AGENDA ATTACHMENTS

Planning Services Committee

Wednesday, 5 February 2014, 6.00 pm
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Attachments</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PSC1402-14</td>
<td>ARUNDEL STREET, NO. 26 (LOT 2) FREMANTLE - REAR GROUND FLOOR ADDITIONS TO EXISTING SINGLE STOREY SINGLE HOUSE AND OUTBUILDING ADDITION - (AA DA0600/13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSC1402-15</td>
<td>LIVINGSTONE STREET, NO. 8 (LOT 31), BEACONSFIELD - TWO STOREY GROUPED DWELLING - (KS DA0556/13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSC1402-16</td>
<td>RENNIE CRESCENT, NO. 76A (LOT 2), HILTON - SINGLE STOREY SINGLE HOUSE - (AA DA0588/13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSC1402-17</td>
<td>HAMPTON ROAD, NO. 109A (LOT 1), SOUTH FREMANTLE - SECOND STOREY GROUPED DWELLING ADDITION (AD DA0300/13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSC1402-18</td>
<td>QUEEN VICTORIA STREET NO. 12 (LOTS 3 AND 31) - REQUEST FOR PERMANENT PLANNING APPROVAL FOR MEALS FACILITY AND CHANGE TO CAR PARKING ARRANGEMENTS - ST PATRICKS COMMUNITY SUPPORT CENTRE LTD (SSDA0507/13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSC1402-19</td>
<td>THOMPSON ROAD, NO. 62 (LOT 1), NORTH FREMANTLE - TWO STOREY SINGLE HOUSE WITH UNDERCROFT - (KS DA0534/13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSC1402-20</td>
<td>SCHEDULE OF APPLICATIONS DETERMINED UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY (3.61.21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSC1402-22</td>
<td>REVIEW AND PROPOSED MODIFICATION OF LPP2.9 RESIDENTIAL STREETSCAPE POLICY - ADOPT FOR ADVERTISING</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PSC1402-14  ARUNDEL STREET, NO. 26 (LOT 2) FREMANTLE - REAR GROUND FLOOR ADDITIONS TO EXISTING SINGLE STOREY SINGLE HOUSE AND OUTBUILDING ADDITION - (AA DA0600/13)

ATTACHMENT 1 – Development Plans
ATTACHMENT 2 – Site Photos

Site Photos (taken 21/01/14)

View of the rear of the subject site with No. 21A Suffolk Street beyond.

View of the rear of the subject site with No. 24 Arundel Street beyond.
View of the adjoining development at No. 30 Arundel Street.

Closer view of the rear boundary fence, No. 21A (left) & No. 19A (right) Suffolk Street.
ATTACHMENT 1

LOT 31 (#8)
LIVINGSTONE STREET, BEACONSFIELD, WA 6162
1,012m²
ZONED: R25

OPEN SPACE CALCS:
SITE AREA: 0.0148ha
EXISTING DWELLING: 201.06m²
EXISTING LOT ROOM: 42.83m²
EXISTING GARDEN: 62.82m²
OPEN SPACE = 0

EARTHWORKS:
FINAL SAND FILL LEVEL: 14.10
FINAL FINISHED FLOOR LEVEL: 14.20

STORMWATER:
DISCHARGE EACH DRAINAGE INTO SWALE

RETAINING WALLS:
EXISTING REF: WALL TO SU SUITABLE SWALE FOR DRAINAGE
EXISTING REF: WALL TO SU SUITABLE SWALE FOR DRAINAGE

APPLICATION NOTE:
THE PURCHASER IS URGED TO INSPECT THE SITE PRIOR TO PURCHASE AS THE SELLER HAS NOT MADE EXAMINATION OR WRITTEN STATEMENTS OF ANY KIND. THE SELLER MAKES NO REPRESENTATIONS OR WARRANTIES WITH RESPECT TO THE EXISTING STRUCTURE OR SITE. THE PURCHASER IS URGED TO ENGAGE A SUITABLE REPUTABLE AND LICENSED建築認可建築師 AND CONDUCT HIS/HER OWN EXAMINATIONS AND DETERMINATIONS PRIOR TO PURCHASE.

SITE PLAN

PROPOSED ADDITIONAL GROUPED DWELLING FOR
MR & MRS OCCHIUTO
AT LOT 31 (#8)
LIVINGSTONE STREET, BEACONSFIELD.

Anthony Mascaro
Architectural Design & Drafting Services
Melbourne • Perth

Page 10
AMENDED DRAWINGS
23/12/2013

GROUND FLOOR PLAN

PROPOSED ADDITIONAL GROUPED DWELLING FOR:
MR & MRS OCCHIUTO
AT LOT: 31 (88)
LIVINGSTONE STREET, BEACONSFIELD.
ATTACHMENT 2: SITE PHOTOS

Southern adjoining property and its double garage setback at a distance of 1m from the right of way.

Right of way dominated by solid boundary fences.
PSC1402-16  RENNIE CRESCEANT, NO. 76A (LOT 2), HILTON - SINGLE STOREY SINGLE HOUSE - (AA DA0588/13)

ATTACHMENT 1 – Development Plans
ATTACHMENT 2 – Site Photos

View of the adjoining dwelling at 74A Rennie Crescent, Hilton

View of adjoining ancillary dwelling at No. 10 Nicholas Crescent with major openings to bedrooms and living areas visible.
View of the adjoining dwelling at 74A Rennie Crescent, Hilton
PSC1402-17  HAMPTON ROAD, NO. 109A (LOT 1), SOUTH FREMANTLE - SECOND STOREY GROUPED DWELLING ADDITION (AD DA0300/13)

ATTACHMENT 1: Development Plans
ATTACHMENT 2: Photos from site inspection
PSC1402-18 QUEEN VICTORIA STREET NO. 12 (LOTS 3 AND 31) - REQUEST FOR PERMANENT PLANNING APPROVAL FOR MEALS FACILITY AND CHANGE TO CAR PARKING ARRANGEMENTS - ST PATRICKS COMMUNITY SUPPORT CENTRE LTD (SSDA0507/13)

ATTACHMENT 1

Planning application for ongoing planning approval to operate a meals facility and to vary a car parking condition at 12 – 16 (Lot 31) Queen Victoria Street, Fremantle.

I write to request that Council provide ongoing approval for St Patrick's to continue to operate its meals facility at our Centre at 12 Queen Victoria Street, Fremantle, which has been operating to date pursuant to a conditional planning approval granted by the State Administrative Tribunal on 20 December 2007.

The SAT approval was granted subject to the meal facility operating for a period of 5 years only from the commencement of the operation of the meals facility (condition 2.(i) of the approval). I understand on advice from the Planning Services section that the five year period expires in November 2013, thereby necessitating this application in order to secure the ongoing operation of our important work with those suffering greatest disadvantage and need in the Fremantle community, particularly homeless people.

Approval is also sought to vary SAT condition 2.(iii), which relates to the location of off-site car parking. An alternative location is proposed rather than the location set out in the SAT decision.

BACKGROUND

St Patrick's Community Support Centre was established (as St Patrick's Care Centre) in 1972 as a response to the significant street-present homelessness evident in the Fremantle community. From its very inception, the Centre's starting point in engaging with the homeless of Fremantle was the provision of meals. This remains a critical element of our approach to this very day, as the most effective way of engaging with our target client group. For various reasons, people who find themselves in a position of homelessness are mistrustful of mainstream services, and engagement is therefore a difficult and delicate process. In our long experience, the provision of meals ensures not only the basic need of our clients for nutrition is...
addressed, but is an effective way of building trust. In doing so, we aim to connect clients to the key services they may require to assist them on the road to an independence, self-sufficiency and quality of life.

It is therefore of critical importance to St Patrick’s mission, goals, and effective operation, that the meals facility at Queen Victoria Street be allowed to continue operation.

**PLANNING HISTORY**

No 12 – 16 (Lot 31) Queen Victoria Street, Fremantle, is the property of the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Perth and is occupied by St Patrick’s under a long term lease to undertake its operations as a service for people who are homeless or at risk of homelessness.

Prior to St Patrick’s occupation of the site, it was for many decades the site of the “Stella Maris Seafarers Centre”, and indeed, many Fremantle locals still know the building as “Stella Maris”. As originally established, the Centre provided facilities for seafarers whose ships were stopping over at the Port of Fremantle. The facility included several “room only” accommodation units, plus recreational and bar facilities carrying a liquor licence.

With modern shipping facilities and practices resulting in little or no need to offer such land-based facilities for seafarers, the opportunity arose to repurpose the use of the building. With St Patrick’s operating in the same precinct, diagonally opposite the “Stella Maris” building, and the expansion of its range of holistic services meaning that additional space was required for its operations, an ideal opportunity arose for St Patrick’s to move its operations to the Stella Maris building with the support of the Archdiocese.

Accordingly, in 2006 correspondence was engaged in with the City of Fremantle which ultimately led to consideration of an application for planning approval. Some elements of St Patrick’s intended occupancy were deemed consistent and/or incidental to its previous approved usage and therefore it was deemed unnecessary to seek a change of use. Other than some elements of the proposed works to be undertaken, the key issue as to use that remained, was that of the operation of a meals facility.

The matter was determined by Council’s Planning Services Committee on 24 January 2007. The recommendation made to the Committee by the City Officers was for conditional approval; however the Committee resolved to reject the application.

This decision was appealed to the State Administrative Tribunal, and as previously outlined, was overturned on 20 December 2007. The substituted approval restricted the operation of the meal facility to a duration of five years as a “precautionary approach”.
ACTUAL OPERATIONS TO DATE AT THE SITE

It can now be demonstrated, almost five years since the operation of the meal facility commenced, that the concerns expressed by the Committee in refusing the original application, whilst understandable, did not eventuate. Whilst it is accepted that issues can and do arise, this is probably true for most operations in the Fremantle CBD, whether business, charitable, or otherwise. It is worthwhile noting that, to our knowledge, no formal complaints have been lodged with Council regarding our operations over the last five years. In our view the key measure is the nature and frequency of any issues that may arise, strategies that are in place to prevent issues occurring, as well as strategies to effectively address issues which emerge. St Patrick’s has taken a very pro-active approach to management of the site, with a view to the safety, and amenity of facility users and staff as much as for neighbours and the local community.

In general terms, these strategies have included:

1. Security: placement of surveillance cameras and recording equipment at strategic locations around the facility, at St Patrick’s expense
2. Active communication and collaboration with external public safety and security services such as those run by Council, and the Police
3. Placement of a gate, with remote control access, on the common driveway leading to ours and neighbouring properties, installed and maintained fully at our expense
4. Training of, and active communication on an ongoing basis with our staff working in the Day Centre to ensure they are pro-active on issues of safety and amenity as it impacts on neighbours and members of the community as well as clients and staff
5. Provision of extensive facilities within the building, including an open-air atrium, to encourage clients to enter and remain in the building for the duration of the visit
6. Clear rules and boundaries set for clients using our facilities, with clear action taken for breaches including full collaboration with the Police if and when the occasion requires it
7. Maintaining open and active lines of communications with neighbours, particularly near residents, who are provided with direct contact details for key personnel
8. Disbursement of some services and staff to other sites since commencing operation at Queen Victoria Street, thereby reducing pedestrian and vehicular traffic there
9. Expansion of off-site parking arrangements from the original 17 bays required by the SAT, to 25 (noting that some of the original services sites at St Patrick’s have now moved to other sites along with their respective staff and clients, as referenced above, about 1/3 of our staff are now based at other sites)
I would like to take this opportunity to address a few of the key concerns raised in our original application, in turn.

**Congregation at the front of the building**

During the day, staff actively work to keep movement in front of the building down to a minimum. The advantage, as anticipated, of the Queen Victoria Street building is the availability of the atrium so clients can gather in an open air setting within the precincts of the building itself.

We have actively sought to improve these facilities to make them more attractive and useful to clients, and indeed now have an application before council for permission to construct a veranda in the atrium area which will make it more comfortable for use all year round for clients.

It is noted that a degree of congregation in the morning prior to opening is not entirely unavoidable, in the same way that it occurs with a number of other operations in Fremantle such as banks and businesses that we have observed. Importantly, to the best of our knowledge there have been no significant ongoing complaints as to clients causing a disturbance to passers-by whilst awaiting the opening of the Centre. Again, our staff are very proactive in observing the behaviour of clients and encouraging them not to arrive unnecessarily early. The design of Centre programs are such that no particular advantage is given for early arrival and in this way the position is reinforced.

**Behavioural issues**

Another concern expressed during the original planning application process was around potential behavioural issues with respect presumably to service users. Given St Patrick’s long previous experience in dealing with the target client group, and, from a neighbourhood perspective, the Centre’s proximity to a primary school, secondary school, public sporting facilities and a Church, St Patrick’s has always been conscious of its responsibilities to service users and the community around it. Given this, behaviour management had been a key strength in its approach for many years, and placed St Patrick’s in good stead for the move to Queen Victoria Street.

There are a number of strategies employed to ensure that the standard of behaviour of all users of our services is acceptable. The starting point is a “compact” of sorts between St Patrick’s and clients, which is summarised clearly in a sign that is clearly visible to everyone that enters the Centre. It addresses the importance of treating all people with dignity, respect, and for maintaining trust. It encourages everyone to work together to create a positive environment.

We find the vast majority of clients very much accept and adopt the spirit of the message. They appreciate the existence of a safe, supportive and non-judgemental space for them, and do not wish to act in a way that prejudices the availability of the service to them.
Naturally, as with any group in the community, it’s never entirely possible to exclude the possibility of problems arising, and there are a number of strategies actively employed to head off problems before they become significant, and on the rare occasion where they do, to promptly contain them. These include:

1. Relationship building and active interaction between Centre workers and clients which allows positive reinforcement of appropriate behaviour, but also early anticipation of and response to emerging issues;
2. Strategically deployed video surveillance and recording systems, with associated clear signage, making all entrants to the Centre aware of the importance of appropriate behaviour and the potential consequences for breach of standards;
3. Appropriately trained staff who are aware of the processes required to defuse undesirable situations or address them should they escalate;
4. Internal security systems with alarm triggers which alert all staff to any situation requiring an urgent response— with connection to an external monitoring centre who are able to call the police in turn. Staff are trained to all stop what they are doing and respond to the situation if the alarm is ever sounded;
5. A very strict policy of involving the police in any violent behaviour, or indeed where any potentially illegal activity comes to the notice of staff. Full cooperation is provided to the police including provision of surveillance footage. Clients are aware of these policies;
6. Clear boundaries and rules are set for client, with clear and prompt consequences for breaches.

It is important to note also that the very existence of St Patrick’s came about to address an existing social problem in our community, that of homelessness. Unfortunately, for various reasons, behavioural issues can be interconnected with homelessness for example due to social isolation, depression, substance dependency, mental health and a variety of other issues. The holistic suite of services delivered by St Patrick’s and partner agencies are designed to help clients address these issues, and as a result our presence in the community has in truth the effect of ameliorating the broader community impacts of homelessness, rather than increasing them.

In a similar vein, it must be emphasised that unacceptable behaviour, and indeed crime and illegal activity, which may somehow be associated with homelessness and poverty, occurs despite St Patrick’s efforts, not because of them. It would be unfair, in other words, to attribute such behaviours and activities to St Patrick’s presence, even if they may occur in proximity to our Centre.
Nevertheless, St Patrick’s has been active in delivering services that provide constructive support to clients whilst endeavouring at least indirectly to mitigate the impacts of homelessness on the broader community. Some examples appear in Appendix 1.

In reality, the level of issues arising from inappropriate behaviour at the Centre itself has been minimal. Where problems have arisen, on the vast majority of occasions they take place within the building and are quickly contained. It is very rare indeed for any problems to occur outside of the building which directly relate to persons visiting the Centre. In either event, the issues are normally verbal in nature (raised voices, verbal abuse) and almost always directed between clients known to each other, rarely to staff, and never to third parties that we are aware of.

Traffic and parking

Concern has also been expressed previously as to the potential impacts of the Centre in terms of local traffic, and parking amenity. St Patrick’s has been pro-active in seeking to manage these potential issues with the aim of minimising and impacts.

Clients

Given the target group of St Patrick’s service, very few clients of the service possess a car or travel to the Centre by car. In the few cases where they do, they are actively discouraged from parking immediately in front of the Centre.

Another concern expressed as to clients and traffic was the danger of a client being struck by a vehicle whilst crossing the road, but this has not transpired in the time St Patrick’s has operated from the site.

Staff and Volunteers

St Patrick’s engages in careful and regular planning around parking needs for staff and volunteers. In a sense, the demand has eased given St Patrick’s expansion to other service delivery sites which are well provided with parking in their own right.

Having surveyed our staff and parking provision, we have found that 55% of our staff do not have a requirement for parking at Queen Victoria Street for a variety of reasons: use of public transport, walking or riding a bike to work; several staff work from offices other than Queen Victoria Street (with all other sites having full provision for off-street parking); and St Patrick’s owned-vehicles are parked off-street behind the Queen Victoria Street premises (7 bays provided).

Of the remainder (20 staff), 1 has a private parking arrangement, 4 utilise public parking facilities (for example, the Beach Street Council Car Park is within very close walking proximity and always has a considerable number of parking bays available), and the remaining 15 have parking provided through an arrangement with the
Fremantle Bowling Club, detailed below. The latter arrangement provides amply (indeed in excess of requirements) for both staff and volunteers who may be rostered for duty on any particular day.

By this current planning application, St Patrick’s seeks a variation of the existing parking arrangement (condition 2.(iii) of the 2007 SAT approval) that we hold 17 parking bays at the Beach Street car park, in substitution for a requirement that we hold 20 bays at the Fremantle Bowling Club. St Patrick’s has an ongoing and mutually beneficial arrangement with the near-by bowling club for 25 day time parking spaces for staff and volunteers. The arrangement has no effective impact on the Bowling Club (noting most St Patrick’s-associated vehicles would have normally vacated by 3.30pm, if not earlier, based on our operational hours), who review their own requirements on an annual basis and only offer us bays according to their capacity, which if anything has gradually increased over time.

We are aware from regular staff reports that even where all our allocation is used the Club still has numerous available bays at any given time. The arrangement benefits the Club in terms of a revenue stream and ongoing financial sustainability, and provides St Patrick’s a substantial saving in comparison with the cost of purchasing parking through the City of Fremantle – funds which are then freed up for improved and increased client services. A letter is appended confirming, from the point of view of the Fremantle Bowling Club, that there is no adverse impact on their operational requirements or surround environs. The allocation is significantly in excess of the number of bays required under the existing planning conditions, and the actual requirements for St Patrick’s as outlined above.

Should for any reason the arrangement with the Fremantle Bowling Club not be in a position to be continued, we would then propose as an alternative to arrange parking at the Beach Street Council parking facility, which as noted earlier, has significant capacity during the week.

Visitors
The number of external visitors to the Centre is relatively minimal, and such visitors are actively encouraged to use the Beach Street council parking facility located conveniently nearby which has considerable available capacity during the week, or to utilise one of a number of public transport options which arrive either immediately in front of the premises or within short walking distance (the Fremantle Railway Station and bus terminal is approximately five minutes walk from the Queen Victoria Street site).

Conclusion

St Patrick’s has been grateful for the opportunity to operate its Centre, including the meals service, from the 12 Queen Victoria Street site, which has represented a far more adequate facility for its client group.

Whilst there was a degree of concern about the potential impacts of the meals facility, in reality many have not eventuated, or have been
very carefully managed so as to minimise or neutralise such impacts. In reality such impact has represented little, if any, difference to the impact of the previous usage as a Sesfaren’s accommodation and recreational facility with bar, or the impact of surrounding industrial, commercial and retail undertakings.

Conversely, St Patrick’s provides a considerable net benefit to the Fremantle community in addressing seriously disadvantage within its midst, and ameliorating the impact of the long-present existence of street-present homelessness in Fremantle. The location of the Centre in Queen Victoria Street is ideal in being very closely connected to public transport (including the railway station nearby) and other key infrastructure, whilst being at the periphery of the main CBD.

The discontinuation of planning approval for the meals facility, as illustrated earlier in this submission, would have a devastating impact on St Patrick’s ability to continue to deliver its important services within and to the Fremantle community.

We accordingly respectfully request that ongoing planning approval be granted for the:

a) continued operation of the meals facility; and

b) location of staff car parking at the Fremantle Bowling Club in lieu of the requirement to locate the car parking spaces at the Beach Street car parking area.

In the event that the car parking arrangements fail through the Fremantle Bowling Club, then approval is sought for an alternative location to be considered, failing which, the Beach Street becomes the default location for the shortfall in car parking.

We would be glad to address any further queries you may have.

Yours faithfully

Steve McDermott
Chief Executive Officer
St Patrick’s Community Support Centre Limited
14 October 2013

To whom it may concern,

Re: St Patrick's Community Support Centre; use of Fremantle Bowling Club Parking facility

I write to confirm that St Patrick's Community Support Centre has a corporate membership arrangement with the Fremantle Bowling Club, which includes parking permits for 25 vehicles during business hours on weekdays on our premises. This use of our car-parking facility from early morning (around 7.30am) to early afternoon (around 3.30pm) does not impinge on our normal operations.

This arrangement is mutually beneficial as it provides convenient parking for the Centre, which we feel provides a valuable service to the community, while the annual corporate membership fees contributed assist with our Club’s viability.

The City of Fremantle may have re-development plans for the site of the Fremantle Bowling and Lawn Tennis Clubs. If this development does go ahead, it may do so in approximately 2 years but up until then, we will continue to support our agreed arrangement with the Centre.

Kind regards,
Matthew Ngui
Secretary
Fremantle Bowling Club
Management Plan
St Patrick’s Community Support Centre (SPCSC).

Supported by a team of dedicated volunteers and staff, St. Patrick’s Community Support Centre is open every day of the year and offers a range of services and programs to the homeless and disadvantaged in the South West Metropolitan region. Such services include: A Drop in Centre, Social Services, Meals, Accommodation, Hands on Health, Educational & Social Activities that include, art, music and literature.

**Intent of this document:**

To provide the venue management with procedures to be followed in the interest of the venue, its management team, guests, visitors and the nearby community.

**Principle Objective**

To provide a safe and secure environment for St Patrick’s client group and to the Fremantle community.

**Purpose**

1. To outline a framework and process for resolving complaints from neighbouring owners or residents (external issues)
2. To ensure a timely and effective response to concerns and complaints raised by nearby property owners and residents
3. To ensure that neighbour relations and amenity is maintained
4. To ensure the operations of the service has a positive impact on the community

**1. PART ONE - COMPLAINTS AND APPEALS PROCEDURE**

**Principles in dealing with complaints and appeals**

SPCSC supports and upholds the following principles:

1. A commitment to ensure organisations and individuals are able to submit a complaint without any fear of repercussions or reprisals. Wherever possible SPCSC will endeavour to achieve a satisfactory outcome from a complaint to the satisfaction of all parties
2. Complaints and appeal processes that is fair, transparent, accountable and accessible to relevant organisations and individuals.
3. A commitment to effective and timely resolution of complaints and appeals.
4. That confidentiality for individuals and organisations are protected.
5. Complaints to be used as an opportunity to improve service delivery.
Lodging a Complaint or Grievance
1. Verbal or written contact to be made with the onsite head lodger, staff member or on call rostered staff member.
2. After hours, the head lodger is the first person to contact. If unavailable, contact rostered staff using contact numbers provided.
3. Onsite head lodger, staff member or on call rostered staff member to
   3.1. respond immediately or as soon as is practical to all concerns raised by property owners and residents relating to SPCSC concerns
   3.2. take all reasonable and appropriate action relevant to the complaint

Documenting and recording of information
1. All records of complaints to be documented in a complaint’s register
2. All complaints recorded in writing at the time the complaint is made and added to at a later time to state any further action taken, including the response.
3. The response must be lodged in writing back to the complainant to advise the complainant of actions taken within the realm of privacy legislation.
4. The response may involve an explanation, an assurance about future actions and/or to notify the complainant of changes made to service delivery to rectify the problem.
5. A written response is to be sent to a complainant even if it is decided that no action is to be taken. The response to explain the reasons for any decision.

Investigation
The complaint to be investigated as quickly and efficiently as possible, preferably within 10 working days by Senior Management.

Appeal process
1. If the individual is not satisfied with the response the complaint to be referred to the Board of Management for review.
2. All documentation relating to the complaint to be reviewed by the Board and a written response to be issued.
3. The decision of the Board will be final with the knowledge that the complainant can pursue any course of action he/she considers appropriate. The Board may refer the matter to an appropriate external body.

Time Limits
Written complaints to be acknowledged in writing within 14 days. The process to take no longer than 60 days, unless the remedy is outside the direct control of SPCSC

Privacy and Confidentiality
1. Records kept in relation to responding to complaints will not be used for any purpose other than as a record of how the complaint was handled.
2. All reports and documents relating to the complaint will be confidential, and will only be given to persons involved in resolving the matter.
3. The file will be stored at SPCSC.

PART TWO – INTERNAL & EXTERNAL SECURITY

Monitoring and Management
1. The responsibility for the everyday management of the premises of SPCSC is in accordance with the Management Model of the Centre.
2. SPCSC is under 24 hour electronic surveillance and is monitored daily.
3. All floor staff are trained to monitor and manage problem clients.

24 Hour Contact Numbers
Contact phone numbers for the Centre itself, Rostered Weekday Staff and Weekend Staff will be made available to nearby property owners and residents.

Access
1. People access to SPCSC is by the door located at the southernmost end of the building- the furthest distance away from the neighbours.
2. Service Access - an electronically-operated gate with a locking device will be installed once the refurbishment of the property has been completed. Only members of the adjoining Strata 7232, Council waste collection services and nominated staff of SPCSC will be allowed access.
3. All residents must have a security pass to enter or exit the building after hours.
4. Visitors to the premises can only enter through the front door using the intercom.

Current Hours of operation
The hours that the premises are open for SPCSC administration are:

Monday to Friday 9.00am – 3.30pm.

Hours of Operation of St. Patrick’s Community Support Centre:
Monday, Tuesday, Thursday and Friday 7.30am-3.30pm
Wednesday 7.30am-1.30pm
Saturday 8.00am-2.00pm
Sunday and Public Holidays 9.00am-1.00pm

PART THREE – RUBBISH AND GRAFFITI REMOVAL

Rubbish removal
Rubbish removal will be in line with council requirements.
Litter from the yard areas and at the front of the property (Footpath/road reserve) will be collected on a daily basis.

Graffiti Removal
Any graffiti will be removed, washed or painted over. Walls of the building will be kept clean.

PART FOUR - DRIVEWAY AND PARKING

Driveway
Driveway to be maintained and kept free of litter caused by SPCSC. The expectation is that all neighbours who use the driveway will be responsible for their litter.

Parking of Vehicles:
All car parking, loading areas, vehicle access and circulation areas shall be maintained and available for car parking, loading, vehicle access and circulation on an ongoing basis that is to the satisfaction of the City of Fremantle.

PART FIVE - FIRE AND EMERGENCY ENTRY AND EXIT

Entrance/Exit:
The side door into the laneway is for fire and emergency exits and rubbish removal only. The front southernmost door of SPCSC is the main entrance/exit for the building and will also be used for ambulance.

PART SIX - STAFF COMMUNICATION STRATEGY

Staff Meetings and Supervision
Weekly meetings: All Staff members included in this process; staff meeting is chaired by SPCSC Executive Director.
Monthly staff supervision: All staff members included in this process; supervision is conducted by Senior Management.
Housing:
Weekly staff supervision: conducted by Senior Management.
Monthly Housing Coordinators meeting: conducted by Senior Management.
Lodging House Head Lodgers' meeting: Conducted on a quarterly basis and chaired by the Lodging House Coordinator.

PART SEVEN – REVIEW

Review Schedule:
This document is a living document and is subject to a yearly review by SPCSC Senior Management.
ATTACHMENT 4

Extract from the SAT 2007 decision showing all conditions of planning approval:

2. The decision of the respondent made on 24 January 2007 to refuse planning consent for alterations and additions and a change of use for a "use not listed" on Lot 31 (Nos 12 - 16) Queen Victoria Street, Fremantle is set aside and a decision is substituted that planning consent be granted for alterations and additions to the existing building as shown on plans prepared by Creative Design Concept dated April 2006 and for a change of use for portion of the building as a meals facility (as applied for) and associated services on Lot 31 (Nos 12 - 16) Queen Victoria Street, Fremantle subject to the following conditions:

(i) The approval for the meals facility is limited to a five-year period only. The time period shall commence upon the applicant giving written notification of "Intention to Commence Operation" to the Chief Executive Officer of the City of Fremantle.

(ii) So as to ensure that the behaviour of persons attending the Stella Maris Centre in connection with the provision of meals does not detrimentally affect the amenity of the neighbourhood, a management strategy, to be agreed by the parties (or in default of agreement, determined by the Tribunal), is to be implemented to the City's satisfaction prior to the operation of the meals facility and thereafter maintained to the City's satisfaction. The management strategy is to contain, but is not limited to, such matters as the control of noise, litter and unruly behaviour generated by persons attending the premises, measures to be implemented to ensure that attendees leave the vicinity of the premises in an orderly manner and do not congregate outside the premises, and complaint and report procedures.

(iii) A total of 17 car parking bays shall be provided to satisfy the car parking demand generated by this development. Any shortfall of car parking bays not provided on-site shall be met by the provision of dedicated car parking bays at the Beach Street carpark.

(iv) So as to ensure orderly management of the car parking areas both on-site and in the immediate locality, a parking strategy, to be agreed by the parties (or in default of agreement, determined by the Tribunal), is to be implemented to the City's satisfaction prior to the operation of the meals facility and thereafter maintained to the City's satisfaction. The parking strategy is to contain, but is not limited to, such matters relating to the use and management of car parking bays, including on-site car parking bays, the dedicated car parking bays at the Beach Street carpark, the use of the area in front of the Stella Maris building and the existing on-street car parking bays in Queen Victoria Street.

(v) Any damage that occurs during construction to the kerb/footpath shall be rectified at the cost of the applicant to the satisfaction of the City of Fremantle prior to occupancy.

(vi) All car parking loading areas and vehicle access and circulation areas shall be maintained and available for car parking/loading and vehicle
access and circulation (deleted as appropriate) on an ongoing basis to the satisfaction of the City of Fremantle.

(vii) Prior to occupation of the development, the on-site car parking and loading area(s), and vehicle access and circulation area shown on the approved site plan, including the provision of disabled car parking (or visitor parking), shall be constructed, drained and line marked (if appropriate) to the satisfaction of the City of Fremantle.

(viii) All persons attending the meals facility must enter and exit the building from the Queen Victoria Street entry only.

(ix) The applicant install, at its own cost, a remote control security gate on the entrance of the right of way adjacent to the Stella Maris building so as to allow access for necessary parking, management and safety requirements for the operation of the premises (Stella Maris Centre) and residents of Nos 18 - 24 Queen Victoria Street.

(x) Any upgrading of windows and air-conditioning systems should be consistent with the requirements set out in Policy D.B.M10 Fremantle Port Buffer Area Development Guidelines.

(xi) The roof of the building is to be insulated to the satisfaction of the City of Fremantle.
PSC1402-19 THOMPSON ROAD, NO. 62 (LOT 1), NORTH FREMANTLE - TWO STOREY SINGLE HOUSE WITH UNDERCROFT - (KS DA0534/13)

ATTACHMENT 1
ATTACHMENT 2 – SITE PHOTOS

Subject site viewed from Thompson Road.

Southern adjoining property and double garage.
Open space and ancillary dwelling associated with the southern adjoining property at No. 60 Thompson Road, North Fremantle which will be shaded by the proposal in winter months.

View of the upper level major opening of the ancillary dwelling associated with the southern adjoining property at No. 60 Thompson Road, North Fremantle.
Double carport associated with the northern adjoining property at No. 1/64 Thompson Road, North Fremantle.

Single garage associated with No. 64A Thompson Road, North Fremantle (two lots north of subject site).
PSC1402-20  SCHEDULE OF APPLICATIONS DETERMINED UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY (3.61.21)

ATTACHMENT 1

1. FORREST STREET, NO. 72 (LOTS 1113 & 1438), FREMANTLE - DEMOLITION OF EXISTING DWELLING AND CONSTRUCTION OF SINGLE STOREY GROUPED DWELLING (AD DA0564/13)

2. RAWLINSON STREET, NO. 10 (LOT 110), O’CONNOR – GENERAL INDUSTRY (12) AND WAREHOUSE (2) DEVELOPMENT – (KS DA0598/13)

3. MINILYA AVENUE, NO. 3 (LOT 1), WHITE GUM VALLEY – PERGOLA ADDITION TO EXISTING GROUPED DWELLING – (KS DA0625/13)

4. SOUTH TERRACE, NO. 218 (LOT 2), FREMANTLE – EXTERNAL PAINTING TO EXISTING BUILDING – (KS DA0003/14)

5. HAMPTON ROAD, NO. 178A (LOT 1), BEACONSFIELD - ADDITIONS AND ALTERATIONS TO EXISTING GROUPED DWELLING (AD DA0524/13)

6. SOUTH STREET, NO. 393A (LOT 4), HILTON - SINGLE STOREY GROUPED DWELLING - (AA DA0577/13)

7. WALKER STREET, NO. 5 (LOT 29), SOUTH FREMANTLE - CARPORT ADDITION TO EXISTING SINGLE HOUSE (AD DA0585/13)

8. HERBERT STREET NO. 27 (LOT 10), NORTH FREMANTLE – RETAINING WALLS AND BOUNDARY FENCE ADDITIONS – (JL DA0601/13)


10. CENTRAL AVENUE, NO. 46 (LOT 89), BEACONSFIELD - ADDITIONS AND ALTERATIONS TO EXISTING SINGLE HOUSE (AD DA0592/13)

11. HOPE STREET, NO. 99 (LOT 32), WHITE GUM VALLEY - ALTERATIONS AND ADDITIONS AND PRIMARY STREET FENCE TO EXISTING SINGLE STOREY SINGLE HOUSE - (AA DA0569/13)

12. ELLEN STREET, NO. 8 (LOT 123), FREMANTLE – CLASSROOM ADDITION AND ALTERATIONS TO EXISTING EDUCATION ESTABLISHMENT (PRIMARY SCHOOL) – (CJ DA0567/13)

13. MINILYA AVENUE, NO. 3A (LOT 2), WHITE GUM VALLEY – CHANGE OF USE TO HOMES OCCUPATION (PHYSIOTHERAPY) – (KS DA0617/13)

14. HOPE STREET, NO. 133 (LOT 1), WHITE GUM VALLEY – ADDITIONS AND ALTERATIONS TO EXISTING GROUPED DWELLING – (AD DA0014/14)
15. STIRLING HIGHWAY, NO. 140 (LOT 2), NORTH FREMANTLE - PARTIAL CHANGE OF USE TO SHOWROOM AND TWO (2) DISPLAY POOL (PONDS) ADDITIONS (AD DA0540/13)

16. CHALMERS STREET, NO. 3 (LOT 2), FREMANTLE – VARIATION TO PREVIOUS PLANNING APPROVAL DA0290/13 (SECOND STOREY ADDITION TO EXISTING SINGLE STOREY SINGLE HOUSE) – (CJ VA0021/13)

17. PAGET STREET, NO. 36 (LOT 4), HILTON - CHANGE OF USE FROM OFFICE TO MULTIPLE DWELLING - (AA DA0566/13)

18. TYDEMAN ROAD, NO. 18 (LOT 1), NORTH FREMANTLE – RETROSPECTIVE ADDITIONS AND ALTERATIONS TO EXISTING GROUPED DWELLING – (CJ DA0571/13)

19. THOMPSON ROAD, NO. 69 (LOT 21), NORTH FREMANTLE – ALTERATIONS TO EXISTING GROUPED DWELLING – (CJ DA0584/13)

20. PEEL ROAD, NO. 11/30 (LOT 18), O’CONNOR – RETROSPECTIVE ADDITIONS TO EXISTING INDUSTRIAL BUILDING – (CJ DA0008/14)

21. SOUTH TERRACE, NO. 11/396 (LOT 11), SOUTH FREMANTLE – EXTERNAL ALTERATIONS TO EXISTING BUILDING – (KS DA0012/14)

22. COLLEGE CORNER, NO. 29 (LOT 110), O’CONNOR – SHADE STRUCTURE ADDITION TO EXISTING SINGLE HOUSE – (KS DA0019/14)

23. WALLACE WAY, NO. 10 (LOT 16), SOUTH FREMANTLE – TWO STOREY GENERAL INDUSTRY, OFFICE AND WAREHOUSE DEVELOPMENT – (KS DA0613/13)

24. PAGET STREET, NO. 29 (LOT 70), HILTON - TWO (2) LOT FREEHOLD SUBDIVISION - (AA WAPC149263)

25. MCCABE STREET, NO. 9-11 (LOTS 802 & 806), NORTH FREMANTLE - FIVE LOT FREEHOLD SUBDIVISION - (AA WAPC149261)

26. CHADWICK STREET, NO. 25 (LOT 1636), HILTON – ADDITIONS AND ALTERATIONS TO EXISTING SINGLE HOUSE – (CJ DA0608/13)

27. MORRIS STREET NO.11 (LOT 68), BEACONSFIELD – CONVERSION OF AN ANCILLARY ACCOMMODATION ADDITION INTO A SINGLE STOREY GROUPED DWELLING (JL DA0623/13)

28. HIGH STREET NO.59 (LOT 8), FREMANTLE –INTERNAL ALTERATION AND FITOUT OF EXISTING SHOP) (JL DA0016/14)
29. MCCLEERY STREET, NO. 19 (LOT 400), BEACONSFIELD - ALTERATIONS AND ADDITIONS TO EXISTING SINGLE HOUSE - (AA DA0572/13)

30. SMITH STREET, NO. 4 (LOT 101), BEACONSFIELD – PRIMARY STREET FENCE AND DECK ADDITION TO EXISTING SINGLE HOUSE – (CJ DA0023/14)

31. WRAY AVENUE, NO. 118A (LOT 17), FREMANTLE – CHANGE OF USE FROM CONSULTING ROOM TO MEDICAL CENTRE – (CJ DA0599/13)

32. FORREST STREET, NO. 128A (LOT 2), FREMANTLE – SINGLE STOREY GROUPED DWELLING – (CJ DA0612/13)

33. FORREST STREET, NO. 8/148 (LOT 26), FREMANTLE - PATIO ADDITION TO EXISTING GROUPED DWELLING (AD DA0609/13)

34. MATHER ROAD, NO. 25 (LOT 26), BEACONSFIELD – TWO STOREY SINGLE HOUSE – (CJ DA0562/13)
ATTACHMENT 1 - Research on LPP2.9 PSC and Council decisions

DAs presented to Council as they did not meet the prescribed street setback of table 1 and required assessment under LPP2.9’s discretionary criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Circumstances for presenting DA to Council</th>
<th>Number of DAs</th>
<th>Officer recommendation</th>
<th>Council decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Does not meet the prescribed street setback; Consistent with the prevailing streetscape</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5 Approve</td>
<td>All Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not meet the prescribed street setback; Not consistent with the prevailing streetscape</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8 Approve</td>
<td>10 Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 Refuse*</td>
<td>1 Refused</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not meet the prescribed street setback; No existing streetscape to assess the prevailing streetscape on</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4 Approve</td>
<td>All Approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Refuse*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17 Approve</td>
<td>20 Approved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Detail of each application provided below. The * provides where the application was recommended for refusal by officers.

A discretion to LPP 2.9 was supported by Council as it was consistent with the Prevailing Streetscape (PS) (5 of 21 – 24%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEETING DATE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>DISCRETION</th>
<th>PSC DECISION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 March 2013</td>
<td>66 Chester Street, South Fremantle – Two storey house</td>
<td>Ground level front setback 7m req, 4.5m provided</td>
<td>2.5 – 8.5m discretion approved as consistent with PS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 March 2013</td>
<td>3 Hale Street, No. 3, Beaconsfield – Two storey house</td>
<td>Ground level front setback 7m req, 6.5m provided</td>
<td>1-4m discretion approved as consistent with PS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 March 2013</td>
<td>4 Fullston Way, Beaconsfield – Two storey house</td>
<td>Ground level front setback 7m req, 4.5m provided</td>
<td>2.5 – 7.5m discretion approved as consistent with PS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 June 2013</td>
<td>17C Forrest Street, Fremantle – Two storey house</td>
<td>Ground level front setback 5m req, 6m provided</td>
<td>2.58m discretion approved as consistent with PS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## MEETING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEETING DATE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>DISCRETION</th>
<th>PSC DECISION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21 August 2013</td>
<td>8B Ashburton Terrace, Fremantle - Two storey house</td>
<td>Issue with partial enclosure of the front balcony which should technically be included in front setback calculations. Reports states “on balance that this balcony design is of a sufficient light weight appearance to not be included in the front setback measurement.”</td>
<td>Approved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A discretion to LPP 2.9 was approved by Council without being consistent with the Prevailing Streetscape (PS) (11 of 21 - 53%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEETING DATE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>DISCRETION</th>
<th>PSC DECISION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17 April 2013</td>
<td>15 Howell Vista, Beaconsfield – Two storey house</td>
<td>Ground level front setback 7m req, 4.0m provided Upper floor front setback 12m req, 6.8m provided</td>
<td>3 -5.2m discretion approved as no consistent setbacks in the PS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 May 2013</td>
<td>74A Jean St, Beaconsfield – Two storey house</td>
<td>Upper floor front setback 12m req, 11m provided</td>
<td>1.0m discretion approved although not consistent with PS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 May 2013</td>
<td>14A Martha St, Beaconsfield – Two storey house</td>
<td>Ground level front setback 7m req, 4.5m provided Upper floor front setback 12m req, 4.5m provided</td>
<td>2.5m discretions on the ground and upper floors approved as on balance consistent with PS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 May 2013</td>
<td>2 King William Street, South Fremantle – Three storey house</td>
<td>Ground level front setback 7m req, 0-6.6m provided Upper floor front setback 10m req, 0-6.6m provided</td>
<td>0-10m discretion approved as consistent with PS on the first 2 floors however 3rd floor is not consistent with the PS but consistent with policy requirements for a ‘hard edge” of D.G.F16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEETING DATE</td>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
<td>DISCRETION</td>
<td>PSC DECISION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 May 2013</td>
<td>*26 Lilly Street, South Fremantle - Two storey house</td>
<td>Ground level front setback 7m req, 5.3m provided Upper floor front setback 10m req, 3.1m provided</td>
<td>1.7 – 6.845m discretion approved although the UF was not consistent with PS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 July 2013</td>
<td>19B Forrest Street, Fremantle – Two storey house</td>
<td>Upper floor front setback 7m req, 1.8-3.2m provided</td>
<td>5.2m-3.8m discretion approved but was not consistent with PS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 August 2013</td>
<td>Hope Street No 11A, White Gum Valley - Single Storey (With Loft)</td>
<td>Ground level front setback 7m req, 4.77-7.05m provided Upper floor front setback 12m req, 4.77-7.05m provided</td>
<td>2.23-7.23m discretion approved but was not consistent with PS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 September 2013</td>
<td>*16A Nannine Avenue, White Gum Valley – Two storey house</td>
<td>Ground level front setback 7m req, 6.6m provided Upper floor front setback 12m req, 10.2m provided</td>
<td>0.4-1.8m discretion approved but was not consistent with PS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 September 2013</td>
<td>15 Cadd Street, Beaconsfield – Two storey house</td>
<td>Ground level front setback 7m req, 7.07m provided Upper floor front setback 12m req, 10.8m provided</td>
<td>1.2m discretion approved but not consistent with PS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 October 2013 (Council)</td>
<td>2 Newbold Street, White Gum Valley – Two Storey Additions</td>
<td>Upper floor front setback 12m req, 10.5m provided</td>
<td>1.5m discretion approved but not consistent with PS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A discretion to LPP 2.9 was refused by Council as it was not consistent with the Prevailing Streetscape (PS) (1 of 21 - 5%)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEETING DATE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>DISCRETION</th>
<th>PSC DECISION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16 October 2013 (Council)</td>
<td>*34- 36 Tuckfield Street, Fremantle – Additions to Two Storey House</td>
<td>Ground level front setback 5m req, 2m provided Upper floor front setback 7m req, 2.7m provided</td>
<td>3-4.3m discretion refused as not consistent with the PS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A discretion to LPP 2.9 was approved by Council as there was no established streetscape (5 of 21 – 24%)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEETING DATE</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>DISCRETION</th>
<th>PSC DECISION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 September 2013</td>
<td>316 High Street, Fremantle – Two storey house</td>
<td>Ground level front setback 5m req, 2.7-4.3m provided Upper floor front setback 7m req, 4.4-5.0m provided</td>
<td>0.4-1.8m discretion approved as it was determined that there was no established streetscape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 October 2013 (Council)</td>
<td>6a Stevens Street, Fremantle – Two Storey Single House With Roof Terrace</td>
<td>Ground level front setback 5m req, 3m provided Upper floor front setback 7m req, 3m provided</td>
<td>2-4m discretion approved as it was determined that there was no established streetscape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 October 2013 (Council)</td>
<td>156A Forrest Street, Fremantle – Two storey house</td>
<td>Ground level front setback 5m req, 1.5m provided Upper floor front setback 7m req, 2.7m provided</td>
<td>3.5-4.3m discretion approved as it was determined that there was no established streetscape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 November 2013</td>
<td>101A Watkins Street, White Gum Valley – Two storey house</td>
<td>Ground level front setback 7m req, 3.5m provided Upper floor front setback 12m req, 3.5m provided</td>
<td>3.5 -8.5m discretion approved as it was determined that there was no established streetscape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 December 2013</td>
<td>74 Stirling Highway North Fremantle - Three storey house</td>
<td>Ground level front setback 5m req, 3.6m provided Upper floor front setback 7m req, 4.75m provided</td>
<td>1.4-2.25m discretion approved as it was determined that there was no established streetscape.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATTACHMENT 2 - Track changes modified LPP2.9

CITY OF FREMANTLE
LOCAL PLANNING POLICY 2.9
RESIDENTIAL STREETSCAPE POLICY

ADOPTION DATE: 19/02/2013
AMENDED DATE: ??/??/2014
AUTHORITY: LOCAL PLANNING SCHEME NO.4

STATUTORY BACKGROUND

Clause 5.2.2 of the City’s Local Planning Scheme No. 4 states that unless otherwise provided for in the Scheme, the development of land for any of the residential purposes dealt with by the Residential Design Codes (R-codes) is to conform to the provisions of the R-codes.

Section 5.2.4 Part 7 of the Residential Design Codes 2013 states that a local government may adopt a Local Planning Policy may contain provisions that amend or replace which varies or replaces specific acceptable development deemed-to-comply provisions provisions of the Residential Design Codes. A Local Planning Policy may also contain development provisions for any aspect of residential development that is not provided for in the Codes.

Those Acceptable Development deemed-to-comply provisions of the Residential Design Codes that are varied or replaced by this policy are clauses 6.2.1 A1.1 - A1.2, 6.2.2 A3.4 - A3.5, 6.2.3 A3 and 6.7.1 A1.1, 5.1.2 C1.1, 5.1.8 C6, 5.2.1 C1.1, C1.2 and C1.5.

Clause 10.2 of the Scheme empowers the Council to consider a broad range of considerations and impose conditions relating to these in dealing with an application for planning approval.

APPLICATION

The provisions of this policy apply to all residential development assessed under Part 6.5 of the Residential Design Codes, except where specific provisions are contained within a Local Area Planning Policy or equivalent. In the event that there is a conflict between this policy, and a provision contained within a Local Area Planning Policy, the most specific policy provision shall prevail.

DEFINITIONS

Prevailing streetscape means the characteristics (generally limited to the setback and orientation of buildings including garages and carports from the primary or secondary street, front walls and fencing, building height, building/roof form and proportion) of the 3 properties, where appropriate, adjoining either side of the
subject site, fronting the same street and in the same street block.

In the case of a corner lot where the dwelling is orientated to the splay, the characteristics of the adjoining three properties, where appropriate, facing both streets shall be considered.

Greater weight may be given to the characteristics of the two immediately adjoining properties on either side of the subject site fronting the same street(s).

For the purpose of this definition, properties separated by a street shall not be considered ‘adjoining’.

**Prescribed street setback** means the minimum setback of a building as per Table 1 of this policy (including garages and carports, but excluding a verandah, porch or balcony). The prescribed street setback is based on the development site’s Local Planning Area and proposed development height. The prescribed street setback is measured on a right angle (90 degrees) from the street alignment to the building. There are two prescribed street setbacks for this policy – one for single storey development and the other for two storey development.

**POLICY**

1. **Setback of Buildings including Garages and Carports under the main roof of the development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local planning Area</th>
<th>Minimum prescribed street setback for development-buildings with an external wall height of 4 metre or less external wall height</th>
<th>Minimum prescribed street setback for development-buildings with an external wall height of greater than 4 metres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fremantle</td>
<td>5m</td>
<td>7m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Fremantle</td>
<td>5m</td>
<td>7m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Fremantle</td>
<td>7m</td>
<td>10m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaconsfield</td>
<td>7m</td>
<td>12m-10m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Gum Valley</td>
<td>7m</td>
<td>12m-10m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samson</td>
<td>6m</td>
<td>8m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O’Connor</td>
<td>8m</td>
<td>12m-10m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hilton (excludes the Hilton Heritage Area)</td>
<td>7m</td>
<td>9m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.1 Buildings are to be setback from the primary street in accordance with the prescribed street setback for the applicable Local Planning Area as prescribed in Table 1.
1.2. Variations to the requirements of clause 1.1 above may be considered, at Council’s discretion subject to the proposed development meeting at least one of the following criteria:

i. The proposed setback of the building is consistent with the setback of buildings of comparable height within the prevailing streetscape; or

ii. The proposed setback of the building does not result in a projecting element into an established streetscape vista by virtue of the road and/or lot layout in the locality or the topography of the land; or

iii. The proposed setback of the building will facilitate the retention of a mature, significant tree deemed by the Council to be worthy of retention (Refer also to LPP2.10 Landscaping of Development and Existing Vegetation on Development Sites); or

iv. Where there is no prevailing streetscape; or

v. Where the proposed development is on a lot directly adjoining a corner lot, Council will consider a reduced setback that considers the setback of the corner lot in addition to buildings in the prevailing streetscape.

Notes: 1. Development additionally needs to meet the requirements of Clause 4 of this policy which relate to building height and scale. The requirements of Clause 4 are not related to the requirements of Clause 1.

2. No prevailing streetscape applies to, but is not limited to, instances where development is proposed on a lot where there are no other Grouped Dwellings or Single Houses adjoining the lot (three either side) that front the same street. Examples include situations where the lot is the first to develop on a new street or right of way, or development of a lot that adjoins a commercial property.

2. Setback of Garages and Carports not under the main roof of the development

2.1 Garages, carports and outbuildings, except as provided for below, are to be setback in line with or behind the front wall of the dwelling.

2.2 Where the property is not on the Heritage List, carports may be located in front of the dwelling where the development meets all of the following criteria:

i. The carport is open on all sides with no door; and

ii. The carport is constructed from timber or steel vertical supports no greater than 150mm in width in any direction; and

iii. The carport does not exceed an average of 2.8 metres in height above natural ground level; and

iv. The carport is located so as to maintain visibility of the dwelling from the street and surveillance from the dwelling to the street; and

v. The maximum width of the carport on a property with a frontage of 12 metres or greater or on a property with a frontage of less than 12 metres, the maximum width of a carport is to be 3 metres; and

vi. The carport is setback one metre or greater from any side boundary.

2.3. Variations to the requirements of clause 2.1 or 2.2 above may be considered, at Council’s discretion subject to the proposed development meeting at least one of the following criteria:
I. The proposed building is consistent with the character of buildings in the prevailing streetscape; or

ii. The proposed setback of the building does not result in a projecting element into an established streetscape vista by virtue of the road and/or lot layout in the locality or the topography of the land; or

iii. The proposed setback of the building will facilitate the retention of a mature, significant tree deemed by the Council to be worthy of retention (Refer also to LPP2.10 Landscaping of Development and Existing Vegetation on Development Sites); or

IV. The carport is lightweight in construction, appears simple in design and is visually subservient to the form and proportion of the dwelling. Additionally, the front setback area is designed in such a way so as to maintain visibility of the dwelling from the street and surveillance from the dwelling to the street.

2.4 Additional to clause 2.3 above, where the property is on the Heritage List the proposed development’s compatibility with and impact on the heritage significance of the property will be considered. Due consideration will be given to the heritage assessment prepared under Local Planning Policy 1.6 Preparing heritage assessments and approval will only be granted where the development is considered compatible with the heritage significance of the property.

3. Building Orientation

3.1 Buildings shall be orientated parallel with the front boundary of the property with front doors and windows facing and clearly visible from the street.

3.2. Variations to the requirements of clause 3.1 above may be considered, at Council’s discretion subject to the proposed development meeting at least one of the following criteria:

i. The building orientation is consistent with the orientation of buildings in the prevailing streetscape; or

ii. The proposed orientation is consistent with the traditional angular orientation of buildings, particularly in the case of corner lots where dwellings are typically set square to the corner splay of the lot; or

iii. The development is specifically designed according to solar passive design principles to achieve a significantly higher level of energy efficiency than would otherwise be achieved by complying with the orientation requirements, and has negligible adverse amenity impacts on adjoining properties; or

iv. The proposed orientation is required so as to retain a heritage listed building or a building in a heritage area.

4. Building Height and Scale

4.1 All properties not subject to specific provisions of Local Planning Scheme No. 4 or a local area planning policy (in relation to height), shall be subject to the category B building height requirements of Table 3 of the Residential Design Codes.

Note: Development additionally needs to meet the requirements of Clause 1 of this policy which relates to the prescribed street setback based on the development’s external
wall height. The requirements of Clause 1 are not related to the requirements of Clause 4.

4.2 Variations to the requirements of clause 4.1 above may be considered, at Council's discretion, subject to the proposed development meeting at least one of the following:

i. The proposed building height is consistent with the predominant building height of development within the prevailing streetscape; or

ii. A portion of the building is over height by virtue of a sloping site and the development is likely to otherwise comply with the requirements of clause 4.1 above if the site's natural ground level comprised of less slope; or

iii. The development does not result in any significant adverse impact on adjoining properties in regards to building bulk, boundary setbacks, visual privacy, access to views of significance and overshadowing.

5. Additions and Extensions for heritage listed properties

5.1 Where the property is included on the City's Heritage List and is not subject to specific provisions of Local Planning Scheme No. 4 or a local area planning policy.

i. Second storey additions to an existing single storey dwelling are to be setback behind the main roof ridge of the existing dwelling a minimum distance of four (4.0) metres; and

ii. Shall be designed and setback so as to retain the impression of a single storey house when viewed from the street.

5.2 Variations to the requirements of clause 5.1 above may be considered, at Council's discretion subject to an assessment of the proposed development's compatibility with and impact on the heritage significance of the property. Due consideration will be given to the heritage assessment prepared under Local Planning Policy 1.6 Preparing heritage assessments and approval will only be granted where the development is considered compatible with the heritage significance of the property.