FuturePerth:- Re: Claremont NEP Draft Design Guidelines, 22/10/2012

Mr Stephen Goode/ NEP Planning Committee
Chief Executive Officer
Town of Claremont
PO Box 514
Claremont, WA 6910
toc@claremont.wa.gov.au

22nd October 2012

Re: Claremont NEP Draft Design Guidelines 15/08/2012

Dear Mr Goode/ NEP Planning Committee,

I have compiled feedback on the Claremont NEP Draft Design Guidelines dated 15th August 2012. FuturePerth is an incorporated group of young planners, architects, designers and enthusiast who strive to be a ‘voice for forward’ thinking in the development of our city. Our support base consists of approximately five hundred young people throughout Perth, including the Western Suburbs. This feedback has been summarised to represent our committee and supporters. We are non-profit, non-partisan organisation and do not have any conflicting interests within this development.

We are strong advocates for large redevelopment projects, especially those increasing residential density within Perth’s existing built area. We are extremely supportive of the development and the Claremont NEP and see it as a pivotal step forwards in consolidating the identity of this suburb.

We are impressed with the extensive design recommendations and suggestions entailed within your guidelines. We believe that the proposal complements existing facilities and ensures that Claremont
remains a key activity hub within Perth’s Western Suburbs. Particularly positive issues of note include:

- 5.5.5: Cycle bay, locker and shower requirements
- 4.7 Public art incorporated into urban design
- 5.2.7, 5.3.8: The use of lighting to highlight entrances, create ambient night time environments and enhance security
- 4.10: Significant clarity in the signage policy, we would also like to see mention of external advertising in this policy (we are generally in favour of such signage as it aids in place-making and way-finding)
- 4.2: Exclusion of blank walls in the public domain
- We applaud your minimum floor details in the site plan to encourage density

We have a number of potential areas of discussion including:

- Our full support of a 6.0m POS interface (condition 2 on page 22 lot 504) and the broader suggestion of laneways and active pedestrian spaces. We are concerned that the proposed residential density may not be high enough to activate these spaces.
- Wind-tunnel effects of maintaining consistent roof heights as proposed on page six, we believe that a variety of built forms would add diversity without contributing to this.
- The particular specifications in section 5.2.5 regarding roof forms to provide character. We fully support the use of roofed areas as paved outdoor gardens and community POS. Including this in the detailed area plans would ensure that developers incorporate greater commercial and residential uses into roof spaces.
- 5.2.6: Would like to see more detail about specific examples of materials that could be used to exemplify ‘high quality urban aesthetic’. We believe the existing Claremont Quarter’s prefabricated concrete structures do not exemplify the high standards we believe developers should be aiming to maintain Claremont’s character.

We also have a number of concerns with the current draft plan which we believe may require addressing to fully meet community needs. These include:

1. Scale

We believe that the design guidelines could be more ambitious in their scale.

We understand there are relevant local planning constraints but are of the opinion that the detailed area plan height limits/density targets are too conservative and may not represent value/return for investors hence not facilitate affordability. In particular we would like to see additional height added to lots 509, 508 and 506 as we believe these will become the anchor residential sites.

2. Diversity & Affordability

We believe more diversity and affordability is needed to fit community needs.

Lots 515-526 and the proposed percentage of studio apartments within the precinct are a welcome start to adding housing diversity within the Claremont NEP. The draft guidelines state that housing diversity will be promoted by ‘creating a new housing offer that meets challenging needs but retains
a sense of being ‘home’ that is private, comfortable all year round and grows in value’. We would like to see a commitment to affordability to ensure that the precinct has high owner-occupancy rates and is accessible to locals. This diversity could be encouraged through developers engaging with a scheme such as Keystart and would lead to a diverse and vibrant community mix. In particular we would like to see a stronger commitment to offering opportunities for lower income, CALD and aging-in-place populations.

Section 4.5.2 does not sufficiently explain this.

3. **POS/Community Space**

*We believe an emphasis on quality community space will serve to inspire the residential population.*

We note that there is provision of POS in site 506 however we would like to see a far greater emphasis on community functions within the development site/s. FuturePerth has been part of a local Claremont focus session with another similar organisation and we concluded that the community were interested in the provision of a facility such as hall, public garden or meeting room.

4. **Site Plans**

*We would like to see more detail in the site plans to be able to make a thorough assessment.*

Many thanks for providing us with the opportunity to impart our feedback. We support your vision and look forward to receiving further updates on this development.

---

Dr John van Bockxmeer (6009)

On behalf of the FuturePerth Committee and supporters