptable to the City.

(o) Any subdivision application is to be prepared in conjunction with an Integrated Development Guide Plan (IDGP), to be prepared by or on behalf of the land owner. The IDGP should illustrate three dimensional building envelopes, indicative building configurations, setbacks, pedestrian and vehicular access, indicative car parking layouts and any rights of way or access easements required. In general, a rectilinear subdivision pattern will be preferred with a minimum lot size of 2,200m² to allow for a simple and cohesive layout.

(p) In lieu of the normal landscaping requirements of the Scheme, developers may be required to contribute to the cost of streetscape and/or landscape works within the public domain in the general vicinity of their development site.
4.5.5 Building Height Development Controls – Patterson West Precinct

To be applied in conjunction with Sections 3.4 to 3.7 and Figures 3.3, 3.3.4, 3.3.5, 3.3.7 and 3.3.8.

(a) **Building Height**:
- Western side of Patterson Road, Railway Terrace (north of Thorpe Street):
  - Minimum 6.0m or 2 storeys, maximum 12.5m or 3 storeys within 3.5m street setback, maximum 19.0m between 3.5m and 6.0m street setback, thereafter maximum 30.0m, subject to Sections 4.5.5(b), (c) & (d).
- Other Streets:
  - Minimum 6.0m or 2 storeys, maximum 12.5m or 3 storeys between 2.0m and 4.5m street setback, thereafter maximum 19.0m to 52.0m high as indicated on Figure 3.3, subject to Sections 4.5.5(b), (c), (d) & (f).

Ground floor to first floor:
- Minimum 3.6m with a minimum floor to ceiling height clearance of 3.0m.

Rear of site/laneway (for unconsolidated street blocks):
- Nil from rear boundary to 6.0m setback, maximum thereafter subject to R-codes.

(b) **Front Setbacks**:
- Western side of Patterson Road, Railway Terrace and Benjamin Way frontages:
  - 3.5m landscaped setback to building frontage, minimum 6.0m setback for building height over 12.5m.
- Other Streets:
  - 2.0m landscaped setback for development to 12.5m high, 4.5m setback for development from 12.5m to 19.0m high, 7.0m setback for development above 19.0m high.

(c) **Side Setbacks**:
- Western side of Patterson Road and Railway Terrace:
  - Nil to 2 or 3 storey podium height. Minimum 4.0m for residential.
- Other Sites:
  - Minimum 4.0m.

(d) **Visual Separation**:
- Minimum 40% north-south visual permeability above 19.0m height.

4.6 Patterson East Precinct Policy

4.6.1 Application

This Policy applies to the Patterson East Precinct as defined in the Precinct Plan (refer to Figure 4.1). The Patterson East Precinct extends from the rear of the lots fronting Patterson Road in the west, encompassing the properties on Benjamin Court to the south, Patterson Road to the north and the Cessnock Way/Commodore Drive lots to the east.

4.6.2 Desired Future Character

The existing pocket of service commercial property that is located to the south of Patterson Road and east of Read Street has potential for more intensive, mixed use urban renewal. It is anticipated that service commercial tenancies will progressively consolidate further to the east in the Challenger Business Park. As redevelopment sites become available in the Patterson East Precinct they should be redeveloped at an urban scale and within an urban townscape discipline.
Properties with less exposure to passing traffic may be well suited for residential development over ground floor offices or showrooms.

4.6.3 Preferred Uses

Within the Patterson East Precinct the preferred uses are:-

- retail
- office and commercial
- professional consulting rooms
- serviced accommodation
- eating and drinking places
- multiple dwellings/residential

Other permissible uses listed under the Scheme are not preferred.

4.6.4 Required Elements - Patterson East Precinct

The IDP (refer to Figure 3.1) and the Patterson East Precinct Concept Plan (refer to Figure 4.7) show the general location and pattern of development envisaged by the City and preferred under this Policy. Within the scope and meaning of the planning and development principles listed in Section 2.3, there is scope for flexibility in the interpretation of the Centre Plan in relation to the scale and configuration of particular developments. Notwithstanding the indicative intent of these plans, development is required to incorporate and maintain the following elements, as applicable:-

(a) The Precinct is to be developed as a high quality, mixed use area with a consolidation of built form that frames the gateway to the Waterfront Village within a more consolidated urban design and townscape context.

(b) Buildings are to be located, configured and activated to frame and address street frontages, laneways and other public spaces in a way that is generally consistent with the Precinct Concept Plan and relevant 'Frontage Types' as indicated in Section 3.7.

(c) Consistent with Figure 3.2 ‘Residential Density’, residential development within the Precinct is to be developed to accommodate a balanced mix of dwelling sizes at preferred densities ranging from 100 to 200 dwellings per hectare, with a minimum density of 80 dwellings per hectare in any development which includes a residential component.

(d) Building height, upper level setbacks, side setbacks etc are to be determined by reference to Sections 3.4-3.7 and 4.6.5 and Figure 3.3 and are to present a minimum 2 storey (6.0m) or equivalent parapet height to the street or relevant public space. The scale and massing of buildings are to be designed to minimise overshadowing of adjoining residential properties and public spaces.

(e) Notwithstanding the constraints imposed by the high water table, ground floor levels should match the adjacent level of public footpath wherever a medium to high level of frontage activation is proposed. In other situations, ground floor levels should not exceed 1.0m in height above the level of the adjacent public footpath.

(f) Street framing development with podium level courtyard gardens over car parks will be the preferred infill development model. Examples of this form of development are located at Rockingham Beach, Midland, Mandurah Marina, Joondalup City Centre, Subi-Centro Subiaco and in Northbridge over the Graham Farmer Freeway.

(g) Car parking is to be provided in accordance with Clauses 4.15, 4.16 and Table 4 of Town Planning Scheme No.2, refer to Appendix 1.

(h) Car parking is not permitted between the road reserve boundary and building frontages.

(i) Off-street car parking is to be located behind, under or over ground floor, streetfront buildings or alternatively, no closer than 20 metres to the streetfront boundary in the case of land identified in the IDP for future building development.
(j) To complement the City's townscape objectives for the Waterfront Village, the massing, articulation and facade treatments of all development will be required to adhere to a quality, urban waterfront aesthetic. The basic building finishes should favour materials which complement the colours and textures of the Rockingham coastal landscape to the satisfaction of the City.

(k) Corrugated steel (whether painted or not) or similar wall cladding, face brickwork, reflective glass and curtain-walling will not be permitted.

(l) The frontage of any building is to incorporate and maintain the required area of transparent facade with suitably glazed shopfronts, windows and doors, consistent with the applicable 'Frontage Types' set down in Section 3.7.

(m) Variety and high design standards will be encouraged in the fit-out, awning treatments, signage and private street furniture attached to individual premises. Where appropriate, the City will encourage businesses to use the widened and upgraded public footpaths for streetside dining, subject to private street furniture meeting design and quality standards acceptable to the City.

(n) Any subdivision application is to be prepared in conjunction with an Integrated Development Guide Plan (IDGP), to be prepared by or on behalf of the land owner. The IDGP shall illustrate building envelopes, indicative building configurations, setbacks, pedestrian and vehicular access, indicative car parking layouts and any rights of way or access easements required. In general, a rectilinear subdivision pattern will be preferred with a minimum lot size of 2,200m² to allow for a simple and cohesive layout.

(o) In lieu of the normal landscaping requirements of the Scheme, developers may be required to contribute to the cost of streetscape and/or landscape works within the public domain in the general vicinity of their development site.

4.6.5 Development Controls – Patterson East Precinct

To be applied in conjunction with Sections 3.4 to 3.7 and Figure 3.3.

(a) Building Height:-

Minimum 6.0m or 2 storeys, maximum 12.5m or 3 storeys between 2.0m and 4.5m street setback, thereafter maximum 19.0m to 30.0m high as indicated on Figure 3.3, subject to Sections 4.6.5(b), (c) & (d).

Ground floor to first floor:-

Minimum 3.6m with a minimum floor to ceiling height clearance of 3.0m.

Rear of site/laneway:-

Maximum 7.0m over 4.0m setback.

(b) Front Setbacks:-

2.0m landscaped setback for development to 12.5m high, 4.5m setback for development from 12.5m to 19.0m high, 7.0m setback for development above 19.0m high.

(c) Side Setbacks:-

Nil to 2 or 3 storey podium height. Minimum 4.0m for residential.

(d) Visual Separation:-

Minimum 40% north-south visual permeability above 19.0m height.
4.7 Village South Precinct Policy
4.7.1 Application
This Policy applies to the Village South Precinct as defined in the Precinct Plan (refer to Figure 4.1). The Village South Precinct extends from Florence, Quin and Houston Streets in the west, Ryan and Greene Streets to the south, Read Street to the east and to the rear of properties fronting Benjamin Court and Patterson Road to the north.

4.7.2 Desired Future Character
This Precinct forms part of the western boundary of the Rockingham Strategic Metropolitan Centre. Medium to high density residential development and aged care accommodation is preferred in the precinct.

The interface with existing, predominantly single storey residential development should be carefully managed with building mass and scale stepped down where appropriate to the 2 storey minimum height of the Precinct.

4.7.3 Preferred Uses
Within the Village South Precinct the preferred uses are:-
- office and commercial
- professional consulting rooms
- serviced accommodation
- multiple dwellings/residential
- aged care

Other permissible uses listed under the Scheme are not preferred.

4.7.4 Required Elements – Village South Precinct
The IDP (refer to Figure 3.1) and the Village South Precinct Concept Plan (refer to Figure 4.8) show the general location and pattern of development envisaged by the City and preferred under this Policy. Within the scope and meaning of the planning and development principles listed in Section 2.3, there is scope for flexibility in the interpretation of the Centre Plan in relation to the scale and configuration of particular developments. Notwithstanding the indicative intent of these plans, development is required to incorporate and maintain the following elements, as applicable:-

(a) The Precinct is to be developed as a mixed use area conforming to an urban townscape discipline.
(b) The City will investigate the potential for supplementary streetscape and landscape works to bolster the structural definition of the southern approach to the Village.
(c) Buildings are to be located, configured and activated to frame and address street frontages, laneways and other public spaces in a way that is generally consistent with the Precinct Concept Plan and relevant ‘Frontage Types’ as indicated in Section 3.7.
(d) Consistent with Figure 3.2 ‘Residential Density’, residential development within the Precinct is to be developed to accommodate a balanced mix of dwelling sizes at preferred densities ranging from 80 to 160 dwellings per hectare, with a minimum density of 60 dwellings per hectare in any development which includes a residential component.
(e) Building height, upper level setbacks, side setbacks etc are to be determined by reference to Sections 3.4-3.7 and 4.7.5 and Figure 3.3 and are to present a minimum 2 storey (6.0m) or equivalent parapet height to the street or relevant public space. The scale and massing of buildings are to be designed to minimise overshadowing of adjoining residential properties and public spaces.
(f) Notwithstanding the constraints imposed by the high water table, ground floor levels should not exceed 1.0m in height above the level of the adjacent public footpath.
(g) For redevelopment of the land within the Village West Precinct a minimum development site size of 2,200m² is required to allow for development which addresses the required development elements.
(h) Street framing development with podium level courtyard gardens over car parks will be the preferred infill development model. Examples of this form of development are located at Rockingham Beach, Midland, Mandurah Marina, Joondalup City Centre, Subi-Centro Subiaco and in Northbridge over the Graham Farmer Freeway.

(i) Car parking is to be provided in accordance with Clauses 4.15, 4.16 and Table 4 of Town Planning Scheme No.2, refer to Appendix 1.

(j) Car parking is not permitted between the road reserve boundary and building frontages.

(k) Off-street car parking is to be located behind, under or over ground floor, streetfront buildings or alternatively, no closer than 20 metres to the streetfront boundary in the case of land identified in the IDP for future building development.

(l) To complement the City's townscape objectives for the Waterfront Village, the massing, articulation and facade treatments of all development will be required to adhere to a quality, urban waterfront aesthetic. The basic building finishes should favour materials which complement the colours and textures of the Rockingham coastal landscape to the satisfaction of the City.

(m) Corrugated steel (whether painted or not) or similar wall cladding, face brickwork, reflective glass and curtain-walling will not be permitted.

(n) The frontage of any building is to incorporate and maintain the required area of transparent facade with suitably glazed shopfronts, windows and doors, consistent with the applicable 'Frontage Types' set down in Section 3.6.

(o) Variety and high design standards will be encouraged in the fit-out, awning treatments, signage and private street furniture attached to individual premises. Where appropriate, the City will encourage businesses to use the widened and upgraded public footpaths for streetside dining, subject to private street furniture meeting design and quality standards acceptable to the City.

(p) Any subdivision application is to be prepared in conjunction with an Integrated Development Guide Plan (IDGP), to be prepared by or on behalf of the land owner. The IDGP should illustrate three dimensional building envelopes, indicative building configurations, setbacks, pedestrian and vehicular access, indicative car parking layouts and any rights of way or access easements required. In general, a rectilinear subdivision pattern will be preferred with a minimum lot size of 2,200m$^2$ to allow for a simple and cohesive layout.

(q) In lieu of the normal landscaping requirements of the Scheme, developers may be required to contribute to the cost of streetscape and/or landscape works within the public domain in the general vicinity of their development site.

4.7.5 Development Controls – Village South Precinct

To be applied in conjunction with Sections 3.4 to 3.7 and Figure 3.3.

(a) Building Height:-

Minimum 6.0m or 2 storeys, maximum 12.5m or 3 storeys between 2.0m and 4.5m street setback, thereafter maximum 19.0m to 30.0m high as indicated on Figure 3.3, subject to Sections 4.7.5(b), (c) & (d).

Ground floor to first floor:-

Minimum 3.6m with a minimum floor to ceiling height clearance of 3.0m.

Rear of site/laneway:-

Maximum 7.0m over 4.0m setback.

(b) Front Setbacks:-

2.0m landscaped setback for development to 12.5m high, 4.5m setback for development from 12.5m to 19.0m high, 7.0m setback for development above 19.0m high.
(c) Side Setbacks:
   Nil to 2 or 3 storey podium height. Minimum 4.0m for residential.

(d) Visual Separation:
   Minimum 40% north-south visual permeability above 12.5m height.

5. SUPPLEMENTARY POLICIES

5.1 Central Arts Policy

5.1.1 Objective

The objective of the Central Arts Policy is to integrate the arts and culture into the built fabric and the day-to-day functioning of the Strategic Metropolitan Centre.

5.1.2 Aspects of the Policy

- The Central Arts Policy will foster ongoing development of an arts culture through the provision of facilities, the programming of arts and cultural activities and the incorporation of an arts component into the planning, development and operation of the Strategic Metropolitan Centre.

- A public art component is to be incorporated into major public building and townscape commissions.

- The City will facilitate the execution of public art beyond the familiar stand-alone sculpture or painting to encompass integral contributions to the form and aesthetics of public spaces, building facades, landscape and street furniture.

- Public art may act as significant landmarks at key entry points to the City or specific spaces and buildings or it may be employed to reinforce localised identity as has, for example, already occurred in the City Square, in the forecourt of the Justice complex and more recently at the gateway to the Waterfront Village.

- An ongoing programme of arts and cultural activities and community involvement will be pursued by the City to ensure that a wide cross section of interests and age groups is catered for in the development and functioning of the City Centre.

- Arts and community festivals will provide opportunities for periodic expression and the enlivenment of the public domain.

5.1.3 Funding of Public Art

A diverse range of funding options is to be pursued for the ongoing development of arts facilities, the running of arts programmes and the incorporation of public art within development.

One percent of the capital cost of public buildings and other appropriate public works is intended to be set aside for the integration of an arts component.

The City will work with other tiers of Government and the private sector to achieve similar funding for public art.

5.2 Security Policy

5.2.1 Objective

The objective of the Security Policy is to integrate a passive approach to crime prevention through appropriate planning and environmental design measures to minimise both the actual and perceived incidence of crime.

5.2.2 Passive Security Principles

In assessing planning and development proposals, the City will have regard for the incorporation of the following passive security principles:

- Incorporate residential occupation into as much of the Waterfront Village as possible to provide extended hours, low key surveillance of public space and buildings.

- Activate the ground or street level of the Waterfront Village as much as possible.
• Avoid grade separated movement networks which remove pedestrian activity from the street.
• Frame streets, pedestrian routes and public spaces with active building frontages to minimise the area of exposed, blank walls and the prevalence of pockets of unclaimed space.
• Give priority to ground floor building tenancies (usually retail) which generate people movement and incorporate glazed shopfronts etc with a minimum of blank wall surface.
• Encourage commercial and community occupation of public pedestrian pavements - whether it be in the form of outdoor restaurants, cafes, charity stalls, buskers or street theatre.
• Make public spaces, pedestrian pavements and parks and gardens attractive, comfortable and well lit.
• Orient residential development towards public streets and laneways such that the outlook oversees the public domain and a defensible pattern of built form and space is established.
• Select durable and easily cleaned materials and finishes where public contact is envisaged.

6. DELEGATION
The Council has the authority to delegate the determination of any application for planning approval. An applicant wishing to know whether the Council or one of the City’s officers will determine an application should contact the City.

7. ADOPTION
This Planning Policy was adopted by the Council at its ordinary Meeting held on the 24th November 2009.

8. AMENDMENT
This Planning Policy was amended by the Council at its ordinary Meeting held on the 24th April 2012.

This Planning Policy is to come into operation at the same time that Amendment No.113 to the Scheme comes into operation.

Appendices
A1 Car Parking
A2 Interpretations
### TABLE A.1
CAR PARKING REQUIREMENTS / ALLOWANCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USE</th>
<th>MINIMUM PARKING REQUIREMENT (AND MAXIMUM PARKING ALLOWABLE - IN BRACKETS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>The provisions of the Residential Design Codes are taken to apply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cinema, Theatre</td>
<td>1 bay per 8 seats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting Rooms</td>
<td>3 bays per consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast Food Outlet</td>
<td>1 bay per 14m² NLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Studio</td>
<td>1 bay per 20m² NLA available to the public, including swimming pools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>1 bay per 40m² NLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Recreation, Restaurant, Reception Centre</td>
<td>1 bay for every 8 persons the building is designed to accommodate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shop</td>
<td>1 bay per 22 m² NLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Showroom, Warehouse</td>
<td>1 bay per 80 m² NLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel, Motel, Tavern</td>
<td>1 bay per bedroom plus 1 bay for every 6.5m² of bar and public areas including lounges, beer gardens and restaurants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Care Premises</td>
<td>1 bay per employee and 1 bay per eight children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Assembly, Public Worship</td>
<td>1 bay per 8 seats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Stay Accommodation</td>
<td>The provisions of the Residential Design Codes with respect to multiple dwellings are taken to apply</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Planning Services Committee Minutes  
Monday 16 April 2012

A2 Interpretations

Active or Interactive Frontages

Refers to street frontages where there is an active visual and physical engagement between people in the street and those on the ground floors of buildings. This quality is assisted where the building facades include the main entrances, and the ground floor uses (such as shops, cafes, offices and residential dwellings) face and open towards the street. Refer to Section 4.4, for an explanation of the various levels of activation related to ‘Frontage Types’.

Amenity

Means all those factors which combine to form the character of an area and includes the present and likely future amenity.

Articulation

An element of building design which means the breaking up of a façade into individual elements to provide a modulated effect aimed at enhancing individual building identity, variety and interest. This can be achieved through the use of such elements as window projections, balconies, awnings, minor recesses and/or projections of walls or parts of walls to provide visual interest, and to enhance the ‘fine grained’ scale of development.

Building Envelope

Means an area of land within a lot marked on a plan approved by the responsible authority, within which all buildings must be contained.

Built Form

The configuration of the aggregate of all buildings, structures, etc., which make up a town or city.

Bulk

The size or mass of a building, referring to structures which in their context appear relatively large.

Character

Character is essentially the combination of the public and private domains. Every property, public place or piece of infrastructure makes a contribution, whether large or small. It is the cumulative impact of all these contributions that establishes Precinct or neighbourhood character.

Centre Plan

Means the Rockingham Strategic Metropolitan Centre - Centre Plan, Volumes 1 and 2 as adopted by the Council on the 22nd September 2009 and the Western Australian Planning Commission on the 10th November 2009.

City Centre

Means the major retail, commercial, civic and mixed use activity centre and the major social and employment hub of the Strategic Metropolitan Centre. In this instance, the existing extent of the City Centre Sector is defined in Figure 3.2.

Facade

Means the exposed face(s) of a building towards roads or open space, or the frontal outward appearance of a building.

Fine Grain

Refers to horizontal strips of development broken into a vertical rhythm by individual shop fronts and windows. This is usually a reflection of the original subdivision pattern of narrow lot frontages. A similar visual effect can be created for new, wide frontage development if the building is broken up into narrow modules by the use of architectural detailing and different colours.
Height
Means the measurement taken from the natural ground level immediately in front of the centre of the face of the building to a level at the top of the ridge, parapet, or flat roof, whichever is the highest, but does not include any lift plant, water tower or similar utility or service, not exceeding 3 metres in height, or any architectural feature or decoration (other than a freestanding sign) not used for any form of accommodation, which may be approved by the City.

Human Scale
Buildings of a size or comprising a range of architectural elements which are of a magnitude and proportion related to our bodily dimensions.

Laneway
Means a narrow or very narrow local ‘street’, usually paved without a verge, located along the rear and/or side property boundary. Might be used exclusively by pedestrians, or shared by both pedestrians and vehicles, depending upon the circumstances.

Legibility
Is where the design of a street system provides a sense of direction and connection, giving clear signals regarding the spatial layout and geography of an area.

Light Rail or Streetcar
A modern electric tram system which usually runs on-street, but may also be capable of being segregated from road traffic.

‘Main Street’
Means mixed land use developments fronting a street in a manner whereby pedestrian access to the majority of individual businesses can be achieved directly from the street, and/or where customer car parks on private property do not separate the road reserve boundary from the front of a building.

Massing
The size and volume of a building.

Mixed Use Development
Good mixed use development involves the ‘fine grain’ mixing of compatible land uses in a balanced blend, integrated in close proximity to each other. Physically it includes both vertical and horizontal mixing of uses. No single use should dominate other uses, although residential use is often the major component. Good mixed use development has the potential to improve the efficiency and amenity of neighbourhoods, reduce travel demand, increase walkability, and make more efficient use of available space and buildings.

Precinct
Means a local area defined for the purposes of describing and managing the preservation and/or development of specific urban characteristics.

Public Realm or Public Domain
Means spaces that are physically accessible to the public, and those aspects of other spaces that are visible from physically accessible spaces. It incorporates features such as streets, parks, shops, community buildings and the street facades of other buildings.

Scale
The size of a building and its relationship with its surrounding buildings or landscape.

Sector
Means a distinct geographic area within a Centre that may reflect an established local identity, coordinated ownership, zoning and/or policy characteristics. A sector may be comprised of one or a number of precincts.
Setback
Means the distance measured from the relevant property boundary to the start of any balcony or wall (in the absence of a balcony).

Strategic Metropolitan Centre
Means the area as defined by the Centre Plan as the Rockingham Strategic Metropolitan Centre. The boundary is defined in Figure 2.1.

Street Alignment
Means the common boundary between the land comprising a street (i.e. the road reserve), and the land abutting it.

Street Setback
Means the horizontal distance between the street alignment and a building, measured at right angles to the street alignment. The ‘street setback area’ is the area between the street alignment and the street setback line.

Streetscape
c means the total visual impression gained from any one location within a street including the natural and man-made elements; and
d is made up of the appearance of, and the relationships between, buildings in terms of design, scale, materials, colours, finishes, signs, external furniture, paving materials for roads, footpaths and landscaping.

Surveillance
Means the presence of passers-by or the ability of people to be seen in public spaces from surrounding windows, decks, balconies or the like. ‘Casual surveillance’ means “eyes on the street” provided by local people going about their daily activities.

Sustainability
Is meeting the needs of current and future generations through an integration of environmental protection, social advancement and economic prosperity.

Sustainable Development
Means development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.

Traffic Calming
Means the introduction of physical traffic management measures or techniques into a road or street aimed at reducing the impact of traffic on that road or street.

Transit Oriented Development (TOD)
Means a compact, mixed use community within the walkable catchment of a transit place, blending housing, shopping, employment and public uses in a pedestrian-friendly environment that makes it convenient and practicable for residents and employees to travel by public transport instead of by private car.

Urban Form
Means the broad shape and structure of an urban community and the distribution of its major features.

Walkability
Means the ease with which a person can walk in an area.

Walkable Catchment
Means the actual area served within a 600m (5 to 10 minute) walking distance along the street system from a central transit system stop or an 800m walking distance from the City Centre.
Waterfront Village

Refers to the area of the old Rockingham Beach town centre which includes a waterfront park, beachfront cafes, restaurants, ‘Main Street’ shops, community facilities, apartments and a mixed use urban renewal project around a new Village Green. Refer to Figure 3.1.” (Policy ends)
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Figure 2.3 - Adopted Movement Network

LEGEND
- STREET BASED TRANSIT SYSTEM
- TRANSIT STATIONS
- MAJOR TRAFFIC ROUTES
- CITY CENTRE ACCESS STREETS
- TRAFFIC LIGHTS
- ROUNDABOUT
- TRANSIT BOULEVARD & TRANSIT PRIORITY STREETS
- CITY CENTRE / TOWN CENTRE STREETS
- LOW SPEED PARK ROAD (Closed at certain times)
- PARKING STREETS
- CONNECTOR STREETS
- PEDESTRIAN LINKS

Figure 2.4 - Proposed Principle Public Transport Routes

LEGEND
- RAIL STATION, CITY CENTRE, UNIVERSITY, FORESHORE SERVICE
- ROCKINGHAM TO FREMANTLE PRINCIPAL TRANSIT SERVICE
- PRINCIPAL SOUTHERN FEEDER SERVICES TO CENTRE AND RAIL STATION
- EXPRESS SERVICES TO TRAIN STATION FROM THE SOUTH
Figure 3.1 - Waterfront Village Indicative Development Plan

Figure 3.1.1 - Indicative Development Cross Section - Rockingham Beach Road
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Figure 3.3.2 - Profile of Development Section BB

Figure 3.3.3 - Profile of Development Section CC

Figure 3.3.4 - Profile of Development Section DD
Figure 3.3.5 - Profile of Development Section EE

Figure 3.3.6 - Profile of Development Section FF
CONFIRMED AT A PLANNING SERVICES MEETING
HELD ON MONDAY, 14 MAY 2012

PRESIDING MEMBER
Figure 4.8 - Village South Precinct Concept Plan
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9. The Committee’s Reason for Varying the Officer’s Recommendation

Not applicable

10. Implications of the Changes to the Officer’s Recommendation

Not applicable
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference No &amp; Subject:</th>
<th>DPD-005/12 Offer to Purchase City Owned Land - Rockingham City Centre</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>File No:</td>
<td>LUP/227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proponent/s:</td>
<td>Rock Garden Pty Ltd ATF Rock Garden Unit Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author:</td>
<td>Ms Tamara Vreeken, Special Projects Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Contributors:</td>
<td>Mr Bob Jeans, Director Planning &amp; Development Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of Committee Meeting:</td>
<td>16th April 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously before Council:</td>
<td>December 2011 (DPD-012/11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure of Interest:</td>
<td>Executive Function</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Council’s Role in this Matter:</td>
<td>Lot 404 Cnr Civic Boulevard and Chalgrove Avenue, Rockingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site:</td>
<td>Lot 404 Cnr Civic Boulevard and Chalgrove Avenue, Rockingham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Area:</td>
<td>2,506m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LA Zoning:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRS Zoning:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachments:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maps/Diagrams:</td>
<td>Figure 1 – Location Plan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Figure 1 - Location Plan**
1. **Purpose of Report**

To consider accepting, in principle, an Offer to Purchase Lot 404 corner Civic Boulevard and Chalgrove Avenue, Rockingham, which is owned by the City.

2. **Background**

In early 2006 the City undertook a public tender process for the sale of the three development sites created from its Lot 80 Civic Boulevard landholding, being:

- Lot 401 Cnr Civic Boulevard and Central Promenade (southern site; 1254sqm)
- Lot 403 Civic Boulevard (central site; 2303sqm)
- Lot 404 Cnr Civic Boulevard and Chalgrove Avenue (northern site; 2506sqm)

Three tenders were received, but rejected by Council in April 2006 as unacceptable.

In June 2011, the City received an Expression of Interest from the Property Matrix on behalf of Rock Garden Pty Ltd ATF Rock Garden Unit Trust to purchase Lot 404 Civic Boulevard.

Property Matrix intends to construct a mixed use development and has advised that it will liaise closely with City Officers in terms of design and land use mix.

In November 2011, Rock Garden Pty Ltd ATF Rock Garden Unit Trust submitted a written Offer to purchase Lot 404. The details of the Offer are as follows:

1. Purchaser's name and address: Rock Garden Pty Ltd ATF Rock Garden Unit Trust
   
   Suite 22, 18 Stirling Hwy
   
   Nedlands WA 6009
   
   ACN 137 012 901

2. Property: Lot 404 on Deposited Plan 43452

3. Purchase Price: $1,315,000 ex GST

4. Deposit: $65,750 ex GST

3. **Details**

In accordance with the provisions of section 3.58(3) and (4) of the Local Government Act 1995, the proposed Land sale was advertised in the Weekend Courier and West Australian for a period of two weeks, concluding on the Monday 12th March 2012. No submissions were received during the comment period.

The Council is now required to resolve, by Absolute Majority, to proceed with the land transaction as advertised prior to proceeding with the contract documentation.

4. **Implications to Consider**

a. **Consultation with the Community**

   Under section 3.58(3) and (4) section of the Local Government Act 1995, the Council is to give local public notice of the proposed disposition for a minimum period of 14 days.

b. **Consultation with Government Agencies**

   Not required.

c. **Strategic**

   **Community Plan**

   This item addresses the Community’s Vision for the future and specifically the following Aspiration contained in the Community Plan 2011:-
Aspiration 11: Planning for Population growth to ensure that future development and land-uses contribute to a sustainable city that provide for a genuinely desirable lifestyle.

d. Policy
The sale of the land will be subject to any Development Application being consistent with the requirements of Planning Policy No.3.2.1 – Development Policy Plan City Centre Sector. In particular, the requirements of the Core Precinct and the Civic Piazza Sub Precinct.

e. Financial
Proceeds from the sale (less costs and commissions) are proposed to be allocated to Sub Account No.6108 - City Centre Development Reserve.

f. Legal and Statutory
3.58. Disposing of property

(3) A local government can dispose of property other than under subsection (2) if, before agreeing to dispose of the property:-

(a) it gives local public notice of the proposed disposition:-
   (i) describing the property concerned; and
   (ii) giving details of the proposed disposition; and
   (iii) inviting submissions to be made to the local government before a date to be specified in the notice, being a date not less than two weeks after the notice is first given;

and

(b) it considers any submissions made to it before the date specified in the notice and, if its decision is made by the council or a committee, the decision and the reasons for it are recorded in the minutes of the meeting at which the decision was made.

(4) The details of a proposed disposition that are required by subsection (3)(a)(ii) include:-

(a) the names of all other parties concerned; and
(b) the consideration to be received by the local government for the disposition; and
(c) the market value of the disposition:-
   (i) as ascertained by a valuation carried out not more than six months before the proposed disposition; or
   (ii) as declared by a resolution of the local government on the basis of a valuation carried out more than six months before the proposed disposition that the local government believes to be a true indication of the value at the time of the proposed disposition.

5. Comments
The ‘Contract of Sale’ has been prepared by the Council’s solicitors and the prospective purchaser has agreed to sign the required documentation.

In this regard, on receipt of the signed documents from the Purchaser, the Mayor and Chief Executive Officer will sign the documents on behalf of Council.

6. Voting Requirements
Absolute Majority
7. Officer Recommendation

That Council:-

1. **PROCEED** with the sale of Lot 404 Civic Boulevard, Rockingham, as advertised.
2. **ALLOCATE** the proceeds from the sale (less costs and commissions) to Sub Account No.6108 - City Centre Development Reserve.

8. Committee Recommendation

That Council:-

1. **PROCEED** with the sale of Lot 404 Civic Boulevard, Rockingham, as advertised.
2. **ALLOCATE** the proceeds from the sale (less costs and commissions) to Sub Account No.6108 - City Centre Development Reserve.
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9. The Committee's Reason for Varying the Officer's Recommendation

   Not applicable

10. Implications of the Changes to the Officer’s Recommendation

   Not applicable
## Purpose of Report

To seek the Council's endorsement of the 'Aspiration' and 'Principles' derived from the 'Keralup Vision and Strategy Workshop' held on the 15th March 2012.

## Background

The progress of the proposed Keralup development has been well documented with regular updates in the Information Bulletin to the Planning Services Committee (refer to Project Status Report 3.5 from the Director, Planning & Development Services).

In summary, Keralup is a 4,000ha parcel owned by the Department of Housing in the south-east corner of Rockingham that extends into the Shire of Murray. It is situated east of the Kwinana Freeway and contains portion of the Serpentine River.
For many years, the Department of Housing has expressed an interest in developing the landholding for residential purposes. Its interest has now reached a stage where a Metropolitan Region Scheme rezoning application for ‘Keralup West’ (about 100ha located between the Kwinana Freeway and the Serpentine River) is being progressed. The Council conditionally supported the rezoning but advised that it would not favourably consider subsequent phases of the planning process until key project implementation and regional planning issues are resolved.

The Department of Housing has undertaken a body of work to justify the urbanisation of the land, including the preparation of a draft District Structure Plan which provides for upwards of 90,000 people, a series of Activity Centres and large areas of open space for environmental protection and water management.

The development of Keralup has been listed as a priority land release by both the Department of Housing and the Western Australian Planning Commission, however, the State Government has not formally committed to the Project.

### 3. Details

The urbanisation of Keralup presents many issues and challenges that require careful consideration and management. The City’s involvement in the processes to-date has sought to identify the issues or constraints and seek appropriate responses from the Department of Housing.

The primary issues of concern include the following:

- The isolated nature of the land and its lack of integration with existing urban development;
- The lack of sub-regional planning to give context to the proposed development;
- The environmental characteristics of the land and its suitability for urban development (including water management and mosquito management); and
- The absence of a statutory framework and project governance structure to guide the Project.

In its pursuit of a response to the above issues, the City has sought from the State Government (via the Department of Housing) an understanding of its vision and aspirations for the Project. As detailed above, the State Government is yet to commit to the development of Keralup, and as a result, its aspirations have not been revealed to the City.

The Department of Housing’s draft District Structure Plan contains a series of ‘Key Development Principles’ which provide an insight into the planning parameters around which the Project could evolve. These Principles are contained in a document that has no status (is it yet to be lodged for assessment) and do not reflect the adopted position of the State Government.

Recognition of the Project, and an indication of a vision, is considered to be an important step in confirming its bone fides and focussing the manner in which it will be progressed. It should also have the benefit of channelling funding commitments to the vital elements of the Project.

In the absence of a State Government vision for the Project, the City embarked on a process to establish the Council’s, and by extension the community’s, vision for Keralup. The intent was to clearly state the outcomes that the Council expects Keralup to deliver which will focus the City’s input into the Keralup planning process and inform the Department of Housing accordingly.

In order to arrive at the vision, the City liaised with leading Urban Design and Planning Consultancy, Roberts Day, which had previously undertaken similar exercises for other significant greenfield developments, most notably Ellenbrook. The similarities between Keralup and Ellenbrook are many as, prior to it being developed, Ellenbrook was a substantial parcel of land (albeit much smaller than Keralup), owned by the Department of Housing in a location that was isolated from the urban development front.

‘Liveability Criteria’

It was established that Roberts Day applies its ‘Liveability Criteria’ to visioning exercises which involves nine elements that contribute to the success or otherwise of a new urban development. Should the development achieve good outcomes across all criteria then it should follow that a sustainable and desirable community is established.
The ‘Liveability Criteria’ are listed below:

(i) Place (or ‘Sense of Place’)
(ii) Housing
(iii) Cultural and Community
(iv) Health and Wellbeing
(v) Environment (the natural environment and sustainable living)
(vi) Employment and Economy
(vii) Education and Learning
(viii) Access (all modes of access including walking/cycling, public transport and the private car)
(ix) Governance (how the Project is managed, regulated and guided)

Further explanation of the ‘Liveability Criteria’, and ‘Need and Opportunities’ as they relate to Keralup, is provided in Attachment 1.

The above ‘Liveability Criteria’, although established by Roberts Day, contains most of the principles that are commonly applied in visioning exercises throughout Australia and abroad, as they are recognised as being the foundations for establishing successful communities.

The City subsequently commissioned Roberts Day to apply its ‘Liveability Criteria’ to Keralup and facilitate a Workshop of the various stakeholders.

‘Vision and Strategy Workshop’

Representatives from all local stakeholders that have an interest in Keralup were invited to attend the Workshop, including the following:

- City of Rockingham Councillors
- Relevant City of Rockingham Officers
- Golden Bay, Singleton, Secret Harbour and Baldivis Residents Associations
- Local members of State Parliament
- Rockingham and Kwinana Chamber of Commerce
- Shire of Murray

Representatives from the Department of Housing and other State Government agencies were not invited to the Workshop as the process was intended to establish the local community’s vision for Keralup.

A total of thirty three (33) people participated in the Workshop on the afternoon of the 15th March 2012 representing an excellent cross-section of interests. The list of attendees is provided in Attachment 2.

The format for the Workshop involved the participants initially being informed of the City’s strategic approach to Keralup along with information about the landholding and its context. Mr Erwin Roberts, from Roberts Day, then spoke about the ‘Liveability Criteria’, the experiences with Ellenbrook and the format of the Workshop.

The Workshop attendees were split into three groups with each given three ‘Liveability Criteria’ to discuss. The groups were asked to list what they consider to be important under the headings in a Keralup context. The exercise was intended to provide a positive contribution to the evolution of Keralup and not focus on the constraints to development.

Each group reported its findings to the Workshop participants who were invited to contribute other matters which may not have been raised.

The Workshop produced a range of comments and desires under each of the ‘Liveability Criteria’ which were reviewed, and refined where necessary, by Roberts Day and City Officers the following day. This exercise resulted in an ‘Aspiration’ and set of ‘Principles’ under the nine ‘Liveability Criteria’.
The ‘Principles’ are a list of the various components that, if implemented, will contribute to the ‘Liveability Criteria’ realising good outcomes and the ‘Aspirations’ are short statements that seek to capture the intent of the ‘Principles’.

The draft ‘Aspirations’ and ‘Principles’ are contained within Attachment 3.

### 4. Implications to Consider

**a. Consultation with the Community**

The Workshop process involved representatives from the community stakeholders that have an interest in Keralup and the adopted ‘Keralup Vision Document’ will be provided to those stakeholders.

**b. Consultation with Government Agencies**

The adopted ‘Keralup Vision Document’ will be provided to the relevant State Government agencies, including the Department of Housing.

**c. Strategic Community Plan**

This item addresses the Community’s Vision for the future and specifically the following Aspiration contained in the Community Plan 2011:-

**Aspiration 11:** Planning for population growth to ensure that future development and land-uses contribute to a sustainable city that provides for a genuinely desirable lifestyle.

**d. Policy**

Nil

**e. Financial**

Nil

**f. Legal and Statutory**

Nil

### 5. Comments

The ‘Aspirations’ and ‘Principles’ are considered to represent a comprehensive basis to achieving good outcomes at Keralup. They reflect the desires and objectives communicated at the ‘Vision and Strategy Workshop’ which was attended by the local community stakeholders.

It is recommended that the ‘Aspirations’ and ‘Principles’ be endorsed by the Council following which they will be placed in the Council’s ‘Keralup Vision Document’.

The ‘Keralup Vision Document’ will be a well presented, graphical publication, that offers information about the Project, explains the basis of the ‘Liveability Criteria’, contains the ‘Aspirations and Principles’ and states its intended purpose.

The ‘Keralup Vision Document’ will guide the City’s ongoing strategic approach to Keralup and generate various actions to realise the intended outcomes. It will also provide the Department of Housing with a clear indication of the matters that the Council will pursue in its ongoing involvement in the processes leading up to development commencing at Keralup.

The content of the ‘Keralup Vision Document’ will also be a useful resource in developing the Town Planning Scheme Provisions for Keralup when the statutory framework is established. In this regard, it is likely that many of the ‘Aspirations’, or slight variations thereto, will become Objectives within the Scheme.

When the ‘Keralup Vision Document’ has been prepared, a copy will be provided to all Workshop invitees, relevant State Government agencies and the Department of Housing representatives.
The City will also prepare an internal document that will identify the step/s in the planning process where the various ‘Principles’ should be progressed and who are the responsible parties. This document will be presented to the Council through the Information Bulletin to the Planning Services Committee.

6. Voting Requirements

Simple Majority

7. Officer Recommendation

That the Council ENDORSE the ‘Aspirations’ and ‘Principles’ established for Keralup following the ‘Vision and Strategy Workshop’.

8. Committee Recommendation

That the Council ENDORSE the ‘Aspirations’ and ‘Principles’ established for Keralup following the ‘Vision and Strategy Workshop’, as follows:-

“(i) PLACE

Aspiration

Create a strong sense of place that draws inspiration from the uniqueness of the Serpentine River and wetlands, the distinctive landscape and vegetation, the views to the Darling Escarpment and local culture and heritage.

Principles

Celebrate Serpentine River, wetlands and surrounding landscape

• Optimise Serpentine River, including Lake Amarillo, and other significant wetlands as the foundations for the place identity of Keralup.

• The design of the main entry route from the west, including the river crossing into Keralup, to reinforce its distinctive place identity.

• The design of streets and parks to preserve view corridors to the Darling Escarpment.

Draw linkages with local heritage

• Open space, boardwalks, trails and public art to incorporate interpretations of local indigenous and European heritage.

Become a self-sustainable community

• Keralup to be recognised as a self-sustainable community of choice where people can work, live and recreate locally.

Local neighbourhood identity

• Keralup to be structured into distinctive neighbourhoods, each with their own clear place identity, supported through building design, architecture and landscape, and framed by natural vegetation.

• Respond to the relatively flat terrain by creating points of interest that assist with legibility and placemaking, including the incorporation of terminating vistas and landmark elements.

• The early provision of community facilities and services to assist in the formation of local identity and community.

Reflect best practice

• Deliver best practice in urban planning, engineering, landscape, architecture, transit and transport to all facets of place delivery.
(ii) HEALTH AND WELLBEING

Aspiration
The design of Keralup to deliver a positive effect on the health and wellbeing of the community.

Principles

Prioritise walking and cycling
• The urban environment to be designed so that every walk is an enjoyable experience.
• Streets to be designed as shared spaces that, in addition to accommodating cars, promote walking, cycling and community interaction (eg. shade trees in all streets, awnings in main streets/centres, seating and other street furniture).
• In addition to the street network, dedicated movement corridors to be provided for walking and cycling.
• The structure of neighbourhoods, permeability of the street network and grouping of facilities/services to be conducive to easy pedestrian/cycle access.

Encourage community interaction
• Community facilities/services and choice of housing to cater for all demographics and income groups.
• Housing design to encourage interaction between residents and people in the street (eg. externalised housing designs with porches and verandas that have a positive relationship with the street).
• Neighbourhoods to include well-designed open spaces, streets and other spaces that facilitate social interaction/community formation and foster a safe environment.

Diverse and accessible civic spaces
• The open space network to provide opportunities for both active and passive recreation that are easily accessible to all.
• Ensure the provision of adequate open space areas for local and district active recreation.
• Streets and laneways to be designed as important elements of the public realm that creates opportunities for children to play safely and for community interaction.
• Natural areas to be retained and enhanced to provide children with opportunities for ‘creative play’.

(iii) EMPLOYMENT AND ECONOMY

Aspiration
To create thriving, sustainable Activity Centres that attract investment and provide for the full range of resident’s needs, including shopping, leisure and employment.

Principles

Access to employment
• Residents to have access to a range of local employment opportunities within Keralup, as well as employment opportunities available across the wider metropolitan region.
• Residents to access their places of employment by walking, cycling or using public transport, and not be reliant on private vehicles.
• A quality public transport service to be provided to the first residents of Keralup, to support access to regional employment opportunities and to promote the early establishment of sustainable travel patterns.

Diverse employment options
• A diverse range of employment to be provided locally to enable the opportunity for all demographic groups to live in Keralup.
• Provide opportunities and incentives for attracting a major employment generating industry/business to Keralup.

• Main street, mixed use environments to be provided within the Keralup Activity Centres so as to allow for extended hours of trade, accommodate diverse tenants and stimulate job creation.

• Keralup Activity Centres to feature vibrant and enticing streetscapes, civic spaces and attractions to encourage people to visit and stay longer.

• Keralup Activity Centres to have regard to their broader role within the Activity Centre framework for the South-West Corridor.

Supporting infrastructure

• Quality communications infrastructure to be provided for high speed internet access.

• A range of building types to be established at Keralup that support diverse businesses and industries and that can accommodate the changing requirements of businesses as they mature.

(iv) COMMUNITY AND CULTURE

Aspiration
To create a vibrant, resilient and connected community where urban growth is led by the early delivery of infrastructure and services and where people’s daily enjoyment and appreciation of place is enhanced.

Principles

Early provision

• Facilities and services required by the Keralup community to be provided in the initial stages of project development to facilitate early patterns of local use and community interaction.

• Recognise the value of early provision of community infrastructure in community wellbeing and place identity through innovative models (eg. subsidised public transport, low-cost rents for initial main street retailing, schools in shops/houses, upfront police and medical services).

• Department of Housing (and any Project partners) to have early physical presence in the community to confirm its commitment to the Project, to build strong relations with the community and to gain insights into community needs and local issues from the outset.

• The early provision of fully integrated public transport services (including extended services that cater for young people seeking recreation and entertainment opportunities in Rockingham, Mandurah, Fremantle and Perth).

Diversity of people, spaces, facilities and services

• Create spaces where people can socialise from the early stages of Project development (eg. local parks, coffee shops, well-designed streets, play areas).

• Ensure the full range of services/facilities required by the Keralup community are available locally.

• Deliver a wide range of housing to accommodate a diverse resident population, including different age groups, cultural groups, family types and income groups.

• Ensure all community infrastructure and service requirements are fully costed and that funding is secured for timely delivery.

Local identity formation

• Arrange Keralup into a series of distinctive neighbourhoods, which embrace its cultural identity, and enables local communities to form within the broader community of Keralup.

• Collocate community facilities and services in centres to facilitate access and, efficiencies in delivery to create vibrant nodes of activity.
Sustainable coastal communities

- Ensure the nearby coastal communities (Madora Bay, Golden Bay, Singleton) are provided with adequate facilities to cater for the additional demands generated by Keralup.

(v) HOUSING

Aspiration
Deliver a range of innovative housing types that support socially equitable and diverse communities that are designed to make positive contributions to the streetscape and public spaces, including opportunities for social interaction.

Principles

Housing choice
- Provide a diversity of private and public housing located in areas that respond to contextual considerations (eg. apartments and terraces within and near Activity Centres/public transport, and detached houses in surrounding areas).
- Housing to be varied to accommodate the full range of age groups and different family types, allowing people to stay in their communities as they progress through their lifecycle.

Quality, innovative designs
- Sustainable housing designs to complement sustainable neighbourhood design.
- Encourage alternative building types and the use of innovative materials to further reinforce local character and identity.
- The design of housing to encourage interaction with street and public spaces (eg. front porches, verandas and decks that give houses a visible relationship with the street, housing to frame intimate pocket parks that cater for local play/recreation opportunities).
- All housing to make a positive contribution to the streetscape.

Engagement with builders
- Early engagement with the building industry to encourage innovation and building design consistent with the Keralup vision.

(vi) ACCESS

Aspiration
To deliver a regional and local access network that facilitates safe movement, reduces travel time, promotes walking, cycling and public transport, and is integrated with land use.

Principles

Viable alternatives to the car
- An efficient and operational public transport strategy to be implemented during the early development stages to provide all Keralup residents with a high level of access to strategic activity and employment centres.
- Light rail to be an essential component of project design and introduced into Keralup to support intended development densities and underpin sustainable urban development over the long term; to be a demonstration project for light rail in a greenfields location.
- The provision of a regular and effective public transport service that connects Keralup residents to Karnup Train Station and the Metropolitan bus network, in the initial stages of development.
- Ensure that residents within Keralup are not dependant on the private car.
- The construction of the Karnup Station preceding the first stage of development.
- The design of local street network to accommodate and encourage cycle and pedestrian movement.
- Dedicated movement corridors to be provided for the safe and efficient regional movement of cyclists and pedestrians.
Well-designed street network
- The journey to be enjoyable for all users, through a permeable, connected street network and coordinated streetscape elements.
- The local and regional street network to complement the land use plan for efficient travel movements (e.g., movement network to facilitate access to key destinations within Keralup as well as externally to the beach/coast, Rockingham, Mandurah, Perth, Nambeelup and other regional destinations to the east).
- Streets to be interconnected to provide for choice of access and facilitate the movement of traffic.

Unobtrusive parking
- Parking areas to be carefully integrated into the design of Activity Centres and housing so as not to dominate streetscapes.

(vii) ENVIRONMENT

Aspiration
To introduce a sustainable urban environment that respects and enhances the existing environmental attributes of Keralup.

Principles

Waterways, wetlands and coast
- The design of Keralup and environmental management strategies to advance the opportunities to address current water quality issues.
- The design of Keralup to embrace the Serpentine River and wetlands as defining elements of its place identity.
- The Serpentine River (including Lake Amarillo), and other significant wetlands in the locality to be rehabilitated to address water quality, mosquito breeding, vegetation quality and other related environmental issues.
- Key conservation areas to be protected.
- Develop appropriate plans to manage increased use of the nearby coastal reserves.

Sustainable living
- The early provision of the Karnup Train Station, that is connected to Keralup by light rail, as part of an integrated public transport network.
- Provide and facilitate direct and legible access to local employment across all modes of transport.
- Priority to be placed on the provision of walking and cycling opportunities.
- Provide attractive public spaces to support housing density.

Management of the environment
- Ensure that the planning of Keralup and future management strategies provides for the long term preservation of conservation areas, whilst also minimising fire risk.
- Ensure that appropriate funding arrangements are in place to manage the environment (including the Serpentine River and mosquitoes).

(viii) EDUCATION AND LEARNING

Aspiration
To facilitate the early provision of quality, innovative education facilities and services that support continuous learning.
Principles

Linking education and employment
- Ensure that educational opportunities respond to regional employment opportunities and that strong relations are established between industry and education service providers.

Early provision
- The early provision of primary and high schools (through traditional or innovative models) to allow the first residents of Keralup to attend local schools.

Education choice and quality
- Keralup to provide the full range of education services to support lifelong learning.
- Residents to have access to both quality private and public schools that will add to the attractiveness of Keralup as a place of residence.
- Department of Housing to work closely with Department of Education to achieve the highest quality of education infrastructure and services, recognising education as integral to driving a positive place identity for Keralup.

Innovative design of schools
- Encourage alternative design models for schools, including designs that allow schools to actively engage with community and Activity Centres.
- Collocate schools with other community facilities and encourage opportunities for shared use of school and community infrastructure.

GOVERNANCE

Aspiration
To establish an effective governance structure involving local, state, community and other relevant stakeholders to ensure the delivery of the Keralup vision.

Principles
- An agreed vision for Keralup being developed by the stakeholders.
- Establish an effective, binding legislative framework to ensure the principles of the agreed vision are carried through to timely implementation.
- Establish a 'Keralup Fund', or a similar revenue stream, to ensure that the infrastructure requirements of this new community can be met within agreed timeframes.
- Establish an effective Project Governance structure involving Local and State Government, community and other relevant stakeholders to ensure that the Keralup vision is implemented.
- Structure neighbourhoods within Keralup to logically relate to agreed Local Government boundaries.
- Land delivery arrangements being established that assist in providing diverse housing and development opportunities to support positive brand and place identity for Keralup.
- The early establishment of neighbourhood associations or equivalent to ensure opportunities are provided from the outset for genuine community involvement.

Committee Voting – 4/0

9. The Committee's Reason for Varying the Officer's Recommendation
Not applicable

10. Implications of the Changes to the Officer's Recommendation
Not applicable
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td><strong>Reports of Councillors</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td><strong>Addendum Agenda</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td><strong>Motions of which Previous Notice has been given</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td><strong>Notices of Motion for Consideration at the Following Meeting</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td><strong>Urgent Business Approved by the Person Presiding or by Decision of the Committee</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td><strong>Matters Behind Closed Doors</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td><strong>Date and Time of Next Meeting</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The next Planning Services Committee Meeting will be held on <strong>Monday 14 May 2012</strong> in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council Boardroom, Council Administration Building, Civic Boulevard, Rockingham. The</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>meeting will commence at 4:00pm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td><strong>Closure</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There being no further business, the Chairman thanked those persons present for attending</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the Planning Services Committee meeting, and declared the meeting closed at 4.33pm.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>