



Building sustainable neighbourhoods

LIVEABILITY AND DIVERSITY FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS

Housing Issues and Phase 2 Actions

June 2023

Report purpose

This report provides a summary of the key issues obtained through Phase 1 of the Local Planning Strategy review project. Phase 1 included:

- Community consultation undertaken by consultants Research Solutions
- Technical analysis, including:
 - a dwelling target review
 - housing supply and demand analysis
 - the analysis of all previous community consultations
 - a technical officer workshop.

This report also outlines the proposed actions to be undertaken through Phase 2 to investigate the key issues obtained from Phase 1.

Key Issues and Actions Summary:

Issues

- Lack of community alignment on preferred spatial location of density.
- Infill development changing the established suburban character in infill areas.
- Poor liveability and design outcomes for medium density housing.
- Poor sustainability outcomes for medium density housing.
- Loss of tree canopy in infill areas and resultant urban heat impacts.
- Increased on street parking in infill areas.
- Amenity impacts of infill developments on adjoining properties.
- Capacity of established infrastructure to service population growth due to infill development.
- Lack of developer contribution to neighbourhood improvement in infill areas.
- Misaligned developer and policy objectives and lack of policy understanding influencing built form outcomes.
- Complexity of planning framework results in difficulty to engage meaningfully with community.
- Reduced housing affordability.
- Limited access to housing.

Actions

Internal review/investigation:

- Develop issues investigation paper to:
 - Investigate potential planning mechanisms to address issues identified.
 - Summarise existing work done which addresses issues identified.
 - Summarise broader state planning influences which guide how the City can respond to issues identified.
- Undertake preliminary work to address the requirements of the Residential Accommodation for Ageing Persons Position Statement.
- Undertake internal review of the City's development application consultation materials.

Technical studies (consultant work):

- Undertake a review of the City's *Local Commercial Strategy* and update as appropriate.

Stakeholder engagement:

- Engage with service providers.
- Engage with industry bodies.
- Engage with the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage

Table 1 outlines issues identified as part of Phase 1 of *Building Sustainable Neighbourhoods* through community consultation and technical analyses and the recommended actions to be undertaken as part of Phase 2 to address them.

Table 2 summarises the outcomes of a gap analysis undertaken of the City’s current Local Planning Strategy to identify where strategic actions may require updating and recommends what technical studies and investigations are required to be actioned as part of Phase 2

Table 3 summarises a review of relevant state planning policies and position statements undertaken to understand whether technical work is required to bring the Local Planning Strategy into alignment with changes to the state planning framework. Table 3 also outlines actions identified to be undertaken as part of Phase 2 (as well as those that will be required as part of future phases).

Table 1 – Issue and Phase 2 action table

	Issue	Phase 2 Actions
Allocation of density	<p>Lack of community alignment on preferred spatial allocation of density.</p> <p>Issue description: Consultation outcomes reporting indicates a lack of community consensus as to where and how density should be allocated in the City. Comments are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discontent with the current allocation of density, specifically in medium density areas. • Preference for higher density around activity centres and along corridors, stepping down in density into the suburb. • Preference for density to be provided in precincts which include a combination of public transport infrastructure, commercial land uses, parks, and community services. • Some preference for medium and high-density housing options to be dispersed throughout the City to allow for a diversity of housing options in a range of locations. • Some preference for less concentrated, larger catchments of infill housing with lower densities to provide for a maximum of two or three houses on a block. • Transitional approach to density criticised as fragmentation of land makes it difficult for consolidation of density in future. <p>The supply and demand analysis indicates the following in relation to housing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The market demand analysis prepared by Urbis examines medium and high-density viability and success factors and finds broadly that market demand for these densities is influenced by amenity factors such as proximity to employment centres and commercial land uses, as well as access to public transport, public open space and views of significance. • This aligns with community preferences for density to be located in precincts which include the above amenity factors but does not align with other community preferences for a more dispersed lower density model. • It should also be noted that the City has an obligation under the strategic directions set out in the <i>Perth and Peel @ 3.5 million</i> suite of documents to ensure density allocation addresses the underpinning principles of urban consolidation. 	<p>Internal review/investigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issues investigation paper to undertake a review of the State Government’s planning framework to understand requirements and criteria for the allocation of density in the City. • Meet with representatives from the Department of Planning Lands and Heritage to understand the current approach to the allocation of density. <p>Further action to address this issue will be undertaken as part of the options development in Phase 3.</p>
Liveability outcomes for infill housing	<p>Infill development changing the established suburban character in infill areas.</p> <p>Issue description: Community consultation outcomes reporting indicates concern that new development in infill areas does not consider or maintain established suburban character. Comments are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General consensus that new dwellings in infill areas are less attractive and that the changing character of the established suburbs is an issue. • Preference for character differences between neighbourhoods in the City to be recognised and planning policy developed to ensure this character is maintained. • Preference for established streetscape character to be reflected in medium density infill developments. • Medium density areas would benefit from a positive, aligned vision of accepted design/character for low, medium, high and transitional density areas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No actions required for Phase 2 <p>Further action to address this issue will be undertaken as part of the options development in Phase 3 including but not limited to potential character studies for various planning catchments, and development of the local planning strategy in Phase 4.</p>

	Issue	Phase 2 Actions
	<p>Poor liveability and design outcomes for medium density housing.</p> <p>Issue description: Community consultation outcomes reporting indicates concern in relation to the liveability of infill housing developments in medium density areas. Comments are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design of contemporary dwellings built at a medium density result in compromised liveability outcomes for future residents including, loss of outdoor space, smaller bedroom and living room sizes, lack of ventilation and lack of access to natural light. • Infill development should be delivered in a way which maintains liveability standards for the existing community. • There is acknowledgement of the tension between developer priorities to maximise return on investment and planning policy objectives for liveable development. • Community and technical officers identified that affordability factors contribute to designs which often result in poor liveability outcomes. A common example occurs where a single storey family home is developed on a small lot. Landowners often are unable to afford to build double storey, so they compromise on room sizes, landscaping or outdoor living area. 	<p>Internal review/investigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issues investigation paper to explore actions currently being taken to address dwelling liveability in infill areas including but not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Local planning policies related to residential development ○ State Planning Policy 7.3 Residential Design Codes ○ Joondalup Design Review Panel ○ Any potential changes to the Building Code of Australia
	<p>Poor sustainability outcomes for medium density housing.</p> <p>Issue description: Consultation outcomes reporting indicates concern in relation to sustainability outcomes of infill housing developments in medium density areas. Comments are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consensus that increased building footprints on smaller lots have adverse sustainability impacts, specifically: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reduced tree canopy and landscaping ○ Heat island impacts ○ Less groundwater recovery ○ Increased energy use (non-passive solar designed homes) ○ Land fragmentation limiting future consolidation of density. • Some community preference for low maintenance housing typologies with smaller landscaped areas. 	<p>Internal review/investigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issues investigation paper to explore actions currently being taken to address sustainability in infill areas including but not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Local planning policies related to residential development ○ State Planning Policy 7.3 Residential Design Codes ○ Any potential changes to the Building Code of Australia
	<p>Loss of tree canopy in infill areas and resultant urban heat impacts.</p> <p>Issue description: Consultation outcomes reporting indicates concern in relation to the reduction in established mature tree canopies in infill areas. Comments are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased density corresponds with increased overall built area and therefore reduced tree canopy cover and increased temperatures in suburbs. • Preference for improved street tree planting in infill areas to allow for improved shading, and to compensate for the loss of urban tree canopy from infill development. • Preference for loss of green space and trees to be offset with additional greening and tree planting of public land (verges and parks) and the creation of additional green spaces within medium and high-density areas. 	<p>Internal review/investigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issues investigation paper to examine planning mechanisms available to local government to support retention of tree canopy. • Issue investigation paper to explore actions currently being taken to address urban tree canopy reduction including but not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Local planning polices relevant to residential development ○ State Planning Policy 7.3 Residential Design Codes ○ The City's Parks Development Program and Leafy City Program
	<p>Increased on-street parking in infill areas.</p> <p>Issue description: Consultation outcomes reporting indicates concern in relation to increased on-street parking in infill areas. Comments are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On-street parking is often the result of inadequate onsite parking provision for infill developments. • On-street parking results in compromised street safety for road users and pedestrians. 	<p>Internal review/investigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issue investigation paper to examine parking issues and options relevant to medium density infill areas.

	Issue	Phase 2 Actions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The established public transport network accessibility does not provide sufficient incentive for a reduction in personal vehicle ownership in the City of Joondalup. Therefore, given current transport behaviours in the City, infill developments with reduced car parking will likely result in increased additional street parking. Preference for visitor parking to be incorporated on site to avoid overflow onto the street. 	
	<p>Amenity impacts of infill developments on adjoining properties.</p> <p>Issue description: Consultation outcomes reporting indicates concern in relation to the adverse impacts of infill developments on adjoining established low density dwellings. Specifically, elements noted as having the greatest impacts on amenity were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overlooking/loss of privacy Overshadowing Impact of building bulk <p>These issues were also raised in detail in previous community consultations as summarised in the meta-analysis reporting.</p>	<p>Internal review/investigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Issue investigation paper to examine actions currently being taken to address impacts of transitional density change in infill areas including but not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local planning policies related to residential development State Planning Policy 7.3 Residential Design Codes
	<p>Capacity of established infrastructure to service population growth due to infill development.</p> <p>Issue description: Consultation outcomes reporting indicates concern in relation to the capacity of existing infrastructure to cater to increasing population as a result of infill development. Comments are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Question as to the capacity of the established road network and public transport network to accommodate increased trips/usage as a result of infill development. Question as to the capacity of established community infrastructure such as schools, main roads, water, power etc to accommodate increasing population as a result of infill development. Preference for sustainable transport infrastructure to encourage use of active modes of transport such as cycling and walking, as well as e-vehicles (e-bikes and e-scooters) in infill areas to reduce car dependence and improve connectivity. Preference for improved provision of state and local government transport infrastructure to support increased density. Preference for upgrades to social infrastructure such as parks, community facilities and other public spaces in infill areas. 	<p>Internal review/investigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Issue investigation paper to review and synthesise existing projects being undertaken by the City regarding infrastructure and service provision, to understand how the City is planning for delivery of community, transport and other infrastructure including but not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Integrated Transport Strategy Social Needs Analysis Parking and supply management plan Major road network review Bike plan Engage with service providers to seek preliminary information on potential capacity issues for various infrastructure portfolios. <p>Further action to address this issue is anticipated to be undertaken as part of Phase 4, strategy development, once a spatial option for the allocation of density is selected.</p>
	<p>Lack of developer contribution to neighbourhood improvement in infill areas.</p> <p>Issue description: Consultation outcomes reporting indicates preference for developer contributions to be sought from medium and high-density redevelopments occurring in infill areas to contribute to infrastructure and amenity upgrades in these neighbourhoods. Comments are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Preference for additional community infrastructure such as community gardens, upgrades to community halls/common spaces and park upgrades to accommodate additional population. Stakeholder commentary included in outcomes reporting suggests that in lieu of stringent landscaping requirements for developments, which can make a development unviable, developers should be given the option of developer contributions in lieu of achieving these provisions. 	<p>Internal review/investigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Issue investigation paper to explore issues and options for development contribution schemes for infill development.
Structural issue	<p>Misaligned developer and policy objectives and lack of policy understanding influencing built form outcomes.</p>	<p>Internal review/investigation:</p>

	Issue	Phase 2 Actions
	<p>Issue description: Consultation outcomes reporting and feedback from the technical officer workshop indicates issues experienced due to a lack of alignment between developer interests and policy objectives. Comments are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developer interests to maximise return on investment are misaligned with the intent and objectives of planning policy to establish liveable and sustainable development outcomes. • Developer interests often look to maximise bedrooms and reduce build costs (i.e., single story builds) to improve return on investment. This results in a larger building footprint often at the expense of open space and landscaping area on a site which compromises liveability and sustainability outcomes for the development. • It was also noted that in some cases, developers or draftspersons did not have a comprehensive understanding of relevant Local Planning Policies prior to undertaking preliminary design works for a site, and therefore would run into numerous issues once the development application is lodged, often resistant to then make significant changes to the established design for the site. • Stakeholder commentary included in community consultation outcomes reporting acknowledges that in many cases the market is driven by the interests of investors and not the interests of future residents. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Undertake engagement with industry to understand development influences and how statutory planning mechanisms may be able to influence better outcomes including but not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Urban Design Institute of Australia ○ Individual developers
	<p>Complexity of planning framework results in difficulty to engage meaningfully with community.</p> <p>Issue description: Feedback from the technical officer workshop in relation to the above is summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When engaging community members during the assessment of a development application, meaningful engagement with adjoining neighbours can be hindered by the complexity of the planning system which leaves community members feeling like they have not been heard or listened to. • For example, the City is not able to compel a developer to modify a particular design, where that design is compliant with the deemed to comply provisions of the R-Codes, even if a neighbour has objected to the design through consultation. 	<p>Internal review/investigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Undertake internal review of the City's development application consultation materials identify areas where greater transparency can be identified.
Housing supply, demand and affordability	<p>Reduced housing affordability.</p> <p>Issue description: Community consultation outcomes reporting indicates concern over the increased cost of housing. Comments are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns expressed in relation to both the cost of purchasing and renting a property in the City. • Need for more affordable housing options across the City, which give greater opportunity for community members to reside in their suburb of choice. • Concerns upcoding increases property values for established single houses, thus reducing affordability for that typology. • Acknowledgment of the need to make compromises on either price, location or dwelling type to access housing in the City. • Affordability concerns are most prevalent among the City's younger demographic, downsizers and renters. <p>The supply and demand analysis indicates the following in relation to affordability:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In 2021, 7.5% of all households in the City were classified as being in housing stress (spending more than 30% of gross household income on rent or mortgage repayments). • 2.3% of households had an unmet need for affordable housing in 2021. This is the percentage of households unable to access housing provided on the market without requiring rental assistance or being in rental stress for more than a year. 	<p>Internal review/investigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issues investigation paper to examine housing affordability broadly and identify whether there are any planning mechanisms available to local government to support housing affordability.
	<p>Limited access to housing.</p> <p>Issue description: Community consultation outcomes reporting indicates concern over the lack of housing available, the affordability of the available housing and the lack of diversity of housing options. Comments are summarised as follows:</p>	<p>Internal review/investigation:</p> <p>Issues investigation paper to examine planning mechanisms available to local government to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incentivise higher density housing in activity centres

	Issue	Phase 2 Actions
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too little housing available for purchase or rent in the City. • Limited diversity in housing typologies and location to meet community needs. • Undersupply of 'downsizing' housing options which prevents empty nesters from retiring in place. • Limited supply of aged care accommodation. • Concern over lack of access to housing is highest among young people trying to enter the market and people currently renting. • Stakeholder interview feedback identified the need for additional social housing/crisis accommodation for people experiencing homelessness. <p>The supply and demand analysis indicates the following in relation to access to housing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The market demand analysis undertaken has found that 89% of dwellings in the City of Joondalup are single detached houses which is indicative of the limited diversity in housing options available. • Population projections to 2041 indicate the largest growth in the retirement age bracket (64 and over). • Future housing modelling indicates the need for between 5,273 – 8,065 additional dwellings by 2041. • Modelling indicates there will be continued increased demand for alternative forms of housing to single houses. • Sales data indicates that when provided, there is an appetite for alternative housing types beyond single houses in the City. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support a diversity of dwelling types • Address the requirements of the WAPC <i>Residential Accommodation for Ageing Persons Position Statement</i>

Current Local Planning Strategy Gap Analysis

A gap analysis of the City's current *Local Planning Strategy* was undertaken to identify areas where strategic actions may require updating. The following outlines Phase 2 actions required to respond to actions in the LPS which were identified to have implications for the review of the *Local Planning Strategy*.

Table 2 – Current Local Planning Strategy Gap Analysis

Theme	LPS Action	Phase 2 Actions
4.3 Commercial Centres (outside the City Centre)	Actions identified through the gap analysis which were considered to have potential implications for the review of the Local Planning Strategy, related broadly to the City's commercial centres outside of the City centre and their operation.	Technical Study: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of the Local Commercial Strategy to update data and alignment with draft SPP 4.2 and SPP 7.2. • Updated Needs Assessment

State Planning Policy Review

A review of relevant state planning policies and position statements has been undertaken to understand whether technical work is required to bring the Local Planning Strategy into alignment with changes to the state planning framework. The following outlines actions identified as part of this review to be undertaken in Phase 2.

Table 3 – State planning policy review

State Planning Policy	Policy Overview	Phase 2 Actions
State Planning Policy 2.6: Coastal Planning (SPP 2.6)	SPP 2.6 provides for the long-term sustainability of Western Australia's coast and is relevant to local governments that contain coastal areas. The purpose of the policy is to provide guidance for	Phase 2 – Action not required. <i>Future action:</i>

State Planning Policy	Policy Overview	Phase 2 Actions
	<p>decision-making within the coastal zone including managing development and land use change, establishment of foreshore reserves and protecting, conserving and enhancing coastal values.</p> <p>SPP 2.6 outlines criteria for the consideration of development and settlement arrangements, including building height limits within local planning frameworks and management of water resources. It further acknowledges the importance of coastal planning strategies, coastal hazard risk management approaches, coastal foreshore reserves and community participation in coastal planning.</p>	<p>Action to address this State Planning Policy may be required as part of future project phases dependent on the outcomes of strategic options development. Anticipated to be Phase 4 – Strategy development.</p>
<p>Draft State Planning Policy 2.9: Planning for Water (SPP 2.9)</p>	<p>SPP 2.9 seeks to ensure that planning and development considers water resource management and includes appropriate water management measures to achieve optimal water resource outcomes. The policy establishes objectives relating to improving environmental, social, cultural and economic values of water resources; protecting public health through appropriate water supply and wastewater infrastructure; sustainable use of water resources and managing the risk of flooding and water related impacts of climate change on people, property and infrastructure.</p>	<p>Phase 2 – Action not required.</p> <p><i>Future action:</i> Action to address this State Planning Policy may be required as part of future project phases dependent on the outcomes of strategic options development. Anticipated to be Phase 4 – Strategy development.</p>
<p>State Planning Policy 3.6: Infrastructure Contributions (SPP 3.6)</p>	<p>SPP 3.6 sets out the principles and requirements that apply to the establishment and collection of infrastructure contributions in new and established areas. The policy establishes objectives to coordinate the efficient and effective delivery of infrastructure to support population growth and development; provide clarity on the acceptable methods of collecting and coordinating contributions for infrastructure and provide the framework for a transparent, equitable, and accountable system for apportioning, collecting, and spending contributions.</p>	<p>Phase 2 – Internal review/investigation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issue investigation paper to explore issues and options for development contribution schemes for infill development. <p><i>Future action:</i> Further action to address this State Planning Policy may be required as part of future project phases dependent on the outcomes of strategic options development. Anticipated to be Phase 4 – Strategy development.</p>
<p>State Planning Policy 3.7: Planning in Bushfire Prone Areas (SPP 3.7)</p>	<p>SPP 3.7 provides a framework in which to implement effective, risk-based land use planning and development outcomes to preserve life and reduce the impact of bushfire on property and infrastructure. The policy emphasizes the need to identify and consider bushfire risks in decision-making at all stages of the planning and development process whilst achieving an appropriate balance between bushfire risk management measures, biodiversity conservation and environmental protection.</p> <p>The policy applies to all land which has been designated as bushfire prone by the Fire and Emergency Services Commissioner as well as areas that may have not yet been designated as bushfire prone but are proposed to be developed in a way that introduces a bushfire hazard.</p>	<p>Phase 2 – Action not required.</p> <p><i>Future action:</i> Action to address this State Planning Policy may be required as part of future project phases dependent on the outcomes of strategic options development. Anticipated to be Phase 4 – Strategy development.</p>
<p>Draft State Planning Policy 4.2: Activity Centres for Perth and Peel (SPP 4.2)</p>	<p>Draft SPP 4.2 and its Guidelines applies to the preparation and assessment of the relevant components of planning instruments that relate to activity centres within the Metropolitan (Perth), Peel and Greater Bunbury Region Scheme areas. Draft SPP 4.2 seeks to provide a consistent approach for the planning and development of a hierarchy and network of activity centres that meets community needs, and provides economic and environmental benefits, enables the distribution of a broad range of goods and services, and facilitates retail, commercial and mixed-use developments.</p> <p>The policy identifies that a needs analysis should be prepared as part of the background analysis step of preparing a local planning strategy. The analysis (Needs Assessment) provides an information base to support decision making by including an assessment of projected retail, commercial and entertainment land use needs of communities in a local government area and its surrounds.</p>	<p>Phase 2 – Technical study:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of the <i>Local Commercial Strategy</i> to align with the requirements of the draft SPP 4.2. <p><i>Future action:</i> Further action to address this State Planning Policy may be required as part of future project phases dependent on the outcomes of the review of the Local Commercial Strategy and strategic options development.</p>

State Planning Policy	Policy Overview	Phase 2 Actions
	Draft SPP 4.2 encourages the preparation of precinct structure plans for strategic, secondary district and specialized activity centres. neighbourhood and local activity centres may require either a precinct structure plan or local development plan, at the discretion of the decision maker.	
State Planning Policy 5.4: Road and Rail Noise (SPP 5.4)	<p>SPP 5.4 provides guidance for the performance-based approach for managing and mitigating transport noise associated with road and rail operations.</p> <p>This policy applies where noise sensitive land uses are located within a specified distance of a transport corridor, new or major road or rail upgrades are proposed where works propose an increase in rail capacity resulting in increased noise. The policy also sets out specific exemptions for where the policy requirements do not apply.</p> <p>SPP 5.4 supports noise impacts being addressed as early as possible in the planning process to avoid land use conflict and achieve better land use planning outcomes. Considerations for decision-makers include ensuring that the community is protected from unreasonable levels of transport noise, whilst also ensuring the future operations of transport corridors. SPP 5.4 is supplemented by the Road and Rail Noise Guidelines.</p>	<p>Phase 2 – Action not required.</p> <p><i>Future action:</i> Action to address this State Planning Policy may be required as part of future project phases dependent on the outcomes of strategic options development. Anticipated to be Phase 4 – Strategy development.</p>
State Planning Policy 7.2: Precinct Design (SPP 7.2)	<p>SPP 7.2 provides guidance for precinct planning with the intent of achieving good planning and design outcomes for precincts within Western Australia. The policy recognizes that there is a need to plan for a broader range of precinct-based contexts and conditions to achieve a balance between greenfield and infill development. Objectives of the policy include ensuring that precinct planning and design processes deliver good-quality built environment outcomes that provide social, economic and environmental benefit to those who use them.</p> <p>Precinct types include activity centres, station precincts, urban corridors, residential infill and heritage precincts. These areas are recognised as requiring a high-level of planning and design focus in accordance with a series of precinct outcome considerations as outlined in the policy. The policy also encourages the use of design review.</p>	<p>Phase 2 – Technical study:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review of the Local Commercial Strategy to align with the requirements of the SPP 7.2. <p><i>Future action:</i> Further action to address this State Planning Policy may be required as part of future project phases dependent on the outcomes of the Local Commercial Strategy review and strategic options development.</p>
Residential Accommodation for Ageing Persons Position Statement	This position statement has been prepared by the WAPC to outline the requirement to support the provision of residential accommodation for ageing persons within Western Australia’s local government planning framework. The position statement seeks to achieve consistent strategic planning consideration of residential accommodation needs for ageing persons in local planning strategies and consistent statutory planning guidance to standardise land use definitions and zoning permissibility for residential accommodation for ageing persons in local planning schemes.	<p>Phase 2 – Internal review/investigation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issues investigation paper to undertake preliminary work required to address the requirements of the WAPC’s <i>Residential Accommodation for Ageing Persons Position Statement</i> to inform spatial options.
Draft Planning for Tourism Position Statement	<p>The intent of his position statement is to guide the appropriate location and management of tourism land uses through the planning framework and:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilitate acceptable development of new and evolving tourism opportunities • Provide high-level of amenity in tourism areas • Deliver quality land use planning outcomes 	<p>Phase 2 – Action not required.</p> <p><i>Future action:</i> Action to address this State Planning Policy may be required as part of future project phases dependent on the outcomes of strategic options development. Anticipated to be Phase 4 – Strategy development.</p>

