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The draft South Perth Activity Centre Plan (draft ACP), proposed Town Planning Scheme Amendment No. 61 (proposed Amendment No. 61) and proposed Local Planning Policy P321: South Perth Activity Centre Competitive Design Policy (proposed P321) have been prepared to set out the long term strategic vision and the statutory planning requirements for development in the South Perth area over the next 10 years.

The study area is bound in red in Figure 1.

In this Report, the draft ACP, proposed Amendment No. 61 and proposed P321 are collectively referred to as the ‘draft documents’.

Figure 1 - Study Area
The draft documents provide a detailed planning framework to guide movement and access, land use and built form within the activity centre. Together, they will shape the development of the area to accommodate projected and required growth to ensure a functioning, sustainable and viable activity centre.

The City sought comment and input through a series of online feedback forms and Q&A on the Your Say South Perth online engagement platform, as well as community drop-in information sessions. The preliminary engagement process was undertaken between May 2019 and July 2019.

Information sessions were held at the John McGrath Pavilion (May 22), South Perth Bowling Club (08 June and 19 June) and City of South Perth Civic Centre on 06 July 2019.

The engagement components were thoroughly publicised on the City’s website, Your Say South Perth, via links to the website on Facebook, via direct emails and letter as well as through printed materials available at the Civic Centre and South Perth and Manning Libraries.

The Your Say South Perth website contained the information about the South Perth Activity Centre Plan process, the online feedback forms, and information about times, locations and registration for the information sessions.

More than 3000 individuals visited the project page on the Your Say South Perth website and more than 2500 documents were downloaded, resulting in more than 900 individual participants becoming informed about the project.

659 individuals provided feedback via online feedback forms including 551 template (proforma) submissions, and 150 direct submissions via email, mail or hard copy.

At the closure of the public engagement period, two important group discussions occurred which together help form the final recommendations. Both groups considered the feedback of the broader community, but were also provided with much more detailed background, analysis and opportunity to seek clarifications; helping them to develop recommendations.

The two groups were the South Perth Station Precinct Reference Group (SRG) and a newly formed, randomly selected Community Panel.

The representatives of the SRG are balanced with the individual residential/ratepayer focused Community Panel.

The recommended modifications of both groups will be considered together and will have a very strong influence on the recommended improvements to the plan.

1.1 Community Panel Background

The Community Panel (the Panel) was the final activity of the engagement process, providing an opportunity for a selection of the community to provide responses and recommendations to the City and the WAPC that align with the broader community aspirations.

The Panel sessions were held at the City of South Perth Civic Centre over two days - Saturday 27 July 2019 and Saturday 03 August 2019.

The panellists were provided with a detailed collation of the broader engagement outcomes but were also provided with a summary of information and some of the high levels details summarised in Section 2 of this report.

The panellists were provided all fact sheets containing necessary information for the session, biographies of speakers and information that linked to the key themes which had been evident in the broader engagement.
1.2 Selection

Selection of the Panel was via a random selection process. A random selection of households in the South Perth Local Government Area were sent invitations by mail and invited to register their interest in attending.

Nominations were all directed to a third party selector to retain independence from the City of South Perth and the facilitators.

Once the expressions of interest phase was complete, all demographic information was transcribed into relevant ‘type’ cells in a spreadsheet, including ‘Age’, ‘Gender’ and ‘Land Ownership’. Double entries were removed and nominations from outside an agreed geographical area were excluded. Nominations that did not provide the required demographic information were also excluded.

A random number was then generated for each nomination using the Microsoft Excel ‘=RAND()’ function and the list sorted in ascending order.

Panellists were selected in number order with stratification goals met in a ‘first met’ selection method. Some participants meet multiple stratification goals, which results in some minor over sampling. All categories were achieved based on high response rates.

The final selection goals were based on age, gender, land ownership and geographical goals which reflected the South Perth post code demographic and the study area (from the latest census data).

A total of 44 participants were selected and 42 panellists completed the two-day Community Panel (see Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selection Goals</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-29 year olds</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39 year olds</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49 year olds</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59 year olds</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69 year olds</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70+ year olds</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Ownership</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Owner Occupiers</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Tenants</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Landlords</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Business Owner</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Geographic</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In ACP area</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In South Perth post code ‘other’</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total number</strong></td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.2.1 Materials

All panel members were provided with a package of information, which included:

• A welcome letter and explanation of the Community Panel’s purpose;
• Fact sheets containing necessary information for the session;
• A summary of the engagement to that point;
• A summary of the first South Perth Station Precinct Reference Group meeting; and
• Biographies of the session’s speakers.

After the first day, the panellist’s were also provided a summary of that meeting, in advance of the second Day.

1.3 The Remit

The Panel were provided a remit for the panel sessions as follows:

*The South Perth Activity Centre is planned to support a significant increase in population with increased in height and density and increases in community activity and vibrancy*

*Increased development is already, and will continue to occur in the precinct.*

*Given this:*

• What improvements can be made to the guiding frameworks for the development of the South Perth Activity Centre?

The focus of the remit was on the potential improvements to the plan. The Panel were advised that there was opportunity to consider improvements to yield and/or distribution of development, setbacks of towers and podiums and other built elements, notwithstanding that the overall yield and development allowable was expected to remain at similar levels. The Panel were also advised that trade-offs and rationale were required to be provided where changes were recommended.

1.4 Purpose of this report

The purpose of this report is to summarise the Panel workshop process and present the Panel’s outputs and recommended improvements to the draft documents.
2. Process and Activities - Day One

Day One was designed to illicit feedback on key areas of concern with the planning frameworks. To support them, panellists were provided with work books on which to write their feedback to the project team and make their own notes and comments.

The Panel commenced with an introduction and welcome from the City of South Perth, explaining the value of and thanking the panel members for their participation in the Panel.

The panellists were provided with background information regarding the purpose of the session, the expected outcomes and the process. The Panellists were presented with the Remit and then a presentation was given regarding the feedback/responses from the broader community.

The panellists were provided a presentation from:

- City officers, to describe the background of the draft ACP and proposed Amendment No. 61 and the advertising process that was undertaken, as well as clarify details of the draft ACP and proposed Amendment No. 61 requirements;
- Geoff Warn, Office of the Government Architect, to further clarify design quality, Design Review Panels and the concept of design excellence. Geoff presented information regarding podiums, building setbacks and towers;
- Peter Ciemetis of Roberts Day, regarding specific design outcomes of the draft ACP. Specific emphasis was given to setbacks, plot ratio and tower footprints and the impact on streetscapes and views; and
- Chris Swiderski of Flyt regarding traffic modelling that had been done to date and how this impacted on the design scenarios proposed in the draft ACP.

There was also a presentation provided on the feedback/responses from the broader community by Anna Kelderman of Shape Urban.

Group discussions were held after each presentation to relate what had been presented to the draft ACP and gain a better understanding of what impact if any these had on individuals’ approach to the process or concerns regarding the planning framework.

The Day 1 presentation is attached to this report in Appendix A.

2.1 Group Discussion 1 - General

The first few questions sought to invite an overall consideration of the documents in response to the initial presentation to ascertain high level concerns or benefits perceived as a result of the plan. The questions were:

1. Thinking about the review, what do you think is the highest priority for us to consider (and why)?
2. What do you think other community members would say is the highest priority for us to consider?
3. And thinking about the broader community what would you say is the biggest opportunity?

Table 2 lists the group responses to these questions.
Thinking about the review, what do you think is the highest priority for us to consider (and why)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question/Topic</th>
<th>Combined Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Existing amenities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Preserving Character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Tying development to the infrastructure that will support the development (Inf. Before development)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Preventing over development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Maintain community environmental / access / interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The effects of the development on the surrounding community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• To ensure the continued quality of the community and residents’ lifestyle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Impact on local residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Impact on local businesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Traffic for access to freeway for greater S. Perth residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sustainable – let transport oriented development occur near ferry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Highest benefits, economic and social, and environmental so interests can say I can live with that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• How to properly accommodate the increasing population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• People staying near transport facilities e.g. ferry / future train station.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Properly – suitable services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Public Transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reasonable Traffic and Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Leisure opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Relation with CBD and other suburbs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The Height distribution shown on the map take into account owner overlooking the Esplanade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The City needs to provide its planners with sufficient controls to ensure the aspirations of the plan (especially in terms of the design quality and public realm) are well met. More specific provisions in the amendment will enable this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question/Topic</td>
<td>Combined Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **What do you think other community members would say is the highest priority for us to consider?** | • No podiums  
• Restrict height to a much lower level  
• Roads / schools/ hospitals/ transport/ jobs – infrastructure.  
• Ensure a variety of retail is offered and meets the needs of the immediate community.  
• Crime, Safety  
• Traffic, Parking  
• Lighting in dark areas (especially under the bridge)  
• Preservation of open spaces + foreshore  
• Accessibility  
• More trees in residential areas and environmental impact.  
• Housing choices where people desire to live. Don't restrict foreshore apartment supply which only increases prices along the foreshore. Demand is strong in those areas .. allow supply.  
• Impact on their property –  
  • Traffic impact  
  • Congestion  
  • Property value  
  • Views  
  • Natural light  
• Public Realm, and lifestyle activities  
• Transport issues – congestion on local road network  
• Views being blocked for existing houses |
| **And thinking about the broader community what would you say is the biggest opportunity?** | • Improve / upgrade amenities  
• Work  
• Diversity  
• Unique living environment  
• Transport  
• Lifestyle  
• Social outcomes – this is an opportunity to create a future area where more people live near the public foreshore and ferry, travel more conveniently and sustainably.  
• For more people to come and live in South Perth near transport facilities, more activity and employment.  
• Slimmer Tower  
• Height reducing from Centre to foreshore  
• Multi- level, varied, pedestrian accessways to a variety of public transport options. |
2.2 Group Discussion 2 - Design Review

Group discussion 2 related to elements of design quality, after a presentation by Geoff Warn, the current WA State Government Architect. The questions were:

1. What concerns do you have about design?

Table 3 - Group Discussion 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question/Topic</th>
<th>Combined Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| What concerns do you have about design? | • Does it achieve long term sustainable goals  
• Compromised implementation of design principles is a concern  
• Lack of design culture  
• Poor design equals depreciation in values  
• Poor design decreases amenities of all.  
• No Cookie Cutter designs  
• More sustainable design  
• Solar power  
• Insulation  
• Natural light  
• Clear definition of rating of design  
• Standardisation of quality of design  
• Level of sustainability achieved  
• Weighting of principles which are more important?  
• Practicality of design  
• Too many buildings the same.  
• Podiums – good to inc in plot ratio, other incentives??  
• Prevent + reduce public engagement/ interaction to buildings or environment  
• Inconsistent standards being applied (examples inc. current buildings in SP)  
• Good Use of space  
• That the ACP and requirements of Amendment 61 do not provide specific enough requirements for developers to meet design excellence in their projects.  
• The local design review panel not having enough resources to thoroughly assess all applications  
• Quality of build  
• Aesthetics/look of buildings  
• Greenery/vegetation  
• Parking/access |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question/Topic</th>
<th>Combined Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cont’d</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **What concerns do you have about design?** | • Use of colours/shape  
• Balcony space/privacy/noise  
• Allow more view corridors  
• Concerned about features of the building (bike paths etc)  
• Quality materials  
• Vibrant and interesting buildings  
• Complement the foreshore and heritage buildings.  
• Inconsistently applied |
| **What do you think about the heights in the plan – in the context of design review processes?** | • Viewshed should be maximised  
• View corridors can be maximised by design / height/slender  
• Best height / design on large area encourage amalgamations  
• Civic Heart Highest Buildings  
• Permeability of light + views  
• If well designed height isn’t so much of an issue.  
• Much too high  
• No real protection is given to existing resident to ensure/ guarantee their access to direct sunlight.  
• Heights / high building may work  
• But not enough focus on better density /design around the ferry / foreshore.  
• Allocate higher heights near transport facilities (for potential office apartment buildings, service – related buildings)  
• High buildings are not a big threat.  
• Much too high  
• No real protection is given to existing residents to ensure / guarantee their access to direct sunlight. |
| **Lower, wider development versus taller/ more slender development. What do you think about this?** | • Sustainable and fairer outcomes – achieved from slender and taller.  
• Lower wider on foreshore  
• Taller /slender interior areas.  
• Allowance for both depending on area  
• Comes back to good design, variance of buildings.  
• Taller slender  
• Taller and slender development so maximise views for everyone.  
• Depends on the location  
• Depends on the design  
• Taller / more slender development is better  
• Considering the practicality of amalgamating properties.  
• Taller and more slender development makes practical sense but it should be supported by increased connectivity between buildings i.e.; pedestrian walkways.  
• What about lower/slender? |
2.3 Group Discussion 3 - Built Form

Group discussion 2 related to elements of built form ‘rules’, after a presentation by Peter Ciemetis from Roberts Day who helped develop the draft documents. The questions were:

1. **What did you find interesting / what do you think is great about the rules?**
   - Slender and taller allows sustainable outcomes to be achieved (e.g. view corridors, spaces etc.)
   - Application of design principles
   - Great as it gives everyone same opportunity (doesn't let buildings to overshadow other buildings just because they have more money).
   - Slender allows better view corridors
   - Create opportunity for good design encourages responsible planning
   - Street level trading in Idea. specified areas is good
   - Focus on gardens and greenery in predominately residential is good.
   - The use of plot ratio as a mechanism for controlling building overshadowing and visual impacts is a good

2. **What are you concerned about with the ‘rules’? Height – Setbacks- Podiums- Plot Ratio**
   - Podiums – will they result in ‘walled’ streets where there is no ‘activators’
   - Why give extra for ‘good design’ – it is or it isn't
   - May set too much limitations for innovation / future development
   - Should have flexibility
   - Some of the existing buildings may be dominated by the new buildings
   - Plot Ratio
   - Podium % 70 -80% - where does this apply

3. **Do you have ideas about improving the plan?**

4. **What do you think about the distribution of heights in the proposed plan?**

5. **What community benefits do you think have not been explored / what do you think should be a priority for the City (and in what area)?**

6. **This is a long-term plan which may take 40 -50 years or longer. As the area transitions, what do you think Council can do to make the transition smoother?**

Table 4 lists the group responses to these questions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question/Topic</th>
<th>Combined Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Do you have ideas about improving the plan?                                  | • Allow more transit-oriented development near the ferry, which encourages sustainable long term outcomes.  
• More opportunities for young people to live near the ferry and foreshore  
• Give public realm more emphasis – not an add-on. More interesting neighbourly places and vitality for younger people.  
• Easy and safe access for kids / family to go to ferry / foreshore  
• Make guidelines on implementation of discretionary buildings clearer.  
• Setbacks – visually available to the public – not fenced, essentially public realm.  
• Hillside tier 2 – expanded  
• More vibrancy along the foreshore  
• Increase setback of podium from base – decrease 4 storey walls.  
• The rules could be expanded and made more specific to fit a wider planning vision. Ie particular ratios for particular building proposals in certain areas (more specific than just being defined by character area) |
| What do you think about the distribution of heights in the proposed plan?    | • Wrong direction – the proposed plan potentially reduces apartment supply by the ferry and foreshore, which means only the rich can afford to stay near the ferry and foreshore.  
• Foreshore height between Frasers Lane and Mends St should not be reduced just to preserve views / keep prices high along foreshore. Density around public ferry should actually be increased, with view corridors encouraged to maximise views and sustainable outcomes for all.  
• Unjust – foreshore are just kept for a few rich people.  
• Few choices for family / kids to live near the foreshore  
• High density near transport facilities near Mends, foreshore, ferry  
• Not very feasible to add more density along Mill Point Road, congested and possibly dangerous  
• Should be consistent across The Esplanade - between Fraser Lane and Mends St – height should be consistent with the rest of the foreshore – low height type and consistent set back with 12 m except between Mends and Harper Tce to accommodate community interests.  
• Hillside – tier 2 expanded  
• Varied heights desirable in Hillside  
• Quite reasonable, could possibly include increased heights in more areas like Hillside, southern part of Mends. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question/Topic</th>
<th>Combined Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| What community benefits do you think have not been explored / what do you think should be a priority for the City (and in what area)? | • Benefits of transit-oriented development in the area around the ferry and foreshore.  
• Public realm is highlighted in a few places but not as a continuous experience. Will walking be encouraged to ensure meetings and also safety.  
• Ferry lines – increase frequency and additional destination  
• Ferry is an asset to South Perth  
• Allow people to stay near transport, foreshore, (ferry) convenient and safe.  
• More open spaces for community access  
• Shady trees (Like Southbank foreshore Brisbane)  
• Setbacks for Alfresco dining  
• Markets on the Streets / Park  
• Wider setbacks in commercial area for pedestrian path.  
• Mends Street as a pedestrian Mall  
• Need to attract visually people across the river (city) to come across. High buildings blocking the streetscape does not promote that attraction / friendliness.  
• Setbacks should be further and create space for public use  
• Balance in between residential and business planning |
| This is a long-term plan which may take 40 -50 years or longer. As the area transitions, what do you think Council can do to make the transition smoother? | • Take into account climate change – winds, temperature (Heat deaths)  
• Encourage amalgamations for better builds.  
• Reopen Riverside drive in the City.  
• Continuity in the town planning  
• Progressive plan rather than change after people have moved / invested into the area.  
• Reduce Commercial buildings built |
2.4 Group Discussion 4 - Transport

Group discussion 4 related to transport and traffic elements, after a presentation by Chris Swiderski of Flyt who helped prepare the traffic reports for the draft ACP. The questions were:

1. What main concerns do you have about transport – what suggestions do you have?

Table 5 lists the group responses to these questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question/Topic</th>
<th>Combined Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| What main concerns do you have about transport – what suggestions do you have? | • Transport oriented development is non-existent around the existing ferry in the current plan  
• Gridlock – more people means more traffic. Set long term Targets (30 Years) measure progress.  
• It will get worse as developments proceed and any traffic studies should be based on cumulative study by facilities.  
• Slow progress on the bike path along the freeway  
• Use of dual use paths, better to have designated cycle ways and separate biles and pedestrians  
• Improve public transport, bus and ferry  
• Easy access to walk to the ferry  
• Allow staging planning as it moves along  
• Increase public transport options, train, buses, ferry, extend time schedules for public transport on special event days.  
• Congestion  
• Cat Bus in South Perth – connects Ferry and Train Station relieve congestion  
• Park and Ride Como/Manning – traffic diversion to Labouchere and Mill Point Roads  
• Weird bike lanes that finish in the middle of nowhere – need to continue to safe ending.  
• Not enough buses. Introduce train station to decrease pressure and increase visitors to area.  
• Gridlock at intersection  
• Development milestones poorly linked with infrastructure delivery  
• Manage parking – prevent access to wider community (Subi, My Lawley)  
• Quality of Life will decrease if population density increases.  
• Trying to use planning approval to lobby  
• May consider commercial use of land options to facilitate plot ratio imp. to land uses.  
• Valuable routes  
• Bike path across Causeway |

2. Do you think the plan adequately encourages use of public transport/alternatives?

3. Do you have any comments related to transport suggestions?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question/Topic</th>
<th>Combined Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Cont'd**  
What main concerns do you have about transport – what suggestions do you have | - The idea of imposing staged development, and public interest contributions, on built form proposals has merit and places the burden of resolving increased congestion on Mill Point Road onto developers not the City of South Perth.  
- Gridlock @ Mill point Rd / Labouchere Rd  
- Infrastructure lagging need  
- Use approval of development as lever to get infrastructure approved  
- Managed parking – less parking – no activity  
- Need more frequent bus and trains and ferry services  
- Need more people can live near transport facilities  
- Ferry can be upgraded to allow cars on board  
- Peak traffic is for limited periods  
- Bus services times limited  
- Parking around Mends St  
- Parking metres for more areas  
- Not enough enforcement of parking provisions.  
- Ferry routes  
- Fast ferries  
- Coode St  
- Multiple piers on foreshore |
| **Do you think the plan adequately encourages use of public transport/alternatives?** | - Plan does the opposite – in the case of the ferry. Density is distributed elsewhere but lacking around the ferry.  
- Grade separation between pedestrians and cyclists would help  
- Flesh out the advantages of a station which is now a nice to have.  
- Not currently it has no choice  
- No train stations are far apart and few. Canning Bridge station has very limited parking and is difficult to access as you have to cross the road.  
- No not enough housing choices along the foreshore. Zig Zag pathways to walk to ferry.  
- No, need more people to live near public transport (ferry) so they can access the public transport  
- Access to pier.  
- Yes, but the plan needs to note the public transport services are the State Govt. responsibilities and therefore it is up to the PTA to work with the City to ensure further uptake of expanded public transport services.  
- Need more incentives to encourage cycling (proper bike paths, live closer to bike paths.  
- It will by people finding their own method that suits. More segregated cycle paths.  
- Cost to individuals – public transport fear quite expensive  
- Lack of routes |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question/Topic</th>
<th>Combined Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Do you have any comments related to transport suggestions? | - Implement transit-oriented development around the ferry  
- Some social research on why there is a preponderance of car use and it is increasing  
- Needs to be available to a wider community. Kids need to safely access the ferry to CBD and train network, so things need to be equitable – areas around public foreshore and ferry are not just for the existing privileged residents but needs to be for more people, more kids, young families to live in.  
- Planning  
- Encouragement of Tandem Parking and Car Stackers.  
- Use of smaller buses in off peak times, only at those times only a few people can be seen using a full size bus.  
- Allow people / family to live near the foreshore so they have direct, safe and easy access to the ferry.  
- Smart freeways  
- Importance of transport facilities being accessible and convenient, letting people live near transport.  
- Bus service to go for longer in evenings  
- Parking needs to be looked at more closely. Parking permits for residents.  
- Cat type bus services in circuit around activity centre.  
- Don’t really see any improvements  
- Not sure what any solutions that are being suggested are. There is nothing concrete that even sounds helpful.  
- We like the widened footpath  
- Improving ratio of commercial to residential to encourage PPI to work in South Perth near transit (destination station).  
- Value capture to fund train station  
- Increase ferry timing all year |
2.5 Group Discussion 5 - Generating Ideas

At this stage the panellists were invited to start generating ideas for possible recommendations. In line with the advice provided at the start of the day, the Panellists were advised that this first ideas generation discussion was intended to get participants thinking and provide the project team with an understanding of what information would be required on Day 2.

Panellists were invited to consider a number of broad topics.

Table 6 lists the group responses to these questions that were written on the group worksheets.

Table 7 provides a summary of what was written and presented to the whole group (and was therefore more widely discussed in the Panel process.)

### Table 6 - Group Discussion 5 - Worksheets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Combined Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Height**          | • Tall and slender buildings is good for long term sustainability  
                      | • Disagree to reduce height for the property near the foreshore.  
                      | • Heights should be allocated near transport facilities.  
                      | • Reduce heights and implement transferable air rights to encourage fairness and increase the solar access |
| **Distribution**    | • More height should be allocated near transport, ferries etc unfair to exclude other people to live near transport, density should be higher, eco friendly, reduce car dependence. |
| **Setbacks**        | • Okay  
                      | • Mill Point 5+ m Minimum  
                      | • Richardson – if a mixed use building they must have a setback. |
| **Podiums**         | • Okay  
                      | • Need to be limited  
                      | • Incentivise developers to create parking underground  
                      | • Further decrease plot ratio  
                      | • Reduce height of podium and introducing mandatory front and side setbacks of podium (Maintain current base setbacks) |
| **Plot Ratio**      | • Okay  
                      | • Decrease plot ratio  
                      | • Reduce residential ratio and increase commercial ration to promote a destination station. |
| **Principles – any suggestions** | • Foreshore properties with access to ferries should be built higher  
                      | • Think about the future, general community and give people chances to live near transport facilities  
                      | • Don't be self interested to just pressure their own area, think about accessibility and convenience. |
| Height/density should be around public transport facilities. I think 40 Storeys OK. Foreshore height should not be reduced on South Perth Esplanade. If it is reduced, this only makes it more difficult to live near the ferry and makes apartments along the foreshore exclusive to the rich. 25 stories maximum – 40 is too high. 40 too big at this moment but progressively taller is good. | Proposed heights and Tiers acceptable Not unlimited, Permeable between buildings Stepped approach for heights from foreshore | Reduce / Limit Heights implement transferable air rights to encourage fairness and increase the solar access | Only benefit is to the developer Height = Cars, Shadows Height shall be limited by amount of cars that can be accommodated without a podium No reduction in existing building height allowances eg. Esplanade Align ACP height recommendations with Canning Bridge recommendations Shadow ends at the end of the shadow not at the adjacent building! | It should be tiered Height system – lowest on foreshore. Height of towers from Fraser lane – Harper Tce should be reduced in line with remainder of foreshore from 37.5m to 17.5m especially in relation to scaling back in front of Aurelia and Reva developments. | Allow Tier 2 in Hillside or High Tier 2 Additional Development in Mill Point to Ferry Court - refer map | We agree, except 1) The medium height designation m/ front of Aurelia should be low-medium 2) The higher the tower street setback should be increased |

**Height - Tower**

Tall and slender buildings is good for long term sustainability Design excellence for each application. High quality building design City Planning Council should work closely with developers on building height, and ensure it is good Height / density should be focused transport oriented development

| Height - Tower | Acceptable | Not unlimited, Permeable between buildings Stepped approach for heights from foreshore | Reduce / Limit Heights implement transferable air rights to encourage fairness and increase the solar access | It should be tiered Height system – lowest on foreshore. Height of towers from Fraser lane – Harper Tce should be reduced in line with remainder of foreshore from 37.5m to 17.5m especially in relation to scaling back in front of Aurelia and Reva developments. | Allow Tier 2 in Hillside or High Tier 2 Additional Development in Mill Point to Ferry Court - refer map | We agree, except 1) The medium height designation m/ front of Aurelia should be low-medium 2) The higher the tower street setback should be increased | Acceptable |

---

Table 7 - Group Discussion 5 - Presented Feedback
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Height - Podium</th>
<th>Table 2</th>
<th>Table 3</th>
<th>Table 4</th>
<th>Table 5</th>
<th>Table 6</th>
<th>Table 7</th>
<th>Table 8</th>
<th>Table 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The lower the better. Two stories 3 storey podiums are OK. Very nice. Good as it is now.</td>
<td>No more than two storeys above ground. Landscaping on Street Frontage to soften Elevation. Use of Alternative textures, colours, foliage for materials on front elevation to maximise sculptural form.</td>
<td>Out of residential – height controlled by non-podium parking. Restricted to retail – in Mends.</td>
<td>No issue with height on podium if aesthetically pleasing but if there is no dressing to the other surfaces increased height increases the unattractiveness to streetscape.</td>
<td>Agree, podiums blend well into landscapes. Podiums should only be built on mixed used developments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setback – Podium front</td>
<td>Incentivise developers to create Parking underground by further decreasing plot ratio. Reduce height of podium. Introduce mandatory front and side setbacks of podium (maintain current base setback in metres).</td>
<td>Street level trading in certain focused areas. Maintaining garden areas and having larger setbacks making than visually available to the public not fenced. Essentially a public realm. Variety of setbacks.</td>
<td>Setback terminology is confusing. Inconsistent – street setback is road carriageway kerb line.</td>
<td>To ensure developers are doing the right thing on setbacks.</td>
<td>Rear – happy with.</td>
<td>Podium front for commercial areas. Podium more to the back for residential.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setback – Tower</td>
<td>Setback – Podium side</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good the way it is now.</td>
<td>Good the way it is now</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed tower setbacks are adequate</td>
<td>Consideration to be given to adjoining buildings before side setbacks determined. Similar podiums requires less setback. Use of podiums for car park encouraged.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill Point Area Increase setbacks to 5 metres. Richardson area: if a mixed-use building they must have a setback.</td>
<td>Side + rear setbacks to recognise privacy. Character streets stay the same as today. No zero- setback at the end of a setback street.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setbacks should not change b/w locations.</td>
<td>Maintain separation of buildings. Change side setback to Mill Point and Hillside to 4.0 metres with discretion to vary to 2.0 metres not nil.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give more flexibility to developers to build closer or away from the podium to factor in overshadowing issues.</td>
<td>Where are the points listed that will be acceptable so no side setback is required (nil).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side by side to buildings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 1</td>
<td>Table 2</td>
<td>Table 3</td>
<td>Table 4</td>
<td>Table 5</td>
<td>Table 6</td>
<td>Table 7</td>
<td>Table 8</td>
<td>Table 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transport</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop ferries to be more accessible More alternative transport rates Allow more people to live nearer, around transport facilities so that such transit facilities will actually be used, so that long term sustainable outcomes can be achieved Social research to find out why car use is increasing and go from there.</td>
<td>More segregated cycle + pedestrian paths Cat Style Bus service in SPACP (Mend St, Zoo, Mill Point Route to be determined. Resident parking permits for on street parking Regular monitoring + enforcement of 4 hr parking General transport is acceptable as issue are concentrated in peak times</td>
<td>Cat bus, better routes/connections, better utilisation of ferries – winter 30 min frequency is inadequate Value capture model for South Perth Station Encourage commercial development to minimise journeys.</td>
<td>Model using build-out data Forget the Station.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increase public transport – buses, ferry Allow cars to go on board ferry (possible suggestion) Increase ferry frequencies Make it more accessible for people living nearby More routes and efficient networks Potential train station Multiple storey car park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plot Ratio Limits</td>
<td>Table 1</td>
<td>Table 2</td>
<td>Table 3</td>
<td>Table 4</td>
<td>Table 5</td>
<td>Table 6</td>
<td>Table 7</td>
<td>Table 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Buildings more slender</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Either plot ratio or height not both</td>
<td>Possibly more than one tower</td>
<td>Improved permeability</td>
<td>Higher plot ratio in primary central areas (Civic Heart)</td>
<td>Lower plot ratio the further from the civic heart.</td>
<td>Decrease Plot Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.6 Group Discussion Summary

Initial discussions from Day One provided an insight into the expectations of the Panellists, and also enabled a better understanding of the information that was still unclear.

Some of the dominant themes emerging from the group discussion included:

- The importance of the existing community
- The impact of traffic.
- Increase in public transport frequency, need for the station and consideration of more ferry services and CAT buses.
- Current tower heights were considered ‘ok’ however a reduction was also supported. Tall and slender is ok.
- Podium heights were generally supported at 2-3 stories, with a need for better designed podiums in residential areas.
- Current tower setbacks were supported but a flexibility was encouraged to improve design.
- Podium setbacks to the street should be varied based on location (commercial closer / residential further back).
- Landscaping should be included in the street setback area.
- Side setbacks were generally supported.
- Current plot ratio was generally supported.

It was also very clear that the understanding of height and setback of towers was very much improved, however, the setbacks and permitted composition of podiums was still poorly understood.

To conclude Day One, Panellists were invited to provide some direction to the project team on the elements of the draft documents that were of most interest/priority for consideration. Figure 2 illustrates the importance to the Panel of various elements.

Figure 2 - Day 1 Final Priorities

Thinking about the draft documents, what would you say is the highest priority for us to review?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community outcomes</td>
<td>3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heights</td>
<td>4th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building setbacks</td>
<td>5th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podiums (setback and height)</td>
<td>6th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plot ratio</td>
<td>7th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Views</td>
<td>8th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Process and Activities - Day Two

Day Two more thoroughly considered the key themes and topics from the first session and the outcomes of both days of the South Perth Station Precinct Stakeholder Reference Group (held a month earlier and the previous day).

This session focussed specifically on areas within the draft ACP, proposed Amendment No. 61 and proposed P321 where changes or improvements could be made.

A presentation and question and answer session was also provided, regarding specific design outcomes of the draft ACP, podium setback requirements and other panellist questions.

Following the presentations (which can be found in Appendix B), the Panel was invited to consider the study area.

3.1 Day Two Group Discussion 1 - Transport

The first workshop on Day Two comprised a short group discussion and then polling on issues surrounding traffic and transport, as this issue was seen as the highest priority on Day One.

Traffic was acknowledged as a key issue in the study area, existing and proposed, and the project team recognised this would continue to be a challenge. Notwithstanding, the City of South Perth is able to advocate for and effect some change in the area.

Using written feedback from Day One, Panellists were invited to prioritise the measure that the City should action to ameliorate the impacts. This poll is shown in Figure 3.

Figure 3 - Transport Actions

*Given that we will have an increase and the traffic network will be affected - what measures should the City prioritise (advocate for and/or deliver)?*
3.2 Day Two Group Discussion 2 - Recommended Improvements

Whilst the draft ACP and proposed Amendment No. 61 comprise four Character Areas, Mill Point, Mends, Hillside and Richardson, the broader community engagement feedback suggested that there were some areas that could be further broken down.

The Mill Point Character Area comprises a general area with limited public submissions, and an area immediately adjacent to the Mends Character Area that had received particular attention.

The Mends Character Area also comprises the core area, and another area within it that appeared to attract a different response to the core retail precinct. For the purposes of the Panel, the Mill Point and Mends Character Areas were broken down into two sub-areas each.

The smaller areas are illustrated in Figure 4, and were used during Day Two of the Panel.
The Panel was divided into six tables with each table required to consider one sub-area. At the conclusion of the workshopping component, groups were invited to present their suggested responses, including rule changes, to the rest of the group.

After presenting recommendations, the Panel was asked to poll levels of support for the proposed recommendations. The project team seeks to achieve a polling threshold of over 75% either ‘Strongly Supportive’ or ‘Supportive’. If the 75% threshold is not achieved, the group is able to discuss potential changes with those who were not supportive. These sub-areas were polled again.

The resultant recommendations in draft, the polling and an illustration of the final outcomes are included in this section.

3.2.1 Mill Point Sub-Area 1

Figure 5 illustrates the written and sketched content of the Panel recommendations.

Changes requested were focussed on the Mill Point Road spine, with a reduction in height suggested at the northern most end, two lots in the south and a limit of Tier 2 heights at the southern end. The southern most end of the spine has been suggested as being more suited to the Mends Street Character Area.

Additional Comments

This area encompasses the northern heritage area around the Old Mill and is accepted to have a spine along Mill Point Road of taller buildings with lower development along the South Perth Esplanade and Melville Parade.

Figure 5 - Mill Point (Sub-Area 1)
Key principles in support of changes to the Mill Point Character Sub-Area 1 are:

- Podiums to remain as included in the planning frameworks with Council discretion to vary setbacks where it suits the existing character or adjacent setbacks.
- Land use for this area should include aged care and serviced apartments.
- No reduction in height along foreshore

A number of additional comments were made that reflected the Panel’s expectations more broadly as recommendations to the draft documents. These are:

- Improvements to public transport and provide more options to move in and out of the area.
- Increase the ferry service and destinations.
- Reconsider car parking numbers (increase recommended).
- Add freeway on ramp to ease up congestion - use any profit from Tier 2 payments back into the community.
- Improve lighting under bridge to better enable walking to the CBD and back at night.
- Introduction of more community things like food carts, activities, along the foreshore

Initial polling of support for this precinct only achieved 68%, with some 14% neutral, 9% opposed and 14% strongly opposed. After some additional discussion, a re-poll reached 77% support or strongly support. Figure 6 illustrates the final polling.

Figure 6 - Mill Point (Sub-Area 1) Polling
3.2.2 Mill Point Sub-Area 2

Figure 7 illustrates the written and sketched content of the Panel recommendations.

Changes requested were focussed on the height of a small area along Mill Point Road (suggested for reduction) and two lots adjacent to this were also suggested to be reduced in permitted height.

Figure 7 also illustrates that the preference of the group is to amend the area slightly by reallocating a small area to the Mends Character Area.

The justification reflected the existing character of the buildings already constructed on some of these lots, that are considered to be more in keeping with the narrow setbacks, more intense and taller development permitted by the Mends Character Area planning requirements.

The group also suggested that the permitted land uses in this area be relaxed to include short stay accommodation/serviced apartments and aged care developments.
Additional comments included:

- Increase in ferry service times and destinations.
- Residential permits for street parking, and more ranger policing.
- Proposed setbacks, plot ratio controls are ok.
- Quality of design for all buildings regardless of site.
- Podiums:
  - Introduce a maximum number of cars in podiums above ground level.
  - Increase minimum number of car bays required

Initial polling of support for this precinct only achieved 69%, with some 11% neutral, 6% opposed and 14% strongly opposed. After some additional discussion, a re-poll reached 73% support or strongly support.

Figure 8 illustrates the final polling.

This area did not achieve the 75% threshold. Several panellists suggested that the key concern related to the reduction in height suggested and the suggested increase in car parking. Some Panellists noted that they would like to have been able to poll on each specific comment rather than vote on the whole proposal.

Notwithstanding the 73% support level, Figure 9 illustrates the final Community Panel recommended changes for the Mill Point Character Area, noting that continued refinement is obviously necessary.

![Area 2 - Mill Point South MKII](image)

Figure 8 - Mill Point (Sub-Area 2) Polling
**WHY IS A ‘TIERED SYSTEM OF BUILDING HEIGHT AND PLOT RATIO LIMITS’ PROPOSED?**

The tiered system of building height and plot ratio limits aims to encourage variety in the built form—so some sites will have taller and larger buildings than others, with different designs. It also ensures that as buildings get taller or larger they must be slimmer, relative to the size of the site, and have more space around them. Finally, taller and larger buildings must meet more demanding standards of design (see summary sheet 5) and provide public benefit contributions, to be spent on items that will benefit the users of the area (see summary sheet 6).

**Building Height Limits (proposed Schedule 9B, Map 2)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HEIGHT TYPE</th>
<th>Base</th>
<th>Tier 1</th>
<th>Tier 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>14.4m (2.0)</td>
<td>17.5m (2.2)</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low - Medium</td>
<td>17.7m (2.5)</td>
<td>30.9m (2.8)</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>24.3m (4.0)</td>
<td>37.5m (4.8)</td>
<td>60.6m (5.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium - High</td>
<td>37.5m (5.4)</td>
<td>57.3m (6.6)</td>
<td>90.3m (7.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>50.7m (7.2)</td>
<td>77.1m (8.8)</td>
<td>123.3m (9.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landmark Site</td>
<td>Refer Provision 5, Element 1 of Schedule 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend: Proposed Changes**

1. Include in Mends Character Area
2. Reduce to ‘Medium’
3. Reduce height to ‘Low-Medium’
4. Remove Tier 2

---

**Figure 9 - Community Panel**

*Mill Point Character Area Proposed Amendments*
3.2.3 Mends Sub-Area 3

Figure 10 illustrates the written and sketched content of the Panel recommendations.

Very few changes were requested, most notably a small area of 'Medium' height type is proposed to have the Tier 2 heights removed, to ensure that the tiering of heights is consistent across the waterfront.

Additional comments are provided regarding the proposed changes where they were presented to the Panel, as follows:

- Preserve street fronts, footpaths - limit the use of podiums that impact on the street experience. There is a concern that the front setback of the podium will be a negative outcome for this area.
- Ensure there is adequate parking in buildings instead of allowing parking to spill out near the foreshore.

The polling of support for this precinct achieved 76%, with only 4% opposed or strongly opposed. Figure 11 illustrates the final polling.

- Land Uses: encourage more retail along Mends Street, near foreshore, no nightclubs.

Figure 10 - Mends (Sub-Area 3)
3.2.4 Mends Sub-Area 4

Figure 12 illustrates the written and sketched content of the Panel recommendations.

This group was generally supportive of heights and setback requirements, however, they suggested amending the boundary of the Mends Character Area along the southern end of South Perth Esplanade, where the height type is ‘Low’ and linking to Parker Street. A small area inside the new proposed boundary was suggested as increasing to the ‘High’ height type.

The group generally agreed that removing the Tier 2 permissibility on the front half of the lot along Mends Street (south side) was an improvement.

There was also support for changing the boundary slightly to include Parker Street in the Mends Character Area.
This group also suggested the need to activate retail in the main street and not permit nightclubs.

The polling of support for this precinct achieved 80%, with only 5% opposed or strongly opposed.

Figure 13 illustrates the final polling.

Figure 14 illustrates the final Community Panel recommended changes for the Mends Character Area, noting that continued refinement will occur as part of the final engagement and feedback summary.
**Activity Centre Plan & Character Areas Boundary**

**Tier 2 Additional Development Potential Available**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HEIGHT TYPE</th>
<th>Building Height Limit (Plot Ratio Limit in Brackets)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Base</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>14.4m (2.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low - Medium</td>
<td>17.7m (2.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>24.3m (4.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium - High</td>
<td>37.5m (5.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>50.7m (7.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landmark Site</td>
<td>Refer Provision 5, Element 1 of Schedule 13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Why is a ‘Tiered System of Building Height and Plot Ratio Limits’ Proposed?**

The tiered system of building height and plot ratio limits aims to encourage variety in the built form – so some sites will have taller and larger buildings than others, with different designs. It also ensures that as buildings get taller or larger they must be slimmer, relative to the size of the site, and have more space around them. Finally, taller and larger buildings must meet more demanding standards of design (see summary sheet 5) and provide public benefit contributions, to be spent on items that will benefit the users of the area (see summary sheet 6).

**Building Height Limits (proposed Schedule 9B, Map 2)**

- 1. Include in Mends Character Area
- 2. Reduce to ‘Medium’
- 3. Remove Tier 2
- 4. Change Boundary of Mends Street Area
- 5. Increase Height to ‘High’ and include Tier 2 in this area

**Legend: Proposed Changes**

- Activity Centre Plan & Character Areas Boundary
- Tier 2 Additional Development Potential Available

**Figure 14 - Community Panel**
Mends Character Area Proposed Amendments
3.2.5 Hillside Sub-Area 5

Figure 15 illustrates the written content of the Panel recommendations.

Most participants did not have a concern with increasing height slightly in this area, noting that the current proposal would actually lower possible heights from current buildings which is unusual considering other planning framework limits. They suggested the controls would limit redevelopment in an area of ageing buildings.

This group also suggested an increase in minimum parking.

Initial polling of support for this precinct only achieved 57%, with some 14% neutral, 16% opposed and 14% strongly opposed.

The group reconsidered some elements, including the car parking. After clarifying the intent with relation to the increase in heights for this area, as well as reverting to support for the proposed parking minimums as advertised, a re-poll reached 70% support or strongly support.

Figure 16 illustrates the final polling.

This area did not achieve the 75% threshold. Several Panellists suggested that the key concern related to the increase in height suggested. Some Panellists noted that they would like to have been able to poll on each specific comment rather than vote on the whole proposal.

Notwithstanding the 70% support level, Figure 17 illustrates the final Community Panel recommended changes for the Hillside Character Area, noting that continued refinement is obviously necessary.
Area 5 - Hillside South MKII

- Strongly support: 30%
- Support: 40%
- Neutral - needs some work: 5%
- Oppose: 16%
- Strongly oppose: 9%

Figure 16 - Hillside Polling
### Building Height Limits (proposed Schedule 9B, Map 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HEIGHT TYPE</th>
<th>Base</th>
<th>Tier 1</th>
<th>Tier 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>14.4m (2.0)</td>
<td>17.5m (2.2)</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low - Medium</td>
<td>17.7m (2.5)</td>
<td>30.9m (2.8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>24.3m (4.0)</td>
<td>37.5m (4.8)</td>
<td>60.6m (5.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium - High</td>
<td>37.5m (5.4)</td>
<td>57.3m (6.6)</td>
<td>90.3m (7.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>50.7m (7.2)</td>
<td>77.1m (8.8)</td>
<td>123.3m (9.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landmark Site</td>
<td>Refer Provision 5, Element 1 of Schedule 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Why is a 'Tiered System of Building Height and Plot Ratio Limits' Proposed?

The tiered system of building height and plot ratio limits aims to encourage variety in the built form—so some sites will have taller and larger buildings than others, with different designs. It also ensures that as buildings get taller or larger they must be slimmer, relative to the size of the site, and have more space around them. Finally, taller and larger buildings must meet more demanding standards of design (see summary sheet 5) and provide public benefit contributions, to be spent on items that will benefit the users of the area (see summary sheet 6).
3.2.6 Richardson Sub-Area 6

Figure 18 illustrates the written and sketched content of the Panel recommendations.

Panellists indicated support for the majority of the precinct, with the exception of some of the buildings along Labouchere Road, where the height of the buildings was a concern for overshadowing of the Perth Zoo.

Additional comments are provided regarding the proposed changes where they were presented to the Panel, as follows:

- Encourage development of a maximum of one nil side setback podium wall, and increase the other side – setback to compensate.
- Introduce protections that provide (ensure) access to winter sunlight for existing residents

Initial polling of support for this precinct only achieved 70%, with some 24% neutral and 5% strongly opposed.

The group discussed and clarified some key elements and a re-poll reached 84% support or strongly support.

Figure 19 illustrates the final polling. Figure 20 illustrates the final Community Panel recommended changes for the Richardson Character Area.
Figure 19 - Richardson Polling
Why is a 'Tiered System of Building Height and Plot Ratio Limits' proposed?

The tiered system of building height and plot ratio limits aims to encourage variety in the built form—so some sites will have taller and larger buildings than others, with different designs. It also ensures that as buildings get taller or larger they must be slimmer, relative to the size of the site, and have more space around them. Finally, taller and larger buildings must meet more demanding standards of design (see summary sheet 5) and provide public benefit contributions, to be spent on items that will benefit the users of the area (see summary sheet 6).

Building Height Limits (proposed Schedule 9B, Map 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HEIGHT TYPE</th>
<th>BUILDING HEIGHT LIMIT (PLOT RATIO LIMIT IN BRACKETS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Base 14.4m (2.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low - Medium</td>
<td>Base 17.7m (2.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Base 24.3m (4.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium - High</td>
<td>Base 37.5m (5.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Base 50.7m (7.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landmark Site</td>
<td>Refer Provision 5, Element 1 of Schedule 13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 20 - Community Panel
Richardson Character Area Proposed Amendments
3.3 Summary of Recommendations

Figure 21 illustrates a consolidated summary of the final Community Panel recommended changes for the study area.

Some of these areas require additional consideration before any amendments are introduced, however, each of these were judged by a majority of participants to be suited to precinct, within the confines of the stated remit.
WHY IS A 'TIERED SYSTEM OF BUILDING HEIGHT AND PLOT RATIO LIMITS' PROPOSED?

The tiered system of building height and plot ratio limits aims to encourage variety in the built form – so some sites will have taller and larger buildings than others, with different designs. It also ensures that as buildings get taller or larger they must be slimmer, relative to the size of the site, and have more space around them. Finally, taller and larger buildings must meet more demanding standards of design (see summary sheet 5) and provide public benefit contributions, to be spent on items that will benefit the users of the area (see summary sheet 6).

Building Height Limits (proposed Schedule 9B, Map 2)

### Table: Building Height Limits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HEIGHT TYPE</th>
<th>Base (m)</th>
<th>Tier 1 (m)</th>
<th>Tier 2 (m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>14.4 (2.0)</td>
<td>17.5 (2.2)</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low - Medium</td>
<td>17.7 (2.5)</td>
<td>30.9 (2.8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>24.3 (4.0)</td>
<td>37.5 (4.8)</td>
<td>60.6 (5.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium - High</td>
<td>37.5 (5.4)</td>
<td>57.3 (6.6)</td>
<td>90.3 (7.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>50.7 (7.2)</td>
<td>77.1 (8.8)</td>
<td>123.3 (9.8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Activity Centre Plan & Character Areas Boundary

Legend: Proposed Changes

1. Change Mends Character Area Boundary to here
2. Include in Mends Character Area
3. Reduce to ‘Medium’
4. Increase to ‘High’ and include Tier 2
5. Remove Tier 2
6. Reduce height to ‘Low-Medium’
7. Increase to ‘High’
8. Reduce to ‘Medium-High’
3.4 General Comments

A number of specific expectations were stated, which relate to the built form in the area. These included:

- Be clever with setbacks subject to design review:
  - Consider being flexible with side setbacks - encourage development of a maximum of one nil side setback podium wall, and increase the other side setback to compensate, or match the adjacent property if nil setbacks already exist and increase front and rear.
  - Identify a suitable maximum length of wall before there should be a break in the structure.
  - Introduce protections that provide (ensure) access to winter sunlight for existing residents.
  - Front setbacks should be landscaped, not paved. No parking should be allowed in these spaces.

A number of additional comments were made that reflected the Panel expectations more broadly as recommendations which will encourage good outcomes as a result of the plan. These are:

- Improvements to public transport and provide more options to move in and out of the area.
- Reconsider car parking numbers (increase recommended), or introduce parking permits to preference local parking (one parking permit per apartment), with better ranger patrols to police this.
- Add freeway on ramp to ease up congestion - use any profit from Tier 2 payments back into the community.
- Improve lighting under bridge to better enable walking to the CBD and back at night.
- Introduction of more community things like food carts, activities, along the foreshore.
- Quality of design for all buildings, regardless of site, size and scale (design review for all).
- Land uses should be somewhat more flexible, with short stay accommodation, serviced apartments and aged care permitted in more locations, whilst most panellists suggested that they would not support nightclubs.

3.5 Community Benefits

When asked to consider the types of community benefit that would be supported to allow for additional development, the panellists polled their preferences. Table 8 comprises the full list and voting, whilst the top priorities were:

- More trees - 25 (other tree suggestions +16).
- Community Space - 15.
- Train with parking at Richardson Area/ Advocate for train station/ Fund for contributions to train station construction - 11 (other transport initiatives +48)
- Focus on public outcomes such as sustainable benefits, sustainable transport, mid block links, access to ferry - 10.
- More shaded areas for families along the foreshore - 10.
- Free parking on weekends to attract visitors/ tourists and to make the area friendlier - 8.
- Children’s play spaces - 6
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Idea</th>
<th>Votes</th>
<th>Idea</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Train with parking at Richardson Area/ Advocate for train station/ Fund for contributions to train station construction.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Transport, more safe, adequate bike lanes, separate veloways and footpaths as opposed to shared paths, more lighting along paths</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ferry Terminals/additional routes/more frequent - Mends, Barrack St (as usual) UWA, Crown (new), link with Canning Bridge AC (link with Crawley and East Perth).</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Allow people to have safe to access to ferry, live near transport</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>More dedicated bike paths on the east side of the freeway</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle paths on road to make it safer and get cyclists off the footpath.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Circular bus route access to freeway and ferry</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat Bus – Part funding</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Improve bus routes/frequency</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Share Scheme</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Freeway on Ramp @ South Tce</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Art</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sculpture by the river</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road lighting all around Perth is very poor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Heavily encourage business/ commercial building</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bike Paths – Slow Bikes to/from school etc.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Free parking on weekends to attract visitors/tourists and to make the area friendlier.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have nice trees along the foreshore on Melville Parade/to block the freeway traffic and noise for residence</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>More shaded areas for families along the foreshore</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees / More trees -____of cutting down trees</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Garden Bed displays</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on public outcomes such as:-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Cultural or performance area - example – allow performance from different segments of South Perth communities, develop uniqueness of our side of river.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sustainable benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sustainable transport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Mid block links</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use public infrastructure spending to purchase land within the ACP to be used as additional parkland, e.g. like Windsor park.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Community spaces, more seating (+bins) near walking paths. Shady Trees. Needs beautifying, not enough shade - example of South Bank Brisbane - bougainvillea on arbour</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Garden/compost</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea</td>
<td>Votes</td>
<td>Idea</td>
<td>Votes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Performance places – maybe an amphitheatre</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bird Baths/ Fountains on foreshore</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Foreshore Kayak and Cycle Hiring</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Food and Drink Carts along the foreshore</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sporting ground</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cultural values</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volley on the beach</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>A beach like South Bank Brisbane</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better toilets – Public shower facilities for water sports</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Beach need Grooming (Cleaning up) regularly</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buy a crocodile for the zoo</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Swimming pool facilities</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's play space</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Something for the affected development</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Safe Play areas for kids</td>
<td></td>
<td>- Remember these funds are paid because the developer can't/doesn't want to provide public benefits.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Well maintained play equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Camera surveillance for safe-guarding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stop 5G in the area</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>No Nightclubs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions to a Public infrastructure trust fund real public infrastructure like roads, sewer, rail, etc not public art</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Skate Park</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The engagement process for the draft ACP and proposed Amendment No. 61 was extensive and multi-layered to ensure that as many members of the community could provide feedback to the City.

To ensure that the feedback was well considered and accurately framed, the engagement process also allowed for intensive workshopping sessions with the randomly selected demographically representative Community Panel, as well as the South Perth Station Precinct Reference Group.

Throughout the Panel, a number of themes emerged which were consistent, and may form key amendments to the planning frameworks. These are summarised in this section.

4.1 Height

Height has been a significant concern throughout the engagement period and is of concern to some members of the Panel, although others are encouraging of it.

Notwithstanding, once detailed explanations of the height limits, podium setbacks and general setbacks were presented, the majority of the Panel suggested that the proposed heights were generally acceptable, subject to the design quality and built form limitations proposed by the draft documents.

Some minor changes were suggested to enhance the tiering effect suggested in the draft ACP, as the principle of tiering from the centre out to the river was very well supported.

4.2 Podiums

Much of the discussion on podiums initially reflected a misunderstanding about the podium street setbacks. Once this was clarified, the Panel was generally in favour of the proposed podium height and setbacks with some minor suggestions.

These included recommendations to be clever with setbacks, ensuring that these are subject to design review:

- Consider being flexible with side setbacks - encourage development of a maximum of one nil side setback podium wall, and increase the other side setback to compensate, or match the adjacent property if nil setbacks already exist.
- Opportunity to increase front and rear setbacks if side setback area would be unusable (and reduce side setbacks).
- Identify a suitable maximum length of wall before there should be a break in the structure, to improve the visual aesthetic of long walls.

4.3 Views

The issue of loss of views from the properties on Harper Terrace were noted by the Panel, with some advocating for height limits in this area and others satisfied with the draft documents.

It was noted that the side setbacks and general design outcomes of the new requirements could ameliorate some impact.

This theme will need to be considered carefully going forward.

4.4 Plot Ratio

The inclusion of car parking in plot ratio was discussed by the Panel, with the final suggestion that car parking be included as proposed.
4.5 Shadowing

Shadowing of nearby properties and of Perth Zoo was identified as a significant concern. Panellists expressed a concern for the current framework which only discusses the adjacent lot.

Most Panellists felt that overshadowing should be measured on all properties, not just adjacent properties, and many noted that shadowing of Perth Zoo was unacceptable.

Panellists recommended introducing protections that provide and ensure access to winter sunlight for existing residents. In addition, height limits were suggested on properties that could potentially overshadow the Perth Zoo (e.g. along Labouchere Road).

4.6 Design Quality

Panellists considered the quality of design for all buildings, regardless of site, size and scale (design review for all) absolutely critical.

4.7 Land Use

It was generally agreed that land uses should be somewhat more flexible, with short stay accommodation, serviced apartments and aged care permitted in more locations, whilst most members suggested that they would not support nightclubs.

Panellists felt that the City should encourage introduction of more community things like food carts and other activities along the foreshore.

4.8 Public Realm

The public realm attracted a lot of interest, particularly the front setback areas and the interface between the street and the front of buildings.

Panellists suggested that front setbacks should be landscaped, not paved and that no parking should be allowed in these spaces.

Retention of trees attracted significant attention, with more than 41 of the community benefits suggestions falling in this general category. A number of other benefits also referred to the public realm, and strong consideration should be given for the elements polled by the Panel (Table 8, page 48).

4.9 Access, Transport and Traffic

In addition to identifying this as the highest priority in the area, some 59 votes were polled in the community benefits falling in this general category.

A number of additional comments were made that reflected the Panel's expectations more broadly as recommendations which will encourage good outcomes as a result of the plan. These are:

- Improvements to public transport and provide more options to move in and out of the area.
- Reconsider car parking numbers (increase recommended), or introduce parking permits to preference local parking (one parking permit per apartment), with better ranger patrols to police this.
- Add freeway on ramp to ease up congestion - use any profit from Tier 2 payments back into the community.
- Improve lighting under bridge to better enable walking to the CBD and back at night.
4.10 Panel Summary

Recommended changes from the Panel described in this summary report are to be combined with the same exercise undertaken by the South Perth Station Precinct Reference Group, plus feedback from the broader engagement. Together, these suggestions will guide the final modifications to the draft ACP, proposed Amendment No. 61 and proposed P321.
Appendix A
Day One Presentations
If you weren’t here and other questions…..

PollEv.com/ShapeUrban450

If you don’t have a smartphone or the ‘app’ – see Kara
Welcome

Welcome and Housekeeping

- Support
- Mobile Phones
- Phone charging/calls
- Photos, videos and privacy
- Bathrooms
- Emergency procedures
Welcome and Housekeeping

- Vicki, Elyse, Mark, Charlotte, Anna, Kara
- Observers
- Tech support
- Workbooks
- Relax – let the day unfold....!

Introductions

- Who are you, what made you come today?
- What is the thing you have heard most about the plan?
- What is the thing you are most interested in about the plan?
How it works

Deliberative Process Map

Planning

- Developing remit
- Ensuring sponsor support to seriously consider recommendations
- Identify range of presenters (based on strong themes)

Facilitation of deliberative process

- Ensure understanding of negotiables, what can be influenced
- Build understanding of drivers, appreciation for complexity of the issue and remit

Purpose

Context

Diverging

Converging

Prioritising

Recommending

Sponsor response

- Consider recommendations
- Make decisions
- Response waste audit

Prepare report

- Developing recommendations
- Documenting rationale for recommendations
- Developing options
- Revising options
- Generating ideas
- Developing/ considering options
- Ensuring sites
- Developing/ considering options
- Understanding of negotiables, what can be influenced
- Build understanding of drivers, appreciation for complexity of the issue and remit
Tips

• You have been selected amongst peers – it’s an important job
• Be curious. Learn as much as you can.
• Keep an open mind.
• Focus on the remit – avoid going down rabbit holes.
• Just trying to find information to support a pre-existing point of view is NOT critical thinking. That is simply exercising confirmation bias.
• Remember that you are here as a citizen, to take into account what is best for the whole community; not necessarily what is best for you.

Tips

• Listen to each other. Work together. Make sure everyone is included.
• There will be disagreement – that’s OK!! Sometimes the disagreement is where we need to spend our time.
• Trust the process.
• If something isn’t working for you let us know – it is important you are not distracted from your task.
REMIT

• The South Perth Activity Centre is planned to support a significant increase in population with increases in height and density and increases in community activity and vibrancy
• Increased development is already, and will continue to occur in the precinct
• Given this:
  • What improvements can be made to the guiding frameworks for the development of the South Perth Activity Centre?

Key Themes

This is what the broader community told us (approximately!).....

• 650 survey submissions inc. approx. 551 proforma submissions
• 167 direct submissions inc. approx. 50 proforma submissions
Key Themes

• Overall Support > approx. 49
• Overall Oppose > approx. 26
• General opposition to unlimited height
• Many different suggestions about requirements (setbacks – res areas, plot ratio, podiums, mid block)
• Population targets
• Train Station

Diverging views:
• ~50 – no change to current heights
• ~450 – heights remain or increase
• ~10 – no change
• ~20 – support change
• ~5 – fix issues
The Context for the Panel

MORNING TEA
The Big Picture – Design Review

Design/Design Review Discussions

• What concerns do you have about design?
• What do you think about the heights in the plan – in the context of design/design review processes?
• Lower, wider development versus taller/more slender/development. What do you think about this?
• Write individually in your workbook – then share for the group workbook
The Design ‘Rules’ of SPACP

The Rules

- What did you find interesting/what do you think is great about the ‘rules’?
- What are you concerned about with the ‘rules’?
  Height – Setbacks – Podiums - Plot Ratio
- Do you have ideas about improving the plan?
- What do you think about the distribution of heights in the proposed plan?
- Write individually in your workbook – then share for the group workbook
LUNCH

Transport
Transport

• What main concerns do you have about transport – what suggestions do you have?
• Do you think the plan adequately encourages use of public transport/alternatives?
• Do you have any other comments related to transport suggestions?
• Write individually in your workbook – then share for the group workbook

Generating Ideas

• Height – Tower (if talking about tiers be specific)
• Height – Podium
• Plot Ratio limits
• Setbacks – Podium Front
• Setbacks – Podium Side
• Setbacks Tower
• Transport

You will put your notes on the wall at the end – make them legible!!
Generating Ideas

• Review the suggestions by other groups
• What do you like? What would you ‘steal’? What don’t you agree with?

What improvements can be made to the guiding frameworks for the development of the South Perth Activity Centre?

AFTERNOON TEA
Presentation

Wrapping Up

• What do we still need to provide information about?
• What are the most important challenges to resolve?
• What final reflections do you have about the day to help us plan the final deliberations?
Thank You!!

• We will send you an email with a little re-cap
• Please make notes on the wall on the way out
• Please let us know what other information you need from us

Thank You
OVERVIEW

1. Existing situation
2. Process to date
3. What we are planning for and why
4. Next steps
How it works

• Two documents
  – Draft Amendment – Requirements that control land use, building size, design and discretion
  – Draft ACP – Objectives and additional requirements not in the scheme

Guiding Framework

• Documents were influenced by a range of key strategies and policies:
  – Perth and Peel @3.5million and Central Sub-Regional Planning Framework:
  – State Planning Policy 4.2: Activity Centres for Perth and Peel City of South Perth Local Planning Strategy
  – City of South Perth Strategic Community Plan
  – City of South Perth draft Local Planning Strategy
What are we planning for and why

- Functioning, viable and sustainable inner city activity centre
- The ACP and amendment are informed by an evidence base:
  - Economic and Demographic Analysis; and
  - Transport and Movement Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>CURRENT</th>
<th>2031</th>
<th>2041</th>
<th>GROWTH BY 2041</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
<td>2,675</td>
<td>4,750</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>4,825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwellings</td>
<td>1,941</td>
<td>2,750</td>
<td>4,250</td>
<td>2,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>2,362</td>
<td>3,400</td>
<td>4,600</td>
<td>2,238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment-Related Floor Space (sqm - excl Retail)</td>
<td>63,000</td>
<td>92,500</td>
<td>110,000</td>
<td>47,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Floor Space (sqm)</td>
<td>8,172</td>
<td>13,860</td>
<td>20,356</td>
<td>12,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourists/Visitors per annum</td>
<td>119,017</td>
<td>172,200</td>
<td>236,000</td>
<td>117,783</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Potential Development 2031
Potential Development 2041

Next steps

- Respond to submissions and modify draft Plan as required – August-September 2019
- Council approval
- WAPC assessment and approval (Activity Centre Plan and amendment No. 61)
- Minister for Planning approval (Amendment No. 61)
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DESIGN WA STAGE ONE
DESIGN QUALITY

The primary aim of Design WA is to create a planning system that can facilitate improved design quality in our built environment for community benefit.
DESIGN QUALITY
WHAT IS GOOD DESIGN?

Good design refers to how things work, not just how they look.

Good design is about functionality, performance and build quality as much as innovation and creativity.

Good design delivers better value for money as well as better buildings and places, particularly when attention is paid to the full cost of a building or place over its lifetime.
1. Context & Character  
2. Landscape Quality  
3. Built Form & Scale  
4. Functionality & Build Quality  
5. Sustainability  
6. Amenity  
7. Legibility  
8. Safety  
9. Community  
10. Aesthetics
DESIGN QUALITY

EXCEPTIONAL
EXCELLENT
GOOD
POOR
DESIGN QUALITY
POOR DESIGN
DESIGN QUALITY
POOR DESIGN
DESIGN QUALITY

POOR DESIGN

- Inboard bedrooms
  - limited outlook, daylighting and natural ventilation for 28 bedrooms in 26 of 31 apartments (84%)
  - bedrooms with windows to kitchen

- Single aspect apartments
  - limited cross ventilation provided for the majority of apartments

- Internalised corridors
  - limited outlook, poor daylighting and natural ventilation provided

- Undersized living areas
  - narrow 3.100mm wide living areas limit outlook and are difficult to furnish and use
DESIGN QUALITY
POOR DESIGN
DESIGN QUALITY
GOOD DESIGN
DESIGN QUALITY
GOOD DESIGN

- rooftop terraces
- all units are cross-ventilated
- louvres provide excellent solar control to apartments whilst still providing an outlook
- private courts to apartments adjoin pedestrian street
- car parking is concealed below planted courtyard and behind ground level apartments facing the main street
DESIGN QUALITY
POOR DESIGN

- NO STREET PARKING
- POOR FRONTAGES
- NO TREES
- POOR SHADE
DESIGN QUALITY
GOOD DESIGN
DESIGN EXCELLENCE

- Well composed and resolved form
- Refined detailing
- Attractive, long lasting materials, and products
- Innovation (Construction, Functional, Use of materials, Integrated technology)
- Contemporary design “language”
- Advanced sustainability
- Recognising context
- Visually striking and memorable (symbolic; landmark)
- Conveys a sense of intrigue and interest
- Invites debate
- Sets new standards
DESIGN QUALITY
EXCELLENT DESIGN
DESIGN QUALITY
EXCELLENT DESIGN
DESIGN QUALITY
EXCELLENT DESIGN
DESIGN QUALITY
EXCELLENT DESIGN
DESIGN QUALITY
EXCELLENT DESIGN
DESIGN QUALITY
EXCELLENT DESIGN
DESIGN EXCELLENCE
EXCEPTIONAL DESIGN
WHAT IS DESIGN REVIEW?

The process of independently evaluating the design quality of a built environment proposal.

It provides independent expert advice and informed assessment of proposals, guided by a set of design quality principles.

It maintains consistently high standards in the quality of its advice.
DESIGN WA – PLANNING REFORM
10 PRINCIPLES OF DESIGN REVIEW

1. Independent
2. Expert
3. Multi-disciplinary
4. Accountable
5. Transparent
6. Proportionate
7. Timely
8. Advisory
9. Objective
10. Accessible
Engaging in design review improves the design quality of projects and can speed up the planning process, leading to the quicker delivery of high-quality buildings and places.
Best-practice model for establishment and operation of design review panels.

SPP7.0 10 design principles as the basis for design review

Model Terms of Reference and reporting templates.

Consistency
LOCAL GOVERNMENT DESIGN REVIEW PANELS

• Around two thirds of metro local governments already have, or are establishing Design Review Panels.

• The Panels can offer:
  • Familiarity with context, addressing challenges with future desired character;
  • Ready access to independent expertise; and
  • Valuable in-house training for planning staff
OGA (OFFICE OF GOVERNMENT ARCHITECT)

• To provide leadership and independent, expert advice to Government to improve the design of public buildings and spaces, and enhance the quality of the built environment.

• To provide the Premier and the Minister for Works on matters regarding the built environment.

• Whole of Government role
STATE DESIGN REVIEW PANEL (SDRP)

- An essential component of Design WA implementation
- The SDRP is a highly experienced, multi-disciplinary panel of built environment professionals from industry and government.
- Provides independent, expert advice to Government agencies, decision-makers and proponents regarding the design quality of a range of project types.
- Provides advice - does not have a decision-making function.
- Provides training and support to local panel processes
Tasked with undertaking design review of:

- Major State Government projects;

- Projects referred from Ministers, the Western Australian Planning Commission, Development Assessment Panels, redevelopment authorities, Heritage Council of WA and other government works agencies; and

- Significant or strategic private sector projects when referred from a local government authority or statutory decision maker;
THANK YOU
DESIGN CONTROLS UNDER THE ACTIVITY CENTRE PLAN

JULY 2019

PETER CIEMITIS
PRINCIPAL, ROBERTSDAY

RobertsDay
planning-design-place

with_ architecture
studio

City of South Perth
CURRENT CONTROLS

- Setbacks are the key driver of form
- Height and volume is effectively limitless
PROPOSED SETTINGS

- Setbacks
- Floor-plate size
- Volume (plot ratio)
- Height
- Design Quality
- Public Benefit
- Public Realm
STEP 1
Define the site
STEP 2

Apply setbacks
STEP 3
Establish podium (if applicable)

Two or three storey podium
STEP 4

Determine Tier height / Tower floorplate limits
STEP 5
Determine Plot ratio
(What is plot ratio?)
STEP 6

Tower Floorplate & Building Height
"Base"
STEP 6

Tower Floorplate & Building Height "Tier 1"
STEP 6
Tower Floorplate & Building Height "Tier 2"
STEP 7 Shaping the Building (eg. overshadowing)
VARIATION BETWEEN SITES

Base building height limit
VARIATION BETWEEN SITES
TOTAL STREETSCAPE EFFECT
TOTAL STREETSCAPE EFFECT
THINKING ABOUT VIEWS

- Foreground
- Middle ground
- Background
COMBINED POSSIBLE DEVELOPMENT

Scenario 1
COMBINED POSSIBLE DEVELOPMENT
Scenario 2
THANK YOU
South Perth Activity Centre Plan

Movement Network
July 2019

SPP 4.2

Objective: Maximise access to activity centres by walking, cycling and public transport while reducing private car trips.
SPP 4.2

- **Public Transport Infrastructure** – Prioritisation of public transport
- **Walking and cycling** – provision for end of trip facilities, improved access and facilities for pedestrians and cyclists
- **Traffic Assessment** - Improved access by all modes, including freight vehicles
- **Parking** – Provides for upper limits and common use of car parking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>South Perth</th>
<th>Population (Employed)</th>
<th>Population (Employed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LRT/Ferry</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car, Driver</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
<td>1143</td>
<td>2269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car, Passenger</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walked</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1598</td>
<td>3172</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SPP 4.2

- **Public Transport Infrastructure** – Prioritisation of public transport
- **Walking and cycling** – provision for end of trip facilities, improved access and facilities for pedestrians and cyclists
- **Traffic Assessment** - Improved access by all modes, including freight vehicles
- **Parking** – Provides for upper limits and common use of car parking

There is no on-road bus priority in the Activity Centre

There is no on-street segregated or line marked cycle infrastructure in the Activity Centre

Majority of the network are local streets, majority of impact is at the regional connection.

Parking supply currently meets demand in the Activity Centre but management is inadequate.
Bus Boarding and Alighting - 2011 and 2017

Ferry Patronage - 2015 and 2017
Movement and Access Plan

The headline outcomes are:

- Focus on getting local streets right – provide pedestrian and cycling facilities, manage parking and provide adequate capacity.
- Improve public transport operation and provide opportunity for more services. Promote the need for a Train Station.
- Lower speed environment on streets and control the access to main roads.
- Support more path connections into and through the Activity Centre.
- Manage the parking as per Parking Strategy.
South Perth Activity Centre Plan

Movement Network
July 2019
Appendix B
Day Two Presentations
What key element of the draft plans had you thinking the most over the last week?

PollEv.com/ShapeUrban450

If you don’t have a smartphone or the ‘app’ – see Kara/Martin
Welcome

Welcome and Housekeeping

• Mobile Phones
• Phone charging/calls
• Photos, videos and privacy
• Bathrooms
• Emergency procedures
Welcome and Housekeeping

- Anna, Kara, Martin
- Vicki, Elyse, Mark, Danielle
- Observers
- Tech support

Recap - How it works
Tips

• You have been selected amongst peers – it’s an important job.
• Be curious. Learn as much as you can.
• Keep an open mind.
• Think critically about the task and focus on the remit – avoid going down rabbit holes.
• Remember that you are here as a citizen, to take into account what is best for the whole community; not necessarily what is best for you.
• Listen to each other. Work together. Make sure everyone is included.
• If something isn’t working for you let us know – it is important you are not distracted from your task.
Engagement Analysis thus far

Key Themes
Feedback from the broader community (approximately).....

• ~100 survey submissions
  • +550 proforma submissions
• ~120 direct submissions (including ~50 proforma submissions)
Key Themes

• Agree with most or all elements > approx. 60
• Do not agree with some, most or all elements > approx. 70

Key Themes

• Height mentioned in approximately 65% of submissions
  • 22% support
  • 48% don’t support generally
  • 30% point to specific locations or have suggested redistribution
### Key Themes

- Setbacks mentioned in approximately 40% of submissions
  - ~50% tower setbacks
  - ~50% podium setbacks
- ~20% mentioned loss of views, property values, traffic, parking
- ~10% mentioned plot ratio/carparking link, shadowing

### Diverging views:

- ~50 – no change to current heights
- ~80 – decrease or limit* heights
- ~10 – no change
- ~20 – support change
- ~5 – fix issues
Consistent with survey…

Q9. To what extent do you support the requirements for building height and plot ratio in Schedule 9B of proposed Amendment No. 61?

Q11. Do you think the proposed tier system for building height and plot ratio limits in Schedule 9B of proposed Amendment No. 61 are appropriate?
Q5. To what extent do you support the requirements for podiums in Schedule 9B of proposed Amendment No. 61?

Q11. To what extent do you support the requirements for tower floorplate area in Schedule 9B of proposed Amendment No. 61?
Q6 Public benefit contributions may be used to fund the following infrastructure and community facilities. Please rank the list below in order from highest priority (highest score = highest priority):

- Upgrade to public open space
- Transport infrastructure
- Streetscape and public realm upgrades
- Community facilities
- Placemaking initiatives

Q7. Further to question 2 above, what other infrastructure and/or community facilities do you think should be funded using public benefit contributions?

- South Perth train station
- Improve public transport facilities
- Maintain high standards residential amenities
- Do not support Public Benefit Contribution
- Restore the beach and foreshore
- Affordable Housing
- Oppose to building South Perth railway station
- Improved pedestrian corridors

Q9. To what extent do you support the requirements for bicycle parking in the draft ACP.

- Strongly support
- Support
- Neutral
- Do not support
- Strongly do not support

Q10. To what extent do you support the requirements for vehicular parking in the draft ACP.

- Strongly support
- Support
- Neutral
- Do not support
- Strongly do not support
Community Panel

Transport – most important element:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggestion</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase public transport services and frequencies – buses, ferry</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow cars to go on board ferry (possible suggestion)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAT buses</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make it more accessible for people living nearby</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast ferries</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build the train station (add value capture)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple storey carpark</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park and ride in Manning/Como</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle path improvements - Causeway and Narrows</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forget the train</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential parking permits</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular monitoring and parking fines</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research car usage</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow more population to use the facilities</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Community Panel - Towers

Height

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggestion</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current heights ok/agreed (40 stores ok* (design quality)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce heights (25 storey max, align with CBACP)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased density / height to be located close to proposed train station</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transferable air rights</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase setbacks as the tower gets higher</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiering supported</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce Fraser Lane to Harper Tce to low - pre A25 - (6.50)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esplanade height near ferry should not be reduced</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce Fraser Lane to Harper Tce to Low-Med (10)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Setback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggestion</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allow Tier 2 in Hllside</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tier 2 Additional Development in Mill Point to Ferry Court</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support current</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility to improve design</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Mill point to 5m</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richardson must have setback</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More slender</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Community Panel - Podiums

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Setback - Street</th>
<th>Setback - Side</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 storey max</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 storey max</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 storey (height limited by parking at grade*)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only for mixed use</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Podium supported</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce height</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking underground</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agree - should be varied based on location (commercial closer/res further) | 3 |
Setback terminology is confusing | 1 |
Support current | 1 |
Consider adjacent development (less if adjacent is less) | 1 |
Mill Point and Hillside to 4.0 metres with discretion to vary to 2.0 metres not nil | 1 |
Rear ok | 1 |
Zero setbacks | 2 |

No zero setbacks at end of well set back street
Landscaping to front
Community Panel – Plot Ratio

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggestion</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support current</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plot ratio or height/not both</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase current in centre/highest area and generally to incentivise slender</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce res, increase commercial</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduce % for commercial development</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not include parking</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recapping the Remit – What’s negotiable

REMIT

• The South Perth Activity Centre is planned to support a significant increase in population with increased in height and density and increases in community activity and vibrancy
• Increased development is already, and will continue to occur in the precinct
• Given this:
  • **What improvements can be made to the guiding frameworks for the development of the South Perth Activity Centre?**
What **improvements** can be made to the guiding frameworks for the development of the South Perth Activity Centre?

- Limited opportunity to consider yield/distribution of development
- Setbacks of towers
- Setback of podiums

*Trade-offs and rationale are required for most changes*

---

**Non-negotiables**

- Growth projections
- Traffic
- A plan!
Given that we will have an increase and the traffic network will be affected – what measures should CoSP prioritise, (advocate for and/or deliver)?

PollEv.com/ShapeUrban450

If you don’t have a smartphone or the ‘app’ – see Kara/Martin
The Design ‘Rules’ of SPACP

and what happens if we push or pull the levers?

Q&A Discussion
Deliberation

Each group will be assigned an area...
Deliberation

1. For your area...
   1. How would you improve the plan for the area you are looking at?
   2. Height of podium, setback of podium (front and side/rear)
   3. Height of tower, setback of tower (front and side/rear), site cover of tower, when Tiers come into play
   4. Plot ratio controls
   5. Parking

FOR YOUR AREA – Mark the Map AND write your proposal on a white poster

Presentation
Generating Ideas

• Review the suggestions by the other groups
• What do you like? What don’t you agree with?

WE WILL POLL AFTER AFTERNOON TEA

What improvements can be made to the guiding frameworks for the development of the South Perth Activity Centre?
Generating Ideas

• Review the suggestions by the other groups
• What do you like? What don’t you agree with?

WE WILL POLL AFTER AFTERNOON TEA

What improvements can be made to the guiding frameworks for the development of the South Perth Activity Centre?

Polling

PollEv.com/ShapeUrban450

If you don’t have a smartphone or the ‘app’ – see Kara/Martin
Next Steps

• Combined Summary of Panel and Reference Group Meetings
• Detailed Summary of Submissions within the next month
Thank You

Refining areas - OPTIONAL

• TABLE 1 and TABLE 2:
  • Reconsider Area x
• TABLE 3 and TABLE 4
  • Reconsider Area y
• TABLE 5 and TABLE 6
  • Reconsider Area z
Polling

PollEv.com/ShapeUrban450

If you don’t have a smartphone or the ‘app’ – see Kara/Martin
Share your feedback with us by completing the feedback forms at yoursay.southperth.wa.gov.au. Hard copy feedback forms are also available at the South Perth Civic Centre and City libraries.

HAVE YOUR SAY
Feedback closes 5pm, Monday 22 July.