

Deputation

**UP24/54- Canning Bridge Activity Centre Plan Review- Further Information Request-
Department of Planning Lands and Heritage**

Mr D Kenny, Applecross



Deputation OMC 19 November 2024
CBACP Review – FIR - DPLH
Council Reference Group

The Community has spoken – the message is clear – major change is needed

Comparison of Plot Ratio Scenarios

CBACP Review	CoM Recommendations		DPLH Scenario 1		DPLH Scenario 2	
	M10	M15	M10	M15	M10	M15+
CBACP Q1 and Q2 Zones	M10	M15	M10	M15	M10	M15+
Storeys	10	15	10	15	13	25
Plot Ratio	2.9	4.2	4.0	5.5	5.3	9.6
Minimum plot area, m ²	2000	2000	2000	2000	2000	2000
Maximum tower footprint, m ²	900	900	900	900	900	900
Maximum height above NGL, m	32	48				
Access & Services as a % Footprint	10%	10%	10%	10%	10%	10%
Maximum accommodation per level, m ²	810	810	810	810	810	810
Tower levels to fill plot ratio with minimum plot size, m ²	7	10	10	14	13	24
Plot area to fill plot ratio at maximum height, m ²	2793	2893				
Larger plot size, m ²	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
Tower levels to fill the plot ratio	11	16	15	20	20	36

EMC 28 March 2023

Plot density

CBACP - HRD Review	H4	H6	H8	M10	M15	Comment
Storeys	4	6	8	10	15	Bonus height 3, 5 & 10 storeys
Plot Ratio	1.0	1.5	2.1	2.9	4.2	HRD Review H6 not specified
Minimum Plot Area, m ²	1000	1200	1200	1800	1800	HRD Review H4 not specified
Total Floor Space, m ²	1100	1980	2772	5742	7560	Based on Plot Ratio plus 10%
Building Area after set backs, m ²	384	504	540	1248	1248	Based on HRD Review Set Backs
Maximum Tower Area, m ²				900	900	HRD Review
Levels to meet plot ratio	3	4	6	7	9	Based on HRD Review
Ground level open space, m ²	62%	58%	55%	31%	31%	
Podium open space, m ²				19%	19%	Not acessable to the public

Deputation to OMC 19 November 2024 – for inclusion in Council Meeting Minutes

Good evening, my name is Dayle Kenny. I am a member of the Council Reference Group that was endorsed by Mayor Gear to participate in the Canning Bridge Activity Centre Plan Review.

The Council's position on the review of the CBACP was concluded in April 2023 and forwarded to DPLH for assessment and WA Planning Commission approval.

The latest further information request is to add two plot ratio scenarios to the assessment of the financial benefit of bonus heights in the M10 and M15 zones of the Kintail and Ogilvie Quarters.

These plot ratio scenarios with a maximum 900m² tower footprint are:

Scenario 1	M10	4.0	
	M15	5.5	
Scenario 2	M10	5.3	
	M15, M15+	9.6	

M15+ was not included in the Council's recommendations, it is a 25 storey zone proposed by HRD.

Council's recommended plot ratios for these zones are:

M10	2.9,	with no bonus height,
M15	4.2,	with no bonus height,
M15+	not accepted.	

Built form in the CBAC is currently based on a building envelope defined by boundary setbacks, tower footprint and building height, leaving aside podiums. Plot ratios are not specified and have not been tested at Canning Bridge.

Plot ratios were proposed by HRD and were included in their advertised recommendations for the CBACP Review.

The CRG proposed building envelopes with greater setbacks and with no bonus heights, to ensure more open space, deep soil for tree growth, to preserve amenity, limit overshadowing and to reduce the psychological and structural impacts on neighbours.

A comparison of HRD's plot ratios and CRG's proposed building envelopes indicated there was a significant reduction in the number of dwellings per development.

There was an overwhelming support for CRG's position on height limitation and density, with 92% of the 588 public submissions in favour, and only 4% in favour of increased height and density.

Following the advertising period HRD recommended a 0.2 increase in the plot ratios for each zone. CGR's modelling indicated density targets could be achieved with this increase and accepted HRD's position and the plot ratios were accepted by Council.

The following table shows the Council recommendations and DPLH scenarios 1 and 2.

Points to note on the Councils recommendations are:

- Under the CoM scenario with the minimum block size, height would be limited to 7 storeys and 10 storeys in the M10 and M15 respectively;

- Also blocks in excess of 2,793m² and 2,893m² are necessary to reach the maximum height of 10 and 15 storeys;
- Again in the CoM scenario, for blocks greater than 3,000m² in both the M10 and M15 the plot ratios would be constrained by the tower footprint and maximum height limit;
- In summary, for the smaller blocks the buildings are constrained by the plot ratio, then and as the block size is increased, the buildings are constrained by the maximum tower footprint and height limitations.

Comparison of Plot Ratio Scenarios

CBACP Review	CoM Recommendations		DPLH Scenario 1		DPLH Scenario 2	
	M10	M15	M10	M15	M10	M15+
CBACP Q1 and Q2 Zones	M10	M15	M10	M15	M10	M15+
Storeys	10	15	10	15	13	25
Plot Ratio	2.9	4.2	4.0	5.5	5.3	9.6
Minimum plot area, m ²	2000	2000	2000	2000	2000	2000
Maximum tower footprint, m ²	900	900	900	900	900	900
Maximum height above NGL, m	32	48				
Access & Services as a % Footprint	10%	10%	10%	10%	10%	10%
Maximum accommodation per level, m ²	810	810	810	810	810	810
Tower levels to fill plot ratio with minimum plot size, m ²	7	10	10	14	13	24
Plot area to fill plot ratio at maximum height, m ²	2793	2893				

Larger plot size, m ²	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
Tower levels to fill the plot ratio	11	16	15	20	20	36

The plot ratios chosen by DPLH to evaluate are designed to fill the plot ratio at the minimum block size. Thereafter as the block size increases the height of the building would increase.

For example, a building on a 3,000m² block in the M15+ could be 36 storeys tall.

DPLH has requested this exercise to evaluate the benefit to developers of bonus heights and what, if any, monetary benefit the community should receive. The introduction of changes to the plot ratio adds another variable and a therefore a greater level of complexity and we believe will not necessarily provide a clear outcome.

The scope has been proposed for the benefit of bonus heights exercise. The development of the scope for the inclusion of plot ratio will add significant delay, cost and complexity.

I should also add that DPLH first received the Council's recommendations over 18 months ago, In three meetings the CRG has had with them since, the issue of plot ratios was not raised.

CRG's position is that the work already scoped to determine the benefit to developers of bonus heights should go ahead. The proposal to include variations with different plot ratios is of little benefit, complicates the issue, and is working contrary to community concerns.

Dayle Kenny
Applecross