

ATTACHMENT C - LOCAL PLANNING POLICY 1.5 REVIEW - DATA ANALYSIS

Policy Application

The table below provides a break-down for each locality.

LOCALITY	TOTAL LOTS	APPROVALS SINCE 2008		COMPLIES		DISCRETION ALLOWED
DUNSBOROUGH	47	22	47%	13	59%	8
QUINDALUP	25	4	16%	4	100%	0
MARYBROOK	60	13	22%	12	92%	1
SIESTA PARK	57	8	14%	4	50%	4
ABBEY	73	8	11%	3	37%	5
BROADWATER	65	11	17%	4	36%	7
WEST BSN	88	17	19%	10	59%	7
GEOGRAPHE	141	25	18%	15	60%	9
WONNERUP	31	3	10%	1	33%	2
TOTAL	587	111	19%	66	60%	45 (40%)

These calculations demonstrate that in the majority of locations, the majority of development for which approvals were issued complied with the LPP provisions, noting that approximately 80% of sites have not been subject to any (relevant) development within the past 13 years.

Impact of built form on the streetscape – Setbacks

The table below provides a summary of how front or rear setbacks (as applicable) can vary for each locality. The 'required setback' is what is required by Table 1 of the R-Codes.

The approximate minimums and maximums are setbacks that were calculated through the desktop assessment, although it should be noted that variations may be less extreme within a street block (i.e. one street block may have varied from 5m minimum setback to 10m maximum).

LOCALITY	R-CODING	REQUIRED SETBACK F = front R = rear	APPROX MINIMUM SETBACK	APPROX MAXIMUM SETBACK
DUNSBOROUGH	R15	F = 6m	4m	15.5m
QUINDALUP	R15	F = 6m	6.5m	19m
	R12.5	F = 7.5m	5m	13.5m
MARYBROOK	R2.5	R = 7.5m	0m	67m
	R5	R = 6m	6m	47m
SIESTA PARK	R2.5	R = 7.5m	0m	56m
ABBEY	R15	F = 6m	3m	41m
BROADWATER	R15	F = 6m	2m	14m
WEST BSN	R15	F = 6m	3m	17m
	R15	R = 6m	3m	52m
GEOGRAPHE	R15	F = 6m	3m	18m
	R15	R = 6m	1m	17m
WONNERUP	R2	F = 20m	13m	26m
	R15	F = 6m	3m	15m

Impact of built form on the streetscape - Building Height

The following table provides a snapshot of single and double storey dwellings in each locality, as well as vacant lots. In some instances it was not clear from the desktop review whether a dwelling was single or double storey – these dwellings have not been included in the data below.

LOCALITY	TOTAL LOTS	SINGLE STOREY		DOUBLE STOREY		VACANT	
		Count	Percentage	Count	Percentage	Count	Percentage
DUNSBOROUGH	47	14	30%	32	68%	1	2%
QUINDALUP	25	7	28%	15	60%	3	12%
MARYBROOK	37	10	27%	24	65%	3	8%
SIESTA PARK	31	16	52%	12	39%	3	9%
ABBEY	65	31	48%	29	45%	5	7%
BROADWATER	56	20	36%	33	59%	3	5%
WEST BSN	81	38	47%	39	48%	4	5%
GEOGRAPHE*	124	52	42%	58	47%	14	11%
WONNERUP	29	9	31%	10	34.5%	10	34.5%
TOTAL	495	197	40%	252	51%	46	9%

*It should be noted that there are a disproportionately high number of vacant lots in Spinnaker Boulevard (60%) – use of this outlier would lead to skewed data and an inaccurate overall conclusion. Therefore these lots have not been included.

Rear Setbacks

The majority of affected lots in Marybrook and Siesta Park are located within the Coastal Management Special Control Area (CMSCA). Any future development proposals will be subject to assessment under the CMSCA and SPP 2.6. These higher order planning instruments consider impact on proposed development from coastal processes, the impact on dunes, and the impact on the landscape or scenic and environmental quality of the land. The aims of these instruments are similar to those of the LPP and it is considered that the LPP adds little additional value.

A portion of a street block in Abbey is subject to a rear easement. The purpose of the easement is unknown however it is noted that the setback distance is 10m or greater. Enforcement of this easement means that the policy loses effect and is irrelevant in the assessment of an application.

Street blocks in Geographe and Wonnerup to which the rear setback provisions apply are subject to separate development guide plans (structure plans). Older development guide plans tend to have development controls relating to the context of the site. The original 2007 *Residential Design Guidelines Policy* explicitly stated that where a development guide plan or detailed area plan applied to a lot, then the provisions of that plan would prevail. It is clear that the intent of the policy was that it should not override planning controls put in place for a particular development guide plan area.

Many lots to which the rear setback provisions apply tend to be heavily vegetated at the rear and therefore are not visible from the dual use path or coastal reserve – as a result, there is no perceived impact on the amenity of the reserve from building bulk