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INTRODUCTION

KEY PROJECT AIMS:

- Satisfy requirements of *Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015* 
- Evaluate performance of LPS 3 in supporting good decision-making 
- Assess if LPS 3 is delivering on City’s Strategic goals for growth 
- Determine if new Scheme required or amendment to current LPS 3
## INTRODUCTION: SCHEME AIMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>![House Icon]</th>
<th>![Stadium Icon]</th>
<th>![Briefcase Icon]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>To provide for</strong> a range of <strong>housing choice</strong> in neighbourhoods with a <strong>strong community identity</strong> and high levels of amenity.</td>
<td><strong>To provide for</strong> convenient, attractive and viable commercial centres, which service the needs of the community and are accessible to pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users as well as motorists.</td>
<td><strong>To assist</strong> employment &amp; economic growth by facilitating the timely provision of suitable land for retail, commercial, industrial, entertainment &amp; tourist developments, as well as providing opportunities for home based employment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>![Leaf Icon]</td>
<td>![Arch Icon]</td>
<td>![Library Icon]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>To protect and enhance the environmental values and natural resources</strong> of the local government area and to promote sustainable land use and development</td>
<td><strong>To encourage the conservation and continued use</strong> of identified places and objects of <strong>cultural heritage significance</strong></td>
<td><strong>To assist in the effective implementation of regional plans and policies</strong> including the State Planning Strategy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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PART ONE: STRATEGIC CONTEXT

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT ACT

PLANNING & DEVELOPMENT (Local Planning Schemes) Regs 2015

RELATED LEGISLATION & POLICY
- Environmental Protection Act
- Heritage of Western Australia Act
- Bush Fires Act

STATE PLANNING FRAMEWORK
- Metro Strategies
- MRS
- State Planning Policies
- Operational Policies

COS STRATEGIC COMMUNITY PLAN

COS PLANNING FRAMEWORK
- Local Planning Strategy
- LPS 3
- Local Planning Policies
- Structure Plans
- Local Development Plans

LOCAL LAWS
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PERTH + PEEL @ 3.5M

CENTRAL REGION BY 2050

250K JOBS
417K PEOPLE
215K HOUSES

28% HOUSING GROWTH WITHIN CITY OF STIRLING (+60,400 HOUSES)

GROWTH OBJECTIVES:

1. CONNECTED CITY
   ACTIVITY CENTRES + CORRIDORS

2. PROTECTED INDUSTRIAL
   EMPLOYMENT + ECONOMIC GROWTH

75% INFILL TO BE IN PLANNED CONSOLIDATION AREAS
25% INFILL TO BE INCREMENTAL GROWTH
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CENTRAL SUB-REGIONAL PLANNING FRAMEWORK

DWELLING TARGETS - HOW’S STIRLING TRACKING?

SUB-REGIONAL FRAMEWORK TARGET

+ 1,725 PER YEAR

CITY OF STIRLING

2,613 PER YEAR

2006 - 2011

ABS, 2011
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TRANSPORT @ 3.5M

RAIL
- Stirling to Murdoch (2.5M)
- Perth to Morley (2.7M)
- Stirling City Centre to Morley (beyond 3.5M)

BUS RAPID TRANSIT / LIGHT RAIL
- Glendalough Station to Scarborough Beach (2.7M)

ROAD
- Reid Hwy upgraded to freeway standard (2.7M)
- Stock Road extension from Leach Highway to Stephenson Avenue at Jon Sanders Drive (new river crossing) (3.5M)
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CITY OF STIRLING STRATEGIES

Local Planning Strategy (2016, Draft)

Housing Strategy (2010)

Retail Centres Strategy (2016)

Integrated Transport Strategy (2009)
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CITY OF STIRLING // LOCAL PLANNING STRATEGY

VISION:

“Focus investment, jobs and growth on corridors and centres around transit; improve the quality of suburbs & centres; and the overall liveability of the City.”
### THEME 1:
“Prioritise Growth & Investment In Activity Centres & Corridors”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CURRENT ISSUES</th>
<th>LOCAL PLANNING STRATEGY RESPONSE</th>
<th>CONSIDERATIONS FOR SCHEME REVIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Activity Centres/Corridors lack residential pop ins to underpin viability</td>
<td>• City’s growth to be directed to 73 Activity Centres &amp; 29 Corridors, allowing retention of suburban character for families</td>
<td>1. Incorporate Centre Zones aligned to SPP 4.2 Activity Centre Hierarchy (floorspace ranges/diversified uses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Activity Centres/Corridors fail to provide ‘sense of place’</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Activity Centre Plans to guide &amp; coordinate development of larger centres (SPP 4.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Pattern of land use/ development promotes cars above other modes</td>
<td></td>
<td>3. LDPs / Policies for local/neighbourhood centres &amp; activity corridors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Review zonings of Activity Centres/ Corridors to create opportunities for expansion / residential infill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Confine multiple dwellings to Activity Centres, Corridors or as part of place-specific studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Adopt land use &amp; development standards specific to each Centre Zone (floorspace ranges, criteria for retail expansion, car parking, built form)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Approach WAPC regarding an additional MRS road classification for Activity Corridors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### THEME 2:

**“Keep The Jobs We Have Now & Grow Them”**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CURRENT ISSUES</th>
<th>LOCAL PLANNING STRATEGY RESPONSE</th>
<th>CONSIDERATIONS FOR SCHEME REVIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Urban areas need to do better in providing amenity, connectivity & infrastructure for job creation & self-sufficiency | Activity Centres, Corridors, Tourism Nodes & Specialised Centres (Edith Cowan) to be key employment generation nodes  
Stirling City Centre / Herdsman-Glendalough to become Perth’s second CBD | 1. Allow diversified uses in Activity Centres / Corridors  
2. Focus retail/commercial growth in centres / corridors (not ad-hoc)  
3. Expand zoning of certain Activity Centres  
4. Introduce Tourism zone (MST) to promote growth of tourism economy (short-stay accommodation encouraged)  
5. Minimise further loss of industrial land & ensure replacement zones accommodate jobs of the New Economy  
6. Limit Activity Centre compatible uses locating in industrial areas (private recreation; large-format retail) |
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CITY OF STIRLING // LOCAL PLANNING STRATEGY

THEME 3:  
“Transport & Land Use Will Be Coordinated & Integrated”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CURRENT ISSUES</th>
<th>LOCAL PLANNING STRATEGY RESPONSE</th>
<th>CONSIDERATIONS FOR SCHEME REVIEW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>♦ Dispersed residential infill perpetuating reliance on cars</td>
<td>♦ Focus growth and transport infrastructure on Activity Centre / Corridors (public transport &amp; active travel)</td>
<td>1. Activity Centre /Corridor dev. standards to encourage urban environments conducive to walking/cycling/PT:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ City’s grid structure provides ‘bones’ for walkable neighbourhoods, however poor quality built form / loss of trees has caused streetscape decline for walking/cycling</td>
<td>♦ Enhance streetscapes in lower density suburbs to encourage walking/cycling/PT use</td>
<td>– active building frontages to key streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Existing road network at capacity</td>
<td>♦ Alternative options for funding infrastructure</td>
<td>– elimination of car parking from street setbacks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>♦ Timely investment in transport infrastructure (including light rail) is needed to underpin successful infill</td>
<td></td>
<td>– smaller street block sizes for improved connectivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– new/upgraded public spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>– minimum mandatory residential, non-retail &amp; community/recreational uses in centres / corridors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Review reserve requirements for planned public transport infrastructure &amp; secure additional reserves where required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Parking standards for Centres / Corridors and industrial areas to limit parking to levels commensurate with road capacity &amp; allow of flexibility for change of use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Reserves for public parking stations within activity centres, corridors &amp; tourist nodes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Development contributions for footpaths, cycling infrastructure/ end-of-trip facilities &amp; public transport</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Theme 4:
“Improve The Quality & Liveability Of The City”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Issues</th>
<th>Local Planning Strategy Response</th>
<th>Considerations for Scheme Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Pressure for infill has potential to compromise amenity &amp; liveability if not well planned</td>
<td>• Focus residential growth in Activity Centres/Corridors &amp; preserve character of suburban areas</td>
<td>1. Scheme zonings &amp; instruments adopted under Scheme to encourage greater housing diversity across City - missing middle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• ‘Backyard infill’ causing significant urban tree loss</td>
<td>• Diversify housing across the City</td>
<td>2. More flexible zonings &amp; min. mandatory dwellings to encourage apartments in &amp; adjoining Activity Centres/ Corridors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Housing choice not keeping pace with demographic changes</td>
<td>• Ensure quality/ quantity &amp; distribution of POS &amp; other community facilities meets community need</td>
<td>3. Scheme &amp; related instruments to consider development incentives in return for ‘public benefit’ - public art, civic space, streetscape enhancements, ground floor activation etc</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• City’s growing population is increasing pressure on POS &amp; recreation facilities</td>
<td>• Encourage expansion/ diversification of local/ neighbourhood centres</td>
<td>4. Explore options for funding streetscape and POS enhancements (flat rate contribution per new dwelling or more extensive POS cash-in-lieu)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Include standards in Scheme &amp; related instruments for tree protection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. Review zones over local/neighbourhood centres (expansion/diversification/new centre options)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7. Review residential coding of heritage areas to eliminate potential conflicts with conservation objectives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Part One Local Strategies

### City of Stirling // Integrated Transport Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Integrated Transport Strategy (City of Stirling)</th>
<th>Transport @ 3.5 Million (Department of Transport)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reid Highway heavy rail link connecting Stirling City to Morley</td>
<td>- Perth City to ECU &amp; Morley Rail by 2.7M (tunnel to Morley)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3 x light rail connections linking to future CBD network.  
  - CBD to Scarborough via Scarborough Beach Road  
  - CBD to Morley via Beaufort Street  
  - CBD to Balga via Wanneroo Road  
  Funding models explored incl. Value Capture | - Stirling to Murdoch Orbital by 2.5M (includes extensive tunnelling)  
- Stirling City Centre to Morley beyond 3.5M |

### Light Rail / Rapid Bus Transit

- Bus Rapid Transit / Light Rail - Glendale to Scarborough
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CITY OF STIRLING // RETAIL CENTRES STRATEGY

STRATEGY DIRECTION:
- Retain retail hierarchy & expand centres
- Focus retail expansion where greatest potential for growth
- Diversify uses from ‘retail-oriented’ centres
- “Re-localised retail” + improve liveability through a better local offer

CITY OF STIRLING

RETAIL PROFILE

(ESSENTIAL ECONOMICS, 2016)
CITY OF STIRLING // RETAIL CENTRES STRATEGY

IMPLICATIONS FOR SCHEME

- Zone for each centre type
- Provisions to cater for:
  - Expansion of small centres (floorspace ranges)
  - Diversification of uses (residential / non-retail)
  - Incentives for renewal of poor trading local/ neighbourhood centres + performance criteria for expansion of larger centres
- Criteria to guide Council decisions to “upzone” centres (e.g., Doubleview NC to DC)?
- Retail trends - large format retail in Industry zones (24% retail floorspace)
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CITY OF STIRLING // HOUSING STRATEGY (2010)

FOCUS AREAS:
1. Housing matched to community need
2. Affordable housing supply
3. Sustainable building forms
4. Housing accessible to local jobs / transport
5. Housing resilient to climate change/utility cost increases
6. Well designed infill housing
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CITY OF STIRLING // HOUSING STRATEGY (2010)

ISSUES FOR SCHEME
‘Backyard Infill’ - R40 coded areas:
- loss of urban trees
- poor built form/streetscapes
- land fragmentation
- loss of family areas
- MD/GD crossover
### Part One Strategic Context

**Alignment between WAPC + COS strategic directions?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Corridors + Centres</th>
<th>Activity Corridor &amp; Centre locations (e.g. Mt Lawley &amp; heritage constraints)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local job creation</td>
<td>Transport infrastructure priorities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green networks</td>
<td>Industrial land transitioning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>×</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing diversity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated transport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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STATE POLICY FRAMEWORK

SPPs to be read as part of the Scheme unless modified by Scheme
# PART ONE  METROPOLITAN POLICIES

## STATE POLICY FRAMEWORK // SPP 3 URBAN GROWTH AND 3.1 R-CODES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY OVERVIEW</th>
<th>COS FRAMEWORK - ALIGNMENT WITH SPP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✷ Sustainable development patterns</td>
<td>✷ Scheme / LPS Aims consistent with Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✷ Prioritises infill in established urban areas</td>
<td>✷ Outcomes however delivering scattered, less sustainable infill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✷ Housing diversity + choice</td>
<td>✷ Stirling LPS aims to refocus infill efforts to centres, high frequency public transport nodes + corridors – zoning and incentivising provisions to reflect this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✷ Higher densities in the most accessible locations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✷ Implemented through further related SPPs (R-Codes, Developer Contributions, Activity Centres)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## PART ONE METROPOLITAN POLICIES

## STATE POLICY FRAMEWORK // SPP 3 URBAN GROWTH AND 3.1 R-CODES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY OVERVIEW</th>
<th>COS FRAMEWORK - ALIGNMENT WITH SPP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• R-Codes alone not delivering good built form outcomes</td>
<td>• Scheme &amp; LDPs/LPPs required to address deficiencies / fill the gaps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Key issues - excessive lot coverage and variations to setbacks - result in over development</td>
<td>• Currently no incentive for other building types (missing middle) - look for other building typologies (grouped housing not delivering good outcomes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Currently no incentives for building types that support quality streetscapes</td>
<td>• Cl.5.3.4 promotes R40 multiple dwellings to consolidated near centres/corridors/transport interchanges (review if clause required in lieu of SPP 7 + Apartment Guidelines)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Watching brief – new suite of controls through SPP 7</td>
<td>• Additional provisions that address building frontages, access/car parking, tree retention/landscaping and retention of neighbourhood character (if not addressed through proposed SPP 7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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STATE POLICY FRAMEWORK //
SPP 7 - DESIGN WA + APARTMENT DESIGN (DRAFT)
## State Policy Framework // SPP 7 - Design WA + Apartment Design (Draft)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Overview</th>
<th>COS Framework - Alignment with SPP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Design WA - design-led policy to promote good design across all forms of development. Incorporates 10 principles of good design – context + character; landscape quality; sustainability; functionality; build quality; amenity; legibility; built form; scale and aesthetics. | SPP 7 consistent with strategic direction of Stirling in LPS for development to be context driven - provides universal design principles to provide consistency to industry. Apartment Guide:  
  - guidance for siting and orientation of apartments into existing neighbourhoods – may negate need for cl.5.4.3 to control locations of R40 multiple dwellings  
  - use of Attached vs Detached – differentiation may create implementation issues (use other place based organising principle?)  
  - focus on existing character & not future character  
  - other controls including Plot Ratio should be reviewed to ensure higher densities can be achieved without variations  
Design review:  
  - Possible opportunities to incorporate framework in Scheme for pre-lodgement design review outside or concurrent with JDAP process.  
Other suite of documents may provide useful controls for infill / coordinated precinct-based development, however these are yet to be released. |
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### STATE POLICY FRAMEWORK // SPP 4.2 ACTIVITY CENTRES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGIC METRO CENTRES (1)</th>
<th>SECONDARY CENTRES (2)</th>
<th>DISTRICT CENTRES (9)</th>
<th>NEIGHBOURHOOD + LOCAL CENTRES (32)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✷ Stirling City Centre “Perth’s second CBD”</td>
<td>✷ Karrinyup approved - 37,127m² retail expansion (+ other uses)</td>
<td>✷ Shopping Centres + Main Street (Dog Swamp Shopping Centre, Beaufort Street)</td>
<td>✷ Retail floorspace up to 4,000m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✷ Approved Westfield Expansion (+33,600m² shop)</td>
<td>✷ Mirrabooka undergoing redevelopment – approx. 1,500 dwellings &amp; mixed-use main-street</td>
<td>✷ Generally 10,000m²+ retail floorspace incl. major supermarket</td>
<td>✷ Strong competitions from large centres / convenience stores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✷ Draft Activity Centre Plan aligned with SPP.4.2</td>
<td>✷ Draft Mirrabooka Activity Centre Plan aligned with SPP 4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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STATE POLICY FRAMEWORK // SPP 4.2 ACTIVITY CENTRES

- STRATEGIC
- SECONDARY
- DISTRICT
- DISTRICT
- NEIGHBOURHOOD
- LOCAL
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STATE POLICY FRAMEWORK // SPP 4.2 ACTIVITY CENTRES

STRATEGIC + SECONDARY
- Form of development inconsistent with SPP 4.2
- Retail focus / dispersed uses / car dependent / enclosed shopping centres
- Strong enforcement of standards required

DISTRICT
- Most performing well with some growth potential (additional 5,000m2+ retail)
- Inglewood - under performing/ high vacancy rates

NEighbourhood + Local
- Centres in affluent suburbs - strongest performers.
- Strategies to support poor performers
- Strongly linked to neighbourhood liveability
- Potential for new Centres where under supply of convenience retail / significant infill planned
## State Policy Framework // SPP 3.6 Developer Contributions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Overview</th>
<th>COS Framework - Alignment with SPP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Revised SPP 3.6 currently being advertised.</td>
<td>- Scheme provisions consistent with metropolitan strategic framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Content similar to 2009 version - new framework broadens scope of contributions to incorporate infrastructure required to deliver ‘Liveability’</td>
<td>- SPP variations may need to be considered to effectively deliver infill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Aimed at Greenfield development - does not specifically deal with incremental infill growth (challenge of applying a per dwelling levy across extensive areas &amp; address requirements to cost infrastructure/ prepare audited statements + consult regularly)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- May require coordinated precinct planning approach such as Better Suburbs &amp; LDPs for Innaloo / Woodlands to enable DC to be applied (SPP 7 - Precinct Design)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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MATTERS FOR SCHEME REVIEW

1. Focus infill in Centres & Corridors
2. Extensive R40 areas - raise the bar/preserve family areas
3. Infrastructure - funding + timely provision
4. Urban tree canopy retention
5. Revitalisation of Local/Neighbourhood Centres
6. Built form control - promote preferred house typologies / streetscape focus
PART TWO
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**PART TWO LPS 3 ACTIVITY SNAPSHOT**

**DEMOGRAPHIC CHANGES**

26% **SINGLE HOUSES IN COS OCCUPIED BY**

- **SINGLES**
- **COUPLES WITH NO CHILDREN**

**HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION**

- **FAMILY**
- **SINGLE (LONE)**
- **GROUPED**

**PROPORTION OF FAMILY HOUSEHOLD GREW 2001 - 2011**

**AGE PROFILE COMPARISON**

- **COS AGE PROFILE BETWEEN 2001 - 2011 RELATIVELY UNCHANGED**
- **COS HAS LOWER PROPORTION OF PEOPLE AGED 0-14 YEARS COMPARED TO GREATER PERTH**
- **COS HAS HIGHER PROPORTION OF PEOPLE AGED OVER 75 YEARS THAN GREATER PERTH**

ABS, 2011
PART TWO LPS 3 ACTIVITY SNAPSHOT

SCHEME AMENDMENTS

- Most Amdts prompted by external proponents
- Some Amdts addressed deficiencies in Scheme - Amdt 32 - Multiple Dwellings, Amdt 4 + 27 - Heritage, Amdt 84 + 85 - SP provisions into LPS 3
- Most rezonings (60%) involve residential density uplift (corridor/centre locations where largest density uplifts supported)
- Reasons for refusals –
  - ad-hoc zoning change
  - deemed unnecessary
  - deemed inconsistent with SPP (R-Codes)
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INSTRUMENTS ADOPTED UNDER LPS 3

Local Planning Policies  Structure Plans  Local Development Plans
# STRUCTURE PLANS

## APPROVED SPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NORMALISE IN SCHEME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roselea, Stirling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton, Stirling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECU, Churchlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carine TAFE, Carine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Butfield, Gwelup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eyrean Way, Gwelup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daviot Park, Gwelup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Mews Estate, Gwelup</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## UNDETERMINED SPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NORMALISE ONCE APPROVED / IMPLEMENTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Channel 9 Site, Dianella</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot 2 North Beach Road, Gwelup</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlas Site, Mirrabooka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channel Ten &amp; DoH Land, Dianella</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## UNDETERMINED SPs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ISSUES FOR NORMALISATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land use permissibilities / land classifications not aligned with Scheme:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stirling City Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mirrabooka Town Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herdsman-Glendalough</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## MATTERS FOR SCHEME REVIEW

- Elevate SP provisions into Scheme - response to ‘due regard’ principle of Regs
- Duplicity between Scheme & SP controls
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LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PLANS

- Growing need for design control for infill (impact of SPP.7 suite of instruments)
- LDPs + LPPs performing similar functions
- Wide-ranging formats - individual lot plans to precinct-based codes
- Progressive - public / private realm standards
- Consistent approach / template needed
- Performance audits – are design outcomes better?

New housing development in Innaloo (adopted LDP)
PART TWO LPS 3 ACTIVITY SNAPSHOT

LOCAL PLANNING POLICIES

ACTION_REVIEW + STREAMLINE

1. Revoke outdated / rarely used_
   - renewable energy
   - satellite dishes

2. Consolidate policies covering common issues_
   - residential with streetscape policies
   - parking + access with bike parking

3. Identify standards to be elevated into Scheme or reassigned to policy
   - parking
   - built form
   - advertising signage

4. Revoke residential estate policies once development delivered

5. Review policies in context of SPP 7 (including draft LDP 2.9)
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DEVELOPMENT IN STIRLING

CITY OF STIRLING LPS 3
TOTAL DEVELOPMENT APPROVALS

- SINGLE RESIDENTIAL
- GROUPED DWELLINGS
- MULTIPLE DWELLINGS
- MIXED USE / COMMERCIAL
- INDUSTRIAL
- CIVIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Single Residential</th>
<th>Grouped Dwellings</th>
<th>Multiple Dwellings</th>
<th>Mixed Use / Commercial</th>
<th>Industrial</th>
<th>Civic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2,402</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2,383</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>3,411</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2,709</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>2,080</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART TWO  LPS 3 ACTIVITY SNAPSHOT

RESIDENTIAL BUILDING PERMITS 2014 - 2016*

- Scattered infill, mostly across R40 coded areas
- Impact on suburb amenity + liveability

* INCLUDES ALL RESIDENTIAL
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SINGLE HOUSE BUILDING PERMITS 2014 - 2016

1,070 SINGLE DWELLINGS
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SINGLE HOUSE

STONER ST, SCARBOROUGH
FRONTAGES DOMINATED BY GARAGES

BOURKE STREET, YOKINE
DARK ROOF
NO EAVES / SHADING DEVICES

REDCLIFF AVE, MIRRABOOKA
WIDE CROSSOVER
POOR STREET ENGAGEMENT
GROUPED HOUSING BUILDING PERMITS 2014 - 2016

511 PERMITS
1,438 DWELLINGS

GROUPED DWELLINGS
GROUPED HOUSING

Design Issues

1. Site coverage + hardstand areas – impact on courtyards/landscaping
2. Garages + extensive hardstand to streets
3. Poor street engagement - openings + verandahs, street walls/fences
4. Building mass - large houses or units?
5. Elevations - materials, proportions, articulation
6. Impact on ‘next door’ - bulk, privacy + overshadowing
7. Services / bin storage to streets
8. Tree loss
GROUPED HOUSING // SIDE BY SIDE

Design Issues

1. Garages to street
2. Wide crossovers / no street trees
3. Orientation - loss of natural light
4. Elevations - materials, proportions, articulation, parapet walls
5. Building mass - discord with street character
6. Services / bin storage to streets
GROUPED HOUSING // RETAINED HOUSE

Design Issues

1. Poor upgrades to retained house
2. Design / courtyards compromised
3. Irregular lots + dwelling forms
4. Design integration - old + new
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MULTIPLE DWELLING BUILDING PERMITS 2014 - 2016

 Amendment 32 allowed CoS to curb ad-hoc multiple dwellings masquerading as grouped housing across R40 areas

97 PERMITS
712 DWELLINGS

MD PRIOR TO AMDT 32 (445DW)
MD POST AMDT 32 (267DW)
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MULTIPLE DWELLINGS // SMALL COMPLEXES

Design Issues

1. Yield controlled by parking - parking + amenity issues (Amdt 33 R60 parking)
2. Poor street engagement - openings + verandahs, street walls/fences
3. Building mass - large houses or apartments?
4. Site coverage + hardstand areas – impact on courtyards/landscaping
5. Extensive parapet walls
6. Poor design responses to privacy
7. Impact on ‘next door’ - bulk, privacy + overshadowing
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MULTIPLE DWELLINGS // HIGH RISE

Design Issues

1. Streetscape interface - sloping sites (calc. of natural ground level)
2. Inadequate opps. for deep planting (basement setbacks)
3. Opportunity to negotiate public benefit from major development
4. Implications of SPP 7 - design quality
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SINGLE OCCUPANCY, ANCILLARY + AGED BUILDING PERMITS 2014 - 2016

- Single occupancy + aged accommodation not focused in centres / corridors
- Community objections to aged accommodation proposals – are concerns validated?

30 PERMITS ANCILLARY
5 PERMITS AGED
316 PERMITS SINGLE OCCUPANCY
## HOUSING // ISSUES FOR SCHEME REVIEW

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>New initiatives: Respond to WAPC’s Design WA (SPP 7) + Better Suburbs recommendations</th>
<th>Community certainty: Prescribe standards for what CoS/communities want to see rather than what they don’t want (more illustrative)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Design standards:</strong> address any shortcomings of SPP 7 (incl. R-Codes) - SPP variations, supplementary controls + design codes for strategic corridors/centres</td>
<td><strong>Dwelling retention:</strong> Revisit ability to retain house as part of grouped housing redevelopment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building types:</strong> Encourage building types that support quality streetscapes (eg. low/mid-rise apartments, terraces, courtyard houses, maisonettes) + discourage those that don’t (grouped dwellings, front loaded side-by-side)</td>
<td><strong>R40 areas:</strong> review coding to discourage scattered + poor quality infill - split coding / tighter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Height:</strong> review calculation of building height (LPP 2.6) to circumvent walling to street frontages</td>
<td><strong>Public benefit:</strong> mechanisms in Scheme to allow dev. incentives in return for public benefit offer (POS, public art, streetscape, civic areas, ground floor activation)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COMMERCIAL/MIXED USE

Planning/ Design Issues

1. Balance between prescription + performance based (compliant developments not always delivering - Aldi on Beaufort Street)

2. Podium developments to reduce impact of height but often poor results – parking occupying lower levels or insufficient variance in tower / podium setbacks & design distinction

3. Desire for residential / commercial mix - mandatory residential for centres/ corridor mixed-use buildings & ability to transfer
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JDAP

94 DETERMINED APPLICATIONS
(2012 - July 2016)
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JDAP

OBSERVATIONS

- JDAP departing from RAR where planning framework not finalised (Beaufort Street Activity Corridor - heights)
- Larger projects consolidating in centres, corridors & industrial areas

MATTERS FOR SCHEME REVIEW:

- Reassign provisions to Scheme to curb unintended built form outcomes/variations (eg building height controls for Activity Corridors)
- Review operation of Clause 5.5.1 – consider specifying clauses to which discretion to vary applies

[Diagram showing JDAP applications from 2012-16: 102 applications, 80 approved, 8 refused, 6 withdrawn, 6 refused JDAP/SAT determination]
CHANGE OF USE

SPECIFIC ISSUES:

1. Private Recreation in mixed business areas – fails to support activity centres
2. Home Office / Home Business / Home Occupation – simplify categories / DA exemption for compliant uses
3. Large format retail in mixed business areas – significant retail locating outside activity centres (Scheme accommodate by adopting Model defn or tighten provisions?)
4. B&B defn restrictive in requiring serving of breakfast. Applications for short-stay on rise with Airbnb, Stayz

OBSERVATIONS:

1. 69 change of use applications (26/8/15 - 30/6/16) - approx 7 per month
2. Of these:
   • 22% Private Recreation (many locating in industrial / mixed business areas)
   • 7% Family Day Care (proposed Amdt 82 exempt approval req.)
   • 7% personal care services (accommodate in Shop defn?)
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CHANGE OF USE MATTERS FOR SCHEME

1. Opportunity to bring some use classes + defs into line with Model Provisions
2. Modify definitions causing confusion in change-of-use applications
3. Simplify use classes into broader functional categories / align with parking standards
4. Respond to trends:
   - personal care services
   - large format retail in mixed business areas
   - private recreation in mixed business areas
   - rise of short stay accom
   - home-based work
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SAT REVIEW

COMMONLY CONTESTED
- (13) Heritage protection
- (13) R-Code standards
- (10) Residential CP
- (9) Building height limits
- (5) Parking stands / shortfall
- (5) Discretionary Uses

APPEALS WHERE COS POSITION OVERTURNED BY SAT:
- Heritage - demolition refusal
- Building height Main St (2-storey)
- Non compliant front fence (sight lines)
- Shop Addition (butcher) - parking shortage
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SAT REVIEW

MATTERS FOR SCHEME REVIEW

- Reassign certain discretional standards to Scheme
  - heritage protection (proposed Amdt 76)
  - residential car parking
  - building height controls
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SUBDIVISION

- WAPC approval of irregular lots - facilitates retention of dwellings / poor built outcome
- Subdivision in heritage protection areas

CITY OF STIRLING FREEHOLD + SURVEY STRATA LOT CREATION (2012 - 2016)

AVERAGE LOT CREATION / YEAR
250 LOTS
PART THREE
SCHEME PERFORMANCE
PART THREE SCHEME PERFORMANCE

PLANNING REGULATIONS

DEEMED PROVISIONS

- Deemed Provisions to be inserted into Scheme - standalone document
- Early amendment or address through Scheme Review?

MODEL PROVISIONS

- Current Scheme based on MST / reasonably consistent
- Assessment undertaken to identify Model Provisions appropriate for new Scheme and those that may be problematic
- CoS Raised Number of Issues re: deficiencies with Model Provisions
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SCHEME AIMS (CL.1.6)

- Revisit Scheme Aims to align with LPS.
- Give aims greater clarity + focus by including a set of aims for each LPS theme
- Determine how success will be measured

- To provide for a range of housing choice in neighbourhoods with a strong community identity and high levels of amenity.
- To provide for convenient attractive and viable commercial centres, which service the needs of the community and are accessible to pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users as well as motorists.
- To assist employment & economic growth by facilitating the timely provision of suitable land for retail, commercial, industrial, entertainment & tourist developments, as well as providing opportunities for home based employment.

- To protect and enhance the environmental values and natural resources of the local government area and to promote sustainable land use and development.
- To encourage the conservation and continued use of identified places and objects of cultural heritage significance.
- To assist in the effective implementation of regional plans and policies including the State Planning Strategy.
## PART THREE SCHEME PERFORMANCE

### SCHEME ZONES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZONE</th>
<th>COMMENT</th>
<th>ALIGNMENT WITH MODEL PROVISIONS (MP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td>• Zone Purpose important for infill sites (Regs doesn’t provide).</td>
<td>• MP equivalent ‘Urban Development’ - pitched to greenfield sites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Duplicity - Development Contribution / Special Control Areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Centre</td>
<td>• Review against SPP 4.2 (zone for centre type)</td>
<td>• Centre Zone closest MP equivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District Centre</td>
<td>• Review against SPP 4.2 (zone for centre type)</td>
<td>• Centre Zone closest MP equivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Centre</td>
<td>• Review against SPP 4.2 (zone for centre type)</td>
<td>• Centre Zone closest MP equivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>• Not achieving infill aligned with State / CoS strategies</td>
<td>• Residential – MP equivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Consider 2 x residential zones – ‘Urban’ and ‘Suburban’</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Zone</td>
<td>• Useful zone - allows small offices in residential areas</td>
<td>• No MP equivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>• Mixed Use - effective for mandating residential</td>
<td>• MP equivalent – Mixed Use, however residential not mandated (potential to become business precincts)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Suitable zone for Activity Corridors/ frame areas to Activity Centres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Business</td>
<td>• Large format shops (non-compliant) locating in zone (impact on activity centres). ‘Retail Establishment’ def. not helping?</td>
<td>• Service Commercial closest MP equivalent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>• Zoning requires review to accom. Transitioning of these areas</td>
<td>• MP Light Industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>• Single use class zone - Substitute with Tourism Zone? (preserve tourist accommodation)</td>
<td>• MP Tourist Zone more expansive objectives (aligned LPS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Institutions</td>
<td>• Broad land use permissibility concern to Council (eg. aged accom. &amp; lack of built form guidance, including height)</td>
<td>• Private clubs, institutions and place of worship zone – MP equivalent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic</td>
<td>• Restrictive Zone – Mostly CoS owned sites</td>
<td>• Nearest MP equivalent is ‘Civic &amp; Community’ reserve uses however often private sector / not-for-profit – is a zone the better option?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Used to preserve parking for local/neighbourhood centres.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Consider alternatives to secure parking whilst enabling redevelopment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Station</td>
<td>• Single use class zone - remove if development standards sufficient to control location / design (compatible with ‘urban’ corridors)</td>
<td>• No equivalent MP zone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ZONE OVERLAYS

- Special Control Areas introduced to avoid separate minor Schemes for specific areas - generally performed well.
- Risk of Special Control Areas being overused / creating cumbersome Scheme - development standards/ land use controls should first & foremost relate to zones where practical
- Duplicity + complexity where separate Development Zones, Special Control Areas & Development Contributions Areas apply to same land area
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RESERVES

LOCAL RESERVES
Opportunity to further align local reserves with reserves of Model Provisions

ADDITIONAL RESERVES
Strategic response for planned population growth – active POS, transport, utilities, schools

MRS
Activity Corridors - a new category? ‘Green Connector Regional Road’
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DEVELOPMENT CONTRIBUTIONS

- Mechanisms needed to fund infrastructure for infill
  - DCs that are fair & simple to administer - flat per dwelling levy (no up-front infrastructure / annual reporting)
  - Able to use contributions to fund public transport, streetscape enhancement, new parks (SPP 3.6 - Liveablity)
  - Cash-in-lieu POS contribution for Form 24 – Built Strata (residential)
  - Better use of Cash-in-lieu of parking provisions (less Council discretion to waive requirement)
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DEVELOPMENT APPROVAL PROCESSES

- DA exemptions (Regs) for R-Code compliant single houses - issues of non-R-Code compliant residential building permit (requires review)
- Other exemptions to consider (subject to addressing criteria) - Change of use (Shop to Personal Care Services); Home Occupation & Home Business;
- Pre-lodgement Design Review - Allow officers to negotiate better design outcomes before design fully resolved by proponent
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COMPLIANCE

- Compliance issues brought to City’s attention usually emanate from complaints. Many more unaccounted for.
- No significant issues with LPS 3 provisions + available powers – key issue is volume of non-compliance with compliance team growing significantly.
- Non-compliance issues can be very minor but time consuming

**Common areas of non-compliance:**
- Non-compliance with planning conditions / approved plans
- No planning approval – illegal development (including change of use that results in parking issues eg. Yelo Café)
- Front fencing - sight-line truncations, height + permeable infill (linked to building typology issues)
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COMPLIANCE

Matters for Scheme Review:

- Additional provision in Scheme to confirm DA required for unlawful use - pressure often to continue use while resolving non-compliance & difficulty of formally stopping activity
- Supplementary provisions to discourage retrospective approval (Regs Deemed Provisions legitimises this avenue)
- Compliance team to audit areas of non-compliance / resourcing requirements & outcomes. Use info. to enable greater focus on results & to ensure resources are most effectively directed
- Greater capacity for a more proactive approach to common non-compliance issues. Is non-compliance a real concern or can Scheme / policy provisions be adjusted to be more permissive?
- Think freely – can some standards that are frequently referred to Compliance Team be revisited (eg truncation & sight line standard review study? Grouping of land use categories for greater flexibility?)
PART FOUR
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EMERGING ISSUES

ENVIRONMENT
climate change - mitigation & adaptation
emergency management - bushfires, flooding
environmental management / biodiversity
conservation
energy efficiency
water resource management
urban tree loss

ACCESS
Integrated transportation
Active Transport
Freight routes
Managed Car Parking

COMMUNITY
Social infrastructure
Cultural heritage
Public health/wellbeing
Safety/ CPTED

HEALTH
Mental Health
Walkable Streets
Adequacy POS standards

HOUSING
Supply matched to need
Design quality
Afford-ability
Well-located infill/ meeting targets

ECONOMY
Job creation/retention
Infrastructure + Services (funding / delivery mechanisms)
New millennium workplace
PART FIVE
NEXT STEPS
## WORK PACKAGE 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TASK</th>
<th>TIMEFRAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate CoS / DoP Comments into Background Analysis</td>
<td>Dec 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Assessment Criteria</td>
<td>Jan – Feb 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting CoS / DoP – Performance Criteria Assessment Results</td>
<td>Feb 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder Consultation # 1</td>
<td>March 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting CoS / DoP – Draft Options</td>
<td>April 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder Consultation # 2</td>
<td>May 2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting CoS / DoP – Project Review (prior to commencing Work Package 2)</td>
<td>June 2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Work Package 2 (2017 - 18 Financial Year) – Preparation of Scheme Review Report