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LOCAL COMMERCIAL STRATEGY

THE STRATEGY: OBJECTIVES, CONTEXT STATEMENTS AND ACTIONS
The Strategy for each of the City’s commercial centres and sites has been drawn from Chapter 7 of this document. For a full discussion of the Strategy for each centre, refer to Chapter 7.

Throughout this document:

‘TPS6’ : means the City of South Perth Town Planning Scheme No. 6 published in the Government Gazette on 29 April 2003.

‘LCS’ : means the Local Commercial Strategy referred to in clause 1.5 of TPS6.

The Strategy for each of the City’s commercial centres is as follows:

**CATEGORY 1  **

**District Centre - Village Green, Karawara**

**Objective for Village Green (Karawara) Centre**

To promote the redevelopment and expansion of Village Green (Karawara) as the primary District Centre in the City of South Perth, while recognising the limitations of its expansion potential.

**Context Statements for Village Green (Karawara) Centre**

- The site is zoned ‘District Centre Commercial’ in TPS6.

- It is the only commercial centre in the City of South Perth identified in the *Metropolitan Centres Policy (2000)* as a District Centre.

- The 1996 draft Strategy has indicated it has a potential to develop to 12,000m² nla by 2006. We do not agree with the assessment of expansion potential modelled by BSD in their 1996 draft Strategy. BSD’s modelling was configured to ‘policy’ rather than ‘commercial’ considerations. In other words, the City of South Perth was modelled as an isolated entity, free of outside competition or influences, where the entire District-level floor area recommended in the *Metropolitan Centres Policy (1991)* could be internally allocated. Therefore, the modelling was not a realistic assessment of the expansion potential for the centre in the context of its competition.

- Given the juxtaposition of major Regional and District Centres in adjoining local governments to the City of South Perth, we do not see any potential for any centre in South Perth reaching 12,000 m².

- South Perth could support an additional major chain supermarket. This finding is not based so much on “need” in terms of per capita floor area ratios. A major supermarket would be able to withstand the strong competition outside and recapture some of the significant level of escape trade potential that exists.

- There are only two prospective sites in the City that could accommodate a new major supermarket, Village Green (Karawara) or the former Telstra site at Pt. Lot 2 (No. 54) Manning Road cnr Ley Street, Manning. The latter site is not currently zoned ‘Commercial’.

- The Village Green (Karawara) site has the *policy impermissibility* to expand, but has a severely constrained site. It will be very expensive to redevelop / expand and viability is an issue. At
best, according to our information, a supermarket expansion would only occur in five to six years – if ever.

- At the Neighbourhood level, which is the level at which Village Green (Karawara) currently operates, its immediate trade area (within 2 km radius) is seriously punctured by trade voids or constrictions. These (going anti-clockwise) include the Canning River and the foreshore parks to the south, Clontarf, Canning College, Curtin University, Technology Park, CALM Headquarters, Collier Park, Penrhos College, Como High School, Koonawarra Primary School, George Burnett Park, Trinity Playing Fields and Challenger Reserve.

- Our experience is that large Neighbourhood Centres (such as Village Green now is) attract upwards of 60% of their trade potential from within 2 kilometres. Our current model for Village Green has 65% of its trade in 2001 coming from this trade area. However, the population within the 2 kilometre radius in 2001 is estimated at 12,700. This represents under half of the population that would be expected in 1,250 hectares of urban zoned land within a 2 kilometre radius (25,000 – 30,000).

- Based on our knowledge of proposed expansions in the study area, including the expansion of 1,500m² at Angelo Street, our projections for Village Green (maintaining turnovers at 2001 levels) with and without the requested centre on Pt. Lot 2 (No. 54) Manning Road cnr Ley Street, Manning, are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Karawara District Centre</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>6,079</td>
<td>6,078</td>
<td>7,754</td>
<td>9,496</td>
<td>10,233</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


- The forecasts in the Table above assume that the requested Neighbourhood Centre on Pt. Lot 2 (No. 54) Manning Road cnr Ley Street, Manning, will not be built. If it is, and if it opens in 2003 as proposed, the expansion potential of Village Green (Karawara), even in the long term, becomes more marginal. Refer to Working Paper No. 1 for a full discussion of the implications of this proposal.

- Given the low forecasts above, which are very similar to the findings of the Shrapnel Urban Planning modelling, there is no guarantee that redevelopment of the Village Green (Karawara) site to an effective District-level centre will occur. We base this opinion also on the observation that Village Green has not expanded to date, despite its privileged policy position.

- In contrast to Shrapnel Urban Planning, we cannot foresee any significant trade area improvements to underwrite the heavy new investment that redevelopment and expansion would require.

- The ‘cost versus return’ issue for the owners of Village Green (Karawara) for major redevelopment and expansion, such as the development of another major supermarket on the site, is very sensitive. Any additional competition in its locality would tip the balance against whatever chances there might be for redevelopment and expansion of that centre. In effect, Village Green (Karawara) needs a monopoly on expansion potential to cajole new shopping tenants to their site – as the only available site.

- The issue for Village Green (Karawara) is not so much a new supermarket per se. Of greater concern is the ability to attract the high rent paying ancillary speciality shops, which are essential to the viability of any new shopping centre development.

- Much of the potential for expansion at the Village Green (Karawara) shopping centre has been mooted in the context of a cooperative ‘town centre’ development with Curtin
From a meeting with Consultants for the University it was apparent that ideas for a ‘town centre’ are only in the early stages of conceptualisation. Vague ideas of a commercial ‘main street’ linking the heart of the campus to Village Green (Karawara) were discussed. However, the size, configuration, location, orientation and components of such a ‘main street’ have not yet been decided. None of these ideas has any official status within the University. They have not been canvassed with, nor endorsed by, the University Council. There has been no market research or commercial analysis undertaken to test the commercial viability any of these concepts. The ideas must be regarded as long term, part of the next 30 year University strategic development plan. It must also be noted that the University site suffers the same trade area constraints as does Village Green (Karawara).

- Technically, because Curtin University falls outside the City of South Perth, these commercial objectives are not part of the City’s Local Commercial Strategy (LCS).

- In its 1996 draft Strategy, with respect to Village Green (Karawara), BSD recommended that if substantial upgrading of the Village Green (Karawara) centre is not undertaken by 2001, the Council should investigate the transfer of District-level floorspace to Mends Street or other Neighbourhood Centres within the City. (For a more complete assessment of the current context of the following recommended actions refer to Working Paper No. 1).

**Recommended Actions for Village Green (Karawara) Centre**

The following actions are recommended for the Village Green (Karawara) Centre:

- Now that the owners of Village Green (Karawara) have demonstrated their commitment to expand the centre to enhance its District Centre role, the Council should not approve another Neighbourhood Centre at Pt. Lot 2 (No. 54) Manning Road cnr Ley Street, Manning.

- The owners should be advised that the City would support and encourage additional development comprising (as a minimum):
  
  (i) a 3,000 m² major chain supermarket in addition to the existing major chain supermarket;
  
  (ii) a minimum of 1,000 m² of ancillary shops in addition to the existing floor area;
  
  (iii) a redesigned car park that meets the requirements of Table 6 of TPS6, and integrated access arrangements serving the entire centre;
  
  (iv) upgraded landscaping and façades for the centres, especially fronting Kent Street; and
  
  (v) any such other facilities that the Council may require.

- Subject to the successful outcome of the first two recommended actions, Council should consider entering into joint negotiations with the Town of Victoria Park to promote the longer term idea of an integrated ‘town centre’ commercial development across Kent Road with Curtin University.

- Should the outcome of the first two recommendations be unsuccessful, Council should consider the longer term strategic objective for Village Green (Karawara) as serving only a larger Neighbourhood Centre role (notwithstanding its designation as a District Centre in the Metropolitan Centres Policy (2000)).
**CATEGORY 1A Mends Street Commercial Centre**

**Objectives for Mends Street Centre**

1. To promote the Mends Street commercial centre as the most important multi-faceted ‘town centre’ in South Perth and maintain prospects for the continued development of those uses which attract visitors and custom to the City.

2. To retain and enhance the high level of visual and functional amenity which the ‘town centre’ now enjoys.

**Context Statements for Mends Street Centre**

- Mends Street centre has its own ‘Mends Street Centre Commercial’ zone in TPS6 to reflect its relative importance in the commercial structure of the City which is much higher than that normally ascribed to a Neighbourhood Centre.

- Mends Street is the largest and most important commercial centre in South Perth although its convenience retailing component is fairly modest, serving a relatively restricted residential catchment.

- Modelling of the local convenience shopping component indicates modest growth potential:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>DPI Code</th>
<th>1997 DPI Data Input nla m²</th>
<th>2002 DPI Data Input nla m²</th>
<th>Modelled 2002 Calibration nla m²</th>
<th>Modelled Potential 2006 nla m²</th>
<th>Modelled Potential 2011 nla m²</th>
<th>Modelled Potential 2021 nla m²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mends Street</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>5,736</td>
<td>6,407</td>
<td>6,419</td>
<td>6,405</td>
<td>6,579</td>
<td>6,987</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


- Over half the floor area in the above Table is in the ‘Eat and Drink Out’ Category (refer to Group 9 in Table 6). This floor area comprises a large component of top class restaurants and other facilities that attract a regional rather than local clientele. The modelling used for this Review is calibrated for normal local convenience shopping and is not geared to take account of this regional attraction.

- Its river front location in proximity to the Mends Street jetty makes it a tourist location with good prospects for further tourist / visitor orientated uses to complement the other regional adjacent attractions like the Zoo and nearby hotels.

- The streetscape works undertaken by the Council in 1992 and thereafter, have raised the level of amenity of the centre in keeping with the high standard of high density surrounding residential development. There has been a positive multiplier effect from these works that has benefited both the local business community and the local residential community.

- Shortage of car parking is a continuing issue raised with us.

- In 1997 there was 7,361 m² nla of office floor area compared with around 7,640 m² in 2002. Office floor area has more than doubled since 1990. Most of this office space is occupied by regionally, rather than locally, orientated businesses.

- A number of Residential zoned lots remained under Scheme 5 immediately adjoining commercially zoned sites, namely 128 Mill Point Road, 3 Darley Street, 3 Ray Street and 71 - 77 South Perth Esplanade. Of these, 3 Darley Street and 71 South Perth Esplanade are developed with medium to high density housing and are unlikely to be redeveloped. 130 Mill
Point Road is listed on both Council's Municipal Heritage Inventory and the State Heritage Register. However, 3 Ray Street and 128 Mill Point Road are appropriately situated to accommodate additional commercial floorspace and/or commercially related activities (e.g., car parking) if required, and this is reflected in TPS6 commercial zoning.

- The Mends Street centre now includes the triangle of land bounded by Mill Point Road, Labouchere Road and Mends Street. The land is predominantly owned by the Council and is zoned as part of the Mends Street Commercial zone. This land, known as the ‘Civic Triangle’ or the ‘Mends Street Triangle’, is situated between the Mends Street centre and Perth Zoo and, in terms of function and range of activities, is complementary to the core retail centre of Mends Street and should be developed as part of the designated commercial centre.

- The remaining land adjoining the centre comprises high quality, high density residential units overlooking the Swan River, or the river foreshore itself. Some car parking has been developed along the foreshore.

**Recommended Actions for Mends Street Centre**

- The Council should continue to enhance the foreshore aspect of the Mends Street centre by applying the provisions of the *Metropolitan Centres Policy (2000)* with respect to ‘main street’ centres, including:
  
  (i) improving the integration of the centre with the ferry / river across South Perth Esplanade by terracing between Southshore restaurants and the ferry terminal;
  
  (ii) encouraging alfresco dining facilities using the footpath, in accordance with relevant City policies and Local Laws;
  
  (iii) the Council should act as the shopping centre manager to institute a cyclical program of upgrading and refurbishment of the public domain (mainly streetscape) parts of the centre.

- The Council should consider applications for increases in retail floor area, excluding ‘Eat and Drink Out’ Category uses (refer to Group 9 in Table 6), which are within 10% of the modelled potential at each period as reasonable. Such increases are unlikely to yield unacceptable impacts on neighbouring centres.

- The Council should encourage ‘Eat and Drink Out’ Category uses (refer to Group 9 in Table 6) which are principally tourist-related or serve tourist needs (including restaurants, cafés and entertainment activities), contribute to the alfresco (open air) character of Mends Street, and/or are not already provided within the centre. The Council should base its assessment of new ‘Eat and Drink Out’ Category proposals on urban design, parking and amenity considerations, rather than modelled retail floor area potential.

- Future development within Harper Terrace and the ‘Mends Street Triangle’ should be functionally linked to existing development in the centre.

- With many major commercial sites within Precinct 1: Mill Point, the City should re-examine all aspects of development within Precinct 1: Mill Point, including appropriate land uses, traffic and parking, and key sites in a major study of the precinct.
**CATEGORY 2  Mixed Use Neighbourhood Centres**
- Angelo Street and Preston Street

**Objectives for Mixed Use Neighbourhood Centres**
1. To maintain and enhance the level of service and amenity offered by these centres.
2. To recognise the importance of these centres as employment and service areas.

**General Context Statements for Mixed Use Neighbourhood Centres**
- There are two centres in this Category in South Perth. Both are zoned ‘Neighbourhood Centre Commercial’ in TPS6.
- Both are ‘main street’ centres, which means that the unifying spaces (streets, sidewalls, street furniture and open spaces) which knit the shopping centre elements together (as do the malls in enclosed centres) are ‘public domain’ and the responsibility of the Council.
- The two centres, at Angelo Street and Preston Street both contain a significant proportion of non-retail commercial activities including banks, agencies, local offices and health, welfare and local community facilities.
- Both are emerging as vibrant, after-hours village centres for the community, endowed with tourist and entertainment facilities (restaurants, theatres etc) and adjoining or accommodating serviced apartments, private hotels / motels and medium to high-density residential development.
- The Council has been actively encouraging the upgrading of these centres in cooperation with landowners. Improvements include streetscape works, allowing use of footpaths, nil front setbacks, and requiring rear car parking.
- Parking is at a premium and difficult to provide and correctly juxtapose with respect to the diverse functions of the centres.

**Recommended Actions for Mixed Use Neighbourhood Centres**
- The Council should ensure that the key function of both these Mixed Use Neighbourhood Centres should be to provide Neighbourhood retail facilities. This could be promoted by specifying policy guidelines for a minimum amount of retail floorspace and a maximum amount of non-retail floorspace permissible in each centre.
- The Council should recognise its special responsibilities in ensuring the success of ‘main street’ commercial centres, and adopt a lead role in instituting a cyclical program of upgrading and refurbishment of the public domain (mainly streetscape) parts of the centres. This should recognise the importance to such a centre of alfresco use of the pavement, in accordance with relevant City policies and Local Laws.

**Context Statements for Angelo Street Centre**
- Angelo Street centre is zoned ‘Neighbourhood Centre Commercial’ in TPS6.
- Angelo Street centre should enjoy the provisions of the *Metropolitan Centres Policy (2000)* in respect to ‘main street’ centres.
The Council has implemented recent streetscape improvements, including new lighting that has lifted the amenity of the centre substantially and soon attracted new restaurants.

The retail floor area of the centres shown in the Department for Planning and Infrastructure 2002 Commercial Survey is 2,409 m². However, from a functional perspective, the ancillary floor areas which also attract the need for car parking is 3,801 m².

The 1997 Commercial Survey identified 2,116 m² of office space. However, this significantly increased to 2,437 m² in the 2002 Survey. This floor area tends to attract all-day parking.

The zoning under TPS6 may permit 1,500 m² of additional retail floor space in the centre at the corner of Angelo Street and Anstey Street, but (at the time of writing this report) a development application has not yet been approved although a current development proposal comprises a supermarket of that order. However, the development is required to meet its parking requirements on-site which is proving difficult. If the proposal proceeds, the addition will increase the overall retail floor area to about 4,000 m² nla.

Modelling for Angelo Street is given in the following Table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angelo Street</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>2,586</td>
<td>2,409</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>3,976</td>
<td>4,101</td>
<td>4,464</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The additional 1,500 m² was assumed to be open at 2003 and was therefore included in the 2006 model. The model shows that by 2006 the modelled potential of 3,912 m² is slightly below the floor area that will exist at that time. This means that the centre will be slightly over-supplied with floor area until demand catches up, some time before 2011.

The analysis in this review shows that a major supermarket in Angelo Street is a desirable rounding off to complete the coverage of the weekly shopping facilities for South Perth residents.

There are three existing small supermarkets in Angelo Street with a combined floor area of 1,013 m² nla. The new supermarket will impact on them severely. One or two of them may close soon after the new supermarket opens.

There are 245 car bays (on-street, Council and private) available, excluding those on the site proposed for the new supermarket development. This figure is consistent with the requirements of Table 6 of TPS6. However, the parking is mostly not well located with respect to the shop-fronts.

**Recommended Actions for Angelo Street Centre**

- The Council should continue its cooperative approach to new development and redevelopment projects.
- The overall Centre commercial floorspace should not exceed 6,500 m² NLA of which there be a maximum retail floorspace of 4,500 m² NLA and a minimum of 2,000 m².

**Context Statements for Preston Street Centre**

- Preston Street centre is zoned ‘Neighbourhood Centre Commercial’ in TPS6.
- The centre has 3 distinct elements:
(i) offices and tourist accommodation adjoining the river;
(ii) a Neighbourhood shopping centre environment adjoining Labouchere Road; and
(iii) an under-utilised central area suitable for redevelopment and upgrading capitalising on existing assets, such as the Cygnet Theatre and recent retail development on the north-eastern corner of Preston and Mary Streets.

- Preston Street is a mixed use ‘main street’ Neighbourhood Centre comprising 4,071 m² nla of retail in 1997. This reduced marginally to 4,010 m² in 2002. In 1997 there was 4,902 m² of office floorspace. By 2002 this office floorspace was 5,480 m². It is unusual for a Neighbourhood Centre to support 11,580 m² of residential within the Commercial zone.

- Modelling for Preston Street shows reasonable expansion potential (Note that the results in the model do not reflect this situation should a new Neighbourhood Centre be developed on Pt. Lot 2 (No. 54) Manning Road cnr Ley Street, Manning – refer to Working Paper No. 1):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>DPI Code</th>
<th>1997 DPI Data Input nla m²</th>
<th>2002 DPI Data Input nla m²</th>
<th>Model 2002 Calibration Output nla m²</th>
<th>Modelled Potential 2006 nla m²</th>
<th>Modelled Potential 2011 nla m²</th>
<th>Modelled Potential 2021 nla m²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preston Street</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>4,071</td>
<td>4,010</td>
<td>4,024</td>
<td>4,038</td>
<td>4,207</td>
<td>4,614</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


- The Council has not yet undertaken ‘public domain’ improvements works similar to Angelo Street. However, it commissioned an urban design study, completed in June 2001, that has made recommendations in this regard.

- The study found that whereas Preston Street - Como Beach was previously a vibrant and community orientated area with wide appeal, by 2002 its land use and development had become fragmented and its attraction had diminished to all but those in the local area.

- Commercial development along Preston Street west of Labouchere Road, is still fragmented by old housing, but this will, in time, present redevelopment opportunities.

- The form of the existing main shopping precinct on the south-west corner of Preston Street and Labouchere Road is not conducive to ‘main street’ amenity.

**Recommended Actions for Preston Street Centre**

- The Council should continue its cooperative approach to new development and redevelopment projects, and promote the development of Preston Street in accordance with the recommendations in the Clifton Coney Stevens (CCS) urban design report.

- The Council should use the expansion potential identified in the model to further the objectives in the report.

- If the area does become as successful as other notable ‘main street’ village centres such as Oxford Street (Leederville), or Rokeby Road (Subiaco), which it could well do, then more attention will need to be paid to the provision and location of car parking than has been given in the CCS report.

- The City should encourage alfresco dining facilities using the footpath, in accordance with relevant City policies and Local Laws.
The Council should encourage appropriate sensitive use of the Cygnet Theatre site which recognise and complement the heritage significance of the building. Some of the uses which the Council would support include Cinema/Theatre, Café/Restaurant, gallery, Shop, Office, Take-Away Food Outlet, and the like.

The maximum size of the Centre should be limited to 10,000 m² NLA including non-retail commercial NLA to a maximum of 5,000 m² and retail NLA to a maximum of 6,000 m².

**CATEGORY 3   RETAIL NEIGHBOURHOOD CENTRES**

There are two existing retail Neighbourhood Centres in South Perth, located at the corner of Meadowvale Avenue and Mill Point Road in South Perth, and on Welwyn Avenue, between Bradshaw and Conochie Crescents in Manning.

A new Neighbourhood Centre of 4,500 m² has been requested on the former Telstra Training School site at Pt. Lot 2 (No. 54) Manning Road cnr Ley Street, Manning. This proposal is the subject of a detailed assessment in Working Paper No. 1 to this study. It is not recommended.

**OBJECTIVE FOR RETAIL NEIGHBOURHOOD CENTRES**

To ensure that these centres provide the appropriate range of retail facilities to service the needs of their respective local neighbourhoods.

**CONTEXT STATEMENTS FOR MEADOWVALE AVENUE CENTRE**

- The Meadowvale Avenue Neighbourhood Centre and the adjoining medical centre is zoned ‘Neighbourhood Centre Commercial’ in TPS6.

- It should be noted that the adjacent former Rhodes Hotel site is not included in the Neighbourhood Centre Commercial zone, although it is included in the same commercial complex in the Department for Planning and Infrastructure 2002 Commercial Survey. This exclusion from the commercial zone in TPS6 is more consistent with the residential redevelopment of the site, recently approved by the Council.

- The Meadowvale Avenue centre is largely developed and there is limited, if any, potential for expansion of the zoned area given the existence of the ‘Surgicentre’ development to the north and an approved new residential development on the former Rhodes Hotel site to the west, with street frontages to the south and east. This centre has only relatively recently been developed and has maximised the use of the site for buildings and associated car parking.

- Modelling for the Meadowvale Avenue centre is given in the following Table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>DPI Code</th>
<th>1997 DPI Data Input nla m²</th>
<th>2002 DPI Data Input nla m²</th>
<th>Model 2002 Calibration Output nla m²</th>
<th>Modeled Potential 2006 nla m²</th>
<th>Modeled Potential 2011 nla m²</th>
<th>Modeled Potential 2021 nla m²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meadowvale Ave / Mill Point Road</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>1,541*</td>
<td>1,546</td>
<td>1,544</td>
<td>1,520</td>
<td>1,542</td>
<td>1,635</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The 1997 floor area has been taken from the BSD 1994 survey because the 1997 Commercial Survey floor area of 2,651m² includes the former, adjacent Rhodes Motel.
**Recommended Action for Meadowvale Avenue Centre**

- The Council should maintain the status quo at this centre until at least 2011.

**Context Statements for Welwyn Avenue Centre**

- The Welwyn Avenue Neighbourhood Centre Commercial zone comprises the Welwyn Avenue shopping centre, the community park and community centre/clinic behind the shopping centre and a motor repair workshop and veterinary centre diagonally opposite the shopping centre.
- The motor repair workshop is a mechanical workshop, which is not compatible with the residential surrounds. The workshop has replaced a former service station.
- The Welwyn Avenue Neighbourhood Centre serves an important Neighbourhood function for the south-west part of the City. However, it is not particularly well located and has little exposure to the movement economy. This was the reason the service station closed.
- The centre has an unusual mix of shops for a Neighbourhood Centre. It includes a large combined clothes shop of 488 m².
- Modelling indicates that the centre has some expansion potential based on a continuation of the current shopping distribution in this part of the City.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>DPI Code</th>
<th>1997 DPI Data Input nla m²</th>
<th>2002 DPI Data Input nla m²</th>
<th>Model 2002 Calibration Output nla m²</th>
<th>Modelled Potential 2006 nla m²</th>
<th>Modelled Potential 2011 nla m²</th>
<th>Modelled Potential 2021 nla m²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Welwyn Avenue</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>1,538</td>
<td>1,670</td>
<td>1,662</td>
<td>1,678</td>
<td>1,702</td>
<td>1,865</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


- Welwyn Avenue centre contains a substantial area of car parking at the front of the centre that could be rationalised and redesigned to accommodate expansions to the centre. Verge parking could also be permissible off Welwyn Avenue.
- There is also potential to expand the centre at the rear into the adjoining A-Class reserve 24331, particularly the hard-stand vacant car parking and basketball court areas which appear under-utilised and neglected.
- The motor repair workshop in Bradshaw Avenue may be redeveloped for retail uses that, if appropriately designed, would have minimal, if any, impact on adjoining residential areas given the existence of the veterinary clinic immediately adjoining to the east.
- If Pt. Lot 2 (No. 54) Manning Road cnr Ley Street, Manning is rezoned and redeveloped for a Neighbourhood Centre of 4,500 m², the findings of Working Paper No. 1 to this Review are that Welwyn Avenue centre will have no expansion potential and will suffer significant impact.
- The extent of the impact will mean that Welwyn Avenue centre will need to diversify its uses to other forms of commercial development. There may be opportunities to combine such new uses with new commercial development on part of the adjacent community park (Reserve 24331) which is currently under-utilised for community purposes.
- The location and surrounds of Welwyn Avenue centre are compatible with combined residential / commercial development. It may be possible to encourage a combined residential / commercial development.
**Recommended Actions for Welwyn Avenue Centre**

- Based on the findings of Working Paper No. 1 and the LCS, the requested new Neighbourhood centre at Pt. Lot 2 (No. 54) Manning Road cnr Ley Street, Manning is not supported and should not proceed. On this basis, the Council should encourage the diversification of the Welwyn Avenue centre to non-retail commercial development, in conjunction with possible further non-retail commercial / residential development on Reserve 24331 and the motor workshop site.

- The Council should use the modest expansion potential at this site to promote the redevelopment of the motor workshop site to more appropriate uses.

**Requested New Neighbourhood Centre on Pt. Lot 2 (No. 54) Manning Road cnr Ley Street, Manning**

This requested centre is canvassed in more detail in Working Paper No. 1 to this Review. Now that the owners of the Village Green (Karawara) shopping centre have demonstrated their commitment to upgrade that centre to better fulfil its District Centre role, the requested Neighbourhood centre at Pt. Lot 2 (No. 54) Manning Road cnr Ley Street, Manning is not recommended.

**Category 4 Highway Commercial**

- Canning Highway and Manning Road

**Objectives for Highway Commercial Centres**

To encourage upgrading of commercial facilities adjoining the City's two major regional roads, Canning Highway and Manning Road, for uses and development which:

(a) require a regional road frontage for accessibility or exposure;

(b) contribute to the physical appearance of development adjacent to the roads and to the variety and diversity of commercial facilities available to the local community;

(c) will not adversely jeopardise access or safety aspects of either road's primary function as important roads within the region; and

(d) are compatible with the long-term road widening requirements on both Canning Highway and Manning Road.

**Context Statements for Highway Commercial Centres**

- The Highway Commercial zone includes all commercially zoned sites and uses adjoining Canning Highway and Manning Road, including CA's 10-15, 28-33 and 36-38, sites zoned 'Service Station' or 'Hotel' under Scheme 5, or where commercial uses are permitted as Additional Uses.

- Commercial development extends in a ribbon fashion adjoining Canning Highway, particularly north of Douglas Avenue. This development ranges from isolated land uses fronting the Highway to integrated centres extending into adjacent residential streets. Other than the Village Green (Karawara) shopping centre, centres on Manning Road are confined to land adjoining Ley and Clydesdale Streets, and the Manning Hotel site.

- The retail modelling results are reflected in the following Table. It should be noted that some of the zoned areas where site constraints prevent expansion, have been held constant in the...
model and the floor area expansion potential (if any) has been redistributed in the model to the most convenient alternative centre.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>DPI Code</th>
<th>1997 DPI Data Input nla m²</th>
<th>2002 DPI Data Input nla m²</th>
<th>Model 2002 Calibration Output nla m²</th>
<th>Modelled Potential 2006 nla m²</th>
<th>Modelled Potential 2011 nla m²</th>
<th>Modelled Potential 2021 nla m²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canning Hwy / Way Rd</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canning Hwy (Hovia to Salisbury)</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>1,289</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canning Hwy / Douglas Av</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>1,171</td>
<td>1,659</td>
<td>1,659</td>
<td>1,639</td>
<td>1,671</td>
<td>1,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canning Hwy / Renwick St</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canning Hwy / South Tce</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canning Hwy / Hobbs Av</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>1,195</td>
<td>1,055</td>
<td>1,051</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td>1,057</td>
<td>1,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canning Hwy / Monash Av</td>
<td>8,746</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canning Hwy / Barker Av</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canning Hwy / Henley St</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>1,517</td>
<td>1,173</td>
<td>1,165</td>
<td>1,175</td>
<td>1,207</td>
<td>1,321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manning Rd / Ley St</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>887</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manning Hotel</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,601</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,084</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,865</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,861</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,858</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,248</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


• The majority of commercially zoned land along the Highway has been developed and current TPS6 provisions restrict additional access for office development.

• Highway Commercial development does not represent a continuous ribbon retailing strip, but is interspersed with, and adjoined by, residential development of varying quality and density.

• The Strategy recognises the role played by Highway Commercial activities in serving both local and regional catchments to varying degrees, depending on the nature of the land use. Such land uses may predominantly service passing trade (ie service stations, fast food outlets, 24 hour facilities), or rely on high exposure and accessibility (eg hotels, car yards, offices, real estate agencies). These facilities also contribute to the local community by offering a range of commercial activities beyond those supportable by a local community centre in a location and environment that is already not conducive to residential amenity.

• The appearance and age of commercial development on Canning Highway and Manning Road varies substantially. New development includes office complexes and refurbishment of the Rosie O’Grady’s Tavern (former Hurlingham Hotel) and the Como Hotel.

• The Council has received requests for rezoning residential sites along Canning Highway to accommodate expansion of the fast food outlets near Way Road. Frequent requests for ‘spot rezoning’ along Canning Highway for commercial purposes have been uniformly rejected.

• Both Canning Highway and Manning Road are subject to long-term road widening / realignment proposals. Discussions with Main Roads WA indicate they could occur some time after 2011. On Canning Highway, the widening is a nominal 17.5 metres on the eastern side. The effect of this widening will be to:
  (i) require the demolition of at least 13 existing commercial establishments; and
  (ii) leave remnants of Highway Commercial zoning which are difficult or impractical to develop.

• Many of the developments are old, without adequate parking and in need of refurbishment or redevelopment.
Recommended Actions for Highway Commercial Centres

- The Council should use the expansion potential at the various points along Canning Highway to promote redevelopment and refurbishment.

- In the case of additions to an existing building, notwithstanding the maximum plot ratio prescribed in TPS6, where proposed additions involve an increase in floor area of more than 10%, such development should only be approved if the existing building is significantly upgraded.

- Development should not be supported by the Council unless vehicular access to and from lots which abut Canning Highway or Manning Road are:
  
  (i) confined to the minimum necessary in the opinion of the Council for orderly traffic movement; and

  (ii) designed in such a manner as to facilitate entry onto the road in a forward gear.

- In any new development within the zone, retailing floorspace should be incidental to the predominant use of the site or is of a nature reliant on passing trade for predominant patronage.

- Development should not occur on land affected by road widening.

- The Council should be satisfied that the physical appearance, amenity and service offered by any new development is compatible with the objectives for this type of centre.

- To promote the upgrading and improvements to the physical appearance of the commercial development as viewed from Canning Highway and Manning Road, the Council should consider relaxing parking requirements, or allowing the use of streets for parking where adjoining land uses are non-residential:

  (i) where such parking cannot be provided on-site or where it would be visually intrusive to do so; and

  (ii) by so doing, better landscaping and / or refurbishment of existing development can occur on the site.

- The Council should discourage excessive signage other than what may be reasonably required to advertise highway businesses and should support variations to signage policy where consolidation of, or improvement to, existing advertising is proposed.

- The Council should encourage integrated development between adjoining commercial properties, and could require cross access and reciprocal parking arrangements and / or lot amalgamation as part of development proposals.

- Given the over-supply of Local and Neighbourhood floorspace throughout the City, and the resistance by the Commission to ad hoc highway commercial development, no additional areas are recommended for Highway Commercial zoning other than those already identified in TPS6.

Objectives for Mixed Use Commercial Centres

To recognise the existing extent and nature of office development within the Mill Point area and to accommodate limited expansion of such activities, having regard to:

(a) employment opportunities such uses generate in the City;
(b) residential development in close proximity, and the need to retain a predominantly residential environment in Mill Point overall;
(c) recognised constraints on development in Mill Point, including traffic and access impacts and proximity to established residential developments.

**Context Statements for Mixed Use Commercial Centres**

- The two areas of 'Mixed Use Commercial' zoning are both in the Mill Point area. Both are in close proximity to the Mends Street Centre Commercial zone.

- The Mixed Use Commercial zone in the Mill Point area is predominantly occupied by offices with a regional or metropolitan service area rather than local. This means that for most offices, the Mill Point Road area is seen as a highly desirable, high amenity, and conveniently close extension of the Perth CBD.

- Trends indicate that there is continuing potential for expansion. Retail modelling was not undertaken for commercial (office) floorspace. While there are current land use constraints there is sufficient land area available, particularly in the area south of Judd Street, for redevelopment of residential properties, to facilitate additional office development.

- The existing situation in the Mill Point area is that there is a diversity of land uses that contribute to the character, employment opportunities and vitality of the area. But this requires careful planning to ensure that competing land uses, such as residential and office development, can both be accommodated without office uses dominating in response to market forces.

- The medium to high density residential coding of the land in TPS6 clearly does not support the retention of the existing housing stock but favours redevelopment for higher density housing. The issue, therefore, for the Council is to retain higher density residential redevelopment opportunities within this part of the City, but to otherwise encourage retention of remaining single houses either for residential purposes or as offices.

- It is also clear that there is a continued demand for some low-scale professional office development within these residential areas and within the City. Such development can co-exist with medium and high density housing with appropriate design controls.

- The Mill Point area has been the subject of numerous previous reports, including the "Mill Point Study" in 1983. The Mill Point Study concluded that offices occupying converted premises have done so at the expense of housing stock and residential character, and that office character dominates in some areas. The requirement to retain existing cottages (converted to offices) meant that the remainder of a site was generally dominated by car parking. The Study also recognised that a component of office uses was desirable to provide work opportunities within the area that had a unique character not solely dominated by residential uses. The Study suggested however, that the intensity of office development in the area endangered its residential quality. It therefore recommended a residential zoning north of Judd Street, but with a mixed residential and office zoning with higher density redevelopment in the core area, and lower density buildings on the perimeter bordering the river to maximise and retain views.

- Not all of the recommendations of the Mill Point Study were adopted, and the Study is now somewhat dated. Accordingly, it is evident that a more contemporary urban design study is required, particularly for the area south of Judd Street, if not for the whole of Precinct 1 : Mill Point. This will ensure that compatible redevelopment occurs, having regard to the prime objectives of retaining streetscape character and fostering an appropriate blend of commercial and residential activity and in view of the design objectives suggested by the Precinct Committee.
• Considering that commercial land elsewhere within the City (ie. Como Beach) has been redeveloped with residential / tourist components, it is considered that facilitating additional low scale or mixed use office development within the Mill Point area will only have a marginal impact on the provision of housing variety and choice within the City. It is also likely to result in more redevelopment incorporating residential dwellings than rezoning and consequent redevelopment by the market place for solely residential purposes would achieve.

Recommended Actions for Mixed Use Commercial Centres
• In order to encourage innovative building design and a mixture of residential and office developments in the area, the Council should offer a plot ratio bonus in cases where:
  (i) the development site has an area of 1,700 m² or more;
  (ii) the residential and the non-residential portions of the development each comprise not less than 40% of the total floor area;
  (iii) the building design is enhanced by way of balconies facing the street, or by other design elements; and
  (iv) outstanding quality landscaping is provided across the front of the site.
• The Council should consider reciprocal car parking arrangements between the office and residential uses.
• The Council should generally require architectural styles and treatments to buildings that are visually harmonious to the streetscapes and to other buildings.
• The Council should set standards of landscaping in keeping with the high level of visual amenity of the area.
• At the interface of the Mixed Use zone and the Residential zone, the Council should require the applicant to demonstrate building design which promotes a harmonious relationship between the two.
• For those parts of the Mixed Use Commercial zone north of Judd Street, or for sites with good exposure to Mill Point Road, the Council should support restaurants and cafés at ground floor level.
• The Council should examine the possible development of a “landmark” building at the entrance into South Perth on the land bounded by Mill Point Road, Mends Street and Labouchere Road, as reflected in the TPS6 provisions for the site.
• With many major commercial sites within Precinct 1 : Mill Point, the City should re-examine all aspects of development within the Precinct 1, including appropriate land uses, traffic and parking, and key sites.

CATEGORY 6 Local Centres

Objective for Local Centres
To recognise, reinforce and retain the important role that small corner stores and Local Centres play in fulfilling the daily shopping and commercial requirements of residents of the City.
CONTEXT STATEMENTS FOR LOCAL CENTRES

- This category excludes those non-conforming uses that will remain non-conforming uses under TPS6.
- Many of these centres and corner shops are old. Many have diversified into non-retail commercial uses. There are high vacancy rates.
- Many of these centres are now poorly located with respect to passing trade.
- It should be noted that the floor area data used was derived from the 1997 and 2002 Commercial surveys (as agreed in our brief to update this report). Since 1997, there have been significant changes, particularly at the lower (smaller) end of the shopping centre hierarchy. For example, in this period, two small centres at Talbot Avenue and Bickley Crescent have been redeveloped for non-retail purposes.
- In the model, most Local Centres and corner shops were on constrained sites with no room for expansion. These sites have been held constant in the model. The results of the model are given in the following Table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>DPI Code</th>
<th>1997 DPI Data Input nla m²</th>
<th>2002 DPI Data Input nla m²</th>
<th>Model 2002 Calibration Output nla m²</th>
<th>Modelled Potential 2006 nla m²</th>
<th>Modelled Potential 2011 nla m²</th>
<th>Modelled Potential 2021 nla m²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mill Pt Rd / Banksia Tce</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill Pt Rd / Douglas Ave</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawler St / Angelo St</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tate Street</td>
<td>547A</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Avenue</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Street</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banksia Terrace, Kgtnt</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandon Street, Kgtnt</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moresby Street</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monash Avenue</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coode St / Hensman St</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Tce / Coode St</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comer St/Labouchere Rd</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talbot Avenue</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bickley Crescent</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>5,247</td>
<td>4,417</td>
<td>4,418</td>
<td>4,413</td>
<td>4,424</td>
<td>4,463</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Retail Model Using Department for Planning and Infrastructure Population Projections 2001-2021 and 1997 Commercial Survey data.

- The results above do not take account of the requested centre at Pt. Lot 2 (No. 54) Manning Road cnr Ley Street, Manning. Even so, it can be seen that there is very little expansion potential for any Local Centres.

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS FOR LOCAL CENTRES

- Wherever possible, the Council should encourage the retention of convenience retail shopping in Local Centres and corner shops. Diversification to non-retail should not be a preferred outcome, but a back-up in the cases where retail fails.
- Where centres are no longer viable and are in the midst of a housing area, the Council should encourage the conversion of the vacant buildings and sites to residential purposes.
• Alternatively, for the larger centres which are better located but not viable as retailing, the Council could permit them to be converted into embryonic office/business premises to encourage expanding home offices to move out of houses.

• The Council should act as catalyst to promote physical upgrading of key Local Centres by implementing streetscape improvements along the lines of Angelo Street.

• In order to encourage upgrading of developments on land zoned Local Commercial, the Council could consider expansion of existing floorspace by a maximum of 10% where significant refurbishment of existing premises will be undertaken as part of the expansion.

• When on-site car parking cannot be provided to accommodate the additional 10% floorspace referred to above, the Council could consider giving use of existing road reserves to accommodate angled or other paved parking. This parking arrangement should be negotiated with the Council and funded by the centre owner as part of the development proposal.

• Expansions to any of the existing buildings on sites zoned Local Commercial, should generally be kept within 10% of the modelled potential.

• In considering a change from one commercial use to another within a Local Commercial zone, Council should aim to ensure that such use will not adversely impact on adjoining residential amenity and can preferably be demonstrated as serving local shopping needs or aspirations. The Council will have regard to the impact of the development on adjacent residential areas, as well as the demand for such facilities to serve the adjacent local community.

• Subject to compliance with any relevant City policy or Local Law, the Council may consider the commercial use of footpath areas external to a site zoned Local Commercial for display, or for alfresco dining activities where such use contributes to the character of the existing business, and any upgrading of the portion of footpath to be used is undertaken to the satisfaction of the Council.

TECHNOLOGY PARK

Objectives for Technology Park

1. To support the development of Technology Park, Kensington, with innovative technological and research uses which meet the Park’s entry criteria and comply with the requirements of Town Planning Scheme No. 6 (TPS6).

2. To ensure that Technology Park, Kensington, is developed as an attractive, landscaped ‘Park’.

3. To encourage high quality, landmark building design within Technology Park, Kensington, commensurate with the internationally acclaimed innovative image of the Park.

Context Statements for Technology Park

• Technology Park, Kensington, forms an extension of the Technology Park estate within the Town of Victoria Park. The latter area is near full capacity, containing 92 companies employing more than 2,500 people, with a combined annual turnover of $500 million, of which approximately 60% is derived from export income and 20% is re-invested into research and development. The individual companies are predominantly small technology enterprises employing an average of 20 persons each.

• Technology Park is the leading Technology Park in Australia and is rated by the International Association of Science as second in Asia and ninth in the world. As such, it has a high level of strategic importance to the City of South Perth.
Technology Park is administered by the Department of Industry and Resources under the provisions of the Industry and Technology Development Act 1998. Uses permitted in Technology Park, Kensington, are at the discretion of the Department, while also needing to comply with TPS6.

The land in the City of South Perth which has been zoned to permit and foster the westerly expansion of Technology Park currently accommodates the Department of Agriculture (AgWA), Department of Conservation and Land Management (CALM), Forest Management headquarters, and the Australian Resources Research Centre branch of the CSIRO. The Council has also approved one private Technology Park use, being an office and laboratory for Clinical Cell Culture Ltd in Dick Perry Avenue.

Technology Park forms part of a wider precinct comprising 314 hectares of mainly State Government controlled land with assets vested in relevant research, education and training, and economic development agencies. In May 1996, a report of the findings of the Technology Precinct Taskforce listed a wide range of objectives and recommendations for the precinct, relating to land uses, transport, education, innovation and technology, and communications. The final version of this report was endorsed by Cabinet on 4 May 1998. On 22 December 2003, Cabinet agreed to support the concept, and approved the establishment of two working groups to focus on the implementation of the Master Plan. The City is represented in this process.

Technology Park is surrounded by a range of educational facilities including Curtin University, a TAFE college and leading technology-based high schools, such as Kent Street Senior High School, which has a nationally recognised aeronautics course.

Technology Park, Kensington, is known as ‘Technology Park (Western Sector)’. It is zoned ‘Technology Park’ under TPS6. Under the Metropolitan Region Scheme it is zoned ‘Urban’.

The land was formerly reserved for government purposes under both the Metropolitan Region Scheme and the local Town Planning Scheme No. 5, but both Schemes were amended when it was decided that some of the land was redundant and surplus to requirements for the existing State Government purposes, and that the surplus land should be made available for sale to private owners.

TPS6 permits a fairly wide range of residential and commercial uses, including the use ‘Research and Development’. Few controls are contained within the Scheme, allowing the City flexibility in processing the more innovative developments.

Some of the land currently held by AgWA and CALM appears to be redundant, and it is likely that portions of those sites could be made available for alternative uses in the future when the Departments have fully rationalised their needs.

**Recommended Actions for Technology Park**

- The Council should be prepared to approve variations from the development requirements of TPS6 in response to particular needs demonstrated in development applications, so as to create a precinct containing attractive, world class building designs with the maximum quantity of high quality landscaping distributed in the most effective manner.

- The Council should primarily support those kinds of retail and other uses which support the objectives of Technology Park, or which service and complement existing uses.

- The City should support the medium to long-term redevelopment of land which might, in the future, be released from sites currently occupied by the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Conservation and Land Management, provided that such development is complementary to the objectives of Technology Park.
• The City should participate as a key stakeholder in the planning of the future development of the Technology Park precinct.

• The City should encourage appropriate residential, commercial and recreational uses that will support the precinct.

* * * * *

* * * * *
LOCAL COMMERCIAL STRATEGY MAP

Mends Street
Existing 1497 m² (2002)
Modelled 1570 m² (2006)
Favourable consideration for EDO expansion, within 20% of modelled potential.

Alpaca Street
Existing 2809 m² (2002)
Modelled 2976 m² (2006)
Further expansion should be contingent on improved amenity and refurbishment.

Meadowlake
Existing 1546 m² (2002)
Modelled 1590 m² (2006)
Further expansion should be contingent on improved amenity and refurbishment.

Canning Hwy/Way Road
Existing 690 m² (2002)
Modelled 580 m² (2006)
Modelled 315 m² (2021)
Further expansion should be contingent on improved amenity and refurbishment.

Canning Hwy
Hovea-Salisbury Streets
Existing 495 m² (2002)
Modelled 444 m² (2006)
Modelled 418 m² (2021)
No further expansion unless based on improved amenity and refurbishment.

Canning Hwy/Gaugus Av
Existing 1859 m² (2002)
Modelled 1375 m² (2006)
Modelled 1135 m² (2021)
Further expansion should be contingent on improved amenity and refurbishment.

Canning Hwy/Hopkins
Existing 350 m² (2002)
Modelled 378 m² (2006)
Modelled 318 m² (2021)
Minor further expansion should be contingent on improved amenity and refurbishment.

Canning Hwy/Manas
Existing 113 m² (2002)
Modelled 129 m² (2006)
Modelled 129 m² (2021)
No further expansion.

Canning Hwy/Henley
Existing 121 m² (2002)
Existing 121 m² (2002)
Modelled 121 m² (2021)
Further expansion should be contingent on improved amenity and refurbishment.

Manning Road/Ley Street
Existing 196 m² (2002)
Modelled 187 m² (2006)
Further expansion should be contingent on improved amenity and refurbishment.

Waltham Avenue
Existing 1870 m² (2002)
Modelled 1878 m² (2006)
Further expansion should be contingent on improved amenity and refurbishment.

LEGEND
Centre Type
- District
- Neighbourhood
- Mixed Use
- Highway Commercial
- Local
See Strategy Report
DPI Survey Data
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OVERVIEW, ANALYSIS AND SYNTHESIS
CHAPTER 1  BACKGROUND

1.1 INTRODUCTION

This Local Commercial Strategy (LCS) has been prepared by Planwest (WA) Pty Ltd and Belingwe Pty Ltd, in response to an invitation by the City of South Perth to undertake a review of its 1996 draft LCS. In 1994 the City of South Perth engaged BSD Consultants to prepare the new Town Planning Scheme No. 6 (TPS6). Part of the work included the preparation of a LCS. Subject to minor modifications, the Council endorsed the draft LCS in February 1996 as the basis for formulating the commercial elements of the (then) proposed TPS6.

Between September 1997 and June 1998 the proposed TPS6 was modified to correct minor errors and omissions, and changes required by the Minister as a prerequisite to advertising.

The draft LCS was advertised along with the other Scheme reports and the draft TPS6 in the latter half of 1998, with the period for inspection and comment closing on 11 December 1998.

As a result of advertising of the 1996 draft Strategy along with other Scheme documents related to TPS6, the Minister required further modifications to portions of the Scheme Text and Maps. This delayed the final approval of the Scheme until 29 April 2003.

The delay, to a certain extent, made the 1996 draft Strategy outdated and in need of review. Specifically, the Council listed the following concerns with the 1996 draft Strategy:

- It is based on population projections by BSD Consultants derived from the 1991 Census. Since then, the 1996 and 2001 census collections have taken place. Therefore, populations projections used in the Strategy need updating.

- It is based on the former Metropolitan Centres Policy (1991). This Policy has now been superseded by the Metropolitan Centres Policy (2000). The new Metropolitan Centres Policy was given statutory effect as a Western Australian Planning Commission Statement of Planning Policy No. 9 in the Government Gazette dated 17 October 2000 (now numbered SPP No. 4.2).

- At the time the Metropolitan Centres Policy floorspace guidelines were formulated in 1991, there was the supposition that inner metropolitan population numbers would fall relative to the outer metropolitan corridors, because of the ageing of the inner metropolitan area population. The supposition is reflected in population projections issued by the Department for Planning and Infrastructure up until 1997.

- Recent inner-metropolitan housing trends have caused the Department for Planning and Infrastructure to revise its thinking about future metropolitan growth trends. These changes are reflected in their report Western Australia Tomorrow – Population Report No. 4 (October 2000). These projections have indicated an expected rise in inner metropolitan populations in the period 2001 – 2026 at the expense of declines or slower growth in the outer corridors.

- While the projections in Population Report No. 4 were based on the 1996 Census, checks with the most recent Australian Bureau of Statistics Estimated Residential Population for 2001 (Publication 3218.0 – 3 April 2003), show that the projections are within acceptable limit of error (1.5% overall). The Department for Planning and Infrastructure has therefore...
agreed that the small area projections by Main Roads Traffic Zones derived from *Population Report No. 4* as used in this study, are acceptable for LCS purposes.

- The commercial data used in the LCS was based upon the (then) Ministry for Planning 1993 Commercial Survey. Since then, further surveys have been undertaken by the Department for Planning and Infrastructure in 1997 and 2002. Our review will therefore use the 2002 data but also the 1997 data for the assessment of recent trends and changes.

- The Minister did not accept the proposal in the 1996 draft LCS that there be two District Centres – at Karawara and Mends Street – which does not accord with the *Metropolitan Centres Policy (2000)*.

- The 1996 draft Strategy needs to be re-written to remove prescriptive statements that are now more appropriately contained in TPS6 where relevant. TPS6 was gazetted on 29 April 2003.

- In some cases, the recommendations made in the 1996 draft Strategy appeared to be inconsistent with the output of the computer modelling of retail potential that was undertaken. One such example is the Neighbourhood Centre at Angelo Street, where a recommendation that some expansion be allowed did not accord with model results which showed no expansion potential.

- In addition to the stated need to update the 1996 draft Strategy, the review has also been triggered by an application for another commercial centre, not envisaged in the 1996 draft Strategy, comprising a Neighbourhood Centre of 4,500 m² on the former Telstra site at Pt. Lot 2 (No. 54) Manning Road cnr Ley Street, Manning. The concern is that this could impact on the prospects of the nearby Village Green (Karawara) centre ever reaching its planned District Centre size of 12,000 m².

- There are also a number of other submissions by consultants for other commercial areas in the City which need to be evaluated in the context of the LCS.

Most of the recommendations in the 1996 draft Strategy are still valid. Many of the recommendations were incorporated into TPS6. Because of the advanced stage of processing of the new Scheme at the time of updating the 1996 draft Strategy, it was not the intention that the recommendations in this review be a radical departure from the 1996 draft. It focuses on addressing the issues above.

Since it was endorsed by the Council in 1996, the City used the 1996 draft Strategy in its day to day administration of the Town Planning Scheme. Throughout this report, the BSD draft version of the LCS will be referred to as the ‘1996 draft Strategy’, to distinguish it from the final version of the LCS which was adopted in 2004 and is referred to in this report as the ‘Local Commercial Strategy’ or ‘LCS’.

The brief for this study makes it clear that this review of the 1996 draft Strategy is not intended to be a new strategy or change in direction from the commercial intent or provisions embodied in TPS6. It is intended to be essentially an update to incorporate:

- New or revised Western Australian Planning Commission policy on retail development in the Perth Metropolitan Region, such as the *Metropolitan Centres Policy (2000)*.

- New planning ideas for shopping centre development such as the ‘main street’ urban design principles currently being promoted by the Western Australian Planning Commission.

- An independent analysis of new shopping centre proposals which are controversial.

- Recent approvals by the Council for additional shopping over and above the draft 1996 Strategy.
Town Planning Scheme No. 6 became operational on 29 April 2003, when it was published in the Government Gazette. The brief for this study requires that any findings and consequent recommendations that are made are consistent with the objectives and provisions of the Scheme.

This is as it should be. The work that was done by BSD Consultants for both documents, in background research, reporting, consultation and preparation of the new Town Planning Scheme was both thorough and professional. The extent to which the commercial aspects of the Strategy are outdated was minor and we did not make any findings that radically differed from those found by BSD.

The work in this study must therefore be read in the context of the more comprehensive work carried out by BSD. We make no apology for drawing heavily from that work.

1.2 BACKGROUND TO COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT IN CITY OF SOUTH PERTH SINCE 1961

The City of South Perth is an inner city suburban area which is virtually fully developed and the commercial framework is now set. It is therefore important to understand the background to the existing commercial structure of the City to put any proposals we may make into context.

Most of the shops in the City of South Perth are old street-front shops or small shopping strips. While much is in need of renewal, the form of development accords with current fashions for shopping development as conceived in the Community Design Codes now being promoted by the Western Australian Planning Commission.

Much of the history of commercial development in the City was reviewed in the 1996 draft Strategy. It is relevant to re-state the more salient points.

The initial concentration of retail development in the City of South Perth was in the northern portion of the City, with the largest centres established along Canning Highway (between Douglas Avenue and Collins Street and Birdwood Avenue and Hobbs Avenue), at Mends Street, and adjoining the Angelo / Coode Streets intersection. This was predominantly strip retailing with no off-street parking provided. Ad hoc ribbon retailing also existed in pockets elsewhere along Canning Highway (eg corner Henley Street), and adjoining Manning Road (southern side, corners of Ley Street).

In 1967, in support of Town Planning Scheme No. 2, a retail survey commissioned by the Council identified 145,225 square feet GLA (gross leasable area) of shop floor area (13,491 m² GLA or 12,140 m² nla) and that this amounted to 6.3 shops per 1,000 persons. This was less than the metropolitan average of 10.8 shops per 1,000 persons at that time. The survey found that only 45% of resident weekly shopping expenditure was within the City of South Perth, with 43% escaping to shops in the adjoining local authorities and Perth City Centre. The survey found that 84% of households in South Perth wanted a modern central city shopping centre to be provided in South Perth.

To explain the shortfall in commercial floor area, the survey concluded that the reluctance of developers was due to the dispersed, but high number of, existing small centres and the inability of such centres to compete with the established larger centres in neighbouring local authorities.

As a consequence to these findings residential land opposite the Council offices bounded by Sandgate Street, Canning Highway, South Terrace and Renwick Street, was nominated in
Scheme 2 as ‘Future District Cultural Commercial Centre’ zone. This site, measuring approximately 8 hectares, could have accommodated a large District sized centre (about 20,000 m²) by today’s standards.

In addition, Scheme 2 included provision for a new shopping mall at Mends Street, and new centres at Kensington (Fourth Avenue) and at Manning Road (cnr Baldwin and Henley Streets). It also extended the commercial zonings adjoining Preston Street in an attempt to rejuvenate the holiday atmosphere of the Como centre following the Freeway construction and the severance of Como Beach.

However, the ‘city centre’ idea was short lived. By 1977 no commercial development had occurred and the site had been rezoned back to Residential. The reason was summarised in the Scheme 5 Report.

“As any future South Perth District Centre, major supermarket or department store operators would attract customer traffic from outside South Perth, residents’ disenchantment with external through-traffic could be considered grounds for abandonment of the City or District Centre development objectives. The most logical course open lies in taking this action and modifying the existing… planning arrangement to support stronger Neighbourhood or minor District shopping centre development.”

These ideas were embodied in the Scheme 5 Report (the Town Planning Scheme following Scheme 2) which proposed a hierarchy of smaller sized centres as shown in Table 1 below and Figure 1 overleaf.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Locality</th>
<th>Centre Name</th>
<th>Centre Classification</th>
<th>Size Range m² (GLA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mill Point</td>
<td>Mends Street</td>
<td>Minor District</td>
<td>3,000 - 9,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karawara</td>
<td>Village Green</td>
<td>Minor District</td>
<td>3,000 - 9,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Perth-Kensington</td>
<td>Angelo Street</td>
<td>Neighbourhood</td>
<td>2,000 - 3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Como</td>
<td>Preston Street</td>
<td>Neighbourhood</td>
<td>2,000 - 3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manning</td>
<td>Welwyn Avenue</td>
<td>Intermediate Neighbourhood</td>
<td>1,000 - 2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Douglas Avenue / Canning Highway</td>
<td>Intermediate Neighbourhood</td>
<td>1,000 - 2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hobbs Avenue / Canning Highway</td>
<td>Intermediate Neighbourhood</td>
<td>1,000 - 2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Manning Road (cnr Ley Street)</td>
<td>Intermediate Neighbourhood</td>
<td>1,000 - 2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Douglas Avenue / Mill Point Road</td>
<td>Small Neighbourhood</td>
<td>500 - 1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Terrace / Coode Street</td>
<td>Small Neighbourhood</td>
<td>500 - 1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Melville Parade / Preston Street</td>
<td>Small Neighbourhood</td>
<td>500 - 1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Letchworth Centre Avenue / Salter Point Parade</td>
<td>Small Neighbourhood</td>
<td>500 - 1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Monash Avenue</td>
<td>Small Neighbourhood</td>
<td>500 - 1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>George Street</td>
<td>Small Neighbourhood</td>
<td>500 - 1,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, a number of Local Centres below 500 m² and single shops were identified. See Figure 1.
FIGURE 1 TOWN PLANNING SCHEME NO. 5 RETAIL HIERARCHY (1980) – BSD
It is interesting that in the 1967 survey, the floor area of 12,140 m² nla (approx) represented 0.38 m² nla per capita for the estimated population of 33,000 at that time, compared to the 0.98 m² per capita identified by BSD in 1994. This is very low and there must have been considerable potential for expansion. Yet the report at that time concluded “the comparative inadequacy of South Perth’s shopping services to cater for the District’s own population is aggravated by the absence of a centre paralleling District standards”.

By the time Scheme 5 was being prepared in 1980, the Scheme Report noted that, by MRPA standards, the City was over-supplied with retail floorspace by 4,708 m². This was based on the philosophy that the City of South Perth should only have centres of the Neighbourhood and minor District category, and that residents could travel to adjoining local authorities for higher order shopping.

By 1994 the BSD commercial survey of the City of South Perth identified 78,035 m² nla of commercial floorspace of which 35,902 m² was retail. This represented 0.98 m² per capita, which BSD points out is substantially less than the metropolitan average of 1.74 m² for all retail floorspace recommended in the Metropolitan Centres Policy (1991), but slightly more than the recommended ratio of 0.93 m² nla per capita for District, Neighbourhood and Local Centres. This was despite there being no District-sized shopping centre in South Perth.

From this, BSD concluded in the TPS6 Report, that: “This reinforces the dominance and over-supply of Local and Neighbourhood floorspace, and the under-supply of District Centre floorspace, a traditional feature of shopping provision in the City.”

This is the situation that still prevails. While there has been provision in the Metropolitan Centres Policies since 1991 for a District Centre at Village Green (Karawara) in the southeastern corner of the City, it has only ever developed as a large Neighbourhood Centre. The centre is based on a large chain supermarket (Coles) and a proliferation of fast food outlets.

Shopping centre development is very responsive to trade potential. The fact that no District-level centre has been developed in the City of South Perth is both a historical legacy but also an indication of lack of potential. For a long time the City’s residents have had to travel outside for higher order shopping which is readily available in adjacent local authorities.

**Commercial Offices**

The background to office development in the City of South Perth is well researched and documented in the 1996 draft Strategy and summarised in the TPS6 Report. For convenience, it is re-stated here:

“Prior to 1970, the only office development that had occurred was in the Mill Point area with small-scale conversion of houses to offices.

However during the mid-1970s a substantial proportion of dwelling stock in the Mill Point locality was converted to offices, heralding the first major office floorspace established in the City. This was permitted by the then Residential GR6-C zoning introduced in Town Planning Scheme No. 2 in 1972. Concerned at the loss of residential housing stock and population for non-residential uses, the Council subsequently amended its Scheme in 1979 to introduce the use “Controlled Use Office” and to prescribe the maximum amount of land area within the residential GR6-C zone that could be converted for office use.

The GR6-C zone was confined to:
(i) Land bounded by Richardson Street, Labouchere Road, Judd Street and Stone Street;
(ii) Land bounded by Judd Street, Mill Point Road, Scott Street and Melville Parade;
(iii) Lots fronting Mill Point Road between Harper Terrace / Judd Street to the south and Stirling / Queen Streets to the north; and
(iv) Two lots fronting Melville Parade between Eric and Preston Streets.

Although the Scheme permitted only 50% of the houses in any street to be used / converted for commercial activities, this was largely exceeded due to the popularity of the Mill Point location for low scale commercial activities.

In 1974 the then Town Planning Board instructed the City of South Perth Council that the Board envisaged Mill Point “becoming a high density, high amenity residential area closely associated with the Perth CBD. The Board will not oppose a modest proportion of professional and consultant offices because these could be a complimentary use to flats, but it does not feel there can be any justification for extreme office development in view of the existing (and increasing) over-supply of new office space in the CBD.”

By the time of Scheme 5 in the mid-1980s, the only residential zone which permitted office development was fronting Judd Street south of the Freeway on / off ramp. Purpose-built office buildings and converted houses within the area north of Judd Street that were developed in the former GR6-C (mixed office / residential) locations under Scheme 2 (outlined above) became conforming uses by way of the Added Use provisions of Scheme 5.

In addition, Scheme 5 facilitated a number of office developments fronting Canning Highway and offices were also developed to varying degrees in the larger Neighbourhood Shopping Centres in Preston Street and Mends Street.

The 1990 DPUD Survey of Commercial Floorspace in Metropolitan Perth indicated that office commercial activities comprised 31% of the City’s commercial floorspace (almost as high as the 35% of retailing) and accounted for 47% of the City’s employment (exceeding retailing which accounted for only 42%).”

**Commercial – Other**

The other commercial land uses existing within the City of South Perth are as follows:

1. **Hotels and Motels** – the City contains a number of older hotels adjoining Canning Highway (Hurlingham Tavern, Como Hotel) and on the corner of Mill Point Road and Mends Street (Windsor Hotel). Motels were also developed along Preston Street prior to the opening of the Narrows Bridge to serve the tourists staying in the area when access was freely available to Como Beach. At a similar time, hotels were developed along Manning Road (the Manning Hotel), Canning Highway (Metro Inn) and in the Mill Point area (Freeway Hotel). The Manning Hotel has since been demolished and replaced with a smaller Tavern, and the Freeway Hotel site has been redeveloped with substantial residential units. Taverns exist in two shopping centres, being the Karalee Tavern in Preston Street and the Waterford Tavern in the Village Green (Karawara) centre. A number of Private Hotels are located within the City and in more recent times the trend has been to develop serviced apartments or “up-market” Private Hotels including the Broadwater Resort, Melville Parade, Como and the Arlington Apartments in Arlington Avenue, South Perth.
2. **Ad hoc commercial development** along Canning Highway – this includes a small number of service stations, car yards and boat sales yards that existed as either Added Uses, Non-Conforming Uses or site specific land use zones under Scheme 5, and which are now accommodated within the Highway Commercial zone of TPS6.

3. **Real Estate Agencies and Banks** – the City has a number of Real Estate Agencies which are predominantly concentrated around the Angelo Street shopping centre or in isolated converted houses or corner stores such as along Canning Highway, Labouchere Road and Mill Point Road. Banks have been established along Canning Highway and in some Neighbourhood Centres, including Mends Street, Welwyn Avenue and Angelo Street but not in the Village Green (Karawara) centre. In the past, the City has had to amend its Scheme to restrict the number of Real Estate Agents and non-retail facilities (i.e. Banks) situated within the Angelo Street centre, concerned that the centre would lose its Neighbourhood shopping function if it was primarily developed for these non-retail activities.

4. **Miscellaneous commercial** – although limited in number, there are a handful of non-retail commercial activities situated amidst the residential areas in the City, including the Cygnet Theatre, numerous TAB agencies, isolated older offices, post offices, veterinary clinics and medical centres. There are no specific designated areas for developments comprising showroom or warehouse activities and there is an absence of much light, service or general industrial development within the City other than dry cleaning premises and automotive repair outlets. The extension of Technology Park into the eastern extremity of the City may alter this scenario by facilitating the development of high technology industries commensurate with the style of development that has previously occurred in Technology Park.

This background is important to understand the context of the recommendations in the 1996 draft Strategy. The shopping centre hierarchy and distribution for the City of South Perth envisaged in the preparation of Scheme 5 in the early 1980’s is similar to that now envisaged for TPS6. It is still essentially small-scale, based on the idea of two minor District Centres and smaller Local Centres fairly evenly distributed, which have not realised their anticipated potential. The Department for Planning and Infrastructure Commercial Surveys indicate that between 1990 and 1997, retail floor area increased by only 1,000 m². Between 1997 and 2002 it fell by 2,100 m², with most of the fall occurring at the smaller centres. Mends Street and Village Green (Karawara) centres, at the upper end, showed increases. Between 1990 and 1997 vacant commercial floor area decreased by about the same amount as retail floor area increased. Similarly, the vacant commercial floor area increased between 1997 and 2002. This indicates that, from the retail perspective, the City of South Perth has about reached its full potential. Most centre sites have been fully developed for a considerable time and any expansion must occur through the redevelopment process or invasion into adjoining residential areas.

Commercial office development is different. South Perth is by far a more important office area than a retail area. Overall office floor area increased by about 14,000 m² between 1990 – 1997, despite the City of South Perth putting brakes on new developments. Between 1997 and 2002 it expanded by a further 2,000 m² – a very much slower rate. The future potential for office development is not related to the demographics of the City. Regional forces are at play in the context of South Perth’s inner city location. There are indications that there will be pressures for further office development in the future. Such pressures will need to be carefully monitored and controlled by the Council if the objectives for enhancing the residential amenity of the City are to be maintained, especially in the prestigious locations overlooking the river on the western and northern edges of the City.
CHAPTER 2 POLICY AND PLANNING CONTEXT

Local Commercial Strategies are required by the Western Australian Planning Commission as an important component of any review of a local government Town Planning Scheme. Alternatively the Western Australian Planning Commission may require the preparation of a Local Commercial Strategy (LCS) where the development of a major commercial project is proposed which is outside the scope of any existing adopted strategies or the Town Planning Scheme.

Until both the Council and the Western Australian Planning Commission endorse a LCS it has no official status.

The 1996 draft Strategy was produced under the Metropolitan Centres Policy (1991). It was endorsed by the Council in February 1996 as the basis for formulating the commercial elements of the then proposed Town Planning Scheme No. 6 (TPS6). However, the overall Scheme review process took so long that the 1996 draft Strategy was overtaken by the new Metropolitan Centres Policy (2000). This new Policy has been given statutory effect by the Western Australian Planning Commission by adopting it as Statement of Planning Policy No. 9.

The Western Australian Planning Commission requires that Local Commercial Strategies take account of State planning policies. These are outlined below, and their implications for the City’s LCS are canvassed.

2.1 METROPOLITAN AND LOCAL CONTEXT

The City of South Perth is located south of the City of Perth CBD, across the Swan River. Its adjoining local authorities are the Town of Victoria Park to the east, City of Canning to the south-east and City of Melville to the south-west across the Canning Bridge.

The Swan and Canning Rivers bound the City of South Perth on three sides. On the northern side is the City of Perth with access via the Narrows Bridge and Kwinana Freeway. So far as this City is concerned, this is a barren trade area. To the west, the only access point from Melville and the area to the south and south west is via the Canning Bridge. It is an inconvenient access. There is no southern access over the Canning River other than through Canning.

The most accessible routes to a wider trade area are Manning Road and Albany Highway. Oats Street and Canning Highway are the other access routes from the east. However, so far as trade potential is concerned, the City of South Perth is cut off from the eastern and south-eastern trade areas by very strong competition from the centres on Albany Highway, including Victoria Park, East Victoria Park and La Plaza Bentley District Centres.

The City of South Perth is also centrally located to three major Regional Centres that dominate the shopping activity of the southern part of the metropolitan region. To the north is the Perth CBD that provides the highest level of comparison shopping in the State. To the east, the Carousel shopping centre in the City of Canning has recently been expanded to 73,000 m² and refurbished. Similarly, Garden City in Melville has also been expanded to 57,655 m² and refurbished. Both these latter centres offer an extensive range of high order shopping comparable to those in Perth, in addition to each having three major supermarket chains for weekly groceries shopping.
These factors, combined with the local community’s long-standing preference not to have any major shopping centre in the City of South Perth, have meant that residents have traditionally travelled outside South Perth to do their major (weekly) shopping. However, the disposition of centres that are mostly within 2-3 kilometres of South Perth’s boundary has meant that the residents are well served. See Figure 2 below:

**FIGURE 2 DISTRIBUTION OF RETAIL AND COMMERCIAL AREAS IN AND AROUND CITY OF SOUTH PERTH**

From a trading perspective, the City of South Perth is an insular trade area, within physical and competing commercial barriers which are not conducive to attracting trade potential from outside. This is the most obvious explanation as to why South Perth has not been able to attract major retail development, and why even the Village Green (Karawara) District Centre, first zoned in 1977 has only developed as a medium sized Neighbourhood Centre.

### 2.2 STATE PLANNING STRATEGY (1996)

The State Planning Strategy was endorsed by the Government in 1996 as the overall land use development strategy to 2029. The Strategy in fact comprises a number of interrelated regional strategies focused on Regional Centres throughout the State. The Perth Metropolitan Region is the prime region and focus of growth.
The main points of relevance of the State Planning Strategy for Perth and, in particular the City of South Perth, are as follows:

- Promote Perth CBD as the commercial, cultural, administrative centre of the State.
- Promote inner city redevelopment with higher density housing.
- Make larger suburban commercial centres (Regional and District) the focus points for commercial and community activity rather than just shopping centres. They should be promoted as important decentralised employment areas.
- Promote higher residential densities around major centres.

2.3 METROPOLITAN CENTRES POLICY (2000)

The Metropolitan Centres Policy (2000) envisages commercial activity in the Perth Metropolitan Region occurring in a hierarchy of centres. These centres are ordered as below:

- Perth Central Business District
- Strategic Regional Centres
- Other Regional Centres
- District Centres
- Neighbourhood and Local Centres

Appendix 2 to the Metropolitan Centres Policy (2000) lists all the existing and planned Regional and District Centres in the Perth Metropolitan Region. For the City of South Perth, only one District Centre has been identified, at Village Green (Karawara). This is no different from the earlier Metropolitan Centres Policy (1991).

In the 1996 draft Strategy, BSD Consultants proposed two District Centres in the City, at Mends Street and at Village Green (Karawara). However, the Western Australian Planning Commission advised the City that the Mends Street centre must be downgraded to a Neighbourhood Centre before TPS6 was permitted to be advertised for public comment. This advice demonstrates that the Western Australian Planning Commission will not depart from the Metropolitan Centres Policy (2000) without very good reason.

The non-acceptance of Mends Street as a District Centre is one of the reasons the Council has commissioned this current review.

The specific policies that apply in the City of South Perth for District, Neighbourhood and Local Centres are summarised in Figure 3 shown overleaf (taken from Appendix 1 of the Metropolitan Centres Policy (2000)).

The policy for District Centres is covered by Section 4.2.4:

"4.2.4 District Centres

District Centres will be promoted as centres serving the weekly shopping and service needs of the suburban population. They should provide mainly convenience goods, a range of comparison goods, local services and local employment.

Shopping floorspace should generally be confined to 15,000 m² unless consistent with a Commission endorsed Local Planning Strategy or centre plan."
Local government is encouraged to prepare centre plans for new District Centres and any existing centres undergoing change and/or experiencing development pressure.

District Centres will generally be required in urban growth areas, but may not be appropriate in areas where a high level of retail service can be provided to a resident population through a combination of a Strategic Regional or Regional Centre, and Neighbourhood Centres of various sizes.

Local Planning Strategies and District Structure Plans should accurately define the new centres which will be required for the new urban areas. As an alternative to the planned centres, local governments may consider a system of more, but smaller centres whereby centre facilities would be located closer to the population."

FIGURE 3 EXTRACT FROM METROPOLITAN CENTRES POLICY
(for the Perth Metropolitan Region)

APPENDIX 1
METROPOLITAN CENTRES POLICY HIERARCHY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centre Functions</th>
<th>Strategic Regional Centres</th>
<th>Regional Centres</th>
<th>District Centres</th>
<th>Ne'hood and Local Centres</th>
<th>Traditional 'Main Street' Centres (all levels in hierarchy)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary Functions</td>
<td>Multi-purpose and major employment centres for a full range of retail, commercial, administrative, entertainment, recreational and regional community facilities.</td>
<td>Multi-purpose centres for retail, office, community and entertainment facilities.</td>
<td>Centres for weekly retail, service and community facilities.</td>
<td>Local centres for convenience shopping, small offices and local services and community facilities.</td>
<td>As for centres in the hierarchy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office and Community Uses</td>
<td>Major offices of businesses and government, professional offices and major entertainment facilities such as multiplex cinemas.</td>
<td>Office development, professional offices and entertainment facilities.</td>
<td>Distict level offices such as professional, sales and service offices.</td>
<td>Small offices.</td>
<td>As for centres in the hierarchy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail Types</td>
<td>Department stores, discount department stores, major supermarkets, major specialised retail stores and convenience stores.</td>
<td>Discount department stores, supermarkets, specialty stores and convenience stores.</td>
<td>Minor discount department stores, supermarkets, specialty stores and convenience stores.</td>
<td>Supermarkets, Convenience stores and local shops.</td>
<td>As for centres in the hierarchy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping Floorpace Guide</td>
<td>Up to 50,000m² nla</td>
<td>Up to 50,000m² nla</td>
<td>Up to 15,000m² nla</td>
<td>Up to 450m² nla</td>
<td>Additional individual retail development of up to 1000m² or cumulative developments of up to 2300m² in any calendar year subject to qualifications in clause 5.4 of this policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred Location</td>
<td>Primary road, rail station and major public transport services.</td>
<td>Primary road, rail station and major public transport services.</td>
<td>District distributor road and public transport services.</td>
<td>Local distributor road and bus route.</td>
<td>As for centres in the hierarchy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centre Plans</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Required</td>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>Recommended</td>
<td>Required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Policy for Neighbourhood and Local Centres is covered in Section 4.2.5:

**4.2.5 Neighbourhood and Local Centres**

Neighbourhood and Local Centres which range from corner shops to small centres should be promoted predominantly for convenience retailing and (in the larger centres) weekly food and groceries shopping. Provision should also be made for small offices, which serve the local community, as well as health, welfare and community facilities.

*Shopping floorspace should generally be confined to 4,500 m² unless consistent with a Commission endorsed Local Planning Strategy.*

The size and location of Neighbourhood and Local Centres should be identified in Local Planning Strategies, district and local structure plans for new urban growth areas.

*Planning controls should support the future of small shops and centres by controlling the size of larger centres and limiting new competing retail development outside Local Centres defined in the Local Planning Strategies and structure plans.*

The Policy for traditional ‘main street’ shopping centres is covered in Section 4.2.6:

**4.2.5 Traditional ‘Main Street’ Centres**

As far as practicable, centres at all levels should be developed or redeveloped in accordance with the traditional ‘main street’ design principles as integrated, attractive, safe and vibrant places to provide a focus for community activities.

*Incentives are provided to promote traditional ‘main street’ development by allowing shopping floorspace development to exceed the shopping floorspace guide of this policy or the floorspace specified in an endorsed Local Planning Strategy.*

With the exception of the Village Green (Karawara) District Centre, all of the centres in the City of South Perth are classified as Neighbourhood and Local Centres.

The Village Green (Karawara) District Centre was first identified in the *Metropolitan Centres Policy (1991).* It is interesting that Village Green (Karawara) was not identified as a District Centre in the retail modelling for the draft *Metropolitan Centres Policy (1997)*, presumably because no potential for a District Centre at this location was seen. In fact no expansion potential was forecast for any of the surrounding District Centres in the Study Area.

Most of the existing centres, including the commercial / retail development along Canning Highway could be regarded as having elements of ‘main street’ centres, namely direct frontage to the public domain. Most of the centres are old and in time will be ripe for redevelopment.

The provisions in the *Metropolitan Centres Policy (2000)* covering ‘main street’ shopping centres is potentially important for the City of South Perth where most of the existing centres were developed along street frontages. Most are old centres in need of renewal. It would be desirable, within the limits of economic viability, for the Council to promote renewal in accordance with ‘main street’ principles. More will be said about this later.

Appendix 2 to the *Metropolitan Centres Policy (2000)* only identified ‘main street’ centres at the District level and above. No ‘main street’ centres were identified in the City of South Perth. In Victoria Park, two District ‘main street’ centres have been identified along Albany Highway.
TPS6 does not contain a ‘main street’ zone. The closest equivalent zones would be the Highway Commercial zone and the Mends Street Centre Commercial zone. The former covers all retail and commercial development along Canning Highway and Manning Roads, with the exception of the Village Green (Karawara) District Centre at the corner of Manning Road and Kent Street. However, the form of commercial development along these two roads is old ribbon style development that would need to be substantially upgraded to meet the standards envisaged in ‘main street’ centre design.

Mends Street, on the other hand, is subject to a Local Strategy Plan, and does meet most of the design criteria for ‘main street’.

Appendix 3 to the Metropolitan Centres Policy (2000) contains floorspace guidelines for the provision of shopping floor area relative to population. The guidelines are prefaced by the statement that:

“The general guidelines are intended as a guide only to give a broad indication of the distribution of shopping floorspace in the hierarchy of centres. The standards will need to be refined and reassessed when preparing Local Planning Strategies and assessing development approvals.”

Notwithstanding this qualification, the guidelines are, without doubt, the most influential part of the Metropolitan Centres Policy (2000) for Local Commercial Strategies. They are unchanged from the guidelines in the Metropolitan Centres Policy (1991). Experience has shown that the Department for Planning and Infrastructure is most wary of any suggestions for altering them, even when it can be shown that most inner areas have existing per capita ratios in excess of them and most outer suburbs are the reverse. They are shown in the Table below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centre Type</th>
<th>Per Capita m² nla</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perth Central Area</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Centres</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Centres</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood &amp; Local Centres</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.74</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These guidelines have been (and still are) the basis of determining future retail floor area requirements for almost all recommendations in the Local Commercial Strategies that have been produced for local governments within the metropolitan region in the last 12 years. The guidelines were used as the basic determinant of floor area requirements and growth potential for all major centres in the major retail modelling exercise carried out for the (then Ministry for Planning) Department for Planning and Infrastructure in 1997, for the review of the Metropolitan Centres Policy (1991). We understand that while this 1997 modelling has no official status in the Metropolitan Centres Policy (2000) it is still used as the yardstick by which the Department for Planning and Infrastructure assess current strategies and proposals.

These guidelines underpin all the recommendations that were made in the 1996 draft Strategy, which has been carried through into TPS6.

We will say more about the use of these guidelines later.
2.4 COMMUNITY DESIGN CODES

A new and potentially far-reaching planning initiative being promoted by the Western Australian Planning Commission is the concept of 'liveable neighbourhoods' based on the 'Community Design Codes'. The main feature of liveable neighbourhoods is that they are based on permeable grid-iron street patterns and on 400 metre radius catchments each served by a focus of local retailing and community facilities. Usually, four such liveable neighbourhoods would support a primary school. District Centres have 800 metre radius catchments.

The extract shown in Figure 4 overleaf provides an example of a District Structure Plan.

An important principle for the location of shopping is that it should be located on the more important streets, preferably at the intersection of important streets. The larger the shopping centre, the more important the streets.

The existing pattern of streets and distribution of commercial facilities in the City of South Perth is reminiscent of these planning principles. There are, therefore, opportunities to promote redevelopment to include the finer points of community design.

Proponents of the Community Design Codes are sceptical of the retail hierarchy contemplated by the Metropolitan Centres Policy (2000) and of the amount of retail floor area generated by the application of the floorspace guidelines. They point out, quite rightly, that the inner suburbs of Perth (and many other cities) which are developed along the grid pattern, have much higher per capita shop floor area ratios than the guidelines, and most of it appears sustainable.

![Example of a District Structure Plan](image)

FIGURE 4 EXAMPLE OF A DISTRICT STRUCTURE PLAN

Source: Liveable Neighbourhoods 2000

However, work on the commercial viability of the liveable neighbourhood concepts is still untested. A research paper commissioned by the Department for Planning and Infrastructure suggests that the 400 metre neighbourhood could only support a small amount of local shops - although the amount is not specified. With average gross population densities in the inner areas, such neighbourhoods would have 1,000 - 1,300 people supporting about 500 - 700 m².
Twelve such neighbourhoods would support a District or ‘Town Centre’. Again, the size is not specified but based on average City of South Perth gross urban population densities of 27 persons per hectare, the 16,000 - 17,000 people could support 6,000 - 7,000 m² nla (based on Metropolitan Centres Policy (2000) guidelines).

This equates to a two-tier hierarchy of small Local Centres and small District Centres with no room for the large in-between Neighbourhood Centres of 3,000 m² - 4,500 m² nla currently popular with developers.

2.5 OTHER REPORTS

There are a number of reports that have a bearing on the LCS. The main findings are discussed below.

CITY OF SOUTH PERTH TOWN PLANNING SCHEME NO. 5

Town Planning Scheme No. 5 was the operative Scheme at the time of commencement of the update of the 1996 draft Strategy. The commercial zones in Scheme 5 comprised:

- Shopping S1
- Shopping S2
- Shopping S3
- Commercial C1
- Commercial C2
- Commercial C3
- Residential R.O.
- Hotel
- Motel
- Service Station
- Motor Repair and Service Station.

The intent of the zones in Scheme 5 was to distinguish between those zones where shops would be permitted (zoned ‘Shopping’) and those in which offices would be permitted (zoned ‘Commercial’). The numbering after the Shopping and Commercial zones was to designate size. For example, Shopping S1 designated a Local Centre, S2 a Neighbourhood Centre and S3 a District Centre. A similar context was intended for the Commercial zones.

However, as BSD pointed out, the Scheme 5 Scheme Text was not specific about the objectives for each of the zones and the original intent was diluted over time in some Commercial areas, particularly along Canning Highway. For example, adjoining lots had different Commercial and Shopping zone designations and numerical suffixes which did not reflect the intent or the use to which the land was being put.

We also note, and will comment more below, that a significant amount of shopping and commercial floorspace was created using the ‘Added Use’ provisions of Clause 50 and Schedule C of Scheme 5. It appears that about four times as much commercial development was created in the City of South Perth on Residential zoned land as Added Uses, than existed in the zoned commercial areas.

The result, which was a product of ad-hoc rezoning, and the creation of Added Uses as de-facto zones, over time, caused considerable confusion in the eyes of developers and the community. It was also an administrative issue, in that refusal for a specific use on a specific zone, which
may not have been originally contemplated, became appealable on the basis of precedents having been granted.

To rectify these inconsistencies and to bring the proposed TPS6 more into line with the recommended zones in the Model Scheme Text and the Metropolitan Centres Policy (2000), the 1996 draft Strategy proposed that the new Scheme should:

- Contain zonings which reflect the existing and intended function of commercial areas within the City;
- Remove the existing Added Use and Restricted Use designations and provisions where possible but retain non-conforming use provisions; and
- Incorporate provisions to require development to be in accordance with the objectives and recommendations of the adopted LCS, notwithstanding the zoning of land.

These issues are discussed further below.

**TOWN PLANNING SCHEME NO 6 - LOCAL HOUSING STRATEGY**

The main findings of the Local Housing Strategy were that:

- South Perth was first settled in 1830, was a highly respected residential district by 1920 and was almost fully developed (with the exception of the Waterford areas) by the 1960s.
- The City’s proximity to Perth and high residential amenity are much sought after, resulting in highly priced property, but which still has a variety of residential densities and housing types that accommodate a wide variety of socio-economic classes and demographic structures.
- There is pressure for increased non-residential (office) development in the northern parts in close proximity to the Perth CBD.
- There are proposals by LandStart (formerly Homeswest) to undertake substantial redevelopment in the southern portions of the City in the suburbs of Manning and Karawara.

In response, the Strategy proposed that:

- Housing strategies and density coding be appropriate to the character and community aspirations in each of the 14 Planning Precincts.
- Dual density codings be introduced throughout the majority of the City’s residential areas, but the higher density only be permitted subject to meeting a stated minimum number of performance criteria.
- A performance-based approach be promoted in the regulation of housing development.

The implications of these findings are discussed further in the context of the socio-economic analysis of the City of South Perth.

**TOWN PLANNING SCHEME NO 6 - PRECINCT PLANS**

Town Planning Scheme No. 6 creates 14 planning precincts. The Scheme Report details the implementation of the housing strategies discussed above for each precinct. A major part of these plans was to assist in community consultation. These precincts are shown in Figure 5 overleaf.
Important community aspirations affecting commercial development were that:

**Precinct 1  Mends Street**
- Mends Street should be developed as a main ‘town centre’.
- In the Office (mixed use) precinct, bounded by Judd Street, Richardson Street, Labouchere Road and the Freeway, the proliferation of renovated houses converted to offices was unsatisfactory. Rather, have properly designed offices on a nil-setback line with central or rear parking. Some non-office commercial, such as al fresco restaurants, should be permitted.
- Parking was an issue, especially all day commuter parking.
- Retain local shops but improve their physical appearance and range of services.

It was on this basis that BSD recommended that Mends Street be designated a District Centre in TPS6.
Precinct 2  South Perth Central
- Angelo Street centre was important to the local community. However the centre needed upgrading with respect to the amount and layout of parking, general appearance, pedestrian amenity, the range of shopping and cafés, extended trading hours, better signage, lighting and landscaping.
- Retain local shops, but improve their physical appearance and range of services.

It was on this basis that BSD recommended that Angelo Street be increased from 2,700 m² (1994) to 3,000 m² notwithstanding that their modelling for 2006 showed a decreased support for only 2,174 m².

Precinct 3  South Perth Civic
- Same comments as for Angelo Street.
- The commercial development along Canning Highway at the corner of Douglas Avenue, and the Como Hotel should be upgraded.
- Retain local shops but improve their physical appearance and range of services.

Precinct 4  Hurlingham
- Maintain the Meadowvale Centre, Rhodes Motor Hotel and adjoining Surgicentre but preclude further commercial development.
- Retain local shops but improve their physical appearance and range of services.

Precinct 5  Arlington
- Upgrade commercial development on the corner of Canning Highway / Douglas Avenue, but do not allow further intrusion of commercial into the residential areas.
- Retain local shops but improve their physical appearance and range of services.

Precinct 6  Kensington
- Upgrade commercial development on the corner of Canning Highway / Douglas Avenue.
- Retain local shops but improve their physical appearance and range of services.

Precinct 7  Collier
- Reduce the level of visual pollution / advertising on shop façades.
- Upgrade commercial development along Canning Highway and rationalise signage.
- Retain local shops but improve their physical appearance and range of services, particularly at Monash Avenue.

Precinct 8  Como Beach
- Upgrade the Canning Highway / Barker Avenue commercial centre.
- Improve parking and reduce signage at the Canning Highway / Henley Street commercial centre.
- Upgrade parking / pedestrian environment in Preston Street centre. It is a good centre but lacks banking facilities.
- Retain local shops but improve their physical appearance and range of services.

It was on this basis that BSD recommended an expansion from 2,571 m² to 4,000 m² despite their model showing only potential for 2,439 m² by 2006.

Precinct 9  Como
- Traffic and parking were problems generally.
- Henley Street / Canning Highway is a good centre with good parking.
• Parking and access is difficult at the Canning Highway / Barker Avenue centre. The centre and parking should be upgraded.
• Retain local shops but improve their physical appearance and range of services.

Precinct 10    McDougall Park
• Upgrade existing businesses along Canning Highway and upgrade pedestrian access to them.
• Retain local shops but improve their physical appearance and range of services.

Precinct 11    Karawara
• Village Green (Karawara) is a District Centre operating as a Neighbourhood Centre. Upgrade / expand the Village Green (Karawara) centre which caters only for basic needs, although it has good parking. Coles (supermarket) needs competition. Plant more trees. The centre may need redevelopment.

Precinct 12    Manning
• Maintain same number and variety of shops at Welwyn Avenue centre, but could do with a small café / coffee shop.
• Retain local shops but improve their physical appearance and range of services.

Precinct 13    Salter Point
• Demolish buildings on Pt. Lot 2 (No. 54) Manning Road cnr Ley Street, Manning and reserve for Public Open Space. (Note that Pt. Lot 2 (No. 54) Manning Road cnr Ley Street, Manning has been the subject of a request for a 4,500m² Neighbourhood Shopping Centre.)
• Retain local shops but improve their physical appearance and range of services.

Precinct 14    Waterford
Commercial development did not appear to be an issue in Waterford.

Given that there is a substantial over-supply of local shopping and shops relative to accepted ratios, and that much of it is old and in need of redevelopment, the widespread support for its retention and upgrading is surprising. This probably explains why BSD did not recommend de-zoning and conversion to non-commercial uses in any instance.

**City of South Perth Community Consultation Survey (October 2001)**

The City of South Perth commissioned this Survey and report by the Hides Group. It is in two parts. The first part canvasses community satisfaction with the Council’s services and performance. Generally, for those respondents who had had dealings with the City, responses were favourable.

The second part was a survey of the business community. Some of the more pertinent findings are summarised below:

• 69% of the businesses had been in South Perth for over 5 years, of which 49% had operated for over 10 years.
• 65% of respondents said South Perth was a good place to do business.
• The principal attraction of South Perth as a business location was its central location and proximity to Perth CBD.
• Over half of those businesses who intended to stay and expand had no room to expand.
Regarding the future of business in the City, it was suggested that it would become more opportune if the City was more pro-active in promoting business expansion and lessened zoning restrictions. ‘A large tract of land needs to be designated for a commercial hub’ was typical of comments.

There was a perceived need for more attractions… bigger reason for tourists to come to South Perth. Specific locations where this could occur included Angelo Street, Mends Street, Preston Street and around the zoo. However parking in all these areas needed improvement.

**City of Belmont Draft Local Commercial Strategy (October 2001)**

The main features of the Belmont draft strategy are:

- An expansion of the Belmont Town Centre from 36,500 m² to 45,000 m² nla, but only for the region serving comparison shopping (not supermarkets etc).
- The establishment of a wider Regional Centre comprising the Town Centre, the Civic Precinct, the Belmont Industrial / Mixed Use area, a section of the commercial development fronting Great Eastern Highway, the connecting streets and selected residential areas.

The recommendations for Neighbourhood and Local shopping including some expansions, some status quo and some phasing out will not affect the City of South Perth. The recommendation to restrict retailing along Great Eastern Highway to the ‘Other Retail’ category (of the PLUC Codes) and encourage office development will also have minimal impacts on South Perth.

**City of Canning Local Commercial Strategy (January 1996)**

The City of Canning Local Commercial Strategy was endorsed by the Western Australian Planning Commission on 8 December 1995 and by the Council on 16 January 1996. The main recommendations, as they affect the City of South Perth were:

- Carousel centre be expanded from 51,700 m² to 73,000 m², notwithstanding that the modelling indicated a trade potential of only 52,200 m² by 2011. This expansion has recently occurred.
- Expansion of the La Plaza (Bentley) District Centre from 12,240 m² to 13,000 m². The Strategy noted that La Plaza had adequate land on-site and adjoining lots fronting Albany Highway for significant expansion beyond 13,000 m². Expansion beyond 13,000 m² would not be supported unless it could be demonstrated that such expansion would not unduly impact on other existing or planned centres in the vicinity. Expansion at La Plaza would directly impact on Village Green (Karawara) District Centre. Any applications for expansion should therefore be carefully monitored.
- The Chapman Road Neighbourhood Centre is proposed to be increased from 1,100 m² to 2,300 m². If this expansion includes a large supermarket it could impact on Village Green (Karawara).
- Other recommendations for District Centres further afield and for Neighbourhood and Local Centres are not likely to impact on South Perth.

**City of Melville Local Commercial Strategy (May 1993)**

The City of Melville Local Commercial Strategy is about to be reviewed (at 2004).
The 1996 draft Strategy proposes that:

- Garden City Centre be expanded from 57,655 m² in 2003 to 65,000 m² by 2006. The existing Community Planning Scheme already provides for it to be expanded to 65,000 m². In the new LCS review it is proposed to raise this to 72,000 m² by 2006.
- There be no expansion at Riseley Street and Canning Bridge District Centres.
- The Strategy notes that while Canning Bridge has been designated a District Centre, this is by reason of its office and other non-retail commercial development. It performs a Neighbourhood shopping function.

It is interesting to note the vagaries of the *Metropolitan Centres Policy (2000)* in the categorisation of District Centres. For example, Mends Street in South Perth and Riseley Street have very similar make up and overall size (according to the Department for Planning and Infrastructure Commercial Survey data). They serve the same functions. Yet Riseley Street is classified as a District Centre in the *Metropolitan Centres Policy (2000)* and Mends Street is not.

**Town of Victoria Park Local Commercial Strategy (Ongoing 2002)**

The Town of Victoria Park does not yet have a Local Commercial Strategy but one is under way. The main issues in Victoria Park likely to affect the City of South Perth are proposals for the retailing along Albany Highway. Modelling suggests there is an over-provision of floor area in Victoria Park relative to the needs of the local community and those of the adjoining local authorities in South Perth, Belmont and Canning. Much of the floor area is old, the historical legacy of times when Albany Highway was the main route connecting Perth to Albany.

The retail structure in Victoria Park also serves much of the City of South Perth and this must be recognised and taken into account in the Victoria Park LCS.
CHAPTER 3  OVERVIEW OF THE 1996 DRAFT LOCAL COMMERCIAL STRATEGY

The purpose of this study is to review and update the 1996 draft Local Commercial Strategy (LCS), rather than to produce a new LCS.

An issue raised by the Western Australian Planning Commission against the 1996 draft Strategy was the use of prescriptive rather than advisory language in that text. The Commission wants to retain the distinction between the role of Local Planning Strategies (which includes Local Commercial Strategies) as advisory policy documents, and Town Planning Scheme texts which are statutory and prescriptive. In other words the wording of Policy documents should be suggestive, using ‘should’ and ‘would’ rather than ‘shall’ and ‘will’ which is more the language of Schemes.

The approach used by the City in its Town Planning Scheme No. 6 (TPS6) has therefore been to translate many of the recommendations of the 1996 draft Strategy into prescriptive clauses in the Scheme.

The BSD 1996 draft LCS, referred to in this report as the ‘1996 draft Strategy’, was one of a number of reports produced by BSD Consultants in support of the (then) proposed new TPS6. It is a comprehensive and professional work. The other reports by BSD, which we have reviewed above, include:

- Town Planning Scheme No. 6 Precinct Plans
- Town Planning Scheme No. 6 Local Housing Strategy
- Town Planning Scheme No. 6 Scheme Report

While we will make comments below on some of the methodologies used, and the implications of using them, our opinion is that the analysis and findings in the 1996 draft Strategy are still relevant and appropriate to TPS6.

Consultation was a major part of the work undertaken by BSD.

At the out-set of the work on the LCS, BSD held a Councillors workshop. The major issues to come out of the workshop for the LCS was that it should address:

- The retention of the village style atmosphere of the City evident in the existing retail centres and development – the emphasis being to encourage small shopping precincts, and retain South Perth as a predominantly residential rather than commercial area.
- Limiting access to and from properties fronting Canning Highway and where best to locate commercial and retail development along the Highway.
- Commercial zonings to be more related to the character of each centre.
- The prescriptions for setback, plot ratios and parking should be in the Town Planning Scheme.
- The provision of on-street and off-street parking, which was considered important.

These aspirations from the community consultation process were largely reflected by BSD in its LCS recommendations.
The main thrust of the 1996 draft Strategy was to propose new commercial zones that were more in line with those recommended in the Model Scheme Text and more closely reflected their functions.

Based on a survey of existing shopping centres and analysis of precinct shopping requirements, BSD identified six categories of CAs (commercial areas) as follows:

**Category 1** **District Centres**  
Village Green, Karawara (CA41)  
Mends Street (CAs 1 and 2)

**Category 2** **Mixed Use Neighbourhood Centres**  
Angelo Street (CA4)  
Preston Street (CAs 26 and 27)

**Category 3** **Retail Neighbourhood Centres**  
Meadowvale Avenue (CA8)  
Welwyn Avenue (CA39)

**Category 4** **Highway Commercial**  
Canning Highway – Various (CA10-15, 28-33)  
Manning Road – Various (CA 36-38)  
All other commercial sites in Scheme 5 existing on Canning Highway or Manning Road that are designated ‘Added Use’ or zoned Commercial, Shopping, Hotel, Motor Repair or Service Station.

**Category 5** **Mixed Use**  
Land bounded by Judd and Richardson Streets, Melville Parade and Labouchere Road; by Scott Street, Mill Point Road, Judd and Stone Streets; and fronting Mill Point Road (east side) north of Ferry Street to Fraser Lane and Lots 2, 5 and 501 (Nos. 58 – 62 and 67) Mill Point Road.

**Category 6** **Local Commercial**  
All land zoned Shopping or Commercial and existing land designated for Added Uses which contain retail or office uses not otherwise included in Categories 1 – 5 above.

This Strategy is reflected on Figure 6 shown overleaf.

To accommodate these categories in TPS6, BSD proposed the following zones for each category of centre:

- “District Centre Commercial” Category 1
- “Neighbourhood Centre Commercial” Categories 2 and 3
- “Highway Commercial” Category 4
- “Mixed Use Commercial” Category 5
- “Local Commercial” Category 6

The 1996 draft Strategy suggests specific objectives and development standards for each of the five zones. In addition, any development for land within each zone will need to comply with the objectives for the category of the centre and the specific provisions of this Strategy.
BSD found that the City of South Perth was significantly under-supplied with District shopping floorspace and very over-supplied with Neighbourhood and Local shopping floorspace. These conclusions were derived from its retail modelling. We take issue with some of their findings based on their decision to adopt a closed trade area in the model, namely South Perth only. However, we will discuss this later in the report in the context of our own retail modelling.

With the exception of Mends Street, which the Minister required to be down-graded from a District Centre, BSD’s recommendations discussed above are supported and have been incorporated into TPS6.

It is our view that these recommendations, aside from Mends Street should therefore form the basis of the recommended strategy in Chapter 7 of this report.
CHAPTER 4     ANALYSIS

4.1    THE STUDY AREA

The Guidelines for the Preparation of Local Commercial Strategies requires that the study area for a LCS comprise two parts. The core study area is normally the local authority for which the strategy is being prepared. Then there is a ‘frame’ area that is the sphere of influence for commercial activity into and out of the target local authority. This is an obvious necessity because the shopping hierarchy in any local authority within a metropolitan area is part of a wider commercial system that transcends local authority boundaries.

In the 1996 draft Strategy, the study area for the LCS comprised only the City of South Perth. BSD Consultants argued that this was acceptable, owing to all the shopping in the City being at the Neighbourhood and Local level with only local sphere of influence. This included that Village Green (Karawara) District Centre which at the time was only 5,697 m² nla and functioning as a Neighbourhood Centre. Their report states:

“Accordingly, with the absence of any higher order centres above Neighbourhood size (other than Karawara) it was considered unnecessary in this particular instance to have a secondary frame area but to instead concentrate specifically on the Local and Neighbourhood floorspace provided for City residents. This was on the basis that the Council had indicated that no future District Centres be established within the municipality and that instead the Local Commercial Strategy concentrates on determining the future of various Local and Neighbourhood Centres within the City. Regard was had, however, to the findings of the Local Commercial Strategies of adjoining municipalities in determining limits for the District Centre floorspace within South Perth.”

While we can see some logic to this we have difficulty reconciling this approach to the modelling results that concluded that Village Green (Karawara) District Centre could expand from its 1994 size of 5,697 m² to 12,000 m² nla of retail by 2006. (This includes a hotel and an unusually large component of fast food outlets). We note firstly, that the centre is at the extreme southern boundary of the City and would draw a very significant part of its trade from east of the City. Secondly, if only trade potential within the City of South Perth was considered, any expansion at Village Green (Karawara) would constitute a floorspace over-supply in view of BSD's finding that 1994 retail floorspace already exceeded the Metropolitan Centres Policy (2000) per capita floorspace guidelines for District, Neighbourhood and Local Centres. Any model would, therefore, have to be deliberately configured to force potential into Village Green (Karawara) which does not reflect true trade area patterns.

We have therefore taken a wider frame area, which we believe would be the sphere of influence of a fully developed District Centre at Village Green (Karawara). This includes the City of South Perth as the study area, with the frame comprising Victoria Park, Belmont, Canning, north of the Canning River, and the north-east part of Melville. These areas are shown on Figure 7.
FIGURE 7   THE STUDY AREA IN THE METROPOLITAN CONTEXT
4.2 PUBLIC TRANSPORT

Figure 8 below shows the existing network of bus routes to and through the City of South Perth. The Figure clearly demonstrates the frequency of stops (shown with a blue dot) and the alignment of routes with major arterial roads (shown green). The majority of houses would be less than two street blocks from the nearest bus stop providing a very efficient and comprehensive network for both the work trips as well as students, shoppers and entertainment.


4.3 DEMOGRAPHICS AND SOCIAL INDICATORS

The City of South Perth and its adjoining local authorities are mature suburbs where residential expansion is occurring through intensification in the redevelopment process rather than through the development of new ‘green-field’ sites. It is now an accepted fact that as dwelling densities increase, occupancy ratios decrease, so that the population growth does not match the growth of new housing units. Population growth in the South Perth study area is likely to be modest but sustained for the foreseeable future. This trend is reflected in the population projections used in this study.

In the 1996 draft Strategy, BSD developed its own population projections for the City of South Perth based on the 1991 census. The projections were based on Census Collector Districts (CCDs) and amalgamated into the 14 South Perth planning precincts.

In this study the population projections used for the City of South Perth, and the remainder of the ‘frame’ study area, are the latest produced by the Department for Planning and Infrastructure based on its report Western Australia Tomorrow – Population Report No. 4 (October 2000) derived from the 1996 census. The population units used are the new Main Roads WA Traffic Zones for the metropolitan area. These, too, are also made up of CCDs. While the configuration of the new Traffic Zones do not exactly match the South Perth planning precincts, they are close enough for practical purposes for retail modelling.

As stated in Chapter 1, while the projections in Population Report No. 4 were based on the 1996 Census, checks with the most recent Australian Bureau of Statistics Estimated Residential Population for 2001 (Publication 3218.0 – 3 April 2003) show that the projections are within acceptable limit of error (1.5% overall). The Department for Planning and Infrastructure has therefore agreed that the small area projections by Main Roads Traffic Zones derived from Population Report No. 4 as used in this study are acceptable for LCS purposes.

The Department for Planning and Infrastructure population projections are more conservative than the BSD projections. The comparisons are made in the following Table. The full set of population projections by Traffic Zone for the core and frame study areas is included in Appendix 1.

**TABLE 3  SUMMARY OF POPULATION PROJECTIONS**
(Used in the 1996 Draft Local Commercial Strategy and in this Strategy)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BSD Study Area</th>
<th>1996</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Perth (BSD)</td>
<td>37674</td>
<td>39899</td>
<td>41947</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Study Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Perth (DPI)</td>
<td>36247</td>
<td>37567</td>
<td>39215</td>
<td>40767</td>
<td>43553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Park</td>
<td>26687</td>
<td>27780</td>
<td>29827</td>
<td>31610</td>
<td>34189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belmont</td>
<td>27258</td>
<td>30496</td>
<td>34770</td>
<td>38763</td>
<td>43138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nth Canning</td>
<td>20371</td>
<td>21629</td>
<td>21911</td>
<td>22089</td>
<td>21662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NE Melville</td>
<td>12309</td>
<td>12997</td>
<td>13446</td>
<td>13947</td>
<td>14841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals for Study Area</td>
<td>122872</td>
<td>130469</td>
<td>139169</td>
<td>147176</td>
<td>157383</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The BSD estimates show a 10 year growth 1996 – 2006 of 4,273. By comparison, the DPI projections show 2,968 for the same period. In terms of local retail modelling this difference of 1,305 is quite locally significant because each person represents 0.93 m² nla according to the Metropolitan Centres Policy (2000) guidelines.
While the population projections in Table 3 show modest growth for the City of South Perth, there is also reasonable growth in the frame area to the east of South Perth. This augurs well for the prospects for Village Green (Karawara) District Centre. However, the actual prospects for this District Centre will be discussed further in the context of the four other District Centres and two Regional Centres within the study area.

It should be noted that the 1996 census count showed the population of South Perth as 35,376, about 900 lower than the Department of Planning and Infrastructure's adjusted figures. This indicates to us that the more conservative Department of Planning and Infrastructure projections are more likely to be closer to the truth than those of BSD. The 2001 census figures have now been factored in, also.

**Socio - Economic Characteristics of South Perth as it affects the Future Prospects for the Commercial Hierarchy**

It is a requirement of the brief for this study to:

“Incorporate the latest available demographic data for the Australian Bureau of Statistics. Particular attention should be given to the current and changing population and dwelling characteristics with the City, including age structure, income, spending patterns, current and changing house types and densities and any other demographic factors which have a commercial influence.”

One of the studies carried out by BSD Consultants for the Town Planning Scheme No. 6 (TPS6) Review was a Local Housing Strategy. This study included a thorough and detailed socio-economic analysis of South Perth at the planning precinct level, for each of the 14 planning precincts. The work included a comparative analysis over a ten year period (1981 – 1991) comparing census data on age structures, household incomes, occupations and housing structure of occupied buildings.

We believe that this work is still relevant to the City of South Perth and a valid input into TPS6. We do not, therefore, propose to repeat it based on the 1996 census that is already also outdated. It is our view that when the data for the 2001 census becomes available comparisons over the past ten years between the BSD 1991 work and 2001 would be more fruitful.

However, so far as can be seen, no conclusions or inferences of the commercial implications of this work were made and it is not apparent if this work was used in the 1996 draft Strategy.

In order to assess the commercial implications of South Perth’s socio-economic characteristics, they must be seen in their geographical context of an old well established inner city residential area just across the river from Perth City Centre. In many ways it could be regarded as an extension of the City Centre, and is certainly regarded as such by many of the major office tenants in the Mill Point precinct.

Since 1976, the City of South Perth has had an age structure typical of inner city living. Very few dependent children, a concentration of young adults, fewer of family caring age and a fairly heavy contingent of older people. In fact the 2001 Census showed South Perth as having only 30% of households with dependent children. These characteristics are reflected in the population pyramid for South Perth 1991, 1996 and 2001 supplied by the Australian Bureau of Statistics. South Perth was ranked as 31st out of the 156 suburban areas in the State in medium weekly income (with Victoria Park 68th).
There is a factor that tends to distort the population make-up towards young adults but not in the higher income brackets. That is the large number of resident students attending Curtin University at the time of the Census. Generally, students are low consumers, relatively speaking. It also accounts for the higher number of unemployed people shown on Australian Bureau of Statistics mapping of Metropolitan social characteristics for 2001.

The population pyramid below (Figure 9) is typical of the inner suburbs. A dominant feature is the lack of a young base of dependent children, so much so that the typical ‘pyramid’ is rather an ‘urn’. The pattern has been constant for a considerable period although numbers have increased slightly. The pattern is expected to continue into the foreseeable future.

This is a major factor in determining spending patterns. The typical pyramid found in the outer suburbs is indicative of high weekly spending on food and groceries and other everyday household necessities. The pyramid is typical in major supermarket country, and major supermarkets favour the developments of large District Shopping Centres.

The ‘urn’ demographic spending patterns are not so much bulk shopping and bargain hunting, as more discerning shoppers. The urn represents more local shopping at the Local level and higher order comparison shopping at the Regional level. When combined with high income levels the ‘urn’ is fertile country for the café and restaurant set.

The implications of the trends shown in the population pyramid for retail in South Perth are that as residential property prices rise in response to the high level of amenity and proximity to Perth, more high income earning residents will move in. Dwelling densities will increase, while household size will become smaller. Overall population will remain fairly constant with only slow growth forecast.
The inference to be drawn from this data is that there will be increasing demand for restaurants and cafés at locations with the highest amenity, while bulk shopping, represented by weekly grocery shopping, will remain constant. More boutique stores, both food and non-food, will have opportunities.

The following social statistics for South Perth at 2001 also help paint the picture.

- Out of a total of 8,534 families, 2,580 were couples with dependent children, 452 were couples with non-dependent children, there were 3,683 childless couples and 1,355 single parents. Other unclassified family types were 464.
- Of the total of 16,222 households in South Perth, 8,485 were families, there were 5,645 single person households and 1,189 group. The average household size was 2.1.
- Of the 18,703 dwellings (16,222 were occupied) in South Perth 5,413 were fully owned, 3,320 were being purchased, 6,165 were rented, 2,450 were vacant or under construction and there were 31 non-private dwellings.
- Of the 30,371 adults (over 15 years) 1,038 had a Postgraduate Degree, 693 had a Graduate Diploma / Certificate, 5,406 (18%) had Bachelor degrees, 2,654 had Advanced Diplomas or Diplomas, 3,701 had certificates. South Perth has 44.4% of its population (over 15 years) with a qualification. This compares with Subiaco with 52.7%, Victoria Park with 37.2%, Nedlands with 49%, Central Stirling with 32.8% and Wanneroo (NW) with 32.4%. The median individual weekly income was $639.

In many ways, South Perth is typical of the modern inner suburbs of Perth. The process of gentrification and renewal of old housing stock is well advanced. For those with high incomes and younger people with good long-term prospects it is a desirable address. It is a City with fine high schools and a emergent top line University which attracts students from outside. It has the highest proportion of rental to private dwellings of any local government in the metropolitan region.

In summary, South Perth’s socio-economic characteristics could be described as highly educated, small, middle income households comprised of young adults or retirees without dependent children.

From a commercial perspective we can infer that there will be a relatively low demand for bulk, high turnover retailing establishments, chain supermarkets, Discount Department Stores etc). However, gentrification brings with it demand for higher class retailing and recreational commercial such as restaurants.

There is, on the other hand, likely to be growing demand for small office space from the large and growing professional class, to meet the escalating trends in self employment.

**Expenditure Patterns**

Data for expenditure patterns for relatively small geographical areas, such as local authorities, has proved so unreliable that the Australian Bureau of Statistics no longer follows the practice. Current statistics are based more on household characteristics Australia wide. It is therefore difficult to draw inferences applicable to a specific area such as South Perth. The following analysis based on household expenditure by household composition from the 1998 / 1999 Household Expenditure Survey (released June 2000) must be regarded with circumspect.

The floor area guidelines in the *Metropolitan Centres Policy (2000)* are based on metropolitan averages. The approach used in the following Table is therefore to compare the expenditure of the predominant household types in South Perth with overall averages. The average weekly...
expenditure for all households for those expenditure items that are retail expenditure was $232.28. This is taken as 100% and the different households predominant in South Perth compared against this.

**TABLE 4 RELATIVE HOUSEHOLD EXPENDITURE**

(OF THE PREDOMINANT HOUSEHOLD TYPES COMPARED TO OVERALL AVERAGE HOUSEHOLD EXPENDITURE)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Type</th>
<th>Number in South Perth</th>
<th>% in South Perth</th>
<th>Household Expenditure</th>
<th>Relative Expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Couple with dependent children*</td>
<td>2,438</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>272.50</td>
<td>+17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couple with non dependent children*</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>299.75</td>
<td>+29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couples without children</td>
<td>3,490</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>220.7</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One parent families</td>
<td>1,305</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>169.22</td>
<td>-27.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other families not classified</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>220.7</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lone person households</td>
<td>5,607</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>110.95</td>
<td>-52.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group households**</td>
<td>1,401</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>268.64</td>
<td>+13.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unclassified households</td>
<td>769</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>220.7</td>
<td>-5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>15,920</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Because of the relatively low average occupancy ratio in South Perth an average of one child per family was assumed

** Many of these groups would be students living around Curtin University and the expenditure in the Table may be high

The main feature of the above Table is the high proportion of households with average weekly spending patterns well below the average for all households. By multiplying the number of different household types in South Perth by the household expenditure for that type, and then comparing it against the product of the total households (15920) by the average household expenditure ($232.28), it can be seen that household expenditure in South Perth is 17.2% below regional averages.

While we have said that these results must be treated with circumspect it would not be unreasonable to infer that one should be conservative in applying the Metropolitan Centres Policy (2000) floor area guidelines in the calculation of floor area potential for centres in South Perth. Based on the above analysis they could be up to 17.2% too high.

In the 1996 draft Strategy, BSD identified 41 retail centres with a total floor area of 35,920 m² nla. It also identified 42,115 m² of office / commercial floor area. The basis of these figures was the 1990 Commercial Survey by the (then) Department of Planning and Development, now the Department for Planning and Infrastructure. However, this data was updated to 1994 by BSD’s own survey.

There are some discrepancies between BSD data and those of the commercial surveys. These are summarised in the following Table.

**TABLE 5 COMPARISON OF RETAIL AND COMMERCIAL SURVEYS (CS)**

(FLOOR AREA DATA FOR SOUTH PERTH AS USED IN THE 1996 DRAFT STRATEGY AND THE DPI COMMERCIAL SURVEYS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shop / Retail</td>
<td>33,325</td>
<td>35,920</td>
<td>34,290</td>
<td>32,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>36,740</td>
<td>42,115</td>
<td>50,975</td>
<td>52,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>70,065</td>
<td>78,035</td>
<td>85,265</td>
<td>85,081</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Table above indicates that the retail figure used in the 1996 draft Strategy probably overestimated the retail floor area and underestimated the commercial floor area when compared to the Department for Planning and Infrastructure Commercial Survey Data. There are also many discrepancies between the data for individual centres between the BSD Survey and the Commercial Surveys. For example, the BSD Survey shows Mends Street as having 5,475 m² nla retail and 9,518 m² of office / commercial, making a total of 14,633 m². In comparison, the 1997 Commercial Survey shows Mends Street with 5,735 m² nla retail but only 7,515 m² of office / commercial. Similarly, BSD have Village Green (Karawara) at 5,697 m² nla retail in 1994, but the Commercial Survey shows only 5,157 m² nla retail in 1997 with no increase in vacant floor area.

For this reason we are using the data from the new Commercial Survey for 2002 completed in the second half of 2003 by the Department for Planning and Infrastructure.

Notwithstanding these discrepancies, it is evident from the data that there has not been much retail development in South Perth between 1990 and 2002. The same applies in Victoria Park where there was 71,937 m² nla retail in 1990, rising to 74,259 m² nla in 1993 and then falling back to 70,483 m² in 2002. Belmont has shown steady growth from 58,712 m² nla retail in 1990, rising to 87,148 m² in 1997 to 90,247 m² in 2002.

Similarly, BSD have Village Green (Karawara) at 5,697 m² nla retail in 1994, but the Commercial Survey shows only 5,157 m² nla retail in 1997 with no increase in vacant floor area.

In Melville and Canning there has been major expansion to the two Regional Centres. Garden City 46,251 m² in 1990 and remaining the same till 1997, but recently increasing to 57,655 m² in 2002. By 2006 it is expected to reach at least 65,000 m² but possibly 72,000 m² nla. Carousel has a similar large expansion from about 50,000 m² in 1990 to 73,000 m² in 2000.

The implications of this for South Perth is that, given the relatively static population in the study area, there does not appear to be much activity to suspect that any major rise in demand for retail floor space is likely to occur.

4.4 COMPOSITION AND DISTRIBUTION OF SHOPPING
(IN THE HIERARCHY EXISTING IN SOUTH PERTH AS AT 2002)

The characteristics of each shopping centre in South Perth are summarised in Table 6 on the following page. It should be noted that it is based on the 2002 Land Use Survey data from the Department for Planning and Infrastructure.

In Table 6, the existing shopping and ancillary commercial uses in South Perth have been classified into 17 functional groups. These groups include uses that are not strictly retail in terms of the Metropolitan Centres Policy (2000) ‘policy’ listing of the ‘shop’ Appendix 4 Policy NLA, but they are very much part of the daily or weekly shopping trips for local residents. The floor areas in Table 6 cannot therefore be directly compared to the 2002 Commercial Survey tables for South Perth but they are a better indicator of the adequacy of the local shopping for the local population. More will be said about this below.

Because the modelling in this review must comply with Metropolitan Centres Policy (2000) Appendix 4 Policy NLA floor areas, the figures in Table 6 are not used in the model. They are used in a qualitative descriptive sense that in many ways is a more reliable measure of adequacy than prescriptive floor area measurements alone.

The existing shopping and ancillary commercial services in South Perth have been locally orientated for a long time. It still is and will remain so in the future. This is not a disadvantage because the City enjoys excellent shopping at the highest levels in the adjacent local authorities, without the traffic congestion and other disruptions to residential amenity that major centres generate.
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Table 6 shows that the two most important shopping centres in South Perth are the Village Green District Centre and Mends Street 'town centre'. Although a designated District Centre, Village Green functions as a large Neighbourhood Centre. Aside from its major supermarket it has limited other functions. Mends Street 'town centre' is less endowed in supermarkets and personal services than Village Green but dominates in 5 out of 17 of the functional groups. In fact, Mends Street is a Neighbourhood Centre that performs more of a District / Regional role than Village Green. This is largely due to its greater range of small shops, its higher level of amenity, its 23 restaurants and cafés (up from 14 in 1997) and the surrounding ancillary commercial development, including hotels and three restaurants. It derives greater benefit from workers and visitors than does Village Green. Both Village Green and Mends Street have banking facilities.

On the whole, the northern part of the City is better served than the southern half. It has three of the four Neighbourhood Centres. Angelo Street Centre with two existing supermarkets totalling 813 m² and with a fourth major one of over 1,000 m² on the drawing board, does appear to be lopsided. Angelo Street is the only Neighbourhood Centre with banking facilities. Angelo Street and Preston Street centres are substantial and offer a wide variety of ancillary benefits such as restaurants. Preston Street has the only cinema in the City.

Meadowvale Neighbourhood Centre in the north east part of the City is a new centre. The groupings in Table 6 show it has a balanced range of shops for its size and function.

The Welwyn Avenue Neighbourhood Centre is the smallest of the four. The centre has a peculiar set of shops for its function and location. O'Brien's Clothing at 488 m² is over twice the floor area of the supermarket. This is not a Neighbourhood convenience function and reduces the effective convenience function. The 300 m² liquor store is also unusually large relative to the supermarket and the Manning Hotel bottle store at 150 m².

Eleven Highway shopping / commercial complexes are located along Canning Highway in South Perth. The predominance of activity is in personal services (Group 8 - refer to Table 6), eating and drinking out associated with the hotels (Group 9), hardware homeware and furnishings (Group 10) and automotive fuels (Group 11). All of these groups target passing trade as much as local support. Only one complex at Hobbs Avenue, has a small supermarket and other shops more suited to local convenience shopping.

There are three Highway shopping / commercial complexes at the western end of Manning Road. With the exception of the Tavern on the former Manning Hotel site, which is highway orientated, the other two are local convenience centres serving the locality.

In 2001, 16 sites or centres were zoned ‘Local Commercial’ in TPS6, these ranging in size from 959 m² to 40 m². By 2002, two Local Centres at Bickley Crescent and Talbot Avenue had been closed and were in the process of being redeveloped for non-retail purposes including residential. The Local Centres are generally located within suburbs and provide a range of small convenience shops particularly small supermarkets (Group 4), food and liquor shops (Group 5) and personal service (Group 8). Three zoned Local Centre sites do not appear to contain any of the 17 Groups.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shopping Centre Name</th>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Centre Code</th>
<th>Groups 1 and 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
<th>Group 4</th>
<th>Group 5</th>
<th>Group 6</th>
<th>Group 7</th>
<th>Group 8</th>
<th>Group 9</th>
<th>Group 10</th>
<th>Group 11</th>
<th>Group 12</th>
<th>Group 13</th>
<th>Group 14</th>
<th>Group 15</th>
<th>Group 16</th>
<th>Group 17</th>
<th>Vacant Shops</th>
<th>Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canning Hwy near Banwick St</td>
<td>Highway Commercial</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>2 60</td>
<td>8 1203</td>
<td>1 245</td>
<td>11 1508</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Tce cnr Coode Street</td>
<td>Local Centre</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>1 209</td>
<td>3 97</td>
<td>11 1232</td>
<td>2 252</td>
<td>3 344</td>
<td>23 2229</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George St between Kennard Street and Lansdowne Road</td>
<td>Local Centre</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>2 190</td>
<td>2 110</td>
<td>2 210</td>
<td>10 979</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monash Ave cnr Murray St</td>
<td>Local Centre</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>1 200</td>
<td>1 75</td>
<td>5 299</td>
<td>2 109</td>
<td>2 240</td>
<td>3 182</td>
<td>17 1395</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canning Highway cnr Henley St</td>
<td>Highway Commercial</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>3 524</td>
<td>4 230</td>
<td>1 217</td>
<td>1 217</td>
<td>4 400</td>
<td>1 50</td>
<td>1 148</td>
<td>17 2328</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latchworth Centre Ave cnr Pepler Avenue</td>
<td>Local Centre</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>1 90</td>
<td>1 90</td>
<td>5 425</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manning Road cnr Ley Street</td>
<td>Highway Commercial</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>1 180</td>
<td>1 80</td>
<td>1 80</td>
<td>1 80</td>
<td>2 260</td>
<td>3 287</td>
<td>18 1672</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canning Highway cnr Banker/Theuma Streets</td>
<td>Highway Commercial - Not all zoned</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>1 24</td>
<td>3 322</td>
<td>2 230</td>
<td>1 67</td>
<td>1 24</td>
<td>12 1368</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canning Highway cnr Renwick St</td>
<td>Highway Commercial</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>1 100</td>
<td>3 370</td>
<td>4 546</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mends Street</td>
<td>Town Centre</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>1 700</td>
<td>5 714</td>
<td>15 1043</td>
<td>9 425</td>
<td>23 5270</td>
<td>2 232</td>
<td>2 100</td>
<td>2 467</td>
<td>11 849</td>
<td>19 5218</td>
<td>5 479</td>
<td>3 1013</td>
<td>6 1327</td>
<td>108 18110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angelo Street</td>
<td>Neighbourhood Centre</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>2 813</td>
<td>4 549</td>
<td>2 164</td>
<td>4 192</td>
<td>6 288</td>
<td>5 403</td>
<td>2 220</td>
<td>5 1530</td>
<td>6 579</td>
<td>1 140</td>
<td>1 150</td>
<td>4 957</td>
<td>2 130</td>
<td>44 6965</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preston Street</td>
<td>Neighbourhood Centre</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>2 530</td>
<td>4 522</td>
<td>2 89</td>
<td>6 984</td>
<td>6 414</td>
<td>8 1796</td>
<td>1 75</td>
<td>1 45</td>
<td>11 1282</td>
<td>37 3244</td>
<td>4 185</td>
<td>4 705</td>
<td>14 1639</td>
<td>100 12081</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canning Highway - Birdwood to Hobbs Avenues</td>
<td>Highway Commercial - Not all zoned</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>1 180</td>
<td>2 360</td>
<td>1 85</td>
<td>1 60</td>
<td>2 310</td>
<td>1 60</td>
<td>1 11 2663</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolvyn Avenue</td>
<td>Neighbourhood Centre - Includes a Park in the zone</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>1 200</td>
<td>2 488</td>
<td>2 165</td>
<td>1 80</td>
<td>1 147</td>
<td>1 156</td>
<td>3 350</td>
<td>6 2406</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village Green, Karawara</td>
<td>District Centre</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>1 3114</td>
<td>1 56</td>
<td>6 687</td>
<td>2 197</td>
<td>3 554</td>
<td>13 1641</td>
<td>1 30</td>
<td>1 9</td>
<td>3 326</td>
<td>4 1231</td>
<td>35 7921</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canning Highway - Hovia Tce to Salisbury Avenue</td>
<td>Highway Commercial - Not all zoned</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>1 26</td>
<td>3 153</td>
<td>3 1390</td>
<td>2 280</td>
<td>1 50</td>
<td>2 654</td>
<td>6 518</td>
<td>3 278</td>
<td>6 397</td>
<td>27 4764</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadowvale Avenue</td>
<td>Neighbourhood Centre - Not all zoned</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>1 350</td>
<td>1 378</td>
<td>1 70</td>
<td>2 263</td>
<td>2 485</td>
<td>1 350</td>
<td>7 5305</td>
<td>15 7507</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canning Highway - Collins Street to Elizabeth Street</td>
<td>Highway Commercial - Not all zoned</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>1 140</td>
<td>2 380</td>
<td>2 322</td>
<td>1 40</td>
<td>1 60</td>
<td>6 1210</td>
<td>1 140</td>
<td>3 230</td>
<td>26 4079</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrocy St between South Tce and Douglas Avenue</td>
<td>Highway Commercial - Not all zoned</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>1 60</td>
<td>1 100</td>
<td>2 190</td>
<td>1 60</td>
<td>5 1823</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canning Highway - Norton Street to South Terrace</td>
<td>Highway Commercial - Not all zoned</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>1 200</td>
<td>2 83</td>
<td>1 1040</td>
<td>2 260</td>
<td>4 348</td>
<td>12 2131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judd Street Commercial</td>
<td>Mixed Use Commercial</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>1 400</td>
<td>10 1872</td>
<td>135 17302</td>
<td>9 833</td>
<td>31 4188</td>
<td>186 24761</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canning Highway cnr Greenock Ave/Coode Street</td>
<td>Highway Commercial</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>1 40</td>
<td>1 150</td>
<td>2 190</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talbot Ave opposite Amery St</td>
<td>Local Centre</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>3 196</td>
<td>6 467</td>
<td>9 663</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manning Hotel cnr Loochert St</td>
<td>Highway Commercial</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>1 150</td>
<td>1 550</td>
<td>2 700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gooden Ave cnr Bickley Cres</td>
<td>Local Centre</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>3 170</td>
<td>3 170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mit Point Commercial</td>
<td>Mixed Use Commercial - Not all Zoned</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>3 215</td>
<td>3 345</td>
<td>19 2478</td>
<td>2 136</td>
<td>18 2196</td>
<td>45 5370</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 6 (cont’d)  17 FUNCTIONAL GROUPINGS OF WESTERN AUSTRALIAN STANDARD LAND USE CODES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shopping Centre Name</th>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Centre Code</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Vacant Shops Summary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mill Point Road cnr Douglas Ave</td>
<td>Local Centre - Not all zoned</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>174</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawler Street cnr Angelo Street</td>
<td>Local Centre</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill Point Road cnr Banksia Tce</td>
<td>Local Centre</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>220</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banksia Tce between Third and Fourth Avenues</td>
<td>Local Centre No Shops</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hensman St cnr Coode Street</td>
<td>Local Centre</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canning Highway cnr Anundel St</td>
<td>Highway Commercial</td>
<td>551</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lansdowne Rd cnr First Ave</td>
<td>Local Centre</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vista St cnr Brandon St</td>
<td>Local Centre - Not Zoned</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banksia Tce between View and Bright Streets</td>
<td>Local Centre</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labouche Rd cnr Comer St</td>
<td>Local Centre - Not zoned</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thelma St cnr Labouche Rd</td>
<td>Local Centre</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canning Highway cnr Comer Street</td>
<td>Highway Commercial - Not all zoned</td>
<td>8746</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>651</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kensington Technology Park</td>
<td>Special Use - Tech Park</td>
<td>8757</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14235</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15455</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30090</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manning Road cnr Clydesdale St</td>
<td>Highway Commercial</td>
<td>543A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3114</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3558</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>5535</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1094</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>4077</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3726</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>15197</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2959</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The table lists various shopping centres with their respective zones and centre codes, along with counts for different functional groupings such as shopping centres, offices, and other land uses. The totals at the bottom summarize the counts across all categories.
4.5 DISTRIBUTION OF THE 17 FUNCTIONAL GROUPS (FROM TABLE 6)

In this section we will use GIS (Geographic Information System) mapping to indicate the adequacy of the existing shopping hierarchy at different levels of shopping.

**MAJOR DEPARTMENT, DISCOUNT DEPARTMENT AND GENERAL STORES (GROUPS 1 AND 2)**

Although neither of these two groups occur within South Perth, the map below shows the proximity of the nearest surrounding stores accessible to residents. (Refer also to Table 6)

Group 1 includes the Major Department Stores, Discount Department Stores and General Stores over 8,000 m², where Group 2 includes these same outlets below 8000 m² but larger than 1,000 m².

The CBD establishments include Myer with 34,973 m² and Target with 12,524 m². Garden City's Myer at 10,736 m² is the closest, along with East Victoria Park's Target of 5,527 m².

Further south on Albany Highway is Carousel with three major stores including Kmart, Myer and Target with 8,760 m² each.

At the Belmont Forum there is a Big W with 8,152 m², and in Beckenham (and industrial complex) there is a Crazy Clark's at 1,100 m².

**FIGURE 10 DISTRIBUTION OF DEPARTMENT STORES IN AND AROUND CITY OF SOUTH PERTH (MAJOR DEPT STORE, DDS AND GENERAL STORES)**

Source: Department for Planning and Infrastructure Commercial Survey 2002.
Supermarkets (Groups 3 and 4)

Supermarkets are the most important convenience shops. Most of the smaller supermarkets are now operating extended hours seven days, thus replacing the role previously reserved for delicatessens. There seems to be an emerging trend of head to head competition that can be destructive at the Local level by leading to vacancies or diversification to other non-retail uses.

Figure 11 below shows the distribution of supermarkets in and around South Perth. There are 13 small supermarkets in South Perth (less than 1,000 m²) and one major store (in Village Green (3,114 m²).

**FIGURE 11 DISTRIBUTION OF SUPERMARKETS IN AND AROUND CITY OF SOUTH PERTH (GROUPS 3 - MAJOR SUPERMARKETS AND 4 - MINOR SUPERMARKETS)**

![Map of Supermarkets in South Perth](image)

*Source: Department for Planning and Infrastructure Commercial Survey 2002.*

Figure 11 illustrates the preponderance of supermarkets in the north of the City and relative lack in the south. The large blue dots represent major supermarkets, which are concentrated to the east of the City.
Food and Liquor Shops (Group 5)

The distribution of small food shops including delicatessens and liquor shops is an important indicator of convenience.

Figure 12 shows that there is a good spread of this group of shops. However, compared to the northern part of South Perth, Victoria Park and Applecross, there is a lack of this group in the south-east of South Perth extending into the neighbouring areas of Canning and south-west Victoria Park. The largest group of these shops is at Village Green (6) and Mends Street with 5 outlets.

**FIGURE 12 DISTRIBUTION OF SMALL FOOD AND LIQUOR SHOPS IN AND AROUND CITY OF SOUTH PERTH (GROUP 5)**

Source: Department for Planning and Infrastructure Commercial Survey 2002.

Apparel and Specialty Shops (Groups 6 and 7)

It is unusual to find individual clothing and footwear shops interspersed with convenience shopping, especially in the suburbs. However, as indicated by the socio-economic analysis above, the shopping profiles of the younger upper income residents will tend to promote boutique shopping. However, a deeper analysis of the distribution of apparel shops in the Figure 13 shows many are older shops or second-hand clothing stores.

Speciality shops at the convenience shopping level mostly comprise chemists, newsagents florists and the like. However, there are a number of upper range speciality shops, such as
boutiques, designer giftware, computer shops, golf and cycle shops. These are also indicative of selective shoppers.

Again, there is a denser spread of speciality shops in the north of South Perth compared to the south. Also, the concentrations at Preston Street and Mends Street are noticeable, but are no comparison to the concentration along Albany Highway in Victoria Park.

In both groupings, Mends Street had the greatest number of outlets with 5 Apparel and 15 Specialty shops.

**FIGURE 13 DISTRIBUTION OF APPAREL AND SPECIALTY SHOPS IN AND AROUND CITY OF SOUTH PERTH (GROUPS 6 - APPAREL AND 7 - SPECIALTY SHOPS)**

Source: Department for Planning and Infrastructure Commercial Survey 2002.

**PERSONAL SERVICES, EAT AND DRINK OUT (GROUPS 8 AND 9)**

Personal services mainly comprise traditional services like hairdressers, beauty salons and the like. However, the category also includes hire places, such as video hire, and hire of clothing.

Figure 14 overleaf shows a very similar distribution to the food and liquor shops – they are both grass roots convenience functions that are responsive to meeting local demand. The spread of personal services shown on Figure 14 is fairly even between the north and south of South Perth and surrounding areas.

Figure 14 combines ‘personal services’ with the ‘eating and drinking out’ group to demonstrate the emphasis of both categories on the attraction of being exposed to passing trade.
Good restaurants have a drawing power much wider than their locality that can reach Regional or Metropolitan level. Usually, restaurants can count on, and depend on having a District and Sub-Regional drawing power. It is questionable, then, why restaurants should be included in the policy limitations on floor area that is derived from a philosophy of preventing localised over-trading – and consequent blight.

Locational amenity is a definite attraction for restaurants, and the more that the City of South Perth can do to improve the amenity of its shopping centres, especially at the District and Neighbourhood Centre levels, the greater will be the overall living amenity. This is both desirable for the social set that aspires to live in South Perth and for the additional 10%-15% in turnover and employment it can generate.

There are three prime restaurant / café locations in South Perth reflected in the following Figure 16. These are Mends Street, Preston Street and Village Green. The Council’s streetscape programs in the former two have had great benefit. Although Mends Street is dominant with 23 establishments, Village Green with 13 provides a good choice. The same street and lighting treatments provided for Mends Street and Angelo Street could make Preston Street a premier ‘dining out’ location south of the River.
HARDWARE, HOMEWARES AND FURNISHINGS (GROUP 10)

This is a wide-ranging group covering everything from electrical appliances to a bag of cement. It includes some of the largest bulk retailers such as Harvey Norman and Bunnings Hardware Warehouses. None of these larger establishments is represented in South Perth.

The Figure 15 shows that high exposure along major highways is important. This is not surprising because most of these uses are classed as ‘other retail’ in contrast to the ‘shop’ PLUC category. Many of these uses are showrooms with a retail component. The largest store is South Perth Retravision on Canning Highway just south of South Terrace. Victoria Park has a much wider selection and size range in this Group and would be a natural shopping area for many South Perth residents for this group of merchandise.

FIGURE 15 DISTRIBUTION OF HARDWARE, HOMEWARE AND FURNISHING SHOPS IN AND AROUND CITY OF SOUTH PERTH (GROUP 10)

Source: Department for Planning and Infrastructure Commercial Survey 2002.

AUTOMOTIVE (GROUP 11)

Most automotive establishments in South Perth are fuel stations and are located along Canning Highway. There are also a couple of car showrooms, with a Volvo dealership at the corner of Henley Street. Victoria Park has a regionally significant concentration of automotive dealers including many new and used car sales yards.

The importance of locating on major roads is highlighted at the Welwyn Avenue centre where the former service station has stopped selling fuel and has been converted into a motor repair...
workshop, which is an inappropriate use in the midst of a residential area. The overall distribution is fairly even and convenient at the entry and exit points of the City. It is better than normally found in the outer suburbs.

**FIGURE 16 DISTRIBUTION OF AUTOMOTIVE ESTABLISHMENTS IN AND AROUND CITY OF SOUTH PERTH (GROUP 11)**

![Distribution of Automotive Establishments in and around City of South Perth](image)

*Source: Department for Planning and Infrastructure Commercial Survey 2002.*

**Banking, Locally and Regionally Oriented Offices (Groups 12, 13 and 14)**

Although not defined as retailing in the *Metropolitan Centres Policy (2000)*, banking services are an important convenience function. The banking services shown on Figure 17 include automatic teller machines (ATMs). While it must be remembered that banks have been moving to replace bank branches with ATMs over the last few years, it is accepted that branch banks may be a regional function, but ATMs are a local convenience function. Figure 17 shows an uneven and disparate distribution between South Perth and surrounding areas. The City should draw this disparity to the attention of the banks.

There are a total of only 6 banking outlets in South Perth: three of these are located in Angelo Street, two in Mends Street and one in Village Green.

The inference to be drawn from the spatial analysis (shown in Figure 17) is that the greater Mends Street Complex is a desirable business office location and will continue to attract investment. The only potential limit to this development in the longer term is how much the Council wants to retain its residential amenity.
It should be noted that the data from which the above analysis is drawn, does not account for home office, many or most of which (such as professional consultants) would have their area of business interest outside South Perth. There is no data to assess trends or the importance of this form of business / office in South Perth. It is noted that in Table 1 of TPS6, ‘Home Office’ is a “P” (Permitted) Use in the Residential zone, ‘Home Occupation’ is a “D” (Subject to Council Consent after advertising) use and ‘Home Business’ is an “X” (Prohibited) use.

FIGURE 17  DISTRIBUTION OF BANKING, LOCALLY AND REGIONALLY ORIENTED OFFICES  (GROUPS 12, 13 AND 14 RESPECTIVELY)

Figure 17 also shows the location of Locally Oriented offices and Regionally Oriented offices. The picture demonstrates a clear convergence of both Locally and Regionally Oriented offices in the Judd Street commercial area in South Perth, and Burswood and Canning Bridge just beyond the South Perth boundary.

Judd Street has over 19,000 m² of office space in both office groups, with most activities being at the Regionally Oriented end of the office market. On the other hand, Mends Street and Preston Street have more Locally Oriented offices but with totals of only 6,067 m² and 4,526 m², respectively.

Kensington Technology Park is home for several Regionally Oriented offices totalling 14,235 m² of floorspace, but no Locally Oriented offices. As can be appreciated from the next grouping, it is also the location of several Government offices.
MEDICAL AND GOVERNMENT ESTABLISHMENTS (GROUPS 15 AND 16)

Typically, the distribution of Medical establishments echoes the transport routes with good visual exposure and easy access. There is an evolving node developing at the Coode Street / South Terrace intersection. This area supports 1,232 m² of Medical establishments. The next largest groupings occur within the Canning Highway and Judd Street complexes with 1,210 m² and 833 m², respectively.

FIGURE 18 DISTRIBUTION OF MEDICAL AND GOVERNMENT ESTABLISHMENTS IN AND AROUND CITY OF SOUTH PERTH (GROUPS 15 AND 16)

Source: Department for Planning and Infrastructure Commercial Survey 2002.

Figure 18 also shows the location of Government agencies. Other than a single establishment (100 m² MP office) at Canning Highway / Renwick Street, all the Government offices are located at the Kensington Technology Park. This area supports 15,455 m² of floorspace occupied by Department of Conservation and Land Management and Agriculture WA.

This analysis can be misleading because ‘Consulting Rooms’ (health orientated) under TPS6 are a “DC” use in the Residential zone. No data is available on the distribution of these rooms in the Residential zone to assess if they are spatially distributed to provide the residents of South Perth with an adequate level of service.
Daily Local Convenience Shopping

In the following analysis, the adequacy of the distribution patterns discussed above will be assessed. The convenience of daily shopping needs at the Local level is an important measure of adequacy.

The measure usually employed to measure the adequacy of local convenience shopping is the 400 metre radius. It forms the basis of current ‘Liveable Neighbourhood’ precincts. The items of local shopping usually mapped have given rise to the term ‘Pint of milk, loaf of bread and newspaper map’. In the following Figure (19) the locations of delicatessens, supermarkets and newsagents in and around South Perth have been plotted. Areas within 400 metre radius of these are shaded.

**FIGURE 19 THE ‘MILK AND BREAD MAP’** *(GROUP 17 - ANALYSIS OF THE COVERAGE OF BASIC CONVENIENCE SHOPS WITHIN WALKING DISTANCE - 400 METRES RADIUS)*

Source: Department for Planning and Infrastructure Commercial Survey 2002.

Figure 19 shows that, on the whole, South Perth is mostly well served for local daily convenience shopping. In fact, the coverage of supermarkets almost parallels the shaded areas showing that convenience food shopping for even a wider range of goods is very well distributed. The only areas that could do with a local shop to meet the 400 metre criteria are Karawara and Waterford in the south. We note that no zoning for a Local Centre in these areas is provided in TPS6.

The other area in South Perth not covered, is the area around the Perth Zoo and Royal Perth Golf Club. However, this is only a small area of housing and the locality is inundated with
convenience shopping to the east, just beyond the 400 metre radius. No further local shops could be justified in this location.

**Weekly Grocery Shopping**

Weekly grocery shopping is bulk shopping. It is usually by car, and trips are normally directly from and to home, because of the need to keep some foods frozen. The distribution normally accepted as adequate is to have a major supermarket (over 1,000 m² nla) within the 5 to 10 minute driving time. This nominally equates to the 2-3 kilometre radius.

In the following Weekly Groceries Map the location of existing supermarkets is mapped. The two and three kilometre radius is also mapped to show the extent of coverage.

**FIGURE 20 WEEKLY SHOPPING MAP OF EXISTING AND PROPOSED SUPERMARKETS (>1,000 m²)**

(3 KM RADIUS OR 5 – 10 MINUTE DRIVING TIME)

Figure 20 shows that most of South Perth is adequately served by existing large supermarkets for its weekly shopping needs (green shading). The only gap is South Perth suburb in the north-west part of the City. However, the proposed new supermarket at Angelo Street Neighbourhood Centre will be over 1,000 m². Its coverage (shaded pink) fills the void in the weekly grocery shopping coverage.

It should be noted that in terms of this map, another major supermarket, as requested for Pt. Lot 2 (No. 54) Manning Road cnr Ley Street, Manning, is not a requirement to meet the criteria. (That is not to say such a supermarket at this location would not be viable).
MAJOR COMPARISON SHOPPING AT DISTRICT AND REGIONAL CENTRES.

Nominal travel times to Regional Centres of 15 – 20 minutes is regarded as acceptable, which also nominally translates into a 10 kilometre radius. For District Centres, it is about 10 minutes or 5 kilometres. In the following map, we have used GIS (Groups 1 and 2) to plot the location of the Regional and large District Centres around South Perth (which we believe serve a regional function). However, rather than drawing 10 kilometre regional coverage for South Perth, the 5 kilometre radius is used. It is used to demonstrate that South Perth is well served at the Regional level between Perth City Centre, Carousel and Garden City, and to a lesser extent Belmont Forum, that these centres are fulfilling both the Regional and District Shopping Centre roles. The Victoria Park centres, which technically are described as District Centres, also help further blanket South Perth’s coverage of higher-order shopping.

FIGURE 21 MAJOR COMPARISON SHOPPING MAP OF EXISTING AND PROPOSED MAJOR REGIONAL SHOPPING CENTRES
(5 KM RADIUS OR 10-15 MINUTE DRIVING TIME)

Figure 21 shows that South Perth is in the centre of a triangle formed by three major Regional Centres, namely Perth CBD, Garden City and Carousel all within very convenient distances. In addition to these there are major shopping facilities nearby in Victoria Park which have not been mapped because they provide double coverage for South Perth. This map illustrates why modelling for the Village Green shopping centre does not identify any significant expansion beyond the role of a large Neighbourhood Centre.
Conclusion on the Adequacy of Shopping Distribution for South Perth

The conclusion from this analysis is that South Perth is mostly well served by the existing shopping hierarchy within the City and adjoining local authorities. The main deficit is the need for a large supermarket at Angelo Street Neighbourhood Centre to plug the weekly shopping coverage for the north west corner of the City. Rezoning to allow such expansion was approved in Scheme 5 and has been incorporated into TPS6.

The only other shortfalls in coverage are for a local convenience store in Karawara west and in Waterford east.

4.6 Assessing Future Retail Floor Area Needs and Potential for Expansion

A retail model was used to assess future retail floorspace requirements for the City of South Perth. In the model, ‘requirements’ is synonymous with ‘potential’. In other words, it is an assumption in the model that any potential for expansion is seen as an under-supply of shops and therefore a ‘need’. However, this is a generalisation which must be tempered by other planning criteria such as urban design considerations, amenity, site availability, compliance with Town Planning Scheme development requirements, and the like. In the model, the same small centres identified in the 1996 draft Strategy as having no expansion potential (for site constraints or other planning reasons), have had their sizes ‘fixed’ to stay the same. Any expansion potential that might have accrued to them in the model is re-allocated to other ‘unfixed’ centres.

In summary, the model was set up to contain all the retail centres shown in the commercial complexes in the Department for Planning and Infrastructure Commercial Survey (2002). Each centre was located by coordinates (gda 94). The sizes of centre used in the model were those shown for PLUC Codes listed in Appendix 4 of the Metropolitan Centres Policy (2000). Because the Policy deals only with overall floor area limits, the floor areas were not desegregated into the 17 functional groups discussed above. (Segregation is important where the objective is to measure commercial impact rather than overall floor area requirements for policy purposes).

The population projections used in the model are those discussed above for the study area by Main Roads WA Traffic Zones. Need is related to population rather than households or dwellings. South Perth has a fast growth in the number of dwellings – which is taken to represent households, but a relatively static number of people. People need shops; dwellings do not.

The model has been set up so that it retains the same relationship between population and floor area as 2001, the calibration year. This is a surrogate measure for maintaining the same turnover per square metre. Through an iterative process, the model progressively increases the size of centres until there is no benefit to increase. In other words any further increase at the modelled period would result in lower turnovers per square metre.

The approach used in this model (in contrast to the working paper which assessed the impact of a possible Neighbourhood Centre on Pt. Lot 2 (No. 54) Manning Road cnr Ley Street, Manning), is one of compounding growth potential. This is analogous compound interest and the larger centres grow much more quickly at the expense of smaller centres.
### TABLE 7  PROJECTIONS OF FLOOR AREA POTENTIAL IN CITY OF SOUTH PERTH

2001 - 2021 (MODEL RESULTS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mends St</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>5,736</td>
<td>6,407</td>
<td>6,419</td>
<td>6,405</td>
<td>6,579</td>
<td>6,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judd St / Labouchere Rd</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angelo Street *</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>2,586</td>
<td>2,409</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>3,976</td>
<td>4,101</td>
<td>4,464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawler St / Angelo St</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tate Street</td>
<td>547A</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill Point Rd / Douglas Ave</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadowvale Ave / Mill Pt Rd</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>2,651</td>
<td>1,546</td>
<td>1,544</td>
<td>1,520</td>
<td>1,542</td>
<td>1,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill Pt Rd / Banksia Tce</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canning Hwy (Way Rd)</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canning Hwy (Hovia Tce to Salisbury Ave)</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>1,289</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canning Hwy / Douglas Ave</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>1,171</td>
<td>1,659</td>
<td>1,659</td>
<td>1,639</td>
<td>1,671</td>
<td>1,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Avenue</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Street</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>628</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banksia Terrace</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandon Street</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moresby Street</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monash Avenue</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coode St / Hensman St</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Tce / Coode St</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comer St / Labouchere Rd</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preston Street</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>4,071</td>
<td>4,010</td>
<td>4,024</td>
<td>4,038</td>
<td>4,207</td>
<td>4,614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canning Hwy / Renwick St</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canning Hwy / South Tce</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canning Hwy / Hobbs Ave</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>1,195</td>
<td>1,055</td>
<td>1,051</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td>1,057</td>
<td>1,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canning Hwy / Monash Ave</td>
<td>8746</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canning Hwy / Barker Ave</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canning Hwy / Henley St</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>1,517</td>
<td>1,173</td>
<td>1,165</td>
<td>1,175</td>
<td>1,207</td>
<td>1,321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talbot Avenue</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bickley Crescent</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manning Rd / Ley St *</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>887</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manning Hotel</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welwyn Avenue</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>1,538</td>
<td>1,670</td>
<td>1,662</td>
<td>1,678</td>
<td>1,702</td>
<td>1,865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letchworth Centre Avenue</td>
<td>524</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karawara District Centre</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>5,157</td>
<td>6,079</td>
<td>6,078</td>
<td>7,754</td>
<td>9,496</td>
<td>10,233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>34,290</strong></td>
<td><strong>32,173</strong></td>
<td><strong>31,963</strong></td>
<td><strong>35,201</strong></td>
<td><strong>37,496</strong></td>
<td><strong>40,168</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

2 Angelo Street is assumed to have expanded to 4,000 m² by 2006 in line with the recent rezoning.

3 Source: Retail Model, 1997 and 2001 Department for Planning and Infrastructure Land Use Data. The requested Neighbourhood Centre on Lot Pt. 2 (No. 54) Manning Road cnr Ley Street, Manning just opposite has not been modelled in this Table (Refer to Working Paper No 1).
4.7 NON-RETAIL COMMERCIAL AREAS

Existing non-retail commercial development is not included in the model. The following analysis is therefore largely qualitative.

Proximity to Perth CBD has been a major factor in South Perth being considered a desirable office location. Amenity is another factor. In 1997, there was a total of 293 offices with a combined floor area, 37,236 m². Of these, 250 offices with a combined floor area of 34,000 m² (91%), are located in the north-west corner of the City in the Mill Point Road - Judd Street - Mends Street ‘town centre’ complex (the greater Mends Street complex). There is as much office floor area in this area as the total retail floor space for the whole of South Perth. Combined with the Mends Street shopping, this corner of the City is the dominant commercial precinct in the City.

To better understand the functional and locational considerations affecting offices in South Perth, they have been broken down into three groups: Regionally Oriented Offices (ROO), Locally Oriented Offices (LOO) and Medical Offices.

4.8 LONG TERM ISSUES FOR HIGHWAY COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT

The 1996 draft Strategy has a planning horizon to 2006. The brief for this review requires that the LCS should take a long-term view. This requires that consideration is given to the impact of the future road widening of Canning Highway and Manning Road on the Highway Commercial zoning in TPS6.

Scheme 5 made provision for a road widening affecting the southern side of Canning Highway and Manning Road. This has been carried over into TPS6. Along Canning Highway, the nominal width of widening is 20 metres. In Manning Road at Ley Street, it is a nominal 14-15 metres. Existing commercial development that occurs in 13 places on Canning Highway and once at Manning Road, corner Ley Street, must eventually be demolished.

For the most part, the remnant commercial zoning will still be viable for minor commercial redevelopment. However, on Canning Highway there are a number of instances where remnant zoning results in small odd-shaped lots too narrow or small to develop.

This issue is not addressed in the 1996 draft Strategy, nor in TPS6.
Our brief requires an independent review of the City of South Perth LCS with a view to resolving a recent application for a Neighbourhood Shopping Centre of 4,500 m² nla at Pt. Lot 2 (No. 54) Manning Road cnr Ley Street, Manning. The site was formerly a Telstra Training School site. The site has been acquired by developers for purposes of building a shopping centre. The purpose of the review is to advise the Council if:

1. A Neighbourhood Centre of 4,500 m² nla on Pt. Lot 2 (No. 54) Manning Road cnr Ley Street, Manning, comprising a major chain supermarket of 3,000 m² nla and 1,500 m² of ancillary specialist shops, would be viable.

2. What the impact of such a development would be on the prospects for the future expansion of the Village Green centre to a size that would better fulfil its policy role as South Perth’s only District-level shopping centre.

3. What impact such a development would have on other shopping centres in the locality.

4. The recently approved expansion of the Angelo Street centre by 1,500 m² nla comprising a mid-range supermarket and some additional ancillary shops would have an adverse impact on nearby centres, particularly Mends Street.

FIGURE 22  COMMITMENTS LOCATION MAP
The detailed analysis in response to these questions is contained in a separate working paper by us, titled *Working Paper No. 1 – Consideration of the Implications of a Proposed New Neighbourhood Centre on the Telstra Site, Corner Manning Road and Ley Street in Manning* (March 2002).

In summary, our findings, in the same order, were:

1. A Neighbourhood Centre of 4,500 m², comprising a major supermarket of 3,000 m² and ancillary shops of 1,500 m² would be viable if opened in 2003. Further, we found that it could be developed in accordance with the development requirements of Town Planning Scheme No. 6 without the requirements for waivers. Also, there would be no adverse traffic impacts to the surrounding roads.

2. The impacts of the requested centre would be severe, if not fatal, to the prospects for the future expansion of Village Green to any significant expansion beyond its current size. We noted that this was because Village Green had a ‘below par’ trade area, which was likely to inhibit its prospects for further expansion, irrespective of the proposal on Pt. Lot 2 (No. 54) Manning Road cnr Ley Street, Manning. We do not foresee Village Green even attaining its recommended size in Town Planning Scheme No. 6 (TPS6) of 12,000 m² nla.

3. The requested Neighbourhood Centre on Pt. Lot 2 (No. 54) Manning Road cnr Ley Street, Manning would have a severe and sustained economic impact on other shopping centres in the locality. These impacts (to Village Green and other centres in the locality) were the reason for recommending refusal of the requested centre on Pt. Lot 2 (No. 54) Manning Road cnr Ley Street, Manning.

4. We found that the recently approved expansion of the Angelo Street centre of 1,500 m² (to include a supermarket over 1,000 m²), would have a temporary low impact on other centres in its locality which were considered to be in the acceptable bounds of normal competition.

Our conclusion is that a proposal for a new Neighbourhood Shopping Centre on Pt. Lot 2 (No. 54) Manning Road cnr Ley Street, Manning would be disruptive to the future prospects of Village Green developing into a District Centre and therefore, should not be permitted.

As a side issue we were asked to also investigate prospects for the development of a cooperative ‘main street’ shopping / commercial development between Village Green and Curtin University, focused across Kent Street. (It is a side issue because Curtin University is outside South Perth and its commercial development is not the subject of the South Perth LCS.)

We met with Clifton Coney Stevens, Project Managers for Curtin University. They are employed to develop plans that will maximise the University’s commercial potential over the next 30 years. In addition, the University wants to become more closely integrated with the existing and future urban fabric surrounding it. In other words, the University wants to permeate into the surrounding areas and wants surrounding uses, commercial and residential, to permeate the University.

The ‘town centre’ idea was prompted by the decision of a global ‘high tech’ company to locate at the University of Western Australia rather than at Curtin, because the former had higher amenity (shops, restaurants, entertainment, the river etc.) for the company’s employees. Amenity is therefore a major consideration for Curtin University in any ‘town centre’ design.

From the meeting it was apparent that ideas for a ‘town centre’ are only in the early stages of conceptualisation. Vague ideas of a commercial ‘main street’ linking the heart of the campus to Village Green were discussed. However, the size, configuration, location, orientation and components of such a ‘main street’ have not yet been decided. To emphasise amenity, the
sorts of uses envisaged include restaurants, boutique shops etc (another Rokeby Road, Subiaco) that would be attractive to University staff, students as well as the surrounding community.

It was emphasised to us that none of these ideas has any official status within the University. They have not been canvassed with, nor endorsed by, the University Council. There has been no market research or commercial analysis yet undertaken to test the commercial viability of any of these concepts. The ideas must be regarded as long term, part of the next 30 year University strategic development plan.

Having now spoken to representatives of both Village Green and Curtin University, it is apparent to us that there must be a much higher level of dialogue and cooperation if the idea of Village Green becoming an integrated ‘town centre’ with the University commercial development is ever to work. At present, neither side appears to have much comprehension of the other side’s objectives. There will also need to be cooperation between the City of South Perth and Town of Victoria Park.
CHAPTER 6 SYNTHESES

In this section, inferences are drawn from the foregoing work which will have a bearing on the recommended strategy.

- The data used in this study includes the Department for Planning and Infrastructure Commercial Survey 2002 and the Australian Bureau of Statistics Population Census 1996. The population data used is derived from the latest population projections by the Department for Planning and Infrastructure in their report *Western Australia Tomorrow - Population Report No. 4 October 2000.*

- South Perth’s retail structure has been in place for a long time. Most of the shops in South Perth are old. The existing distribution of shops has a legacy dating back to the 1920’s based on the need for people to be able to walk to shops. There will not be any significant change to this structure. (Part 1)

- Since the 1960s, it is evident on the one hand that developers of major shopping centres have found South Perth unattractive as a location. On the other hand, Councils over the years have not wanted such developments because of the traffic they generate and their impact to residential amenity. (Part 1)

- Since the mid-1970s, office development began to take over the Mill Point Road – Judd Street area – in the old GR6-C zone. The proximity of the area to Central Perth, and its high amenity, have made it a favoured office location and growth has been sustained. Since the 1970s, successive Councils have had a policy of constraining such uses to prevent the displacement of the ‘high amenity residential area close to Perth’. (Part 1)

- Although South Perth itself is an insular trade area bounded by the river on three sides and a ‘wall’ of retailing in Victoria Park on the east, it is well served at the District and Regional shopping centre level by surrounding facilities. (Part 2.1)

- With regard to the District Centre, the *Metropolitan Centres Policy (2000)* (in Section 4.2.4) notes:

  “District Centres will generally be required in urban growth areas, but may not be appropriate where a high level of retail service can be provided to a resident population through a combination of a Strategic Regional or Regional Centre, and Neighbourhood Centres of various sizes.”

- South Perth is not an urban growth area. The latter situation applies in South Perth. A District Centre is not a necessity and may not be appropriate. (Part 2.3)

- Notwithstanding that the *Guidelines on Shopping Floorspace Provision* in the 1991 and 2000 *Metropolitan Centres Policies* have been ‘guidelines’, they are used as the basis of calculating floor area requirements by consultants and local governments. They were the basis of the 1996 draft Strategy. (Part 2.3)

- Current philosophies in the Community Design Codes support the concept of convenience shops within walking distance (400 metres radius). (Part 2.4)

- The modelling by BSD Consultants for the 1996 draft Strategy was based on a strict application of the *Metropolitan Centres Policy (1991)* within South Perth as a closed trade area. The conclusion that Village Green could support 12,000 m² nla must be considered a ‘policy’ rather than a ‘real world’ commercial assessment, because it ignores the effect of the substantial existing competition which substantially undermines Village Green’s prospects for expansion. (Part 3.1)
• The precinct-based public consultation process for Town Planning Scheme No. 6 (TPS6) showed:
  ▪ There was consistent support across precincts for the retention and upgrading of local shops.
  ▪ Lack of parking was an issue at all the older street-front shopping centres.
• The Department for Planning and Infrastructure population forecasts used in this study are less optimistic than those used in the 1996 draft Strategy, but nevertheless reflect slow growth in South Perth, and the wider study area, between 1996 – 2001. The growth is not sufficient to expect any significant growth in population based trade potential. (Part 3.3)
• The socio-economic characteristics of South Perth and the study area are characteristic of relatively low demand for bulk, high turnover establishments such as major supermarkets, discount department stores etc. (Part 3.3)
• Expenditure patterns, given the relatively stable population numbers, do not indicate that any major rise in the demand for retail floorspace is likely. (Part 3.3)
• An analysis of the commercial functions of existing centres in South Perth (in contrast to just the amount of retail floor area) indicates that Mends Street is the dominant and most important centre in South Perth. (Part 4.4)
• The spatial analysis of retailing and ancillary functions shows that, in general, the northern half of South Perth is better provided and served than the southern part. (Part 3.5)
• At the daily convenience shopping level (‘Pint of milk and loaf of bread’), except for gaps in Karawara and Waterford, South Perth has a good coverage. (Part 3.5)
• At the weekly shopping level (5 – 10 minute driving time or nominal 2 – 3 km radius), South Perth is adequately served by Village Green and other surrounding major supermarkets. The only gap in the north west of the City will be plugged by the proposed new major supermarket at Angelo Street centre. (Part 3.5)
• At the regional shopping level, South Perth is well served by being central and within 15 – 20 minutes driving time to Perth, Carousel and Garden City major Regional Centres. (Part 3.5)
• In the long term (towards 2021), the road widening along the south-western sides of Canning Highway and Manning Road will impact on a significant number of existing commercial properties and may make some of the remnant Highway Commercial zoned land untenable. (Part 3.8)

Working Paper No. 1 to this study examined the proposal to establish a new Neighbourhood Centre on the former Telstra Training School site at Pt. Lot 2 (No. 54) Manning Road cnr Ley Street, Manning. The Paper found that, on balance, this centre should not be permitted because it would be disruptive to the Council objectives to promote the development of Village Green shopping centre as a District Centre.
CHAPTER 7  THE RECOMMENDED STRATEGY

7.1 BACKGROUND

As already stated, this study is intended to be a review of the draft Local Commercial Strategy (LCS) produced by BSD Consultants in 1994 and endorsed by the South Perth Council in February 1996. Most of the recommendations by BSD have already been included into the proposed Town Planning Scheme No. 6 (TPS6). Most of the 1996 draft LCS is still applicable and relevant.

There is therefore no need or requirement to rewrite the 1996 draft Strategy. Only changes in response to specific issues raised in the brief to this study will be made. Much of the original text of the BSD Strategy has been reproduced below. However all use of prescriptive language has been removed to emphasise that this is an advisory policy rather than a statutory instrument.

The strategy for the future of commercial areas in the City was determined based on the following:

- The findings of the Synthesis in Section 6.
- Working Paper No.1 to this review, titled Consideration of the Implications of a Proposed New Neighbourhood Centre on the Telstra Site, corner Manning Road and Ley Street in Manning.
- Analysis of the different functions the City's commercial areas traditionally and currently perform, including the dominance of Local retailing floorspace and absence of dominant District or higher order centres.
- Retail modelling analysis of future demand.
- Input from the City of South Perth Commissioners and staff.
- The Policies contained in the Metropolitan Centres Policy and the Community Design Codes.
- Findings and recommendations of the TPS6 reports.
- The provisions of TPS6.

The recommended Strategy (refer Figure 23) has also been developed having regard to the unique attributes of the City's commercial areas outlined in preceding sections and summarised below:

1. There are no higher order retail centres in the City. The two most important centres, at Mends Street and Village Green (Karawara), serve as large Neighbourhood Centres. Both have existing nla floor in 2002 of just over 6,000 m². This does not mean that the City is under-serviced with shopping centres at a higher level. The City is adjoined by three District Centres, four Regional Centres and the Perth CBD which have re-enforced this phenomenon, and past decisions of the Council have reflected a desire not to have major shopping centres within the City. All centres in South Perth therefore currently perform a Local or Neighbourhood Centre function (including the one designated District Centre, Village Green (Karawara)), according to the Metropolitan Centres Policy guidelines, in terms of the degree of retail floorspace.
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In contrast, however, a number of centres have a disproportionately high level of office or non-retail commercial floorspace relative to retail floorspace which is not traditionally located in, or recommended to be in, ‘Neighbourhood Centres’ (eg Mends Street, Preston Street, Angelo Street).

The designation of ‘District’ or ‘Neighbourhood / Local’ Centres in this Strategy, therefore, may not directly align with the definitions in the Metropolitan Centres Policy, but reflects the hierarchy of centres within the City of South Perth. Similarly, the zoning and permissible land use may vary from those suggested for such centres in the Policy.

2. The City has two concentrated pockets of office development amidst residential areas in the Mill Point area north and south of Judd Street. These areas contain little, if any, retail floorspace and vary in terms of the character of adjoining residential development, with the northern area situated generally amidst higher density residential development than exists in the southern area.

3. On the basis of the MCP floorspace per capita guidelines, the City has an over-supply of Local / Neighbourhood floorspace, largely as a result of this traditional under-supply of higher order centres. Residents shop for comparison goods largely outside the City, and are keen to retain the village character of their Neighbourhood Centres and the convenience of their corner stores.

4. Many of the centres and individual shops are old and in need of renewal / redevelopment.

5. There are a number of vacant shops existing in some Neighbourhood Centres and Local Centres, although the situation appears to have improved since the BSD Survey in 1994.

6. While there have been two recent applications for a new Neighbourhood Centre and increased floor area for a supermarket at Angelo Street, the general trend over the last decade has been away from retail. Whilst the Metropolitan Centres Policy expresses concern about the potential loss of residential areas to commercial activities, the reverse has been true in Preston Street where commercially zoned land has been developed for residential apartments or tourist accommodation.

7. During the life of Scheme 5, there was increasing pressure on the Council to undertake streetscape works in several Neighbourhood Centres to improve their amenity, viability and level of service to patrons, including additional or improved parking facilities. Streetscape works were undertaken in Mends Street in 1992 and in Angelo Street in 1996. Opportunities also exist for improvement works elsewhere in other commercial areas of the City. Preston Street is an obvious priority currently under consideration.

8. While the City of South Perth has a substantial concentration of offices in the north-west corner of the City which mostly serve a Regional function, there is an absence of any significant service commercial centres, light or service industrial activities and showroom or bulk retailing developments. There are, however, a number of entertainment or tourist-related commercial activities which make an important contribution to the City’s commercial land use, employment opportunities and tourist attraction, including:

- Perth Zoo
- Cygnet Theatre, Como
- Windsor, Hurlingham (Rosie O’Grady’s) and Como Hotels
Of less significance, but also contributing to commercial land uses, are the taverns in Preston Street and at Village Green (Karawara) and a number of motels and private hotels. The former Manning Hotel has recently been redeveloped in the form of a Tavern, but has about half of its site available for further development.

9. Since 1997 the Local Centres at Talbot Avenue and Bickley Crescent have diversified away from shopping. This has been reflected in the modelling.

7.2 COMPATIBILITY WITH TOWN PLANNING SCHEME NO. 6

The Strategy is compatible with Town Planning Scheme No. 6 insofar as:

(i) it is based on the new commercial zones in TPS6;
(ii) it is framed as a policy without the use of prescriptive language;
(iii) its intent is not contradictory to the statutory provisions of TPS6.

7.3 CENTRE CATEGORIES FOR STRATEGY PURPOSES

The shopping centres in South Perth have been categorised as follows: (Refer also to Figure 23 where centres are located by their code number (in brackets below) )

Category 1. District Centre
Village Green, Karawara (523)

Category 1A. Town Centre
Mends Street (528)

Category 2. Neighbourhood Mixed Use Shopping Centres
Angelo Street (529)
Preston Street (530)

Category 3. Neighbourhood Shopping Centres
Meadowvale Avenue (535)
Welwyn Avenue (532)
Manning Road, south-west cnr Ley Street (525)

Category 4. Mixed Commercial and Retail uses along Canning Highway and Manning Road
Canning Highway, near Berwick Street (209)
Canning Highway, Hovia Terrace to Salisbury Avenue (534)
Canning Highway, Collins Street to Elizabeth Street (537)
Canning Highway, cnr Arundel Street (551)
Canning Highway, cnr Renwick Street (527)
Canning Highway, Norton Street to South Terrace (539)
Canning Highway, Birdwood Avenue to Hobbs Avenue (531)
Canning Highway, Comer Street (8746)
Canning Highway, cnr Barker Avenue and Thelma Street (526)
Canning Highway, Greenock Avenue / Coode Street (541)
Canning Highway, Henley Street (523)
Manning Road, cnr Ley Street (525)
Manning Road, cnr Clydesdale Street (543A)
Manning Road, Manning Hotel (543)
All other commercial sites under Scheme 5 existing on Canning Highway and Manning Road that are designated ‘Added Use’ or zoned Commercial, Shopping, Hotel, Motel, Motor Repair and Service Station, or Service Station.

**Category 5. Mixed Use Commercial – (Mainly Office)**
- Judd Street complex (540).
- Mill Point Road complex (545).

**Category 6. Local Centres and Corner Shops**
- Mill Point Road, cnr Banksia Terrace (548)
- Mill Point Road, cnr Douglas Avenue (546)
- Lawler Street, cnr Angelo Street (547)
- Hensman Street, cnr Coode Street (550)
- South Terrace, cnr Coode Street (520)
- Labouchere Road, cnr Comer Street (555)
- Thelma Street, cnr Labouchere Road (556)
- Talbot Avenue, opposite Amery Street (542) (redeveloped for non-retail)
- Godwin Avenue, cnr Bickley Crescent (544) (redeveloped for residential)
- Letchworth Centre Avenue, cnr Pepler Avenue (524)
- Monash Avenue, cnr Murray Street (522)
- George Street, between Kennard Street and Lansdowne Road (521)
- Lansdowne Road, cnr First Avenue (552)
- Vista Street, cnr Brandon Street (553)
- Moresby Street, between South Terrace and Douglas Avenue (538)
- Banksia Terrace, between Third Avenue and Fourth Avenue (549)
- Banksia Terrace, between View Street and Bright Street (554)

7.4 **COMMERCIAL ZONES IN TOWN PLANNING SCHEME NO. 6**

The following Commercial zones in Town Planning Scheme No. 6 have been used for the above categories of centres:

- "District Centre Commercial" - Category 1
- "Mends Street Centre Commercial" - Category 1A
- "Neighbourhood Centre Commercial" - Categories 2 and 3
- "Highway Commercial" - Category 4
- "Mixed Use Commercial" - Category 5
- "Local Commercial" - Category 6

Non-conforming use provisions have been retained in TPS6. Additional Use provisions have also been retained in TPS6, whereby specific commercial activities may be permitted notwithstanding the zoning. However, use of the ‘Additional Use’ controls is intended to be more tightly controlled and used more sparingly in TPS6 than in Scheme 5.

7.5 **RECOMMENDED CENTRE STRATEGIES**

In this section, a ‘Context Statement’ and ‘Recommended Actions’ will be made for each category of centres identified above.
7.5.1 CATEGORY 1 DISTRICT CENTRE — VILLAGE GREEN, KARAWARA

OBJECTIVE FOR VILLAGE GREEN (KARAWARA) CENTRE
To promote the redevelopment and expansion of Village Green (Karawara) as the primary District Centre in the City of South Perth, while recognising the limitations of its expansion potential.

CONTEXT STATEMENTS FOR VILLAGE GREEN (KARAWARA) CENTRE

• The site is zoned ‘District Centre Commercial’ in TPS6.
• It is the only commercial centre in the City of South Perth identified in the Metropolitan Centres Policy (2000) as a District Centre.
• The 1996 draft Strategy has indicated it has a potential to develop to 12,000m² nla by 2006. We do not agree with the assessment of expansion potential modelled by BSD in their 1996 draft Strategy. BSD’s modelling was configured to ‘policy’ rather than ‘commercial’ considerations. In other words, the City of South Perth was modelled as an isolated entity, free of outside competition or influences, where the entire District-level floor area recommended in the Metropolitan Centres Policy (1991) could be internally allocated. The modelling was not, therefore, a realistic assessment of the expansion potential for the centre in the context of its competition.
• Given the juxtaposition of major Regional and District Centres in adjoining local governments to the City of South Perth, we do not see any potential for any centre in South Perth reaching 12,000 m².
• South Perth could support an additional major chain supermarket. This finding is not based so much on “need” in terms of per capita floor area ratios. A major supermarket would be able to withstand the strong competition outside and recapture some of the significant level of escape trade potential that exists.
• There are only two prospective sites in the City that could accommodate a new major supermarket, Village Green (Karawara) or the former Telstra site at Pt. Lot 2 (No. 54) Manning Road cnr Ley Street, Manning. The latter site is not currently zoned ‘Commercial’.
• The Village Green (Karawara) site has the policy imprimatur to expand, but has a severely constrained site. It will be very expensive to redevelop / expand and viability is an issue. At best, according to our information, a supermarket expansion would only occur in five to six years – if ever.
• At the Neighbourhood level, which is the level at which Village Green (Karawara) currently operates, its immediate trade area (within 2 km radius) is seriously punctured by trade voids or constrictions. These (going anti-clockwise) include the Canning River and the foreshore parks to the south, Clontarf, Canning College, Curtin University, Technology Park, CALM Headquarters, Collier Park, Penrhos College, Como High School, Koonawarra Primary School, George Burnett Park, Trinity Playing Fields and Challenger Reserve.
• Our experience is that large Neighbourhood Centres (such as Village Green now is) attract upwards of 60% of their trade potential from within 2 kilometres. Our current model for Village Green has 65% of its trade in 2001 coming from this trade area. However, the population within the 2 kilometre radius in 2001 is estimated at 12,700. This represents under half of the population that would be expected in 1,250 hectares of urban zoned land within a 2 kilometre radius (25,000 – 30,000).
• Based on our knowledge of proposed expansions in the study area, including the expansion of 1,500m² at Angelo Street, our projections for Village Green (maintaining turnovers at
2001 levels) with and without the proposal for Pt. Lot 2 (No. 54) Manning Road cnr Ley Street, Manning, are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>DPI Code</th>
<th>2002 DPI Data Input nla m²</th>
<th>Model 2002 Calibration Output nla m²</th>
<th>Modelled Potential 2006 nla m²</th>
<th>Modelled Potential 2011 nla m²</th>
<th>Modelled Potential 2021 nla m²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Karawara District Centre</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>6,079</td>
<td>6,078</td>
<td>7,754</td>
<td>9,496</td>
<td>10,233</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Retail Model Using Department for Planning and Infrastructure Population Projections 2001-2021 and 1997 and 2002 Commercial Surveys data.

- The forecasts in the Table above assume that the proposed Neighbourhood Centre on Pt. Lot 2 (No. 54) Manning Road cnr Ley Street, Manning, will not be built. If it is, and if it opens in 2003 as proposed, the expansion potential of Village Green (Karawara), even in the long term, becomes more marginal. Refer to Working Paper No. 1 for a full discussion of the implications of this new proposal.

- Given the low forecasts above, which are very similar to the findings of the Shrapnel Urban Planning modelling, there is no guarantee that redevelopment of the Village Green (Karawara) site to an effective District-level centre will occur. We base this opinion also on the observation that Village Green has not expanded to date, despite its privileged policy position.

- In contrast to Shrapnel Urban Planning, we cannot foresee any significant trade area improvements to underwrite the heavy new investment that redevelopment and expansion would require.

- The ‘cost versus return’ issue for the owners of Village Green (Karawara) for major redevelopment and expansion, such as the development of another major supermarket on the site, is very sensitive. Any additional competition in its locality would tip the balance against whatever chances there might be for redevelopment and expansion of that centre. In effect, Village Green (Karawara) needs a monopoly on expansion potential to cajole new shopping tenants to their site – as the only available site.

- The issue for Village Green (Karawara) is not so much a new supermarket per se. Of greater concern is the ability to attract the high rent paying ancillary speciality shops, which are essential to the viability of any new shopping centre development.

- Much of the potential for expansion at the Village Green (Karawara) shopping centre has been mooted in the context of a cooperative ‘town centre’ development with Curtin University. From a meeting with Consultants for the University it was apparent that ideas for a ‘town centre’ are only in the early stages of conceptualisation. Vague ideas of a commercial ‘main street’ linking the heart of the campus to Village Green (Karawara) were discussed. However, the size, configuration, location, orientation and components of such a ‘main street’ have not yet been decided. None of these ideas has any official status within the University. They have not been canvassed with, nor endorsed by, the University Council. There has been no market research or commercial analysis undertaken to test the commercial viability any of these concepts. The ideas must be regarded as long term, part of the next 30 year University strategic development plan. It must also be noted that the University site suffers the same trade area constraints as does Village Green (Karawara).

- Technically, because Curtin University falls outside the City of South Perth, these commercial objectives are not part of the City’s LCS.

- In its 1996 draft Strategy, with respect to Village Green (Karawara), BSD recommended that if substantial upgrading of the Village Green (Karawara) centre is not undertaken by 2001, the Council should investigate the transfer of District-level floorspace to Mends Street or other Neighbourhood Centres within the City.
(For a more complete assessment of the current context of the following recommended actions refer to Working Paper No. 1).

**Recommended Actions for Village Green (Karawara) Centre**

The following actions are recommended for the Village Green (Karawara) Centre:

- Now that the owners of Village Green (Karawara) have demonstrated their commitment to expand the centre to enhance its District Centre role, the Council should not approve another Neighbourhood Centre at Pt. Lot 2 (No. 54) Manning Road cnr Ley Street, Manning.

- The owners should be advised that the City would support and encourage additional development comprising (as a minimum):
  1. a 3,000 m² major chain supermarket in addition to the existing major chain supermarket;
  2. a minimum of 1,000 m² of ancillary shops in addition to the existing floor area;
  3. a redesigned car park that meets the requirements of Table 6 of TPS6, and integrated access arrangements serving the entire centre;
  4. upgraded landscaping and façades for the centres, especially fronting Kent Street; and
  5. any such other facilities that the Council may require.

- Subject to the successful outcome of the first two recommended actions, Council should consider entering into joint negotiations with the Town of Victoria Park to promote the longer term idea of an integrated ‘town centre’ commercial development across Kent Road with Curtin University.

- Should the outcome of the first two recommendations be unsuccessful, Council should consider the longer term strategic objective for Village Green (Karawara) as serving only a larger Neighbourhood Centre role (notwithstanding its designation as a District Centre in the *Metropolitan Centres Policy (2000)*).

**7.5.2 CATEGORY 1A Mends Street Commercial Zone**

**Objectives for Mends Street Centre**

1. To promote the Mends Street commercial centre as the most important multi-faceted ‘town centre’ in South Perth and maintain prospects for the continued development of those uses which attract visitors and custom to the City.

2. To retain and enhance the high level of visual and functional amenity which the ‘town centre’ now enjoys.

**Context Statements for Mends Street Centre**

- Mends Street centre has its own ‘Mends Street Centre Commercial’ zone in TPS6 to reflect its relative importance in the commercial structure of the City which is much higher than that normally ascribed to a Neighbourhood Centre.
• Mends Street is the largest and most important commercial centre in South Perth although its convenience retailing component is fairly modest, serving a relatively restricted residential catchment.

• Modelling of the local convenience shopping component indicates modest growth potential:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mends Street</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>5,736</td>
<td>6,407</td>
<td>6,419</td>
<td>6,405</td>
<td>6,579</td>
<td>6,987</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


• Over half the floor area in the above Table is in the ‘Eat and Drink Out’ Category (refer to Group 9 in Table 6). This floor area comprises a large component of top class restaurants and other facilities that attract a regional rather than local clientele. The modelling used for this Review is calibrated for normal local convenience shopping and is not geared to take account of this regional attraction.

• Its river front location in proximity to the Mends Street jetty makes it a tourist location with good prospects for further tourist / visitor orientated uses to complement the other regional adjacent attractions like the Zoo and nearby hotels.

• The streetscape works undertaken by the Council in 1992 and thereafter, have raised the level of amenity of the centre in keeping with the high standard of high density surrounding residential development. There has been a positive multiplier effect from these works that has benefited both the local business community and the local residential community.

• Shortage of car parking is a continuing issue raised with us.

• In 1997 there was 7,361 m² nla of office floor area compared with around 7,640 m² in 2002. Office floor area has more than doubled since 1990. Most of this office space is occupied by regionally, rather than locally, orientated businesses.

• A number of Residential zoned lots remained under Scheme 5 immediately adjoining commercially zoned sites, namely 128 Mill Point Road, 3 Darley Street, 3 Ray Street and 71 - 77 South Perth Esplanade. Of these, 3 Darley Street and 71 South Perth Esplanade are developed with medium to high density housing and are unlikely to be redeveloped. 130 Mill Point Road is listed on both Council's Municipal Heritage Inventory and the State Heritage Register. However, 3 Ray Street and 128 Mill Point Road are appropriately situated to accommodate additional commercial floorspace and / or commercially related activities (eg car parking) if required, and this is reflected in TPS6 commercial zoning.

• The Mends Street centre now includes the triangle of land bounded by Mill Point Road, Labouchere Road and Mends Street. The land is predominantly owned by the Council and is zoned as part of the Mends Street Commercial zone. This land, known as the 'Civic Triangle' or the 'Mends Street Triangle', is situated between the Mends Street centre and Perth Zoo and, in terms of function and range of activities, is complementary to the core retail centre of Mends Street and should be developed as part of the designated commercial centre.

• The remaining land adjoining the centre comprises high quality, high density residential units overlooking the Swan River, or the river foreshore itself. Some car parking has been developed along the foreshore.
Recommended Actions for Mends Street Centre

- The Council should continue to enhance the foreshore aspect of the Mends Street centre by applying the provisions of the Metropolitan Centres Policy (2000) with respect to ‘main street’ centres, including:
  
  (i) improving the integration of the centre with the ferry / river across South Perth Esplanade by terracing between Southshore restaurants and the ferry terminal;
  
  (ii) encouraging alfresco dining facilities using the footpath, in accordance with relevant City policies and Local Laws;
  
  (iii) the Council should act as the shopping centre manager to institute a cyclical program of upgrading and refurbishment of the public domain (mainly streetscape) parts of the centre.

- The Council should consider applications for increases in retail floor area, excluding ‘Eat and Drink Out’ Category uses (refer to Group 9 in Table 6), which are within 10% of the modelled potential at each period as reasonable. Such increases are unlikely to yield unacceptable impacts on neighbouring centres.

- The Council should encourage ‘Eat and Drink Out’ Category uses (refer to Group 9 in Table 6) which are principally tourist-related or serve tourist needs (including restaurants, cafés and entertainment activities), contribute to the alfresco (open air) character of Mends Street, and / or are not already provided within the centre. The Council should base its assessment of new ‘Eat and Drink Out’ Category proposals on urban design, parking and amenity considerations, rather than modelled retail floor area potential.

- Future development within Harper Terrace and the ‘Mends Street Triangle’ should be functionally linked to existing development in the centre.

- With many major commercial sites within Precinct 1 : Mill Point, the City should re-examine all aspects of development within the Precinct, including appropriate land uses, traffic and parking, and key sites in a major study of the precinct.

7.5.3 CATEGORY 2 Mixed Use Neighbourhood Centres - Angelo Street and Preston Street

Objectives for Mixed Use Neighbourhood Centres

1. To maintain and enhance the level of service and amenity offered by these centres.

2. To recognise the importance of these centres as employment and service areas.

General Context Statements for Mixed Use Neighbourhood Centres

- There are two centres in this Category in South Perth. Both are zoned ‘Neighbourhood Centre Commercial’ in TPS6.

- Both are ‘main street’ centres, which means that the unifying spaces (streets, sidewalks, street furniture and open spaces) which knit the shopping centre elements together (as do the malls in enclosed centres) are ‘public domain’ and the responsibility of the Council.

- The two centres, at Angelo Street and Preston Street both contain a significant proportion of non-retail commercial activities including banks, agencies, local offices and health, welfare and local community facilities.
Both are emerging as vibrant, after-hours village centres for the community, endowed with tourist and entertainment facilities (restaurants, theatres etc) and adjoining or accommodating serviced apartments, private hotels / motels and medium to high-density residential development.

The Council has been actively encouraging the upgrading of these centres in cooperation with landowners. Improvements include streetscape works, allowing use of footpaths, nil front setbacks, and requiring rear car parking.

Parking is at a premium and difficult to provide and correctly juxtapose with respect to the diverse functions of the centres.

**General Recommended Actions for Mixed Use Neighbourhood Centres**

- The Council should ensure that the key function of both these Mixed Use Neighbourhood Centres should be to provide Neighbourhood retail facilities. This could be promoted by specifying policy guidelines for a minimum amount of retail floorspace and a maximum amount of non-retail floorspace permissible in each centre.

- The Council should recognise its special responsibilities in ensuring the success of ‘main street’ commercial centres, and adopt a lead role in instituting a cyclical program of upgrading and refurbishment of the public domain (mainly streetscape) parts of the centres. This should recognise the importance to such a centre of alfresco use of the pavement, in accordance with relevant City policies and Local Laws.

**Context Statements for Angelo Street Centre**

- Angelo Street centre is zoned ‘Neighbourhood Centre Commercial’ in TPS6.

- Angelo Street centre should enjoy the provisions of the *Metropolitan Centres Policy (2000)* in respect to ‘main street’ centres.

- The Council has implemented recent streetscape improvements, including new lighting that has lifted the amenity of the centre substantially and soon attracted new restaurants.

- The retail floor area of the centres shown in the Department for Planning and Infrastructure 2002 Commercial Survey is 2,409 m². However, from a functional perspective, the ancillary floor areas which also attract the need for car parking is 3,801 m².

- The 1997 Commercial Survey identified 2,116 m² of office space. However, this significantly increased to 2,437 m² in the 2002 Survey. This floor area tends to attract all-day parking.

- The zoning under TPS6 may permit 1,500 m² of additional retail floor space in the centre at the corner of Angelo Street and Anstey Street, but (at the time of writing this report) a development application has not yet been approved although a current development proposal comprises a supermarket of that order. However, the development is required to meet its parking requirements on-site which is proving difficult. If the proposal proceeds, the addition will increase the overall retail floor area to about 4,000 m² nla.

- Modelling for Angelo Street is given in the following Table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>DPI Code</th>
<th>1997 DPI Data Input nla m²</th>
<th>2002 DPI Data Input nla m²</th>
<th>Model 2002 Calibration Output nla m²</th>
<th>Modelled Potential 2006 nla m²</th>
<th>Modelled Potential 2011 nla m²</th>
<th>Modelled Potential 2021 nla m²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Angelo Street</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>2,586</td>
<td>2,409</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>3,976</td>
<td>4,101</td>
<td>4,464</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• The additional 1,500 m² was assumed to be open at 2003 and was therefore included in the 2006 model. The model shows that by 2006 the modelled potential of 3,912 m² is slightly below the floor area that will exist at that time. This means that the centre will be slightly over-supplied with floor area until demand catches up, some time before 2011.

• The analysis in this review shows that a major supermarket in Angelo Street is a desirable rounding off to complete the coverage of the weekly shopping facilities for South Perth residents.

• There are three existing small supermarkets in Angelo Street with a combined floor area of 1,013 m² NLA. The new supermarket will impact on them severely. One or two of them may close soon after the new supermarket opens.

• There are 245 car bays (on-street, Council and private) available, excluding those on the site proposed for the new supermarket development. This figure is consistent with the requirements of Table 6 of TPS6. However, the parking is mostly not well located with respect to the shop-fronts.

**Recommended Actions for Angelo Street Centre**

• The Council should continue its cooperative approach to new development and redevelopment projects.

• The overall Centre commercial floorspace should not exceed 6,500 m² NLA of which there be a maximum retail floorspace of 4,500 m² NLA and a minimum of 2,000 m².

**Context Statements for Preston Street Centre**

• Preston Street centre is zoned ‘Neighbourhood Centre Commercial’ in TPS6.

• The centre has 3 distinct elements:
  (i) offices and tourist accommodation adjoining the river;
  (ii) a Neighbourhood shopping centre environment adjoining Labouchere Road; and
  (iii) an under-utilised central area suitable for redevelopment and upgrading capitalising on existing assets, such as the Cygnet Theatre and recent retail development on the north-eastern corner of Preston and Mary Streets.

• Preston Street is a mixed use ‘main street’ Neighbourhood Centre comprising 4,071 m² NLA of retail in 1997. This reduced marginally to 4,010 m² in 2002. In 1997 there was 4,902 m² of office floorspace. By 2002 this office floorspace was 5,480 m². It is unusual for a Neighbourhood Centre to support 11,580 m² of residential within the Commercial zone.

• Modelling for Preston Street shows reasonable expansion potential (Note that the results in the model do not reflect this situation should a new Neighbourhood Centre be developed on Pt. Lot 2 (No. 54) Manning Road cnr Ley Street, Manning – refer to Working Paper No. 1):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>DPI Code</th>
<th>1997 DPI Data Input nla m²</th>
<th>2002 DPI Data Input nla m²</th>
<th>Model 2002 CalibrationOutput nla m²</th>
<th>Modelled Potential 2006 nla m²</th>
<th>Modelled Potential 2011 nla m²</th>
<th>Modelled Potential 2021 nla m²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preston Street</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>4,071</td>
<td>4,010</td>
<td>4,024</td>
<td>4,038</td>
<td>4,207</td>
<td>4,614</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• The Council has not yet undertaken ‘public domain’ improvements works similar to Angelo Street. However, it commissioned an urban design study\(^4\), completed in June 2001, that has made recommendations in this regard.

• The study found that whereas Preston Street - Como Beach was previously a vibrant and community orientated area with wide appeal, by 2002 its land use and development had become fragmented and its attraction had diminished to all but those in the local area.

• Commercial development along Preston Street west of Labouchere Road, is still fragmented by old housing, but this will, in time, present redevelopment opportunities.

• The form of the existing main shopping precinct on the south-west corner of Preston Street and Labouchere Road is not conducive to ‘main street’ amenity.

**Recommended Actions for Preston Street Centre**

• The Council should continue its cooperative approach to new development and redevelopment projects, and promote the development of Preston Street in accordance with the recommendations in the Clifton Coney Stevens (CCS) urban design report.

• The Council should use the expansion potential identified in the model to further the objectives in the report.

• If the area does become as successful as other notable ‘main street’ village centres such as Oxford Street (Leederville), or Rokeby Road (Subiaco), which it could well do, then more attention will need to be paid to the provision and location of car parking than has been given in the CCS report.

• The City should encourage alfresco dining facilities using the footpath, in accordance with relevant City policies and Local Laws.

• The Council should encourage appropriate sensitive use of the Cygnet Theatre site which recognise and complement the heritage significance of the building. Some of the uses which the Council would support include Cinema/Theatre, Café/Restaurant, gallery, Shop, Office, Take-Away Food Outlet, and the like.

• The maximum size of the Centre should be limited to 10,000 m² NLA including non-retail commercial NLA to a maximum of 5,000 m² and retail NLA to a maximum of 6,000 m².

### 7.5.4 CATEGORY 3  Retail Neighbourhood Centres

There are two existing retail Neighbourhood Centres in South Perth, located at the corner of Meadowvale Avenue and Mill Point Road in South Perth, and on Welwyn Avenue, between Bradshaw and Conochie Crescents in Manning.

A new Neighbourhood Centre of 4,500 m² has been requested on the former Telstra Training School site at Pt. Lot 2 (No. 54) Manning Road cnr Ley Street, Manning. This proposal is the subject of a detailed assessment in Working Paper No. 1 to this study. It is not recommended.

**Objective for Retail Neighbourhood Centres**

To ensure that these centres provide the appropriate range of retail facilities to service the needs of their respective local neighbourhoods.

---

\(^4\) Como Beach / Preston Street Community Village Study - Final Report, Managed by Clifton Coney Stevens, June 2001.
CONTEXT STATEMENTS FOR MEADOWVALE AVENUE CENTRE

• The Meadowvale Avenue Neighbourhood Centre and the adjoining medical centre is zoned ‘Neighbourhood Centre Commercial’ in TPS6.

• It should be noted that the adjacent former Rhodes Hotel site is not included in the Neighbourhood Centre Commercial zone, although it is included in the same commercial complex in the Department for Planning and Infrastructure 2002 Commercial Survey. This exclusion from the commercial zone in TPS6 is more consistent with the residential redevelopment of the site, recently approved by the Council.

• The Meadowvale Avenue centre is largely developed and there is limited, if any, potential for expansion of the zoned area given the existence of the ‘Surgicentre’ development to the north and an approved new residential development on the former Rhodes Hotel site to the west, with street frontages to the south and east. This centre has only relatively recently been developed and has maximised the use of the site for buildings and associated car parking.

• Modelling for the Meadowvale Avenue centre is given in the following Table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>DPI Code</th>
<th>1997 DPI Data Input nla m²</th>
<th>2002 DPI Data Input nla m²</th>
<th>Model 2002 Calibration Output nla m²</th>
<th>Modelled Potential 2006 nla m²</th>
<th>Modelled Potential 2011 nla m²</th>
<th>Modelled Potential 2021 nla m²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meadowvale Ave / Mill Point Road</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>1,541*</td>
<td>1,546</td>
<td>1,544</td>
<td>1,520</td>
<td>1,542</td>
<td>1,635</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


* The 1997 floor area has been taken from the BSD 1994 survey because the 1997 Commercial Survey floor area of 2,651m² includes the adjacent Rhodes Motel.

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS FOR MEADOWVALE AVENUE CENTRE

• The Council should maintain the status quo at this centre until at least 2011.

Context Statements for Welwyn Avenue Centre

• The Welwyn Avenue Neighbourhood Centre Commercial zone comprises the Welwyn Avenue shopping centre, the community park and community centre / clinic behind the shopping centre and a motor repair workshop and veterinary centre diagonally opposite the shopping centre.

• The motor repair workshop is a mechanical workshop, which is not compatible with the residential surrounds. The workshop has replaced a former service station.

• The Welwyn Avenue Neighbourhood Centre serves an important Neighbourhood function for the south-west part of the City. However, it is not particularly well located and has little exposure to the movement economy. This was the reason the service station closed.

• The centre has an unusual mix of shops for a Neighbourhood Centre. It includes a large combined clothes shop of 488 m².

• Modelling indicates that the centre has some expansion potential based on a continuation of the current shopping distribution in this part of the City.
Welwyn Avenue centre contains a substantial area of car parking at the front of the centre that could be rationalised and redesigned to accommodate expansions to the centre. Verge parking could also be permissible off Welwyn Avenue.

There is also potential to expand the centre at the rear into the adjoining A-Class reserve 24331, particularly the hard-stand vacant car parking and basketball court areas which appear under-utilised and neglected.

The motor repair workshop in Bradshaw Avenue may be redeveloped for retail uses that, if appropriately designed, would have minimal, if any, impact on adjoining residential areas given the existence of the veterinary clinic immediately adjoining to the east.

If Pt. Lot 2 (No. 54) Manning Road cnr Ley Street, Manning is rezoned and redeveloped for a Neighbourhood Centre of 4,500 m², the findings of Working Paper No. 1 to this Review are that Welwyn Avenue centre will have no expansion potential and will suffer significant impact.

The extent of the impact will mean that Welwyn Avenue centre will need to diversify its uses to other forms of commercial development. There may be opportunities to combine such new uses with new commercial development on part of the adjacent community park (Reserve 24331) which is currently under-utilised for community purposes.

The location and surrounds of Welwyn Avenue centre are compatible with combined residential / commercial development. It may be possible to encourage a combined residential / commercial development.

**Recommended Actions for Welwyn Avenue Centre**

Based on the findings of Working Paper No. 1 and the LCS, the requested new Neighbourhood centre at Pt. Lot 2 (No. 54) Manning Road cnr Ley Street, Manning is not supported and should not proceed. On this basis, the Council should encourage the diversification of the Welwyn Avenue centre to non-retail commercial development, in conjunction with possible further non-retail commercial / residential development on Reserve 24331 and the motor workshop site.

The Council should use the modest expansion potential at this site to promote the redevelopment of the motor workshop site to more appropriate uses.

**Requested New Neighbourhood Centre on Pt. Lot 2 (No. 54) Manning Road cnr Ley Street, Manning**

This requested centre is canvassed in more detail in Working Paper No. 1 to this Review. Now that the owners of the Village Green (Karawara) shopping centre have demonstrated their commitment to upgrade that centre to better fulfil its District Centre role, the requested at Pt. Lot 2 (No. 54) Manning Road cnr Ley Street, Manning, is not recommended.
Objectives for Highway Commercial Centres

To encourage upgrading of commercial facilities adjoining the City's two major regional roads, Canning Highway and Manning Road, for uses and development which:

(a) require a regional road frontage for accessibility or exposure;

(b) contribute to the physical appearance of development adjacent to the roads and to the variety and diversity of commercial facilities available to the local community;

(c) will not adversely jeopardise access or safety aspects of either road's primary function as important roads within the region; and

(d) are compatible with the long-term road widening requirements on both Canning Highway and Manning Road.

Context Statements for Highway Commercial Centres

- The Highway Commercial zone includes all commercially zoned sites and uses adjoining Canning Highway and Manning Road, including CA's 10-15, 28-33 and 36-38, sites zoned ‘Service Station’ or ‘Hotel’ under Scheme 5, or where commercial uses are permitted as Additional Uses.

- Commercial development extends in a ribbon fashion adjoining Canning Highway, particularly north of Douglas Avenue. This development ranges from isolated land uses fronting the Highway to integrated centres extending into adjacent residential streets. Other than the Village Green (Karawara) shopping centre, centres on Manning Road are confined to land adjoining Ley and Clydesdale Streets, and the Manning Hotel site.

- The retail modelling results are reflected in the following Table. It should be noted that some of the zoned areas where site constraints prevent expansion, have been held constant in the model and the floor area expansion potential (if any) has been redistributed in the model to the most convenient alternative centre.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>DPI Code</th>
<th>1997 DPI Data Input nla m²</th>
<th>2002 DPI Data Input nla m²</th>
<th>Model 2002 Calibration Output nla m²</th>
<th>Modelled Potential 2006 nla m²</th>
<th>Modelled Potential 2011 nla m²</th>
<th>Modelled Potential 2021 nla m²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canning Hwy / Way Rd</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>572</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canning Hwy (Hovia to Salisbury)</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>1,289</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canning Hwy / Douglas Av</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>1,171</td>
<td>1,659</td>
<td>1,659</td>
<td>1,639</td>
<td>1,671</td>
<td>1,790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canning Hwy / Renwick St</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canning Hwy / South Tce</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canning Hwy / Hobbs Av</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>1,195</td>
<td>1,055</td>
<td>1,051</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td>1,057</td>
<td>1,135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canning Hwy / Monash Av</td>
<td>8,746</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canning Hwy / Barker Av</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canning Hwy / Henley St</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>1,517</td>
<td>1,173</td>
<td>1,165</td>
<td>1,175</td>
<td>1,207</td>
<td>1,321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manning Rd / Ley St</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>887</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manning Hotel</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td>10,601</td>
<td>9,084</td>
<td>8,865</td>
<td>8,861</td>
<td>8,858</td>
<td>9,248</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• The majority of commercially zoned land along the Highway has been developed and current TPS6 provisions restrict additional access for office development.

• Highway Commercial development does not represent a continuous ribbon retailing strip, but is interspersed with, and adjoined by, residential development of varying quality and density.

• The Strategy recognises the role played by Highway Commercial activities in serving both local and regional catchments to varying degrees, depending on the nature of the land use. Such land uses may predominantly service passing trade (ie service stations, fast food outlets, 24 hour facilities), or rely on high exposure and accessibility (eg hotels, car yards, offices, real estate agencies). These facilities also contribute to the local community by offering a range of commercial activities beyond those supportable by a local community centre in a location and environment that is already not conducive to residential amenity.

• The appearance and age of commercial development on Canning Highway and Manning Road varies substantially. New development includes office complexes and refurbishment of the Rosie O'Grady's Tavern (former Hurlingham Hotel) and the Como Hotel.

• The Council has received requests for rezoning residential sites along Canning Highway to accommodate expansion of the fast food outlets near Way Road. Frequent requests for 'spot rezoning' along Canning Highway for commercial purposes have been uniformly rejected.

• Both Canning Highway and Manning Road are subject to long-term road widening / realignment proposals. Discussions with Main Roads WA indicate they could occur some time after 2011. On Canning Highway, the widening is a nominal 17.5 metres on the eastern side. The effect of this widening will be to:
  (i) require the demolition of at least 13 existing commercial establishments; and
  (ii) leave remnants of Highway Commercial zoning which are difficult or impractical to develop.

• Many of the developments are old, without adequate parking and in need of refurbishment or redevelopment.

**Recommended Actions for Highway Commercial Centres**

• The Council should use the expansion potential at the various points along Canning Highway to promote redevelopment and refurbishment.

• In the case of additions to an existing building, notwithstanding the maximum plot ratio prescribed in TPS6, where proposed additions involve an increase in floor area of more than 10%, such development should only be approved if the existing building is significantly upgraded.

• Development should not be supported by the Council unless vehicular access to and from lots which abut Canning Highway or Manning Road are:
  (i) confined to the minimum necessary in the opinion of the Council for orderly traffic movement; and
  (ii) designed in such a manner as to facilitate entry onto the road in a forward gear.

• In any new development within the zone, retailing floorspace should be incidental to the predominant use of the site or is of a nature reliant on passing trade for predominant patronage.

• Development should not occur on land affected by road widening.

• The Council should be satisfied that the physical appearance, amenity and service offered by any new development is compatible with the objectives for this type of centre.
• To promote the upgrading and improvements to the physical appearance of the commercial development as viewed from Canning Highway and Manning Road, the Council should consider relaxing parking requirements, or allowing the use of streets for parking where adjoining land uses are non-residential:
  (i) where such parking cannot be provided on-site or where it would be visually intrusive to do so; and
  (ii) by so doing, better landscaping and / or refurbishment of existing development can occur on the site.
• The Council should discourage excessive signage other than what may be reasonably required to advertise Highway businesses and should support variations to signage policy where consolidation of, or improvement to, existing advertising is proposed.
• The Council should encourage integrated development between adjoining commercial properties, and could require cross access and reciprocal parking arrangements and / or lot amalgamation as part of development proposals.
• Given the over-supply of Local and Neighbourhood floorspace throughout the City, and the resistance by the Commission to ad hoc Highway commercial development, no additional areas are recommended for Highway Commercial zoning other than those already identified in TPS6.

7.5.6 CATEGORY 5  Mixed Use Commercial

Objectives for Mixed Use Commercial Centres
To recognise the existing extent and nature of office development within the Mill Point area and to accommodate limited expansion of such activities, having regard to:
(a) employment opportunities such uses generate in the City;
(b) residential development in close proximity, and the need to retain a predominantly residential environment in Mill Point overall;
(c) recognised constraints on development in Mill Point, including traffic and access impacts and proximity to established residential developments.

Context Statements for Mixed Use Commercial Centres
• The two areas of ‘Mixed Use Commercial’ zoning are both in the Mill Point area. Both are in close proximity to the Mends Street Centre Commercial zone.
• The Mixed Use Commercial zone in the Mill Point area is predominantly occupied by offices with a regional or metropolitan service area rather than local. This means that for most offices, the Mill Point Road area is seen as a highly desirable, high amenity, and conveniently close extension of the Perth CBD.
• Trends indicate that there is continuing potential for expansion. Retail modelling was not undertaken for commercial (office) floorspace. While there are current land use constraints there is sufficient land area available, particularly in the area south of Judd Street, for redevelopment of residential properties, to facilitate additional office development.
• The existing situation in the Mill Point area is that there is a diversity of land uses that contribute to the character, employment opportunities and vitality of the area. But this requires careful planning to ensure that competing land uses, such as residential and office
development, can both be accommodated without office uses dominating in response to market forces.

- The medium to high density residential coding of the land in TPS6 clearly does not support the retention of the existing housing stock but favours redevelopment for higher density housing. The issue, therefore, for the Council is to retain higher density residential redevelopment opportunities within this part of the City, but to otherwise encourage retention of remaining single houses either for residential purposes or as offices.

- It is also clear that there is a continued demand for some low-scale professional office development within these residential areas and within the City. Such development can co-exist with medium and high density housing with appropriate design controls.

- The Mill Point area has been the subject of numerous previous reports, including the "Mill Point Study" in 1983. The Mill Point Study concluded that offices occupying converted premises have done so at the expense of housing stock and residential character, and that office character dominates in some areas. The requirement to retain existing cottages (converted to offices) meant that the remainder of a site was generally dominated by car parking. The Study also recognised that a component of office uses was desirable to provide work opportunities within the area that had a unique character not solely dominated by residential uses. The Study suggested however, that the intensity of office development in the area endangered its residential quality. It therefore recommended a residential zoning north of Judd Street, but with a mixed residential and office zoning with higher density redevelopment in the core area, and lower density buildings on the perimeter bordering the river to maximise and retain views.

- Not all of the recommendations of the Mill Point Study were adopted, and the Study is now somewhat dated. Accordingly, it is evident that a more contemporary urban design study is required, particularly for the area south of Judd Street, if not for the whole of Precinct 1: Mill Point. This will ensure that compatible redevelopment occurs, having regard to the prime objectives of retaining streetscape character and fostering an appropriate blend of commercial and residential activity and in view of the design objectives suggested by the Precinct Committee.

- Considering that commercial land elsewhere within the City (ie. Como Beach) has been redeveloped with residential / tourist components, it is considered that facilitating additional low scale or mixed use office development within the Mill Point area will only have a marginal impact on the provision of housing variety and choice within the City. It is also likely to result in more redevelopment incorporating residential dwellings than rezoning and consequent redevelopment by the market place for solely residential purposes would achieve.

**Recommended Actions for Mixed Use Commercial Centres**

- In order to encourage innovative building design and a mixture of residential and office developments in the area, the Council should offer a plot ratio bonus in cases where:
  - (i) the development site has an area of 1,700 m² or more;
  - (ii) the residential and the non-residential portions of the development each comprise not less than 40% of the total floor area;
  - (iii) the building design is enhanced by way of balconies facing the street, or by other design elements; and
  - (iv) outstanding quality landscaping is provided across the front of the site.

- The Council should consider reciprocal car parking arrangements between the office and residential uses.
• The Council should generally require architectural styles and treatments to buildings that are visually harmonious to the streetscapes and to other buildings.

• The Council should set standards of landscaping in keeping with the high level of visual amenity of the area.

• At the interface of the Mixed Use zone and the Residential zone, the Council should require the applicant to demonstrate building design which promotes a harmonious relationship between the two.

• For those parts of the Mixed Use Commercial zone north of Judd Street, or for sites with good exposure to Mill Point Road, the Council should support restaurants and cafés at ground floor level.

• The Council should examine the possible development of a “landmark” building at the entrance into South Perth on the land bounded by Mill Point Road, Mends Street and Labouchere Road, as reflected in the TPS6 provisions for the site.

• With many major commercial sites within Precinct 1: Mill Point, the City should re-examine all aspects of development within the Precinct, including appropriate land uses, traffic and parking, and key sites.

7.5.7 CATEGORY 6  LOCAL CENTRES

OBJECTIVE FOR LOCAL CENTRES
To recognise, reinforce and retain the important role that small corner stores and Local Centres play in fulfilling the daily shopping and commercial requirements of residents of the City.

CONTEXT STATEMENTS FOR LOCAL CENTRES
• This category excludes those non-conforming uses that will remain non-conforming uses under TPS6.

• Many of these centres and corner shops are old. Many have diversified into non-retail commercial uses. There are high vacancy rates.

• Many of these centres are now poorly located with respect to passing trade.

• It should be noted that the floor area data used was derived from the 1997 and 2002 Commercial surveys (as agreed in our brief to update this report). Since 1997, there have been significant changes, particularly at the lower (smaller) end of the shopping centre hierarchy. For example, in this period, two small centres at Talbot Avenue and Bickley Crescent have been redeveloped for non-retail purposes.

• In the model, most Local Centres and corner shops were on constrained sites with no room for expansion. These sites have been held constant in the model. The results of the model are given in the following Table:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Centre</th>
<th>DPI Code</th>
<th>1997 DPI Data Input nla m²</th>
<th>2002 DPI Data Input nla m²</th>
<th>Model 2002 Output nla m²</th>
<th>Modelled Potential 2006 nla m²</th>
<th>Modelled Potential 2011 nla m²</th>
<th>Modelled Potential 2021 nla m²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mill Pt Rd / Banksia Tce</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill Pt Rd / Douglas Ave</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawler St / Angelo St</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tate Street</td>
<td>547A</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Avenue</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Street</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banksia Terrace, Kgtn</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandon Street, Kgtn</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moresby Street</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monash Avenue</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coode St / Hensman St</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Tce / Coode St</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comer St/Labouchere Rd</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talbot Avenue</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bickley Crescent</td>
<td>544</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>5,247</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,417</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,418</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,413</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,424</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,463</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Retail Model Using Department for Planning and Infrastructure Population Projections 2001-2021 and 1997 Commercial Survey data.

- The results above do not take account of the requested centre at Pt. Lot 2 (No. 54) Manning Road cnr Ley Street, Manning. Even so, it can be seen that there is very little expansion potential for any Local Centres.

**Recommended Actions for Local Centres**

- Wherever possible, the Council should encourage the retention of convenience retail shopping in Local Centres and corner shops. Diversification to non-retail should not be a preferred outcome, but a back-up in the cases where retail fails.

- Where centres are no longer viable and are in the midst of a housing area, the Council should encourage the conversion of the vacant buildings and sites to residential purposes.

- Alternatively, for the larger centres which are better located but not viable as retailing, the Council could permit them to be converted into embryonic office / business premises to encourage expanding home offices to move out of houses.

- The Council should act as catalyst to promote physical upgrading of key Local Centres by implementing streetscape improvements along the lines of Angelo Street.

- In order to encourage upgrading of developments on land zoned Local Commercial, the Council could consider expansion of existing floorspace by a maximum of 10% where significant refurbishment of existing premises will be undertaken as part of the expansion.

- When on-site car parking cannot be provided to accommodate the additional 10% floorspace referred to above, the Council could consider giving use of existing road reserves to accommodate angled or other paved parking. This parking arrangement should be negotiated with the Council and funded by the centre owner as part of the development proposal.

- Expansions to any of the existing buildings on sites zoned Local Commercial, should generally be kept within 10% of the modelled potential.
In considering a change from one commercial use to another within a Local Commercial zone, Council should aim to ensure that such use will not adversely impact on adjoining residential amenity and can preferably be demonstrated as serving local shopping needs or aspirations. The Council will have regard to the impact of the development on adjacent residential areas, as well as the demand for such facilities to serve the adjacent local community.

Subject to compliance with any relevant City policy or Local Law, the Council may consider the commercial use of footpath areas external to a site zoned Local Commercial for display, or for alfresco dining activities where such use contributes to the character of the existing business, and any upgrading of the portion of footpath to be used is undertaken to the satisfaction of the Council.

7.5.8 CATEGORY 6 TECHNOLOGY PARK

OBJECTIVES FOR TECHNOLOGY PARK

1. To support the development of Technology Park, Kensington, with innovative technological and research uses which meet the Park’s entry criteria and comply with the requirements of Town Planning Scheme No. 6 (TPS6).

2. To ensure that Technology Park, Kensington, is developed as an attractive, landscaped ‘Park’.

3. To encourage high quality, landmark building design within Technology Park, Kensington, commensurate with the internationally acclaimed innovative image of the Park.

CONTEXT STATEMENTS FOR TECHNOLOGY PARK

- Technology Park, Kensington, forms an extension of the Technology Park estate within the Town of Victoria Park. The latter area is near full capacity, containing 92 companies employing more than 2,500 people, with a combined annual turnover of $500 million, of which approximately 60% is derived from export income and 20% is re-invested into research and development. The individual companies are predominantly small technology enterprises employing an average of 20 persons each.

- Technology Park is the leading Technology Park in Australia and is rated by the International Association of Science as second in Asia and ninth in the world. As such, it has a high level of strategic importance to the City of South Perth.

- Technology Park is administered by the Department of Industry and Resources under the provisions of the Industry and Technology Development Act 1998. Uses permitted in Technology Park, Kensington, are at the discretion of the Department, while also needing to comply with TPS6.

- The land in the City of South Perth which has been zoned to permit and foster the westerly expansion of Technology Park currently accommodates the Department of Agriculture (AgWA), Department of Conservation and Land Management (CALM), Forest Management headquarters, and the Australian Resources Research Centre branch of the CSIRO. The Council has also approved one private Technology Park use, being an office and laboratory for Clinical Cell Culture Ltd in Dick Perry Avenue.

- Technology Park forms part of a wider precinct comprising 314 hectares of mainly State Government controlled land with assets vested in relevant research, education and training, and economic development agencies. In May 1996, a report of the findings of the Technology Precinct Taskforce listed a wide range of objectives and recommendations for...
the precinct, relating to land uses, transport, education, innovation and technology, and communications. The final version of this report was endorsed by Cabinet on 4 May 1998. On 22 December 2003, Cabinet agreed to support the concept, and approved the establishment of two working groups to focus on the implementation of the Master Plan. The City is represented in this process.

- Technology Park is surrounded by a range of educational facilities including Curtin University, a TAFE college and leading technology-based high schools, such as Kent Street Senior High School, which has a nationally recognised aeronautics course.

- Technology Park, Kensington, is known as ‘Technology Park (Western Sector)’. It is zoned ‘Technology Park’ under TPS6. Under the Metropolitan Region Scheme it is zoned ‘Urban’.

- The land was formerly reserved for government purposes under both the Metropolitan Region Scheme and the local Town Planning Scheme No. 5, but both Schemes were amended when it was decided that some of the land was redundant and surplus to requirements for the existing State Government purposes, and that the surplus land should be made available for sale to private owners.

- TPS6 permits a fairly wide range of residential and commercial uses, including the use ‘Research and Development’. Few controls are contained within the Scheme, allowing the City flexibility in processing more innovative developments.

- Some of the land currently held by AgWA and CALM appears to be redundant, and it is likely that portions of those sites could be made available for alternative uses in the future when the Departments have fully rationalised their needs.

**Recommended Actions for Technology Park**

- The Council should be prepared to approve variations from the development requirements of TPS6 in response to particular needs demonstrated in development applications, so as to create a precinct containing attractive, world class building designs with the maximum quantity of high quality landscaping distributed in the most effective manner.

- The Council should primarily support those kinds of retail and other uses which support the objectives of Technology Park, or which service and complement existing uses.

- The City should support the medium to long-term redevelopment of land which might, in the future, be released from sites currently occupied by the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Conservation and Land Management, provided that such development is complementary to the objectives of Technology Park.

- The City should participate as a key stakeholder in the planning of the future development of the Technology Park precinct.

- The City should encourage appropriate residential, commercial and recreational uses that will support the precinct.
CHAPTER 8  IMPLEMENTATION

Implementation of the Local Commercial Strategy (LCS) is already embodied in Town Planning Scheme No. 6 (TPS6). In this section the relevant provisions of TPS6 are reviewed.

The version of the draft TPS6 we reviewed in this study was the version incorporating modifications required by the Minister as identified in letters July 1998 and 15 June 2001. The text was supplied to us in digital form in January 2002.

The approach and content of TPS6 as it affects retail and commercial development is overviewed below.

8.1 SCHEME OBJECTIVES FOR COMMERCIAL DEVELOPMENT

The overall objective of TPS6 is to promote precinct-orientated, performance-based development which retains and enhances the overall attributes of the City and the particular objectives and attributes of each precinct.

For commercial development, the specific objectives as stated in Clause 1.6 (2), are to:

“(i) Create a hierarchy of commercial centres according to their respective designated functions, so as to meet the various shopping and other commercial needs of the community.

(j) In all commercial centres, promote an appropriate range of land uses consistent with:
   (i) the designated function of each centre as set out in the Local Commercial Strategy; and
   (ii) the preservation of the amenity of the locality.”

These objectives broadly reflect those in the 1996 draft Strategy, and combined with the other measures in TPS6 should, in general, provide the right guidance and controls to ensure that the objectives are met.

8.2 INCORPORATING THE LOCAL COMMERCIAL STRATEGY INTO TOWN PLANNING SCHEME NO. 6

The final LCS, endorsed by the Western Australian Planning Commission will become one of the supporting documents to TPS6 under Clause 1.5 and Clause 9.6 of the Scheme. By so doing, it is one of the foremost matters that the Council must take into account under Clause 7.5 of the Scheme. It would therefore effectively be part of the Scheme.

TPS6 adopted the zones recommended in the 1996 draft Strategy, but added ‘Mends Street Centre Commercial’ zone in response to a Ministerial direction that the District Centre zoning recommended by BSD for Mends Street must be changed, as it did not accord with the Metropolitan Centres Policy (2000).
8.2.1 Commercial Zones

The Commercial zones are created in Part 3 of TPS6, and are listed in Table 1 relating to Zoning – Land Use. These are:

- District Centre Commercial
- Mends Street Centre Commercial
- Neighbourhood Centre Commercial
- Highway Commercial
- Mixed use Commercial
- Local Commercial.

The disposition and hierarchy of commercial centres throughout the City of South Perth is shown of Figure 23.

An examination of the symbols in Table 1 of TPS6 show the same permissibility symbols for uses in the District Centre Commercial zone and the Mends Street Centre Commercial zone (except for aged care which is a discretionary use in Mends Street but not the District Centre zone). This indicates that the City’s intentions for each are similar.

The main difference between the District-level centre and the smaller centres of Neighbourhood, Highway Commercial and Local status, is that whereas the main commercial functions of shops and offices are ‘P’ (permitted) uses in the District Centre, at the Neighbourhood and Local level they are ‘D’ (discretionary) uses.

The provisions affecting commercial development in all zones are contained in Part 5 of TPS6 and generally cover the objectives and recommendations made in the 1996 draft Strategy.

Additional safeguards to promote the objectives of the 1996 draft Strategy are included in Part 5 of TPS6. This Part sets the requirements for development in each of the Commercial zones. The provisions of Part 5 are summarised below:

**Clause 5.1** relates to development requirements for non-residential uses in non-residential zones, and deals more specifically with certain of the 1996 draft Strategy objectives, including:

(i) the need to comply with development requirements contained in Table 3;
(ii) expansion of buildings in the Highway Commercial and Local Commercial zones;
(iii) Mixed Developments in the Mixed Use zone, including a plot ratio ‘bonus’;
(iv) special setback requirements in certain circumstances, such as adjacent to the Residential zone; and
(v) possible reduction in the provision of landscaped area if the front of the site and street verge are landscaped to an outstanding quality to the Council’s satisfaction.

*We concur with the intent of this clause.*
Clause 5.2 relates to development requirements for non-residential uses in the Residential zone, and deals with:

(i) the need to comply with development requirements contained in Table 4;
(ii) method of calculating which density code applies in a dual coding situation.

*We concur with the intent of this clause.*

Clause 5.3 relates to setbacks from specified streets for non-residential uses, and deals with:

(i) setback requirements related to Table 5 of the Scheme; and
(ii) how to measure setbacks where road widening is proposed in Canning Highway and Manning Road.

*We concur with the intent of this clause.*

Clause 5.4 relates to development requirements for six specific sites, including special provisions previously inserted into Scheme 5 through Scheme amendments. The sites comprise:

(i) **Site A:** No. 19 Bowman Street and No. 11 (Lot 188) Labouchere Road, corner of Judd Street, South Perth. Sub-clause (1) specifies landscaping and urban art to be carried out by the owner in conjunction with the café / restaurant proposed for the site. (Based on Amendment 104, Government Gazette dated 9.7.1999)

(ii) **Site B:** No. 1 (Lot 10) Preston Street, Como. Sub-clause (2) specifies conditional building height and plot ratio in relation to footpath, parking and streetscape-landscaping requirements for a mixed shopping office and residential development. (Based on Amendment 107, Government Gazette dated 20.4.2000)

(iii) **Site C:** No. 64-68 (Lot 46) South Terrace, corner Coode Street, South Perth. Sub-clause (3) sets out plot ratios for non-residential and residential components of a Mixed Development as well as balcony and storage areas for the residential units. (Based on Amendment 112, Government Gazette dated 31.12.1999) *In fact, this site was developed with Offices rather than a Mixed Development, and therefore was not affected by these provisions.*

(iv) **Site D:** No. 56 Ley Street and Nos. 2 and 4 Downey Drive, Como. Sub-clause (4) sets out detailed conditions for the development for the whole or parts of the site, involving preferred land uses, plot ratios and design features. (Based on Amendment 118, Government Gazette dated 13.8.2002)

(v) **Site E:** No. 296 (Lot 19) Mill Point Road, South Perth. Sub-clause (5) sets out special development requirements for a building exceeding a certain floor area. (Based on Amendment 121, Government Gazette dated 4.2.2003)
(vi) **Site F:** No. 23 (Lot 2) Bowman Street corner of Labouchere Road, South Perth. Sub-clause (6) sets out development requirements for a Mixed Development involving a plot ratio of up to 1.0. (Based on Amendment 123, Government Gazette dated 4.2.2003)

*While we accept the intent of the above clause we wonder if the Scheme Text would not have been more streamlined if site specific development controls were to be included in a schedule at the back of the Scheme Text rather than in the body of the text.*

*We nevertheless agree that the intent of Part 5 of the Scheme is in keeping with recommendations in the 1996 draft Strategy.*

**Clause 5.5** relates to the need to comply with any non-residential design guidelines.

### 8.2.2 Additional Uses (Clause 3.4 and Schedule 2 of TPS6)

The brief for this study requires that comment be made on commercial uses and future ‘Additional Uses’ in the Residential zone in TPS6, and any special considerations which should be given to such uses.

Clause 3.4 in TPS6, although worded differently, has the same intent as Clauses 19 and 50 in Scheme 5. In Scheme 5, Schedule C - Clause 50 was used to permit the development of about as much commercial floor space in the Residential zone as all the combined commercial zones in the City. The main area affected was the area bounded by Mill Point Road, Labouchere Road, Richardson Street and the Kwinana Freeway. The 1997 Department for Planning and Infrastructure Commercial Survey identified 28,737 m² of Office / Business floor area and 1,152 m² of shop / retail. Of the 103 Additional Uses listed in Schedule C in Scheme, 88 were commercial or commercial related (car parking etc).

This Mill Point / Labouchere Road office area is now proposed as a Mixed Use Commercial zone in TPS6. Most of the office / business area and shops have been included into one or other of the six Commercial zones proposed in the Scheme. There were also a number of shops and other commercial Additional Uses created along Canning Highway which are now included in the Highway Commercial zones in TPS6.

We note in Schedule 2 to Clause 3.4 in TPS6 that there are seven Additional Uses listed of which four are taken from Schedule C of Scheme 5.