Kensington / South Perth – Character Study Report – Part B

Canning Highway #ShapeOurPlace Stage 2

Proudly brought to you by TPG+Place Match

Contents

This page has been left blank intentionally.

Executive Summary

Background and Intent

The Canning Highway Residential Density and Built Form Study (November 2015) investigated residential density and built form adjacent to Canning Highway in order to understand the role of Canning Highway as an activity corridor. The Study separated Canning Highway into five parts. The Kensington/South Perth Character Study focuses on the first two of those parts.

This report forms the second component (Part B) of the Kensington/ South Perth Character Study. The first component (Part A) identified elements of the existing built form of the study area that contribute positively to the character of the area. Part B provides the rationale and rigour for a new built form planning framework to facilitate appropriate medium density development along and within close proximity to Canning Highway and provide for an appropriate transition to adjacent low density residential areas.

Approach and Methodology

This report analyses a wide range of planning considerations with a view to determining potential modifications to the City of South Perth's existing planning framework, and the need for formulating new provisions, in the context and character of the Study Area. It does this by examining:

- existing planning controls (Town Planning Scheme No. 6);
- draft planning controls (Volume Two of State Planning Policy No. 7.3 Residential Design Codes - Guidance for multiple-dwelling and mixed-use developments (draft for public comment October 2016) (Apartment Design Policy)); and
- previously recommended planning controls (Canning Highway Residential Density and Built Form Study (November 2015)), in light of the findings of the Part A Character Study.

A workshop was held in December 2016 with planners from a number of local governments with experience planning for activity corridors. The purpose of this workshop was to identify issues in the analysis undertaken to date and to incorporate the experience of the participants into the recommendations of the Part B report. The planning controls are identified as either being sufficient, requiring modification or reinforcement, to ensure the existing character of the Kensington and South Perth area can be maintained and enhanced, while encouraging contemporary medium density development adjacent to the Highway. The need for potential new provisions are also identified.

This report seeks to document a 'path of rationale' in accordance with the principles of orderly and proper planning and that is suited to the Study Area.

Summary of Key Recommendations

A number of existing, draft and previously recommended planning controls are considered sufficient to continue as the basis for guiding new development within the Study Area, including:

- Streetscape typologies, façade design, solar access, garages, landscaping and public domain provisions as outlined in the draft Apartment Design Policy;
- General objectives and intent of the streetscape, primary street setbacks, open pace, solar design and access provisions as outlined in the Canning Highway Residential Density and Built Form Study (November 2015);

It is recommended to follow State direction and ensure the medium density development planning framework reflects the streetscape typologies outlined in the draft Apartment Design Policy, while modifying primary controls to suit the local context where warranted. Section 5 outlines the operation of the streetscape-based recommendations and how they may be incorporated into the City's planning framework.

Attached streetscapes are identified along Canning Highway, with higher intensity at activity nodes. Surrounding areas are identified as detached streetscapes of varying heights a shown in Plan 1 – Streetscape Typologies Plan. In order to provide for appropriate transition of building bulk and scale between areas of different densities, 'transition provisions' are identified. It is recommended that new developments at the boundaries between different streetscape intensities be required to provide larger setbacks and ensure that overshadowing and privacy is managed appropriately through building siting and design. A number of other recommendations are made to enhance controls relating to climate-sensitive design, open space and landscaping and the interface with public domain.

1. Introduction

1.1 Purpose

This report forms the second component (Part B) of the Canning Highway Residential Density and Built Form study (November2015) (Canning Highway #ShapeOurPlace project) Stage 2; following on from, and informed by, the Kensington/ South Perth Character Study (Part A) and Canning Highway #ShapeOurPlace Stage 1. The purpose of Part B is to provide the rationale and rigour for new planning frameworks facilitating appropriate medium density development along Canning Highway (Berwick Street to Douglas Avenue).

1.1.1 Focus of Medium Density Development Controls

It is intended that the future built form controls will focus on protecting and enhancing the character of the area as investigated in Part A and validated through community feedback. Those character elements considered most important through community feedback are:

- **Openness and sense of space** - The open character of the area is provided through a consistency in front setbacks and the provision of side/rear setbacks, which provide a sense of separation and openness between dwellings and opportunities for soft landscaping;
- **Trees and green spaces** - The street trees and greenery in the front gardens soften the hard appearance of the roads and buildings, contribute to the aesthetic appeal of the streets, provide shade and create a sense of connection to nature;
- **Respect for topography** - Generally the built form complements and responds (i.e. is stepped without large areas of retaining to the existing topography of the land), which in many instances enables views of the city and surrounding areas to be captured;
- **Connection to the street** - Regardless of their age and style, those buildings which positively contribute to the streetscapes share similar characteristics in that they address the street with both windows and front doors being parallel to the street often with street facing verandahs, porches, balconies and permeable front fencing.

Other character elements discussed in Part A include fine grain traditional detail, separation of use and subdivision pattern. It is recommended that all seven character elements be articulated in a planning policy, as elements to be addressed in future development proposals.

Non-built form related matters such as traffic, access and parking are intended to be addressed through separate studies and management plans, informed by this project. While the project does not propose changes to land use zoning of properties within the Study Area, it is recognised that land use can influence built form outcomes. This report therefore identifies where different development standards could apply to residential and non-residential land uses, particularly at street level and the interface with the public domain.

Any new low density development (single or grouped dwellings) will be guided and assessed as per current R-Codes and local planning policy.

1.2 Objectives

The ultimate objective for Stage 2 of the Canning Highway #ShapeOurPlace study is to prepare a draft amendment to Town Planning Scheme No. 6 (TPS6) and a complementary/ supporting draft planning instrument to facilitate appropriate medium density development adjacent to Canning Highway and a suitable transition from the highway to surrounding suburbs.

The key objectives of Part B include:

a) Concentrating medium density close to the Canning Highway corridor, thereby protecting the surrounding established suburban neighbourhoods;

b) Providing for a suitable transition in built form away from the highway to the established residential areas beyond;

c) Protecting and enhancing the character of the Kensington/ South Perth suburban areas;

d) Identifying the appropriate locations for activity nodes along the highway that have the potential for mixed use built form outcomes;

e) Encouraging the amalgamation of lots to achieve development outcomes that respond to the character of the area;

f) Ensuring the interface between higher and lower streetscape intensity is managed carefully through sensitive urban design and site-responsive solutions.

2. Part B Approach and Methodology

This report has been prepared using the following approach:

a) Analyse existing planning controls to understand the current development potential of the corridor;

b) Review the planning controls recommended through Stage 1 of Canning Highway #ShapeOurPlace (including community feedback) in light of the outcomes of the Character Study Part A;

c) Review the feedback from community consultation of Part A (refer to Appendix 1);

d) Analyse the principles, design guidance and primary controls of the draft Apartment Design Policy; and

e) Gain an appreciation of the successes and challenges faced by other local governments that have recently prepared or implemented similar medium density planning frameworks (via an inter-local government strategic and statutory planners' discussion hosted by the City of South Perth - explained further below).

Gaps in planning considerations, including justified departures from existing/draft work, have then been identified as either requiring modification, reinforcement or potential new provisions to ensure the existing character of the Kensington and South Perth areas will be maintained and enhanced, while encouraging contemporary development that responds to the desired streetscape typologies for the area. The outcome of this process is summarised in Section 4 of this report.

As mentioned above, a collaborative discussion was held with strategic and statutory planners from a number of metropolitan local governments in December 2016, to complement the Part B analysis work. The workshop-style discussion served as a knowledge sharing exercise, providing insight on preparing and implementing similar medium density projects.

While local contexts varied, the principles of applying medium-density planning frameworks proved not too dissimilar across all case studies discussed.

Key areas of discussion were:

- Drafting of planning instruments and Council buy-in
- Community and stakeholder communication and consultation
- Managing building heights, transition, form and character
- Traffic and public domain considerations

Notes of this discussion are included as part of the analysis in Section 4 of this report.

Refer to Appendix 2 - Inter-Local Government Discussion Attendees.

This page has been left blank intentionally.

3. Key Issues and Influences

3.1 State Strategic Planning Direction

Canning Highway through Kensington and South Perth is a prominent urban corridor within the Perth metropolitan region. The highway and its immediate surroundings are strategically located having good public transport access, strong movement networks, and urban amenities within close proximity to the Perth CBD. The State strategic planning direction, as set out in draft Perth and Peel @3.5 Million (released May 2015), seeks to enhance the role and function of corridors through increasing their residential density and diversity based on the principles of infill housing and urban consolidation, including:

(a) Ensure the attractive character and heritage values within suburbs are retained and minimise changes to the existing urban fabric;

(b) Provide for a diversity of quality higher-density housing to match the changing demographics of the growing population and ensure that the scale and design of new development integrates into the surrounding neighbourhood;

(c) Ensure that existing and planned public transport routes are supported by quality higher-density residential land uses; and

(d) Ensure more efficient use of existing and planned services and social infrastructure to achieve a more sustainable urban environment.

The Central Sub-Regional Strategy identifies on infill housing target for the City of South Perth of 8,300 new dwellings by 2050. Canning Highway has an important role in accommodating future population growth.

This report therefore aims to evaluate how the Canning Highway corridor through Kensington and South Perth can accommodate appropriate medium density development in line with these principles, having regard to the outcomes of the Kensington/ South Perth Character Study Report - Part A.

3.2 Contemporary Development and Established Character

As increases in density are introduced into an area, it is important to be mindful of integration with the existing character, so as to build on it positively rather than impact the qualities that contribute to the unique sense of place. This could be interpreted to mean that introducing contemporary development into a character area is undesirable, however this is not always the case, but rather it is often the lack of quality contemporary examples that can create such a perception. When the character of an area is well understood and articulated through planning instruments, it can challenge this perception, and instead allow a harmonic relationship between contemporary development and the existing character of a place.

'Character' is essentially identified by the built form and age of an area and its relationship with the surrounding topography, open space, streetscape, land use and activity.

To respect the existing character of an area, contemporary development must make an effort to:

- Avoid direct mimicry of previous architectural styles in full, or that are not appropriate to the context or building;
- Exemplify qualities of the existing character, whilst being mindful not to contest these qualities; and
- Respect qualities of the existing character, or provide a point of difference that creates a positive impact and enhances the amenity or character of the area.

Contemporary development provides the opportunity to bring new life into an existing area, revitalise derelict places, positively contribute to an area's image, attract new investment, and increase the overall level of amenity.

3.3 Benefits of Density to the Wider Community

In addition to providing housing for our growing population, medium-density developments can offer economic, environmental and aesthetic benefits to the community, including:

- Increasing dwelling diversity, and providing affordable housing options in an area;
- Providing opportunities for an overall enhancement of amenity and liveability of a wider area by generating a critical mass of local employees and customers required to support an increase in the provision of active uses and services on offer in the area, such as the viability of retail and public transport, and reducing the risk of urban decline of an area;
- Contributing to the making of diversified, dynamic and sustainable communities where residents enjoy spending time;
- Providing more 'eyes on the street' and deterring crime and anti-social behaviour. Greater population and activity levels, particularly beyond traditional working hours, can lead to an increase in passive surveillance of the public domain. Ensuring local planning frameworks adopt the principles of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) when planning for increased density can create safer, more active streets for the whole community.
- Increasing infrastructure efficiencies and reducing the impacts of urban sprawl on the wider metropolitan area; and
- Reducing travel times and dependency on the private vehicle.

Canning Highway has the opportunity to become more than just a regional transport route. Carefully thought-out and planned medium density development within the study area has the potential to transform the highway into an activity corridor with improved streetscapes, public domain offerings, and higher levels of visual and physical connection between the two sides of the highway. Enhancing the pedestrian experience with human-scaled buildings, active interfaces and the integration of public transport networks has the real potential of supporting a safe and active community for the existing and future residents of Kensington and South Perth.

3.4 Locating Density

Through the Character Study Report - Part A, it is recognised that the community highly value the leafy, low-scale suburban areas of Kensington and South Perth, which creates the area's inherent character. However, it was also identified that many properties adjacent to Canning Highway have potential for redevelopment and this has the potential to improve the amenity of the area.

Part B seeks to facilitate opportunities for appropriate medium density concentrated close to Canning Highway in the future, and exemplify a suitable transition to the lower density suburbs beyond the corridor. This acts to prevent unplanned density creep into low density neighbourhoods by concentrating change along an activity corridor, in line with the State Government's strategic planning direction.

It is recognised that the existing Primary Regional Road reservation under the Metropolitan Region Scheme affects a large proportion of lots fronting the south-eastern side of Canning Highway. Amalgamation of lots (either along the Highway or behind) will likely be required to accommodate better redevelopment outcomes, given land will be required to be ceded free of cost for road widening.

4. Analysis and Rationale for Change to Planning Framework

The following table details the analysis work undertaken to determine potential modifications to the City of South Perth's existing planning framework or the need for formulating new provisions. It seeks to document a 'path of rationale' in accordance with the principles of orderly and proper planning. A summary by theme is then provided in Section 5 of this report.

Planning Framework Formulation Table

The following table provides an analysis of the planning framework and illustrates the rationale behind the recommendations for the South Perth/ Kensington Character Study area. This process seeks to avoid duplicating sound State planning principles, and instead focuses on demonstrating the rigour behind how and why a particular control has come about. This is particularly helpful for decision-makers when justifying their exercise of discretion, where applicable, through appropriate 'due regard'.

Table 1: Kensington/ South Perth Canning Highway Character Study Part B Analysis and Rationale Table

<table>
<tr><th>Suggested Development Controls (#ShapeOuPlace Stage 1) and/or Existing Provisions (in red).</th><th>Key Elements of Draft SPP No. 7 - Apartment Design Policy Apartment Guidelines</th><th>Key Outcomes of Community Consultation</th><th>Commentary from Character Study - Part A</th><th>Commentary from Inter-LGA Workshop</th><th>Part B Recommendations</th></tr>
<tr><td colspan="6">Streetscape Typologies, Density, Building Heights, and Plot Ratio (Primary Controls)</td></tr>
<tr>
<td>
Ref. Section (4.3)
· Three streetscape types suggested:
<table>
<tr><td>Highway</td><td>R60-R80+</td><td>High and high-medium density
Mixed use</td></tr>
<tr><td>Urban</td><td>R50-R60
R40</td><td>High-medium and medium density</td></tr>
<tr><td>Suburban</td><td>R15-R40</td><td>Medium and Low density</td></tr>
</table>
(5.3.2)
· Building height should not be discretionary:
<table>
<tr><th>Streetscape</th><th>Max. Height</th></tr>
<tr><td>Highway</td><td>2-6 storeys</td></tr>
<tr><td>Urban</td><td>2-4 storeys</td></tr>
<tr><td>Suburban</td><td>2-3 storeys</td></tr>
</table>
· Minimum lot sizes to achieve building heights:
<table>
<tr><td colspan="2">Highway</td></tr>
<tr><td>6 storeys</td><td>Min. 1800sqm</td></tr>
<tr><td>5 storeys</td><td>Min. 1350 sqm</td></tr>
<tr><td>4 storeys</td><td>Min. 900 sqm</td></tr>
<tr><td>2-3 storeys</td><td>No minimum</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Urban</td></tr>
<tr><td>4 storeys</td><td>Min. 1350 sqm</td></tr>
<tr><td>2-3 storeys</td><td>No minimum</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="2">Suburban</td></tr>
<tr><td>2-3 storeys</td><td>No minimum.</td></tr>
</table>
*Note: Multiple dwellings are prohibited in R40 coded areas under TPS6
</td>
<td>
(2.1)
· Apartment Design Policy provides for varying intensities of 'Attached' and 'Detached' streetscape typologies.
· Detached typologies are appliedby default; Attached typologies are only applicable if nominated by LG in LPS/Precinct Plan.
· Potential Medium-Low Density streetscape types for the Study Area include:
<table>
<tr><th>Streetscape</th><th>R-Code</th><th>Description</th></tr>
<tr><td>Medium Density Attached</td><td>R80</td><td>Town centre, urban corridor, district centre, mixed business or similar ('Highway')</td></tr>
<tr><td>Medium Density Detached</td><td>R60; and R80</td><td>Predominantly residential with good local amenity ('Urban')</td></tr>
<tr><td>Neighbourhood Detached</td><td>R50</td><td>Neighbourhood character ('Suburban')</td></tr>
</table>
(2.1)
<table>
<tr><th>Streetscape</th><th>Plot Ratio</th><th>Description</th></tr>
<tr><td>Attached – Medium density</td><td>2.0
(3.0*)</td><td>4 storeys
(6*)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Detached – Medium density</td><td>1.0
(1.5*)</td><td>R80 - 4 storeys (5*)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Detached – Medium density</td><td>0.7
(1.0*)</td><td>R60 - 3 storeys (4*)</td></tr>
<tr><td>Detached Neighbourhood</td><td>0.6
(0.8*)</td><td>3 storeys
(No additional height)</td></tr>
</table>
· * Developer incentives are applicable to upper limit (discretionary additional height - refer s2.11).
· Modifying primary controls should balance certainty and flexibility.
· No minimum lot sizes stipulated.
It is noted that Apartment Design Policy defines height in storeys as opposed to metres and that TPS6 adopts metres. A wider whole-of-scheme amendment would therefore be required and may not be achievable through this project.
</td>
<td>
Support for Density
· Support for increased density/amenity along the highway and within activity centre nodes (support for up to R100, 4-6 storeys and nil setbacks).
· Potential for density at major intersections such as Canning Highway and Douglas Ave, Vista Street, and Cliffe Street.
· Careful and respectful delivery of high and medium density, including respect for existing character, increased services and increased green spaces.
· Need for urban renewal and street activation along Canning Highway, which could be achieved through higher densities.
Opposition to Density
· Some respondents did not believe there was support for increased heights in the community.
· Physical impact of building mass on directly adjoining properties, which is perceived to decrease the amenity and liveability of the locality.
· Concern for how three storey plus buildings would blend with the existing streetscape, urban and suburban residential areas.
· Concern that any density will erode the area's character.
· Lack of openness and feeling of enclosure between previous medium density/ commercial development and existing areas, within the project area.
· Some respondents defined the 'single-storey detached house' as defining the character of the project area. New development should protect the single-storey suburban precinct, using guidance to maintain the character within that area. A suggestion was made to limit development to two storeys to protect character.
· Concerns around the over-development of sites, particularly for narrow blocks
</td>
<td>
· Some areas along Canning Highway are capable of accommodating higher intensity development (given context, particularly near activity centres).
· Generally the built form steps with the existing topography (without large areas of retaining), enabling views to the surrounds.
· Generally the subdivision pattern is consistent in regard to layout and the size of allotments.
· Buildings generally present as compact and contained forms, rather than continuous, horizontal rambling forms.
· Majority of the 'suburban' streetscape lots are 450-550sqm in area, with a typical street frontage of 12-14m.
· It is recognised that some R80 coded lots adjoin R15 coded lots. It is not the intent of this Study to reduce R-Coding, rather this interface is recommended to be managed appropriately.
</td>
<td>
· Issues always emerge where lots interface with lower residential density, especially where this is not enough room on the lot to mitigate bulk or where there is no laneway or 'buffer'. A vision for the transition of the wider precinct is critical in managing impacts.
· The interface of new and existing can be poor when a lot is the first to develop surrounded by single storey dwellings. It takes time to achieve an overall transition of an area.
· Can encourage amalgamation or side street access through split-coding, but has not had a 100% success rate. Timing is an issue i.e. when lots become available.
· Community can be focused on the look of a building – a Design Review Committee process can reassure the community and Council that the building is a good design.
· Height was generally agreed to be more 'user friendly' measured in storeys as opposed to metres.
· A cap on bonuses doesn't necessarily result in a better outcome. Important to refer back to the vision and bigger picture (e.g. Canning Bridge steps to implement vision).
· Illustrating streetscape types is important to show how higher density coded areas are different to lower coded areas. Focus on built form rather than r-code numbers.
</td>
<td>
· Apartment Design Policy is the new State planning policy that will effectively replace the R-Codes, and should be used as a basis for future local planning controls. The Primary Controls of Apartment Design Policy may be varied through Scheme Provisions.
· TPS6 to therefore nominate streetscape typologies in accordance with Apartment Design Policy (see Plan 1 – Streetscape Typologies); an outcome of reviewing Project 1 streetscapes. This could be implemented through introducing a new Precinct into TPS6 for the Study Area, with precinct-based controls contained within a Schedule of the Scheme. The precinct controls could include the streetscape typologies and corresponding building heights limit plan (for comprehensive new development), incentives for additional height and plot ratio, and transition provisions, with additional guidance on treatments of setbacks etc. through policy. This is further described below.
· R50 to be used in 'suburban' / Neighbourhood Streetscape as opposed to R40 to facilitate medium density development.
· Plan 1 to nominate streetscape typology interfaces subject to curated / context responsive transition provisions (Transition Provisions A and B).
· Corresponding 'base' streetscape densities, heights and plot ratio provisions to be adapted from Apartment Design Policy.
· Plot ratio of mixed use developments to apply to residential component only (and at the ratio applied under Apartment Design Policy, i.e. plot ratio is stipulated through streetscape type rather than zoning).
· Incentives to be provided on an eligibility basis, with first criteria being identified on Plan 1.
· Balance of certainty and flexibility through upper height limits, with discretionary bonuses varying across the Study Area. i.e. less flexibility is given to lower density areas, and conversely more flexibility is given to higher density areas.
· Plan 1 also acts to show where height and R-Code is changing from existing scheme provisions and what areas are remaining unchanged.
</td>
</tr>
</table>

Suggested Development Controls (#ShapeOuPlace Stage 1) and/or Existing Provisions (in red).	Key Elements of Draft SPP No. 7 - Apartment Design Policy Apartment Guidelines	Key Outcomes of Community Consultation	Commentary from Character Study - Part A	Commentary from Inter-LGA Workshop	Part B Recommendations
· Highway Commercial zone: R80. · Residential zoned lots adjacent: R15 and R25. This has the effect of permitting a higher density development directly next to a lower density development. · Highway Commercial zone: 10.5m (3 storeys). · All other lots in the Study Area: 2 storeys. · Residential development in Highway Commercial zone: maximum plot ratio of 0.5. R80 would otherwise permit 1.0. This provides a disincentive to mixed use developments - which are limited by plot ratio controls - compared to wholly residential developments in a residential zone.					· Ensure the interface between higher and lower streetscape intensity is managed carefully through sensitive urban design and site-responsive solutions (transition provisions and principles - to be detailed in separate planning instruments) in this study. · Identify activity nodes along the highway that have the potential for mixed use and commercial developments (through increased development potential). · Encourage the amalgamation of lots to achieve development outcomes that respond to the character of the area.
CONSULTATION FEEDBACK AS PART OF STAGE 1 Canning Highway #ShapeOurPlace · Density typologies preferred on/close to the Highway: o Terraces and apartments on the highway streetscape; o Single houses, townhouses, manor house apartments, terraces and apartments in the transition zone (urban streetscape); o 3-storey townhouses and apartments; o 3-6 storey multiple dwellings around the intersection of Canning Highway and Douglas Avenue; and o 3 storey multiple dwellings and terraces north east of Gwenyfred Road. · Density typologies preferred away from the Highway: o Single houses, townhouses, manor house apartments in the suburban streetscapes; o 2-storey townhouses; o 2-storey grouped dwelling developments; and o Single houses on south side of Canning Highway (between Landsdowne and Dyson streets) and Market Street.					

<table>
<tr><th>Suggested Development Controls (#ShapeOuPlace Stage 1) and/or Existing Provisions (in red).</th><th>Key Elements of Draft SPP No. 7 - Apartment Design Policy Apartment Guidelines</th><th>Key Outcomes of Community Consultation</th><th>Commentary from Character Study - Part A</th><th>Commentary from Inter-LGA Workshop</th><th>Part B Recommendations</th></tr>
<tr><td>· Feedback on Building Heights in Place 1 and 2:
o No increase of building height limits for First Avenue and Hovia Terrace;
o Increasing height limits on the South Perth side to buffer the bulk of the Metro Hotel;
o Increasing height limits for properties in Vista and Collins Streets;
o Decrease in height limits between Collins Street and Douglas Avenue; and
o Three-storeys is too high for properties on Dyson Street that back onto David Vincent Park.</td><td></td><td>Management of Density
· Apartments should not dominate the landscape, diversity in the landscape should be employed.
· Strong highway interface with the sections back from the highway needing to respect and integrate with the established housing stock in terms of scale and front setbacks.
· Sufficient zoning of the urban transition area (one example given was R60) to ensure the transition from high density to low density occurs seamlessly.
· Existing character and contemporary building design were explored and embraced. Building materials such as raw brick, concealed roofs and specified panelling materials; and aspects such as the use of balconies were seen to increase the value and character of the development.</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="6">Street Setbacks</td></tr>
<tr><td>(5.3.5)
· Street setbacks are not discretionary
· Upper floors have an additional setback of 2.0m from the street.
<table><tr><th>Streetscape</th><th>Primary Street Setback</th></tr><tr><td>Highway</td><td>2m; 4 – 6m</td></tr><tr><td>Urban</td><td>2 – 4m</td></tr><tr><td>Suburban</td><td>4 – 6m</td></tr></table></td><td>· Consider split-level setbacks to reduce impact of scale on ground level and to minimise the development overshadowing on surroundings.
· Passive surveillance: Person on balcony can easily see the street.
<table><tr><th>Streetscape</th><th>Primary Street Setback</th></tr><tr><td>Attached – Medium Density (A2)</td><td>2.0m</td></tr><tr><td>Ground floor commercial.</td><td>Nil</td></tr><tr><td>Detached – Medium density (D2a and D2b)</td><td>4.0m</td></tr><tr><td>Detached – Low density (D1)</td><td>4.0m</td></tr></table></td><td>· Openness is valued for how it provides space for landscaping, attractiveness, greening and softening of buildings beyond (both horizontally and vertically.
· Sense of space was linked to maintaining amenity and perceived sustainability.
· Large setbacks (on the highway) reduce street activation.
· Large setbacks should be maintained in the suburban development area.
· Street activation elements should be confined to the urban and highway precincts of the project area.</td><td>· The open character of the area is provided through a consistency in front setbacks and the provision of side/rear setbacks, which provide a sense of separation and openness between dwellings and opportunities for soft landscaping.
· Many lower density streets have front setbacks of approximately 5-7m.</td><td></td><td>· Ensure consistent and transitioning streetscapes through nominated streetscape typologies.
· Increase street setback provision from Apartment Design Policy for D1 streetscape.
· Encourage open space within the front setback that provides for or retains large trees.
· Use of dual upper floor street setbacks in D2a and D2b streetscape e.g. require third and potential fourth storey to be setback further from the street than first two storeys.
· How setbacks (and where) help deep soil requirements below.
· Primary Controls (within Precinct controls of TPS6) to apply to non-residential development.</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="6">Side and Rear Setbacks</td></tr>
<tr><td>(5.3.6)
· Side and rear setbacks are not discretionary
· The deemed-to-comply setback provisions in the R-Codes are considered appropriate to achieve the outcomes desired by Canning Highway #ShapeOurPlace.
(5.3.14) Edge Areas – properties adjoining unchanged properties should mimic lower density requirements.</td><td>(2.1)
<table><tr><th>Streetscape</th><th>Min. Side</th><th>Min. Rear</th></tr><tr><td>Attached – Medium</td><td>Nil</td><td>Nil</td></tr><tr><td>Detached – Medium</td><td>3.0m*</td><td>6.0m</td></tr><tr><td>Detached – Low</td><td>3.0m*</td><td>6.0m</td></tr></table>· * Nil setbacks considered at ground floor level only, subject to open space and streetscape requirements (s2.10)
· Additional building separation distances (e.g. 12m for 4 storeys or more), which may result in larger side and rear setbacks than the table above.</td><td>· A sense of openness and space for greenery was valued by the community, particularly as part of the lower density areas.
· Setbacks are very important for low density (or transitions to low density) but less important for high/urban density areas. Certain sites within the Study Area are considered sufficiently large in area, close to public transport and open space to justify this higher density.
· There was preference for amalgamation of lots, but was considered not enough of an incentive on its own for good development.</td><td>· The open character of the area is provided through a consistency in front setbacks and the provision of side/rear setbacks, which provide a sense of separation and openness between dwellings and opportunities for soft landscaping.</td><td></td><td>· Identify streetscape typology interfaces that are subject to transition provisions where controls need to manage changes in density over a boundary (larger side/rear setbacks).
· Side setbacks should not be reduced to nil for D2a, D2b and D1 streetscapes, unless the parapet wall is single storey, behind the street setback line, adjoins a neighbouring parapet wall or is less than one third the length of the side boundary.
· Building separation distances of Apartment Design Policy appear onerous for future developments, and ‘dual setbacks’ for upper floors is considered reasonable.</td></tr>
</table>

Suggested Development Controls (#ShapeOuPlace Stage 1) and/or Existing Provisions (in red).	Key Elements of Draft SPP No. 7 - Apartment Design Policy Apartment Guidelines	Key Outcomes of Community Consultation	Commentary from Character Study - Part A	Commentary from Inter-LGA Workshop	Part B Recommendations
Façade Design and Treatments					
(5.3.3) ***Development should be designed so as to minimise the bulk and scale on the street and surrounding properties through the implementation of varied façade treatments and materials and building articulation.*** · Built form elements to be discretionary, enable creativity, and ensure variation in: o Colours; o Materials; o Setbacks; o Height; and o Roof pitches. · Articulation should be achieved through: o Insertion of balconies; o Awnings and eaves; and o Windows and openings that address the street.	**(4.12)** · Colours and materials – 4.12 Façades. · Roof pitches – 4.13 Roof design. · Articulation – Façades. · 4.12.1 - Building façades provide visual interest along the street while respecting the character of the area. o Design solutions for front building façades may include: - A composition of varied building elements; - A defined base, middle and top of the building; - Revealing and concealing certain elements; and - Changes in texture, material, detail and colour to modify the prominence of elements. o Locate building fixtures away from frontages – fixtures should be integrated into the design. o Building façades should be well resolved with an appropriate scale and proportion to the streetscape and human scale. - Well-composed horizontal and vertical elements; - Variation in floor heights to enhance the human scale; - Elements that are proportional and arranged in patterns; - Public artwork or treatments to exterior blank walls; and - Grouping of floors or elements such as balconies and windows on taller buildings.	· Supportive of contemporary architectural design responses, particularly along the highway commercial strips. · This may allow character homes to be highlights and not replicated, and support the area evolving as the next generation of urban renewal. · High and medium density developments are more likely to be accepted and approved of within the community where they integrate with the local character. · Cues could be taken from the material palettes of the area to achieve compatibility of character. · The Arlington Precinct Guidelines (single storey development) currently express the character of the area. · The building bulk is one of the most concerning features of higher density development and future development should avoid bulky, single material façades and hardscapes, · A range of materials does not necessarily reduce building bulk. · Building materials were seen to be very important and influential in integrating new development within its existing surroundings. Some case studies showed favourable materials (such as exposed brick). · Comments were noted that weatherboard and metal roofs are accepted and preferred building materials in integrating with the existing character.	· Traditional buildings have a shared palette of materials, a fine grain detail and consistent form, which collectively contributes to the character of the area and its sense of place. · Whilst it is not desirable to mimic traditional styles moving forward, new development can learn from and interpret in a contemporary manner, the special qualities of early buildings.		· It is considered that the guidance provided in Apartment Design Policy on façade design and treatment is comprehensively sound and will set a high standard for development outcomes. · Elements that could be enhanced in the context of the Study Area include: o Material palette o Eaves, awnings, overhangs o Fine-grain detail and relationship to the street · Corner highway lots should address both Canning Highway and the side street. · Ensure where possible that streetscape types are mirrored over rear boundaries, except in instances where transitions are required, such as stepping back from the highway. · Façade treatment to be detailed in policy, rather than Scheme.

Suggested Development Controls (#ShapeOuPlace Stage 1) and/or Existing Provisions (in red).	Key Elements of Draft SPP No. 7 - Apartment Design Policy Apartment Guidelines	Key Outcomes of Community Consultation	Commentary from Character Study - Part A	Commentary from Inter-LGA Workshop	Part B Recommendations
	• *4.12.2 – Building functions are expressed by the façade.* o Building entries are clearly defined; and o Important corners are given visual prominence through a change in articulation, materials or colour, roof expression or changes in height. **Roof Design (4.13)** • *4.13.1 Roof treatments are integrated into the building design and positively respond to the street.* o Roof design relates to the street. Design solutions may include: - Special roof features and strong corners; - Use of skillion or very low pitch hipped roofs; - Breaking down the massing of roof by using smaller elements to avoid bulk; - Using materials or a pitched form complementary to adjacent buildings; and - Concealed roofs. o Roof treatments should be integrated with the building design: - Roof design proportionate to the overall building size, scale and form; - Roof materials complement the building; and - Service elements are integrated into the design, considering position, alignment and screening where appropriate. • *4.13.2 – Opportunities to use roof space for residential accommodation and open space are maximized.* o Habitable roof space should be provided with good levels of amenity: - Penthouse Apartments; - Dormer or clerestory windows; and - Openable skylights. o Provide open space on rooftops, subject to acceptable visual and acoustic privacy, comfort levels, safety and security considerations.				

Suggested Development Controls (#ShapeOuPlace Stage 1) and/or Existing Provisions (in red).	Key Elements of Draft SPP No. 7 - Apartment Design Policy Apartment Guidelines	Key Outcomes of Community Consultation	Commentary from Character Study - Part A	Commentary from Inter-LGA Workshop	Part B Recommendations
	• *4.13.3 – Roof design incorporates sustainability features.* o Roof design maximizes solar access to apartments during winter and provides shade during summer: - Skillion roof with North-facing clerestory windows; and - Eaves and overhands shade walls and windows for summer sun. o Green roofs encouraged. o Skylights and ventilation systems should be integrated into the roof design. o Provide an area of roof that is suitable for photovoltaic system, located to reduced visibility on the ground. o Consider optimum solar collection angle for the roof, according to the relevant climate zone. • *4.19.1 – Awnings are well located and complement and integrate with the building design.* o Awnings located along all high-traffic pedestrian areas and active frontages. o Design solutions: - Continuous awnings are maintained and provided in areas with an existing pattern; - Height, depth, material and form complement the existing street character; - Protection from weather elements; - Awnings should wrap around the secondary frontages of corner sites; - Consider retractable awnings in areas without an established pattern; o Awnings should be located over building entries for building address and public domain amenity. o Awnings relate to residential windows, balconies, street tree planting, power poles, and street infrastructure. o Awning material and configuration is designed to reduce acoustic reverberation in loud environments and between mixed land uses. o Gutters and down pipes should be integrated and concealed, while considering maintenance in the event of functional failure. o Lighting under awnings should be provided for pedestrian safety. • *4.19.2 – Signage responds to the context and desired streetscape character.* o Legibility of building design should reduce dependence on signage. o Signage should be integrated into the building design and respond to the scale, proportion and detailing of the development. o Way finding signage should be provided for larger roof developments.				

Suggested Development Controls (#ShapeOuPlace Stage 1) and/or Existing Provisions (in red).	Key Elements of Draft SPP No. 7 - Apartment Design Policy Apartment Guidelines	Key Outcomes of Community Consultation	Commentary from Character Study - Part A	Commentary from Inter-LGA Workshop	Part B Recommendations
Climate Sensitive/ Sustainable Design, Solar Access					
(5.3.4) • Living and outdoor areas on northern side of building – passive solar design • Windows capture prevailing wind and positioned opposite for cross ventilation. • Windows on east and west shaded • Eaves/ Fixed awnings used on all major openings on the Northern, western and eastern sides of dwelling. • Dark roof and wall colours not supported. **(5.3.9)** Development should be designed in a manner that minimises the overshadowing impacts on the adjoining properties through appropriate setbacks, orientation and building heights. Green star ratings required for developments over 1000m², through City policy P350.01 Environmentally Sustainable Building Design.	• 4.1 Solar and daylight access. o Minimum 70% apartments receiving at least 2 hours sunlight between 9a and 3pm to living rooms and private open space. o Guidance for new development to evaluate impact on above standard on existing neighbouring dwellings. o Encourages dual aspect apartments, shallow apartment layouts, mezzanine level apartments, bay windows etc. o Window glazing to a minimum 10% room area. o Highlight windows or skylights not to be main source of natural light. o Shading devices, interior finishes that bounce light etc. • 4.2 Natural ventilation. o Minimum 60% apartments receiving natural cross ventilation. o Maximum 18m cross ventilation depth. o Encourages building orientation, adjustable windows, dual aspect apartments etc. • 4.20 Energy efficiency • ***(4.20.1) – Development establishes appropriate energy efficiency commitments in the development application stage.*** o DC1 – The development proposal is accompanied by a sustainability report addressing the items listed in the Sustainability Checklist. • ***(4.20.2) – Minimise energy use and emissions through passive strategies, supported by active systems.*** o DC1 – (10 dwellings or more, and/or are 3+ storeys): • (4.21) Water management and conservation.	• Consider sustainability in development siting (solar access) and design. • Solar access to dwellings is important for amenity and quality of life, protect this feature of the lower density areas.	• While solar access was not assessed as part of the Character Study, it contributes to the character element of having a sense of openness between dwellings and provides opportunities for sunlight penetration to outdoor living areas and habitable rooms.		• Apartment Design Policy guidance considered appropriate and encompasses all (and more) of the provisions recommended by Stage 1. • Reinforce character elements of eaves, awnings and overhangs for east and west openings through policy provisions. • Reinforce building height transition boundary provisions and principles, particularly boundaries adjacent to 'no change' areas. • Developments along the northern verge of Canning Highway should be encouraged to comprise dual-aspect apartments to ensure that design both addresses the highway and achieves adequate levels of sunlight access. • Developments along southern portion of highway to be considerate of overshadowing impacts to lower density lots to the south. • Solar access is noted as being important for energy generation and consumption, reinforcing why developments need to be considerate of overshadowing.

<table>
<tr><th>Suggested Development Controls (#ShapeOuPlace Stage 1) and/or Existing Provisions (in red).</th><th>Key Elements of Draft SPP No. 7 - Apartment Design Policy Apartment Guidelines</th><th>Key Outcomes of Community Consultation</th><th>Commentary from Character Study - Part A</th><th>Commentary from Inter-LGA Workshop</th><th>Part B Recommendations</th></tr>
<tr><td colspan="6">Open Space</td></tr>
<tr>
<td>(5.3.7)
<u>Highway</u>
Highway streetscapes are to provide a highly functional; attractive communal and private open spaces to facilitate a desirable retreat from the urbanized environment of the highway.
<u>Urban</u>
Urban streetscapes are to provide functional open spaces that enable established gardens whilst still facilitating the urban environment.
<u>Suburban</u>
Suburban streetscapes are dominated by open space to provide for landscaping, access, living areas and an open character.</td>
<td>(3.5)
Communal open space is provided at the following rates (3.5.1a):<table><tr><th>No. of Dwellings</th><th>Communal open space requirement</th></tr><tr><td>Up to 10 Dwellings</td><td>No requirement</td></tr><tr><td>11 – 20 Dwellings</td><td>10% of the site area</td></tr><tr><td>21-30 Dwellings</td><td>15% of the site area</td></tr><tr><td>31+ dwellings</td><td>20% of the site area</td></tr></table>
(3.5.1b) Developments can achieve a minimum of 50% direct sunlight to the principle usable part of primary communal open space for minimum of two hours between 9.00am and 3.00pm on 21 June.
(3.5.2) Communal open space is designed to allow a range of activities, respond to site conditions and be attractive and inviting.
(3.5.3) Communal open space is designed to maximize safety and comfort.
(3.5.4) Publicly accessible open space (e.g. a through-site link) where provided, is responsive to the existing pattern and uses of the neighbourhood.</td>
<td>Under-provision of open space generally.
A need for ‘quality’ open space.</td>
<td>The open character of the area is provided through a consistency in front setbacks and the provision of side/rear setbacks, which provide a sense of separation and openness between dwellings and opportunities for soft landscaping.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Adapt Stage 1 objectives of open space into principles to differentiate between streetscape typologies. D1 streetscape largely addressed by Apartment Design Policy’s ‘Design Priorities’ description, being that the retention of mature trees on private property is a design priority for this streetscape;
Open space % of Apartment Design Policy considered appropriate, however could be reduced for sites that directly address public open space or for developments that provide publically accessible communal open space.
Bonuses for through-site links that improve access to public open space.
Encourage landscaping (mature) buffer along a transition boundary, or locating open space adjoining lower density areas.
Open space requirements to be detailed in Scheme (through Primary Controls / setbacks / plot ratio) and policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr><td colspan="6">Visual Privacy</td></tr>
<tr>
<td>(5.3.8)
Development should be designed in manner that maximises the visual privacy on the adjoining properties through appropriate setbacks, screening and orientation.</td>
<td>(3.6)
(3.6.1) Adequate building separation distances are shared by equitably between neighbouring sites, to achieve reasonable levels of external and internal visual privacy.
(3.6.1a) – Separation between windows and balconies is provided for visual privacy, achieving the minimum required separation distances to the side and rear boundaries as follows:<table><tr><th>View Cone from</th><th>Distance*</th></tr><tr><td>Non-Habitable Space</td><td>3.0m</td></tr><tr><td>Bedroom, study or open space access walkway</td><td>4.5m</td></tr><tr><td>Habitable space or balcony</td><td>6.0m</td></tr></table>
*Distance should be increased by 3m if adjoining lower density area (excluding attached streetscape).
(3.6.1b) Balconies are unscreened for at least 25% of their perimeter (including edges abutting a building).
(3.6.2) – Site and building design elements increase privacy without compromising access to light and air and balance overlook and views from habitable rooms and private open space.</td>
<td>Privacy (to existing dwellings) should be protected in any new development, to maintain high amenity and quality of life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apartment Design Policy guidance considered appropriate, noting that the design criteria setback distances could be staggered when adjoining lots of a lower intensity streetscape, to protect the privacy of existing dwellings.
Further consideration to be given to interface with ‘unchanged’ lots.
Visual privacy provision to be detailed in policy, particularly for Transition boundaries.</td>
</tr>
</table>

Suggested Development Controls (#ShapeOuPlace Stage 1) and/or Existing Provisions (in red).	Key Elements of Draft SPP No. 7 - Apartment Design Policy Apartment Guidelines	Key Outcomes of Community Consultation	Commentary from Character Study - Part A	Commentary from Inter-LGA Workshop	Part B Recommendations
Garages					
(5.3.10) • All new development to provide onsite car parking. • Any proposed garage should be either behind the building line or to the property rear. • The garage should be less than 50% of the total building frontage. • Manor House Apartments require either undercroft car parking and/or integration with the building design. • The following Streetscape Specific guidelines are suggested: o Highway *Garages and parking areas are located away from the street frontage, or screening is used to provide an attractive street environment.* o Urban *Garages and parking areas are located away from the street frontage, or screening is provided to provide an attractive, enjoyable street environment.* o Suburban *Garages are not the dominant visual structure on the lot, and are located and designed to provide a façade that integrates with the character of the dwelling.*	Refer Access below.				• Apartment Design Policy guidance on vehicular access design sound. • Encourage reciprocal rights of access over lots fronting Canning Highway with no existing alternate access.
Landscaping, Trees and Deep Soil Areas					
(5.3.11) • The deemed-to-comply standards in the R-Codes are sufficient basic guidelines. • Focus on setbacks allows adequate spaces and opportunities for landscaping. • In addition to the R-Codes standards o A minimum percentage of soft landscaping should be imposed within the front setback. o Trees removed within the development and construction processes should be replaced with the equal amount. LPP P350.5 Trees of Development Sites and Street Verges o Development to retain and incorporate existing trees where possible. o Tree/s to be planted on development site or verge if applicable. o Register of Tree Preservation Orders o Street tree retention and replacement provisions.	**(4.14)** • *4.14.1 – Landscape design is viable and sustainable.* o Landscape design should be environmentally sustainable and can enhance environmental performance by incorporating: - Diverse and appropriate planting that preferences native species or other low water use plants; - Vegetated storm water management systems or passively irrigated gardens; - Appropriately planted shading trees - Areas for residents to plant vegetables and herbs - Space and equipment for composting - Green roofs or green walls/façades and other vertical greening strategies - Integrated water re-use systems that can increase the ability to irrigate and to improve landscape quality and cooling effects in summer. - Irrigation systems that offer responsive controls to maximize water efficiency. - When planting species, use ecozoning and hydrozoning to minimize irrigation needs o Landscape plan and ongoing maintenance plans should be prepared. o Minimise water and maintenance hungry turf areas unless required for recreation.	• Many respondents believed there are plenty of green open spaces in the Study Area, which should be maintained and increased, including community gardens and green verges. • Trees and green spaces are largely a Council responsibility; limited ability for residents to impact this. • Vegetation is valued as being the most important aspect within the community. • Future development should incorporate (and not take over) public green spaces, and should be required to protect and enhance the natural environment and mature trees, where possible. • There was a preference for 'consistent infill' but not akin to 'McMansion' style of large building footprints that do not accommodate trees. • Trees are very important for shading, creating offsets to traffic and noise pollution, and to support the ecology of the site.	• The street trees and greenery in the front gardens soften the hard appearance of the roads and buildings, contribute to the aesthetic appeal of the streets, provide shade and create a sense of connection to nature.		• Not intended to prepare landscaping guidelines beyond facilitating appropriate site planning for streetscape typologies. Apartment Design Policy design guidance is considered appropriate. • Encourage landscaping (mature) buffer along a transition boundary. • Encourage retention of mature trees on private property as a design priority for the D1 streetscape; • Encourage open space within the front setback that retains and incorporates mature trees. Provides 'residential' frontage to the street. • Streetscapes that require ceding of private land (typically in the front setback) for future road widening are to be landscaped in accordance with local authority verge greening policy until which time the road is widened. • Encourage development to provide direct pedestrian access to the highway's public domain.

Suggested Development Controls (#ShapeOuPlace Stage 1) and/or Existing Provisions (in red).	Key Elements of Draft SPP No. 7 - Apartment Design Policy Apartment Guidelines	Key Outcomes of Community Consultation	Commentary from Character Study - Part A	Commentary from Inter-LGA Workshop	Part B Recommendations
	• *4.14.2 – Landscape design contributes to resident amenity and recreation* o Landscape design should consider the requirements of the residents. Refer to 3.5 for Communal Open Space o Microclimate is enhanced by: - Consideration of winter and summer sun angles/positions - Consideration of prevailing winds - A balance of evergreen and deciduous trees to provide shading in summer and sunlight access in winter. - Shade structures such as pergolas for balconies and courtyards - Water bodies that can cool through transpiration - Use of irrigation o Food production areas require specific microclimate, soil and maintenance requirements. Consider requirements. • *4.14.3 – Landscape design contributes to the streetscape and amenity.* o Responds to existing site conditions; including view, topography and significant landscape. o Where the local authority is supportive of verge greening, consider low native ground cover (avoid turf and other irrigation-intensive plantings). o Streetscapes that require ceding of private land (typically in the front set back) for future road widening are to be landscaped in accordance with local authority verge greening policy until which time the road is widened. Low native ground covers are generally recommended. Maintenance of the road widening area (on private lot) is to be considered. o Consider permeable pavement surfaces, especially as part of driveways, visitor car parking near adjacent trees. o Consider the use of structural soils under car parking or drive way surfaces adjacent to existing or proposed trees to improve tree health.				

<table>
<tr><th>Suggested Development Controls (#ShapeOuPlace Stage 1) and/or Existing Provisions (in red).</th><th>Key Elements of Draft SPP No. 7 - Apartment Design Policy Apartment Guidelines</th><th>Key Outcomes of Community Consultation</th><th>Commentary from Character Study - Part A</th><th>Commentary from Inter-LGA Workshop</th><th>Part B Recommendations</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>(Objectives 3.3 and 3.4)
Identify existing trees for retention prior to development and as part of early site planning.
Healthy existing trees are retained where possible; or adequate measures are taken to mitigate reduction of tree canopy (tree replacements).
Objective 3.4(1) – Deep Soil Areas:
Deep soil areas are identified in site layout and meet the following requirements<table><tr><th>Site Area</th><th>Min Dimension</th><th>Min Deep Soil Area</th></tr><tr><td><650sqm</td><td>Nil</td><td>12%* total site area.</td></tr><tr><td>650sqm – 1500m2</td><td>3m</td><td>12%* total site area.</td></tr><tr><td>> 1500sqm</td><td>6.0m</td><td>12%* total site area</td></tr></table>
* Developer offset – if existing tree(s) are retained and incorporated the minimum deep soil area requirement can be reduced to 8% of the site area.
Objective 3.4(2) – The deep soil area provides a minimum number of trees (and shade producing canopies) as follows:
Minimum 1 small tree for every 16sqm; or
Minimum 1 medium tree for every 36sqm; or
Minimum 1 large tree for every 64sqm; or
A combination of the above.</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="6">Fencing</td></tr>
<tr><td>(5.3.12)
Reduce the maximum height of fencing allowed along Canning Highway from 1.8 meters to*:
Solid fence of 1.2 meters; and
The additional 600mm is of visually permeable material.
* Subject to amending City of South Perth's LPP P350.7 – Fencing and Retaining Walls.</td><td>The height of solid fences or walls should average less than 1m and not exceed 1.5m.</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>Apartment Design Policy guidance is considered sound for Detached streetscapes.
Guidance for Attached streetscape should consider short lengths of landscaped, solid fencing that provide ground floor residences with adequate visual and noise privacy to private open space, whilst maintaining an overall average of low and open fencing.
Fencing requirements to be detailed in policy rather than Scheme</td></tr>
</table>

Suggested Development Controls (#ShapeOuPlace Stage 1) and/or Existing Provisions (in red).	Key Elements of Draft SPP No. 7 - Apartment Design Policy Apartment Guidelines	Key Outcomes of Community Consultation	Commentary from Character Study - Part A	Commentary from Inter-LGA Workshop	Part B Recommendations
Access					
(5.3.13) • Strong preference for laneways and right of way for properties fronting Canning Highway. • Alternative access options include o A requirement to cede land to facilitate the development of a right of way o Secondary street access where possible o Providing access via another street by obtaining land from rear properties o Encouraging amalgamation of lots from the Highway to the rear to allow shifted access points. • Subject to City of Perth/ Developer negotiations and/or agreements. Further investigation is required. • <u>Highway</u> Developments shall provide a 6-meter ROW to enable rear vehicle access. 6m ROW is not required in lots with secondary street access, unless required to provide for future development. • Vehicle Access Hierarchy: o Right of way o Secondary street o Single primary street (hub for more than one dwelling) o Primary street service individual dwelling. • Under the intent of Development Control Policy 5.1 Regional Roads (Vehicular Access), new development fronting Canning Highway should provide vehicular access from a side street or laneway, thereby rationalising the number of crossovers onto a Primary Regional Road. This has both a positive effect on improve traffic safety and flow, and a negative effect on potentially limiting the development potential of 'land-locked' parcels of land should access to Canning Highway not be granted.	**(3.9)** • (3.9.1) – Vehicle access points are designed and located to minimise streetscape impacts and avoid conflicts between pedestrians and vehicles. o The width and number of vehicle access points should be limited to the minimum. o Car park access should be integrated with the buildings overall façade. o Car park entries located behind building line. o Vehicle entries designed to minimise ramp lengths, excavation and impacts of the building form and layout. o Car park entry and access should be from the lowest order vehicle access way. (Laneway/ROW; secondary street; primary street) • (3.9.1) – Vehicle access points are designed and located to minimise streetscape impacts and avoid conflicts between pedestrians and vehicles.			• Bonuses for creating laneways can be helpful (e.g. height, plot ratio) but may need greater incentives if applicants think they can receive these concessions regardless. Be clear on desired outcome.	• Adopt Project 1 design objectives, with Apartment Design Policy assisting with vehicular access design generally. • Require developments to gain access from a laneway or secondary street where available. Mechanisms and forward planning to ensure lots fronting Canning Highway, for instance do not become 'land locked' should be investigated by the City. • Encourage reciprocal rights of access for lots without alternate means of access and which are heavily burdened by the MRS primary regional road reservation.

Suggested Development Controls (#ShapeOuPlace Stage 1) and/or Existing Provisions (in red).	Key Elements of Draft SPP No. 7 - Apartment Design Policy Apartment Guidelines	Key Outcomes of Community Consultation	Commentary from Character Study - Part A	Commentary from Inter-LGA Workshop	Part B Recommendations
Commercial Areas / Mixed Use					

(5.3.15)
• Highway Commercial
  o Various zones along the Canning Highway area – predominantly mixed-use developments.
  o Residential development standards apply.
  o Ground floor commercial developments are subject to a nil street setback.
• Specific Commercial/Mixed Use development controls:
  o Large windows (Minimum percent glazing)
  o Al fresco dining
  o Use of public art
  o Use of varying materials
  o Awnings
  o Street furniture (planter boxes, benches, bike racks etc)
	(4.18)
	• ***4.18.1 – Mixed-use developments are provided in appropriate locations and provide active street frontages that encourage pedestrian movement.***
	  o Concentrated around public transport and centres.
	  o Ground use floors should be designed to enable future conversion to mixed use (in areas where not yet feasible).
	  o Mixed use developments can positively contribute to the public domain by:
	  - Development addresses the street
	  - Active frontages are provided
	  - Diverse activities and uses
	  - Avoiding blank walls at the ground level
	  - Live/Work apartments on the ground floor level, rather than commercial.
	• ***4.18.2 – Residential levels of the building are integrated within the development, and safety and amenity is maximized for residents.***
	  o Residential circulation areas should be clearly defined:
	  - Residential entities are separated from commercial entries and directly accessible from the street.
	  - Commercial service areas are separated from residential components.
	  - Residential car parking and communal facilities are separated and secured.
	  - Security at entries and safe pedestrian routes are provided.
	  - Concealment opportunities are avoided.
	  o Landscaped communal open space should be provided at podium levels.
	  o Adequate acoustic separation should be provided between residential and other uses.
	• Ground floor non-residential development subject to nil street setback.
		• There was support for mixed-use development on the Highway, generally.	• The lineal pattern of development, with commercial buildings, higher densities and infill located close to the highway ensure a high level of amenity is maintained to the predominately lower-density one and two-storey single houses located on the suburban side streets.	• Ground floor frontages should be flexible e.g. Cambridge not requiring DA to change ground floor use from interim residential to active use once market and critical mass is there to support such a use.	• Ground floor commercial/retail on highway confined to certain precincts – consider ground floor residential (courtyards) frontages elsewhere.
					• Commercial and mixed use areas can have different built form to residential areas. While consistency in streetscape typologies is desired, it may be necessary to provide controls for ground floor interface with the public realm, including small, landscaped street setbacks, avoiding blank walls, defining residential and non-residential entrances and spaces, and pedestrian shelter.
					• Requirements for ground floor commercial to be detailed in policy, with some requirements in Scheme (Primary Controls).

Suggested Development Controls (#ShapeOuPlace Stage 1) and/or Existing Provisions (in red).	Key Elements of Draft SPP No. 7 - Apartment Design Policy Apartment Guidelines	Key Outcomes of Community Consultation	Commentary from Character Study - Part A	Commentary from Inter-LGA Workshop	Part B Recommendations
Public Domain Interface/ Improvements					
N/A	**(3.7)** · (3.7.1) – Transition between private and public domain is achieved without compromising safety and security. o Direct street entry. o Upper level passive surveillance. o Level changes between private terraces and street. o Limit solid wall expanses. o Encourage casual interaction between residents and public domain. o Differentiate between building entries. o Minimise concealment opportunities. · (3.7.2) – Amenity of the public domain is retained and enhanced. o Landscaping to soften urban edges and sub-basement parking structures. o Mail boxes within lobby perpendicular to street. o Building infrastructure located within basement or out of view. o Setting ground floor levels in relation to footpath levels. o Materials that are durable and anti-graffiti. o Positive address public open space through access, low fencing, minimal blank walls etc. o Parking not included in front setback. o Tre planting in front setback/ public domain interface to be responsive to pattern of tree planting in the area.	· Contribution could be made through public realm upgrades such as "providing lights, street signs etc. that reflect the heritage of the area".	· Regardless of their age and style, those buildings which positively contribute to the streetscapes share similar characteristics in that they address the street with both windows and front doors being parallel to the street often with street facing verandahs, porches, balconies and permeable front fencing.	· Public domain investment should sit alongside, if not in front of, any new building investments for a precinct. · Link vision for development to public realm improvements, show how Council is supporting the place vision. · Council can enhance character of a precinct through street furniture, lighting, tree planting etc. which can also help sell the vision to the community. · Can achieve better integration of new development and bigger buildings in to the overall precinct by public domain upgrades early on (timing important to help sell apartments). Developer contributions could assist, but mindful that with new builds and infill brings a substantial boost in rates base to assist.	· Apartment Design Policy guidance considered appropriate to achieve desired public domain interface. · Encourage private landscaping of MRS road reservation (ceded land) adjacent to new developments on Canning Highway. · Encourage City investment in public domain improvements such as street furniture, street trees, verge treatments, lighting etc. (noting that the increased density will provide an increase in rates base). · Provide specific vision or character statement for each streetscape typology to assist with public domain improvements (within policy).

This page has been left blank intentionally.

5. Summary by Theme

The following section summarises the key outcomes of Table 1: Analysis and Rationale Table.

5.1 Streetscape Typologies and Primary Controls

5.1.1 Streetscape Typologies

Draft Apartment Design Policy advocates the establishment of desired streetscape patterns as an appropriate focus for development controls. Streetscape typologies are classified as either 'attached' or 'detached', relating to whether buildings on a street are predominantly connected or separated.

The following streetscape typologies and associated densities, as described in Apartment Design Policy, are considered appropriate within the Study Area. These streetscapes form a review of the 'Highway', 'Urban' and Suburban' streetscapes recommended by Canning Highway #ShapeOurPlace Stage 1.

Medium Density Attached (A2) R80

Character statement: Apartment buildings in the A2 type contribute to strong and consistent urban frontages appropriate for a highway activity corridor. Contiguous street frontage often relates to lower 3-5 storeys with setbacks to higher levels, or tower / feature element, clear pedestrian access / entry, and vehicular access obtained away from the highway.

Design priorities: Support active and high quality streetscapes.

Medium Density Detached (D2a and D2b) R60 and R80

Character statement: Apartment and medium-density buildings typically align to locations and aspects, capturing key views. They should reflect the prevailing patterns of side setbacks along their street, and allow for on-site landscaping. In areas of transitioning density, it may be appropriate to reduce or increase front setbacks to promote the intended streetscape.

Design priorities: Ensuring good solar orientation, adequate landscaping, context appropriate built form transitions, as well as protecting the amenity and privacy of adjacent development.

Neighbourhood Detached (D1) R40

Character statement: Apartment and medium-density buildings in the D1 type should be designed to reflect the finer-grained proportions and lower street-scale of free-standing houses in order to integrate with the streetscape. They should reflect the prevailing patterns of front and side setbacks along their street, and allow for generous on-site landscaping, especially between buildings.

Design priorities: Retention of existing trees on site is a priority, as well as protection of the amenity and privacy of back gardens of adjacent lots.

Unchanged from Existing Controls

Other areas within the Study Area are not considered to warrant change to the existing built form or density controls.

Any new low density development (single or grouped dwellings) will be guided by and assessed against current R-Code provision and local planning policy.

These possible streetscapes are shown on Plan 1 – Streetscape Typology Plan, with the rationale for change outlined in Table 2. Streetscape types and corresponding primary controls could be implemented as precinct-based controls as part of a new 'Canning Highway East' precinct within TPS6.

LEGEND

Precinct Area

Streetscape Type	Density	Storeys
D1	R50	3
D2a	R60	3
D2b	R80	3
A2	R80	4

Lots unchanged from Existing Building Height Controls and R-Codes

Boundaries subject to Transition Provisions

Provision A

Provision B

Eligible for Additional Plot Ratio & Building Height

1 Additional Storey

2 Additional Storeys

Indicative Location of MRS Primary Regional Road Reserve

Public Open Space

Possible Shared Access Arrangement

01 Segment ID

Streetscape Typology Plan

Kensington / South Perth Character Study (Part B - Rationale)

Date: 2 June 2017
Scale: NTS @ A3
Drawing No. 716-540 CP-1 A
Staff: AMH_GW

Level 7, 182 St Georges Terrace
Perth Western Australia 6000
Telephone +61 08 9289 8300
Facsimile +61 08 9321 4786
www.tpgwa.com.au
The Planning Group WA Pty Ltd
ABN 36 097 273 222

tpg + PLACE MATCH

Figure 1. Streetscape Typology Plan

Table 2: Streetscape Typology Plan – Rationale for Change

Note: Current residential density codes are not recommended to be decreased.

Segment	Streetscape Type (Max. Storeys)	Rationale for Allocated Streetscape Type (Refer to key following table)								
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	Additional/ Other	Summary of Change to Existing and Canning Highway #ShapeOurPlace Stage 1 Suggested Building Height Limits and R-Code
1	A2 (6)	✓	✓	✓		✓		✓		Increase in base building height limit of 1 storey. Up to a further 2 storeys possible via incentives. Remains R80.
2	D2a (3)		✓			✓			Proximity to a potential activity centre node at Berwick Street	Increase in base building height limit of 1 storey. Remains R60. Partial reduction in suggested height of Stage 1 to reflect R60.
3	A2 (4)	✓	✓		✓	✓		✓	Grouped lots in consistent zoning to encourage a better redevelopment outcome, given a portion of the lots is ceded to the highway widening.	Increase in base building height limit of 1 storey. Remains R80. Partial increase in suggested height of Stage 1 to reflect R80.
4	A2 (4)	✓	✓		✓				Highway widening impacts on lots and access is required, given lots to rear are already established, cannot cede land or utilise a rear laneway. Further investigations are required to prepare a Highway access strategy (e.g. consideration of access in the form of a lane at the front of lots as a buffer to highway).	Increase in base building height limit of 1 storey. Remains R80.
5	D2b (3)		✓				✓		Opposite site of First Avenue unchanged given it is an established and consistent streetscape.	No change in building height limit. Remains R80.
6	A2 (4)	✓	✓		✓				Agglomeration of lots in streetscape type could accommodate a better redevelopment outcome, given a portion of the lots is ceded to the highway widening.	Increase in base building height limit of 1 storey. Remains R80.
7	D2b (3)		✓		✓		✓	✓		No change in building height limit. Remains R80.
8	A2 (4)	✓	✓						Grouped lots in consistent zoning to encourage a better redevelopment outcome, given a portion of the lots is ceded to the highway widening.	Increase in base building height limit of 1 storey. Remains R80.
9	D2b (3)		✓		✓		✓	✓		No change in building height limit. Remains R80.
10	A2 (4)	✓	✓						Grouped lots in consistent zoning to encourage a better redevelopment outcome, given a portion of the lots is ceded to the highway widening.	Increase in base building height limit of 1 storey. Remains R80.
11	D1 (3)		✓		✓		✓	✓		Increase in base building height limit of up to 1 storey. Increase in R-Code from R30 to R50.
12	A2 (4)	✓	✓		✓				Grouped lots in consistent zoning to encourage a better redevelopment outcome, given a portion of the lots is ceded to the highway widening. The lots share a boundary with a gazetted street and public space which provide a buffer to existing lower density lots.	Increase in base building height limit of 1 storey. Remains R80.
13	D1 (3)				✓		✓	✓	Increase in development potential due to rear boundary shared with a gazetted road and public open space, which provide a buffer.	Increase in base building height limit of 1 storey. Increase in R-Code from R15 to R50.
14	D1 (3)				✓				Increase in development potential due to rear boundary shared with a gazetted road and public open space, which provide a buffer.	Increase in base building height limit of 1 storey. Increase in R-Code from R25 to R50. Reduction in suggested height of Stage 1 to reflect R50.
15	A2 (4)	✓			✓		✓	✓	These lots provide a transition between the adjoining A2 (5) streetscape type and the D1 (3) type across Collins Street, as part of tapering out the scale and intensity of an activity centre node at Douglas Avenue.	Increase in base building height limit of 1-2 storeys. Part remains R80; and part increases from R25 to R80. Increase in suggested height of Stage 1 to reflect transition away from activity node.
16	A2 (5)	✓		✓	✓	✓		✓	These lots provide a transition away from an activity centre node at Douglas Avenue to a lower intensity of development in adjoining lots. These lots also provide the potential for mixed use or commercial developments as part of the node.	Increase in base building height limit of 1 storey. Up to a further 1 storey possible via incentives. Remains R80. Reduction in suggested height of Stage 1 to manage transition to adjoining dwellings on Vista Street.
17	D1 (3)				✓		✓		Increase in development potential (from existing zoning) to better manage the transition from the intensity of development on adjoining lots. Good access provided by Collins, Cliffe and Vista Streets.	Increase in base building height limit of 1 storey. Increase in R-Code from R25 to R50.
18	A2 (6)	✓	✓	✓		✓		✓	Important corner site within the activity centre node, with portions of the site zoned R80 and Highway Commercial in the existing scheme provisions.	Increase in base building height limit of 1-2 storeys. Up to a further 2 storeys possible via incentives. Part remains R80; and part increase from R25 to R80. Increase in suggested height of Stage 1 to reflect activity node.
19	A2 (5)	✓			✓	✓			Important corner site within the activity centre node.	Increase in base building height limit of 2 storeys. Up to a further 1 storey possible via incentives. Part remains R80; part increase in R-Code from R15 to R80. Increase in suggested height of Stage 1 to reflect activity node.
20	D2a (4)				✓	✓	✓		Capacity for increased development potential given Douglas Avenue frontage and proximity to an activity centre node.	Increase in base building height limit of 1 storey. Up to a further 1 storey possible via incentives. Increase in R-Code from R15 to R60. Increase in suggested height of Stage 1 to reflect activity node.
21	A2 (4)	✓				✓	✓			Increase in base building height limit of 1-2 storeys. Part remains R80; part increase in R-Code from R40 to R80. Reduction in suggested height of Stage 1 to manage transition and reflect land parcel size.
22	A2 (5)	✓	✓		✓	✓		✓		Increase in base building height limit of 1-2 storeys. Part remains R80; part increase in R-Code from R15 to R80. Partial increase in suggested height of Stage 1 to reflect corner site in activity node.

Segment	Streetscape Type (Max. Storeys)	Rationale for Allocated Streetscape Type (Refer to key following table)								
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	Additional/ Other	Summary of Change to Existing and Canning Highway #ShapeOurPlace Stage 1 Suggested Building Height Limits and R-Code
23	D1 (3)				✓	✓	✓		Good access provided by Broome and Cliffe Streets. Located opposite public open space provides greater amenity.	Increase in base building height limit of 1 storey. Increase in R-Code from R15 to R50.
24	A2 (4)	✓	✓		✓	✓				Increase in base building height limit of 1-2 storeys. Part remains R80; part increase in R-Code from R25 to R80.
25	D1 (3)				✓		✓		These lots are provided good access by Cliffe, Collins and Broome Streets. Located opposite public open space provides greater amenity.	Increase in base building height limit of 1 storey. Increase in R-Code from R25 to R50.
26	D1 (3)				✓		✓		Capacity for increased development potential due to Council ownership, dual street frontages providing good access, and public open space either side of the lots to provide a buffer.	Increase in base building height limit of 1 storey. Increase in R-Code from R15 to R50.
27	A2 (5)	✓			✓				Deep lots that front both the highway and Broome Street provide a better site than lots that would adjoin lower density residential.	Increase in base building height limit of 2 storeys. Up to a further 1 storey possible via incentives. Increase in R-Code from R15 to R80. Increase in suggested height of Stage 1 to reflect R80 and development potentials of lots.
28	D1 (3)				✓		✓			Increase in base building height limit of 1 storey. Remains R40.
29	A2 (4)	✓	✓	✓	✓					Increase in base building height limit of 1 storey. Remains R80.
30	D1 (3)				✓		✓	✓		Increase in base building height limit of 1 storey. Increase in R-Code from R15 to R50.
31	A2 (4)	✓	✓	✓	✓				Site is presently vacant, which indicates redevelopment potential.	Increase in base building height limit of 1 storey. Remains R80. Partial increase in suggested height of Stage 1 to reflect land parcel size and R80.
32	D1 (3)				✓		✓	✓		Increase in base building height limit of 1 storey. Increase in R-Code from R15 to R50.
33	A2 (4)	✓	✓	✓	✓					Increase in base building height limit of 1 storey. Remains R80. Partial decrease in suggested height of Stage 1 to manage transition away from activity node.
34	D1 (3)				✓		✓	✓		Increase in base building height limit of 1 storey. Increase in R-Code from R15 to R50.
35	A2 (6)	✓	✓	✓	✓				Existing landmark site located on a ridge, provides potential for redevelopment as a landmark development site.	Increase in base building height limit of 1 storey. Up to a further 2 storeys possible via incentives. Remains R80.
36	D1 (3)				✓			✓		Increase in base building height limit of 1 storey. Increase in R-Code from R15 to R50.
37	A2 (6)	✓			✓				Capacity for increased development potential on corner to mirror landmark development site.	Increase in base building height limit of 2 storeys. Up to a further 2 storeys possible via incentives. Part remains R80; part increase in R-Code from R15 to R80. Increase in suggested height of Stage 1 to reflect landmark site.
38	D2a (4)				✓		✓		Lots located within an inconsistent streetscape that is subject to continual change, and can accommodate increased development. Lots provide potential for corner development.	Increase in base building height limit of 1 storey. Up to a further 1 storey possible via incentives. Increase in R-Code from R15 to R60. Increase in suggested height of Stage 1 to manage transition.
39	A2 (4)	✓			✓		✓			Increase in base building height limit of 1 storey. Increase in R-Code from R15 to R80.
40	D1 (3)				✓		✓			Increase in base building height limit of 1 storey. Increase in R-Code from R15 to R50.
41	A2 (6)	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			Capacity for increased development potential as part of the Berwick street activity centre node.	Increase in base building height limit of 1-2 storeys. Up to a further 2 storeys possible via incentives. Part remains R80; part increase in R-Code from R15 to R80.
42	D2a (4)				✓	✓	✓		Capacity for increased development potential as part of the Berwick street activity centre node, and given frontages to both Mill Point Road and Way Road.	Increase in base building height limit of 1 storey. Up to a further 1 storey possible via incentives. Increase in R-Code from R15 to R50.

Expanded Rationale:

A. Highway frontage can accommodate greater density.
B. Existing scheme zoning allows for R80 density development (3 storeys).
C. Existing scheme zoning is Highway Commercial.
D. Grouping of lots in similar streetscape type allows potential for amalgamation of sites, which can better accommodate compatible design characteristics such as setbacks to adjoining lots as part of redevelopment.
E. Potential for more intensive development around an activity centre type node.
F. A transition in streetscape type required to manage the transition to existing dwellings.
G. Specific planning controls required to manage the transition in density over the boundary where streetscape types change.

5.1.2 Density, Building Bulk and Incentives

A Primary Controls Table, which defines a base level density, plot ratio and building height for each streetscape typology, adapted from Apartment Design Policy Table 1, is recommended to be added to TPS6 as part of a new precinct that sets development controls in the study area. The City should discuss this approach with the Department of Planning to confirm support prior to initiating an amendment. Additional plot ratio and building height should then be applied in a considered manner, rather than for all lots within a particular streetscape. In this regard, Plan 1 identifies those select areas considered 'Eligible for additional Plot Ratio and Building Height'. These primary controls and eligible areas are shown in Table 3 and are considered to represent a balance between certainty and flexibility. Note: R50 coding is recommended for D1 streetscapes to allow multiple dwelling housing typologies (currently prohibited under TPS6 within R40 coded areas and below).

Table 3 – Streetscape Typologies Primary Controls (Adapted from Apartment Design Policy)

Streetscape Type	D1 Neighbourhood Detached	D2a Medium Density Detached	D2b Medium Density Detached	A2 Medium Density Attached
Site R-Coding	R50	R60	R80	R80
Plot ratio limit	0.6	0.7	1.0	2
Plot ratio upper limit with additional plot ratio applicable*	0.8	0.9	1.5	3
Building height limit (storeys)	3	3	4	4
Building height upper limit with additional height applicable (storeys)	3	4*	5*	6*

* Refer below for incentives and to Plan 1 for location eligibility.

Incentive Based Development Provisions (Additional Height and Plot Ratio)

Further to the location eligibility, the following provisions are considered appropriate to incentivise better built form and amenity outcomes:

1. **Quality design:** a development achieves design excellence in all areas of external and internal amenity, aesthetics, neighbour relations, sustainability, climate-responsive design and public domain interface, having regard for the elements of Apartment Design Policy and as determined by a Design Review Panel.
2. **Lot amalgamation or lot width:** development that amalgamates two or more lots, or has a primary frontage of 23m or more, and can demonstrate the resulting site layout achieves a superior built form outcome.
3. **Vegetation retention:** development retains one or more mature trees (as defined by Apartment Design Policy) or replaces removed trees with additional plantings.
4. **Public benefit:** a development that provides facilities of public benefit as determined by the City of South Perth, such as publicly accessible communal open space (pocket parks) or public plazas, or through-site links that improve access to public open space.

5. **Affordable Housing:** development that provides a minimum of 10% of the total dwellings as affordable housing, demonstrated through partnership agreements with an approved housing provider or not for profit organisation recognised by the Housing Authority.

Incentives should be discretionary with proposal being required to demonstrate the achievement of an incentive based development provision. The additional height and/or plot ratio awarded to a development should be determined on a case-by-case basis giving regard to the degree of incentives being achieved and the principles of good design as set out in Apartment Design Policy. Future planning provisions could require developments to achieve Incentive No. 1 (quality design) and at least one other incentive, as a benchmark for awarding additional height and/or plot ratio.

The Scheme should also identify the sites that are eligible for additional height and/or plot ratio and the maximum that may be considered in each case.

5.1.3 Setbacks and Transition Provisions

Building setbacks play an important role in defining a consistent streetscape and for the Study Area in particular, creating or maintaining a desired sense of openness or separation. Setbacks can also be used to help ensure that areas of higher density transition appropriately into lower density areas.

Canning Highway #ShapeOurPlace Stage 1 suggested a range of street setbacks according to streetscape typology, with the 'Highway' streetscape subject to further investigation. It also suggested that the deemed-to-comply side and rear setback provisions of the R-Codes are considered appropriate to achieve the outcomes of the Study, and that setback provisions not be discretionary. However, draft State Planning Policy 7 (Apartment Design Policy) reimagines the side and rear setbacks of the R-Codes and its provisions have been subject to their own rigour and testing process. Given this, it is recommended that the setback guidance based on street typology for the Study Area be adapted from Apartment Design Policy (refer to Table 4), with complementary provisions to assist with transitioning built form at sensitive interfaces, such as upper floor setbacks and larger setbacks at ground level (particularly for attached streetscapes).

It is considered that development fronting Canning Highway require a small setback unless providing an active, trading front, in which case the setback may be nil.

Where nil setbacks are provided closer to the activity nodes, this allows for the provision of awnings which is more applicable in a setting where pedestrian access is more likely. The 2m setback would shift the building back from the pedestrian streetscape (path) providing separation between the building edge and pedestrian access (through soft landscaping for example), and would reduce the incidence of large glass panes and signage abutting the highway, but would not prevent them being provided 2m back. This would need to be controlled by signage policies or guidelines. The provision of awnings over the pedestrian path in these instances would be reduced, however this would be the case where any residential buildings abut Canning Highway.

The current lack of quality address to the street is evident on Canning Highway, especially at the commercial nodes. Awnings can be one component in providing a quality pedestrian environment and should be encouraged or required where the adjoining building face is an active or trading frontage. Pedestrian experience can also be provided through shade trees, clear navigation, rest spots, activity on the street, and public art installations or interest at street level – which are difficult to implement in a local planning policy for developments and should be initiated by the City. The 2m setback will help achieve relief from the high-traffic environment of the highway and landscaping will assist in screening noise (provided it is not too high and does not screen sight lines of the building).

Fencing is recommended to only be provided on the highway boundary for the portion where the ground floor use is residential, which will help delineate public and private space.

Primary street setbacks on side streets would be controlled by the nominated streetscape type and associated Primary Controls, regardless of whether the land use is residential or non-residential.

It is therefore recommended that development fronting Canning Highway be setback 2m unless providing an active, trading front, in which case the setback may be nil. This should be provided in the Scheme (Primary Controls) and detailed in policy.

Table 4: Streetscape Typology Setbacks (Adapted from Apartment Design Policy)

Streetscape Type	D1 Neighbourhood Detached	D2a Medium Density Detached	D2b Medium Density Detached	A2 Medium Density Attached
Front setback	5m	4m	4m	2m, or nil for commercial ground floor
Side setback	3m^	3m^	3m^	Nil^
Rear setback	7m^	6m^	6m^	Nil^

^ Refer to Plan 1 – Streetscape Typologies for boundaries subject to Transition Provisions.

Additional setback provisions could apply to different floor levels to manage appropriate built form transitions across all streetscape types.

The two different transition boundaries identified on Plan 1 are as follows:

- **'Provision A'** references those interfaces that may result in a building height difference of 1 or 2 storeys; a 'medium' transition in density.
  Future planning framework should employ the principles of good neighbour relations, and could provide transition guidance through increasing the side and / or rear setbacks along the 'Provision A' transition boundary.
- **'Provision B'** would apply to those interfaces where building heights are generally 2 storeys or greater in difference; a 'high' transition in density, and where more careful consideration is warranted due to existing sites with lower density, notable character or recent development, unlikely redevelopment potential (e.g. grouped dwellings) or other amenity factors.
  As above, with additional consideration given to applying minimum rear setbacks for the podium interface of an Attached streetscape, and upper floor setbacks for 3 storeys and above to demonstrate adequate sunlight access and building bulk reduction for adjoining sites.

Transition provisions could also encourage the development of townhouse typologies and mature vegetation buffers to 'sleeve' or screen multiple dwelling development, where appropriate. Any development along a transition boundary should demonstrate a contextual site analysis, highlighting those aspects of the proposal that act to create an appropriate built form transition. Other suggestions for treatment of these transitions can include: balconies, openings, fencing and façade detailing.

It is recommended that the Scheme should identify the boundaries subject to transition provisions and include setbacks to control the transition in building bulk from a higher-density streetscape to a lower-density streetscape. It is also recommended that additional detail be included in policy regarding the treatment of transition boundary facing façades and adjoining space.

5.2 Façade Design

The Character Study Part A acknowledged that while there a many individual characteristic dwellings, all streets within the Study Area presented some level of change or disturbance as expected in an established area. A key character element of the Kensington/ South Perth area was instead its sense of openness and greenery that set it apart from other areas along Canning Highway. It is considered important to maintain and enhance this character, especially on side streets and within the transition areas away from the highway.

It is noted that multiple dwellings and terrace housing typologies can be compatible in green and well-vegetated streetscapes and, in some instances, can reduce the number of crossovers and space required for vehicular circulation compared to separate dwellings. In this regard, redevelopment can have a positive impact through public realm improvements.

As mentioned in section 3.2 of of this report, contemporary development can coexist with the established character of the area, by making an effort to:

- Avoid direct mimicry of previous architectural styles in full, or that are not appropriate to the context or building;
- Exemplify qualities of the existing character, whilst being mindful not to contest these qualities; and
- Respect qualities of the existing character, or provide a point of difference that creates a positive impact and enhances the amenity or character of the area.

It is considered that the guidance provided in Apartment Design Policy on façade design and treatment is comprehensively sound and will

set a high standard for sensitive development outcomes. Its guidance places an emphasis on demonstrating contextual considerations. While it is considered that future planning provisions should focus on built form outcomes rather than regulating detailed façade design and individual architectural expression, it is recognised that the following elements could be enhanced through new development within the Study Area:

- The use of a shared palette of materials as identified in Part A of the Character Study;
- Continuing the fine-grained detail and street presence through building orientation, façade rhythm address and contextual subdivision pattern; and
- The use of eaves, overhangs and contemporary shading devices to provide a greater street presence.

It is recommended that guidance on façade design and character be provided in policy.

5.3 Climate-Sensitive Design

The guidance provided in Apartment Design Policy for climate-sensitive building design are considered to set a high standard for development outcomes. The guidance includes objectives and design criteria relating to solar access, cross ventilation, ceiling height, apartment size and layout, energy efficiency, and water management, and seeks to complement those primary controls that increase density and building scale. These controls comprise and go beyond those recommended by Canning Highway #ShapeOurPlace Stage 1.

While not assessed as part of the Character Study, it is acknowledged that climate-sensitive design (and in particular solar access) contributes to the area's identified character of having a sense of openness between dwellings that provide opportunities for sunlight penetration to outdoor living areas and habitable rooms. It is therefore considered appropriate to reinforce building height transition boundary provisions to protect the sunlight access of existing dwellings (especially for lots identified for 'no change' from existing built form controls), and to reinforce character elements used for shading such as awnings, eaves and overhangs. A contextual site analysis as specified by Apartment Design Policy should be encouraged.

Developments along the northern portion of Canning Highway should be encouraged to comprise dual-aspect apartments to ensure that design both addresses the highway and achieves adequate levels of sunlight access. Similarly, developments on the southern portion of the highway should consider overshadowing impacts to neighbouring lower density sites.

It is recommended that design guidance on solar access be provided in policy.

5.4 Open Space and Landscaping

The open character of the Study Area is provided through consistent front setbacks and the provision of side and rear setbacks, which together provide a sense of separation between dwellings and opportunities for soft landscaping. Similarly, the amount and location of open space within a development site can help create or enhance a desired streetscape typology. The open space objectives of Canning Highway #ShapeOurPlace Stage 1 could be adopted into a set of principles to guide streetscape responses, with complementary guidance provided for transition boundary interfaces, such as encouraging landscaping buffers or locating open space adjoining areas of lower density.

The provision of open space should also be encouraged to be responsive to the existing pattern of the area and have an emphasis on their quality and potential to deliver benefit to residents, visitors and, where appropriate, the public. Given the leafy character of the area, development could be incentivised to retain mature trees on development sites and incorporate these into communal open space where possible, or to provide through-site links to improve access to adjoining areas of public open space. Consideration could be given to reducing open space requirements for developments that directly address public open space or provide publicly accessible communal areas, in instances where providing the full amount of open space would otherwise compromise good neighbour relations.

It is recommended that design guidance on open space and landscaping be provided in policy.

5.5 Visual Privacy

Privacy is one of the key concerns raised by the community in relation to medium density residential development. It is considered that the privacy setbacks for major openings specified in Apartment Design Policy, along with the building separation distances, provide reasonable levels of privacy in a medium density, inner city area. While Apartment Design Policy recommends that the separation distances be increased by 3m where a proposal adjoins a lower density area, it is considered there could be potential for this to be increased further in the instances where a Neighbourhood Detached streetscape adjoins an area of 'unchanged' streetscape. Provisions could encourage a landscaping (mature) buffer along transition boundaries or controls in regard to balcony and opening treatments, unless otherwise agreed by neighbours to further ameliorate privacy concerns.

It is recommended that design guidance on visual privacy (especially for transition boundaries) be provided in policy.

5.6 Vehicular Access

There are a number of lots fronting Canning Highway that are not afforded alternate access (in terms of secondary streets or rear laneways). It is intended that the future medium density planning framework focusses on built form outcomes as opposed to vehicular accessibility, traffic or parking. However, in the absence of an integrated access strategy, it is considered that the framework could adopt the principles of a vehicle access hierarchy and encourage the amalgamation of lots to achieve low-order road access. Plan 1 suggests reciprocal rights of access for a portion of lots along the highway without alternate means of access and heavily burdened by the Metropolitan Region Scheme (MRS) primary regional road reservation. This could increase separation from the highway for these lots, and increased amenity for future residents, however further investigations would be regarded to detail the most appropriate access strategy in terms of road safety and design as part of the highway widening works.

Notwithstanding the above, it is recommended that an integrated transport access and parking strategy should be prepared for the study area.

5.7 Public Domain Interface

The design principals and criteria as set out within Apartment Design Policy are considered to provide an appropriate level of guidance to ensure new development positively interfaces with the public domain. To maintain and enhance the character of the Study Area, these principles and criteria could be complemented by:

- Encouraging development along the highway to acknowledge the function of the activity corridor through adaptable ground floor space (as land demands shift over time), direct pedestrian access and nil or reduced setbacks with openings for active uses;
- Short expanses of landscaped, solid walls to provide privacy to ground floor highway dwellings, while maintaining an average of low, permeable fencing for the development's highway frontage;
- Development that addresses secondary streets (rather than a solid boundary) and provides architectural features to articulate and define the building corner;
- Public domain improvements that complement the desired streetscape typology. It is recognised that the integration of new development and larger buildings into the precinct can be enhanced by investing in public domain upgrades early on, which could also assist with the sale and acceptance of new apartments and help realise the overall vision for the area and its different streetscapes. In this regard, Council could enhance the identified character of the area through street tree planting, themed street furniture and public art installations. While developer contributions could support this investment, residential infill does contribute a substantial boost in the rates base to assist the City with public domain improvements.
- Landscaping of the MRS road reserve. In line with Apartment Design Policy, lots along Canning Highway that require ceding of private land (typically in the front setback) for future road widening could be required to landscape that space in accordance with a verge greening policy until such time as Canning Highway is widened.

It is recommended that design guidance on how buildings interface with the public domain (especially mixed use / commercial development) be provided in policy.

This page has been left blank intentionally.

6. Next Steps

Part B completes the Kensington/ South Perth Character Study by analysing the findings of Part A and demonstrating rationale for the future medium density planning framework. The next and final steps for Canning Highway #ShapeOurPlace Stage 2 include:

- Reviewing Part B recommendations to determine which components may form an amendment to TPS6 and which may be better suited as local planning policy;
- Refining Part B recommendations into clear, concise planning provisions that either depart from or reinforce the guidance of Apartment Design Policy and that are easily understood by all users and suit the context;
- Preparing a draft amendment and policy for Council information and preliminary community consultation, in accordance with the City's Policy P301 Community Engagement in Planning Proposals; and
- Finalising planning instruments based on outcomes of the preliminary consultation process, ready for formal initiation and consideration.

This page has been left blank intentionally.

Appendix 1

Part A Community Feedback Summary

This page has been left blank intentionally.

City of South Perth - Canning Highway #ShapeOurPlace

Stage 2: Kensington/South Perth Character Study Part A

Community Feedback Summary

1. How have you heard about the Canning Highway #ShapeOurPlace project?

Response	Number of Respondents
Letter from the City of South Perth	14
Email from the City of South Perth	9
Community newspaper	4
Other *(South Perth website, word of mouth, local Councillor)*	3
Peninsula magazine	2
Facebook	1
Community Open Day	1

2. What is your interest in this project?

Response	Number of Respondents
Owner / occupier	27
Property owner (absent)	3
Other *(multiple properties, keen interest in the City)*	2
Occupier	1
Work in the area	1
Own a business in the area	0

3. Have you reviewed the Kensington/South Perth Character Study Report Part A; and
4. Do the findings of the Character Study embrace the unique character of the study area?

Have you review the Kensington/South Perth Character Study Report Part A?	Number of Respondents
Yes	30
No	4
Do the findings of the Character Study embrace the unique character of the study area?	**Number of Respondents**
Yes	23
No	11

Yes, Why?
• Heritage aspects, considerations and acknowledgement – particularly the different housing types • Good summary of existing character • Findings reflect the study area • Greenery and trees and openness all favourable
No, Why?
• A need to understand discretionary aspects (i.e. for JDAP interpretation) • Already sufficient medium density in South Perth • Further clarity / scrutiny needed for streetscape types • Density will eradicate existing (and depicted) character • Existing character is single dwellings / low density • Should aim for sustainable design • R80 is directly adjacent R15 with no transition

5. For each character element, can you please identify whether you think it is: highly important, important, not important.

Weighting:	2	1	0	
Character Element	Highly important	Important	Not important	Weighted Score
Openness and sense of space	18	11	4	**47**
Trees and green spaces	20	13	0	**53**
Fine grain traditional detail	10	11	12	31
Respect for topography	15	13	6	**43**
Separation of use	14	12	7	40
Subdivision pattern	15	9	10	39
Connection to the street	15	14	4	**44**

The most valued character elements were 'trees and green spaces' and 'openness and sense of place'.

6. Please elaborate on your answer.

Openness and Sense of Space
• Respondents valued openness for how it provides space for landscaping, attractiveness, greening and softening of buildings beyond (both horizontally and vertically. • Sense of space was linked to maintaining amenity and perceived sustainability.
Trees and Green Spaces
• Many respondents believed there are plenty of green open spaces in the Study Area, which should be maintained and increased, including community gardens and green verges. • One respondent noted that "Trees and green spaces" was the most important for the purposes of this study because it is very much a City of South Perth task. Individual landowners and occupiers can do little in their tiny gardens to contribute "trees and green spaces".
Subdivision Pattern
• There were not many comments on 'Subdivision pattern'. One respondent noted that the subdivision pattern that exists in the area is not considered consistent, therefore this aspect was not considered appropriate in the context of the area.
Solar Access and Privacy
• Respondents noted that if the Study Area is to accommodate density, that developments must consider sustainability and careful siting to shield from the summer sun and take advantage of the winter sun. There was a notion that poorly designed and planned 'high-rise' will result in loss of solar access to, and privacy of, existing dwellings, which will impact negatively on amenity and quality of life.
Density and Transition
• Many respondents believed that the highway interface should be relatively strong, with the sections back from the highway needing to respect and integrate with the established housing stock in terms of scale and front setbacks. Many respondents cited that it is also important there is sufficient zoning of the urban transition area (one example given was R60) to ensure the transition from high density to low density occurs seamlessly. One respondent believed that we should accept that South Perth is an urban area and build for the future. • Some respondents noted that setbacks are very important for low density but unimportant for high/urban density areas. Certain sites within the Study Area are considered sufficiently large in area, close to public transport and open space to justify this higher density. • There was preference for amalgamation of lots, but was considered not enough of an incentive on its own for good development.
Other Comments
• Many respondents concur with the identified character elements, noting they are all relevant to preserve the character of the area as they contribute positively to the community. Further contribution could be made through public realm upgrades such as "providing lights, street signs etc. that reflect the heritage of the area". The suburban areas were noted as needing to be protected with any development needing to be sensitive and value adding to the suburbs. • There was strong support for mixed use development on the Highway, generally. • Traffic and parking issues were raised.

7. Are there any significant character elements missing? If yes, please provide details below.

Architectural Design, Old and New, Materials and Colours
• Most respondents are supportive of contemporary architectural design responses, particularly along the highway commercial strips. This may allow character homes to be highlights and not replicated, and support the area evolving as the next generation of urban renewal. • Cues could be taken from the material palettes of the area to achieve compatibility or character. • One respondent believed that anything that does not fit the Arlington Precinct Guidelines (single storey development) would not fit the character of the area.
Density
• Some respondents voiced concerns of the density layouts of future developments. Density should be tightly controlled, allowing for the respect and retainment of the traditional low-density suburban areas within the project area. • One respondent acknowledged the lack of openness and feeling of enclosure between previous medium density and commercial development within the project area.
Traffic and Parking
• Most respondents were concerned about the impact of higher density developments on the already congested Canning Highway and related suburban Avenues (First Ave given as one example). Traffic management controls are encouraged to improve flow within the project area. This is particularly true on the traditionally narrow suburban streets. • Respondents also recognised the impact higher-density developments have historically had increasing the demand for on-street parking, and the increased safety risks associated with increased street parking (such as pedestrian movement with restricted sight lines).
Other Comments
• Respondents reiterated their concerns on the negative impacts of high-density development on the existing low-density, suburban lots. These concerns, as mimicked from the Kensington/ South Perth Character Study Report, were noted as over-shadowing and solar access; vehicle access and traffic congestion; and privacy and overlooking concerns of the existing landowners. • Respondents also noted the impact of future development on the local ecology and environment. Specifically, one respondent noted the impact that future development could have on the habitat of Carnaby's Cockatoos in the area. Future development should protect and enhance the significant local vegetation within the project area. • One respondent was very supportive of new development within the project area. They were specifically enthusiastic about increasing the access of public transport and reducing the overall private vehicle dependency.

8. What character elements do you think the City of South Perth should prioritise of those listed above or identified by you?

Character Element	Number of Respondents	Comments
Openness and sense of space	6	• The sense of openness is a highly valued character aspect for the residing community. • Future development should conform to the traditional development guidelines including large front and side setbacks.
Trees and green spaces	7	• The majority of respondents valued vegetation as being the most important aspect within their community. • Future development should incorporate (and not take over) public green spaces, and should be required to protect and enhance the natural environment and mature trees, where possible. There was a preference for 'consistent infill' but not akin to 'McMansion' style of large building footprints that do not accommodate trees. • Trees were noted as very important for shading, creating offsets to traffic and noise pollution, and to support the ecology of the site.
Fine grain traditional detail	1	Nil
Respect for topography	2	• There was a preference for topography-sensitive design and consistent construction of development.

Character Element	Number of Respondents	Comments
Separation of use	3	Nil
Subdivision pattern	1	• A variety of lot sizes and a diverse range of housing tenures should be maintained within the project area.
Connection to the street	5	• Large setbacks are recognised as reducing street activation. Large setbacks should be maintained in the suburban development area. • Street activation elements should be confined to the urban and highway precincts of the project area.

Other Feedback

- Many respondents identified the need for urban renewal and street activation along Canning Highway. Higher density development was recognised as an appropriate means of increasing the activity and services within the area, and many respondents were pleased with presented examples of medium density development.
- In activating the street, place-making strategies that could occur include public art and furniture; increased vegetation including soft landscaping and street trees; and an improvement to the bicycle and pedestrian movement networks.
- Other respondents were concerned with the way that three storey buildings (and above) would blend with the existing streetscape, and the adjacent urban and suburban residential areas. Careful consideration should be undertaken to mitigate the negative impacts discussed earlier.

9. Do you think the examples of recent medium density development presented strike the right balance between meeting the needs of the future residents whilst protecting the character and amenity of the study area?

	Number of Respondents
Yes	12
No	21

**Note – there could be a misrepresentation if people don't interpret the examples as those provided in the report/at the Open Day, and could be responding to those actually built in the study area.*

Liked Elements – Responding to Case Studies Directly

- Respondents were enthusiastic about the variety of medium density examples presented.
- Both existing character and contemporary building design were explored and embraced. Building materials such as raw brick, concealed roofs and specified panelling materials; and aspects such as the use of balconies were seen to increase the value and character of the development. Respondents felt that the proposed case studies mostly fit the amenity of the area, and would be acceptable for the development of the project area.
- Mixed-use development (residential and commercial) is largely acceptable along the Canning Highway streetscape.

Disliked Elements - Responding to Case Studies Directly

- One respondent found that the case studies from Claremont and Perth differed significantly from the character of Kensington and South Perth.
- Respondents were impartial to those case studies in which employed greater front and side setbacks. Figure 27 was considered acceptable, where greater setbacks provided opportunities for soft landscaping in of the front; Figure 23 was considered completely unacceptable, perceived to overpower the surrounding house, limiting the solar access and natural breeze to the neighbour.
- Figure 25 was acceptable in the picture (featured design), though one respondent was questioning of the amenity (rear landscaping, upper storey eaves etc.) that was not pictured.
- Respondents were concerned about the lack of flow between high, medium and low-density development. Concerns were illustrated through Figure 26, which is a tall 6 storey building situated between single storey developments.
- Figure 28 was seen as an unacceptable development, where the new development was seen as taking away of the character of the house in the forefront.
- Many respondents were concerned about the ratio of green-space available (both within developments and within the public realm), to service the proposed increase population.

Comments Relevant to the Project, But Not in Direct Response to the Case Studies
• Many respondents are enthusiastic to see the increase of contemporary architecture, sustainable building practices and contemporary design within the project area. This includes incorporating elements of passive climate control; and energy standards for development; and proximity to public transport and active open spaces. • The maintenance and enhancement of green spaces within the project area was highly valued. Respondents suggest that higher density requires greater levels of green spaces and vegetation to be acceptable within the project area. • The building bulk is one of the most concerning features of higher density development and that future development should avoid bulky, single material facades and hardscapes, however one respondent believed that a range of materials does not necessarily reduce building bulk. • Many respondents have embraced the future vibrancy and activity proposed within the project area. Submissions were received to increase the density and vibrancy in specific activity hubs and major intersections, and underutilised sites in close proximity to the city, public open space and high frequency public transport, including the site adjacent the Red Rooster site development. Mixed-use development and taller residential buildings are most supported in these centres. • Some respondents defined the 'single-storey detached house' as defining the character of the project area. New development should protect the single-storey suburban precinct, using guidance to maintain the character within that area. A suggestion was made to limit development to two storeys to protect character. • Building materials were seen to be very important and influential in integrating new development within its existing surroundings. Some case studies showed favourable materials (such as exposed brick). • One respondent believed that "allow(ing) infill whist ensuring character is preserved does not go together".

10. Are there any other elements/built form features that you think could positively contribute or would be compatible with the local character going into the future?

Built Form Features
• Mixed use and higher-density developments are generally seen as acceptable if they can be developed to be aesthetically pleasing and contribute to the streetscape of the project area. Significant attention should be paid to transitioning to higher density development, respecting neighbouring properties and the low-density stock. • One respondent was enthusiastic to the use of dual building setbacks, whereby higher storeys are set further back from the street than the primary storeys. • Another respondent noted that weatherboard and metal roofs are accepted and preferred building materials in integrating with the existing character.
Density/ Activity Corridor Comments
• Respondents were enthusiastic about the increased development and built form potential of Canning Highway. Noting the traditional character surrounding the activity corridor, one respondent agrees that the presented case studies indicate how high density development can increase the amenity of the area, increase the activity of the area and integrate with the surrounding character. • Canning Highway should not be dominated by vehicles, and continue on its path as a major transport route. Canning Highway can be developed to be safe and attractive for pedestrian and cyclist activity. This can be achieved through built form techniques as presented in the case studies.
Greenery
• The overwhelming response from all respondents was the need to green the area through greenery spaces, trees and other vegetation.
Process/ Other Comments
• Continued dialogue and community consultation is valued and should be employed to encourage residents to embrace change in the area, by both educating and exciting the project area population. It was noted that fear does not create good place-making or exceptional outcomes that guidelines could assist with innovative design solutions to reshape this place. • Certainty, promotion and incentives should be provided to enhance the commercial developments on Canning Highway. This will allow activity to support the higher density developments. • Considerable respect has been employed in maintaining the character of both Kensington and South Perth low-density residential areas. This respect should be continued throughout the development of the Canning Highway activity corridor and surrounds. • One respondent noted that "the less development the better".

11. Do you have any other feedback you would like to share?

Zoning/Height
• There are polarising responses regarding the intensity of development in the Kensington-South Perth activity corridor. • Many respondents were enthusiastic and excited for the increased density and associated amenity and activity along the highway and within activity centre nodes (support for up to R100, 4-6 storeys and nil setbacks). Some noted the increased potential for specific major intersections such as Canning Highway and Douglas Ave, Vista Street, and Cliffe Street, while one respondent strongly believed there is no support for this in the community. • Other respondents support the careful and respectful delivery of high and medium density development as proposed. Careful delivery includes respect for existing character, increased services and increased green spaces. • Some respondents oppose high-density development due to the physical impact of building mass on their directly adjoining properties, which is perceived to decrease the amenity and liveability of the locality. • One respondent believes that apartment building should not dominate the landscape in South Perth, believing that they will result in limited sales. Diversity in the landscape should be employed.
Character
• High and medium density developments are more likely to be accepted and approved of within the community where they integrate with the local character. • The case studies presented were accepted as being consistent with the existing development in Kensington. • Focus on breaking up building mass by using a variety of techniques, avoiding passive facades and monotone colour schemes.
Movement, Transport, Parking, Road Widening
• Many respondents viewed the potential road widening of Canning Highway as a prohibiting factor of future development. Respondents believed that this uncertainty would decrease the services available along Canning Highway; and was a contributing factor to many run-down houses along the highway. • There is a need for more frequent and diverse public transport along Canning Highway to support to proposed density, and reduce the car dependence within the area. • An increase in the cycle and pedestrian movement networks is strongly supported. • One respondent highlights the R-Code standard of minimum one-car bay per apartment as being ambitious. The respondent recommends that this be increased to two-car bays per apartment, in efforts to reduce overflow parking in the streets and local amenities.
Other Considerations – e.g. Affordability, Land Use, Design, Heritage
• Affordable housing options have been highlighted as a significant concern for the development of the Canning Highway precinct. Developer incentives should be strategized to deliver these results. • A large variety of amenity including retail and hospitality services should be encouraged along the Canning Highway precinct, including bars, restaurants and cafes. • Prevent overcrowding by concentrating high density in areas with sufficient services and amenity; and maintaining the residential development (low-density detached housing) within the single housing precinct. • One respondent queried if and when a heritage study in Kensington (South Terrace to Douglas Avenue) will be conducted.
Other Comments / General Feedback on the Study Itself
• The communities involved, Kensington and South Perth, remain largely enthusiastic about future development along Canning Highway and transitioning to protect surrounding suburban, singe storey areas. • Concentrated density on Canning Highway is considered the best option to maintain and enhance the existing suburban character of both South Perth and Kensington, while providing the services and amenity required delivering the density. One respondent encouraged the community to "be brave in the way we move forward with our desire and the necessity for change". • Dialogue between the City of South Perth and its residents, and transparency of decision-making, should continue throughout the implementation of the project. Many respondents eager to remain in contact for advisory and positive input, with the City throughout the project. • Many respondents used this opportunity to ask developers to exercise great caution within the project area. The report has identified significant negative impacts that can arise as a result of high and medium- density development in the area; though there is still suspicion that these impacts will still arise as a result of the development.

Appendix 2

Inter-Local Government Discussion Attendees

Notes of this discussion are included as part of the analysis in Section 4 of this report.

This page has been left blank intentionally.

Canning Highway – #ShapeOurPlace – Project 2:
Kensington / South Perth Character Study and Medium Density Planning Framework

Inter-Local Government Planners' Workshop Meeting Notes

Date and Time: Tuesday 6 December 2016
9.00am – 11.00am

Location: City of South Perth Library Meeting Room
Cnr Sandgate Street and South Terrace

Attendance:

Consultant (TPG + Place Match)
Andrew Howe – Director
David Read - Director
Alison Healey – Senior Planner
Bronwyn Slater – Urban Designer | Town Planner
Madison Mackenzie – Student Placement (observations)

City of South Perth
Mark Carolane – Senior Strategic Projects Planner
Vicki Lummer – Director Development and Community Services
Siven Naidu – Coordinator Statutory Planning
Cameron Howell – Senior Statutory Planning Officer
Erik Dybdahl – Senior Statutory Planning Officer

City of Bayswater
Noah McDonald – Strategic Projects Officer
Alix Bray – Strategic Projects Officer

Town of Cambridge
Stev Rodic – Manager Development
Sam Moss – Planning Officer

City of Melville
Dean Cracknell – Senior Strategic Urban / Property Planner
Martin Spencer – Senior Strategic Urban Planner

The discussion can be summarised into the following key themes:

1. Drafting of Planning Instrument and Council Buy-In
2. Communication and Consultation
3. Building Heights, Transition, Form and Character
4. Traffic
5. Public Domain
6. Key Observations