

9.1.4 Draft Car Sharing Policy

Requested by: Mayor John Carey
Prepared by: Gabriela Poezyn, Director Planning Services

PROPOSED AMENDMENT:

That the Officer Recommendation be amended to read as follows:

“That Council, AUTHORISES the Chief Executive Officer to advertise the draft Car Sharing Policy – Policy No. 7.7.2 as shown in Attachment 001 – pursuant to Clause 47 of the City’s Town Planning Scheme No. 1 and the City’s Policy No. 4.1.5 relating to Community Consultation, subject to the following amendment:

1. Clause 7 being deleted and replaced with the following:

“7. CONSULTATION

During the assessment process, Administration will consult with the relevant town centre representative group and will give due consideration to any comments received prior to any determination being made.” ”

Administration Comment:

This Amendment is supported by Administration.

Requested by: Cr Joshua Topelberg
Prepared by: Gabriela Poezyn, Director Planning Services

PROPOSED AMENDMENT:

That the Officer Recommendation be amended to read as follows:

“That Council, AUTHORISES the Chief Executive Officer to advertise the draft Car Sharing Policy – Policy No. 7.7.2 as shown in Attachment 001 – pursuant to Clause 47 of the City’s Town Planning Scheme No. 1 and the City’s Policy No. 4.1.5 relating to Community Consultation, subject to the following amendment:

1. A new Clause 8 being included as follows:

“8. LOCAL NOTIFICATION

Upon approval, the City will write to owners and occupiers in the immediate vicinity of a proposed Car Share bay to inform them of the pending change of status of the bay.” ”

Administration Comment:

This Amendment is supported by Administration.

9.1.6 Review of Planning Policy Framework

Requested by: Cr Emma Cole
Prepared by: Gabriela Poezyn, Director Planning Services

PROPOSED AMENDMENT NO. 1:

That Item 1 of the Officer Recommendation be amended to read as follows:

"1. Draft Precinct Policy Nos. 7.1.1 – 7.1.5 as per Attachments 001 - 005, subject to the following amendment; and

1.1 that Section 5.1.1 of Part 5 (District Centre) of the Draft North Perth Precinct Policy No. 7.1.2 be amended to read as follows:

5.1.1 Residential Density Coding	<p>Residential development included as part of a mixed use development is to be in accordance with the Residential R100 general site requirements of the R Codes.</p> <p>i. <u>The area zoned District Centre located on Fitzgerald Street is to be in accordance with the R100 general site requirements of the R Codes.</u></p> <p>ii. <u>The area zoned District Centre located on Angove Street is to be in accordance with the R60 general site requirements of the R Codes.</u></p>
---	---

Subject to the above, Item 2 of the Officer Recommendation being amended to read as follows:

"2. Draft Policy No. 7.1.6 – Development Requirements and Building Design, as shown in Attachment 006, subject to the following amendments; and

2.1 Table 1 of draft Policy 7.1.6 – Development Guidelines and Building Design being amended as follows:

ZONE	PERMITTED PLOT RATIO	PERMITTED PLOT RATIO VARIATION	CONDITIONS RELATED TO PLOT RATIO VARIATIONS	PERMITTED HEIGHT	MAXIMUM HEIGHT VARIATION	CONDITIONS RELATED TO HEIGHT VARIATIONS
District Centre R60	0.7	Up to 1.0	<p>1. <u>Any plot ratio variation must not exceed that specified in Column C.</u></p> <p>2. <u>Any plot ratio variation must satisfy requirements of Part 2 of this Policy.</u></p> <p>3. <u>Plot Ratio variations relate only to the residential component of development.</u></p>	3 storeys	Nil.	<p>1. <u>Height variations are not permitted where the subject site adjoins (includes R.O.W) any residential land zoned R30 or below.</u></p> <p>2. <u>Any height variation must satisfy the requirements of Part 2 of this Policy.</u></p>

Administration Comment:

The recommended increase from R80 to R100 for District Centre fronting Angove St will increase the height from the current precinct policy (and in the draft Precinct Policy) from 3 storeys plus 1, to 4 storeys, plus 1. With its location abutting R60 on the south side, and the northern side primarily located on street corners this was considered an appropriate increase of density and height. Although this option remains the preferred option of Administration, this Amendment is supported given the low scale nature of the surrounding area and the increased development potential on Fitzgerald Street.

Requested by: Cr Emma Cole
Prepared by: Gabriela Poezyn, Director Planning Services

PROPOSED AMENDMENT NO. 2:

That Item 1 of the Officer Recommendation be amended to read as follows:

"1. **Draft Precinct Policy Nos. 7.1.1 – 7.1.5 as per Attachments 001 - 005, subject to the following amendment; and**

1.1 that new Section 1.1.5 be added to Part 1 (Residential) of the Draft Perth Precinct Policy No. 7.1.3 to read as follows:

1.1.5 Height	<u>In areas zoned R50 where multi-dwellings are not permitted, 3 storeys may be considered where the original dwelling is retained.</u>
---------------------	---

Administration Comment:

One of the matters recommended to be discussed with the community during the consultation was to consider reverting the permitted height limits to those prescribed by the R Codes, which for R50 is an increase from 2 to 3 storeys.

Administration felt it was timely to have a conversation with the local community on this matter particularly in light of the recent downzoning in this area.

Requested by: Cr Emma Cole
Prepared by: Gabriela Poezyn, Director Planning Services

PROPOSED AMENDMENT NO. 3:

That Item 1 of the Officer Recommendation be amended to read as follows:

"1. **Draft Precinct Policy Nos. 7.1.1 – 7.1.5 as per Attachments 001 - 005, subject to the following amendment; and**

1.1 that Section 3.1.1 of Part 3 (Commercial) of the Draft Perth Precinct Policy No. 7.1.3 being amended to read as follows:

3.1.1 Residential Density Coding	<p>i. The area zoned Commercial located south of Newcastle Street is to be in accordance with the R-AC 2 general site requirements of the R Codes.</p> <p>ii. <u>The area zoned Commercial located on Bulwer Street and William Street is to be in accordance with R100 general site requirements of the R Codes.</u></p> <p>iii. All other land zoned Commercial is to be in accordance with the R160 general site requirements of the R Codes.</p>
---	--

Administration Comment:

The previous draft Precinct Policy reduced the density of these areas to R80 from R100 under the current Policy (*Appendix 18 – Design Guidelines for William Street*). The recommendation to re-instate a higher density was made to align it with the District Centre zone to the south, however it is acknowledged that its location and proximity to lower coded R50 properties may be problematic. A density of R100 is supported by Administration, a result of one additional storey to that specified by the Draft Precinct Policies.

Requested by: Mayor John Carey
Prepared by: Gabriela Poezyn, Director Planning Services

PROPOSED AMENDMENT NO. 4:

That Item 2 of the Officer Recommendation be amended to read as follows:

“2. Draft Policy No. 7.1.6 – Development Requirements and Building Design, as shown in Attachment 006, subject to the following amendments; and

2.1 Dot point 1 of Table 2B relating to development not requiring a variation to the rear setbacks as an ‘Additional Requirement’ for height and plot ratio variations being moved to Table 2A as new dot point 3, Mandatory Requirements;”

Administration Comment:

Administration supports the relocation of the requirement to comply with rear setbacks to achieve greater height from ‘Additional’ to ‘Mandatory’ in Part 2. This will ensure that developments seeking height allowances are required to be comply with rear setback requirements mandatorily reducing the potential impact on neighbours.

Requested by: Cr Matt Buckels
Prepared by: Gabriela Poezyn, Director Planning Services

PROPOSED AMENDMENT NO. 5:

That the following words are added to the end of Item 2 of the Officer Recommendation:

In addition to the advertising requirements specified by TPS 1 and in Policy No. 4.1.5, the Administration shall undertake targeted consultation with the City’s Design Advisory Committee and key building and planning industry representatives who regularly undertake projects within the City of Vincent, as determined by the Director Planning Services;”

Administration Comment:

Administration recognises the importance of the consultation for this draft Policy. As part of the overall consultative approach, the method identified in the Agenda Report to conduct a focus group/workshop with combined community and planning and industry representatives remains the preferred approach.

Administration is supportive of increasing the number of these focus groups/workshops to avoid the outcomes of any single consultation event being skewed.

9.1.6 Review of Planning Policy Framework

Ward:	Both	Date:	20 February 2015
Precinct:	All	File Ref:	SC2027
Attachments:	<p>001 – Draft Leederville Precinct Policy No. 7.1.1 002 – Draft North Perth Precinct Policy No. 7.1.2 003 – Draft Perth Precinct Policy No. 7.1.3 004 – Draft Mount Lawley/Highgate Precinct Policy No. 7.1.4 005 – Draft Mount Hawthorn Precinct Policy No. 7.1.5 006 – Draft Policy No. 7.1.6 – Development Requirements and Building Design (Updated hyperlink) 007 – Summary of Draft Policy 008 – Summary of Changes to Precinct Policies (Updated hyperlink) 009 – Review Framework of Residential Design Elements Policy 010 – Current Policy No. 7.2.1 – Residential Design Elements 011 – Current Policy No. 7.4.8 – Development Guidelines for Multiple Dwellings 012 – Current Policy No. 7.5.12 – Development Guidelines for Commercial and Mixed Use Developments 013 – Current Policy No. 7.5.11 – Exercise of Discretion for Development Variations</p>		
Tabled Items:	N/A		
Reporting Officer:	J O’Keefe, A/Manager Strategic Planning Services Sustainability and Heritage Services		
Responsible Officer:	G Poezyn, Director Planning Services		

OFFICER RECOMMENDATION:

That Council **AUTHORISES** the Chief Executive Officer to advertise the following policies pursuant to Clause 47 of the City’s Town Planning Scheme No. 1 (TPS1) and the City’s Community Consultation Policy No. 4.1.5:

1. **Draft Precinct Policy Nos. 7.1.1 – 7.1.5 as per Attachments 001 – 005, subject to the following amendments:**
 - 1.1 **that Section 5.1.1 of Part 5 (District Centre) of the Draft North Perth Precinct Policy No. 7.1.2 be amended to read as follows:**

5.1.1 Residential Density Coding	<p>Residential development included as part of a mixed use development is to be in accordance with the Residential R100 general site requirements of the R Codes.</p> <p>i. <u>The area zoned District Centre located on Fitzgerald Street is to be in accordance with the R100 general site requirements of the R Codes.</u></p> <p>ii. <u>The area zoned District Centre located on Angove Street is to be in accordance with the R60 general site requirements of the R Codes.</u></p>
---	--

- 1.2 that new Section 1.1.5 be added to Part 1 (Residential) of the Draft Perth Precinct Policy No. 7.1.3 to read as follows:

1.1.5 Height	<u>In areas zoned R50 where multi-dwellings are not permitted, 3 storeys may be considered where the original dwelling is retained.</u>
---------------------	---

- 1.3 that Section 3.1.1 of Part 3 (Commercial) of the Draft Perth Precinct Policy No. 7.1.3 be amended to read as follows:

3.1.1 Residential Density Coding	<p>i. The area zoned Commercial located south of Newcastle Street is to be in accordance with the R-AC 2 general site requirements of the R Codes.</p> <p>ii. <u>The area zoned Commercial located on Bulwer Street and William Street is to be in accordance with R100 general site requirements of the R Codes.</u></p> <p>iii. All other land zoned Commercial is to be in accordance with the R160 general site requirements of the R Codes.</p>
---	--

2. Draft Policy No. 7.1.6 – Development Requirements and Building Design, as shown in Attachment 006, subject to the following amendments:

- 2.1 Table 1 of draft Policy No. 7.1.6 – Development Guidelines and Building Design being amended as follows:

ZONE	PERMITTED PLOT RATIO	PERMITTED PLOT RATIO VARIATION	CONDITIONS RELATED TO PLOT RATIO VARIATIONS	PERMITTED HEIGHT	MAXIMUM HEIGHT VARIATION	CONDITIONS RELATED TO HEIGHT VARIATIONS
District Centre R60	<u>0.7</u>	<u>Up to 1.0</u>	<p>1. <u>Any plot ratio variation must not exceed that specified in Column C.</u></p> <p>2. <u>Any plot ratio variation must satisfy requirements of Part 2 of this Policy.</u></p> <p>3. <u>Plot Ratio variations relate only to the residential component of development.</u></p>	<u>3 storeys</u>	<u>Nil.</u>	<p>1. <u>Height variations are not permitted where the subject site adjoins (includes R.O.W) any residential land zoned R30 or below.</u></p> <p>2. <u>Any height variation must satisfy the requirements of Part 2 of this Policy.</u></p>

- 2.2 Dot point 1 of Table 2B relating to development not requiring a variation to the rear setbacks as an 'Additional Requirement' for height and plot ratio variations being moved to Table 2A as new dot point 3, Mandatory Requirements; and

In addition to the advertising requirements specified by TPS1 and in Policy No. 4.1.5, the Administration shall undertake targeted consultation with the City's Design Advisory Committee and key building and planning industry representatives who regularly undertake projects within the City of Vincent, as determined by the Director Planning Services; and

3. The intent to rescind existing Policies No. 7.2.1 – Residential Design Elements, No. 7.4.8 – Development Guidelines for Multiple Dwellings, No. 7.5.11 – Development Guidelines for Commercial and Mixed Use Developments and No. 7.5.12 – Exercise of Discretion for Development Variations, as shown in Attachments 010 – 013.

**9.2.1 Traffic Management – Intersection of Vincent Street and Norfolk Street,
North Perth/Mount Lawley**

Requested by: Cr Joshua Topelberg
Prepared by: Rick Lotznicker, Director Technical Services

PROPOSED ALTERNATE RECOMMENDATION:

That Council:

- 1. NOTES:**
 - 1.1 that the majority of respondents recognised the traffic risks associated with this intersection; and**
 - 1.2 that the majority of the opposition to the proposed treatment was due to concerns about potential traffic impacts on surrounding streets (particularly Ethel Street);**
- 2. PROCEEDS with a six (6) month trial of the originally proposed treatment banning the right turn as shown on attached Plan No. 3144-CP-01 (Attachment 001);**
- 3. MONITORS traffic movements on Chelmsford Road and Ethel Street during the trial period;**
- 4. CONSULTS with residents at the conclusion of the trial;**
- 5. RECEIVES a further report at the conclusion of the consultation; and**
- 6. FURTHER WRITES to Main Roads WA requesting a 40kmh speed limit on Vincent Street, between William and Fitzgerald Streets as a matter of priority citing the following concerns:**
 - 6.1 reduced visibility due to the topography of Vincent Street;**
 - 6.2 single narrow traffic lane;**
 - 6.3 popularity of Hyde Park - particularly in the summer months;**
 - 6.4 recent accidents on the road (including a fatality); and**
 - 6.5 heavy use of on-road car parking which limits visibility for drivers and pedestrians; and**
- 7. INFORMS the respondents of the decision.**

9.4.2 Amendment to Policy No. 7.5.13 Relating to Percentage for Public Art

Requested by: Mayor John Carey
Prepared by: Rob Boardman, Director Community Services

PROPOSED AMENDMENT:

That Clause 1 of the Officer Recommendation be amended to read as follows:

- 1. ENDORSES the proposed amendments to Policy No. 7.5.13 'Percentage for Public Art' as shown in Attachment 001; , subject to the following change:**

<p>4.2 Location of Public Art The City encourages Owners/Applicants to situate the Public Art on private property within the relevant development, in a location that is highly visible to the public realm. However, the City may also consider proposals to install Public Art on public land as considered appropriate by the City.</p>	<p>The addition of the criterion '<i>in a location that is highly visible to the public realm.</i>' Is to ensure that the artwork is for the general public and not secured solely for the development's occupants.</p>
---	---

9.4.4 Alternative Uses for On Road Car Bays – Policy Review

Requested by: Mayor John Carey
Prepared by: Rob Boardman, Director Community Services

PROPOSED AMENDMENT:

That Item 1 of the Officer Recommendation be amended to read as follows:

“1. ENDORSES the proposed amendments to Policy No. 2.2.13 ‘Alternative Uses for On Road Car Bays’ as shown in Attachment 001; subject to the deletion of Clause 1.8, as follows:

1.8 A maximum of four (4) Parklets hosted by food or café service businesses will be permitted in each Town Centre.”