



## CHAPTER 7 RECOMMENDED STRATEGY

---

The analysis on which the following recommendations are made is derived from the data from the population projections as discussed in Section 4.2 and the 2002 Commercial and Industrial Survey. These data sets have shown emerging trends in the inner and middle metropolitan region, including Melville, that indicate there may be significantly higher potential to support more retail floorspace than envisaged in the floorspace guidelines in the Metropolitan Centres Policy (2000). The Policy guidelines, which have remained unchanged since the 1990 Metropolitan Centres Policy, have underpinned the floorspace calculations in most Local Commercial Strategies up to now. We suggest that in view of the findings in Chapters 4 & 5 of this study, it is not appropriate to adopt them for this strategy.

Consequently the recommendations are based on the premise of higher floorspace guidelines and the recognition of the evolving roles of some major centres identified in Chapters 4 & 5 of this study.

### 7.1 SETTING THE SCENE

The era of greenfields development in Melville is over. The City is fully developed. It has a mix of residential suburbs ranging from old to new, including street patterns, housing styles and the distribution of commercial and shopping facilities.

The planned shopping hierarchy is also fully developed. From now on the commercial strategies will not be about identifying the need for new shopping centre locations and sizes, but how to retain and enhance the vitality, amenity, profitability and level of service of the existing shopping centre network. In Melville this network is quite diverse in form and function.

The older part of the City in the north, focused on Canning Highway, was developed on the grid street pattern at a time when movement was much more restricted. It pre-dates the introduction of Metropolitan Centres Policies. As a consequence shopping is more closely spaced and there is more of it. On the one hand it is more conveniently spaced, more walkable, more diverse, has more public domain, is more interesting with more restaurants and provides more opportunities for new entrants into retailing. On the other hand it is older, some is in need of renewal or redevelopment and some of it has been, and still is, diversifying into non-retail uses.

The newer part of the City is in the south, focused on Leach Highway and South Street. It was developed in recent times as a product of successive Metropolitan Centres Policies, when the car dominated the planning of suburbs and the spacing of shopping centres. In performance terms, these centres can be divided into two groups – the large centres (Regional and District) and small centres – (Neighbourhood and Local). The large centres are trading very well, perhaps too well. Most of these large centres are relatively new, or recently refurbished, trading profitably and offer a convenient grouping of shops under one roof with ample free parking on-site. However, there has been criticism that these larger 'box' centres are repetitive in style, carry the same range of shops, are aesthetically sterile especially when closed, have no public domain to speak of, and are monopolistic in the treatment of shop tenants and new entrants into retailing.

The smaller shopping centres, which are intended to provide local convenience shopping, are having chequered success. Some, such as the Brentwood Centre are trading well; others such as Bateman Village have failed and left the suburb without any meaningful convenience



shopping. Mostly the larger and newer Neighbourhood Centres are faring much better than the older and smaller local centres.

## 7.2 VISION STATEMENT

In the next 25 years the City of Melville will mature and transform from a suburban area into an inner city urban area. Housing densities will increase, family and household sizes will get smaller, but the population will have a net increase. Rising standards of living will translate into a demand for a more diverse range of centres and locations providing social, cultural, leisure and entertainment attractions available at all hours.

The vision is that in time, and in stages, Melville will achieve its long standing objective for the City Centre to grow and evolve into a centre with a multitude of land uses and activities, to become the social, cultural and entertainment focus of the municipality. Garden City Shopping Centre will be turned from an inward looking 'box' shopping centre to be an outward facing City Centre, focused on a new internal '*main street*', with shop fronts, mainly for restaurants and entertainment on both sides. It will connect Almondbury Road, through the City Square with Davy Street. Almondbury Road and Riseley Streets will be secondary '*main streets*' concentrating on offices and non-retail business. There will be other places of public domain where people have a right to be at all times. The surrounding areas, which now comprise the 'Frame' in the Community Planning Scheme, will transform into inner city living areas of medium and high density.

The older larger centres, especially the larger ones such as Melville and Petra Street, will be refurbished and consolidated to enhance their '*Main Street*' function, also making use of their 'Frame' areas. The existing smaller '*Main Street*' District Centres at Riseley Street and Canning Bridge will retain their present characters as multipurpose centres. Smaller Neighbourhood Centres and Local Centres will continue to be refurbished, and transformed into community centres by improvements to local streetscapes and the introduction of community socially based activities.

Bull Creek Centre will retain much of its 'box' characteristics, but will hopefully diversify over time to offer the local community more after-hours entertainment, restaurants and other non-retail commercial.

At Kardinya Park the process of refurbishment which has been successfully completed for the main centre will be continued over time to upgrade and refurbish the eastern section of the centre.

At the neighbourhood and local levels the use of good urban and streetscape design will be used to enhance the amenity of neighbourhood and local centres. These 'Community Centres' will become more harmonious and useful to the communities they serve. They will transform from being shopping centres to community centres in line with current Community Planning Scheme objectives - providing the focus and stimulus for community interaction both during and after business hours.

## 7.3 GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Given that the shopping hierarchy in the City of Melville is now fully developed as a product of the Metropolitan Centres Policy (2000) and its forerunners, the goal of this Local Commercial Strategy is to create the right conditions and opportunities for the long term sustainability and enhancement of the existing centres to meet the changing needs of Melville's existing and future community.



To meet this goal there are a number of objectives that are derived from the current Local Commercial Strategy (1993) objectives, namely:

- To promote the transition of the City of Melville from a suburban area into an inner city urban area, with all that this entails for the expectations of inner city lifestyles.
- To ensure that the centres remain attractive, readily accessible and provide for a wide range of functions appropriate to each level in the hierarchy as envisaged in Appendix 1 of the Metropolitan Centres Policy (2000) and presented as Figure 2.1 in this report.
- To achieve a more balanced distribution in the amount, diversity, amenity, public domain, and distribution of shopping between the northern half of Melville, north of Leach Highway, which is richly endowed and the southern half which is not.
- To promote the diversification of the larger single purpose centres such as Garden City, Bull Creek and Kardinya into City and Town Centres in the full sense of the words denoted for this level of centres in the Community Design Codes.
- To encourage the location of employment generating activities at centres – especially where these centres are efficiently served by public transport.
- To use whatever expansion potential may exist for any existing centre in the future to promote the objectives listed above.
- To consolidate and reinvigorate the older shopping precincts by the introduction of streetscape and other improvements to the public domain.
- To plan appropriately for retailing that is infiltrating the Myaree Mixed Business Zone while ensuring and that retailing is not allowed to infiltrate to the extent it becomes detrimental to the formal shopping centre hierarchy.
- To streamline the planning approval process to recognise and meet these changing needs.

## 7.4 PLANNING PRINCIPLES

### IN GENERAL

It is apparent in the administration of the Metropolitan Centres Policy (2000) and Local Commercial Strategies that undue emphasis is being placed on calculations of trade potential as the basis for justification of recommendations in Commercial Strategies. It is our experience that the Strategy Map, a stylised presentation of the location, existing floor area and future floor area of existing and planned centres becomes the strategy. We believe floorspace guidelines should be only one consideration in assessing the desirability of expanding or diversifying the existing shopping and commercial structures in Melville. Questions of aesthetics, urban design, community usefulness, amenity and safety should be the primary considerations.

Too much importance must not be given to the result of retail modelling or other trade area/potential calculations as the basis for retail strategies. There must be a clear understanding that the results of the retail model are intended to identify retail trading potential, and affect, in terms of supportable retail floor area. The retail gravity model is not the arbiter of good urban planning and it should not be seen as justification for rezoning or development approval or refusal for new or increased rights. Trade potential at any particular location should not be taken as the sole measure of over- or under-supply of shops because in today's highly mobile society local deficiencies are of no consequence. People have demonstrated a high propensity to travel to centres of their choice for a host of social, economic, aesthetic, planning and convenience reasons other than proximity.



In the Whitford City Appeal before Mr LA Stein, it was made explicitly clear in the judgement that calculations (modelling) of potential trade area potential were just one factor to be taken into account in the assessment of development proposals. Of equal importance are such criteria as community aspirations, accessibility, traffic, safety, aesthetics, amenity, site availability and compliance with Town Planning Scheme development requirements and the like.

## FOR MELVILLE

In Melville there is a considerable Policy imbalance between the amount of 'District' level retail floorspace and 'Neighbourhood and Local' retail floorspace compared to the proportional hierarchy contained in the Floorspace Guidelines in Appendix 3 of the Metropolitan Centres Policy (2000). The District Floorspace is over-provided and the Neighbourhood and Local is under-provided. However, in practice the existing arrangement works very well and cannot be considered out of balance.

With one exception, there is no evidence that this balance has produced an unsatisfactory or inefficient supply and distribution of shopping through Melville. The exception is the demise of Bateman Village, which has diversified into a business centre of no benefit or use to the local Bateman community.

There is emerging evidence in Melville (and other inner and middle metropolitan local authorities) that small local centres and corner stores are not competitive and are failing. Much of this has to do with the changing role of larger supermarkets, combined with the propensity of customers to travel for convenience shopping taking over the role of the 'walkable' convenience store. Bateman Village, for example, was formerly a Neighbourhood Centre of the order of 2,500m<sup>2</sup> nla based on a large supermarket. It is now down to one small deli, despite having been assessed as having expansion potential in the current (1993) Local Commercial Strategy.

Partly for historical reasons, but mostly because of the Metropolitan Centres Policy (2000) and its forerunners, there is a noticeable imbalance in the quantity, diversity and quality of shopping between the north and south of Melville, with Leach Highway as the divide. Most shopping in the northern part, focused on Canning Highway was developed prior to the Centres Policy era. There is more '*Main Street*' shopping, more public domain, greater variety, many more ancillary commercial services, more restaurants and leisure/entertainment, more opportunity for new entrants to retailing and a much better distribution in terms of 'walkability'. In the north this is being further promoted by the zoning of centre 'Frames' to increase opportunities.

In the south (south of Leach Highway) the centres are sterile – especially after hours. There is virtually no '*Main Street*' shopping, no public domain, little variety, virtually no ancillary commercial services, very few restaurants, no leisure or entertainment, no opportunity for new entrants to retailing and a dismal distribution in terms of 'walkability'. In the south diversity is not being promoted because there is virtually no zoning of centre Frames around centres to increase opportunities.

## 7.5 THE ROLE OF THE 'FRAMES'

The City of Melville has introduced an innovative concept of 'Frames' around most of the shopping centres and Mixed Business areas into its Town Planning Scheme. The purpose is twofold;



- To act as buffers or areas of transition between the shopping centres or mixed business areas and adjoining residential areas.
- To provide opportunities to enhance and extend the functions of the centres or mixed business areas.

The notion of a Frame is supported in this Strategy Review – with the recommendation that these Frames be considered part of the commercial functions of each centre or mixed business area – and therefore subject of this draft Local Commercial Strategy.

## 7.6 DEFINITIONS

For purposes of the recommendations made in this draft Local Commercial Strategy, floorspace assessments and recommendations are based on the description given in Section 4.5 of the Metropolitan Centres Policy (2000), namely:

*The shopping floorspace referred to in the Shopping Floorspace Guide in Appendix 1 (to the Metropolitan Centres Policy (2000)) and this policy is defined as in Planning Land Use Category 5 (but excludes hotels, taverns and nightclubs) of the WA Standard Land Use Classification (WASLUC). Uses such as banks, real estate agents, medical practices and showrooms are not included. The list of Category 5 uses is provided in Appendix 4 (of the Metropolitan Centres Policy (2000))*

*In calculating shopping floorspace of a centre, the shopping floorspace of the entire centre is to be included. This includes the total shopping floorspace within the retail zone and any shopping floorspace in other parts of the centre which are not zoned retail.*

No definition is given in the Metropolitan Centres Policy (2000) for the physical extent of a centre. For purposes of this strategy centres have been defined by the extent of zoning in the Town Planning Scheme and are shown superimposed onto aerial photography in Chapter 5 of this report.

It is important to note that the definition of a centre in this Strategy does not necessarily coincide with the configuration of Commercial Complexes used in the Department for Planning and Infrastructure commercial surveys. The reason is that complexes in the commercial surveys have been compiled for administrative and data collection reasons rather than on functional economic units.

The reason for raising the question of definitions is that there are significant inexplicable differences in the amount of retail floorspace identified in some centres in the current (1993) Local Commercial Strategy and this work. In this work GIS techniques were used to identify shop floor areas (as defined above) from the 1997 and 2002 Commercial Surveys for the areas falling within the physical extent of centres as defined for this study.

These differences have statutory implications for the maximum retail floorspace limits set in the Community Planning Scheme.



## 7.7 STRATEGY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR SPECIFIC CENTRES

The recommendations for the maximum 'Policy' NLA for Regional and District Centres is summarised in Table 7.1

**TABLE 7.1 SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR REGIONAL AND DISTRICT CENTRES IN MELVILLE**

Centre	2001- 2003 DPI Surveyed (Policy) NLA	Recommended Maximum Policy NLA at 2006	Recommended Future (MCP Policy) Floorspace Guide
GARDEN CITY (Unconstrained)	57,655	74,100	Use 2006 as Guide (on merit)
BULL CREEK (Constrained to 15,600m <sup>2</sup> )	15,363	15,600	Use TPS Cap (on merit)
KARDINYA (Constrained to 20,000m <sup>2</sup> )	15,322	20,000	Use TPS Cap (on merit)
CANNING BRIDGE Constrained to 5,400m <sup>2</sup> )	4,327	5,400	Use TPS Cap (on merit)
MELVILLE (Constrained to 12,000m <sup>2</sup> )	9,205	12,000	Use TPS Cap (on merit)
PETRA ST (Constrained to 9,200m <sup>2</sup> )	8,063	9,200	Use TPS Cap (on merit)
RISELEY ST (Constrained to 11,300m <sup>2</sup> )	6,350	11,300	Use TPS Cap (on merit)

**Note:** (Policy) NLA means only those types of shop/retail floorspace included in Appendix 4 of the Metropolitan Centres Policy (2000)

In the above Table 'on merit' means that we recommend that modelled floorspace potential is not the main criteria to be used in assessing development applications for expansion. Rather urban design, aesthetic, safety, and community utility criteria should count for more.

### 7.7.1 MELVILLE CITY CENTRE

Melville City Centre is not recognised as a multi-function City Centre in the Metropolitan Centres Policy (2000). It is identified as a Regional Centre called Booragoon. The Policy states that shopping floorspace should generally be confined to 50,000m<sup>2</sup> nla unless consistent with a Commission endorsed Local Planning Strategy or centre plan.

The current (1993) endorsed Local Commercial Strategy recommends 60,000m<sup>2</sup> (Policy NLA) retail floorspace by 2006. The current size (2002) is 57,655m<sup>2</sup> of 'Policy' shopping floorspace. A limit of 65,000m<sup>2</sup> NLA has been placed on the Centre in the Community Planning Scheme. *In our view this limit focuses too much on the artificial (retailing) boundary based on the local authority boundary. It does not take account of the areas outside Melville such as parts of South Perth, for example, which depend of Melville City Centre for their regional shopping.*

The floorspace requirements for any centre is essentially a product on two key factors:

1. The number of people in its trade area.
2. The socio-economic characteristics of its trade area population.

The higher these factors are, the larger the floorspace requirements of the centre which serves it.

The analysis, in section 5.2 of this report, shows that Melville City Centre has a main trade area with a population forecast to be 134,115 by 2006 and 148,145 by 2026. The application of the Metropolitan Centres Policy (2000) guideline of 0.61m<sup>2</sup> NLA per capita to these populations would produce 81,810m<sup>2</sup> by 2006 and 90,368m<sup>2</sup> NLA of regional NLA by 2026. In addition to this, our analysis in section 5.3 shows that the socio-economic characteristics of the main trade area could support at least 10% above metropolitan averages. The



application of the Metropolitan Centres Policy guidelines is based on metropolitan averages. In theory the socio-economic characteristics of the main trade area increases the floorspace requirements of Melville City Centre by a further 10% to 89,990m<sup>2</sup> NLA by 2006 and 99,400m<sup>2</sup> NLA by 2026.

For reasons stated in section 5.7 of this report, namely that the Local Commercial Strategy must allow for imbalances in the shopping centre hierarchy both inside and outside Melville, the application of the theoretical floorspace requirements illustrated above is not recommended. The modelling used in this Local Commercial Strategy takes account of the current imbalances, which may or may not persist into the future. These factors will be subject to future reviews.

The floor area recommendations for Melville City Centre in this section are not based on optimistic assumptions, they are based on demonstrable facts of floorspace requirements, which should be incorporated into the Local Commercial Strategy.

The recommended strategy for Melville City Centre is that the Vision currently being developed for the City Centre (at the time of writing) should be progressively implemented in stages over time.

The Vision embodies measures to remedy issues identified in the current (1993) Local Commercial Strategy namely:

- That pedestrian movement within the car parks should be improved.
- The 'legibility' of the centre as a whole should be improved.
- The (aesthetic and amenity) aspect of the centre to its residential surroundings should be improved.

The production and implementation of such a Vision Plan is provided for in the Community Planning Scheme.

The content and detail of the Vision, including measures to enhance traffic, safety and public transport efficiency, has been published under separate cover by the City of Melville. It will be subject to full public consultation processes before being adopted as an approved Centres Plan as envisaged by the Metropolitan Centres Policy (2000). The vision also provides for expansion of the shopping component of the centre.

Notwithstanding that the analysis in this report identifies that additional 'Policy' retail floorspace can be supported at the Melville City Centre location without undue impact on other existing centres, it does not constitute a recommendation that it should be developed. Expansion should only occur if it is in accordance with the approved Vision Centre Plan and it demonstrably meets the aforementioned criteria.

Staging of any expansion to the 'Policy' retail shopping component of the Vision should not exceed:

- 74,100m<sup>2</sup> nla by 2006.
- 77,400m<sup>2</sup> nla by 2026.

These floorspace guidelines for 2006 should be incorporated into the Community Planning Scheme.

The Frame around Melville City Centre, especially on the northern side, across Almondbury Road plays an important role in the Vision. It transforms 'Booragoon Regional Centre' into Melville City Centre.



### 7.7.2 CANNING BRIDGE CENTRE

Canning Bridge Centre is classified as a 'Main Street' District Centre in the Metropolitan Centres Policy (2000). It is designated as DC1 on the Community Planning Scheme Map.

The Statement of Intent in the Community Planning Scheme for this centre is:

*Primarily retail shopping, tourist facilities, motel/hotel, office and licensed restaurants, with residential uses encouraged. Access to car parking areas on Lots 1, 2 and 3 Canning Highway and Lot 6 Sleat Road and over Lot 5 Sleat Road, shall be maintained at all times. The Council may prepare urban design guidelines for the precinct.*

Our analysis in Section 5.5.4 of this Report shows that retail is not the prime use in this centre. It constitutes only 12% of the commercial floor area. Offices are the primary use with 54% of the commercial floor area, most of which is regionally orientated (ie serves outside the district) and serves no local purpose. Canning Bridge centre has a district-wide or even region-wide influence, but as an office and entertainment centre rather than a shopping centre.

As a shopping centre it does not even serve an appropriate neighbourhood convenience shopping function. It has an existing 'Policy' retail floor area of 4,327m<sup>2</sup> of which over 50% comprise restaurants and take-away food outlets. Only about 2,000m<sup>2</sup> would be considered normal convenience shopping, making it a small Neighbourhood Centre. In this sense the Canning Bridge Centre is failing to provide adequate service to its district.

Overall, however, the centre has over 36,000m<sup>2</sup> of commercial floorspace. It is the largest office complex in Melville with over 19,000m<sup>2</sup> (54%) office floorspace. Another major component is the Raffles Hotel, in advanced stages of construction at the time of writing (March 2006).

In the current Local Commercial Strategy (1993) Canning Bridge is modelled as having 5,356m<sup>2</sup> of retail floorspace potential by 2006. The maximum retail floor area permitted in the Community Planning Scheme is 5,400m<sup>2</sup>. It is recommended that this be retained for the life of this Local Commercial Strategy - but should be reviewed if proposals are put forward which would increase the diversity of 'Policy' shopping at this centre.

At present Canning Bridge, as a District Centre, does not meet the Metropolitan Centres Policy (2000) policy objective of satisfying the weekly shopping needs of its trade area. To do this more retailing must be encouraged to locate at Canning Bridge. However, given the history of low key shopping development at Canning Bridge it is difficult to foresee proposals being made for any major shopping development that would exceed the cap of 5,400m<sup>2</sup> set in the Community Planning Scheme.

Our analysis is that Canning Bridge Centre will never become important as a shopping centre. It will, however, become an increasingly important office precinct. We endorse the recommendation in the current Local Commercial Strategy that the Council encourage office development in accordance with the objectives of the Metropolitan Centres Policy (2000).

The recommendation in the current Local Commercial Strategy (1993) that a Centre Plan or urban design guidelines for Canning Bridge should be prepared by Council is endorsed. The Centre is a designated 'Main Street' Centre in the Metropolitan Centres Policy (2000) and this presents opportunities. We consider that the Council should undertake the required planning because the issues are mostly to do with public domain. The issues for study include:



- Providing for better and safer integration of the centre either side of Canning Highway, where the volume and composition of traffic bisects the centre.
- The need for more public parking.
- Legibility of the centre as a whole
- Landscape and urban design.
- Heritage protection
- Promoting appropriate mixes of development in the 'Frame' that extend the commercial functions of the centre while being harmonious and compatible with the amenity of adjoining residential areas.

We recommend that the Centre Plan should include the Frame. It should be flexible and performance based rather than being spatially definitive or prescriptive in designating the juxtaposition of land uses.

### 7.7.3 RISELEY STREET CENTRE

Riseley Centre is classified as a 'Main Street' District Centre in the Metropolitan Centres Policy (2000). It is designated as DC2 on the Community Planning Scheme Map.

The Statement of Intent for this Centre in the Community Planning Scheme is:

*Primarily retail shopping, boutiques, small scale offices, restaurants and other commercial activities and residential.*

The Riseley Street Centre is located at the intersection of Riseley Street and Canning Highway. It has the benefit of excellent regional accessibility and exposure to passing trade. It is in an interceptory position to siphon some of the trade drawn past it to Melville City Centre. This is important because most trips to Melville City Centre are shopping trips – which are the right type of passing trade to have. Its location has made it one of the most successful 'Main Street' centres in Perth. It has maintained a strong trading position since the early 1980's despite the growth of (the then) Garden City shopping centre nearly trebling its size in the same period. That is not to say that there has not been a turnover of tenants and periodic vacancies in some shops, but this is normal for such a diversified centre.

Our analysis in Section 5.5.7 of this report shows that this centre is meeting the Statement of Intent. Its functions should be maintained and even enhanced.

The current Local Commercial Strategy (1993) recorded Riseley Centre as having 11,311m<sup>2</sup> of shop retail in 1991 and suggested that this centre would not expand beyond 11,311m<sup>2</sup> by 2006 and adopted that as the Strategy objective. The maximum floor area permitted in the Community Planning Scheme is 11,300m<sup>2</sup> nla.

According to our analysis the Centre had only 5,340m<sup>2</sup> shopping (Policy) floorspace in 1997 and 6,350m<sup>2</sup> in 2002. Our modelling (in an unconstrained mode) suggests that the centre could support about 7,500m<sup>2</sup> in 2006 and 8,600m<sup>2</sup> by 2026. This is well below the current Policy limit in the Community Planning Scheme.

We see no harm in retaining the maximum floor area of 11,300m<sup>2</sup> nla in the Community Planning Scheme, because it is a 'Main Street' centre.

The centre has been fully developed since 1991 in the sense that there is no additional vacant zoned land available. It is of note that modelling Melville City Centre has been made in the context of the Riseley Street Centre being constrained to support 11,300m<sup>2</sup> at Riseley Street. We therefore infer that there will be no significant impact on Riseley Street by the



implementation of the Vision at Melville City Centre. Nevertheless we recommend that the impact situation be monitored prior to each expansion stage at the City Centre.

Whether or how this additional shopping floorspace should or could be accommodated is a matter for future planning. In our analysis of this Centre in Section 5.5.7 we indicated that part of the strength and attraction of this centre was its diversity, both in uses and ownership.

It is recommended that this centre be encouraged to gradually diversify and expand to the limit of its capacity. However, it is recognised that as the centre is fully developed new redevelopment by way of the increased use of structures for parking (decks) etc should only be done in terms of a centre plan. Council should be committed to an ongoing program of maintenance and streetscape enhancement.

It is also recommended that Council undertake a Centre Plan with a view to promoting appropriate mixes of development in the 'Frame' that extend the commercial functions of the centre while being harmonious and compatible with the amenity of an adjoining residential areas.

#### **7.7.4 MELVILLE CENTRE**

The Melville Centre is classified as a 'Main Street' District Centre in the Metropolitan Centres Policy (2000). It is designated as DC3 on the Community Planning Scheme Map.

The Statement of Intent for this Centre is

*Primarily retail, but may include offices, other commercial activities and residential uses.*

The current Local Commercial Strategy (1993) identified the Melville Centre has having 11,906m<sup>2</sup> of shopping floor area in 1991 and recommended that this size be retained in the Strategy to 2006. We note that nothing eventuated from an evident wish by the owners of the Centre, reported in the 1993 Local Commercial Strategy, to expand to 20,000m<sup>2</sup>. The maximum allowable retail floorspace in the Community Planning Scheme is 12,000m<sup>2</sup>.

Our analysis shows that in 1997 there was 9,169m<sup>2</sup> of 'Policy' retail floor area, which had increased marginally to 9,205m<sup>2</sup> in 2002. We therefore recommend that the existing cap of 12,000m<sup>2</sup> in the Community Planning Scheme be retained.

The whole centre is aging and will need comprehensive refurbishment within 10-15 years. It is also fragmented. It is recommended that any expansion be tied to refurbishment and consolidation of the existing centre, including the possible linking of Dewsons supermarket with the Coles centre by an extended mall and making different arrangements for access and parking. If the assessment of existing retail floorspace is correct, there is room for enough expansion (about 2,800m<sup>2</sup> nla) within the maximum limit in the Community Planning Scheme to accommodate all forecast expansion potential.

We note that the condition of housing in the 'Frame' adjacent to the centre, especially at the rear, is aging with no signs of new development either residential or commercial. It is recommended that the Council undertake a Centre Plan with a view to promoting appropriate mixes of development in the 'Frame' that extends the commercial functions of the centre while being harmonious and compatible with the amenity of an adjoining residential areas.



### **7.7.5 PETRA STREET CENTRE**

Petra Street Centre is classified as a 'Main Street' District Centre in the Metropolitan Centres Policy (2000). It is designated as DC4 on the Community Planning Scheme Map.

The Statement of Intent for this Centre is:

*Primarily retail shopping, but may include offices, other commercial development and residential uses.*

The Centre is located both sides of Canning Highway and either side of Petra Street. The Centre straddles the boundary between Melville and East Fremantle. It is East Fremantle's main centre for weekly shopping trips.

In the current Local Commercial Strategy (1993) the shop floorspace of this centre in 1991 was given as 7,414m<sup>2</sup>. No expansion was recommended by 2006. However the maximum retail floorspace limit in the Community Planning Scheme is 9,200m<sup>2</sup> nla.

According to our analysis summarised in Table 5.8, the Petra Street centre had 8,340m<sup>2</sup> shop floorspace in 1997 and 8,033m<sup>2</sup> in 2002. We therefore recommend that the floorspace limit in the Community Planning Scheme be retained.

We recommend that the Council together with the East Fremantle Council undertake a joint Centre Plan with a view to promoting appropriate mixes of development in the 'Frame' that extend the commercial functions of the centre while being harmonious and compatible with the amenity of adjoining residential areas.

### **7.7.6 KARDINYA DISTRICT CENTRE**

Kardinya Centre is classified as a District Centre in the Metropolitan Centres Policy (2000). It is designated as DC5 on the Community Planning Scheme Map.

The Statement of Intent for this Centre is:

*Primarily retail shopping, but may include offices, other commercial development and residential uses.*

Our analysis in Section 5.5.3 of this report indicates that this centre is fulfilling the Town Planning Scheme intent.

Kardinya Park Shopping Centre, on the western part of the District Centre Zone has recently been refurbished and expanded by about 3000m<sup>2</sup> nla as recommended in the current Local Commercial Strategy (1993). However there is some discrepancy about the size of the centre. The smaller Farmer Jack's supermarket and commercial centre on the eastern part is in need of refurbishment.

The 1993 Strategy identified Kardinya as having 16,566m<sup>2</sup> of shop floorspace and recommended it be permitted to expand to 20,000m<sup>2</sup> within the context of a comprehensive development plan. The maximum retail floorspace permitted in the Community Planning Scheme is 20,000m<sup>2</sup> nla.

According to our analysis of the Department for Planning and Infrastructure Commercial Surveys Kardinya had 11,559m<sup>2</sup> of 'Policy' shop floorspace in 1997, increased to 15,332m<sup>2</sup> in 2002. This is so it leaves room for considerable expansion within the existing Community Planning Scheme limit.



We do not therefore recommend changing the maximum limit in the Community Planning Scheme.

### **7.7.7 BULL CREEK CENTRE**

Bull Creek Centre is classified as a District Centre in the Metropolitan Centres Policy (2000). It is designated as DC6 on the Community Planning Scheme Map.

The Statement of Intent for this Centre is:

*Primarily retail shopping, but may include offices, other commercial development and residential uses.*

There is no frame to the Bull Creek District Centre although other development and density opportunities may arise in the longer term as part of the Fiona Stanley TOD at Murdoch Station some 600 metres to the west. We note that the District Centre Zone includes the City of Melville Senior Citizens Home fronting Harris Crescent on the western side of the centre. The whole District Centre Zone is fully developed.

Bull Creek Centre was shown as having 15,548m<sup>2</sup> retail floorspace in 1993. No expansion was recommended. The maximum size limit in the Community Planning Scheme is 15,600m<sup>2</sup> nla.

It is evident from the modelling carried out for the 1993 Local Commercial Strategy that Bull Creek Centre had the second highest trade area potential for expansion in Melville after Kardinya Park. The latter centre was recommended for 3,500m<sup>2</sup> expansion. Bull Creek Centres modelled Relative Trade Performance Index of 0.92 in 1993 was substantially higher than Melville City Centre with 0.86. Yet 10,000m<sup>2</sup> of expansion (to 60,000m<sup>2</sup>) was recommended for Melville City Centre for 2006 which ultimately translated into 15,000m<sup>2</sup> expansion (to 65,000m<sup>2</sup>) in the Community Planning Scheme. The recommendation in the 1993 Strategy for no change at Bull Creek Centre was apparently based more on 'Policy' than 'Modelled Potential' criteria, because the 1993 model definitely shows significant expansion potential.

According to our analysis Bull Creek had 15,353m<sup>2</sup> nla in 1997 and 15,363m<sup>2</sup> in 2002. There has been a recent upgrading of the Bull Creek Centre in the period 1997 – 2002 that explains the marginal increase.

Bull Creek services an unusually large trade area. The centre also has excellent regional accessibility and exposure.

As part of the recent upgrade of the centre access into the parking areas from South Street has been improved. However, the disposition of some of the parking at the rear of the centre means that there is pressure for parking nearer the entrances, especially on the Benningfield Road side.

The modelling indicates that this centre is and will remain one of the most prosperous centres in Melville. It fulfils the Statement of intent in the Community Planning Scheme and the objectives of the Metropolitan Centres Policy (2000).

No changes to the 'Policy' floorspace cap in the Community Planning Scheme are recommended for this Centre.



## 7.8 NEIGHBOURHOOD AND LOCAL CENTRES (COMMUNITY CENTRES)

In the current Local Commercial Strategy (1993) it was found that there was a shortfall of 8,425m<sup>2</sup> of Neighbourhood and Local retail floorspace in 1991 which was forecast to rise to 15,540m<sup>2</sup> in 2006. The modelling at the time found that the existing floorspace at that time of 37,991m<sup>2</sup> post 1991 could expand to 45,000m<sup>2</sup> in 2006.

Our analysis shows that by 2002 the existing Neighbourhood and Local retail floorspace had decreased to 34,111m<sup>2</sup> of 'Policy floorspace'. However, it is not possible to conclude that this is an actual decrease in the amount of neighbourhood and local shopping because of the difference in the data collection and interpretation methods used in this study compared to the Shrapnel Local Commercial Strategy in 1993. However it is apparent that while some centres have expanded significantly, others like Bateman Village have fallen from about 2,500m<sup>2</sup> to under 200m<sup>2</sup>.

At the outset of this Chapter it was noted that the retail hierarchy in Melville was fully developed. There are no more Neighbourhood or Local centre sites to develop to make up the shortfall. Most sites have been developed to capacity.

Based on modelling undertaken for this study our recommendations for Neighbourhood and Local Centres is summarised in the following Table.

**TABLE 7.2 SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR NEIGHBOURHOOD AND LOCAL CENTRES IN MELVILLE**

Centre Name	2001-2003 Existing (MCP Policy) NLA	2006 Modelled Potential (Two Centres Constrained)	2026 Modelled Potential (Two Centres Constrained)	Recommended Future (MCP Policy) Floorspace Guide
McKIMMIE RD NTH	2540	1616	1800	Use Existing Size - allow minor fluctuations
WINTHROP	3401	5651	6216	Use MCP Policy (4,500 on merit)
APPLECROSS (Constrained)	3572	4000	4000	Use TPS Cap - allow minor fluctuations
FARRINGTON	3674	6188	6761	Use MCP Policy (4,500 on merit)
PARRY AVE	1980	5559	6004	Use MCP Policy (4,500 on merit)
BATEMAN VILLAGE	433	2447	2500	Allow up to originally approved NLA
HISLOP RD (Constrained)	1652	2760	2760	Use TPS Cap - allow minor fluctuations
MYAREE	3572	3247	3660	Use Existing Size - allow minor fluctuations
NORTH LAKE RD	1182	1309	1491	Use 2006 as Guide (on merit)
BRENTWOOD	1346	2661	2880	Use 2006 as Guide (on merit)
ATTADALE	1082	640	703	Use Existing Size - allow minor fluctuations
WILLAGEE	1198	1765	1971	Use 2006 as Guide (on merit)
MARMION ST	1075	846	945	Use Existing Size - allow minor fluctuations
WEBBER ST	1034	663	738	Use Existing Size - allow minor fluctuations
MT PLEASANT	815	1608	1784	Use 2006 as Guide (on merit)
PALMYRA	940	586	647	Use Existing Size - allow minor fluctuations
BRISTOL AVE	745	463	516	Use Existing Size - allow minor fluctuations
MELVILLE FRESH	700	681	762	Use Existing Size - allow minor fluctuations
ALFRED COVE	560	761	865	Use 2006 as Guide (on merit)
CASTLE HILL	535	227	253	Use Existing Size - allow minor fluctuations
BAWDON	330	263	293	Use Existing Size - allow minor fluctuations
SOMERVILLE	310	499	558	Use 2006 as Guide (on merit)
ARCHIBALD ST	354	445	496	Use 2006 as Guide (on merit)
YEE SENG ORIENTAL SUPERM	350	341	381	Use Existing Size - allow minor fluctuations
McKIMMIE STH	255	179	198	Use Existing Size - allow minor fluctuations
GIBSON ST	190	228	260	Use Existing Size - allow minor fluctuations
GLENELG ST	173	239	274	Use Existing Size - allow minor fluctuations
REYNOLDS RD/HWY	85	97	112	Use Existing Size - allow minor fluctuations
HARRISON ST WILLAGEE	71	73	81	Use Existing Size - allow minor fluctuations

**Source:** Interpreted from Table 5.8

**Note:** (Policy) NLA means only those types of shop/retail floorspace included in Appendix 4 of the Metropolitan Centres Policy (2000)



In the above Table 'on merit' means that we recommend that modelled floorspace potential is not the main criteria to be used in assessing development applications for expansion. Rather urban design, aesthetic, safety, and community utility criteria should count for more.

Since the draft Local Commercial Strategy was published in December 2003 a new Woolworths supermarket and Post Office agency of 2,990m<sup>2</sup> NLA has opened at Willagee increasing the overall shop retail to 3,350m<sup>2</sup> NLA

Bateman Village appears to be an anomaly in the modelling done for this study and that for the previous Local Commercial Strategy by Shrapnel Urban Planning. All indications are that it should be trading well beyond its present NLA. The only explanation must be the poor design and placement of the centre. This is a good example to show that other factors aside from modelling determine the success of any particular centre - especially at the neighbourhood and local level.

We have not been able to identify any obvious opportunities for expansion on zoned centre sites. We recommend therefore that the Council adopt a pro-active and positive attitude to any proposals for the expansion of existing centres by gauging the merits of the proposal on urban design, functional and aesthetic grounds rather than on trade potential or impact assessments.

In our view increases in Neighbourhood and Local Centre size up to 25%, not exceeding 4,500m<sup>2</sup>, would not have significant impacts on the existing retail/commercial establishment.

We endorse the concept of Community Centres used in the Community Planning Scheme. The Statement of Intent for Community Centres is:

*Primarily community facilities, such as shops, schools and halls but may include aged persons housing and other medium density residential to take advantage of facilities. May include licensed premises, parks, religious, public, recreational, educational and medical uses, and small scale offices provided they are not developed to such an intensity that they disturb the precinct. Any additional retail facilities shall adjoin existing shops and shall be advertised in accordance with Section 7.5 (of the Community Planning Scheme).*

With the range of uses intended in Community Centres there are increased chances for co-location and shared facilities and services such as parking, loading and refuse storage. Even landscaping can be rationalised between uses.

In the interests of increasing opportunities for additional retail shopping at the Neighbourhood and Local level we recommend that the Council review its limitation of maximum plot ratio of 0.3. We see no reason why local centres, especially those modelled on 'Main Street' principles could not have plot ratios up to 0.8 or higher provided alternative arrangements to loading, refuse storage, on-site parking and landscaping can be made which still achieve high levels of functionality, safety and amenity. Proposals could be assessed on these merits.

## 7.9 HOMESTORES

We note the provisions of Section 5.14 of the Community Planning Scheme covering Corner/Home Stores. These facilities were somewhat of an experiment in Winthrop and Kardinya. Our assessment is that it is unlikely that such stores will become a significant feature of the retailing infrastructure in Melville.



We recommend that the performance of these stores be monitored for future strategies.

## 7.10 MIXED BUSINESS

Myaree is the only Mixed Business Area/Zone in the City of Melville.

The Metropolitan Centres Policy (2000) policy for Mixed Business Areas (Section 4.1.15) is that they should accommodate *bulky goods outlets, retail warehouses, hypermarkets, showrooms, service industries and small scale business uses.*

Bulky goods retailing (Section 4.1.9) includes *activities requiring large display areas associated with household goods, home improvements stores, automotive products, specialised goods and the like.*

None of these uses fall within the 'Policy' Metropolitan Centres Policy (2000) definition of retail/shopping floorspace.

In the City of Melville Community Planning Scheme, convenience stores and restaurants are permitted uses in a Mixed Business Zone. A shop is permitted only as an 'Incidental Use'.

A convenience store is defined in the Community Planning Scheme as meaning:

*Any land and or buildings used for the retail sale of convenience goods being those goods commonly sold in supermarkets, delicatessens and newsagents but including the sale of petrol and operated during hours which include, but which may extend beyond normal trading hours and providing associated parking. The buildings associated with a convenience store shall not exceed 300 metres gross leasable area.*

The Statement of Intent for Myaree Mixed Business Area is:

*An industrial area in transition to commercial use in accordance with the Local Commercial Strategy, accommodating retail uses of a bulky nature. Some residential use may occur. The amenity of the area is to be upgraded and attention given to landscaping all new development*

With regard to retailing the current Local Commercial Strategy (1993) recommends:

*That this area (Myaree) be recognised for what it is and what it is rapidly becoming – a mixed business area with a major retail component. It is recommended that the mixed business aspect be recognised and planned for, but that the establishment of retail uses which would be more appropriately be located within the shopping centres be resisted and phased out.*

It appears that permitting restaurants and 'convenience stores' in Myaree is at odds with the Local Commercial Strategy, the Statement of Intent in the Community Planning Scheme and the Metropolitan Centres Policy (2000) because these are appropriate types of retailing for shopping centres.

An analysis of the Department for Planning and Infrastructure Commercial 1990 survey identified 12,658m<sup>2</sup> of 'Policy' shop retail floorspace in Myaree. By 2002 this had expanded to 18,168m<sup>2</sup>. This is the type of retailing that the current Local Commercial Strategy



recommends is more appropriate in shopping centres and which should be phased out of Myaree.

This analysis points to flaws in policy or its implementation. It appears to us that the *de-facto* situation should be recognised and planned for.

In recognition of the change occurring in the Myaree Mixed Business Area, the Department for Planning and Infrastructure has initiated, through the Omnibus amendment process, a proposal to amend the Metropolitan Region Scheme to rezone the area from Industry to Urban. Relative to this, the City of Melville has commenced an investigation of land uses within the area with the intention of preparing a 'Master Plan' for future development and land use opportunities within the Myaree Mixed Business precinct. The aim of the Master Plan is to establish suitable parameters for the creation of a 'true' Mixed Business precinct comprising retail, showroom, entertainment, office, service and general commercial and limited residential use on a precinct basis, along with standards for achieving an improved amenity through built form and streetscape design initiatives.

Further to this, the recently released 'Network City' document by the Department for Planning and Infrastructure identifies the Myaree Mixed Business area as an "Activity Centre" supporting a multitude of compatible uses.

Whilst the Council has yet to conclude the master planning process for the Myaree Mixed Business area, the likely outcome is that the area will no longer be designated 'Industrial', but rather comprise a series of specialised sub-precincts, commercial in nature and in a spatial arrangement that best fits the land uses currently occurring in Myaree. Low impacting industrial uses (i.e. mechanical repairs, limited manufacturing, hire premises etc) will not be excluded but recognised in a precinct basis. Likewise, retailing will not be excluded but limited to certain areas of the precinct that best serves the region and located where retail/shop outlets currently occur and in a 'main street' configuration.

The 18,186m<sup>2</sup> of designated shop/retail floor space currently within the Myaree Mixed Business area represents only 7% of the total floor area (265,000m<sup>2</sup>) of the area. Whilst this 7% of retail activity is technically contrary to the intention of Community Planning Scheme No.5, it is also evident that a demand exists for retail activity in transitional industrial areas, also that the additional retail does not obviously impact on the function of higher order centres such as the Melville City Centre. The issue for the City of Melville is to determine an acceptable level of retailing that can reasonably occur in the Myaree Mixed Business area that promotes orderly change and at the same time, does not compromise established shopping centres. As the City grows and businesses address market changes, it may be reasonable to permit moderate growth in the level of retailing activity at Myaree at incremental levels (e.g. 2,000m<sup>2</sup> per year) provided the proportion of retail does not exceed 10% of the total floor area of Myaree. Specific 'high order' retail activity such as department stores, supermarkets and discount department stores should not be permitted in the area in order to protect the established function of the Melville City Centre and district centres while 'main street' retailing of a mixed nature would be encouraged.

The City has lodged a corresponding Amendment No 47 to its Community Planning Scheme No. 5. Relative to this, the City has commenced an investigation of land uses within the area with the intention of preparing a 'Master Plan' for future development and land use opportunities within the Myaree Mixed Business precinct. Part of this Master Plan will be to convert Norma Road 'main street' in terms of Section 1.1.4 of Appendix 3 of the in the Metropolitan Centres. A 'main street' centre plan for Norma Road will be submitted to the Western Australian Planning Commission for endorsement in due course.



We therefore recommend that Council consider that:

- All shops, including restaurants and convenience stores should be made 'D' use under the Community Planning Scheme and subject to planning approval.
- Where shops are identified (using GIS analytical techniques on Department for Planning and Infrastructure Surveys from time to time) for which planning approval has not been granted, the shop tenant/s or owner/s should be classed as an 'Unauthorised Existing Development' under Section 7.14 of the Community Planning Scheme – a retrospective approval.
- That any approval granted under Section 7.14 should include the requirement that the tenant/s and or owner/s provide parking in the ratio required for District Centres or pay 'Cash in Lieu' as provided for under Section 5.8 of the Community Planning Scheme.

Such a process would be an equitable way of balancing the costs of establishing shops in Myaree with the costs developers of shopping centre zones face under the parking and landscaping provisions of the Community Planning Scheme. It might also encourage more shop tenants to locate into shopping centres – especially at the local level.

These provisions may be reviewed subject to the outcomes of the master planning process underway for the Myaree Mixed Business area and future review of the Community Planning Scheme No 5.