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The Town of Cambridge abuts the local governments of the City of Subiaco, City of Nedlands, City of Stirling, the City of Vincent and the City of Perth.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Town of Cambridge Local Planning Strategy (Background Analysis Report) has been prepared in accordance with the Town’s statutory requirements under the Planning and Development Act 2005 and the Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015.

The purpose of the report is to provide relevant background information and analysis which supports the strategic direction and key actions outlined within the Town’s Local Planning Strategy.

In accordance with the Western Australian Planning Commission’s (WAPC’s) Local Planning Guidelines the Strategy has been arranged in two main parts:

Part 1 – Local Planning Strategy

This part provides:

• The Town’s vision, planning principles and objectives which are to guide land use and development;
• Strategies and actions to deliver the desired outcomes within identified areas; and
• A framework for implementation and periodic review.

Part 2 – Background Analysis Report

This part provides:

• A summary of the relevant State and regional planning context;
• A summary of the relevant local planning considerations; and
• Local profile and key issues/opportunities which have been identified through analysis of the major influences on planning for the future.
1. INTRODUCTION

The Town of Cambridge is a Western Australian local government municipality encompassing a total area of 22km² in the central western Perth region. The Town is approximately 8km west of the Perth GPO, and is bordered by the local governments of the City’s of Perth, Nedlands, Subiaco, Vincent and Stirling.

The local government is predominantly suburban in nature, and is characterised by lower density suburban residential development, higher density urban development within district centres and along Cambridge Street, and large precincts of open space and conservation areas, including Bold Park, the City Beach and Floreat Beach Foreshore Reserves, Perry Lakes, Lake Monger, Alderbury Reserve and Pat Goodridge Reserve (Figure 1).

The key urban centres within the Town are West Leederville Activity Centre, Wembley Activity Centre and Floreat Forum, which are generally linked by the Cambridge Street corridor.

The Town consists of several suburbs, being:

- **City Beach**, which incorporates the western most quarter of the municipal area, and includes all of the coastal frontage along with Bold Park;
- **Floreant**, which incorporates the central region of the municipal area, and incorporates the Floreat Forum, Perry Lakes and Alderbury Reserve;
- **Wembley**, in the eastern portion, incorporating Lake Monger and the Wembley Town Centre;
- **West Leederville**, in the far eastern portion, incorporating the West Leederville Activity Centre, part of Lake Monger and sitting adjacent the West Leederville and Leederville Train Stations;
- **Jolimont**, a portion of a suburb shared with the City of Subiaco, to the central southern part of the municipal area;
- **Mount Claremont**, a portion of a suburb shared with the City of Nedlands, in the southwestern corner of the municipal area;
- **Wembley Downs**, a portion of a suburb shared with the City of Stirling, comprising of the Wembley Golf Course; and
- **Subiaco**, a portion of a suburb shared with the City of Subiaco, comprising of St John of God Hospital.

The Town had an estimated population of 28,339 people (ABS, ERP 2017) and this is forecast to grow to 31,940 people by the year 2026.
FIGURE 1: TOWN OF CAMBRIDGE LOCAL CONTEXT PLAN
2. STATE AND REGIONAL PLANNING CONTEXT

2.1 STATE PLANNING STRATEGY

The State Planning Strategy 2050 (June 2014) was prepared by the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage (DPLH) on behalf of the Western Australian Planning Commission (WAPC) to provide the strategic context for planning and development decisions within Western Australia.

The Strategy proposes that diversity, liveability, connectedness and collaboration must be central to the vision of sustained growth and prosperity for Western Australia.

The State Planning Strategy identifies the following six interrelated and interdependent principles which underpin and inform the strategy:

- **Environment**: To protect and enhance the key natural and cultural assets of the State and deliver to all West Australians a high quality of life which is based on environmentally sustainable principles.

- **Community**: To respond to social changes and facilitate the creation of vibrant, safe and self-reliant communities.

- **Economy**: To actively assist in the creation of regional wealth, support the development of new industries and encourage economic activity in accordance with sustainable development principles.

- **Infrastructure**: To facilitate strategic development by making provision for efficient and equitable transport and public utilities.

- **Regional Development**: To assist the development of regional Western Australia by taking account of the special assets and accommodating the individual requirements of each region.

- **Governance**: Building community confidence in development processes and practices.

The State Planning Strategy 2050 also seeks to facilitate sustained growth, sustainable communities, promote global competitiveness, strong and resilient regions, high capacity and adaptive infrastructure, and the conservation and management of natural assets within sustainable communities.

2.2 STATE PLANNING POLICIES

State Planning Policies (SPP’s) are prepared under Part 3 of the Planning and Development Act 2005 and provide the highest level of planning policy control and guidance in Western Australia.

SPP 1 takes the form of a State Planning Framework, outlining all of the State and regional policies, plans, strategies and guidelines which apply to land use and development in WA. Updates to this policy was gazetted in November 2017 (Variation No. 3) to reflect the adopted State Planning Strategy 2050.

The WAPC has adopted a number of SPP’s under the categories of:

- Environment and natural resources;
- Urban growth and settlement;
- Economy and employment;
- Transport and infrastructure; and
- Regional Planning and Development.

Although SPP’s do not have a binding effect, the Planning and Development Act 2005 requires local government and the DPLH/WAPC to have due regard to SPPs in considering applications and preparing or amending a local planning scheme and for the State Administrative Tribunal to have due regard to when considering an application for review.

SPP’s considered to be specifically relevant to the Town of Cambridge municipal area are outlined and described in the following sections.
2.2.1 ENVIRONMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES (SPP2)

The Environment and Natural Resources policy defines the principles and considerations that represent good and responsible planning in terms of environment and natural resource issues within the framework of the State Planning Strategy.

The objectives of this policy are to:

- Integrate development and natural resource management with broader land use planning and decision-making;
- Protect, conserve and enhance the natural environment; and
- Promote and assist in the wise and sustainable use and management of natural resources.

The policy covers matters including water resources, air quality, soil and land quality, biodiversity, landscapes and greenhouse gas emissions and energy efficiency.

Several measures are outlined in the Policy which recognize the significance of natural resources including:

- Avoiding development that may result in unacceptable environmental damage;
- Support for development which improves environmental restoration or enhancement;
- Protection of significant natural, indigenous and cultural features;
- Accounting for the potential for economic, environmental and social (including cultural) effects on natural resources;
- Take account of the potential for on-site and off-site impacts of land use on the environment;
- Ensure use and development on or adjacent to the coast is compatible with its future sustainable use for conservation, recreation and tourism in appropriate areas; and
- Support conservation, protection and management of native remnant vegetation.

2.2.2 STATE COASTAL PLANNING (SPP2.6)

The State Coastal Planning Policy provides for the long term sustainability of Western Australia’s coastline. There are pressures on the Western Australian coastal zone for land use and development for a variety of purposes including a mix of recreational, residential, industrial and commercial uses.

The policy deals with development and land use along the coast and on abutting land; the determination of coastal foreshores; risk and hazard assessment (including sea level rises) and management of physical coastal processes.

The key changes to the policy introduced in 2013 include new requirements for hazard risk management, adaptation planning and the preparation of coastal strategies and management plans.

The objectives of this policy are to:

- Ensure that the location of coastal facilities takes into account coastal processes, landform stability, coastal hazards, climate change and biophysical criteria;
- Ensure the identification of appropriate areas for the sustainable use of the coast for housing, tourism, recreation, ocean access, maritime industry, commercial and other activities;
- Provide for public coastal foreshore reserves and access to them on the coast; and
- Protect, conserve and enhance coastal zone values, particularly in areas of landscape, biodiversity and ecosystem integrity, indigenous and cultural significance.

The State Coastal Planning Policy also establishes methodology for calculation of setbacks for development near the coastline to account for future sea level changes.
2.2.3 BUSH LAND POLICY FOR PERTH METROPOLITAN REGION (SPP2.8)

The Bushland Policy for the Perth Metropolitan Region (2010) deals with Bush Forever areas and local bushland. The policy aims to provide a framework that will ensure bushland protection and management issues in the Perth Metropolitan Region are addressed and integrated with broader land use planning and decision-making.

The policy seeks to secure long-term protection of biodiversity and associated environmental values. In general terms, the policy does not prevent development where it is consistent with the policy measures and satisfies other planning and environmental considerations.

The three key objectives of this policy are:

- To establish a conservation system at the regional level (through Bush Forever areas and to operate within the clearing controls under the Environmental Protection Act 1986) that is, as far as is achievable, comprehensive, adequate and representative of the ecological communities of the Swan Coastal Plain portion of the Perth Metropolitan Region;

- To seek to protect and manage significant bushland recommended for protection and management for conservation purposes through a range of implementation mechanisms and as a collective and shared responsibility and general duty of care on the part of government, landowners and the community; and

- To provide a policy and implementation framework for significant bushland areas recommended for protection and management to assist conservation planning, planning assessment and decision-making processes.

The policy specifically involves the long-term retention of areas of environmental importance in the metropolitan region in the form of ‘Bush Forever’ designations and the support for the preparation of bushland protection at a local government level. The policy provides impact assessment frameworks for proposals which may impact regionally significant bushland and Bush Forever sites, which are further outlined in Section 4.1.

2.2.4 WATER RESOURCES (SPP2.9)

This policy provides clarification and additional guidance to planning decision-makers for consideration of water resources in land use planning strategies.

This policy aims to protect and improve the quality and ecological value of water resources and provides specific guidance for the identification and protection of water resources and catchments in the preparation of planning mechanisms and the consideration of planning proposals and applications.

The policy primarily relates to the protection of water resources, total water cycle management and the encouragement of the adoption of water sensitive urban design practices.

The objectives of this policy are:

- Protect, conserve and enhance water resources that are identified as having significant economic, social, cultural and/or environmental values;

- Assist in ensuring the availability of suitable water resources to maintain essential requirements for human and all other biological life with attention to maintaining or improving the quality and quantity of water resources; and

- Promote and assist in the management and sustainable use of water resources.
2.2.5 URBAN GROWTH AND SETTLEMENT (SPP3)

This policy aims to foster and facilitate well-planned and sustainable growth and settlement by establishing requirements for sustainable settlements and communities and the broad policy in accommodating growth and change.

The policy objectives are to:

- Promote a sustainable and well planned pattern of settlement across the State, with sufficient and suitable land to provide for a wide variety of housing, employment, recreation facilities and open space.
- Build on existing communities with established local and regional economies, concentrate investment in the improvement of services and infrastructure and enhance the quality of life in those communities.
- Manage the growth and development of urban areas in response to the social and economic needs of the community and in recognition of relevant climatic, environmental, heritage and community values and constraints.
- Promote the development of a sustainable and liveable neighbourhood form which reduces energy, water and travel demand while ensuring safe and convenient access to employment and services by all modes, provides choice and affordability of housing and creates an identifiable sense of place for each community.
- Coordinate new development with the efficient, economic and timely provision of infrastructure and services.

2.2.6 RESIDENTIAL DESIGN CODES (SPP3.1)

The Residential Design Codes of Western Australia (R-Codes) are a WAPC policy which controls residential development across the State. The R-Codes provide guidance on matters such as density, setbacks, privacy, streetscapes, open space, parking, fill and height. The development requirements vary according to the ‘R-Code’ which is designated to an area.

The R-Codes are currently split into Part 5 - design elements for single and grouped dwellings in areas less than Residential R40 and Part 6 - design elements for multiple dwellings in areas coded R40 or greater, within mixed use development and activity centres (the multi-unit housing codes).

The Codes stipulate ‘deemed to comply’ standards which represent one way that development can obtain planning approval, as well as ‘design principles’ for development to be assessed on merit value.

Local governments may vary the provisions of the R-Codes where a particular matter is locally important and requires specific planning/development controls, which can be achieved through Local Planning Policies and Local Development Plans or via specific provisions in a Local Planning Scheme. The Town has adopted local planning policies to provide further guidance over particular areas such as streetscape control or for specific development controls for new development areas.

The R-Codes and Multi Unit Housing Code are currently being reviewed by the Department of Planning, Lands and Heritage (DPLH) and the first stage of new policies have been released under Draft State Planning Policy 7 - Design of the Built Environment, which includes the draft Apartment Guidelines (refer Section 2.2.13).
2.2.7 HISTORIC HERITAGE CONSERVATION (SPP3.5)

This policy sets out the principles of sound and responsible planning for the conservation and protection of Western Australia’s historic heritage.

The objectives of this policy are:

- To conserve places and areas of historic heritage significance;
- To ensure that development does not adversely affect the significance of heritage places and areas;
- To ensure that heritage significance at both the State and local levels is given due weight in planning decision-making; and
- To provide improved certainty to landowners and the community about the planning processes for heritage identification, conservation and protection.

The Policy also sets out development control principles for properties and buildings with heritage values.

The properties identified on the State Heritage List and Local Government Inventory are outlined in Sections 3.4.5 and 4.9.5.

2.2.8 DEVELOPMENT CONTRIBUTIONS FOR INFRASTRUCTURE (SPP3.6)

The Development Contributions for Infrastructure Policy primarily aims to promote efficient and effective provision of public infrastructure and facilities to meet demands from new growth and development in a consistent and transparent way. Development contributions can be sought for infrastructure that is required to support the orderly development of an area or community infrastructure.

Infrastructure includes utilities and services to lots (water, electricity, gas, drainage, footpaths, roads, street lights and signage) but can also include community infrastructure such as community centres, sporting and recreation facilities, libraries and cultural facilities to enable communities and neighbourhoods to function effectively.

This policy sets out the objectives and framework for administering Development Contribution Plans for the provision of standard infrastructure in new and established urban areas and establishes a framework for charging development contributions which seeks to provide certainty to developers, local government and the community about the charges that apply, and how funds will be spent.

The policy has the following overarching objectives:

- To promote the efficient and effective provision of public infrastructure and facilities to meet the demands arising from new growth and development;
- To ensure that development contributions are necessary and relevant to the development to be permitted and are charged equitably among those benefiting from the infrastructure and facilities to be provided;
- To ensure consistency and transparency in the system for apportioning, collecting and spending development contributions; and
- To ensure the social well-being of communities arising from, or affected by, development.
2.2.9 ACTIVITY CENTRES POLICY FOR PERTH AND PEEL (SPP4.2)

State Planning Policy 4.2 ‘Activity Centres for Perth and Peel’ was gazetted in 2010 and guides the planning and development of new and existing activity centres within the metropolitan area. The Policy is primarily concerned with the distribution, function, broad land uses and urban design of activity centres and ensuring that centre development is coordinated with broader infrastructure planning.

The objectives of the Activity Centres Policy are as follows:

- Distribute activity centres to meet different levels of community need and enable employment, goods and services to be accessed efficiently and equitably by the community.
- Apply the activity centre hierarchy as part of a long-term and integrated approach by public authorities and private stakeholders to the development of economic and social infrastructure.
- Plan activity centres to support a wide range of retail and commercial premises.
- Promote a competitive retail and commercial market.
- Increase the range of employment in activity centres and contribute to the achievement of sub-regional employment self-sufficiency targets.
- Increase the density and diversity of housing in and around activity centres to improve land efficiency, housing variety and support centre facilities.
- Ensure activity centres provide sufficient development intensity and land use mix to support high-frequency public transport.
- Maximise access to activity centres by walking, cycling and public transport while reducing private car trips.
- Plan activity centre development around a legible street network and quality public spaces.
- Concentrate activities, particularly those that generate high numbers of trips, within activity centres.

Each centre is identified with an activity centre ‘core’ and ‘frame’, with the core identified for commercial and mixed uses and the application of R-AC (Residential Activity Centre) Codes with varying built form controls for residential development allowing for transition zones into the surrounding neighbourhood.

The frame is defined within a minimum 200m buffer of the core boundary and contains predominantly residential uses. The core and frame of activity centres are expected to be examined by local government for opportunities to increase residential densities.

Local planning strategies should guide the long-term distribution of retail and commercial floorspace and housing supply via a network of centres that:

- Capitalise on opportunities to revitalise activity centres in established urban areas, as a catalyst for urban renewal in the surrounding catchment;
- Provide sufficient development opportunities to enable a diverse supply of commercial and residential floorspace to meet projected community needs;
- Cater for a full range of needs from shopping, commercial and community services from local convenience to higher-order comparison retail/goods and services;
- Mitigate the potential for an over-concentration of shopping floorspace in large activity centres at the expense of a more equitable level of service to communities; and
- Promote the walkable neighbourhoods principle of access to employment, retail and community facilities by distributing activity centres to improve access by foot or bicycle, rather than having to depend on access by car in urban areas.

A Retail Needs Analysis is generally required to guide the preparation of activity centre plans, and generally address the projected population and its socio-economic characteristics, household expenditure and required retail floorspace, changing shopping patterns and trends and the needs of different retail sectors.
2.2.10 PLANNING IN BUSHFIRE PRONE AREAS (SPP3.7)

State Planning Policy Planning 3.7 (Planning in Bushfire Prone Areas) was gazetted in December 2015, and directs how land use should address bushfire risk management in Western Australia. The policy applies to all land which has been designated as bushfire prone by the Department of Fire and Emergency Services (DFES) and highlighted on the Map of Bush Fire Prone Areas (Figure 2).

The policy seeks to guide the implementation of effective risk-based land use planning to reduce the impact of bushfire on property and infrastructure. It applies to all higher order strategic planning documents, strategic planning proposals, subdivision and development applications located in designated bushfire prone areas (unless exemptions apply).

This policy also applies where an area is not yet designated as bushfire prone but the proposed development is planned in a way that introduces a bushfire hazard (e.g. revegetation). The accompanying Guidelines for Planning in Bushfire Prone Areas provide supporting information to assist in the interpretation of the objectives and policy measures.

The objectives of SPP 3.7 are as follows:

- Avoid any increase in the threat of bushfire to people, property and infrastructure. The preservation of life and the management of bushfire impact are paramount.

- Reduce vulnerability to bushfire through the identification and consideration of bushfire risks in decision-making at all stages of the planning and development process.

- Ensure that higher order strategic planning documents, strategic planning proposals, subdivision and development applications take into account bushfire protection requirements and include specified bushfire protection measures.

- Achieve an appropriate balance between bushfire risk management measures and, biodiversity conservation values, environmental protection and biodiversity management and landscape amenity, with consideration of the potential impacts of climate change.

The policy was released as part of the State Government’s bushfire planning reforms. The Bushfire Reforms focus on the Map of Bushfire Prone Areas, which identifies parts of the State that are bushfire prone. The identification of a ‘Bushfire Prone Area’ triggers the need for proposed development to undergo a Bushfire Attack Level (BAL) assessment prior to commencement.

The outcome of the BAL assessment will determine if planning approval is required and the bushfire protection criteria to be considered in the planning assessment process. The BAL rating will also dictate the applicable bushfire construction standards required under the building permit process.

The DFES is to review the map of Bushfire Prone Areas annually to give stakeholders the opportunity to suggest the addition or removal of Bushfire Prone sites.

Image: As a key natural bushland asset Bold Park is identified as a bushfire prone area.
Figure 2: Identified Bushfire Prone Areas (DFES 2018)
2.2.11 TELECOMMUNICATION INFRASTRUCTURE (SPP5.2)

SPP 5.2 Telecommunications Infrastructure Policy (2015) aims to balance the need for effective telecommunications services and effective roll-out of networks, with the community interest in protecting the visual character of local areas.

Using a set of land use planning policy measures, the policy intends to provide clear guidance pertaining to the siting, location and design of telecommunications infrastructure.

The objectives of this policy are to:

- Facilitate the provision of telecommunications infrastructure in an efficient and environmentally responsible manner to meet community needs;
- Manage the environmental, cultural heritage, visual and social impacts of telecommunications infrastructure;
- Ensure that telecommunications infrastructure is included in relevant planning processes as essential infrastructure for business, personal and emergency reasons; and
- Promote a consistent approach in the preparation, assessment and determination of planning decisions for telecommunications infrastructure.

This policy applies throughout Western Australia in respect of above and below ground telecommunications infrastructure other than those facilities exempted under the Commonwealth Telecommunications Act 1997 (Telecommunications Act).

2.2.12 ROAD AND RAIL TRANSPORT NOISE AND FREIGHT CONSIDERATIONS IN LAND USE PLANNING (SPP 5.4)

The policy aims to minimise the effect of traffic noise on residential development and other noise-sensitive land uses and ensure efficient operation of transport corridors are not adversely affected by incompatible noise-sensitive development.

The objectives of the policy are:

- Protect people from unreasonable levels of transport noise by establishing a standardised set of criteria to be used in the assessment of proposals;
- Protect major transport corridors and freight operations from incompatible urban encroachment;
- Encourage best-practice design and construction standards for new development proposals and new or redeveloped transport infrastructure proposals;
- Facilitate the development and operation of an efficient freight network; and
- Facilitate the strategic co-location of freight handling facilities.

A number of potential management and mitigation measures are outlined within the policy, including:

- Using distance to separate noise-sensitive land uses from noise sources;
- Construction of noise attenuation barriers such as earth mounds and noise walls;
- Building design, such as locating outdoor living areas and indoor habitable rooms away from noise sources;
- Building construction techniques, such as upgraded glazing, ceiling insulation and sealing of air gaps; and
- Planning and design of the road or rail project such as construction in cut, traffic management or the use of low-noise road surfaces.

SPP5.4 is currently under review by the WAPC. The draft policy was released for public comment in December 2017.
2.2.13 DESIGN OF THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT (DRAFT) (SPP7)

The Draft Design of the Built Environment policy addresses the design quality of the built environment across all planning and development types, in order to deliver broad economic, environmental, social and cultural benefit. It is also intended to improve the consistency and rigour of design review and assessment processes across the State.

### DESIGN WA KEY PRINCIPLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Context &amp; Character</th>
<th>Landscape Quality</th>
<th>Built Form &amp; Scale</th>
<th>Functionality &amp; Build Quality</th>
<th>Sustainability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amenity</td>
<td>Legibility</td>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Aesthetics</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Design Review and Design Skills**

A key component of SPP7 focuses on the opportunities for expert design review and improvement of design skills, and how this may assist local governments in achieving better design through processes that are consistent, transparent and focussed.

This includes the potential for amending design review practices undertaken within a local government, making use of a State Design Review Panel, and/or establishing a Local Government Design Review Panel.

This also includes the potential to apply requirements for skilled practitioners to design complex developments, such as apartments and mixed use developments.

Each of these opportunities is likely to become important to the Town as higher density development opportunities are identified, and greater reliance on built form design is required to achieve high quality private and public realm outcomes.

**Apartment Design Guidelines**

As a component of the suite of policy documents included under SPP7, the DPLH has released the draft Apartment Design Guidelines, which are ultimately intended to replace Part 6 of the existing Residential Design Codes (SPP3.1).

The Apartment Design Guidelines ultimately work to encourage good design outcomes by establishing higher baseline requirements for apartment developments, particularly focusing on:

- Creating greater levels of on-site open space for private and communal use;
- Retention of existing mature trees on-site where possible;
- Designing dwellings to take advantage of passive solar design and natural ventilation;
- Encouraging ‘attached’ dwelling types (boundary to boundary) in higher density areas such as activity centres and corridors; and
- Ensuring that internal living spaces are of a sufficient size and have access to natural light and breezes.

SPP7 and the Apartment Design Guidelines were released for public comment in November 2016 and are anticipated to be finalised in 2018. Once approved, the Design Guidelines will be applied to new apartment developments throughout the Town.

**House Design Guidelines**

The DPLH have advised that a draft House Design Guidelines are under preparation, which are intended to ultimately replace Part 5 of the existing Residential Design Codes (SPP3.1).
2.3 REGIONAL STRATEGIES

2.3.1 DIRECTIONS 2031 AND BEYOND

Directions 2031 and Beyond is a high level plan to accommodate future metropolitan growth from a population of 1.65 million (as of 2010) to an expected population of 2.2 million or more by 2031.

It has been estimated that to accommodate this level of population growth, an additional 328,000 houses and 353,000 jobs will be required. The preferred growth scenario to accommodate this future population is for 47% of the predicted growth (154,000 dwellings) to be met through infill development across the Perth metropolitan area. Of these 154,000 dwellings, 121,000 are to be accommodated within the Central Sub-region, which includes the Town of Cambridge.

2.3.2 PERTH AND PEEL @ 3.5 MILLION

In 2018 the WAPC released an updated strategy - Perth and Peel @3.5 million - with an accompanying series of sub-regional planning frameworks to provide a long-term growth strategy for land use and infrastructure for the Perth and Peel regions.

The Strategy sets out that Greater Perth currently has a population of more than two million people and it is expected by 2050 it will have a population of 3.5 million. The Central Sub-regional Planning Framework and housing targets have been updated, with the Town of Cambridge to provide for an infill target of 6,830 additional dwellings by 2050.

The aim under the new framework is for 75% of all new infill residential development (or 5,123 dwellings in the Town of Cambridge) to occur within ‘growth areas’ such as activity centres, corridors and station precincts and the remaining 25% or 1,708 dwellings to be provided as ‘small scale incremental’ development such as in existing built-up areas within traditional suburban streets.

2.3.3 CENTRAL SUB-REGIONAL PLANNING FRAMEWORK

Four sub-regional planning frameworks for the Central, North-West, North-East and South Metropolitan Peel sub-regions accompany Perth and Peel @3.5 million. The Town is located within the Central Sub-Region Framework which is shown in detail in Figure 3. The Central Metropolitan Perth Sub-region Framework, released in March 2018, provides a broad strategy for delivering the objectives of Perth & Peel @3.5 million and identifies a strategic plan of action, agency responsibilities and delivery timeframes by:

- Providing housing targets for each local government area;
- Outlining development opportunities;
- Investigating development potential of targeted growth areas, activity centres, urban corridors and transit oriented developments;
- Prioritising actions to revitalise activity centres and facilitating the supply, affordability and choice of housing in areas easily accessible to public transport and other essential services;
- Supporting the planning of land for employment and economic growth;
- Identifying key public transport and service infrastructure projects to support growth; and
- Informing all levels of government decision-making on the funding and implementation of public infrastructure.

The Central Sub-Region Planning Framework indicates that by 2050:

- The population of the Central sub region will increase from 783,000 to 1.2 million;
- There will be an additional 285,000 jobs (540,000 jobs in 2011)
- More than 11,000 hectares of land will be conserved for green open space (inclusive of existing open space); and
- An additional 213,130 dwellings will be needed to reach the infill target.
2.3.4 PERTH AND PEEL @3.5 MILLION - THE TRANSPORT NETWORK

As Perth and Peel @3.5million anticipates Perth's population moving toward 3.5 million, fundamental changes to the city's transport network will be vital to service growth areas and enable high levels of accessibility for work, education and other activities. In March 2018, the State Government released Perth and Peel @3.5million – Transport Network which summarises the transport components of the Perth and Peel @3.5 Million.

A number of projects across the Transport Portfolio will aim to support efficient and effective movement of people and freight that is integrated with land uses and links key economic and employment opportunities. One of the Government's key priorities to achieve moving people efficiently, while integrating with land use opportunities, is METRONET. METRONET aims to link diverse urban centres together and provide opportunities for greater density and infill development through multiple key suburban centres.

2.3.5 PERTH CAPITAL CITY FRAMEWORK

The Capital City Planning Framework is an initiative of the WAPC and was prepared to provide a vision and context to guide strategic planning and development of central Perth and its surrounding localities. The Planning Framework was proposed to provide a link between Directions 2031 and more detailed local plans and policies of the respective local authorities.

The core study area was defined as the City of Perth boundary, however, to ensure a fully integrated planning framework, a broader frame of reference taking in the surrounding local government areas of Nedlands, Subiaco, Cambridge, Vincent, Stirling, Bayswater, Belmont, Victoria Park and South Perth, was also included.

Key issues the Planning Framework sought to address are:

- Future population requirements
- Future commercial space requirements
- Future social and community needs
- Future transport requirements
- Governance

The spatial form proposed is conceptual in nature and as such the map provided in the Planning Framework is intended as a guide for local planning and how development in Central Perth could be structured according to a larger framework.
2.4 METROPOLITAN REGION SCHEME

The Metropolitan Region Scheme (MRS) applies to the entirety of the Town of Cambridge municipal area, and the area is primarily zoned ‘Urban’ as outlined in Figure 4.

The remainder of the area is reserved under the MRS as follows:

- **Parks and Recreation**, which is applied to the Foreshore area, Bold Park, Perry Lakes, Wembley Golf Course, Matthews Netball Centre, Henderson Park and Lake Monger, among other smaller precincts;

- **Public Purposes**, which includes the City Beach High School site and the Mt Kenneth Reservoir.

- **Primary Regional Roads**, which includes the West Coast Highway alignment, a portion of Oceanic Drive and the Stephenson Highway reservation; and

- **Other Regional Roads**, which includes Cambridge Street, Hale Road, Lake Monger Drive, Grantham Street, the Boulevard and Underwood Avenue.

There are several conservation areas included as ‘Bush Forever’ areas, including Bold Park, Perry Lakes and large areas of the coastal foreshore.
2.5 OTHER RELEVANT STRATEGIES, PLANS AND POLICIES

2.5.1 CITY OF STIRLING LOCAL PLANNING STRATEGY

The City of Stirling, which adjoins the Town of Cambridge to the north, includes a variety of urbanised and suburban areas covering over 100km².

The City has prepared a draft Local Planning Strategy, which is broadly based on the culmination of all the Local Area Plans it has prepared, whilst using the principles of the reviewed Corporate Strategic plan. At the time of preparing this report, the draft Strategy was open for public comment, concluding June 2018.

There are over 30 actions recommended by the draft Local Planning Strategy, ranging from Planning Scheme amendments and Local Planning Policy reviews to site specific projects. The main themes arising from these actions include:

- Focus increased densities around centres and activity corridors;
- Guide design elements of multiple and grouped dwellings throughout the City;
- Review residential capacity in areas where unsustainable growth can occur;
- Increase housing diversity in suitable locations;
- Expand on the existing local commercial centers improvement program to investigate potential density increases and revitalise local centres;
- Protect the natural and historic built environment;
- Improve sustainable transport options and reduce car dependency; and
- Provide for increased employment and commercial opportunities within the City.

2.5.2 CITY OF VINCENT LOCAL PLANNING STRATEGY

The City of Vincent is located to the east of the Town of Cambridge and is an inner city local government area which includes the suburbs of Leederville, Mt Hawthorn, Mt Lawley and part of North Perth.

A key project by Vincent is the Leederville Masterplan/Activity Centre Structure Plan. The Leederville Masterplan is a blueprint for the future development of the area. The Town Centre will incorporate adequate car parking, diverse housing choices, active uses such as retail, restaurants and cafés, office space and diversity of activities that will help create a sustainable and vibrant precinct.

The City is in the process of preparing an Activity Centre Structure Plan based on the Masterplan. The Masterplan area was also extended to incorporate the West Perth area around Newcastle Street to facilitate future redevelopment of this area.

In 2005, the City also completed Vincent Vision 2024 which sought to establish a long-range ‘community vision’ for a new Town Planning Scheme and to guide the strategic direction of the City of Vincent into the future.

In 2014, the City’s Council adopted a draft Local Planning Strategy. The objectives within the Strategy have been derived from the outcomes and visions created, in part, by the community through the Vincent Vision 2024.
2.5.3 CITY OF NEDLANDS LOCAL PLANNING STRATEGY

The City of Nedlands Local Planning Strategy was finalised and endorsed by the WAPC in September 2017. The Strategy primarily focuses growth on targeted infill areas along Stirling Highway, Broadway and Hampden Road, in addition to a number of identified development sites including Shenton Park Hospital.

Of specific relevance to the Town of Cambridge, the Strategy identifies the following:

Mt Claremont West
- Retain and enhance the character and streetscape of the existing residential areas, in order to protect the established character of this precinct.

Mt Claremont East
- Retain and enhance the character and streetscape of the existing residential areas.
- Comprehensively plan for the remaining non-residential areas.
- Land uses and development within this area shall not conflict with the urban character being predominantly of sporting and educational facilities.
- Minimise the encroachment of sensitive land uses and residential development within the Subiaco Waste Water Treatment Plant odour buffer area.
- Consider opportunities to consolidate and improve access throughout the precinct.

Floreat
- Retain and enhance the character and streetscape of the existing residential areas, in order to protect the established character of this precinct.
- Kirwan Street shopping precinct is designated as a local centre.

2.5.4 CITY OF SUBIACO LOCAL PLANNING STRATEGY

The City of Subiaco has prepared a Local Planning Strategy which has recently been endorsed by the WAPC. The endorsed LPS sets out the local government’s objectives for future planning and development and includes a broad framework by which to pursue those objectives. The LPS will set out the long term strategic planning framework for the next 10-20 years.

The City of Subiaco has nominated that the majority of new dwellings will be within and around nominated activity centres, within large under-developed sites or other large sites presently occupied by government institutions and already identified for redevelopment in the short, medium and long term.

This includes the following areas near the Town of Cambridge:

- Subiaco Activity Centre;
- Along Hay Street;
- TAFE site (Salvado Road);
- “Self-lock” storage site (Salvado Road); and
- Arcus site (Roydhouse Street).

At the time of preparing this report, the City’s Local Planning Strategy and Town Planning Scheme were being advertised.

Additionally the City has prepared the Subiaco Activity Centre Plan, which provides a long term planning vision to support the economic and social vitality of the Subiaco town centre as an attractive place to live, work, shop and visit (approved in November 2017). In 2017, the City also endorsed the North Subiaco Structure Plan which provides an implementation plan for the redevelopment of the North Subiaco Precinct in accordance with the Council endorsed Town Planning and Urban Design Study. The North Subiaco Structure plan has been forwarded to the WAPC for consideration and final approval.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy/Strategy</th>
<th>Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>State Planning Policies</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment and Natural Resources (SPP2)</td>
<td>The policy will influence land use planning within proximity to key conservation areas such as City Beach and Floreat Beach foreshore areas, Bold Park, Perry Lakes, Lake Monger and other identified bushland reserves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Coastal Planning (SPP2.6)</td>
<td>The policy will influence the acceptability and design of land use planning and development within proximity to coastal areas, which will impact upon future development within the City Beach area and along the coast.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bushland Policy for Perth Metropolitan Region (SPP2.8)</td>
<td>The policy will influence land use planning that may impact upon identified Bush Forever sites and local bushland, particularly Bold Park, Perry Lakes Reserve and the coastal foreshore area. The planning framework will need to demonstrate that the protection and management of the identified bushland assets will not be negatively impacted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Resources (SPP2.9)</td>
<td>The policy will influence land use planning and development that may impact upon water resources, which particularly applies to the identified conservation category wetlands of Perry Lakes and Lake Monger, in addition to encouraging water sensitive urban design techniques in future development of private and public land, inclusive of drainage and irrigation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Growth and Settlement (SPP3)</td>
<td>The policy reinforces the need to focus urban growth on existing centres where feasible to make optimal use of existing infrastructure and services, and support and reinforce local commercial and retail centres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Design Codes (SPP3.1)</td>
<td>The policy establishes a base standard for residential development that will influence the built form outcomes within the Town. It is noted, however, that the Codes are being comprehensively reviewed as a result of a focus on design based outcomes, which is anticipated to address some long standing concerns with the design of medium and high density residential development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Heritage Conservation (SPP3.5)</td>
<td>The policy provides guidance for future development control of properties and buildings with heritage values in the Town and will likely be subject to development pressure over time. This will be highly relevant in the review of the Town's Local Government Inventory and Heritage List.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Contributions for Infrastructure (SPP3.6)</td>
<td>The policy will become important in guiding any proposals for shared infrastructure cost funding for infrastructure required as a result of infill development into the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity Centres Policy for Perth &amp; Peel (SPP4.2)</td>
<td>The policy provides guidance on activity centre planning for identified activity centres, which include West Leederville, Wembley and Floreat as ‘District Centres’. The policy requires the preparation of an Activity Centres Plan for each centre, which have been completed for West Leederville, completed and referred to the WAPC for Wembley and initiated for Floreat. The policy also sets out residential density targets equivalent to R30 in District Centres.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning for Bushfire Prone Areas (SPP3.7)</td>
<td>The policy will impact upon land use and development within identified bushfire prone areas, which are particularly prevalent in City Beach and Floreat. Changes in land use or development intensity within these areas will require justification against SPP3.7.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telecommunications Infrastructure (SPP5.2)</td>
<td>The implications of the policy are restricted to consideration of future infrastructure requirements as the population grows and the need for further infrastructure arises.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road and Rail Transport Noise and Freight Considerations in Land Use Planning (SPP5.4)</td>
<td>The policy provides guidance for future development adjacent or in close proximity to the passenger rail network, primary distributors (West Coast Highway, Mitchell Freeway) and roads forecast in the next 20 years to carry more than 20,000 vehicles per day, which could potentially include Cambridge Street, Grantham Street, Selby Street, Harborne Street and the Boulevard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design of the Built Environment (SPP7)</td>
<td>The draft policy provides guidance on the design of multiple dwellings and mixed use development, which will be highly relevant to development within the identified activity centres of Floreat, Wembley and West Leederville. Future revisions to the Residential Design Codes, which will likely fall under SPP7, will also provide guidance to the design of medium density residential development, which may impact upon other areas within the Town.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2.6 IMPLICATIONS

#### TABLE 1: IMPLICATIONS OF STATE PLANNING FRAMEWORK FOR THE TOWN OF CAMBRIDGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy/Strategy</th>
<th>Implications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional Strategies</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directions 2031 and Beyond</td>
<td>The increased focus of the Strategy on infill development is pertinent to the Town of Cambridge, as a proportion of the 121,000 dwellings required to be accommodated in the Central Sub Region will need to be accommodated within the Town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth and Peel @3.5 million</td>
<td>The Strategy identifies an infill development target of 6,830 additional dwellings for the Town from a baseline dwelling count at the year 2010. A focus on existing centres and other infill development areas will be required in order to meet the additional housing target to identify a longer term growth vision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Sub-Regional Planning Framework</td>
<td>The Framework reinforces West Leederville, Wembley Town Centre and Floreat Forum as the key activity centre core areas, with Cambridge Street between Selby Street and Loftus Street forming an Activity Corridor, along with Grantham Street, Harborne Street and Selby Street. The framework guides infill development to predominantly occur within the activity centres and activity corridors, which results in the majority of growth to occur within the West Leederville and Wembley areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth Capital City Framework</td>
<td>The Framework provides relevant regional considerations that reinforce the work undertaken by DPLH on the Central Sub-Regional Planning Framework and the draft Perth and Peel @3.5 million.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth and Peet @3.5 million - Transport Network</td>
<td>As Perth and Peel @3.5 million anticipates Perth's population moving toward 3.5 million, fundamental changes to the city's transport network will be vital to service growth areas and enable high levels of accessibility for work, education and other activities. The report summarises the key transport components of the Perth and Peel @3.5 Million.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other Relevant Strategies, Plans and Policies</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| City of Stirling Local Planning Strategy | Major planning projects in proximity to the Town of Cambridge include:-
  - Stirling City Centre Structure Plan - Plans for the Stirling City Centre will provide additional retail, commercial and employment floor space that may attract visitors and employees from the Town given the relative ease of north/south movements.
  - Herdsman Glendalough Structure Plan - Plans for the Herdsman Glendalough area will provide additional retail, commercial and employment floor space that is likely to attract visitors and employees from the Town given the relative ease of north/south movements.
  - Scarborough Redevelopment Project - The Metropolitan Redevelopment Authority project which aims to redevelop the area as a major tourism attraction, creating a vibrant hub of activity with new restaurants, cafes, shops and entertainment, with a range of events and activities for families and people of all ages and likely to attract visitors and employees from the Town. |
| City of Vincent Local Planning Strategy | The implementation of the Leederville Masterplan and Activity Centre Structure Plan is the most significant outcome of the Strategy to the Town of Cambridge, as this will create additional retail, commercial, hospitality and residential floor space within the Leederville town centre, which may compete with development opportunities in the West Leederville precinct, and likely to attract visitors and employees to the broader Leederville / West Leederville area. |
| City of Subiaco Local Planning Strategy | The City of Subiaco Strategy focuses growth around the Subiaco Town Centre, North Subiaco area and Metropolitan Redevelopment Area, all of which are within 800m of the Town and all of which will have an influence or impact upon the Town. Densification throughout these precincts will need to be considered in the context of future densification plans within commensurate areas in the Town, particularly within 800m of the West Leederville and Subiaco train stations. The opportunity at Subiaco Oval should provide substantial residential densification opportunities to assist in meeting Subiaco’s dwelling target. |
| City of Nedlands Local Planning Strategy | The Strategy primarily focuses growth along Stirling Highway and Hampden/Broadway, which is likely to have minimal influence upon development within the Town. Future considerations for redevelopment within the Mt Claremont area, most notably along Underwood Avenue, will have an impact on Wembley and Floreat centres, but this is not considered as a component of the most recent Local Planning Strategy for the City of Nedlands. |
3. LOCAL PLANNING CONTEXT

3.1 VISION AND MISSION STATEMENTS

3.1.1 VISION AND VALUES

The Town of Cambridge’s vision for the next decade, as outlined in the current Town of Cambridge Strategic Community Plan 2018-2028, is outlined as follows:

**Cambridge: the best liveable suburbs.**

The Town is endowed with a range of housing, employment, and lifestyle opportunities. Our inner-city charm, character laden suburbs, extensive parkland and quality streetscapes reflect who we are, what we value and what we offer. Our activity hubs, mixed-use areas and events create a sense of community, belonging and wellbeing for residents of all ages. These are all community values we seek to protect and enhance into the future.

The Town’s endorsed core values are:

- **Friendly and Helpful:** We value our community members and will assist them in the best way we can.
- **Teamwork:** We believe teamwork is essential for improving our services and achieving our goals.
- **Creativity:** We can improve the way we do business by challenging the status quo.
- **Integrity:** We will act responsibly, place trust in each other and will be accountable for our actions.

3.2 LOCAL GOVERNMENT’S STRATEGIC PLAN

The Town of Cambridge Strategic Community Plan 2018-2028 (SCP) was finalised in 2018 and outlines the Town of Cambridge community’s long term vision and aspirations, and needs for the next 10 years. The SCP also helps to guide the priorities for future Council projects. The SCP outlines four priority areas, goals and strategies which are summarised in Figure 5.

Of critical importance to the Local Planning Strategy is ‘Our Neighbourhood’ Focus Area which outlines the finalisation of the Local Planning Strategy to be one of the priorities within the next four years. ‘Our Neighbourhoods’ outlines the following three goals:

**Goal 4: Neighbourhoods where individual character and quality is respected, and planning is responsive to residents**

- **Strategy 4.1:** Examine and better identify through planning and consultation those features and qualities which define our individual neighbourhoods.
- **Strategy 4.2:** Create opportunities for greater housing choice in forms relevant to demand, lifestyle needs and location.
- **Strategy 4.3:** Ensure new development is harmonious with established residences and respects our existing ‘sense of place’ and our unique character.
- **Strategy 4.4:** Enhance and respect our existing streetscapes, setbacks and green spaces.

**Goal 5: Successful commercial, retail and residential hubs**

- **Strategy 5.1:** Ensure future planning recognises the emerging diverse role, mixed use potential and opportunities of our centres, and integrates change and growth with surrounding local areas.
- **Strategy 5.2:** Foster and encourage local business development in the local and district centres which support our residents and the local and broader community.
- **Strategy 5.3:** Ensure a high standard of public infrastructure is maintained in and around our centres throughout the Town.
- **Strategy 5.4:** Develop and implement activity centre planning and/or local development plans for all centres to reflect the community’s expectations for these nodes and corridors of activity.

**Goal 6: Efficient transport networks**

- **Strategy 6.1:** Coordinate our approach to transport planning, acknowledge transport pressures and respond to local needs and broader district and regional initiatives.
- **Strategy 6.2:** Engage with surrounding local governments to ensure a more coordinated response to land use and transport planning and noise impacts.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Our Community</th>
<th>Our Neighbourhoods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goals</strong></td>
<td><strong>Goals</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- A sense of community, pride and belonging</td>
<td>- Neighbourhoods where individual character and quality is respected, and planning is responsive to residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Quality local parks and open spaces for the community to enjoy</td>
<td>- Successful commercial, retail and residential hubs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- An active, safe and inclusive community</td>
<td>- Efficient transport networks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Future Focus</strong></td>
<td><strong>Future Focus</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Activate major public spaces</td>
<td>- Retain our highly valued built heritage and charm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Generate the most value from the Town’s community facilities and services by increasing community participation in:</td>
<td>- Encourage vibrant commercial hubs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- events and activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- clubs and groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- use of facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Getting around easily by car, bike, foot and public transport; future proofing for new technology</td>
<td>- “Locals first”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Education, access and management to enhance experience of the natural environment</td>
<td>- Service efficiency and modernisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Climate change resilience</td>
<td>- Advocacy for the Community</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Our Environment**

**Goals**
- The Town is environmentally responsible and leads by example
- A community that embraces environmentally responsible practices

**Future Focus**
- Embedding sustainable practices into the operations of the Town
- Education, access and management to enhance experience of the natural environment
- Climate change resilience

**Our Council**

**Goals**
- Transparent, accountable governance
- The Town is a proactive local government that provides financially sustainable public assets, services and facilities
- An efficient local government
- Advocacy for the Community

**Future Focus**
- “Locals first”
3.3 TOWN PLANNING SCHEME NO 1

Town Planning Scheme No.1 (adopted in 1998), which consists of the scheme text, scheme map and the policy manual, is the primary statutory document that controls the use and development of land within the Town and is prepared in accordance with the Metropolitan Region Scheme.

The preparation of the Local Planning Strategy will guide opportunities for the preparation of a new local planning scheme which will ultimately replace Town Planning Scheme No. 1.

The scheme map as shown in Figure 6 shows the classification of land (either as a reserve or a particular zone) within the Town as well as residential density codes applicable to ‘Residential’ zoned sites.

The scheme text prescribes the land uses which may or may not be permitted in the various zones via the zoning table. The scheme text also establishes development standards and requirements for the use and development of land throughout the Town.

The Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015 came into effect in October 2015, replacing the Town Planning Regulations 1967 and the Model Scheme Text. The Regulations introduce a set of ‘deemed provisions’ which automatically apply and form part of all local government planning schemes including the Town of Cambridge Town Planning Scheme No. 1.

The introduction of the new Regulations will require updates to Town Planning Scheme No. 1 which may ultimately be undertaken in conjunction with the preparation of the new local planning scheme.
FIGURE 6: TOWN PLANNING SCHEME NO. 1 MAP (2016)
The implementation of the West Leederville Centre Plan shown in Figure 7 is currently in progress. The West Leederville Precinct Policy was reviewed in 2012 and introduced a system of plot ratio bonuses to encourage lot amalgamation and developments to provide infrastructure such as laneways and pedestrian connections. Upon further review, a Residential Interface Node was introduced for properties in the Commercial Zone which abut the Residential R30 Zone to introduce more detailed control over the type of development which directly abuts lower scale residential development. Further, upgrades to the Cambridge High Street were completed by the Town in 2015.

An amendment to the Town Planning Scheme (Amendment 27) was adopted by Council in April 2014 to introduce a Mixed Use zone over the Southport Street Node and Cambridge High Street as well as a Residential Activity Centre (R-ACO) zone for the residential area between the two mixed use nodes. Scheme Amendment 27 was gazetted in June 2016.

The Town will now prepare detailed development standards for the Residential R-AC0 area and prepare a Local Development Plan for the Special Control Area so as to provide further guidance to the future planning of the area between Holyrood Street, Cambridge Street and Southport Street. The Activity Centre Plan as been translated and updated to meet more recently introduced WAPC requirements for Activity Centre Plans and is currently with the WAPC for determination.

A Local Development Plan is also required to guide future redevelopment of the Leederville Link precinct, which comprises the land to the north of Cambridge Street. The plan is to address the establishment of an improved connector from Cambridge Street across the railway/freeway to Leederville Station, and guide the form of future redevelopment in the area.
FIGURE 7: WEST LEEDEVILLE ACTIVITY CENTRE PLAN (2010)
3.4.2 DRAFT WEMBLEY ACTIVITY CENTRE PLAN

In December 2017 the Wembley Activity Centre Plan (Figure 8) was referred to the WAPC for determination and it is anticipated that the Wembley Activity Centre Plan will be approved by late 2018. The plan has been prepared as part of the review of Town Planning Scheme No. 1 and provides guidance for the future planning, land use and development of the centre and looks to:

- improve the centre’s amenity to attract retailers and businesses that will be valued by the community;
- offer housing choice in the area;
- address access to the centre, whether by car, bus, bicycle or by foot; and
- provide a transition in building height and scale from the centre to the surrounding area.

The Activity Centre is divided into five primary development precincts described as follows:

- **Hotel/Forum Anchor (A1):** The site represents the existing Wembley Hotel and Wembley Forum sites, and is proposed to be redeveloped for mixed use commercial, retail and residential purposes with a maximum height of seven storeys, with building height and bulk setback from property boundaries to reduce overshadowing and overlooking impacts. A key feature will be a public plaza which will be the focal point and heart of the centre.

- **IGA/Service Station Anchor (A2):** The site represents the existing IGA and Service Station sites, and is proposed to be redeveloped for mixed use commercial, retail and residential purposes with a maximum height of six storeys, and development setback to facilitate rear laneway access and reduce overlooking and overshadowing impacts.

- **Cambridge Street West (CW):** This precinct covers the western section of Cambridge Street between Jersey Street and Marlow Street, and is proposed to be redeveloped for mixed use commercial, retail and residential purposes with a maximum height of five storeys (on larger lots), and development set back to facilitate rear laneway access and reduce overlooking and overshadowing impacts.

- **Cambridge Street East (CE):** This precinct covers the eastern section of Cambridge Street between Jersey Street and Essex Street, and is proposed to be redeveloped for mixed use commercial and residential purposes with a maximum height of three storeys and development set back to facilitate rear laneway access and reduce overlooking and overshadowing impacts.

- **Salvado Road (S):** This precinct covers the Salvado Road fronting lots within the Activity Centre and is proposed to be redeveloped for residential purposes with a maximum height of six storeys (on larger lots) and development set back from adjacent lot boundaries to minimise the impact of overlooking.
3.4.3 HOUSING OPTIONS STUDY

In 2013 the Town prepared a Housing Options Study which examined alternate housing options for varied household types.

The project covered housing options possible under the existing planning framework such as ancillary dwellings (granny flats) and aged and dependent person’s dwellings as well as a range of options which would require changes to the Town Planning Scheme.

These included:
- Grouped dwelling developments on corner lots throughout City Beach and Floreat;
- Maisonette/manor home apartments throughout City Beach and Floreat;
- Small apartments along Cambridge Street/Oceanic Drive between Selby Street and Floreat Forum;
- Corner lot grouped dwellings on Grantham Street (introduced via Scheme Amendment 27); and
- Small lot multiple dwelling developments in West Leederville.

Following the Housing Options Study, Amendment 31 was initiated which included proposals for housing options in the City Beach and Floreat Precincts. Amendment 31 was met with significant community opposition, resulting in the amendment being refused by the Minister for Planning in September 2016. The minister advised the Town to consider other planning options to respond to the need to provide opportunities for infill and housing diversity. Such options have been considered and are proposed in the Local Planning Strategy.

3.4.4 ACCESS AND PARKING STRATEGY

In August 2016, the Access and Parking Strategy was finalised and is the guiding document for the future control and management of parking and access in the Town.

The Strategy is prepared in two parts.
- Part 1 - Issues, Options and Long Term Strategic Directions
- Part 2 - Precinct Parking Management Plans

Each Precinct Parking Management Plan incorporates a number of recommendations for the short, medium and longer terms in order to provide guidance over a 20 year planning horizon. The broad aim is to manage and control parking together with a process of phased implementation of a place based package of measures as these centres move to accommodate higher densities and intensities of use.

The report first deals with general parking issues which are common to all four commercial centres. Detailed topics and specific plans are then set out for each precinct. These allow local issues to be considered, and transitional arrangements permitted in line with broad transport policy and strategic plans.

The Strategy is primarily focused on commercial centres along Cambridge Street, the Southport Street Node, Cambridge High Street, the Medical Precinct and the Wembley Activity Centre, and covers matters and options such as:
- Potential multi-level car parks and the conversion of parallel to angle bays; and
- Managing demand and implementing parking measures via enforcement, parking guidance systems and website information.

The Strategy was used to guide a review of the Town's Parking Policy in 2013, and provides a framework for annual parking occupancy surveys undertaken to monitor the issue into the future.
3.4.5  LOCAL GOVERNMENT INVENTORY - HERITAGE

In accordance with the Heritage of Western Australia Act 1990, the Town is required to compile and maintain a list of buildings/places which are or could become of cultural heritage value. The Town’s Municipal Heritage Inventory was adopted in 1997, however is now currently under review.

Six sites across the Town have been included in the State Registrar which means that their protection is afforded under the Heritage of Western Australia Act 1990 which include Leederville Town Hall, West Leederville Primary School, Holy Spirit Catholic Church (City Beach), Catherine McAuley Centre (Wembley) and two original homes in Floreat.

It is of note that the Municipal Heritage Inventory (now referred to as Local Government Inventory) serves as a reference source and does not hold statutory power. Statutory protection would be provided through a Heritage List adopted under the Town Planning Scheme. As part of the review of the Local Government Inventory, a draft Heritage List has been prepared. Community consultation of the revised Local Government Inventory and draft Heritage List was being undertaken by the Town at the time of preparing this report.

3.4.6  CITY BEACH DEVELOPMENT PLAN

The City Beach Development Plan sets out improvements to enhance and improve the use of City Beach, maintain the cultural and natural landscape of the beach, provide amenities and facilities and minimize associated management costs.

The Plan takes the preceding Coastal Plan to a more detailed level and establishes component projects and suggests staging to progressively implement the project. Work to date includes the construction of the beachfront path, works along Challenger Parade and the board-walk connection to Floreat Beach.

More recently the Town has undertaken the development of a new surf club, restaurants and public space.

3.4.7  COASTAL PLAN AND COASTAL NATURAL AREAS MANAGEMENT PLAN

The Town’s Coastal Plan was adopted in 1998 and looks to protect the ecological values of the Town’s coastline; maintain and enhance amenity for recreational users and improve the coastal landscape.

In 2006 a Coastal Natural Areas Management Plan was prepared which provides guidance for the management of approximately 53 hectares of coastal bushland in the Town, and identified priority bushland sites for rehabilitation. More recently, a coastal vulnerability assessment has been completed for the coastland area between the City Beach and Floreat groynes.

Planning and management for the Town’s coast continues to focus on enhancing amenity and the natural values of the coastal landscape as reflected in the more recent City Beach Development Plan.

3.4.8  PERRY LAKES RESERVE ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT PLAN

This Environmental Management Plan (EMP) for Perry Lakes and Alderbury Street Reserves was prepared in 2012 which describes the existing physical and biological environment, and identifies and assesses the impacts associated with the current land uses of the Reserve, including boundary issues with Bold Park.

The EMP prescribes the management objectives, strategies, tasks, procedures, practices, performance indicators, reporting and monitoring which will be required for the effective environmental management of the Reserves. The EMP aims to identify management strategies for the two lakes i.e. East Lake and West Lake, and for various issues relating to the parks surrounding the lakes, namely Perry Lakes Reserve and the Alderbury Street Reserve.
3.4.9 LAKE MONGER MANAGEMENT PLAN

The Lake Monger Reserve Management Plan 2008-2018 highlights major initiatives to be undertaken over the 2008-2018 period. The plan was prepared after extensive consultation with users, nearby residents, the broader community and indigenous people for whom the reserve is culturally significant.

The vision under the plan is: “For Lake Monger Reserve to be recognised as a Conservation Wetland and a significant recreational facility enjoyed and managed with the community.”

The long-term goal is: “To establish an ecologically sustainable system within Lake Monger Reserve, ensuring its long term viability; and to continue the Reserve’s positive contribution to the quality of life of those who live in and are visitors to the area.

Lake Monger Reserve is currently the subject of ecological restoration works, the need for which was identified in the Town’s Lake Monger Reserve Management Plan 2008-2018. The aim of the restoration program is to:

- restore ecological communities to provide a variety of fauna habitats for breeding, feeding and nesting;
- improve water quality; and
- protect and enhance the natural beauty and historical value of Lake Monger.

When preparing this report, the Lake Monger Activity Plan was being developed which will give further direction to matters such as siting of recreational and café facilities, parking and access arrangements.

3.4.10 BIKE PLAN

The Town of Cambridge Bicycle Plan (2018-2022) identifies proposed changes to the cycling network, hazards and signage improvements, recognises travel demands and identifies crash sites.

3.4.11 SUSTAINABILITY STRATEGY

The Town is in the process of preparing a Sustainability Strategy which aims to identify clear environmental objectives, actions and priorities. At the time of preparing this report, the Town had entered preliminary consultation with the community to inform a common view on what is meant by sustainability and determine the community’s expectations of the Town in promoting and achieving sustainable outcomes. The final draft Sustainability Strategy is anticipated to be completed by February 2019.

3.4.12 TREESCAPE PLAN 2010-2020

In response to the threats impacting the survival of existing street trees and planting of new trees, such as less rainfall, hotter temperatures and increased urban development, the Town prepared a town-wide Treescape Plan. The purpose of the Plan is to:

- Develop attractive treescapes for every street in the Town;
- Increase the Town’s overall tree canopy area each year;
- Improve the visual appeal of commercial centres; and
- Foster community awareness of the importance of street trees and so create a sense of pride in the quality of our streets.

In 2014 the Town commissioned the preparation of a Street Tree Inventory which catalogued nearly 13,000 trees in road reserves, including verges and median islands. The Inventory identified the tree canopy coverage from the Town’s street trees was 11.2% of the total area of the Town’s road reserves. The purpose of having a street tree inventory is to assist the Town of Cambridge to sustainably manage its street trees, in accordance with its Treescape Plan.

The Treescape Plan proposes to increase tree numbers and canopy coverage, and to achieve this. Two winter planting programs, the Priority Streets Planting Program and Precinct Streets Planting Program, have been implemented. The Treescape Plan aims to have 16,800 trees within the Town of Cambridge by 2024. In order to reach this target, an extra 4,244 trees (based on the 2013 number 12,556) are required to be planted. This means the team need to plant, on average, 354 new street trees per year.
3.5 LOCAL PLANNING POLICIES

The Town’s Local Planning Policy manual is an essential supplement to the Scheme and provides precinct specific development provisions to reflect variances in development controls required across the Town.

The Town Planning Scheme Policy Manual consists of local planning policies covering the following matters:

- **Residential Policies**: These policies vary requirements under the R-Codes including the Streetscape Policy (which covers street setbacks, fencing, roof pitch, carport, garage design and crossovers which vary requirements under the R-Codes); Building Height Policy, Home Occupations Policy, Bed and Breakfast Policy, Aged and Dependent Person’s Policy as well as policies for specific residential subdivisions including Parkside Walk, Jolimont, St John’s Wood Mt Claremont and Jersey Street (south of Salvado Road). Other residential design matters are generally covered in the Residential Design Codes (as discussed under the Metropolitan Planning Context section of this Strategy).

- **Ancillary Uses and Development Policies**: These policies mostly pertain to non-residential development and cover matters such as parking, advertising signs, public art and construction management plans.

- **Precinct Policies**: These policies provide area specific design standards for different precincts including City Beach, Reabold, Floreat, Wembley, West Leederville and Lake Monger Precincts.

3.5.1 STREETSCAPE POLICY

Policy 3.1 Streetscape Policy relates to all residential development over the Town, but is most applicable to single and grouped dwellings and only to multiple dwellings in some circumstances as multiple dwellings are otherwise controlled through the Multi-Unit Housing Code. The policy seeks to promote open style front setback areas and to maintain the garden feel of the streetscape. It covers matters including street setbacks, landscaping, front fencing design and crossover locations and design.

3.5.2 AGED AND DEPENDENT PERSONS DWELLINGS POLICY

Aged and Dependent Persons’ dwellings provide the opportunity for small-scale specialised housing in local communities and are one option to meet the growing need for housing for the aging population and people who wish to downsize and live in their local area.

The R-Codes of Western Australia allow for a one-third reduction in site area for Aged or Dependent Persons’ dwellings. The Town’s Aged and Dependent Person’s Policy reduces the requirement to receive the site area reduction from five dwellings as is required in the R-Codes to only two dwellings (or one dwelling where an existing dwelling is retained). This increases the flexibility to provide this type of housing on smaller lots, though it is noted that this flexibility is proposed to be incorporated into the R-Codes as part of future amendments to allow the reduction to two dwellings.

3.5.3 PERCENT FOR ART

The Town seeks to promote the provision of public art as part of private development through the application of a percent for Public Art policy. The provision of public art contributes towards a sense of place and to community identity and can enliven and enhance the visual amenity of the public domain. The heritage of a place and its interpretation can also be reinforced through public art.

The policy aims are:

- To enhance a sense of place by encouraging public art forms.
- To improve the legibility of streets, open spaces and buildings through the provision of public art.
- To enrich the visual amenity of public places.
- To allow for the interpretation of cultural, environmental and/or built heritage.
- To improve the functionality of the public domain through the use of public art, including appropriate street furniture.
- To establish a clear and equitable approach for the provision of public art as part of the development process.
3.5.4 DESIGN REVIEW PANEL POLICY

Council has recently adopted Design Review Panel Policy (Policy 2.7). The Policy sets out provisions for the establishment of a Design Review Panel (DRP) to provide guidance to improve the quality of larger types of development and to input into strategic planning projects.

The policy aims are to:

- To improve the design quality and functionality of new development within the Town through provision of independent expert advice to the Council, Town and to applicants on the design of specific development proposals, applications and planning matters;
- To outline the principles of good design by which new development will be assessed, including context and character, heritage, built form and scale, functionality, amenity, built quality, urban design and public space, landscaping, safety and environmentally sustainable design;
- To ensure the heritage, character and natural features of the area are protected and reflected in new development; and
- To ensure DRP advice is consistent with the objectives and intent of the Town’s policies and strategies.

The Town has worked with the WA Government Architect in preparing the Policy and has taken on feedback through the Planning Reform for Better Design project which is a joint initiative between the WA Government Architect and DPLH.

Six members have been appointed to the Towns DRP which has been in operation since 2017. The DRP reviews proposals and provides advice on the ten design principles specified in Policy 2.7.

3.5.5 PARKING POLICY

The Town’s Parking Policy (Policy 5.1) sets out requirements for access and parking provisions for non-residential development. For both environmental and practical reasons, the policy includes measures to provide for and encourage greater use of alternative transport modes, reducing reliance on the car.

The Policy was reviewed in response to findings from the Access and Parking Strategy and adopted by Council at its Meeting of 26th February 2013.

The Policy consists of:-

- Parking ratios (covering car, bicycles and motorcycles/scooters/gophers);
- Concessions on parking requirements up to 20% dependent on access to and attractiveness of alternative transport; and
- Cash-in-lieu for parking provisions.

3.5.6 HOLYROOD STREET HERITAGE DEVELOPMENT AND DESIGN GUIDELINES

Holyrood Street in West Leederville has been identified as having cultural heritage value as it provides a unique example of an intact streetscape characterised by mostly Federation housing which was developed in the first decade of the twentieth century.

In order to protect the heritage value of the Holyrood Street streetscape, design guidelines have been developed to cover setbacks, development in front setback areas, fencing styles and façade treatments. In 2013, the Town installed public art lighting features beneath street trees projecting images to reflect the heritage values of the street.
3.5.7 OTHER LOCAL LAWS

There are a number of local laws which are separate to the Town Planning Scheme and Policies which impact planning outcomes. These include:

- **Private Property Law**: covering matters including definition of a sufficient fence, materials of fence construction and street numbering;

- **Local Government and Public Property Local Law**: covering matters including awnings, balconies and verandahs over public land;

- **Trading in Public Places**: covering matters including alfresco dining, food vans/trucks and temporary stallholders; and

- **Building on Endowment Lands and Limekilns Estate**: covering requirements for construction standards of dwellings and outbuildings within the estate, which covers the majority of City Beach and Floreat.
3.6 MAJOR DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

There are a number of major redevelopment projects which are at various stages of development throughout the Town. These projects have been used as opportunities to meet housing targets under Perth and Peel @3.5 million and to provide a variety of housing types.

3.6.1 PERRY LAKES REDEVELOPMENT

The Perry Lakes Redevelopment Plan (refer Figure 9) has been developed by Landcorp to guide the redevelopment of the Perry Lakes stadium site and surrounds. The detailed area plan introduces approximately 600 new dwellings and builds on the site’s sporting history and ties in with Floreat’s garden nature.

Planning controls for Perry Lakes were transferred to the State Government under the Perry Lakes Redevelopment Act 2005. Planning control transferred back to the Town in November 2016. Design guidelines to guide development in the area which override the Residential Design Codes and promote more modernist design.

As of 2016, the Perry Lakes Redevelopment is mid-completion with the majority of single dwelling lots being built on or development and apartment sites recently completed and under development.

FIGURE 9: PERRY LAKES REDEVELOPMENT PLAN AND ARTISTS IMPRESSION OF COMPLETED DEVELOPMENT SITE (LANDCORP, 2016)
3.6.2 PARKSIDE WALK

Parkside Walk (refer Figure 10), on the Former City of Perth Nursery site on Salvado Road, commenced development in 2016. The site is being developed by Landcorp on behalf of the Town, with net returns split between the Town and the State Government. An Outline Development Plan (ODP) was prepared for the site which was endorsed by the WAPC in July 2015 and design guidelines were adopted by Council in December 2015 to control future building design.

The vision for Parkside Walk is: ‘To transform a once hidden pocket of Jolimont into a vibrant inner city community in a parkland setting. A new place which is integrated into the surrounding neighbourhood structure and enhances connections by linking green spaces and amenities’.

The ODP sets out the residential density and dwelling targets, public open space and local road and access network for the site. The plan is based on a minimum housing target of 200 dwellings and housing target of 350 dwellings.

A total of 24 single terrace-style dwellings are proposed, which will be located in the southern portion of the site. Seven apartment sites, ranging between three and six storeys in height are proposed in the northern portion of the site and in the south-east corner towards Mabel Talbot Reserve.

FIGURE 10: PARKSIDE WALK DEVELOPMENT AREA INDICATIVE DEVELOPMENT PLAN (RIGHT) AND ARTISTS IMPRESSION (LEFT)
3.6.3 ST JOHN’S WOOD

Landcorp recently completed the St John’s Wood Estate on land known as ‘Area G’ in Mt Claremont, with the Town receiving a substantial contribution of the net returns on the development.

The development comprises 49 lots, two of which are for grouped dwellings, the remainder for single dwellings and an area of public open space to integrate with the existing Daran Park. The Estate Plan is shown in Figure 11 below, and the relevant policy was adopted by Council in March 2016 with specific design standards relating to access and estate fencing, with other development standards as per the City Beach Precinct Policy and R-Codes.

The land known as Lot 87 (Banksia Farm) has been transferred to the Botanic Gardens and Parks Authority (BGPA) and retained as natural bushland via a trust placed on the land.
3.6.4 OCEAN MIA ESTATE

Ocean Mia Estate is located in City Beach, bounded by The Boulevard and Kalinda Drive, west of Bold Park. The Estate comprises 66 individual (single) lots and 2 grouped dwellings sites, over which there is to be a minimum of 91 dwellings.

Design guidelines have been prepared for the area to promote development styles which are sympathetic with the generally modernist styles of development in Floreat and City Beach. Building height and setback provisions have been specified relating to the orientation of the lot to make best use of site features.

The western portion of the subdivision was released in 2007 and development is nearing completion at the time of preparing this report. Sale of city side lots has occurred over 2015 and 2016.

3.6.5 OCEAN VILLAGE (KILPA COURT) SHOPPING CENTRE

A local development plan is to be prepared, in conjunction with landowners, to guide future re-development of the Ocean Village Shopping Centre and the area including Council owned parking lots. The local development plan will seek to co-ordinate redevelopment and improvements to a centre which is at the stage of its lifecycle where reinvestment is now warranted. Further, it will provide opportunities to make more efficient use of Council owned land and deliver community benefit by way of a revitalised local centre.

The local development plan will also consider how the Ocean Village Park relates to the centre and whether there are opportunities for enhancements to the park and for improvements to access to the centre as well as how the centre interfaces with adjoining sites including St Paul’s Anglican Church and residential dwellings on Kilpa Court.
4. LOCAL PROFILE

4.1 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

The Town contains notable environmental and open space landmarks including Bold Park, Lake Monger Reserve, Perry Lakes Reserve, Wembley Golf Course, City Beach and Floreat Beach. The coastline is a key regional attraction and comprises one of the largest intact stretches of dune vegetation within the Perth metropolitan region, forming part of a continuous ecological linkage.

Other significant features within the Town include Bush Forever sites, Conservation Category Wetlands, Registered Indigenous Heritage sites and Carnaby’s Cockatoo roosting habitat. The urban tree canopy also contributes to the overall biodiversity and amenity values within the Town.

Predicted metropolitan population growth will place development pressures on all local governments, and within the Town the majority of this will be in the form of infill development, given the lack of available or suitable areas for new greenfield development.

While this means that the environmental impacts might seem less relevant, infill pressures and associated population growth can put direct and indirect pressures on environmental assets in reserved areas, and also what residual environmental values remain in residential areas (i.e. tree canopy).

The climate within the Town, which applies to the broader south-west region of Western Australia, is described as Mediterranean with hot, dry summers and moderately wet, mild winters. The majority of rainfall within the region occurs between May and October each year, and on average is between 600 to 1000 mm per year. In the last 40 years there has been a marked decrease in rainfall (between 10 to 15% decrease), with a noticeable shift to a drier climate across the south-west of Western Australia (CSIRO 2009).

The closest weather station is located in Swanbourne, roughly 3km south of City Beach. Temperature and rainfall statistics recorded at the weather station indicates the mean maximum temperature is 24.1°C degrees and occurs in February, and the mean minimum temperature is 13.9°C and occurs in July (BoM 2016). The average annual rainfall recorded at the station is 721mm with the majority occurring between May and September. These climatic conditions are summarised in the Figure 12.

Climate modelling undertaken by CSIRO for the next century indicates that higher temperatures, increased frequency of hot days, lower winter rainfall, increased evapotranspiration rates, and higher sea levels are predicted, with at least a high confidence, for the Perth region (CSIRO and BoM 2015).

The key considerations these impacts have for planning include: increased urban heat island effects, higher open space irrigation requirements, reduced water levels in wetlands, coastline retreat due to erosion, biodiversity loss, and increased bushfire risks.
4.1.1 LANDFORMS, TOPOGRAPHY AND SOILS

4.1.1.1 TOPOGRAPHY

The topography across the Town is generally undulating and varies from relatively flat in the central portion of the Town, to steep rises in the western portion related to the underlying dune formations, as shown in Figure 13.

The highest point is associated with Reabold Hill in Bold Park and is approximately 85m Australian Height Datum (m AHD). This elevated area protects the eastern portion of the Town from strong coastal winds.

4.1.1.2 REGIONAL GEOMORPHOLOGY

The Town is located on the Swan Coastal Plain, which forms the central portion of the Perth basin. Within the Town, the Quindalup dunes occur at the coastline, and extend inland until being replaced by the Spearwood dunes which encompass the remaining area eastward. The Quindalup dunes are characterised by a belt of parabolic dunes and beach ridges adjacent to the coast, and are comprised of calcareous sands.

The Spearwood dunes are characterised by low hilly landscapes with brown sands over limestone, and are generally representative of the Cottesloe soil-land formation.

4.1.1.3 LANDFORMS AND SOILS

The environmental geology of the Town has been mapped as part of the Geological Survey of Western Australia (Gozzard 1986).

At the coast, the soils are Calcareous Sand (S1, S2) before transitioning to Limestone (LS1), then transitioning to Sand (S7). Areas of Peaty Clay (Cps) and Peat (P) occur around Perry Lakes Reserve and Lake Monger Reserve, respectively.

On the eastern boundary of the Town a small area of Peaty Sand (Sp) occurs. The soils found within the Town generally have medium to high permeability and the infiltration of water at the surface.

The geological units occurring within the Town are described in Table 2 below and shown in Figure 14.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geological Unit</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calcareous Sand</td>
<td>S1, S2</td>
<td>White, fine to medium-grained, sub-rounded quartz and shell debris, of eolian origin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limestone</td>
<td>LS1</td>
<td>Light, yellowish brown, fine to coarse-grained, sub-angular to well rounded, quartz, trace of feldspar, shell debris, variably lithified, surface kankar, of eolian origin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sand</td>
<td>S7</td>
<td>Pale and olive yellow, medium to coarse-grained, sub-angular to sub-rounded quartz, trace of feldspar, moderately sorted, of residual origin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peaty Clay</td>
<td>Cps</td>
<td>Dark grey and black with variable sand content of lacustrine origin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peat</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Black, clayey in part, saturated fibrous organic soil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE 13: TOPOGRAPHICAL CONTOURS
4.1.2 FLORA AND VEGETATION

The Town is located within the Swan Coastal Plain Interim Biogeographic Regionalisation for Australia (IBRA) region (Thackway and Cresswell 1995). The Swan Coastal Plain IBRA region is broadly compatible with the Swan Coastal Plain (Drummond Botanical Subdistrict) Phytogeographical Subregion as described by Beard (1990). This region is characterised by Banksia low woodlands on leached sands, woodlands of tuart (Eucalyptus gomphocephala), jarrah (Eucalyptus marginata) and marri (Corymbia calophylla) on less leached soils and Melaleuca swamps.

Regional vegetation mapping by Heddle (1980) indicates the existing vegetation complexes within the Town include the Quindalup Complex, the Cottesloe Complex-Central and South, and the Karrakatta Complex-Central and South. The Herdsman Complex originally occurred within the Town but has been completely cleared. The pre-European vegetation extent covered an area of 2181 ha, with the 2010 remaining extent covering an area of 558.9ha, or approximately 25.6% of the original extent, with the lowest proportion remaining for the Karrakatta Complex-Central and South (detailed in Table 3). Of the extant vegetation, 478 ha is currently reserved for Parks and Recreation.

The Local Biodiversity Program (WALGA 2013) indicates that the remaining extents of pre-European vegetation complexes within the Town include the Quindalup Complex, the Cottesloe Complex-Central and South, and the Karrakatta Complex-Central and South. The Herdsman Complex originally occurred within the Town but has been completely cleared. The pre-European vegetation extent covered an area of 2181 ha, with the 2010 remaining extent covering an area of 558.9ha, or approximately 25.6% of the original extent, with the lowest proportion remaining for the Karrakatta Complex-Central and South (detailed in Table 3). Of the extant vegetation, 478 ha is currently reserved for Parks and Recreation.

On the Swan Coastal Plain portion of the Perth Metropolitan Region EPA Guidance Statement No. 10 – Level of assessment for proposals affecting natural areas within the System 6 region and Swan Coastal Plain portion of System 1 region (EPA 2006) specifies that a biodiversity objective is to retain at least 10% of the pre-European settlement extent of the Heddle (et al. 1980) vegetation complexes.

The interim strategic advice for Perth and Peel @ 3.5 issued by the EPA under S16 of the EP Act 1986 indicates a broader objective to retain at least 30% of the pre-clearing extent of each ecological community, which is consistent with national biodiversity objectives.
FIGURE 15: AREAS CLASSIFIED AS HAVING A HIGH TO MODERATE RISK OF ACID SULFATE SOILS OCCURRING WITHIN 3M OF THE NATURAL SOIL SURFACE
While this is unachievable for some vegetation complexes that have less than 30% remaining (and hence the 10% minimum) it should be considered as a best practice target where achievable.

Overall the Town has good representation of the remaining vegetation complexes for a metropolitan local government area, as shown in Table 3, however any future use or development within reserved areas should be cognisant of broader biodiversity retention objectives. Of those described, the Karrakatta Complex-Central and South has the lowest remaining proportion within the Swan Coastal Plain, and an even smaller extent within the Town.

The limited remaining vegetation of this complex is located within portions of Perry Lakes, Roscommon Park, Wembley Golf Course and McLean Park. Any use/management or development within these reserves should take into account the impacts they may have on this vegetation complex.

### TABLE 3: VEGETATION COMPLEXES FOUND WITHIN THE TOWN OF CAMBRIDGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vegetation Complex</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2010 Remnant vegetation extent (ha)</th>
<th>Bush Forever (ha)</th>
<th>% of Pre-European Extent</th>
<th>% Remnant vegetation is Bush Forever</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quindalup Complex</td>
<td>Coastal dune complex consisting mainly of two alliances - the strand and fore dune alliance and the mobile and stable dune alliance. Local variations include the low closed forest of M. lanceolata - Callitris preissii and the closed scrub of Acacia rostellifera</td>
<td>47.10</td>
<td>34.59</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>73.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cottesloe Complex (Central and South)</td>
<td>Mosaic of woodland of E. gomphocephala and open forest of E. gomphocephala - E. marginata - E. calophylla; closed heath on the limestone outcrops</td>
<td>45.72</td>
<td>423.54</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>92.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karrakatta Complex (Central and South)</td>
<td>Predominantly open forest of E. gomphocephala - E. marginata - E. calophylla and woodland of E. marginata - Banksia spp.</td>
<td>54.10</td>
<td>34.58</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>63.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.1.2.1 SIGNIFICANT FLORA

Species of flora acquire ‘Threatened’ or ‘Priority’ conservation status where populations are restricted geographically or threatened by local processes. The Department of Parks and Wildlife (DPaW) recognises these threats and subsequently applies measures towards population protection and species conservation. DPaW enforces regulations under the Wildlife Conservation Act 1950 (WC Act) to conserve Threatened flora species and protect significant populations.

The Commonwealth Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 (EPBC Act) promotes the conservation of biodiversity by providing statutory protection for Matters of National Environmental Significance (MNES) including flora at a species level. Some Threatened Flora listed under the WC Act are also listed at a Federal level. Section 178 and 179 of the EPBC Act provides for the lists and categories of threatened species under the Act.

A search of significant flora within the Threatened and Priority Flora Database (DPaW 2016) has indicated that 5 Priority species are found within the Town (detailed in Table 4). These species are most likely to occur within reserved areas, so future infill development in existing residential areas is unlikely to have impacts on significant flora.

### TABLE 4: DECLARED RARE FLORA FOUND WITHIN THE TOWN OF CAMBRIDGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
<th>Life Strategy</th>
<th>Substrate</th>
<th>Flowering Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fabronia hampeana</td>
<td>P2</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Limestone outcrops</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austrostipa mundula</td>
<td>P3</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Sandy soils</td>
<td>Oct - Nov</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beyeria cinerea subsp. cinerea</td>
<td>P3</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Coastal limestone</td>
<td>May-Oct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hibbertia spicata subsp. leptotheca</td>
<td>P3</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Near-coastal limestone ridges, outcrops &amp; cliffs</td>
<td>Jul-Oct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacksonia sericea (Waldjumi)</td>
<td>P4</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Calcareous &amp; sandy soils</td>
<td>Dec-Feb</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.1.2.2 THREATENED ECOLOGICAL COMMUNITIES

Threatened Ecological Communities (TECs) are those ecological communities which are under threat of extinction, are rare, or otherwise in need of special protection.

TECs are not afforded direct statutory protection at a state level but their significance is acknowledged through other state environment legislation and regulation approval processes including environmental impact assessment pursuant to Part IV of the EP Act. Since 1994, DPaW has identified and listed TECs under the state process. In addition to TECs, DPaW also identify Priority Ecological Communities (PECs), which are communities that require further research and investigation. Floristic community types (FCTs) described by Gibson et al (1994) provide the broad classifications of vegetation communities across the Swan Coastal Plain (Gibson et al. 1994) and are the primary basis for determining TECs or PECs.

TECs are recognised and afforded statutory protection at a federal level pursuant to the EPBC Act, and are listed as either ‘Critically Endangered’, ‘Endangered’ or ‘Vulnerable’. Most TECs listed as Critically Endangered under the state process are also recognised at the federal level. In September 2016, Banksia Woodlands of the Swan Coastal Plain was declared as a TEC under the EPBC Act.

The only TEC likely to occur within the Town is the Banksia Woodlands of the Swan Coastal Plain. The designation of this TEC under the EPBC Act relies on the structure, condition and patch size of the vegetation present to meet the thresholds defined in the approved Conservation Advice. This TEC is likely to occur within Bold Park, and potentially some areas reserved for Parks and Recreation under TPS 1, and therefore should not be of concern for future infill development.

Tuart woodland of the Swan Coastal Plain has also been nominated as a priority assessment item to potentially become a TEC pursuant to the EPBC Act, with the assessment completion due in July 2018. If listed, this TEC is also likely to occur within reserves in the Town.

4.1.2.3 BUSH FOREVER AND ENVIRONMENTALLY SENSITIVE AREAS

The State Government’s Bush Forever is a strategic plan for conserving regionally significant bushland within the Swan Coastal Plain portion of the Perth Metropolitan Region. The objective of Bush Forever is to protect comprehensive representations of all original ecological communities by targeting a minimum of 10% of each vegetation complex for protection (Government of Western Australia 2000).

Bush Forever sites are representative of regional ecosystems and habitat and have a key role in the conservation of Perth’s biodiversity. Bush Forever Sites are designated as Environmentally Sensitive Areas (ESAs), which are prescribed under the Environmental Protection (Clearing of Native Vegetation) Regulations 2004, however ESAs are not limited to Bush Forever Sites. Within an ESA, exemptions under the Environmental Protection (Clearing of Native Vegetation) Regulations 2004 do not apply and the presence of an ESA would indicate that the site is likely to support significant environmental values.

Three designated Bush Forever sites are located within the Town, which include Floreat Bushland (BF site 310), Bold Park and surrounding bushland (BF site 312) and Swanborne Bushland (BF site 315) (detailed in Table 5 and Figure 16). These sites cover a combined area of 492.7ha.

At 437 ha, Bold Park is the largest remnant bushland in the urban area of the Swan Coastal Plain, and makes up almost 20% of the Town’s land area. Bold Park was established in 1936 before being declared an A-class reserve in 1998 following the transfer of land from the Town to the State, and is currently managed by the Botanic Gardens and Parks Authority. Being a Class-A reserve means that the purpose of the land can only be changed by an Act passed by State Parliament.

Bold Park encompasses Tuart-Banksia woodland and heath vegetation and contains over 1000 identified fauna, flora and fungi species (including non-native species). The draft Bold Park Management Plan 2016-2021 prepared by the Botanic Gardens & Parks Authority (BGPA) outlines the management plans for Bold Park over the next 5 years.
FIGURE 16: CLASSIFIED BUSH FOREVER SITES AND DECLARED RARE FLORA LOCATIONS
Swanborne Bushland is located south of Bold Park and extends into the City of Nedlands. The site contains shrubland dominated by acacia, melaleuca and scaevola as well as spinifex grassland. It was not assessed for the presence of threatened ecological communities.

Floreat Bushland comprises the dune vegetation between Floreat Beach and Peasholm Beach, as well as the vegetation within Chipping Park and Templetonia Park.

**TABLE 5: BUSH FOREVER SITES LOCATED WITHIN THE TOWN OF CAMBRIDGE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bush Forever site ID</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Conservation Status</th>
<th>Ownership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>310</td>
<td>Floreat Bushland</td>
<td>Informal (MRS Parks and Recreation, LPS1 Local Parks and Recreation)</td>
<td>Town of Cambridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>312</td>
<td>Bold Park and adjacent Bushland</td>
<td>Class A Nature Reserve</td>
<td>Crown land (Botanic Gardens &amp; Parks Authority)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>Swanborne Bushland</td>
<td>Informal (MRS Parks and Recreation)</td>
<td>Botanic Gardens &amp; Parks Authority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4.1.2.4 ECOLOGICAL LINKAGES**

Ecological linkages allow the movement of fauna, flora and genetic material between areas of fragmented remnant habitat. The movement of fauna and the exchange of genetic material between vegetation remnants improve the viability of those remnants by allowing greater access to breeding partners, food sources, refuge from disturbances such as fire and maintenance of genetic diversity of plant communities and populations. Ecological linkages are often continuous or near-continuous as the more fractured a linkage is, the less ease flora and fauna have in moving within the corridor (Molloy et al. 2009).

Ecological linkages have been generally identified by the State Government in Bush Forever, Perth's Greenways and the System 6 study and have been published by the Perth Biodiversity Project (WALGA 2013). These identified linkages reflect the on-ground linkages throughout the Perth Metropolitan area (Molloy et al. 2009). The dataset is employed as a conservation tool aimed to conserve and enhance Perth's regional ecological linkages.

Two regional ecological linkages have been identified within the Town. Regional ID Link 1 includes the entire foreshore dune network within the Town and connects the foreshore coastal dune system of the Perth region. The intact nature of the coastal vegetation within the Town suggests this vegetation forms a significant contribution to the regional link. Regional ID Link 5 connects Bold Park and remnant vegetation in Wembley Golf Course to Herdsman Lake (within the City of Stirling) and Kings Park, and contains significant stands of mature native trees.

The Western Suburbs Greening Plan (2002), a joint initiative between WESROC and the Town of Cambridge, outlines wetlands, bushland, riverine and coastal habitats and conservation reserves, along with vegetation density. The plan identified and mapped greenways and ecological linkages required to connect remnant vegetation, coastal and riverine habitats in a cohesive network. The plan prioritises linkages based on those that connect with significant bushland areas and have good potential for greenway establishment or bushland regeneration.
The total trees identified by suburb were as listed: Floreat (4,457), City Beach (3,342), Wembley (2,909), West Leederville (1,464), Jolimont (338), Wembley Downs (297), Mt Claremont (104). Notably the western suburbs of Floreat and City Beach have significantly more street trees than other large suburbs of Wembley and West Leederville. This is likely due to the western suburbs being developed at a later period and with generally larger road reserves than the inner suburbs.

Private Land

Privately owned lots contain a significant number of trees and green areas that contribute to the overall biodiversity and environmental function within the Town. These trees also play a significant role in reducing urban heat island effects. Trees within private lots are at the highest risk of removal due to developmental pressure and the lack of statutory protection, leading to their removal during subdivision or development (as shown in the aerial photo below). A ‘blanket’ approach to increasing residential densities has the potential to result in the loss of tree canopy within private lots, and replacement with dwellings and hard surfaces.

Urban Tree Canopy

Urban tree canopies provide a range of important environmental and social values, including: habitat and food sources for native species, amenity values (e.g. shade), aesthetic values, and the moderation of urban heat island effects. Urban heat islands are caused by the storage and reflection of solar energy from hardstand surfaces including roads, paving and roofs. Trees and green areas reduce this heat buildup by providing a cooling effect through evapotranspiration, absorption and reflection, and shading (Brown et al. 2013).

As Perth’s temperatures are likely to increase due to climate change, the urban canopy has a crucial role in maintaining livable neighborhoods. The interim strategic advice for the Perth and Peel regions published by the EPA under S16 of the EP Act 1986 states that ‘a key consideration for mitigating the effects of heat will be increasing canopy cover across suburbs’.

Mapping produced in preparation of the Urban Forest of Perth and Peel Statistical Report (CSIRO 2014) shows the urban canopy percentage for the suburbs within the Town are 10-15% for City Beach, Wembley, West Leederville and Mount Claremont, and 15-20% for Floreat, Jolimont and Wembley Downs (including areas of each suburb outside the ToC).

Road Reserves

Street trees are important assets to the Town and provide significant values, including character and sense of place, comfort, environmental benefits and increased property prices. As climate change causes increases in temperature and associated urban heat island effects, street trees have a critical role in reducing the passive buildup of heat in residential areas. The Town has developed the Treescape Plan 2010-2020 to address this and other issues, with the target of planting an additional 4,244 street trees by 2024.

An inventory of the street trees within the Town was prepared by Paperbark Technologies in 2014, which mapped 12,991 trees within the road reserves, equivalent to 11.2% of the canopy area. The purpose of the street tree inventory is to assist the Town to sustainably manage its street trees in accordance with its Treescape Plan 2010 - 2020. One of the plans purposes is to increase the Town’s overall canopy area over time. An inventory for parks is currently being progressed by the Town.
4.1.3 FAUNA

Significant fauna habitat within the Town is primarily associated with large patches of vegetation including Bold Park, Perry Lakes Reserve, Lake Monger Reserve, the foreshore reserve and other Bush Forever Sites.

Urban areas provide important habitat for birds, as well as providing a linkage between remnant vegetation areas. Common fauna found within the Town include birds, frogs, lizards, snakes and tortoises.

4.1.3.1 THREATENED FAUNA

The conservation status of fauna species in Western Australia is assessed under the State Wildlife Conservation Act 1950 (The WC Act). The WC Act utilises a set of schedules, and in addition DPaW also produces a list of Priority fauna species which, while not considered Threatened under the WC Act, there is some concern over their long-term survival.

The Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016 recently received Royal Assent and will replace the WC Act as the key legislation for the protection of fauna in WA. As well as those species protected under state legislation, species can also be identified as Matters of National Environmental Significance (MNES) and be protected pursuant to the EPBC Act. Any potential impacts on listed threatened species constitute a MNES under the act and require assessment by the Commonwealth government.

To assess the potential for protected fauna species that occur within the Town, searches of DPaW’s NatureMap Database (DPAW 2016) and the DoEE Protected Matters database (DoEE 2016) were undertaken within of the Town.

The conservation significant species returned by these are listed in Table 6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific name</th>
<th>Common name</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Federal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actitis hypoleucos</td>
<td>Common Sandpiper</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apus pacificus subsp. pacificus</td>
<td>Fork-tailed Swift</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ardea modesta</td>
<td>Eastern Great Egret</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botaurus poiciloptilus</td>
<td>Australasian Bittern</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calyptorhynchus banksii subsp. naso</td>
<td>Forest Red-tailed Black-Cockatoo</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calyptorhynchus latirostris</td>
<td>Carnaby’s Cockatoo</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Careta caretta</td>
<td>Loggerhead Turtle</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diomedea chrysostoma</td>
<td>Grey-headed Albatross</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falco peregrinus</td>
<td>Peregrine Falcon</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haliaeetus leucogaster</td>
<td>White-bellied Sea-Eagle</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ixobrychus minutus</td>
<td>Little Bittern</td>
<td>P4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macropus irma</td>
<td>Western Brush Wallaby</td>
<td>P4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merops ornatus</td>
<td>Rainbow Bee-eater</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morelia spilota subsp. imbricata</td>
<td>Carpet Python</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neelaps calonotos</td>
<td>Black-striped Snake</td>
<td>P3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxyura australis</td>
<td>Blue-billed Duck</td>
<td>P4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plegadis falcinellus</td>
<td>Glossy Ibis</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tringa nebularia</td>
<td>Common Greenshank</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes in relation to Table 6:
T = Threatened fauna
IA = Protected under international agreement
S = Other specially protected fauna
PX = Priority fauna, with ‘X’ indicating the number priority
V = Vulnerable
E = Endangered
CE = Critically Endangered.
4.1.3.2 BLACK COCKATOOS

Carnaby’s and forest red-tailed black cockatoos are iconic bird species found across the Perth metropolitan area, and are listed as Endangered and Vulnerable respectively under the EPBC Act.

The Town contains confirmed roosting habitat which is located within Perry Lakes Reserve, with most recent counts identifying 86 cockatoos in the site. Perry Lakes Reserve contains numerous exotic and remnant mature trees over 8m tall that provide ideal roosting habitat for black cockatoos, which are also likely to feed in adjacent bushland areas.

4.1.3.3 PEST SPECIES

Introduced species, particularly foxes, cats and rabbits are known to be of concern in the Town due to the large areas of remnant vegetation that provide habitat and food sources.

Rabbits are recognized to cause degradation of coastal dune vegetation, and impede rehabilitation works by feeding on planted seedlings. Foxes and feral cats prey on native wildlife, as well as introduced species. This is will be a key consideration for the future management of reserved areas within the Town.

4.1.4 HYDROLOGICAL FEATURES

4.1.4.1 SURFACE DRAINAGE SYSTEMS

Surface drainage within the Town comprises a combination of piped local drainage and Water Corporation arterial drainage. Surface drainage can be broadly divided into the western, central and eastern catchments.

The western catchment primarily infiltrates, the central catchment drains to Herdsman Lake and Perry Lakes, and the eastern catchment drains to Swan River and Lake Monger (JDA Consultant Hydrologists 2002). Future management of stormwater quantity and quality is therefore an important consideration as a large proportion of the Town drains to conservation significant wetlands.

Urban infill is likely to impact on the nature of existing stormwater runoff within the Town. Greater proportions of impermeable areas resulting from increased roof areas and paving will likely result in increased stormwater runoff, placing greater pressure on the existing drainage infrastructure and receiving waterbodies. Stormwater runoff must be contained on private land.

Although rainfall is predicted to decline overall, and the frequency of high intensity storm events is also likely to decline, the intensity of these large events may increase (CZM 2010). The combination of increased impermeable areas and more intense rainfall events may exceed the capacity of current drainage infrastructure unless stormwater is contained on private land.

4.1.4.2 GROUNDWATER

The Town is situated over the Gnangara Groundwater System, a multi-layered aquifer system comprising an unconfined superficial aquifer, the confined Leederville aquifer, and the confined Yarragadee aquifer.

Within the Town, historic average groundwater levels in the superficial aquifer range from 12m AHD near the eastern boundary, to <1m AHD near the coastline, with groundwater flowing in a generally westward direction. The Perth Groundwater Atlas indicates that groundwater...
salinity in the superficial aquifer within the Town typically ranges between 500-1000 mg/L, which is marginally saline (DoW 2016).

The Gnangara System is the largest source of good quality fresh water in Perth and is primarily used for public water supply (42% of use). Groundwater levels in the Gnangara system have been declining over the past 40 years due to increased abstraction caused by land use intensification and population growth, and decreased recharge due to the drying climate.

Managing the use of the Gnangara Groundwater System is a critical aspect of future population growth in Perth, and is outlined in the Gnangara groundwater areas allocation plan (DoW 2009). A new plan is currently being prepared and is due for public comment in late 2018.

The Town is also situated within the Perth Groundwater Area, which is currently not fully allocated as summarized below in Table 7. The majority of local parkland/reserves as well as the Wembley Golf Course are irrigated through groundwater bores, with private groundwater use also prevalent.

The Town allocated funds in 2016/17 to review cost-effective ways to revive Perry Lakes, including the use of treated waste water from Subiaco Wastewater Treatment Plant, to raise groundwater levels and recharge the aquifer using water from Herdsman drain.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aquifer</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Allocation Limit (GL/a)</th>
<th>Allocated (GL/a) (2014)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superficial</td>
<td>Town of Cambridge</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leederville</td>
<td>Perth North confined</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>13.7 (overallocated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yaragadee</td>
<td>Perth North confined</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19.7 (almost allocated)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**4.1.4.3 WETLANDS**

Wetlands across the Swan Coastal Plain hold high social, cultural and environmental values and form an integral part of the natural environment of Perth. Prior to European settlement, the Swan Coastal Plain supported large areas of wetland, many of which have since been filled or drained to support development.

Remaining wetlands have been prioritised for their protection and management by the Department of Niodiversity, Conservation and Attractions (DBCA). Conservation category wetlands (CCWs) are wetlands which support high levels of ecological attributes and functions, and management objectives should seek to preserve these attributes and functions through reservation and protection under environmental protection policies. Within the Town both Lake Monger Reserve and Perry Lakes Reserve are classified as CCWs, and are shown in Figure 17.

Lake Monger Reserve is 109 ha and is located in the eastern portion of the Town. Lake Monger itself (UFI 8183) is 71 ha and is surrounded by a 38 ha reserve, which is primarily turfed parkland with scattered parkland tree, as well as some revegetated natural areas. The reserve supports a variety of fauna including 33 bird species, tortoises, frogs and other wetland species.

Lake Monger is a surface through-flow waterbody that is connected to the shallow superficial Gnangara aquifer. Surface stormwater from the Town discharges into the lake through pipe drainage outlets located in the western and southern boundaries of the lake, with an additional drain discharging water from outside the Town into the eastern boundary of the lake and the lake discharges into the Swan River. Stormwater quality is managed by nutrient stripping channels in the east of the lake. The Lake Monger Reserve Management Plan 2008-2018 (Ecoscape 2007) outlines the principal management objective:

"To continue biodiversity conservation and restoration of Lake Monger Reserve to achieve a more diverse and self-sustaining ecosystem that provides a variety of fauna habitats, improves water quality, enhances and protects the natural and historical value and allows for passive recreation, education and community involvement."
FIGURE 17: GEOMORPHIC WETLANDS, WHICH INCLUDE PERRY LAKES AND LAKE MONGER
Perry Lakes Reserve is located in the central portion of the Town and contains two separate CCW areas, Perry Lakes north (UFI 8184) and Perry Lakes south (UFI 8195). Extensive clearing of the habitat surrounding the waterbodies occurred in 1962, and the reserve exists today primarily as grassed parkland with mature remnant native and planted non-native trees.

Perry Lakes Reserve supports a variety of fauna including more than 20 species of birds, as well as tortoises, frogs and other wetland species. In recent years both lakes have largely dried out as a result of declining groundwater levels in the Gnangara Mound, with permanent water being supported in a small portion of the southern lake.

This drying has led to “terrestrialisation” of the lakes and associated invasion of weeds, particularly by couch and kikuyu grasses (Kabay 2007). The Town has prepared the Perry Lakes Reserve Environmental Management Plan 2001 and the Perry Lakes Reserve Weed Management Plan 2007 to address the management requirements of Perry Lakes Reserve.

Both Lake Monger Reserve and Perry Lakes Reserve are popular recreational locations, and hold Aboriginal heritage values. Continued efforts to conserve and promote the biodiversity and cultural values of these features should be prioritised. The potential for greater (but managed) stormwater inflow into the wetlands could be considered as part of future management.
4.1.5 COASTLINE AND ASSOCIATED HAZARDS

The Town contains approximately 4.8km of coastline, including the popular City Beach and Floreat Beach. The coastline is a key regional attraction and is utilised for a variety of recreational activities. It also contains significant ecological values associated with the largely intact high quality dune system. The recent redevelopment of City Beach including a new surf club and restaurant precinct is likely to increase attraction to the coastline within the Town. Any future development in coastal areas should consider the impacts of coastal hazards associated with shoreline retreat, and dune degradation and erosion, as well as maintaining the coastal values within the Town.

Beach and dune erosion is a significant threat to the Town coastline, as well as the broader Perth coastline. Sea level rise and the increased frequency of severe storm events due to global climate change are predicted to cause significant shoreline retreat over the next century (Climate Commission 2013). A coastal vulnerability assessment has recently been prepared for City Beach (between City Beach and Floreat Groynes) by M P Rogers & Associate.

The report modelled a total estimated impact of shoreline retreat for the next 50 years at between 45 to 64m which includes sea level rise, severe storm erosion and an allowance for uncertainty (MP Rogers & Associates 2013). Since the report was published an underground sea wall of 165m in length has been constructed at City Beach to mitigate the impacts of shoreline retreat and protecting new development. Within the Town there is generally greater than 300m between the shoreline and existing residential lots, however some areas within City Beach adjacent to Challenger Parade are closer to the shoreline.

Along the coastline there are noticeable areas of degraded vegetation within the foreshore dunes, as well as significant blowouts (Figure 18). Blowouts occur from sand being mobilised by high velocity winds, and sand from blowouts can smother surrounding vegetation and infrastructure. While these are naturally occurring they are exacerbated by the disturbance and removal of native vegetation which help stabilise the dunes. Revegetation of foreshore dune areas can reduce the risks of blowouts and increase the ecological and aesthetic value of the dunes. In response, Cambridge Coastcare has recently arrested some of these dune blowouts at Floreat dog beach. Working with and co-operating with community groups are an important aspect of biodiversity and coastal management in the Town.

FIGURE 18: COASTAL BLOWOUTS OCCURING AT CITY BEACH
4.1.6 BUSHFIRE HAZARDS

Within the Town there are significant areas of bushfire hazard primarily related to areas of remnant vegetation. The largest of these areas is Bold Park and adjacent bushland, which contains areas of dense woodland with a variety of fuel layers (Figure 19). Between 2011 and 2016, four fires occurred within Bold Park, two of which were moderate sizes (10ha and 14ha). For the past 30 years controlled burning has not occurred within the park, until recently where a 6ha controlled burn was conducted in April 2016 for scientific purposes. Long periods between fire events allow the accumulation of litter which contributes to overall fuel loads. Further controlled burns may occur within the park as part of future scientific research and/or park management. Other areas of bushfire hazard include the coastal dunes, Bush Forever sites and local and regional parks containing remnant vegetation.

SPP 3.7 Planning in Bushfire Prone Areas was released in December 2015, identifying areas as bushfire prone in the Map of Bush Fire Prone Areas (OBRM 2016 or as updated). The identification of Bushfire Prone Areas within any portion of subdivision and/or development applications acts as a trigger for the further assessment of the bushfire hazard implications on the proposal in accordance with the Guidelines for Planning in Bushfire Prone Areas (WAPC et al. 2015). In accordance with SPP 3.7, all strategic planning proposals, subdivisions and development applications within a designated bushfire prone area will need to be accompanied by either a Bushfire Hazard Level assessment, a BAL Contour Map and/or a BAL assessment.

Within the Town there is 909 ha of land identified as “Bushfire Prone Areas” under the state-wide Map of Bushfire Prone Areas (refer section 2.2.10 and Figure 20). The Map of Bush Fire Prone Areas provides a single means of identifying whether a site is designated under law as being bushfire prone at the state level. The Town of Cambridge as part of its Local Planning Strategy requested Emerge Associates to prepare a Bushfire Management Plan to investigate the implications of SPP 3.7 and potential bushfire considerations affecting four potential development sites:

- Eastern surplus Wembley Golf Course site (part lot 2 on diagram 54860) (Site 1)
- Western surplus Wembley Golf Course site (lot 2 on diagram 34289 and part lot 2000 on plan 73159) (Site 2)
- Old quarry site (lot 9001 on plan 58139) (Site 3)
- Town administration centre site (lot 713 on diagram 90076) (Site 4)

The Bushfire Management Plan outlines recommendations to maintain compliance with SPP3.7, including:

- A public road network (at least 6m wide) within each site that provides access to at least two different destinations and where possible, avoids cul-de-sacs.
- Ensure future residential buildings are able to be located so that BAL-29 or less applies. Separation distances should be in accordance with the minimum distances outlined in the Bushfire Management Plan and maintained in accordance with the definition of low threat in AS 3959 at cl.2.2.3.2(f) or the Asset Protection Zone Standard provided in the Guidelines.
- The provision of public open space within the sites should not contribute to classified vegetation.
- A minimum BAL construction standard (AS 3959) should apply across site 4, including a requirement that all residential development be fitted with gutter guards as recognised by AS 3959.
- Notification should be provided on the land title articulating the setback requirements required to achieve BAL29 at the building, and for site 4 the additional bushfire management requirements.

**Figure 19: Bold Park contains areas of dense woodland**
4.1.7 DRAFT GREEN GROWTH PLAN FOR PERTH AND PEEL @ 3.5 MILLION

The State government released the Draft Green Growth Plan for Perth and Peel @ 3.5 million (Department of Premier and Cabinet 2015) which is intended to integrate environmental protection with land use planning at a strategic level, to support the development of the Perth and Peel regions and a population of 3.5 million over the next 25 years.

The plan considers the potential cumulative environmental impacts associated with this projected population growth for both Commonwealth and State significant environmental values, with particular consideration of development associated with urban, industrial and rural-residential land uses, construction and implementation of major infrastructure and the use of basic raw materials. Overall the Draft Green Growth Plan for Perth and Peel @ 3.5 million intends to improve certainty for decision makers as well as provide opportunities to improve the environment at a landscape scale, rather than on a project-by-project basis.

Most of the land within the Town is included within the ‘urban class of action’. Where a development proposal falls within the definition of a ‘class of action’, the streamlined environmental approval processes will apply and referral under Part 9 of the EPBC Act will no longer be required and cannot occur.

Draft mapping associated with the Green Growth Plan identified areas within the Town as ‘specific commitments’, and ‘broad commitments and values’. Areas with specific commitments are: threatened flora and ecological communities, CCWs and wetlands of international importance, vegetation complexes with less than 10 percent remaining, Bush Forever sites, and areas of Short Tongued Bee (Leioproctus douglasiellus) distribution. Areas with broad commitments and values are: threatened fauna habitat, vegetation complexes with more than 10% but less than 30% remaining, resource enhancement wetlands with remnant vegetation, and 50 metre buffers for CCWs. Areas subject to ‘broad commitments and values’ are intended to be refined to inform decision making.

Within the Town, areas containing ‘specific commitments’ include Chipping Park and Templetonia Park (part of Bush Forever site 310). Areas of ‘broad commitments and values’ are Fred Burton Park, Roscommon Park, the remnant vegetation within McLean Park, and remnant vegetation within Helston Park.

The State Government announced in April 2018 that work on the Strategic Assessment of the Perth and Peel Regions (SAPPR), which aims to produce the Green Growth Plan for Perth and Peel, was suspended until ‘critical review of the ongoing costs, risks and benefits to Western Australia is completed and can be considered by government.’
4.1.8 HISTORICAL AND EXISTING LAND USES

HISTORICAL USES

The Town was first developed in the suburbs of West Leederville and Wembley in the 1890s, with various subdivisions gradually expanding residential areas to the coast.

Substantial growth in the large residential areas of City Beach and Floreat took place in the 1950-60s. Cambridge Street has historically been the main activity corridor within the Town.

The historical land uses within the Town are not likely to have caused significant contamination that would significantly constrain future infill development.

A review of the Department of Water and Environmental Regulation (DWER) publicly available Contaminated Sites Database (DWER 2015) identifies six classified sites pursuant to the Contaminated Sites Act 2003. These include:

- 234 Cambridge Street Wembley (contaminated – remediation required);
- 53 Marlow Street Wembley (remediated for restricted use);
- 55, 57 and 59 Marlow Street Wembley (contaminated – remediation required);
- a small site within the northern portion of Lake Monger Reserve (remediated for restricted use); and
- Former quarry site on The Boulevard, City Beach.

EXISTING USES

The primary land uses within the Town are residential and parks and recreation. Commercial and mixed use areas are largely located along Cambridge Street and Floreat Forum. There are permitted low scale industry use classes however these are not permitted to adversely affect the amenity of the locality, as specified in TPS 1. Land use conflicts between residential and industrial land uses are not expected to present significant concerns within the Town.

The Town contains large areas of land reserved under the MRS as Parks and Recreation, primarily related to the foreshore dunes, Bold Park, Perry Lakes, Lake Monger and Wembley Golf Course. The MRS includes a primary regional road extending from Oceanic Drive through the northern portion of Bold Park and areas of the Wembley Golf Course to Pearson Street, which was originally designated in 1963 (proposed Stephenson Highway). This use would have a significant impact on the conservation value of bushland in Bold Park, as well as the linkage values of this area.

Significant areas of native vegetation that are reserved as Local Parks and Recreation in TPS 1 include the eastern portions of Bush Forever Site 310 (Templetonia Park and Chipping Park), Fred Burton Park, Roscommon Park, and Mclean Park.

SPP 5.4 Road and Transport Noise and Freight Considerations in Land Use Planning provides guidance for identifying situations where transport noise impacts need to be considered. These include noise sensitive development (development adjacent to transport corridors), major roads and railways. SPP 5.4 outlines the noise criteria that represent an acceptable margin of compliance in relation to these developments. The requirements of this policy will need to be considered when considering urban infill in close proximity to major roads within the Town.

SPP 5.4 is currently under review and the draft policy was released for public comment in September 2017.
INDIGENOUS HERITAGE

Registered indigenous heritage sites are protected under the *Aboriginal Heritage Act 1972* and are important cultural and historical sites that must be managed accordingly. The classification and general location of all known Aboriginal Heritage Sites is made publicly available through the Department of Aboriginal Affairs (DAA) Aboriginal Heritage Inquiry System (AHIS) online database.

The AHIS is maintained pursuant to Section 38 of the *Aboriginal Heritage Act 1972* by the DAA, and contains information on Registered Aboriginal Heritages Sites and Other Heritage Places throughout Western Australia.

Based on a review of the AHIS online database, there are five registered Aboriginal Heritage Sites within the Town, and several other sites designated as “Stored Data/Not a Site”. These sites have been detailed in Table 8 and are shown in Figure 20.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DAA ID</th>
<th>DAA Name</th>
<th>Size (ha)</th>
<th>DAA Status</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20178</td>
<td>Bold Park</td>
<td>436.67</td>
<td>Registered Site</td>
<td>Historical, Mythological, Camp, Hunting Place, Plant Resource, Other: Lookout Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3788</td>
<td>Lake Monger (Galup)</td>
<td>90.51</td>
<td>Registered Site</td>
<td>Mythological, Quarry, Skeletal Material / Burial, Camp, Hunting Place, Ochre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3318</td>
<td>Lake Monger NW &amp; W</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>Registered Site</td>
<td>Artefacts / Scatter, Camp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3323</td>
<td>Lake Monger Velodrome</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>Registered Site</td>
<td>Artefacts / Scatter, Camp, Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3734</td>
<td>Stephenson Avenue</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>Registered Site</td>
<td>Camp, Plant Resource</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3735</td>
<td>Perry Lakes</td>
<td>20.59</td>
<td>Stored Data / Not a Site</td>
<td>Camp, Hunting Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32766</td>
<td>Site Area G</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>Stored Data / Not a Site</td>
<td>Artefacts / Scatter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3160</td>
<td>Lake Monger South</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>Stored Data / Not a Site</td>
<td>Artefacts / Scatter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3756</td>
<td>Trigg to Fremantle</td>
<td>95.28</td>
<td>Stored Data / Not a Site</td>
<td>Mythological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3202</td>
<td>Tranmore Way</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>Stored Data / Not a Site</td>
<td>Artefacts / Scatter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE 20: KNOWN ABORIGINAL HERITAGE AS IDENTIFIED ON THE AHIS DATABASE
### 4.2 POPULATION AND HOUSING

#### 4.2.1 POPULATION HIGHLIGHTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Town of Cambridge</th>
<th>Perth Metropolitan Area</th>
<th>Western Australia</th>
<th>Australia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>AGE</strong></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INCOME</strong></td>
<td>$2,449</td>
<td>$1,643</td>
<td>$1,595</td>
<td>$1,438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median weekly household income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couples with children</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older couples without children</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>dwelling types</strong></td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium and high density housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with a mortgage</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median weekly rent</td>
<td>$450</td>
<td>$360</td>
<td>$347</td>
<td>$335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households renting</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ETHNICITY</strong></td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-english speaking backgrounds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University attendance</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor or higher degree</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCHOOL / EDUCATION</strong></td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.2 POPULATION ESTIMATES AND FORECASTS

It is estimated that some 28,339 people live in the Town of Cambridge (ABS, ERP 2017). There has been an increase in population of 3,074 persons between 2006 and 2016. Rates of growth were relatively steady (albeit slight dips in 2009 and 2010) reaching a peak in 2013, then noticeably slowing in 2014, 2015 and 2016 (Figure 21).

Population growth has generally slowed over the past two census periods with an increase of 1,351 (4.9%) residents between 2011 and 2016 (ABS), averaging an annual population change of 1.41% per year over that period (Figure 22).

The State Government’s official Population Report No. 10 medium term forecasts a population of between 30,450 and 33,520 within the Town of Cambridge by the year 2026, dependent on five different possible growth scenarios (Western Australia Tomorrow, 2015). It is generally accepted practice to use Band C for future forecast purposes, giving an anticipated population of 31,940 by 2026 (refer Table 9).

TABLE 9: TOWN OF CAMBRIDGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Persons</th>
<th>Band</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>26 730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>27 940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>29 240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026</td>
<td>30 450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In all instances, predicted annual growth rates for the Town of Cambridge are almost half of those forecast for Greater Perth (refer Table 10 and Table 11). It is reasonable to assume that an increased rate of growth would be dependent upon/responsive to proactive strategies.

### TABLE 10: AVERAGE ANNUAL GROWTH RATE\(^1\) TOWN OF CAMBRIDGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Band</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.89%</td>
<td>1.18%</td>
<td>1.41%</td>
<td>1.61%</td>
<td>1.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.90%</td>
<td>1.14%</td>
<td>1.31%</td>
<td>1.46%</td>
<td>1.71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.87%</td>
<td>1.06%</td>
<td>1.19%</td>
<td>1.32%</td>
<td>1.52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
\(^1\) Average annual growth rate from 2011

### TABLE 11: AVERAGE ANNUAL GROWTH RATE\(^1\) GREATER PERTH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Band</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.71%</td>
<td>2.13%</td>
<td>2.48%</td>
<td>2.76%</td>
<td>3.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.80%</td>
<td>2.08%</td>
<td>2.31%</td>
<td>2.50%</td>
<td>2.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2026</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.77%</td>
<td>2.00%</td>
<td>2.18%</td>
<td>2.34%</td>
<td>2.59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
\(^1\) Average annual growth rate from 2011

The population by suburb is illustrated in Table 12.

### TABLE 12: POPULATION BY SUBURB

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Beach</td>
<td>6631</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>6357</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>6173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floreat</td>
<td>6890</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>6273</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>6125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wembley - Jolimont</td>
<td>8803</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>8187</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>7480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Leederville</td>
<td>4076</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>3748</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>3663</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, there has been an increase in population throughout the Town. Floreat experiencing the greatest population increase over recent years, with an additional 617 (9.8%) persons between 2011 and 2016, substantially increasing from 2.4% between 2006 and 2011. This increase may be likely due to residential development in Perry Lakes over recent years. West Leederville has had a significant population increase between 2011 and 2016, with 8.8% increase in dwellings, compared to 2.3% between 2006 and 2011.

Although generally population within Wembley-Jolimont is increasing, the growth rate has slowed from 9.5% to 7.5% in 2001 to 2016. The rate of population growth in City Beach has remained steady, with a slight increase in recent years possibly reflecting new developments at Ocean Mia.
4.2.3 AGE COHORTS

The age structure of the Town’s population is generally indicative of an area’s residential role and function and provides key insights into the level of demand for housing, services and facilities.

Parents and Home Builders (35 to 49 years) were the most dominant service age group within the Town (21.7%), followed by older workers and pre-retirees (50 to 59 years) (13.4%) and primary schoolers (5 to 11 years) (11.1%) (Figure 23).

Compared to Greater Perth, the Town of Cambridge has a higher proportion of people in the younger age groups (0-17 years) as well as a higher proportion in the older age groups (70+ years) (Figure 23). At the time of the 2016 census, 25.1% of the population was aged between 0 and 17, and 21.1% were aged 60 years and over (22.7% and 19.0% respectively for Greater Perth).

Whilst growth was experienced between 2011 and 2016 in majority service groups, there was a decline in the population aged between 0-4 and 18-24 years. Trends indicate that the population of the Town of Cambridge will continue to include comparatively higher numbers of primary school children; a young workforce; older workers and pre-retirees; and empty nesters and retirees.

The major differences between the age structure of the Town of Cambridge and Greater Perth were:

- A larger percentage of ‘Primary schoolers’ (11.1% compared to 9.0%)
- A larger percentage of ‘Elderly aged (85 and over)’ (3.17% compared to 1.8%)
- A smaller percentage of ‘Young workforce (25 to 34)’ (10.7% compared to 15.8%)
- A smaller percentage on ‘Tertiary education and independence (18 to 24)’ (7.9 compared to 9.4%)

From 2011 to 2016, Town of Cambridge’s population increased by 1,351 people (4.9%). This represents an average annual population change of 0.96% per year over the period. The largest changes in the age structure in this area between 2011 and 2016 were in the age groups (Figure 24):

- Primary schoolers (5 to 11) (+420 people)
- Young workforce (25 to 34) (+275 people)
- Older workers and pre-retirees (50 to 59) (+234 people)
- Empty nesters and retirees (60 to 69) (+387 people)
These emerging groups will have a direct impact on forward planning in the Town as there will be increased demand for age/lifecycle specific facilities and programs. This demand will be particularly relevant to hard infrastructure/recreational provision and training and employment requirements and diversity in the Town's housing stock.

Residents are of all different ages over the different suburbs of the Town although some areas have higher proportions of particular age groups.

Although each suburb has a slightly different age profile, parents and homebuilders (35 to 49 years) account for the greatest proportion of residents throughout the Town. Figure 25 shows that City Beach has fairly a diverse age profile, with notably lower proportion of young workforce and a higher proportion of seniors (70 to 84 years) when compared to the remainder of the Town. City Beach has the highest proportion of secondary schoolers (12 to 17 years), tertiary education and independence (18 to 24 years), older works and pre-retirees (50 to 59 years) and seniors (70 to 84 years) in comparison with Floreat, Wembley-Jolimont and West Leederville. Comparatively, Floreat and Wembley-Jolimont have a similar age profile with the highest proportion of parents and homebuilders (35 to 49 years) within the Town compared with City Beach and West Leederville. Notably, West Leederville has a significantly higher proportion of young workforce (25 to 34 years) and a lower proportion of primary schoolers (5 to 11 years) in comparison to City Beach, Floreat and Wembley-Jolimont.

The largest changes in the age structure in City Beach between 2011 and 2016 were in the age groups (refer Figure 25):

- Older workers and pre-retirees (50 to 59) (+81 people)
- Elderly aged (85 and over) (+71 people)
- Primary schoolers (5 to 11) (+51 people)
- Young workforce (25 to 34) (+50 people)

The largest changes in the age structure in Floreat between 2011 and 2016 in the age groups:

- Primary schoolers (5 to 11) (+180 people)
- Empty nesters and retirees (60 to 69) (+118 people)
- Older workers and pre-retirees (50 to 59) (+117 people)
- Young workforce (25 to 34) (+110 people)

The largest changes in the age structure in Wembley-Jolimont between 2011 and 2016 in the age groups:

- Primary schoolers (5 to 11) (+145 people)
- Young workforce (25 to 34) (+122 people)
- Tertiary education and independence (18 to 24) (-114 people)
- Secondary schoolers (12 to 17) (+110 people)

The largest changes in the age structure in West Leederville between 2011 and 2016 in the age groups:

- Parents and homebuilders (35 to 49) (+113 people)
- Primary schoolers (5 to 11) (+86 people)
- Seniors (70 to 84) (+80 people)
- Empty nesters and retirees (60 to 69) (+55 people)
4.2.4 ETHNICITY

The Town of Cambridge does not have a significant ethnic mix. Analysis of country of birth in 2016 shows there was a smaller proportion of people born overseas compared to Greater Perth (29.1% versus 36.1% for Greater Perth) as well as from non-English speaking background (14.0% versus 19.3% for Greater Perth).

Between 2011 and 2016, however, there was an increase of residents within the Town who were born in China, United Kingdom, Malaysia and South Africa.

4.2.5 QUALIFICATIONS

The 2016 census shows that a high proportion of residents aged over 15 years within the Town of Cambridge (64.8%) hold formal qualifications including a Bachelor Degree, Advanced Diploma or Diploma, or Vocational qualifications. This is a greater proportion when compared to Greater Perth (51.7%).

FIGURE 25: AGE STRUCTURE - SERVICE AGE GROUPS BY SUBURB
4.2.6 HOUSEHOLD TYPES

The Town of Cambridge’s household and family structure is one of the most important demographic indicators which reveals an area’s role and function and provides insights into demand for services and facilities. The number of households in the Town grew by 514 between 2011 and 2016.

Analysis of the household/family types in the Town of Cambridge in 2016 (Figure 26) compared to Greater Perth shows that there was a higher proportion of couple families with children and a lower proportion of one-parent families. Overall, 38.5% of total households were couple families with children, and 6.5% were one-parent families, compared with 32.3% and 9.8% respectively for Greater Perth.

Couple families with children are also growing at the fastest rate, with approximately 9.5% increase in 5 years between 2011 and 2016 and 12.0% increase between 2006 and 2011.

Couples without children and lone person households made up almost half of the Town’s total households (45.8%). The number of couples without children has remained relatively the same between 2011 (24.8%) and 2016 (24.4%). Lone person households are slightly decreasing as couples with children and one parent families grows.

4.2.6.1 HOUSEHOLDS WITH CHILDREN

For Households with Children in the Town of Cambridge, life stage is based on the age of children in the household (Table 13). The age of the parent(s) is not taken into account.

- Young children: Children aged under 15 only
- Mixed age children: One or more children under 15 and one or more children over 15 (must have 2 or more children)
- Older children: Children aged 15 and over only

To continue building the story, the Town of Cambridge’s Household data should be viewed in conjunction with Household Size, Age Structure and Dwelling Type.

\[\text{TABLE 13: HOUSEHOLDS WITH CHILDREN BY LIFE STAGE}\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town of Cambridge</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th></th>
<th>%</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>2011 to 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Couples with children</td>
<td>3,784</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>3,455</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>+329</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couples with young children</td>
<td>2,134</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>1,928</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>+206</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couples with mixed-age children</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>+31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couples with older children</td>
<td>1,154</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>1,062</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>+92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single parents with children</td>
<td>640</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>+60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single parents with young children</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>+21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single parents with mixed-age children</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>+6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single parents with older children</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>+33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total households with children</td>
<td>4,424</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>4201</td>
<td>4,035</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>+389</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total households</td>
<td>9,824</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>9,310</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>+514</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DOMINANT GROUPS

Analysis of the families with children in 2016 compared to Greater Perth shows that there was a larger proportion of couples with young children, as well as a larger proportion of couples with older children (Figure 27).

Overall, 21.7% of total households with children were couples with young children, and 11.7% were couples with older children, compared with 18.0% and 9.9% respectively for Greater Perth.

There was a smaller proportion of single parent households with young children and a smaller proportion of single parent households with older children. Overall, the proportion of single parent households with young children was 2.1% compared to 3.7% in Greater Perth while the proportion of single parent households with older children was 3.8% compared to 5.0% in Greater Perth.

EMERGING GROUPS

Between 2011 and 2016, the number of households with children increased by 389 households or 9.6%.

The largest changes in households with children in this area between 2011 and 2016 were (Figure 28):

- Couples with young children (+206 households)
- Couples with older children (+92 households)
4.2.6.2 HOUSEHOLDS WITHOUT CHILDREN

For Households without Children in the Town of Cambridge, life stage is based on the age of the household reference person (usually person 1 on the Census form):

- Young: Aged 15-44
- Middle-aged: Aged 45-64
- Older: Aged 65 and over

DOMINANT GROUPS

Analysis of the households without children in 2016 compared to Greater Perth shows that there was a smaller proportion of young couples without children, a smaller proportion of middle-aged couples without children, and a larger proportion of older couples without children (Figure 29).

In addition, there were a smaller proportion of young lone person households and middle-aged lone person households, with a larger proportion of older lone person households.

EMERGING GROUPS

Between 2011 and 2016, the number of households without children decreased by 21 (Figure 30). The largest changes in households without children in the Town of Cambridge, between 2011 and 2016 were:

- Older couples without children (+99 persons)
- Young lone persons (-78 persons)
- Older lone persons (+55 persons)
4.2.6.3 DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSEHOLDS

Analysis of the three largest household types in the Town of Cambridge in 2016 (Figure 31) shows the most noticeable variations are:

- There is a higher proportion of couples with dependent children in City Beach and a substantially higher proportion of couples with dependent children in Floreat. West Leederville has the lowest proportion of couples with dependent children.

- There are higher proportions of one person households in Wembley-Jolimont and West Leederville.

Households with children require different services and facilities than other household types and their needs change as both adults and children age. When there is a predominance of households at the same stage in their lifecycle in a suburb it can create a suburb lifecycle, for example in Floreat there may be a high level of demand for facilities for children at present, but this cohort may be dependent upon facilities and services for young adults over the next 10 years up to 2026.
4.2.7 HOUSEHOLD SIZE

The size of households in general follows the lifecycle of families, from early marriage through to families with children and then smaller households once the children have left home. However, household size can also be influenced through trends such as multi generational or extended families or the sharing economy/multiple households under one roof. Household size in Australia has gradually declined since the 1970s but remained stable from 2006-2016. An increasing or stable household size can be an indicator of lack of affordable housing but may also reflect the trend toward larger properties.

A clear correlation can be seen between the larger homes established in the suburbs of City Beach and Floreat and larger than the Perth average household size. The profile of household size in the suburbs of Wembley and West Leederville is smaller dwellings and smaller household size and is more closely reflective of the Perth average.

The distribution of household sizes across the Town is similar to that across the Perth Metropolitan Area at large, with the majority of houses consisting of 1 to 2 people. There is however a slightly greater proportion of households with 4 or 5 people in the Town (Figure 32). In line with family type distributions, the proportion of larger households (4+ people) is more dominant in City Beach and Floreat, while West Leederville has the highest proportion of smaller households, particularly two person households.

The largest changes in the number of persons usually resident in a household in the Town of Cambridge (Figure 33) between 2011 and 2016 were:

- 4 persons (+165 households)
- 3 persons (+155 households)
- 5 persons (+92 households)
- 1 persons (-63 households)
4.2.8 HOUSEHOLD INCOME

Analysis of household income levels in the Town of Cambridge in 2016 compared to Greater Perth shows that there was a larger proportion of high income households (those earning $2,500 per week or more) and a lower proportion of low income households (those earning less than $600 per week) (Figure 34).

Overall, 42.9% of the households earned a high income, and 11.3% were low income households, compared with 24.8% and 15.7% respectively for Greater Perth. The major differences between the household incomes of the Town of Cambridge and Greater Perth were:

- A larger percentage of households who earned $6,000 - $7,999 (6.3% compared to 1.6%)
- A larger percentage of households who earned $5,000 - $5,999 (6.5% compared to 2.0%)
- A larger percentage of households who earned $3,500 - $3,999 (8.4% compared to 4.6%)
- A larger percentage of households who earned $4,500 - $4,999 (5.6% compared to 2.3%)

The most significant change in Town of Cambridge between 2011 and 2016 was in the highest quartile which showed an increase of 166 households (Figure 35).
4.2.9 NEED FOR ASSISTANCE

Overall, 3.5% of the population reported within the Town needing assistance with core activities, compared with 3.9% for Greater Perth.

Analysis of the need for assistance of persons in the Town of Cambridge compared to Greater Perth shows that there was a slightly greater proportion of persons who reported needing assistance with core activities (Figure 36).

Between 2011 and 2016, those aged between 20 to 29 experienced the greatest increase in the number of persons requiring assistance with core activities (Figure 37).
4.2.10 HOUSING STOCK

4.2.10.1 OVERALL HOUSING STOCK

It is important to understand the make up of the Town’s housing stock as an indicator of the Town’s residential role and function, and to determine whether the stock is compatible with future forecasts of population and household growth and dynamics.

In 2016, housing within the Town comprised of 8,042 separate houses (74.8%), 1,784 medium density dwellings (16.6%) and 895 high density dwellings (8.3%). This mix generally reflects Greater Perth with a slightly higher percentage of medium density dwellings (19.6% for Greater Perth) and slightly lower percentage of high density (5.1%) for Greater Perth (Table 14).

Of the 10,758 private dwellings within the Town, 91.2% were occupied, while 8.6% were unoccupied (Table 15).

### TABLE 14: DWELLING STRUCTURE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dwelling Type</th>
<th>Town of Cambridge</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Greater Perth %</th>
<th>town of Cambridge</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Greater Perth %</th>
<th>Change 2011-2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Separate house</td>
<td>8,042</td>
<td>74.8</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>8,017</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td>76.7</td>
<td>+25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium density</td>
<td>1,784</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>1,460</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>+324</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High density</td>
<td>895</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>+138</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caravans, cabin, houseboat</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>+17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>+4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Private Dwellings</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,758</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>+508</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### TABLE 15: DWELLING TYPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dwelling Type</th>
<th>Town of Cambridge</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Greater Perth %</th>
<th>Town of Cambridge</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Greater Perth %</th>
<th>Change 2011-2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupied private dwellings</td>
<td>9,826</td>
<td>91.2</td>
<td>89.4</td>
<td>90.7</td>
<td>9,310</td>
<td>90.7</td>
<td>90.8</td>
<td>+516</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unoccupied private dwellings</td>
<td>927</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non private dwellings</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total dwellings</strong></td>
<td><strong>10,771</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>+505</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.10.2 DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING STOCK BY SUBURB

Although the growth rate has steadied in more recent years, Wembley-Jolimont has experienced the highest increase in the number of dwellings (250 dwellings or 8.9%) in the past decade. Both Floreat and West Leederville have also experienced an increase in the number of dwellings, with a prominent a more prominent increase in recent years. Between 2011 and 2016 Floreat’s number of dwellings increased by 7.6% (compared 1.0% between 2006 and 2011), while the growth rate for West Leederville was 6.4% (compared to 1.0% between 2006 and 2011). In City Beach, the 2016 to 2011 period saw an increase in the number of dwellings, following a fall of approximately the same number of dwellings between 2011 and 2016.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Beach</td>
<td>2535</td>
<td>2476</td>
<td>2539</td>
<td>-2.5%</td>
<td>+2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floreat</td>
<td>2226</td>
<td>2271</td>
<td>2443</td>
<td>+1.0%</td>
<td>+7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wembley-Jolimont</td>
<td>3424</td>
<td>3626</td>
<td>3674</td>
<td>+5.9%</td>
<td>+1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Leederville</td>
<td>1713</td>
<td>1780</td>
<td>1894</td>
<td>+1.0%</td>
<td>+6.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>9894</strong></td>
<td><strong>10266</strong></td>
<td><strong>10550</strong></td>
<td><strong>+3.7%</strong></td>
<td><strong>+2.8%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FIGURE 38: DWELLING STRUCTURE (2016) AND CHANGE IN DWELLING STRUCTURE (2011-2016) BY SUBURB**
4.2.10.3 DWELLING SIZE

Housing size within the Town, in terms of number of bedrooms, varies to Greater Perth most significantly at the extreme ends of the size range. Most homes within the Town comprise of three (3) bedrooms, accounting for 32.2% (compared to 35.2% for Greater Perth) and four (4) bedrooms, accounting 31.8% compared to 37.0% for Greater Perth. There is a significantly higher proportion of homes with five (5) or more bedrooms (10.5% compared to 6.8% for Greater Perth).

This dwelling profile provides an insight into the role the Town plays in the housing market. For example, dwellings with one (1) and two (2) bedrooms are likely to attract students, single workers and young couples. Accommodation with two (2) and three (3) bedrooms may attract more families and ‘empty nesters’. The largest changes in the number of bedrooms per dwelling between 2011-2016 were four (4) bedrooms (+292 dwellings) and five (5) or more bedrooms (+158 dwellings), with a notable decrease in two (2) bedroom dwelling (-113 dwellings) and a decrease in three (3) bedroom dwelling (-94 dwellings).

**TABLE 17: NUMBER OF BEDROOMS PER DWELLING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dwelling Type</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>2011</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Change 2011 to 2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Greater Perth</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Greater Perth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 or 1 bedrooms</td>
<td>591</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>+16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 bedrooms</td>
<td>1,288</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>1,401</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>-113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 bedrooms</td>
<td>3,165</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>3,259</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>-94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 bedrooms</td>
<td>3,120</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>2,828</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>+292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 bedrooms or more</td>
<td>1,035</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>+158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>627</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>+256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total households</strong></td>
<td>9,826</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>9,311</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>+515</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2.10.4 DISTRIBUTION OF DWELLING BY SIZE BY SUBURB

The major differences between the number of bedrooms per dwelling of the Town of Cambridge and Greater Perth were:

- A larger percentage of households with five (5) bedrooms dwellings (10.5% compared to 5.9%)
- A larger percentage of dwellings with one (1) or no bedrooms (includes bedsitters) (6.0% compared to 3.5%)
- A smaller percentage of households with four (4) bedrooms dwellings (31.8% compared to 37.0%)
- A smaller percentage of households with three (3) bedrooms dwellings (32.2% compared to 35.2%)

The largest changes in the number of bedrooms per dwelling in the Town of Cambridge between 2011 and 2016 were:

- Four (4) bedroom dwellings (+292 dwellings)
- Five (5) bedroom dwellings (+158 dwellings)
- Two (2) bedroom dwellings (-113 dwellings)
- Three (3) bedroom dwellings (-94 dwellings)

To examine the differences in housing stock across the Town between 2011 and 2016:

- In West Leederville, there were losses in five or more bedroom dwellings, and a gain in one, two, three and four bedroom dwellings. The greatest gain was four bedroom dwellings.
- In Wembley-Jolimont there was a loss of one, two and three bedroom dwellings, with the largest fall in two bedroom dwellings (-121 dwellings). Increases in Wembley-Jolimont were pronounced in most four and five or more bedroom dwellings.
- In Floreat, there was a loss of approximately 24 dwellings with one, two and three bedrooms and a gain in number of four bedroom and five or more bedroom dwellings. The most notable increase was five or more bedroom dwelling, with an increase of 100 dwellings between 2011 and 2016.
- In City Beach, there were losses of homes with one and three bedrooms, and gains in dwellings with two, four, and five and above bedroom dwellings.

### TABLE 18: DIFFERENCE IN HOUSING STOCK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suburb</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2011-2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>West Leederville</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 or 1 bedrooms</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>+23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 bedrooms</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 bedrooms</td>
<td>658</td>
<td>633</td>
<td>+25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 bedrooms</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>+80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more bedrooms</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>+8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Households</td>
<td>1,721</td>
<td>1,594</td>
<td>+128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wembley-Jolimont</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 or 1 bedrooms</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 bedrooms</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>-121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 bedrooms</td>
<td>1,208</td>
<td>1,286</td>
<td>-78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 bedrooms</td>
<td>828</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>+96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more bedrooms</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>+6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>+200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Households</td>
<td>3,380</td>
<td>3,292</td>
<td>+88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Floreat</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 or 1 bedrooms</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 bedrooms</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 bedrooms</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 bedrooms</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>+88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more bedrooms</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>+100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>+30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Households</td>
<td>2,302</td>
<td>2,108</td>
<td>+194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>City Beach</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 or 1 bedrooms</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 bedrooms</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>+29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 bedrooms</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>-43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 bedrooms</td>
<td>993</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>+40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more bedrooms</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>+51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Stated</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>+35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Households</td>
<td>2,340</td>
<td>2,233</td>
<td>+107</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
USING TENURE AND AFFORDABILITY

In 2016, most residents either owned their own home or were paying off a mortgage. Of particular note is the proportion of those who fully owned their homes, which was significantly higher than for Greater Perth (36.8% compared to 26.7%). The proportion of those renting in the Town of Cambridge was lower at 21.2% compared to 25.5% for Greater Perth, and those renting social housing was proportionally lower at 0.5% compared to 3.1% for Greater Perth.

Housing loan repayments and weekly rentals within the Town of Cambridge in 2016 showed that there was a larger proportion of households paying high mortgage repayments ($2,600 per month or more) (51.3%) compared to Greater Perth (18.9%), as well as high weekly rental payments with 51.1% of households paying high rental rates compared with Greater Perth (24.0%).

The proportion of fully owned properties is particularly high in City Beach and Floreat (approximately 49.5% and 40.3% respectively). On the other hand, rentals in City Beach and Floreat are considerably lower at approximately 12.8% and 12.2% respectively.

The housing tenure profile of Wembley-Jolimont is similar to that across the Greater Perth at large, with approximately 26% rentals, which has remained steady between 2011 and 2016.

In the case of West Leederville, the proportion of fully owned properties is similar to the average level across Greater Perth at 26.5%. However, compared to both Cambridge and Greater Perth, there is a higher proportion of rental properties, reflecting the inner city location of the suburb (36.2% rentals in West Leederville compared to 25.5% across Perth and 21.2% across Cambridge).
4.2.11 IMPLICATIONS

A growing residential population and expected future population growth

The Town’s population increased approximately 4.9% over the 2011 to 2016 period and 12.3% in the period 2006-2016. This follows a period of population stagnation over the 1990s. Household sizes have been increasing to accommodate the increased population (change from 2.50 to 2.61 people per dwelling between 2001 and 2016). The Town’s population is expected to increase by approximately 11.5% to 31,940 by 2026 from 2015 levels (WAPC Band C forecast).

Growing proportions of young children and couples with children, loss of young workforce and growing empty nesters and retirees

The Town has a higher than average proportion of couples with children in 2016 than is the case across the Greater Perth (38.5% compared to 32.3% of households). This proportion has increased over recent years over the Town. There has been a decrease in babies and preschoolers with an increase in school children throughout the Town. School children accounting for 19.4% of the Town’s population in 2016, compared with 18.7% in 2006 which is a higher proportion when compared with Greater Perth accounting for 16.2% of the population. In particular, there has been a prominent increase in primary school children (5 to 11 years) within the Town (11.1%) compared to Greater Perth (9.0%).

There has been a recent decrease in young adults (18 to 24 years of age) from 8.8% in 2011 to 7.9% in 2016, but an increase in the young workforce (25 to 34 years of age). In comparison with 2011, the proportion of empty nesters and retirees (60 to 69 years of age) has increased, with empty nesters representing 9.3% of the Town’s population, which previously represented 8.5% in 2016.

Forecast increases in seniors, lone person households and couple households without children

Population forecasts for the Town (from demographers Informed Decisions) indicate that the number of lone person households and couple households with no children are likely to increase over the next 20 years and that couple families with dependents will increase over the next five to ten years before stabilising. Meanwhile, it is expected that the most significant changes to the Town’s age profile over the next 20 years will be increases in those aged 50 to 85 years (particularly those over 60 years) and those in the 35-49 age group. There will be some continued short-term increases in the number of those aged 5-17 years over the next five to ten years, before reductions in these age groups.

Key Implications

Without more area specific analysis being undertaken (and while also accounting for state and regional planning objectives), the following implications are noted:

- Additional housing and infrastructure provision required for growing population;
- Additional aged housing and services and greater housing diversity for elderly are required and the need to consider opportunities for aging in place;
- Increased housing diversity opportunities across the Town required given the diversity in the population profile – with an emphasis on providing dwellings for smaller households (especially in the longer term);
- Need to consider the robustness of housing stock so as to accommodate changing household structures and tenures.
4.3 ECONOMY AND EMPLOYMENT

4.3.1 EMPLOYMENT

In 2016, some 13,096 people worked in the Town of Cambridge. Most of the workforce resides in Cambridge or the adjacent Local Government Areas of Stirling, Joondalup, Nedlands, Subiaco and Vincent. Some of the workforce travel into Cambridge from further afield including Melville and Swan.

At the same time, there were 12,952 employed residents. Of these workers, 2,313 also lived in the area. In other words, 17.7% of the workers in the area also live in the Town of Cambridge.

The Town of Cambridge's employment statistics are an important indicator of socioeconomic status. The levels of full or part-time employment, unemployment and labour force participation indicate the strength of the local economy and social characteristics of the population.

Employment status is linked to a number of factors including Age Structure, which influences the number of people in the workforce; the economic base and employment opportunities available in the area; and the education and skill base of the population. The table Employment Status (Table 19) illustrates the Town’s employment profile.

At the time of the 2016 census, the employment rate within the Town of Cambridge was high with 94.7% of the labour force employed and 5.3% unemployed. This compares to 91.9% and 8.1%, respectively for Greater Perth.

Perth City Centre is the major employment destination in the region and for the Town's working population Perth City Centre is the key employment area and commercial centre for the region. Of the Town’s working population of approximately 3,681 (28.4%) are employed within the City of Perth while 17.9% work within the Town, with the remaining 53.7% working elsewhere.

### TABLE 19: EMPLOYMENT STATUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Greater Perth</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Greater Perth</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>12,929</td>
<td>94.7</td>
<td>91.9</td>
<td>12,595</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>+334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed full-time</td>
<td>7,576</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>7,642</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>-66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed part-time</td>
<td>5,210</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>4,799</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>+411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours worked not stated</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed (Unemployment rate)</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>+331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking for full-time work</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>+181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Looking for part-time work</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>+150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total labour force</td>
<td>13,654</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>12,989</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>+665</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.2 TRAVEL TO WORK

As for Greater Perth, the method of travel to work for residents of the Town of Cambridge is overwhelmingly dominated by the car (as a driver), although the proportion is less than that for Greater Perth (58.8% compared to 64.1%). Table 20 below demonstrates that a higher proportion of Cambridge residents than those in Greater Perth used alternative travel to work methods such as bus (6.8% compared to 4.1%); bicycle (3.3% compared to 1.0%); and walked (3.7% compared to 2.1%). In addition, a higher proportion of Cambridge residents worked at home (6.9% compared to 3.9%).

Method of travel to work has not changed greatly since 2011, however, there was a slight increase in the proportion of residents driving to work and a slight increase in the proportion of those catching a bus or cycling.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 20: METHOD OF TRAVEL TO WORK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Town of Cambridge - (Enumerated)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main method of travel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Train</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tram or Ferry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car - as driver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car - as passenger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motorbike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walked only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked at home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not go to work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total employed persons aged 15+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


4.3.3 EMPLOYMENT INDUSTRY

In 2016, the industry sectors of Health Care and Social Assistance (16.5%); Professional, Scientific and Technical Services (14.4%); and Education and Training (10.6%) dominated employment within the Town of Cambridge. Retail Trade (7.4%) and Construction (6.3%) were the next highest industry employment sectors, as highlighted in Figure 41.
From the previous census in 2011, most growth was notably experienced in the Health Care and Social Assistance, with Education and Training and Accommodation Food Services. It is also worth noting that there was a significant increase in the number of those whose industry is ‘Inadequately describes or not stated’ suggesting that there may be an increase in the diversity of industry residents are employed in. Several sectors experienced some decline being most significantly in Professional, Scientific and Technical Services (refer Figure 42).

4.3.4 OCCUPATION

Professionals (41.9%), Managers (17.8%) and Clerical and Administrative Workers (11.5%) accounted for the bulk of the workforce occupations in 2016. The proportions of Professionals and Managers in the Town compared to Greater Perth are significantly higher; particularly in relation to Professionals which is almost double (41.9% compared to 22.2% for Greater Perth).

A smaller proportion of persons are employed as Technicians and Trade Workers (6.7% compared to 15.6% for Greater Perth) and Labourers (3.7% compared to 9.0% for Greater Perth), as can be seen in the Figure 43 below.

Over the period 2011 to 2016, Table 21 shows that the greatest change in occupation of employment was growth in Professionals and then Managers and Community, and Personal Service Workers. There was a decline in Clerical and Administrative Workers which is consistent with what Greater Perth has experienced.
### TABLE 21: OCCUPATION OF EMPLOYMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Greater Perth %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>2,298</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td>5,420</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technicians and Trades Workers</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community and Personal Service Workers</td>
<td>1,022</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clerical and Administrative Workers</td>
<td>1,489</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Workers</td>
<td>953</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machinery Operators And Drivers</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labourers</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequately described</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total employed persons aged 15+</td>
<td>12,921</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


#### 4.4.2 INCOME

Coinciding with the major industry employment sectors and occupations, individual and weekly household incomes within the Town of Cambridge are not unexpectedly high.

Analysis of individual income levels in the Town of Cambridge in 2016 shows a higher proportion of those earning a high income ($1,750 per week or more) and a lower proportion of low income earners (less than $500 per week) compared to Greater Perth. Some 29.0% of the population earned a high income (15.1% for Greater Perth) and 29.7% earned a low income (35.7% for Greater Perth).

Similar results are apparent for weekly household income (Table 22). A total of 42.9% of households earned $2,500 per week or more (24.8% for Greater Perth) and 11.3% earned less than $650 per week (15.7% for Greater Perth).

### TABLE 22: WEEKLY INDIVIDUAL INCOME (2016)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town of Cambridge - Persons Aged 15+ (Usual Residence)</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Weekly Gross Income</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Income / Nil Income</td>
<td>2,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1 - $149</td>
<td>1,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$150 - $299</td>
<td>1,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$300 - $399</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$400 - $499</td>
<td>1,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500 - $649</td>
<td>1,096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$650 - $799</td>
<td>989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$800 - $999</td>
<td>1,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,000 - $1,249</td>
<td>1,469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,250 - $1,499</td>
<td>1,158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,500 - $1,749</td>
<td>1,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1,750 - $1,999</td>
<td>951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2,000 - $2,999</td>
<td>2,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$3,000 or more</td>
<td>3,102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>1,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total persons aged 15+</td>
<td>21,134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4 ECONOMIC DRIVERS AND FUTURE EMPLOYMENT REQUIREMENTS

4.4.1 EMPLOYMENT GROWTH REQUIREMENTS

Employment generation and economic growth within the Town will be essential so that;

- the local population has a choice of places of employment in the Town and within easy access of their homes;
- the local population has a sustainable and high quality of life with local facilities, shops, entertainment, events, education and employment choices;
- the Town is able to capture resident and business expenditure locally to support additional enterprises and to sustain the local economy.

The likely demand for employment can be calculated in a number of ways including the increase in proportion of the population of working age and also as a factor of household growth. This rudimentary calculation is intended to highlight the requirement for employment growth but the detail of how those jobs could be achieved and where they could be located is a matter for further examination.

Clearly not all of the eligible workforce will be seeking or able to gain employment, or local employment, although the town does have a high participation rate at present. Similarly the community may seek specific jobs associated with their needs and qualifications outside of the Town, a scenario whereby the current low levels of employment self containment would be perpetuated.

As a basic calculation, the Town can expect approximate growth in the age groups 15-65, people most likely eligible or actively seeking employment, of 3,880 people or a 19.4% increase in the same age cohorts from 2016 to 2026 and similarly the anticipated growth in the number of households over the period 2016-2026 is 1,100 households or 9.3%.

In 2016 the employment participation rate of the local labour force was 64.6%, and 55.5% of the employed local workforce worked full time, and 38.2% worked part time. If these ratios remained static, this may equate to a desirable increase of future employment opportunities by 2026 of 2,735 jobs or 1.5 jobs per household (a reasonable jobs/household ratio), of which 1,668 jobs could be full time job opportunities and 1,039 jobs could be part time job opportunities.

In 2016 the level of employment self-sufficiency (ratio of the number of jobs provided and the number of employed persons within the Town of Cambridge) was 75% but the level of employment self-containment (persons who live and work within the Town of Cambridge) was only 17.7%. Moderate employment self sufficiency and low employment self containment is not unusual so close to Perth CBD, however the Town could aim to sustain or even increase the level of employment self sufficiency and to increase the level of employment self containment, that is increase opportunities to live and work locally, over the period of the Local Planning Strategy.

Key Implications

Bearing in mind the above profile as well as the need to have diverse, attractive and active centres, support sustainable design and the emphasis on local amenity in the Town’s Strategic Plan, the following implications have been identified for commercial centres and the local economy.

- Maintain the Town’s existing commercial centres to reflect their value in the community and provision of employment opportunities;
- Enhance the appearance and functionality of these centres through centre plans as appropriate, with an emphasis on sustainable urban design and main street development principles (particularly for larger centres i.e. Floreat Forum);
- Ensure that centre development provides for a mix of land uses and activities so as to provide diverse employment opportunities and services (possibly review planning provisions to encourage mixed use development);
- Ensure that traditional economic activities in existing centres (i.e. service commercial activities) are not all lost so as to protect existing employment choice;
- Clarify the future role and function of the Medical Centre zone;
- Consider the introduction of corner stores, delis, coffee shops and similar, particularly in City Beach, to provide less car reliant access to these services and a greater ‘local’ community focus.
4.5 RETAIL AND COMMERCE

4.5.1 RETAIL

Current floor space assessment

A retail assessment has been prepared to investigate retail potential for those activity centres within the Town of Cambridge LGA area. The study includes those activity centres within the LGA area, those at the periphery in surrounding LGA areas, and prominent higher order competing activity centres affecting the shopping behaviour of residents in Cambridge.

A retail gravity model was developed to forecast customer choice for different retail centres, resulting from the distribution of shopping floor space and the nature of the transport network. The model estimates the probability of visitation and level of expenditure at each activity centre, based on:

- the size of each activity centre;
- the travel time to all competing activity centres from every residential origin zone modelled; and
- the size of all competing activity centres modelled.

In 2011/12 the Town had an approximate total of retail floor space and of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Centre</th>
<th>Floor Space</th>
<th>Turnover ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Floreat Forum</td>
<td>16,900 m²</td>
<td>$9,173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge Street</td>
<td>7,479 m²</td>
<td>$6,268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Beach</td>
<td>2,467 m²</td>
<td>$6,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean Village</td>
<td>1,763 m²</td>
<td>$5,764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empire Village</td>
<td>2,504 m²</td>
<td>$6,190</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Floreat Forum attracted the greatest expenditure from households in the Town, although expenditure was below the 2011 average for all metropolitan local governments, which was recorded as $13,912 in the year 2011/12.

Future floor space capacity

Future retail floor space capacity and likely turnover forecasts were based on modelling the impact of population forecasts. The population within the Town has been projected for the years 2026 and 2031 by the Department of Planning. The population projections are provided in spatial units called Main Roads Transport Zones (MTZ), which function as origin zones in the model. The MTZ zones vary from the SA2 ABS census areas but are the best data for the purpose of assessing travel catchments related to shopping attractions.

In the timeframes 2026 and 2031 the following floor space has been modelled:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Centre</th>
<th>Floor Space</th>
<th>Turnover ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Floreat Forum</td>
<td>16,900 m²</td>
<td>$9,541/$10,939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge Street</td>
<td>7,479 m²</td>
<td>$6,529/$7,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Beach</td>
<td>2,467 m²</td>
<td>$5,773/$6,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean Village</td>
<td>1,763 m²</td>
<td>$5,366/$6,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empire Village</td>
<td>2,504 m²</td>
<td>$6,034/$6,828</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Expansion at the adjacent competing centres of Claremont, Innaloo, Karrinyup and Subiaco were included in the model in accordance with future plans/approved applications. It is evident from the modelling that the City Beach and Ocean Village centres appear to suffer a little with an expansion to 25,000 m² at Floreat, during or before 2026, but by 2031 trade appears to improve marginally.

A number of issues require further investigation:

- DoP population projections for 2031 appear optimistic and may require further refinement/reduction.
- Some staging may be required at Floreat Forum or at least a Retail Sustainability Assessment may be required.
- Some sensitivity analysis is required to determine the size and location of the Cambridge Street/West Leederville centre to be included in the modelling.
FIGURE 43: DISTRIBUTION OF RETAIL CENTRES WITHIN THE TOWN
4.6 TOURISMS AND VISITORS

Tourism and hospitality are key industries and major contributors to Australia’s economy. As an industry within Australia, tourism has been steadily increasing over the past five years, with key trends on the previous year identifying that:

- Nights spent in hotels, motels and resorts increased by 9% to 27.5 million on the back of strong growth in the holiday segment, while nights spent at guest houses and bed and breakfasts increased 29% to 1.3 million;
- Spend on inclusive package travel grew strongly by 22% to $4.5 billion;
- First-time visitor numbers were up 12% and return visitors 10%;
- Backpacker visitor numbers increased slightly, up 2% to 611,900; and
- Growth in travel party type was highest for adult couples, and friends and family travelling together, both increasing by 16% to 1.5 million and 804,200 respectively. Those travelling alone increased 7% to 3.7 million and accounted for 52% of all arrivals.

4.6.1 STATE CONTEXT

Within Western Australia (WA) during the same period, 10.1 million overnight visitors came to or travelled within WA, and Western Australians took 19.4 million day trips within the State. Together these visitors spent $9.6 billion in WA, with approximately $5 billion spent in the Perth metropolitan area. This represented a 12% increase from the previous financial year in both total spent and the number of visitors entering WA.

Tourism Research Australia (TRA) forecasts that this will continue to grow year on year by an average of 3.5% up to the 2024-25 financial year. Of those visiting WA during 2015, 8% stated that their visit was for culture and heritage, 34% for food and wine and 11.6% for nature based purposes.

Information available from .idcommunity for the Western Suburbs Regional Organisation of Councils (WESROC) comprising the Town of Claremont, Town of Mosman Park, the City of Nedlands, the Shire of Peppermint Grove and the City of Subiaco is shown in Table 23. Whilst the Town of Cambridge is not included within the WESROC area, the data available provides a good indication of how the tourism sector is performing for the Town and wider western suburbs area.

The table provides an overview of employment generated from tourism and hospitality industries. In 2014/15, there were 3,562 full-time employees who make up the tourism and hospitality workforce in the WESROC area, representing 5.2% of the total industry and an increase in 243 employees from 2010.

In the WESROC area, tourism and hospitality generated $799 million in 2014/15 equating to 4.6% of total industry and an increase of $154 million from 2010. Value add, a measure of how productive the tourism and hospitality sector has been at producing this output as a component of input expenditure, identifies a total of $358 million generated by the tourism and hospitality industries in 2014/15, equating to approximately 4.0% of total industry and an increase of $92 million from 2010.

Compared to WA as a whole, the tourism and hospitality sector in the WESROC area generally performs above average. In the economic context, tourism is a very small contributor to current economic activity in the WESROC area, however its value can be sustainable over time and opportunities are available for its increased contribution.
4.6.2 LOCAL CONTEXT

Within the local context, tourism within the Town of Cambridge is a very small contributor to the Town. This could be attributed to its geographical isolation for the Perth CBD and other major tourism attractions such as Fremantle.

The following tourist attractions within the Town of Cambridge are seen as opportunities for the area:

- Floreat Beach
- City Beach
- Bold Park
- Reabold Hill Summit Lookout
- Quarry Amphitheatre
- Perry Lakes
- Wembley Golf Course
- Lake Monger

A review of available hotels, motels, bed and breakfasts and short stay accommodation indicates that there are no hotels located within the Town. The short-term accommodation market has only three operational bed and breakfasts, being the Cambridge Atrium in Wembley, Lakeside Bed and Breakfast in West Leederville and City Beach Bed and Breakfast in City Beach.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>2014/15 WESROC area</th>
<th>2014/15 Western Australia%</th>
<th>2009/10 WESROC area</th>
<th>2009/10 Western Australia%</th>
<th>Change 2010 to 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment (total)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>4,995</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>4,713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>1,562</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>1,453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6,557</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6,166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment (FTE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>3,562</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>3,319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>1,695</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>1,562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,256</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>4,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Output/Sales ($m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>799</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,207</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value added ($m)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>403</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Town is in the early stages of preparing a short-stay accommodation policy which will address emerging forms of accommodation such as Airbnb.

Tourism attractions and short-term accommodation facilities located within the Town are shown in Figure 45.

Existing tourism attractions within the Town are primarily recreation and nature based and the main focus of the Town for tourists is undoubtedly the water (Floreat Beach, City Beach, Lake Monger), and recent food and beverage developments and enhanced public open space at City Beach have seen growth in visitation. Tourism is a sector that provides minimal economic stimulus for the Town, however the following issues and opportunities are identified for consideration in the Local Planning Strategy to enhance the growth of the tourism sector.

The demand for short-term accommodation options in the Town could be regarded as low, however given the perceived attraction of the coast for tourists and small number of bed and breakfast operators within the area, there is an opportunity to increase and diversify short-term accommodation options within proximity to coastal assets as well as the medical precinct.

In order to capitalise on the existing natural and recreational assets of the Town there exists opportunities to upgrade and expand these facilities, marketing and promote to older visitors’, international visitors and nature-based visitors and target future opportunities for nature-based and low-impact tourism.

Whilst currently tourism is a small component of the Town’s planning framework and economic sector, strategies to overcome these challenges and realise the benefits of tourism in the Town are necessary.
FIGURE 44: EXISTING TOURIST ATTRACTIONS AND ACCOMMODATION VENUES
4.7 RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE

The Town has extensive open space areas which have been broadly classified as nature based space, sport space and recreation space as shown in Figure 46.

4.7.1 REGIONAL OPEN SPACE AND RECREATION

Bold Park

Bold Park is a 437 hectare urban bush land area in the Reabold precinct which was established by the Perth City Council in 1936. It was transferred from the Town to the State in May 1998 to create a regional A-Class Reserve, and since 2000 has been managed by the Botanic Gardens and Parks Authority (BGPA) in accordance with the Bold Park Environmental Management Plan (2000 - 2005). It includes the Mt Kenneth Reservoir on the western edge of the park, off Kalinda Drive, and the 640 person capacity Quarry Amphitheatre.

Coastal Foreshore

The 4.8km of ocean shoreline and coastal beaches of Floreat and City Beach are a major community and regional attraction for the Town. The total area of open space equates to 129 hectares, and is public purpose reservation and largely a Bush Forever site, and as such is highly protected to ensure preservation of the fragile sand dune ecosystems. The Town has prepared the Coastal Natural Areas Management Plan to guide the management of these areas.

Wembley Golf Course

Wembley Golf Course is a 36 hole public golf course in Perth which encompasses a total area of 131 hectares. Set in natural bushland it is a key attraction and asset for the surrounding neighbourhoods.

Perry Lakes Reserve

Perry Lakes Reserve is located further south in the Reabold precinct and covers an area of 80 hectares. This includes a 57 hectare regional recreation reserve and a 13 hectare conservation wetland, which is a drought refuge for a range of fauna. The Town has prepared the Perry Lakes Environmental Management Plan to guide the management of the Reserve.

Alderbury Sportsground

Within the Perry Lakes precinct is Alderbury Sportsground, a 10 hectare reserve for club sports including cricket and hockey and the Town’s skate park. The skate park is a well-used community asset built in 2001, after consulting with young people in the area, and is to be upgraded in 2017. It includes an area for skaters and BMX riders as well as spectators.

Lake Monger

The Lake Monger reserve covers an area of 109 hectares, and is made up of a 38 hectare regionally significant recreation reserve visited by the local and regional community. It includes 71 hectare of conservation wetland that is a key habitat and permanent drought refuge for various fauna. The Town developed the Lake Monger Reserve Management Plan 2008-2018 to manage the reserve including an implementation program.

Floreat Sporting Precinct

The Floreat Sporting Precinct covers an area of 14 hectares and accommodates a wide range of sporting clubs and infrastructure, including facilities for tennis, cricket, lacrosse, lawn bowls, croquet and a range of other sports and recreation activities.

Other Facilities

Other facilities include:

- Wembley Sports Park, including the State Netball Centre, Matthews Netball Centre and Wembley Oval;
- City Beach Oval; and
- AK Reserve, including the State Basketball Centre and Athletics and Rugby facilities.
4.7.2 OPEN SPACE PROVISION

City Beach

The suburb of City Beach has a very high provision of open space, with a total of 566 hectares (56%) of recreation, nature and sport space provided.

This is, however, predominantly composed of regional open space, including Bold Park and the coastal foreshore, which combined equate to 473 hectares (47%), with the remaining 93 hectares made up of more localised open space.

Floreat

The suburb of Floreat also has a very high provision of open space, with a total of 212 hectares (38%) of recreation, nature and sport space provided.

Again, this is largely comprised of regional open space, including the Perry Lakes reserve, Alderbury Park, Floreat Park and the Wembley Golf Course. More localised open space equates to 23 hectares, or 4% of the gross developable area excluding regional open space.

Wembley

The Wembley area, as an earlier region of subdivision and development, is comprised of Lake Monger and a network of smaller localised open space areas, which account for 58 hectares (13%), with 22 hectares of local open space (including open space in the immediately abutting areas of Jolimont).

West Leederville

The West Leederville area has the least amount of open space comparative to the broader Town of Cambridge area, with only 5.5 hectares of open space, which equates to 4% of the total suburb area.

Open Space Needs Analysis

Further analysis on the need for upgrades of existing open space and/or the creation of new open space is required as a component of the Local Planning Strategy, and is likely to require a more detailed open space strategy as a component of implementation of the Local Planning Strategy.
### OPEN SPACE ACCESSIBILITY

The Town of Cambridge is well serviced by a variety of public open spaces, with approximately 975ha (43.9%) of the municipal area dedicated for local, neighbourhood and district parks (Figure 47). Throughout the Town, existing public open spaces are highly accessible by the community, with approximately 95% of developed areas located within 300m of open space. All developed areas within City Beach are within 400 metres of open space, while 98.6% and 94.9% of developed areas within West Leederville and Floreat, respectively, also fall within a five minute walk to areas of open space. Within Wembley, areas of open space are also highly accessible, with 87.5% of developed areas fall within 400 metres of open space.

At a regional scale, the Town has an extensive district open space network, predominately found in the western portion of the Town. District open spaces are commonly used by the broader community and therefore it is important to ensure areas of public open space are well-connected to the broader network and accessible by users within and outside of the Town via public open space, walking and cycling. Currently there are some bus services that connect the Town’s regional open spaces such as the coastal foreshore, Bold Park and Wembley Sports Park to surrounding areas. However, these services are limited in that they are not frequently available, with some services not available on weekends or public holidays. Additionally, there is currently very limited service availability to access Lake Monger in West Leederville. In order to improve the accessibility of regional open spaces and sporting facilities within the Town, improved connectivity to these facilities is vital.

As well as connecting district open spaces to the broader community, it is important that residents are well connected to local open spaces within the Town. This is particularly important to those within the eastern portion of the Town that are located further way from the concentration of regional spaces within the western portion of the Town. An example of initiatives to encourage greater connectivity to the Town’s regional open spaces is the Summer Bus Services. In December 2017, the Town of Cambridge trialled the Summer Bus Services, which was a privately run bus service that linked West Leederville and Wembley with the Town’s community facilities, including stops at Bold Park Aquatic Centre, Perry Lakes Skate Park, and City and Floreat beaches. This programme aimed to reduce parking congestion within the Town and improve connectivity. This was an excellent example of initiatives that will aim to improve connectivity of residents and visitors to the Town’s regional open spaces and sporting facilities.
FIGURE 46: RECREATION AND OPEN SPACE
### OPEN SPACE FUNCTIONALITY

Table 24 details the features and functions of all parks in the Town.

**TABLE 24: OPEN SPACE FUNCTIONALITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Name</th>
<th>Parking</th>
<th>Picnic Table</th>
<th>BBQ</th>
<th>Gazebo</th>
<th>Play-ground</th>
<th>Skate Park</th>
<th>Blue Rack</th>
<th>Exercise Equipment</th>
<th>Drink Fountain</th>
<th>Lighting</th>
<th>Public Toilet</th>
<th>B-ball Back-board</th>
<th>Sports Facilities</th>
<th>Dogs Permitted</th>
<th>Look-outs</th>
<th>Patrolled Beach</th>
<th>Shower</th>
<th>Club room/ pavilion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alderbury Sportsground, Perry Lakes, Floreat</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cricket &amp; Hockey</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alyth Park, Floreat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beecroft park, City Beach</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Posts Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bent Park, City Beach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Posts Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birkdale Park, Floreat</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Tennis Clubrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulevard Quay Park</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bourneville Park, Floreat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Challenger Park, City Beach</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Volleyball Poles</td>
<td>Surf Club</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Beach</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Beach Park, City Beach</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Beach Oval, Fred Burton Way, City Beach</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowden Park, Wembley</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crosby Park, Floreat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drabble Park, City Beach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donegal Park, Floreat</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elphin Street Median, Floreat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empire Park, City Beach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floreat Beach</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Volleyball Courts</td>
<td>Surf Club</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floreat Beach North</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floreat Beach Park, City Beach</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floreat Oval, Floreat</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cricket, Lacrosse</td>
<td>Croquet, Tennis</td>
<td>Clubrooms, Bowls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shower</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortview Park, Mt Claremont</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frinton Park, City Beach</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Tennis Clubrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifford Gardens, City Beach</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grantham Park, Floreat</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cricket</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harborne Playground, Wembley</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helston Park, City Beach</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henderson Park, Wembley</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>AFL &amp; Baseball</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park Name</th>
<th>Parking</th>
<th>Picnic Table</th>
<th>BBQ</th>
<th>Gameb</th>
<th>Play-ground</th>
<th>Skate Park</th>
<th>Bike Rack</th>
<th>Exercise Equipment</th>
<th>Drink Fountain</th>
<th>Lighting</th>
<th>Public Toilet</th>
<th>B-ball Backboard</th>
<th>Sports Facilities</th>
<th>Dogs</th>
<th>Permitted</th>
<th>Look-outs</th>
<th>Patrolled</th>
<th>Beach</th>
<th>Shower</th>
<th>Club room/pavilion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holyrood Park, West Leederville</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pavilion, Bowls Clubrooms</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jubilee Park, City Beach</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kilkenny Park, Floreat</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingsland Playground, West Coast Highway</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Monger Reserve (NW) West Leederville</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Monger Reserve (E) West Leederville</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Monger Reserve (SW) West Leederville</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leederville Memorial Gardens, West Leederville</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AFL, Soccer, Hockey, Rugby &amp; Netball (Posts / Bowls Clubrooms)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lothian Park, Floreat</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maloney Park, City Beach</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCourt Park, West Leederville</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McLean Park, Floreat</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean Mia Park, City Beach</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean Village Park, City Beach</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wembley Sports Park, Jolimont</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perry Lakes Reserve (N) Floreat</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perry Lakes Reserve (S) Floreat</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose Gardens, Wembley</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ruislip Park, West Leederville</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rutter Park, Wembley</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South City Beach</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tara Vista Park, West Leederville</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taworri Park, City Beach</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Templetonia Park, City Beach</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tilton Park, City Beach</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wembley Oval, Wembley</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winmarley Park, Floreat</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.8 COMMUNITY FACILITIES

The Town of Cambridge is home to a wealth of community facilities that service the local community, as illustrated in Figure 48.

4.8.1 BEACHES AND NATURAL ASSETS

The Town of Cambridge consists of a 4.8km of coastline as well as many well landscaped and highly functional parks and reserves.

City Beach

City Beach offers a large range of facilities for visitors to enjoy and with new infrastructure built in 2008 as part of the City Beach Redevelopment Plan, including:

- New City Beach Surf Life Saving Club;
- Beach Volleyball courts;
- Play and picnic equipment;
- 3 new restaurants; and
- Amphitheatre with terraced seating and grassed areas.

Floreat Beach

Floreat is a popular family beach with ample parking available, and includes the following facilities for visitors:

- Floreat Surf Life Saving Club;
- Volleyball courts;
- grassed areas and large shaded playground with soft fall;
- seating, picnic tables, barbeques and lighting; and
- public toilets, change rooms and showers.

Perry Lakes Reserve

The Town of Cambridge manages Perry Lakes Reserve in Floreat which covers an area of 80 hectares. It consists of a regional recreation reserve, a 13 hectare conservation wetland,
FIGURE 47: MAJOR COMMUNITY FACILITIES

Legend:
1. Wembley Boulevard Centre / Library
2. Wembley Town Hall
3. Wembley Community Centre
4. Glyngarth Amphitheatre
5. No. 86 Youth Centre
6. Community Garden
7. Hollywood Pavilion
8. Bold Park Aquatic Centre
9. Wembley Golf Course

Map showing major community facilities in the Town of Cambridge.
which is a drought refuge for a range of fauna, and 10 hectares for Alderbury Sportsground which caters for formal club sports including cricket and hockey.

Although not registered as an Aboriginal heritage site, the lakes themselves are considered to be significant to the Aboriginal people due to historical use as a fishing hole.

In its current form, the reserve dates from 1962 when the area was landscaped in association with the construction of Perry Lakes Stadium and associated sporting tracks and facilities for the 1962 Commonwealth Games. This stadium and other facilities are now relocated and the area has been redeveloped into housing.

Visitors can enjoy easy access to the reserve with the following facilities and amenities provided:

- public car parking and toilets;
- playgrounds with shade including a playground accessible to children of all abilities;
- outdoor exercise equipment;
- floodlit picnic areas including free push button electric barbecues, picnic tables, drink fountains and park seats;
- internal recreation path network for bike riding, jogging and walking;
- tree lined parklands providing shade and home for birds;
- open parkland areas for kite flying/ball games; and
- lake views and water bird interaction.
Lake Monger Reserve

Lake Monger is a conservation category wetland which has been progressively modified since European settlement to form the Lake today. In its current form it is surrounded by grass and rehabilitated areas which are highly valued for their aesthetic qualities, passive recreational pursuits and as a habitat for an abundance of waterbirds.

Facilities provided at Lake Monger include:

- Public car parks and toilets;
- Shaded playgrounds including a playground accessible to children of all abilities;
- Flood lit picnic areas and public barbecues;
- Path around the lake for bike riding, walking and jogging;
- A nature trail with lookouts throughout the rehabilitation areas to the east of the reserve;
- Open parkland areas for kite flying/ball games;
- A dog exercise area to the south east of the reserve near the Vincent Street freeway on ramp; and
- An educational facility where students and members of the public can be informed of the environmental background and restoration of the lake through interpretive signage.

Image: Lake Monger has a wide variety of passive and active recreation facilities, including dual use paths, picnic areas and childrens playgrounds.
**Bold Park**

Bold Park is an A Class Reserve set across 437 hectare urban bush land area in the Reabold precinct. The area is managed by the Botanic Gardens and Parks Authority (BGPA) in accordance with the Bold Park Environmental Management Plan (2000 - 2005).

The Park area includes a variety of community facilities including:

- The Western Australian Ecology Centre, which houses Bold Park staff in their work assisting community groups, environmental practitioners and educators;
- The historic Perry House, which is home to the Wildflower Society of WA and the Friends of Bold Park;
- Peregrine House, which is occupied by Birdlife WA;
- Reabold Hill, a popular lookout and wedding venue;
- Multiple walking trails allowing views of the wildflowers and biodiversity throughout the park, and spectacular views of the ocean and CBD area; and
- Public toilets, car parking and other amenities.
4.8.2 COMMUNITY CENTRES

The Boulevard Centre / Library
The Boulevard Centre is located within the centre of Floreat and forms a multi-purpose facility available for hire for corporate use, community events, meetings and functions.

The facility includes:

- Free parking, kitchen facilities, toilets and disabled access;
- Rooms from 10 to 260 persons seated theatre style; and
- Stage (Hall only) and large break out areas.

Rooms are designed to be flexible and can be divided into smaller rooms, creating an ideal setting for training workshops with:

- Conference and training equipment;
- PA systems with radio microphones;
- Audio visual and multi-media projection;
- Internet capabilities; and
- Communications ports.

Leederville Town Hall
The Leederville Town Hall is an historic building with over 100 years of character, reflecting the heritage and architectural style of a bygone era. The Hall is available for use by the public and facilities include:

- Free parking, kitchen facilities, toilets;
- Capacity for 180 persons seated theatre style, and up to 296 for a stand up event; and
- Separate bar area and PA System.
Wembley Community Centre
The Wembley Community Centre is a multi-purpose venue catering for a wide range of community events and meetings. It hosts over 40 different user groups as well as catering for events such as dinners, parties, conferences and seminars. Various recreation and lifestyle programs are also held for adults, seniors and children.

Venue facilities include:
- A large main hall with in house PA system; and
- A spacious medium sized room and several smaller sized rooms.

The Centre is understood to be experiencing impacts from the adjoining Wembley Primary School with some play activities encroaching into the Community Centre site. The Department of Education has advised that Wembley Primary is currently under pressure from excessive enrolment members, which may explain the encroachment of activities. With continuous growth in demand anticipated for both education and community Centre facilities, consideration will need to be given to addressing the existing and future demand.

Quarry Amphitheatre
Perched high on Reabold Hill in Floreat, the Quarry is set in natural bushland surrounds and enjoys wonderful views across the City and beyond. The open air setting and soaring limestone walls of the Quarry create an intimate, informal atmosphere.

With seating for up to 557 people on grass covered limestone terraces, the Quarry is a licensed and BYO facility where visitors can picnic and recreate. The Quarry Amphitheatre is also available for hire for corporate and social events including weddings.

Community Garden
The West Leederville Community Garden, located on Cambridge Street in West Leederville, was developed by the Town of Cambridge and the West Leederville Residents Association. The organic garden provides an opportunity for residents to meet new people, grow fresh food in a pesticide and herbicide free environment and be part of an exciting community project. There are garden allotments for rent and also a communal garden space with annual fees payable.

A second community garden is also located at north Lake Monger near Dodd Street.

Holyrood Pavilion
Holyrood Pavilion, located on Holyrood Street at the corner of Cambridge Street in West Leederville, is a community facility that can accommodate up to 62 people and is suitable for small gatherings, parties or community events. The pavilion provides a range of facilities including:
- Function/meeting area with kitchen; and
- Patio area and children’s playground.

No. 86 Youth Centre
The ‘Number 86’ Youth Centre in West Leederville is a safe drop in place for young people in the area aged 12-25. The facility offers a school holiday program, competitions and training for younger people to assist them in moving into the workforce. Facilities on site at the Youth Centre include recreation facilities, cafe and computing/audio-visual equipment.
4.8.3 SPORTING AND FITNESS

**Bold Park Aquatic Centre**

Bold Park Aquatic Centre is set in bushland within the suburb of City Beach, and provides heated and open air swimming pools for swimming, leisure and fitness, with a range of programs for all ages and abilities.

Facilities include:
- 50m 10 lane outdoor pool, heated to 27 degrees;
- Semi-enclosed 20m 4 lane leisure pool with beach entry and teaching pod, heated to 30 degrees;
- Lap and leisure lanes;
- Shaded grandstand;
- Accessible and family change rooms;
- Multi-purpose room;
- Adventure play ground; and
- Cafe.

**Wembley Golf Course**

The Wembley Golf Course is the only 36 hole public golf course in Perth, set in natural bushland on The Boulevard in Wembley Downs. The course is one of the busiest in Australia, and is managed by the Town of Cambridge. The Wembley Golf Course is also home to the Swing Driving Range built in 2010 which features 80, fully-automated bays spread over two storeys.

A major redevelopment of facilities was completed in 2016 providing:
- New food & beverage;
- Mini golf;
- Childrens playground;
- Practice facilities; and
- Function Rooms.

![Image: The Wembley Golf Course is the only 36 hole public golf course in Perth.](image-url)
Walking Trails

In recognition of the Town’s unique bushland assets, a number of walking trails have been established to showcase these areas, including:

- The Yange Kep Bidi, which starts at Freshwater Bay on the Swan River Foreshore and links with the Claremont Meanders “Cobblers and Convicts Trail”; the City of Nedlands’ Mount Claremont Walk” and the Town of Cambridge’s Western Bush and Lakelands Trail and Heritage Trail on route to Lake Monger in the north, and passes through varied metropolitan areas.

- The Bush to Beach Trail, which is a 16.3km walking trail from Perth City finishing at Grant Marine Park near Cottesloe Beach, and traverses Perry Lakes and Bold Park.

- The Heritage Trail, which was completed with the Lions Club of Floreat, and identifies key locations of historical significance in West Leederville, Wembley, Floreat and City Beach.

In addition to the sign posted trails, the Botanic Gardens and Parks Authority run regular guided walks throughout the scenic Bold Park bushland, giving visitors an experience through this lush and flourishing landscape.

Public Sporting Facilities

Other public sporting facilities are available throughout the parks and reserves within the Town, and are outlined in Table 26.
### TABLE 26: OTHER SPORTING FACILITIES AVAILABLE WITHIN THE TOWN OF CAMBRIDGE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sporting equipment</th>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practice Cricket Wickets (public and club use)</td>
<td>Bent Park</td>
<td>Bent Street, City Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City Beach Oval</td>
<td>Fred Burton Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grantham Park</td>
<td>Pearson Street, Floreat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Henderson Park</td>
<td>Jersey Street, Jolimont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Floreat Oval</td>
<td>Chandler Avenue, Floreat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pat Goodridge Oval</td>
<td>Selby Street, Jolimont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricket Match Wickets (club use only)</td>
<td>City Beach Oval</td>
<td>Fred Burton Way, City Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>McLean Park</td>
<td>Chandler Avenue, Floreat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pat Goodridge Oval</td>
<td>Selby Street, Jolimont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Grantham Park</td>
<td>Pearson Street, Floreat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball Backboards (public use)</td>
<td>Holyrood Park</td>
<td>Holyrood Street, West Leederville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maloney Park</td>
<td>Maloney Way, City Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lake Monger Reserve</td>
<td>Lake Monger Drive, West Leederville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ocean Village Park</td>
<td>Tarongo Way, City Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Helston Park</td>
<td>Helston Avenue, City Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Winmarley Park</td>
<td>Highbury Street, Floreat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bent Park</td>
<td>Bent Street, City Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alderbury Sportsground</td>
<td>Perry Lakes Drive, Floreat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball Court (full size)</td>
<td>Alderbury Sportsground</td>
<td>Perry Lakes Drive, Floreat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Rules Goal Posts (club and public use)</td>
<td>Beecroft Park</td>
<td>Oban Road, City Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Henderson Park</td>
<td>Jersey Street, Jolimont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bent Park</td>
<td>Bent Street, City Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>McLean Park</td>
<td>Chandler Avenue, Floreat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City Beach Oval</td>
<td>Fred Burton Way, City Beach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lake Monger Reserve</td>
<td>Lake Monger Drive, West Leederville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wembley Oval</td>
<td>Selby Street, Jolimont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pat Goodridge Oval</td>
<td>Selby Street, Jolimont</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise Equipment</td>
<td>Perry Lakes Reserve</td>
<td>Perry Lakes Drive, Floreat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lake Monger Reserve</td>
<td>Lake Monger Drive, West Leederville</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City Beach (walking totems)</td>
<td>Challenger Parade, City Beach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.8.4 EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES

Early Learning Centres
There are five early learning centres within the Town's municipal area, including:
- West Leederville School of Early Learning;
- Jellybeans Kids Club (West Leederville);
- Mercy Care Day Care (West Leederville);
- Jellybeans Child Care (Wembley); and
- Great Beginnings (Floreat).

Primary Schools
There are six primary schools within the study area, including:
- Holy Spirit Primary School, Kapinara Primary School and City Beach Primary School in City Beach;
- Floreat Park Primary School in Floreat;
- Wembley Primary School in Wembley;
- Lake Monger Primary School in Wembley; and
- West Leederville Primary School in West Leederville.

Public School enrolment numbers for Semester 1 of 2018 are shown in Table 27.

Secondary Schools
There are no public or private Secondary Schools within the Town's municipal area, with the former City Beach High School closed in 2005. There are several Secondary Schools within abutting suburbs, however, including Churchlands Senior High School, Newman College, John XXIII College and Perth Modern School surrounding the municipal area.

Tertiary Facilities
There are no tertiary educational facilities within the Town's municipal area, with the University of Western Australia in Crawley the closest university campus, and the North Metropolitan TAFE in Leederville the closest non-university campus.

TABLE 27: TOWN OF CAMBRIDGE SEMESTER 1 PUBLIC SCHOOL ENROLMENTS (DOE 2018)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Enrolments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wembley Primary School</td>
<td>806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Monger Primary School</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Leederville Primary School</td>
<td>552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floreat Park Primary School</td>
<td>622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Beach Primary School</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapinara Primary School</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School Capacity
The Department of Education has advised that the Wembley and West Leederville Primary Schools are experiencing enrolment pressure with limited capacity to expand on their existing sites. This demand is expected to increase with future population growth anticipated.

Analysis on the future demand for school placement and the need for expansion of existing school sites or the creation of new school sites will need to be considered as a component of the Local Planning Strategy in consultation with the Department of Education.
4.8.5 EMERGENCY SERVICES

Medical Services

The Town of Cambridge is well serviced by medical facilities, with

- St John of God Hospital located in West Leederville/Subiaco;
- QEII Medical Centre in Nedlands to the south of the Town; and
- Royal Perth Hospital within the Perth CBD to the east of the Town.

The Town is also well serviced by a variety of medical consulting rooms particularly within West Leederville and Wembley.

Police

The Town’s local police station is located on Cambridge Street in Wembley and is open to the public from Monday to Friday from 8am until 4pm. After hours numbers are available for local police units servicing City Beach, Floreat, Wembley and West Leederville.

Fire

Whilst there are no fire stations located within the Town, there are stations located within Osborne Park, Daglish, Claremont and Perth which would provide services to the Town in the event of a fire emergency.

4.8.6 PLANNING FOR FUTURE COMMUNITY FACILITY NEEDS

Community Needs Analysis

A community needs analysis is required to establish the needs of the existing and future community, and identify gaps and opportunities in the existing network. It is understood that there has been no community needs analysis undertaken in recent years, and so an updated study would need to be undertaken as a part of any community development strategy.

Community Facilities Planning

In recent years the Town has been active in producing and implementing Precinct Development Plans for a number of its community recreational precincts. Areas that have been, or are in the process of being subject to development planning for the future community facilities include:

- Floreat Sporting Precinct;
- Wembley Sports Park;
- Aldebury Sports Ground; and
- Coastal Beach Development Plan.

The Town has also resolved to prepare an open space strategy for Lake Monger and adopted a Bike Plan for the Town. It is also in the process of preparing an Age-Friendly Community Plan.

It is, however, recognised that, in addition to the various specific initiatives, the Town needs to consider all of its community facilities and services more holistically through a whole-of-Town strategy for its open space and community facilities network. A higher lived strategy would have a more integrated approach to the provision of services and in the future.
4.9 URBAN DESIGN, CHARACTER AND HERITAGE

The progressive development of the Town since the late 19th century has seen the development of strong local residential area characters. The Town can be broadly divided into four precincts (for housing), each with a unique character reflective of the different eras of development as well as more recent influences on development.

The following generally divides the Town into four precincts based by and large on suburb boundaries.

4.9.1 CITY BEACH

Development in City Beach dates to the 1920’s, the area having been established as a satellite coastal community at the time. The subdivision design reflected the Garden City Movement, whereby strong emphasis was placed on the integration of open and landscaped area and reserves around residential areas. The earliest development in this area included beach-front houses from the mid-1930s, typically constructed of fibro or weatherboard, some of which remain today.

The area experienced an increased rate of residential development in the post-war era, particularly in the 1960’s when the Games Village to accommodate athletes from the 1962 Empire Games was developed along The Boulevard. The 1970’s and 1980’s was characterized by the introduction of more grandiose and larger residential developments, often inspired by internationalist and highly modern designs.

The high desirability of the coastal location resulted in the continued development of large dwellings, generally replacing post 1970’s housing stock (one new dwelling to replace existing dwelling as opposed to infill given the Residential R 12.5 zoning). These larger dwellings have come to characterize much of the suburb.

The streetscapes in the area remain generally open with large setbacks, yet the dominance of homes on the street has increased. There has also been development over recent years of some areas of Council owned land for new medium density single residential housing at Ocean Mia. There is still significant scope for redevelopment and refurbishment of housing in the area given that many older dwellings remain in the area.

Similar to the Floreat area, the City Beach area features a poorly defined and broken pedestrian network. The Garden City subdivision model has resulted in several residential streets featuring either no footpath along the street or just a single footpath on one side of the street. The street network consists of many curved roads / looped roads.
4.9.2 FLOREAT

The majority of Floreat was developed throughout the 1950’s and 1960’s, although development dates back to the 1930’s in the south eastern portion of the suburb. The area was mostly designed around the Garden City subdivision model of integrating residential areas with open spaces and green streetscapes, which continue to characterise the area. The area is characterised by low density residential development, primarily separate detached dwellings with considerable street setbacks.

The area also comprises of architectural designs from the 1950’s and 1960’s which are unique to Perth and synonymous with the establishment of the suburb as a prestigious residential area.

Given the low density zoning at R12.5, where redevelopment occurs one new house will replace an existing house. Overtime, redevelopment in the area has introduced a greater proportion of larger, multi-storey dwellings.

The Floreat area features a poorly defined and broken pedestrian network. The Garden City subdivision model has resulted in several residential streets featuring either no footpath along the street or just a single footpath on one side of the street. As such the historical design of these areas does not prioritise or in some cases facilitate walk trips to local services.

Image: Floreat is characterised by 1950s and 1960s style single dwellings with large street setbacks (top) but the desirability of the area has led to a proportion of older dwellings being demolished and replaced with more modernist homes (bottom).
4.9.3 WEMBLEY

Development in Wembley dates back to the 1920’s and 1930’s, with most of the suburb developed by the 1950’s. The southern and eastern portions of the suburb were first to develop, with the areas north of Grantham Street developed later.

Wembley’s streetscape and built form are highly uniform and characterised by low-density housing from the interwar and immediate post-war period, although infill has occurred throughout the suburb since the 1970’s and there continues to be slight increases in the number of dwellings in the area.

There has been medium and high density development along Cambridge Street and subdivision throughout the suburb, although the original uniform grid-based subdivision design generally remains intact. The traditional character of the housing in the area has also been maintained, in part, through the introduction of roof pitch controls in the suburb to assist in keeping with the traditional housing form.

The Wembley area features a well established pedestrian network, where streets in a grid network typically feature footpaths on both sides of the street. The pedestrian infrastructure is typically of a high standard and pedestrian crossing facilities feature in areas of high pedestrian activity, such as along the Cambridge Street activity corridor.
West Leederville was the earliest area to be developed in the Town, with access provided to the area by rail transport and proximity to Perth City resulting in development dating back to the 1890’s, predominantly in the eastern portion of the suburb. The north-western most portion of the suburb was subdivided in the 1930’s and 1940’s, while the ‘Hill of Tara’ estate was developed in the 1990’s after subdivision of the Home of the Good Shepherd site.

The area has a range of lot sizes and development density, with the Cambridge Street activity corridor running through the suburb featuring a range of commercial development, including the medical area of St John of God Hospital.

Early development in West Leederville consisted primarily of small timber and iron cottages. While some examples of such residential development remain, there has been redevelopment over the post-war period which has introduced a wide variety of housing designs and types into the area including medium density residential development along Cambridge Street. Furthermore, commercial and light industrial land uses moved into the area which has resulted in the loss of the original urban form and subdivision pattern. More modern dwellings are also located in the Hill of Tara Estate.

Overall, the area is characterized by an eclectic mix of housing styles and designs and a variety of lot sizes, at low to medium density. This is representative of the diverse age in the housing stock which also includes more contemporary housing designs as the area continues to be redeveloped.

There are some areas of particular heritage significance based on streetscape and housing character, such as Holyrood Street.

The West Leederville area features a well established pedestrian network, where streets typically feature footpaths on both sides of the street. The pedestrian infrastructure is typically of a high standard and pedestrian crossing facilities feature in areas of high pedestrian activity, such as along the Cambridge Street activity corridor.
4.9.5 HERITAGE PLACES

The identification, conservation and protection of places and areas of State heritage significance are provided for in the Heritage of Western Australia Act 1990. The Act provides for the compilation of the state heritage register by the Heritage Council and Heritage Minister. A search of the State Heritage Register reveals 67 heritage places within the Town of Cambridge. This includes 44 places listed in the Municipal Inventory, and 10 State Registered Places. There are no National heritage sites within the Town of Cambridge. The State Registered Places are detailed in Table 28.

There are two residential properties in Floreat, whilst all other heritage places are non-residential or publicly owned.

The heritage sites detailed in Table 26 are likely to have considerations for any future development. SPP 3.5 Historic Heritage Conservation sets out the principles for the protection of heritage in Western Australia.

The conservation and protection of places and areas of local heritage significance is provided for in the Planning and Development Act 2005, which enables local governments to protect heritage places and objects in local planning schemes.

The Town is currently reviewing its Municipal Inventory of Heritage Places which will result in an updated list of Heritage Places.

Image: The Town of Cambridge exhibits a variety of built form heritage throughout its municipal area, including the State listed St Vincents Foundling Home (top) and the Holyrood Conservation Area (bottom), both within the suburb of West Leederville.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Heritage Place no.</th>
<th>Place Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23834</td>
<td>Olive Trees</td>
<td>There are a number of olive trees in the grounds of the Catherine McCauley Centre which represent a remnant of the original grove planted by the Benedictine Monks in the 1850’s.</td>
<td>The olive trees are of historic and aesthetic significance for associations with the original Benedictine Monks who settled there in the 1850’s. The trees give a sense of history to the grounds of the centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23872</td>
<td>Leederville war memorial and rose garden</td>
<td>Built circa 1920’s. A rough hewn granite obelisk memorial with sculpted marble lions, memorial rose garden, bowling greens, and mature trees and setting.</td>
<td>Social and historic significance representing community respect for soldiers in World Wars I and II.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13020</td>
<td>Holy Spirit Catholic Church, City Beach</td>
<td>Constructed from 1973 to 1974</td>
<td>Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08895</td>
<td>Model Timber House</td>
<td>Model Timber Home is a single-storey Jarrah weatherboard and tile residence in the Inter-War Californian Bungalow style set in original landscaped gardens and built as a model home in 1934.</td>
<td>Aesthetic significance as an example of an inter-war architect designed house in WA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08894</td>
<td>Model Brick House</td>
<td>Model Brick Home is a single-storey brick and tile residence in a simplified version of the Inter-War Old English style set in landscaped gardens and built as a model home in 1934.</td>
<td>Aesthetic significance as an example if an inter-war architect designed house in WA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02231</td>
<td>Catherine McAuley Centre</td>
<td>The Old Chapel is a rendered stone and custom orb colorbond construction.</td>
<td>The old Chapel and Schoolroom from St Joseph’s Orphanage is of historic significance representing the work of the Catholic Church in the care of orphans on the site of the present day Catherine McAuley Centre, from the early years of the 20th century.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23380</td>
<td>St Vincent’s Foundlings Home</td>
<td>Tuck pointed brickwork and Marseilles profile clay tiles. Verandahs around the building with decorative timber posts and fretwork.</td>
<td>St Vincent’s Foundlings Home was opened in 1914 and operated by the Sisters of Mercy as a home for orphaned or relinquished babies and children up to the age of six.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23680</td>
<td>Stables - Catherine McAuley Centre</td>
<td>Random rubble with limewash. Simple rectangular form with simple timber door and window frames from rough sawn timber, Original shingled roof has been replaced with short sheets of corrugated iron.</td>
<td>The building is of historic significance because it marks the earliest period of settlement on the south side of Lake Monger by the Benedictine Monks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02195</td>
<td>Leederville Town Hall &amp; Recreation Complex</td>
<td>Leederville Town Hall &amp; Recreation Complex is a pair of single storey classically planned face brickwork, stucco walls and Colorbond custom orb roof buildings in the Federation Free Classical style, together with a rough hewn granite obelisk memorial with sculpted</td>
<td>Leederville Town Hall is of historic significance representing a stage in the development of local government in the area to the west of the City of Perth. Now known as the Town of Cambridge, the area has been but known as the Municipality of Leederville and subsequently part of the City of Perth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02208</td>
<td>West Leederville Primary School</td>
<td>West Leederville Primary School is a brick and iron primary school in the Federation Arts and Crafts style.</td>
<td>West Leederville Primary School is of historic significance representing the development and settlement of the area from the 1890’s. It is of aesthetic significance as a very good example of a school from he turn of the century.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.10 TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORT

4.10.1 STRATEGIC MOVEMENT NETWORK

ROAD NETWORK

Regionally significant roads that traverse the Town include:

- **West Coast Highway** – which forms a link between the northern suburbs and Fremantle.
- **Mitchell Freeway** – which connects Perth CBD with Perth’s northern residential areas.
- **Stephenson Highway Reserve** – designated in the Metropolitan Region Scheme to form a major freight corridor (it should be noted that the Town opposes the need for this road and have campaigned for the route’s removal from the MRS).
- **Selby Street/Harborne Street** – much north-south traffic passes through the Town along these roads.

In addition to these regionally significant road corridors, the Cambridge Street-Oceanic Drive/The Boulevard, Grantham Street/Lake Monger Drive and Salvado Road/Railway Parade corridors form the major east-west link within the Town’s road network (Figure 49).

The Cambridge Street link is the primary activity corridor within the Town and connects the commercial centres of West Leederville, Wembley and Floreat, as well as providing access to a range of medical facilities and providing a connection towards the Mitchell Freeway and Perth CBD.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT NETWORK

The Town has two train stations on its boundaries that form part of the metropolitan passenger rail network, Leederville and West Leederville stations (Figure 50). This network is a key component of Perth’s public transport system and connects major centres including Perth, Joondalup and Fremantle. Of the two train stations, West Leederville is more accessible to a wider residential catchment within the Town, as well as providing access to the commercial centre of West Leederville.

The Town is primarily served by a series of bus routes that operate east-west through the Town between Perth city and the coastal suburban areas of City Beach. Other bus routes provide connections between Perth city and Wembley Downs and Glendalough Station (via Herdsman Parade).

In addition, the high frequency Circle Route bus runs north-south through the Town along Pearson Street and Selby Street. Circle Route bus services connect to Shenton Park Station to the north and Shenton Park Station to the south.

CYCLE NETWORK

The spine of the Town’s formal cycle network is made up of two main east-west routes and two north-south routes (Figure 50), these are:

- **Perth Bike Network Route NW12** – which runs east-west between Leederville Station and Floreat Beach via Tower Street, Ruslip Street, Peebles Road and The Boulevard.
- **Perth Bike Network Route C2C** – which is the “City to Coast” route between Subiaco Station and City Beach via Shenton Park and City Beach (Alderbury Street and Oceanic Drive).
- **Perth Bike Network Route NW9** – which runs north-south through Wembley via Jersey Street.
- **West Coast Highway/Challenger Parade Shared Path** – a high quality shared path which runs along the coast.

In addition, there are a number of shared paths within parklands and reserves across the Town, as well as around Lake Monger – providing opportunities for leisure and recreational cycling. There are also a number of local streets identified as ‘Local Bicycle Friendly Streets’ which provide informal connections through residential areas to connect to the spine network or leisure/recreational network previously identified.

The Town’s Bicycle Plan was renewed in 2017 and a Bicycle Plan (2018-2028) adopted in July 2018.
FIGURE 48: ROAD NETWORK
PEDESTRIAN NETWORK

The evolution of development across the Town has seen the creation of strong local residential area characteristics and the Town can be divided into four broad precincts (for housing) each with a unique character reflective of the different eras of development as well as more recent influences on development, inclusive of pedestrian networks.

The West Leederville and Wembley areas feature a well established pedestrian network, where streets typically feature footpaths on both sides of the street. The pedestrian infrastructure is typically of a high standard and pedestrian crossing facilities feature in areas of high pedestrian activity, such as along the Cambridge Street activity corridor.

The Floreat and City Beach areas feature limited pedestrian paths. The Garden City subdivision model has resulted in several residential streets featuring either no footpath along the street or just a single footpath on one side of the street. As such the design of the local movement network in these areas does not prioritise, or in some cases facilitate, walk trips to local services. The low traffic volumes on local roads do provide suitable pedestrian environments in some cases.

4.10.2 TRANSPORT AND LAND USE

Perth is considered to be one of the most livable cities in the world, and State Government policies and strategies for growth and development are aimed at ensuring Perth’s livability is maintained and improved.

A vibrant, connected and productive Perth will need a transport network that meets a range of objectives, one of which is the integration of land use (growth and development) and transport (sustainable travel options and public transport service provision).

By integrating land use with transport, it is possible for people to live and work closer to activity centres or along transport corridors where they can access public transport more easily, or simply walk or cycle to work or to complete local trips to shops, education or community facilities.

The State Government policies and strategies of growth and development promote high activity generating land uses in areas with good public transport provision, which presents a range of opportunities throughout the Town, but particularly in the West Leederville area and the Cambridge Street activity corridor.

The Town should continue to explore opportunities for redevelopment and increased density within the Cambridge Street activity corridor, but this must go hand in hand with enhanced public transport provision to support such development. Whilst increased bus service frequency may be required in the longer term to support wide spread redevelopment along the corridor, other public transport priority measures may be required in the future to deliver a quality and reliable public transport service and help to ensure high levels of patronage. The success of the 950 bus route along Beaufort Street is an example that this can be achieved.

Whilst it is noted that ultimate decision-making power regarding public transport service provision and public transport priority measures sits with the Public Transport Authority as opposed to the Town – the Town should continue to advocate for enhanced public transport services and assist the Public Transport Authority where appropriate to promote and deliver the required services and priority measures.

The historical weekday movement patterns across the inner suburban metropolitan areas is based on the movement of people and vehicles towards central areas of the city in the AM peak period and the movement back to the inner suburban areas in the PM peak; however, it should be noted that this pattern may be diluted over time in locations such as West Leederville, through additional development and employment opportunities within the Cambridge Street corridor and also the major redevelopment that is likely to take place in the medium term in North Subiaco through the Subiaco Stadium, Kitchener Park and Princess Margaret Hospital sites.

If land use outcomes within the Cambridge Street activity corridor, and in nearby areas such as North Subiaco, are progressed in the medium term, higher density residential dwellings, mixed use commercial developments and enhanced public transport access will see a more balanced movement of people into and out from the area to work and access facilities and service, as well as those living within walking and cycling distance of employment opportunities and local facilities and services. This is likely to increase the use of public transport services, which is essential to ensure their viability.
THE PERTH AND PEEL @3.5 MILLION - THE TRANSPORT NETWORK

The Perth and Peel @3.5 million - The Transport Network (2018) (refer section 2.3.4) sets out the State Government’s vision for a transport network to support a vibrant, connected and productive city of 3.5 million people.

The following is an overview of the transport components of the Central sub-region land use planning and infrastructure framework.

Public Transportation

To accommodate future population growth and ensure efficiency of the transport system is not compromised, the sub-regional frameworks recognise the need to integrate urban and employment nodes with transport infrastructure and services, including upgrading and adding new transport infrastructure to the network.

The 2050 Public Transport Network (Figure 51) identifies Grantham Street, Cambridge Street and Harborne Street as high frequency public transit corridors. The 2050 Public Transport Network also identifies a proposed high-priority transit node running north-south through the middle of the Town along Selby Street/Pearson Street.

Cycling

As the city grows, there will be more emphasis on providing high-quality, safe and comfortable pedestrian and cycling infrastructure, especially around activity centres. The cycling network within the Perth and Peel 2050 Cycling and Walking Network proposes the following enhancements to increase the use of active transport:

- An extension to the current 172 km of metropolitan off-road commuter cycle paths to over 850 km, to cater for approximately half a million bicycle trips each day; and
- Active transport bridges: new active transport (cycling and pedestrian) and green (active and public transport) bridges to improve connectivity across rivers and lakes, reducing walking and cycling times.

Oceanic Drive/ Cambridge Street and Brookdale Street have been identified as strategic in-road cycling routes. The 2050 Cycling and Walking Network also identifies an off-road cycling route around Lake Monger and the Town's foreshore.

Roads

Figure 5 identifies West Coast Highway and a portion of Oceanic Drive as existing primary distributors (MRS/PRS reservation). Within the Town, Hale Road, The Boulevard, Grantham Street, Cambridge Street and Underwood Avenue/Hay Street are identified as existing integrator arterial roads (MRS reservation). The Transport Network does not propose any additional primary distributor roads or integrator arterial roads within the Town.

Freight

A number of enhancements will be made to the metropolitan freight rail network to accommodate the more than fourfold increase in international containers expected by mid-century. The 2050 Freight Network identifies one Secondary Freight Road within the Town, which runs along West Coast Highway.
All non-Stage 1 METRONET public transport proposals are subject to further investigation and will be refined as part of a future review of the frameworks.
4.11 INFRASTRUCTURE SERVICES

An initial desktop review of infrastructure services and capacity has been undertaken to inform future land use planning (Figure 53).

4.11.1 SCHEME WATER

The Town is generally well served by water distribution mains, although some upgrades may be required due to the aging cast iron mains that are prevalent throughout parts of the Town, particularly within West Leederville and Wembley. Upgrades are likely to be required where further land use intensification and redevelopment require increased water capacity, particularly where high rise or mixed use developments are proposed, as these will require additional water supply to comply with fire suppression regulations.

Once a preferred densification and intensification scenario is agreed upon the Water Corporation will undertake modelling to ascertain whether their network has sufficient capacity, and advise on necessary upgrades that will need to be undertaken to accommodate the growth.

In areas where a large proportion of the reticulation network will need to be upgraded, the Town might consider a Development Contribution Scheme to subsidise these works, rather than leaving it to individual developers to upgrade piecemeal portions. This is potentially necessary for the West Leederville and Wembley areas, where aging infrastructure is prevalent and more intensive development is proposed.

4.11.2 WASTEWATER

The Town falls into three sewer districts, being City Beach, Subiaco and Perth. All sewer in the Town of Cambridge is treated at the Subiaco Wastewater Treatment plant, much of which is gravity fed by the Perth Main Sewer.

There are some areas of City Beach which are not serviced by sewer but are part of the Water Corporation’s infill sewer program and are scheduled to be served in the next five years.

Once a preferred densification and intensification scenario is agreed upon the Water Corporation will undertake modelling to ascertain whether their network has sufficient capacity, and advise on necessary upgrades that will need to be undertaken to accommodate the growth.

If upgrades are required, they are most likely to be short sections of the 150mm diameter mains serving larger catchments. If any of the 225mm sewers require upgrading it falls under the Water Corporation’s headworks and therefore is the responsibility of the Water Corporation. The need to upgrade any of the Wastewater Pump Stations within the Town will also be the responsibility of the Water Corporation.

4.11.3 POWER

Western Power has advised that there is moderate capacity within their network across the Town, with existing substations located in Wembley Downs and Herdsman Parade.

Western Power has recently completed a new substation adjacent to the existing Shenton Park substation which is proposed to serve the western suburbs for the next 50-75 years. The old Shenton Park and Herdsman Parade substations are currently being decommissioned.

4.11.4 DRAINAGE

The Town is served by several Water Corporation drains and compensating basins, including the Herdsman Main Drain, Subiaco Main Drain, Lake Monger and the Mounts Bay Main Drain, and Mabel Talbot Park and the Wembley Jolimont Main Drain.

The Water Corporation advised that many of their drains in the area are already at capacity, and as a result stormwater detention will be required for any new development which increases runoff.
FIGURE 52: SERVICE INFRASTRUCTURE CONSIDERATIONS FOR THE TOWN
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5. OPPORTUNITIES FOR AND ISSUES ANALYSIS

5.1 RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

The target established by the Perth and Peel @ 3.5 million of an additional 6,830 dwellings to support a metropolitan population of 3.5 million is an ambitious goal for the Town of Cambridge which presents a multitude of opportunities and issues.

Under the existing local strategic planning framework the Town anticipates it will deliver in the order of 3,359 additional dwellings between 2010 and 2031, primarily via redevelopment within the West Leederville and Wembley precincts and the completion of existing development projects including Perry Lakes, Ocean Mia, St John’s Wood and Parkside Walk, as detailed in Table 29. Figure 54 identifies the key residential development opportunities and issues.

### TABLE 29: ESTIMATED ADDITIONAL DWELLINGS UNDER EXISTING LOCAL STRATEGIC PLANNING FRAMEWORK.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West Leederville</td>
<td>West Leederville Activity Centre Plan</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wembley Town Centre</td>
<td>Wembley Activity Centre Plan</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perry Lakes Estate (Floreat)</td>
<td>Perry Lakes Redevelopment Plan</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkside Walk (Jolimont)</td>
<td>Parkside Walk Outline Development Plan</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Johns Wood (Mt Claremont)</td>
<td>St Johns Wood Estate Plan</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean Mia</td>
<td>Ocean Mia Estate Plan</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Development Sites</td>
<td>Former Quarry Site</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Templetonia Crescent Site</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Existing Infill Potential</td>
<td>Town Planning Scheme No. 1</td>
<td>212(^{a})</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Delivered/Planned Dwellings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1,249</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,359</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infill Development Target</td>
<td>Perth and Peel @ 3.5 Million</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Remaining Infill Development Required</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>3,471</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{a}\) Based on dwellings/lots approved by the Town of Cambridge / WAPC without identification of whether development actually occurred.

\(^{b}\) This is an estimate only and is subject to more detailed planning to determine constraints and potential density coding.

**FIGURE 54 NOTES**

1. There is limited diversity in housing type within the City Beach area, with the vast majority of dwellings being single houses.
2. Opportunity to increase residential density and diversity around local centres to assist in growing public transport nodes and optimising use of open space within the centres.
3. Former quarry site has potential for redevelopment for residential purposes, although this requires remediation from contamination.
4. The development of Perry Lakes will deliver additional dwellings over the coming years as the final stages of development progress.
5. Identified Bushfire Prone Areas will be a constraint on additional residential densification.
6. Redevelopment of Floreat Forum shopping centre could provide apartment development opportunities as a component of the shopping centre site.
7. The area immediately surrounding the Floreat Forum shopping centre has potential to accommodate increased residential density and diversity, albeit at an appropriate scale that does not compromise the surrounding suburban character.
8. Cambridge Street (Salby Street to Floreat Forum and Essex Street to Station Street) has potential to accommodate higher density residential development taking advantage of the proximity to retail and commercial centres and public transport availability.
9. Wembley Town Centre has potential to accommodate additional residential density and diversity through redevelopment under the Wembley Activity Centre Plan.
10. West Leederville area has substantial opportunity to accommodate additional dwellings and residential diversity given its proximity to train stations and the Subiaco and Leederville Town Centres.
11. Potential longer term opportunity for densification if high priority public transport extends to Harborne Street.
12. Development opportunity on land owned by the Town of Cambridge (Templetonia Crescent).
13. Development will continue to progress over the next 5 years as part of Parkside Walk development.
14. Potential development opportunity for surplus land at Wembley Golf Course.
FIGURE 53: RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES AND ISSUES
This does, however, leave Cambridge with a shortfall of approximately 3,471 additional dwellings to be created to meet the targets of Perth & Peel @ 3.5 million. The opportunity to deliver the additional dwellings should primarily be focused along the activity corridor of Cambridge Street, particularly around the three activity centres of Floreat Forum, Wembley Town Centre and West Leederville, and the land generally fronting Cambridge Street between these areas.

Other opportunities for further investigation of housing density and diversity include:

- Land within proximity of key neighbourhood centres, including the centres at Birkdale/ Cambridge Street (Floreat), the Boulevard Shopping Centre (City Beach) and the Ocean Village Shopping Centre (City Beach);
- Identified development sites such as the City’s land on Templetonia Crescent, the City Beach Civic Centre site, the old Quarry land on the Boulevard, the Town’s Administration Centre, the old City Beach High School site and surplus portions of the Wembley Golf Course; and
- Land fronting Cambridge Street, Selby Street, Harborne Street and Grantham Street, as these are identified as high frequency or high priority and/or high frequency public transport corridors as a component of the Perth Transport Network, and would support a reduction in car based transportation and provide a sufficient catchment to make the additional bus frequency viable.

Issues for additional housing density and diversity include:

- Environmental risks, including bushfire prone areas and coastal areas vulnerable to environmental hazards;
- The increased demand for key service infrastructure, including water, sewerage, power, telecommunications and gas services, which is likely to necessitate upgrades and expansion of existing infrastructure;
- The increased demand for school placements and community services, particularly within areas where such services are already in high demand;
- The increased demand for active and passive open space, particularly within precincts where such open space is not in abundance;
- Identified heritage buildings and precincts, including the Holyrood Conservation Precinct; and
- Comparatively poor public transport service within the western areas of City Beach and Floreat.
Image: An example of infill residential development in West Leederville.
5.2 ECONOMY AND EMPLOYMENT

5.2.1 ECONOMIC GROWTH OPPORTUNITIES

Figure 55 identifies the key economy and employment opportunities and issues.

Future economic activity, economic growth and employment growth in the Town of Cambridge is likely to be facilitated through a number of proactive strategies including but not limited to:

- Resident population and household growth;
- Increased visitation;
- Increased and diversified floor space for employment generating uses; and
- Planning, construction and administration activities associated with the growth opportunities identified in the Local Planning Strategy.

The Town has a highly skilled and qualified labour force and therefore opportunities to expand the employment and economic profile of the Town could focus on the following sectors:

- Medical related, health and wellbeing industry sector;
- Creative arts, information technology and fast manufacturing, for example, 3D printing, sector;
- Beach tourism, sporting events, eco or environmentally based interpretive/interactive attractions;
- Hotel, short stay accommodation;
- Retail and food and beverage;
- Professional services, architecture;
- Age care services, accommodation; and
- Education and training.

FIGURE 55 NOTES

1. City Beach Foreshore redevelopment could see additional economic and employment opportunities within the precinct.
2. A review of facilities and development potential within the Floreat Beach precinct could provide additional economic and employment opportunities.
3. Redevelopment and expansion of local centres is likely to be necessary, particularly to accommodate local population growth and increased demand for local consumers.
4. Redevelopment of the Floreat Forum could provide additional retail and commercial floor space.
5. Redevelopment under the Wembley Activity Centre Plan will see the creation of additional retail and commercial floor space, providing additional employment and business opportunities within the precinct.
6. The medical precinct is anticipated to continue offering substantial employment opportunities into the future, with some redevelopment of surrounding properties likely to increase the floor space available for consulting rooms and ancillary services.
7. The redevelopment of West Leederville Activity Centre and Leederville Link project is anticipated to provide substantially more commercial and retail floor space within the precinct, offering significant opportunities for employment and business activity in the future.
8. There is likely to be increased demand for short-stay accommodation such as hotels and bed and breakfasts adjacent key attractions, including but not limited to the medical precinct, Lake Monger and the ocean fronting areas.
9. Smaller commercial nodes offer local employment and specific commercial services but are likely to expand into surrounding residential areas.
10. Tourist attractions at the beach, Golf Course, Lake Monger and in areas of natural environment have the potential to generate economic activity directly and indirectly.
11. Sporting venues generate significant activity and potential for economic growth particularly when supported by public transport, mixed use and commercial development.
5.3 OPEN SPACE AND COMMUNITY FACILITIES

5.3.1 OPEN SPACE AND RECREATION

Figure 56 identifies the key open space and community facilities opportunities and issues.

The Town has an abundance of open space and recreation areas, but the largest proportion of these are located within the western sections of the Town throughout Floreat and City Beach, with less local and regional open space throughout the eastern suburbs of Wembley and West Leederville, with the exception of Lake Monger and Wembley Sports Park.

Overall, West Leederville and Wembley may have good access to regional open space, but there is limited supply of smaller open space such as pocket parks. There is a recognised need to improve the distribution, function and form of public open space, however, and further densification in these suburbs will put existing open space and creation areas under pressure. These matters should be considered as a component of a broader public open space strategy for the Town as a whole, which should include an implementation and action plan identifying key upgrades/additions to open space assets and a sustainable funding mechanism for these works.

The opportunity for expansions of existing open space areas or the creation of new recreation spaces will be challenging, as neither the City or the State Government own substantial areas of land suitable for the development of open space within these areas. As a result such expansion would need to occur through the acquisition of private land, which will be difficult from a number of perspectives.

An alternative method of creating public space, particularly in higher density mixed use infill areas, is the leverage of privately owned public open space as a condition of development approval, which may be in exchange for a development bonus such as height or plot ratio. These spaces are ideally located adjacent to existing public land, such as a street corner or existing open space area, or as part of a redevelopment project such as the Leederville Link, and would be required to be lawfully available for the broader public to use.

5.3.2 COMMUNITY FACILITIES

The growth and forecasted change in resident population will require additional community facilities that may come from redevelopment and expansion of existing facilities, where suitably located and available, or the creation of new facilities where suitable land is available.

To seek funding of these infrastructure upgrades from developers the Town will be required to undertake a full community facilities audit as a component of a community needs analysis to demonstrate and justify upgrades proposed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FIGURE 54 NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Areas with a shortage of local open space in comparison to other precincts within the Town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Areas of future population growth and redevelopment that may provide opportunity for additional public open space, potentially as privately owned publicly accessible spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Existing large areas of publicly owned land which may accommodate additional or upgraded community facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Future public High School to provide for surrounding catchment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FIGURE 55: OPEN SPACE AND COMMUNITY FACILITIES OPPORTUNITIES AND ISSUES
5.4 TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORT

Figure 57 identifies the key traffic and transport opportunities and issues.

Key opportunities for the Town include:

- The Town has the opportunity to develop and encourage a cycling culture across its resident and business communities, through the review of the Town’s Bicycle Plan (2018-2022) and development of a network of local routes and strategically located Bike Boulevards.

- Local bike routes in the West Leederville/Wembley areas will need to provide access to local centres of activity, employment, education and other community services as well as enhance connections to Perth city and adjacent centres of Subiaco and Leederville.

- Local bike routes in Floreat/City Beach will need to provide access to local centres but also connect into the recreational routes that are prevalent in those areas, whilst linking through to Wembley and West Leederville.

- The Town should provide support to the Public Transport Authority in delivery of measures that enhance public transport service provision.

- Enhanced public transport service provision and priority measures along the Cambridge Street activity corridor should be supported.

- Improved connectivity between Stirling-Floreat-Claremont and Leederville-West Leederville-Subiaco-QEII/UWA public transport routes should be supported.

- The Town should remain engaged in the planning for the ‘Stirling to Murdoch Orbital’ railway and advocate for a station within the vicinity of Floreat Forum Shopping Centre.

- A station near Floreat Forum would provide direct rail access between the Town and key employment, education and medical service land uses such as Stirling City Centre, QEII/UWA and Murdoch.

- Removal of Stephenson Highway reservation from the Metropolitan Region Scheme.

However, it should be noted that in order to facilitate new or enhanced public transport provision within and across the Town, it is paramount that the Town continues to focus increased development and activity within strategic corridors previously identified as part of State planning initiatives. The Town must also continue to engage with State Government to support (where appropriate) the introduction of new public transport priority infrastructure or service enhancement proposals.

The Town’s planning initiatives will need to build on the State’s moves to capitalise on public transport infrastructure through increasing development around transit stations, as without such planning initiatives the Town will find it increasingly difficult to compete for public transport funding against other competing inner metropolitan areas.

**FIGURE 57 NOTES**

1. Focusing increased development within strategic corridors and centres will promote new or enhanced public transport provision.
2. Existing multiple transit options surrounding West Leederville present an opportunity to enhance current targets for density and employment as expressed in the West Leederville Activity Centre Plan.
3. Stephenson Highway alignment - reserve remains on Metropolitan Region Scheme and Local Planning Scheme, but is not referred to in the 2016 Perth Transport Plan and its removal from the MRS is supported by the Town of Cambridge.
4. Management of short/long term parking demand in areas of intensive use, particularly West Leederville and the medical precinct, where the mix of demands may compromise land use and amenity objectives. Issue may be compounded by competition between local parking patrons and those parking to catch public transport to the CBD.
FIGURE 56: TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORT OPPORTUNITIES AND ISSUES
5.5 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

Figure 58 identifies the key environmental opportunities and issues.

5.5.1 BUSHFIRE HAZARDS

Designated Bushfire Prone Areas cover approximately 41% of the land area within the Town and due to the recent introduction of SPP 3.7 there are now additional considerations for new developments within these areas.

While much of the Bushfire Prone Areas within the Town are related to large remnant Bush Forever sites and coastal reserves, some residential areas now fall within designated Bushfire Prone Areas. Future development in these areas will need to take relevant bushfire planning and building policy into consideration.

Opportunities for development include:

• Land not designated as Bushfire Prone Areas require no further bushfire consideration in the development process; and
• Increasing the urban canopy / greening of existing residential areas, including enhancing current vegetation and allowing for more space for landscaping (including medians and private gardens/open space).

Issues for development include:

• Development not permitted within areas that contain extreme fire hazard, unless deemed “unavoidable development”;
• Requirements of higher building standards for any buildings rated or exceeding Bushfire Attack Level (BAL) 12.5 rating;
• Requirements of BAL assessments for development within Bushfire Prone Areas (further costs);
• Preparation of Bushfire Management Plans to mitigate bushfire risks through planning and building strategies.

The Town of Cambridge as part of its Local Planning Strategy requested Emerge Associates to prepare a Bushfire Management Plan to investigate the implications of SPP 3.7 and potential bushfire considerations affecting four potential development sites:

• Eastern surplus Wembley Golf Course site (part lot 2 on diagram 54860) (Site 1)
• Western surplus Wembley Golf Course site (lot 2 on diagram 34289 and part lot 2000 on plan 73159) (Site 2)
• Old quarry site (lot 9001 on plan 58139) (Site 3)
• Town administration centre site (lot 713 on diagram 90076) (Site 4)

Recommendations to maintain compliance with SPP3.7 are outlined in the Bushfire Management Plan.

FIGURE 58 NOTES

The Threatened Ecological Community (TEC) of ‘Banister Woodlands’ is likely to occur within the Bold Park and some other Parks and Recreation reserves throughout the Town.

The limited remaining vegetation of the Karakatta Complex (South and Central) which has the lowest remaining proportion within the Swan Coastal Plain is located within portions of Perry Lakes, Roscommon Park, Wembley Golf Club and McLeans Park.

Further residential development within Bushfire Prone Areas will be subject to assessment and compliance with the WAPC’s Planning for Bushfire Prone Areas policy.

Areas of West Leederville, Wembley and the eastern section of Floreat largely unconstrained by regional environmental considerations.
FIGURE 57: ENVIRONMENTAL OPPORTUNITIES AND ISSUES
5.5.2 COASTAL HAZARDS

As outlined in SPP 2.6, coastal development must take into account future hazard risk management and adaptation planning where developments are at risk of coastal hazards over a planning timeframe. Where risk assessments identify hazards that are unacceptable to proposed developments, adaptation measures must be utilised to reduce these risks to an acceptable level.

The adaptation measures can be separated into four categories: avoidance, planned or managed retreat, accommodation, and protection.

Opportunities for development include:
- Utilisation of adaptive measures to minimise coastal hazard risk for new developments;
- Existing protective features including groynes and buried seawall at City Beach designed to mitigate future coastal erosion and shoreline retreat; and
- Shoreline retreat unlikely to impact existing residential areas.

Constraints upon development include:
- Requirement of coastal hazard risk management and planning pursuant to SPP 2.6;
- Loss of coastal values and attraction from overdevelopment/inappropriate development in foreshore reserves; and
- Potential public concern over development in coastal areas.

The City’s Coastal Natural Management Study and Coastal Vulnerability Study provide further information on the impact of coastal hazards.

5.5.3 WATER QUALITY AND QUANTITY

Managing Perth’s water resources is a critical component of integrating future population growth in a sustainable manner, particularly as climate change is predicted to have significant impacts on Perth’s water supply and demand. Future development should incorporate Water Sensitive Urban Design principles (WSUD) which aims to integrate water management into the landscape.

The key WSUD considerations for the Town include reducing overall water consumption and minimising the impacts of stormwater runoff on drainage infrastructure and wetlands.

Urban infill is likely to decrease overall irrigation demands as turf and garden areas are replaced by hardstand, however this will also lead to increases in stormwater runoff. The impacts on stormwater runoff quality and quantity should be a key consideration when considering infill development, along with the underlying principle that stormwater on private land must be retained on-site.

Opportunities for development include:
- New development incorporating WSUD principles in all aspects of planning and building design;
- Investigation of wastewater reuse via the Subiaco Waste Water Plant;
- Regional stormwater management plan to identify methods to manage and accommodate stormwater management considerations; and
- Investigating rising water levels and reuse of wastewater from Subiaco Waste Water Plant.

Constraints upon development include:
- Reduced rainfall due to climate change increasing the dependence on current water resources;
- Limited groundwater availability for non-potable uses;
Current drainage infrastructure may not be adequate to manage future rainfall events given urban infill and climate change; and
Managing stormwater runoff to reduce impacts on drainage infrastructure and receiving waterbodies.

5.5.4 BIODIVERSITY MANAGEMENT

Promoting and conserving the biodiversity values within the Town, particularly within high value areas including Bold Park, Perry Lakes Reserve and Lake Monger Reserve will provide the foundation for future social and ecological sustainability. In general, the remnant vegetation within reserves within the Town is quite intact and provides important ecological functions and should be prioritised for ongoing conservation and management. In addition, the potential impacts on the urban tree canopy should be taken into consideration when planning for urban infill.

The Town’s Policy 5.1.1 Management of Conservation Areas within Public Open Space defines the objectives of management of conservation areas (remnant bush) of public open space to achieve improved biodiversity habitats and to ensure their long term viability and sustainability.

The Biodiversity Action Plan 2011-2015 and Coastal Natural Areas Management Plan 2006-2010 are currently used to inform biodiversity management within the Town. The implementation plan is a working document that is adaptive and responsive to changing conditions and accounts for climate change impacts. The Town is yet to develop a climate change adaptation plan, although it is anticipated to be addressed in the development of the WESROC Climate Change Adaptation Plan. Should a local plan be developed the issue of how to manage the long-term viability and sustainability of the Town’s biodiversity values in a changing climate can be addressed.

In relation to Biodiversity, opportunities for development include:

- Majority of the key biodiversity values within the Town exists within reserved areas;
- Retention of urban canopy within new development; and
- Opportunities to strengthen ecological linkages.

In relation to Biodiversity, constraints upon development include:

- Presence of vegetation with important values within reserves means that opportunities for further facilities and public amenities are limited.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report provides a summary of the submissions received during the community engagement and consultation on scenarios for future residential infill development within the Town of Cambridge as a component of the preparation of a Local Planning Strategy for the Town.

The scenarios were advertised for a period of 37 days between Wednesday 15th March and Friday 21st April 2017. The open days were well attended by the Cambridge community. Town staff and consultant team members were on hand to explain the scenarios, answer questions and discuss any concerns or opportunities raised by the community members.

There were a total of 959 individual submissions received from respondents during the consultation period, the vast majority of which were provided by residents and ratepayers within the Town. Submissions were received from individuals, businesses and representative groups.

The three scenarios presented are broadly summarised as:

- **Scenario A - The District Centres Scenario:** This focuses urban growth on the three district centres - Floreat Forum, Wembley Town Centre and the West Leederville Activity Centre;

- **Scenario B - The Corridor Growth Scenario:** This focuses growth along the identified corridors of Cambridge Street, Harborne Street, Grantham Street and Selby Street, with slightly less intensity within the District Centres; and

- **Scenario C - The Local Opportunities Scenario:** This looks to target growth potential around smaller local centres, suitable government owned land and other limited suburban subdivision opportunities, in addition to retaining a focus on District Centre precincts.

Respondents were asked to provide feedback on each of the three scenarios, and in particular:

- What aspects respondents liked about each scenario;
- What aspects they didn’t like about each scenario; and
- Whether there were other opportunities that they consider should be further investigated.

This report provides an overview of the respondents comments to each of the scenarios/questions by theming common comments and providing a summary of the themes identified in responses.

It should be noted in reviewing the report that the theme summaries are not intended to be an exhaustive description of all 959 submissions, and minority views or more nuanced points raised may not have been captured in the summary description. To ensure that an accurate portrayal of the comments received is provided, the verbatim comments have been included as appendices to this report.

The report concludes by providing a series of recommendations to the Town in undertaking the next steps to preparing the Local Planning Strategy in cognisance of the feedback and preferences of the broader community.
1. INTRODUCTION

This report provides a summary of the submissions received during the community engagement and consultation on scenarios for future residential infill development within the Town of Cambridge as a component of the preparation of a Local Planning Strategy for the Town.

The scenarios were advertised for a period of 37 days between Wednesday 15th March and Friday 21st April 2017. During this period the scenarios were available via the Town’s website, and the Town hosted a series of five open days as follows:

- Leederville Town Hall, West Leederville on Wednesday 15th March;
- Empire Village Shopping Centre, City Beach on Saturday 18th March;
- Activ Foundation Offices, Wembley on Wednesday 22nd March;
- Floreat Forum Shopping Centre, Floreat on Saturday 25th March; and
- West Leederville Shopping Centre, West Leederville on Saturday 1st April.

Each of the open days was well attended by the Cambridge community. Town staff and consultant team members were on hand to explain the scenarios, answer questions and discuss any concerns or opportunities raised by the community members.
2. SUBMISSION OVERVIEW

2.1 SUBMISSIONS RECEIVED

During the consultation period there were a total of 959 submissions received, with:

- 544 (56.7%) submissions lodged via the City’s website portal.
- 308 (32.1%) submissions completed using the feedback forms provided by the Town;
- 66 (6.8%) submissions completed using a pro-forma submission prepared by members of the community; and
- 42 (4.4%) submissions prepared in alternative formats, including formal letters and emails direct to Town officers.

![Figure 1: Breakdown of submissions received by type]

![Figure 2: Extract from the feedback form provided by the Town of Cambridge]
2.2 SUBURB BREAKDOWN

Of the 959 submissions received:

- 355 were received from City Beach (37.0%);
- 214 were received from Floreat (22.3%);
- 1 was received from Jolimont (0.1%);
- 1 was received from Mt Claremont (0.1%);
- 53 were received from Wembley (5.5%);
- 2 were received from Wembley Downs (0.2%);
- 318 were received from West Leederville (33.2%);
- 2 were received from outside of the Town’s municipal area (Doubleview, Karrinyup) (0.2%); and
- 13 submissions did not state their suburb (1.3%).

![Figure 3: Breakdown of submissions received by suburb](image3.png)

![Figure 4: Spatial plan showing submissions received by suburb](image4.png)
2.3 RESPONDENT CLASSIFICATION

In response to the question of the respondents relationship with the Town’s municipal area:

- 730 respondents identified they were a resident of the Town;
- 39 respondents identified they were business owners within the Town;
- 52 respondents identified that they worked within the Town;
- 5 respondents identified that they were visitors to the Town;
- 450 respondents identified that they were property owners within the Town; and
- 5 respondents identified that they were studying within the Town.

It should be noted that many respondents identified themselves as falling within more than one category (e.g. resident and property owner).

2.4 AGE GROUPS

Respondents generally fell within an age group above 40 years of age, which corresponds with the age structure of the Town of Cambridge more generally.

In summary, the age range provided by respondents identified that:

- The majority of respondents were aged between 40 and 69, with a total of 601 responses from those aged within this grouping;
- There were very few responses from those aged under 30, with only 25 respondents identifying themselves as falling within this age bracket; and
- There were 154 respondents who identified themselves as over 70 years of age; and
- 103 respondents did not provide a response to the question, or the question was not applicable as they were not responding as an individual.
2.5 SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

The summary of submissions outlined in Sections 3, 4, 5 and 6 has been prepared to provide an overview of the key themes that were raised in the submissions received to provide a reader with an overall picture of the community view.

Sections 3, 4 and 5 relate to those feedback forms and online submissions that directly answered questions on the three scenarios. Section 6 outlines pro-forma submissions and the alternative format submissions received (letters, emails).

It should be noted that the summary is not an exhaustive description of all 959 submissions, and minority views or more nuanced points raised may not have been captured in the summary description.

To ensure that an accurate portrayal of the comments received is provided, the verbatim comments have been provided as appendices to this report.

2.5.1 NON-CONFORMING SUBMISSIONS

In reviewing the submissions made, a number of respondents provided an answer that did not conform to the question posed. These submissions have been included within a ‘non-conforming responses’ theme and are generally identified where:

- A respondent has provided a negative response when asked what they like about a scenario (e.g. ‘No’ or ‘Nothing’);
- A respondent has provided a positive or neutral response when asked what they don’t like about a scenario (e.g. ‘Not sure yet’ or ‘Nil’);
- A respondent provided a response that was unclear (e.g. ‘Moving to the country...’); or
- A respondent provided a response that was unrelated to the scenarios (e.g. ‘We should stop everything and wait for the new Council to be voted in for October 2017’).

Non-conforming submissions have been considered by the project team and are outlined as a component of this report.

PLATE 2: SUBMISSIONS REPEATEDLY RAISED CONCERNS OF THE IMPACT OF FUTURE INFILL DEVELOPMENT ON EXISTING SUBURBAN RESIDENTIAL AREAS AND THE DEMAND FOR COMMUNITY SERVICES, OPEN SPACE AND SCHOOLS
3. DISTRICT CENTRES SCENARIO (SCENARIO A)

The District Centres Scenario (Scenario A) focused urban growth on the three district centres - Floreat Forum, Wembley Town Centre and the West Leederville Activity Centre.

Each centre is a focal point for the community, and presents opportunities to accommodate additional urban growth and employment to create mixed use, active and diverse centres.

The District Centres Scenario as presented during the consultation and engagement period is outlined below and on the page on the right.
FIGURE 6: SCENARIO A AS PRESENTED TO THE COMMUNITY DURING THE CONSULTATION AND ENGAGEMENT PERIOD
3.1 WHAT ASPECTS DO YOU LIKE?

There were 633 responses which related to what respondents liked about Scenario A. These responses were generally aligned with two key themes, being:

- Support for intensification of existing district centre precincts; and
- General support for the concepts outlined within the plan.

These themes are further outlined below, and the individual submissions aligned with the theme are outlined in Appendix 1.

3.1.1 SUPPORT FOR INTENSIFICATION OF EXISTING DISTRICT CENTRE PRECINCTS

A total of 401 comments were received which generally identified that respondents were supportive of the existing district centres accommodating further infill development, with many individuals indicating that they considered these centres suitable for such development as they:

- Are located close to existing public transport infrastructure, minimising reliance upon private vehicles;
- Are predominantly existing urban environments where higher density development and land uses are well established; and
- Generally limit the expanse of growth into ‘traditional residential streets’ throughout the broader suburban areas.

It should be noted that some of these responses were qualified with suggestions to amend the extent or building heights proposed within centre precincts.

3.1.2 GENERAL SUPPORT

A total of 123 comments were received that were generally supportive of Scenario A, without specifying the elements of the scenario which they supported.

3.1.3 NON-CONFORMING RESPONSES

A total of 109 responses to the question were classified as ‘non-conforming’ as their responses were either unclear or they answered in the negative rather than the positive.
3.2 WHAT ASPECTS DON’T YOU LIKE?

There were 553 responses received which related to what respondents did not like about Scenario A. These responses are generally aligned with six key themes, being:

- Insufficient distribution of population growth;
- Building height/intensity too extreme;
- Extent of district centres too extreme;
- Congestion of the movement network;
- Insufficient community services, schools and public open space; and
- General opposition.

These themes are further outlined below, and the individual submissions aligned with the theme are outlined in Appendix 2.

3.2.1 INSUFFICIENT DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION GROWTH

A total of 125 comments were received which identified concern with the concentration of population growth solely within District Centres under Scenario A.

In particular concerns were raised with:

- An over reliance on West Leederville to accommodate a significant amount of growth, both through changes in the height/intensity of built form and in the extent of the district centre expanding into traditional suburban streets;
- A reliance on Wembley and Floreat, which were not considered to be presently well serviced by public transport, and are currently smaller centres not considered to be ‘urban’ in character; and
- The lack of any proposed infill development throughout the City Beach and broader Floreat areas, and a perceived lack of recognition of further infill development opportunities within surrounding local governments including Subiaco, Stirling, Vincent and Perth.

The comments were generally underpinned by concerns about a lack of equity in the distribution of infill requirements across the Town, a desire to see opportunities spread throughout the Town to allow ‘aging in place’ and greater diversity of dwellings throughout all suburbs, and a concern that focusing population growth only on centres would result in those centres losing their unique character.

3.2.2 BUILDING HEIGHT/INTENSITY TOO EXTREME

A total of 113 comments were received which identified concern with the intensity and height of built form proposed under Scenario A.

Particular concerns were repeatedly raised with respect to:

- The intensity and height of new residential buildings being constructed in the West Leederville precinct, and concern that this may spread beyond the inner core area of the precinct;
- The intensity and height of buildings suggested within the residential transition areas, particularly as these areas are primarily single storey residential areas, and 2-4 storeys is a significant change to the local environment;
- The intensity and height of building proposals within Wembley, particularly in the context of adjacent single and double storey residential precincts; and
- The intensity and height of building proposals within the Floreat precinct, with some concern about the potential for the Floreat Forum to have substantial height, and others concerned about the transition of such height to the surrounding residential precinct.

The comments received were underpinned by concerns about visual blight, poorer quality built form, overshadowing or overlooking of neighbouring residential areas and associated issues of congestion and infrastructure demand that higher density development will result in.
3.2.3 EXTENT OF PROPOSED CENTRES TOO EXTREME
A total of 61 comments were received which identified concerns with respect to the extent of the area proposed for consideration of redevelopment. In particular comments noted that:

- The northern extent of the ‘Residential Transition’ and ‘District Centre Frame’ extended too far into the existing suburban streets within West Leederville and Wembley centres;
- The West Leederville Centre as a whole was too large and exceeded the current West Leederville Activity Centre Plan boundary too significantly; and
- The extent of transition within the Floreat District Centre precinct was too large and should be accommodated closer to the existing shopping centre.

In support of these comments respondents referenced concerns with the potential destruction of the suburban character within these precincts, demolition of heritage/architectural significance, traffic congestion and overlooking/overshadowing of existing dwellings.

3.2.4 CONGESTION OF THE MOVEMENT NETWORK
A total of 59 comments were received which identified concerns with respect to potential congestion of the movement network within the centres and corridors as a result of proposed infill development.

In particular comments noted that:

- Concentration of higher density development within centres to the extent suggested will result in increased road network congestion with continued reliance on private vehicle use;
- Vehicle parking will become a more substantial issue as a result of more residents and visitors accessing the centres, which needs to be catered for and well managed;
- Greater prioritisation and investment in cycling and walking infrastructure is required to support higher density development within the centres; and
- The current provision of public transport within the majority of the three centres is insufficient to cater for the proposed population growth, and it is unclear how this is going to be improved.

3.2.5 INSUFFICIENT COMMUNITY SERVICES, SCHOOLS AND PUBLIC OPEN SPACE
A total of 40 comments were received which identified concerns with respect to the extent of the pressure on community services, schools and public open space. In particular comments noted:

- The existing demand for schools within the local areas, and the increase in demand as a result of increasing population within these areas;
- The extent/usability of open space within district centres and the increasing demand for these spaces as a result of increasing population in centres; and
- The increasing demand for community services and utility infrastructure that will come with population growth.

It should be noted that comments were primarily focused on issues of insufficient community services, schools and open space within West Leederville, and to a lesser extent Wembley.

3.2.6 GENERAL OPPOSITION
A total of 85 comments were received which were attributed to the theme of ‘general opposition’. These comments were primarily:

- Straightforward objections without qualification (e.g. ‘No’, ‘Not Acceptable’); and
- More qualified objections listing multiple reasons that could be attributed to multiple themes previously identified.

3.2.7 NON-CONFORMING RESPONSES
A total of 70 responses to the question were classified as ‘non-conforming’ as their responses were either unclear or they answered in the positive rather than the negative.
3.3 ARE THERE OTHER OPPORTUNITIES YOU THINK SHOULD BE FURTHER INVESTIGATED?

There were 447 responses which related to further opportunities for investigation. These responses were generally aligned with five key themes, being:

- Distribution of infill development;
- Building height / intensity;
- Community services, schools and public open space;
- Movement Network; and
- Heritage.

These themes are further outlined below, and the individual submissions aligned with the theme are outlined in Appendix 3.

3.3.1 DISTRIBUTION OF INFILL DEVELOPMENT

A total of 245 comments were received which identified concern with the distribution of infill development, and identified other areas that are worthy of further investigation.

Particular comments were repeatedly raised with respect to:

- The lack of opportunities for redevelopment within the western sections of the Town, particularly within City Beach and Floreat;
- The potential for smaller lot subdivision within existing residential areas to allow a greater diversity of product;
- A desire for surplus government land assets to be considered for new residential development;
- The desire for a focus along Cambridge Street, rather than expanding centres north into existing suburban areas;
- Consideration of neighbourhood centres and local centres as opportunities for further intensification; and
- Objection to the suggestion that infill development within the Town is required, with suggestion that the targets established by the State should be rejected and growth should occur elsewhere.

3.3.2 BUILDING HEIGHT / INTENSITY

A total of 32 comments were received which related to the proposed building height / intensity. These comments broadly identified:

- Potential modifications to the building heights suggested, predominantly reducing the suggested heights within the centres and the transition areas;
- Focusing taller buildings in areas such as the railway precincts and Cambridge Street, rather than encroaching on residential areas; and
- Adjusting building setbacks to reduce the impact of building height on adjacent properties.

3.3.3 COMMUNITY SERVICES, SCHOOLS AND PUBLIC OPEN SPACE

A total of 27 comments were received which related to community services, schools and public open space. These comments broadly identified:

- The desire for further investment in local public open space within and surrounding existing growth areas, particularly focusing on the West Leederville precinct;
- The need for consideration of current student numbers within local schools, and the impact that further population growth may have on these schools; and
- The impact of further infill development on community and infrastructure services, and the need for expansion of these services to cater for growth in demand.
3.3.4 MOVEMENT NETWORK

A total of 31 comments were received which related to the impact of proposed growth on the movement network within the Town.

In particular comments noted that:

- Parking within centres was considered to already be challenging, and required further consideration in the context of additional development;
- Consideration of technological advancements in transport, including driverless cars, need to be considered in planning for the longer term;
- Improvements in public transport, including light rail and expansion of heavy rail, need to be factored in to proposed growth areas; and
- Further investment in cycling and walking infrastructure is required to connect centres and the surrounding suburbs.

3.3.5 HERITAGE

A total of 9 comments were received which related to the protection of heritage, identifying the need for any infill development proposal to take account of the importance of existing heritage buildings and character within suburbs and natural areas, and be designed to ensure that these values are not compromised.

3.3.6 NON CONFORMING RESPONSES

A total of 103 responses to the question were classified as ‘non-conforming’ as their responses were either:

- Unclear;
- In the negative (e.g. ‘No’, ‘Not Acceptable’);
- Suggested that the preparation of a Local Planning Strategy should be deferred until after the 2017 Council elections; or
- Opposed planning towards an infill dwelling target as they considered the methodology used to calculate the target was flawed.
4. CORRIDOR GROWTH SCENARIO (SCENARIO B)

The Corridor Growth Scenario (Scenario B) focuses growth along the identified corridors of Cambridge Street, Harborne Street, Grantham Street and Selby Street, with slightly less intensity within the District Centres.

With increased public transport frequency along each of these corridors proposed, and linkages between the three district centres, these corridors have opportunities to accommodate further urban growth.

The Corridor Growth Scenario as presented during the consultation and engagement period is outlined below and on the page on the right.

1. The development proposed under the West Leederville Activity Centre Plan and the Wembley Activity Centre Plan could remain as currently endorsed by the Town of Cambridge.

2. Floreat District Centre could accommodate 6 to 8 storeys of mixed use development as part of redevelopment of the Floreat Forum Shopping Centre, with surrounding properties accommodating residential development of between 2 and 6 storeys depending on location, site area, accessibility and impact on adjoining properties.

3. The Cambridge Street urban corridor could accommodate commercial and residential development of up to 5 storeys, with improvements to the streetscape and road reservation to ensure efficiency of movement and a high quality public realm.

4. The Selby Street, Grantham Street and Harborne Street areas could accommodate increased residential development of between 2 and 4 storeys immediately abutting these roads, making good use of the increased public transport frequency and provision.

5. Residential areas immediately fringing centres and the Cambridge Street urban corridor could accommodate increased residential development between 2 and 4 storeys to assist in transitioning from higher intensity development to the existing suburban environment.
FIGURE 7: SCENARIO B AS PRESENTED TO THE COMMUNITY DURING THE CONSULTATION AND ENGAGEMENT PERIOD
4.1 WHAT ASPECTS DO YOU LIKE?

There were 678 responses which related to what respondents liked about Scenario B. These responses were generally aligned with two key themes, being:

- Support for intensification within the identified centres and along corridors; and
- General support for the concepts outlined within the plan.

These themes are further outlined below, and the individual submissions aligned with the theme are outlined in Appendix 4.

4.1.1 SUPPORT FOR INTENSIFICATION OF CORRIDORS

A total of 362 comments were received which identified support for focusing infill development within centres and along corridors with many individuals indicating that they considered these centres to be suitable for such development as they:

- Limit the expansion of the district centre precincts into surrounding suburban areas;
- Are predominantly existing urban environments where medium and higher density development and land uses are well established;
- Are located close to existing and/or proposed public transport infrastructure, minimising reliance upon private vehicles; and
- Generally limit the expanse of growth into ‘traditional residential streets’ throughout the broader suburban areas.

There was some conditional support noted within this theme, with some respondents identifying concern with:

- Expansion of higher density development along Harborne, Grantham and Selby Streets which are generally characterised by lower density;
- Residential transition areas expanding from Cambridge Street into the suburban areas; and
- The height and intensity of development within growth areas.

4.1.2 GENERAL SUPPORT

A total of 160 comments were received that were generally supportive of Scenario B, with comments that:

- Indicated general support without specifying the elements of the scenario which they supported (e.g. ‘Yes’, ‘Okay’); and
- Indicated support for specific elements of the plan (extent of centres shown, building heights, specific corridors).

4.1.3 NON-COMFORMING RESPONSES

A total of 156 responses to the question were classified as ‘non-conforming’ as their responses were either unclear or they answered in the negative rather than the positive.
PLATE 2: THE SUBURB OF FLOREAT LOOKING EAST TOWARDS THE PERTH CBD
### 4.2 WHAT ASPECTS DON’T YOU LIKE?

There were 547 responses which related to what respondents did not like about Scenario B. These responses are generally aligned with six key themes, being:

- Insufficient distribution of population growth;
- Building height/intensity too extreme;
- Extent of corridors too extreme;
- Congestion of the movement network;
- Insufficient community services, schools and public open space; and
- General opposition.

It was noted that the key themes raised in Scenario B were very similar to those raised in Scenario A.

These themes are further outlined below, and the individual submissions aligned with the theme are outlined in Appendix 5.

#### 4.2.1 INSUFFICIENT DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION GROWTH

A total of 94 comments were received which identified concern with the concentration of population growth within centres and corridors under Scenario B. In particular concerns were raised with:

- The sole focus on the suburbs of Floreat, Wembley and West Leederville to accommodate future population growth, with no infill development proposed within City Beach or the broader suburban residential areas; and
- The limited extent of corridors proposed, with some respondents suggesting these should be expanded further west along Oceanic Drive and the Boulevard.

#### 4.2.2 BUILDING HEIGHT/INTENSITY TOO EXTREME

A total of 98 comments were received which identified concern with the intensity and height of built form proposed under Scenario B.

Particular concerns were repeatedly raised with respect to:

- The intensity and height of buildings suggested within the residential transition areas, particularly as these areas are primarily single storey residential areas; and
- The intensity and height of building proposals within the West Leederville, Floreat and Wembley precincts, with similar concerns as those raised in Scenario A regarding existing examples of such development causing problems within these precincts.

The comments received were underpinned by concerns about visual blight, poorer quality built form, overshadowing of overlooking of neighbouring residential areas and associated issues of congestion and infrastructure demand from higher density development.

#### 4.2.3 EXTENT OF CORRIDORS TOO EXTREME

A total of 47 comments were received which identified concern with the extent of the proposed corridors and centres under Scenario B.

In particular concerns were raised with:

- The expansion of higher density residential development into surrounding residential areas, particularly adjacent the ‘Urban Corridor’ precinct and the three District Centres;
- The reduced focus on existing District Centres (in comparison to Scenario A) which are primarily urban in character, and the spreading of the urban environment further throughout the Town; and
- The expansion of higher density development along Harborne, Grantham and Selby Streets which are currently lower density residential environments.
4.2.4 CONGESTION OF THE MOVEMENT NETWORK

A total of 91 comments were received which identified concern with congestion of the movement network under Scenario B.

Particular concerns were raised with:

- The recent reduction of Cambridge Street in sections to only a single lane, which was considered to contribute to traffic congestion throughout these precincts;
- The existing traffic congestion on Grantham Street, Harborne Street and Selby Street during peak periods;
- The narrowsness of the road network throughout corridor areas, particularly when trying to accommodate increased frequency of public transport along these corridors;
- The uncertainty of State Government commitment to fund improvements in public transport infrastructure along these corridors;
- The increase in traffic congestion along the corridor as a result of higher intensity development putting greater demand on the road network;
- The lack of cycling and walking infrastructure along these corridors to encourage people to cycle or walk instead; and
- Parking difficulties within centres, which could expand throughout the corridor unless properly planned.

4.2.5 INSUFFICIENT COMMUNITY SERVICES, SCHOOLS AND PUBLIC OPEN SPACE

A total of 20 comments were received which identified concerns with respect to the extent of the pressure on community services, schools and public open space.

In particular comments noted:

- The existing demand for schools within the local areas, and the increase in demand as a result of increasing population within these areas;
- The extent of open space within the Wembley and West Leederville areas and the increasing demand for these spaces as a result of increasing population in centres;
- The impact on the streetscapes for identified corridors as a result of increased demand for crossovers and on-street parking and the potential removal of street trees; and
- The increasing demand for community services and utility infrastructure that will come with population growth.

4.2.6 GENERAL OPPOSITION

A total of 170 comments were received which were attributed to the theme of ‘general opposition’. These comments were primarily:

- Straightforward objections without qualification (e.g. ‘No’, ‘Not Acceptable’); and
- More qualified objections listing multiple reasons that could be attributed to multiple themes previously identified.

4.2.7 NON-CONFORMING RESPONSES

A total of 27 responses to the question were classified as ‘non-conforming’ as their responses were either unclear or they answered in the positive rather than the negative.
4.3 ARE THERE OTHER OPPORTUNITIES YOU THINK SHOULD BE FURTHER INVESTIGATED?

There were 405 responses which related to further opportunities for investigation which were generally aligned with four key themes, being:

- Distribution of infill development;
- Building height / intensity;
- Community services, schools and public open space; and
- Movement Network.

These themes are further outlined below, and the individual submissions aligned with the theme are outlined in Appendix 6.

4.3.1 DISTRIBUTION OF INFILL DEVELOPMENT

A total of 207 comments were received which identified concern with the distribution of infill development, and identified other areas that worthy of further investigation.

Particular comments were repeatedly raised with respect to:

- The lack of opportunities for redevelopment within the western sections of the Town, particularly within City Beach and Floreat;
- The potential for smaller lot subdivision within existing residential areas to allow a greater diversity of product;
- Suggestion that the railway line be sunk in West Leederville to allow development to occur overtop between West Leederville and Subiaco;
- A desire for surplus government land assets to be considered for new residential development, with a particular focus on sites throughout City Beach, Floreat and Wembley;
- Consideration of neighbourhood centres and local centres as opportunities for further intensification; and
- Objection to the suggestion that infill development within the Town is required, with suggestion that the targets established by the State should be rejected and growth should occur elsewhere.

4.3.2 BUILDING HEIGHT / INTENSITY

A total of 32 comments were received which related to the proposed building height / intensity. These comments broadly identified:

- Potential modifications to the building heights suggested, predominantly reducing the suggested heights within the centres, corridors and transition areas;
- Need for activation of ground floor areas within centres to ensure that passive surveillance of the street and street life / interaction is encouraged;
- Focusing taller buildings in areas such as the railway precincts and Cambridge Street, rather than encroaching on residential areas; and
- Adjusting building setbacks to reduce the impact of building height on adjacent properties.

4.3.3 COMMUNITY SERVICES, SCHOOLS AND PUBLIC OPEN SPACE

A total of 20 comments were received which related to community services, schools and public open space. These comments broadly identified:

- The desire for further investment in local public open space within and surrounding existing growth areas;
- The need for consideration of current student numbers within local schools, and the impact that further population growth may have on these schools; and
- The impact of further infill development on community and infrastructure services, and the need for expansion of these services to cater for growth in demand.
4.3.4 MOVEMENT NETWORK

A total of 43 comments were received which related to the impact of proposed growth on the movement network within the Town.

In particular comments noted that:

- Modifications to the road network to reduce congestion and improve functionality, with particular focus on Cambridge Street, Hale Road, The Boulevard and Grantham Street;
- Parking within centres was considered to already be challenging, and required further consideration in the context of additional development;
- Improvements in public transport, including light rail and expansion of heavy rail, need to be factored in to proposed growth areas; and
- Further investment in cycling and walking infrastructure is required to connect centres/corridors and the surrounding suburbs.

4.3.5 NON CONFORMING RESPONSES

A total of 102 responses to the question were classified as ‘non-conforming’ as their responses were either:

- Unclear;
- In the negative (e.g. ‘No’, ‘Not Acceptable’);
- Suggested that the preparation of a Local Planning Strategy should be deferred until after the 2017 Council elections; or
- Opposed planning towards an infill dwelling target as they considered the methodology used to calculate the target was flawed.
5. LOCAL OPPORTUNITIES SCENARIO (SCENARIO C)

The Local Opportunities Scenario (Scenario C) looks to target growth potential around smaller local centres, suitable government owned land and other limited suburban subdivision opportunities.

As these opportunities will only accommodate a fraction of the growth target, it would be proposed to focus more substantial urban growth within the West Leederville Activity Centre, similar to the District Centres Scenario, with moderate growth in the smaller centres of Wembley and Floreat Forum.

The Local Opportunities Scenario as presented during the consultation and engagement period is outlined below and on the page on the right.

1. **West Leederville District Centre** could accommodate additional development opportunities within 800m of the railway stations, and reconsider the maximum building heights to facilitate a range of buildings between 4 storeys and 10 storeys abutting Cambridge Street and the railway lines, and 2 to 5 storeys within fringing areas depending on location, site area, accessibility and impact on adjoining properties.

2. **Wembley Town Centre** could remain as currently endorsed by the Town of Cambridge under the Wembley Activity Centre Plan.

3. **Floreat District Centre** could accommodate 6 to 8 storeys of mixed use development as part of redevelopment of the Floreat Forum Shopping Centre, with surrounding properties accommodating residential development of between 2 and 6 storeys depending on location, site area, accessibility and impact on adjoining properties.

4. **Residential areas** within close proximity to Neighbourhood Centres and Local Centres could accommodate residential development between 2 and 4 storeys depending on location, site area, accessibility and impact on adjoining properties.

5. **Potential development areas owned by the Town of Cambridge**, including the former quarry site and the vacant land on Templetonia Crescent, could be developed for residential purposes.

6. Opportunities for **corner lot subdivision** could be identified where they will have minimal impact on surrounding residents and improve the overall streetscape, as depicted in the ‘corner lot subdivision opportunity’ diagram.
FIGURE 8: SCENARIO C AS PRESENTED TO THE COMMUNITY DURING THE CONSULTATION AND ENGAGEMENT PERIOD
5.1 WHAT ASPECTS DO YOU LIKE?

There were 534 responses which related to what respondents liked about Scenario C. These responses were generally aligned with three key themes, being:

- Support for greater distribution of infill development opportunities across the Town;
- Support for increased development potential within the West Leederville area; and
- General support for the scenario.

These themes are further outlined below, and the individual submissions aligned with the theme are outlined in Appendix 7.

5.1.1 DISTRIBUTION OF INFILL DEVELOPMENT

A total of 216 comments were received which identified support for focusing infill development across the whole of the Town, with many individuals indicating that they:

- Wanted to see further opportunities identified throughout the City Beach and Floreat areas, particularly around local and neighbourhood centres;
- Wanted to retain a focus on development within proximity to the train stations at West Leederville, City West and Subiaco;
- Were supportive of consideration of suburban residential subdivision opportunities such as that shown in the corner lot subdivision example; and
- Preferred the reduction in spread of higher density throughout Wembley and Floreat.

5.1.2 FOCUS ON SURPLUS GOVERNMENT LAND

A total of 10 comments were received which support focus on identifying and facilitating the development of surplus government land assets such as that identified in Templetonia Crescent and the ‘Old Quarry’ site. These were considered to be strong opportunities for the Town to quickly achieve infill development without impacting upon existing neighbourhoods.

5.1.3 GENERAL SUPPORT

A total of 34 comments were received that were generally supportive of Scenario C, with comments that indicated general support without specifying the elements of the scenario which they supported (e.g. ‘Yes’, ‘Okay’).

5.1.4 NON-CONFORMING RESPONSES

A total of 274 responses to the question were classified as ‘non-conforming’ as their responses were either unclear or they answered in the negative rather than the positive.
PLATE 3: THE SUBURB OF CITY BEACH LOOKING NORTH-EAST
5.2 WHAT ASPECTS DON’T YOU LIKE?

There were 715 responses which related to what respondents did not like about Scenario C. These responses are generally aligned with seven key themes, being:

- Residential Subdivision outside of Centres/Corridors;
- Expansion of the West Leederville Activity Centre;
- Insufficient distribution of population growth;
- Building height/intensity too extreme;
- Congestion of the movement network;
- Insufficient community services, schools and public open space; and
- General opposition.

These themes are further outlined below, and the individual submissions aligned with the theme are outlined in Appendix 8.

5.2.1 RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT OUTSIDE OF CENTRES/ CORRIDORS

A total of 336 comments were received which identified concern that residential development would occur within the broader town area, with common concerns expressed relating to:

- The reduced focus on existing urban centres and corridors to accommodate further infill development;
- The potential that the Town had rebranded Amendment 31 and were attempting to progress with broad scale upcoding of residential areas via Scenario C;
- The proposed Residential Transition precinct surrounding the local centres and neighbourhood centres, as this was considered detrimental to the amenity and character of these areas;
- The potential for corner lot subdivision to be permitted as this was considered to be detrimental to the character and amenity of suburban areas; and
- The proposal for the Quarry Site to be developed as it was seen as a community asset.

5.2.2 EXPANSION OF WEST LEEDERVILLE ACTIVITY CENTRE

A total of 28 comments were received which identified concern with the expansion of the West Leederville Activity Centre precinct in this scenario, with particular comments concerned about:

- The expansion of the activity centre area north into the more traditional suburban streets of West Leederville; and
- The increase in the building heights compared to that envisaged under the existing Activity Centres Plan.

The comments received were underpinned by concerns about visual blight, poorer quality built form, overshadowing of overlooking of neighbouring residential areas and associated issues of congestion and infrastructure demand from higher density development.

5.2.3 INSUFFICIENT DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION GROWTH

A total of 129 comments were received which raised concern with the distribution of population growth, with respondents generally identifying that Scenario C still did not provide sufficient equity in the spread of infill opportunities, and relied too heavily on centres such as West Leederville.

5.2.4 BUILDING HEIGHT/INTENSITY TOO EXTREME

A total of 23 comments were received which identified concern with the intensity and height of built form proposed under Scenario C.

Particular concerns were repeatedly raised with respect to:

- The intensity and height of building proposals within the West Leederville, Floreat and Wembley precincts, with similar concerns as those raised in Scenario A regarding existing examples of such development causing problems within these precincts; and
- The intensity and height of buildings suggested within the residential transition areas, particularly as these areas are primarily single storey residential areas.
The comments received were underpinned by concerns about visual blight, poorer quality built form, overshadowing of overlooking of neighbouring residential areas and associated issues of congestion and infrastructure demand from higher density development.

### 5.2.5 INSUFFICIENT COMMUNITY SERVICES, SCHOOLS AND PUBLIC OPEN SPACE

A total of 36 comments were received which identified concerns with respect to the extent of the pressure on community services, schools and public open space. In particular comments noted:

- The existing demand for schools within the local areas, and the increase in demand as a result of increasing population within these areas;
- The extent of open space within the Wembley and West Leederville areas more broadly and the increasing demand for these spaces as a result of increasing population in centres;
- The impact on the streetscapes for identified growth areas as a result of increased demand for crossovers and on-street parking and the potential removal of street trees; and
- The increasing demand for community services and utility infrastructure that will come with population growth.

### 5.2.6 CONGESTION OF THE MOVEMENT NETWORK

A total of 23 comments were received which identified concern with congestion of the movement network under Scenario C.

Particular concerns were raised with:

- The increase in traffic congestion and parking problems in centres;
- The increase in traffic in local streets with further development causing congestion and parking problems;
- The uncertainty of State Government commitment to fund improvements in public transport infrastructure along these corridors, and the lack of public transport investment in the broader suburban areas; and
- The lack of cycling and walking infrastructure along these corridors to encourage people to cycle or walk instead.

### 5.2.7 GENERAL OPPOSITION

A total of 127 comments were received which were attributed to the theme of ‘general opposition’. These comments were primarily:

- Straightforward objections without qualification (e.g. ‘No’, ‘Not Acceptable’); and
- More qualified objections listing multiple reasons that could be attributed to multiple themes previously identified.

### 5.2.8 NON-CONFORMING RESPONSES

A total of 13 responses to the question were classified as ‘non-conforming’ as their responses were either unclear or they answered in the positive rather than the negative.
5.3 ARE THERE OTHER OPPORTUNITIES YOU THINK SHOULD BE FURTHER INVESTIGATED?

There were 414 responses provided in relation to the question of further opportunities for investigation which were generally aligned with eight key themes, being:

- Distribution of infill development;
- Development opportunities;
- Support for residential development;
- Building Height / Intensity
- Community services, schools and public open space;
- Movement Network;
- General Support;
- General Opposition.

These themes are further outlined below, and the individual submissions aligned with the theme are outlined in Appendix 9.

5.3.1 DISTRIBUTION OF INFILL DEVELOPMENT

A total of 124 comments were received which identified concern with the distribution of infill development, and identified other areas that worthy of further investigation.

Particular comments were repeatedly raised with respect to:

- Concern with the proposed size and scale of West Leederville centre, and the impact that such redevelopment would have on the character and amenity within these areas;
- The equity of infill development throughout the Town, with respondents primarily raising concern with the greater emphasis on the eastern precincts of Wembley and West Leederville to deliver the bulk of infill development; and
- Concern regarding the reliance upon local and neighbourhood centres, along with surrounding residential precincts, to provide infill development.

5.3.2 DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES

A total of 62 comments were received which related to development opportunities within the Town which respondents thought worthy of consideration. These comments primarily related to:

- Outlining either objection or support for proposed development areas such as the Quarry Site, Templetonia Crescent, Empire Village, Ocean Village and others; and
- Identification of other opportunities including City Beach foreshore area, the former Drive-In theatre site, the Town’s Administration Centre, Perry Lakes, City Beach High School site, Wembley Golf Course and the sinking of the railway line.

5.3.3 SUPPORT FOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

A total of 40 comments were received which related to support for further residential subdivision and development opportunities within suburban areas, with respondents identifying:

- Support for the proposed corner lot subdivision opportunity; and
- Support for broader scale upcoding of existing suburban residential areas to assist in meeting infill targets.

5.3.4 BUILDING HEIGHT / INTENSITY

A total of 21 comments were received which related to the proposed building height / intensity. These comments broadly identified:

- Objection to ‘high rise’ development, with a suggestion that more moderate densification within centres and corridors is appropriate;
- The need for activation of ground floor areas within centres to ensure that passive surveillance of the street and street life / interaction is encouraged;
- A preference of focus to taller buildings in areas such as the railway precincts and Cambridge Street, rather than encroaching on residential areas; and
- Adjusting building setbacks to reduce the impact of building height on adjacent properties.
5.3.5 COMMUNITY SERVICES, SCHOOLS AND PUBLIC OPEN SPACE

A total of 29 comments were received which related to community services, schools and public open space. These comments broadly identified:

- The desire for further investment in local public open space within and surrounding existing growth areas;
- The need for consideration of current student numbers within local schools, and the impact that further population growth may have on these schools;
- The impact of further development and urban intensification on the local natural environment; and
- The impact of further infill development on community and infrastructure services and the need for expansion of these services to cater for growth in demand.

5.3.6 MOVEMENT NETWORK

A total of 15 comments were received which related to the impact of proposed growth on the movement network within the Town. In particular comments noted that:

- Improvements in public transport, including light rail and expansion of heavy rail, need to be factored in to proposed growth areas;
- Modifications to the road network to reduce congestion and improve functionality, with particular focus on Cambridge Street, Hale Road, The Boulevard and Grantham Street;
- Parking within centres was considered to already be challenging, and required further consideration in the context of additional development; and
- Further investment in cycling and walking infrastructure is required to connect centres/corridors and the surrounding suburbs.

5.2.7 GENERAL OPPOSITION

A total of 30 comments were received which were attributed to the theme of ‘general opposition’. These comments were primarily objections to Scenario C and/or objections to any further infill development within the Town.

5.3.8 GENERAL SUPPORT

A total of two submissions were received which were attributed to the theme of ‘general support’ for Scenario C.

5.3.9 NON-CONFORMING RESPONSES

A total of 91 responses to the question were classified as ‘non-conforming’ as their responses were either:

- Unclear;
- In the negative (e.g. ‘No’, ‘Not Acceptable’);
- Suggested that the preparation of a Local Planning Strategy should be deferred until after the 2017 Council elections; or
- Opposed planning towards an infill dwelling target as they considered the methodology used to calculate the target was flawed.
6. OTHER SUBMISSIONS

6.1 PRO-FORMA SUBMISSIONS

As outlined in Section 2.1, there were 67 pro-forma submissions received from respondents which took two different forms. The content of these submissions is shown in Appendix 10.

6.2 FORMAL LETTER SUBMISSIONS

During the submission period the Town received 40 submissions from respondents in longer letter format. To ensure the message of these letters was conveyed accurately they have been included as Appendix 11 to this report. It is noted that personal details contained in the letter have been redacted for privacy reasons.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Respondent Classification</th>
<th>Summary of letter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Individual Respondent</td>
<td>Letter 1 outlines an objection to all three scenarios on the basis of inequitable distribution of increased density throughout the Town, and a lack of contextual information to allow respondents to provide informed feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Individual Respondent</td>
<td>Letter 2 outlines concerns with respect to West Leederville in particular, calling for a greater understanding of constraints to urban development, a need to better understand the drivers for the preparation of a Local Planning Strategy and the identification of areas for infill development, a need for equity in distribution of growth across the Town, and a preference towards continuing the implementation of the West Leederville Activity Centre Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Individual Respondent</td>
<td>Letter three outlines support for the majority of the elements of Scenarios A and B, but expresses concern with the reliance under Scenario C on local areas to do a disproportionate share of the density heavy lifting, and considers that Scenario C spreads densification too far into traditional suburban areas. In particular it raises concern with respect to the residential transition zone adjacent Empire Village and the corner lot subdivision proposal identified under Scenario C. The submission then proceeds into detail about the respondents preferred scenario mix and specific concerns in relation to elements raised in Scenario C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Pindan Capital Ltd</td>
<td>Letter 4 is submitted by Pindan Capital Ltd and identifies a preference towards a combination of the three scenarios as the most appropriate and effective method in achieving the purposes of the Local Planning Strategy. The letter outlines a number of implementation limitations to each of the scenarios, including fragmented land ownership, geographical limitations, need for coordination and requirements for infrastructure upgrades. The letter also outlines the respondents preferred approach for redevelopment of the Ocean Village Shopping Centre as a high quality mixed use development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>CLE Town Planning &amp; Design on behalf of APIL</td>
<td>Letter 5 is submitted by CLE Town Planning &amp; Design on behalf of APIL, representing the Floreat Forum landowners. The letter outlines recognition of the need for the Town to plan for infill development as part of the Local Planning Strategy, and identifies that the Floreat Forum site is a substantial opportunity to accommodate higher density, mixed use development and assist in meeting the Town’s dwelling targets. The letter identifies that APIL are eager to work with the Town in preparing an Activity Centre Structure Plan for the Floreat District Centre to further guide redevelopment of the Floreat Forum and the surrounding area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Individual Respondent</td>
<td>Letter 6 outlines concerns with the proposed expansion of inappropriate higher density housing throughout the City Beach and Floreat areas outlined within Scenario C, as this is considered to greatly impact upon the heritage, character and amenity within these residential areas, and is not considered to be supported by the State planning framework. The submission then proceeds into detail as to the concerns with the aforementioned elements of Scenario C, and identifies alternative growth areas and building typologies for consideration by the Town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Individual Respondent</td>
<td>Letter 7 outlines concerns with proposed high density development along Cambridge Street and within centres under each of the Scenarios due to the perceived impact upon amenity, streetscapes, traffic congestion, anti-social behaviour and infrastructure demand. The respondent outlines a number of alternative development opportunities, including redevelopment sites and alternative building typologies, for consideration by the Town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Respondent Classification</td>
<td>Summary of letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Individual Respondent</td>
<td>Letter 8 questions the underlying methodology and objectives of the proposed strategy and community engagement, and raises concern with the notion of identifying potential growth areas without consideration of consequential opportunities and constraints analysis, implications of higher density development and necessary infrastructure upgrades.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Individual Respondent</td>
<td>Letter 9 outlines a need to plan for an aging population, in addition to ensuring that affordable housing opportunities are provided throughout the Town. The letter then outlines concerns with each of the Scenarios presented, citing feasibility of future development, need to understand detailed development requirements (access, setbacks, parking), streetscape impacts and public transport availability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Individual Respondent</td>
<td>Letter 10 outlines a concern that the Council and Town officers have ignored the outcome of Amendment 31 and proceeded to prepare a densification strategy which the community do not support, and a concern that the case for infill development has not been sufficiently justified to the Town's residents and ratepayers. The respondent then identifies the reasons for their lack of support for any of the scenarios, citing a lack of vision, a need for clearly linked transport planning, a need for further community services, schools and open space and a need for greater equity in the geographical spread of infill development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Individual Respondent</td>
<td>Letter 11 primarily raises concerns with the impact of all three scenarios on West Leederville, citing concerns about the impact of higher density development on existing residents, the impact of infill development on streetscapes, the potential to compromise heritage values, the impact upon the West Leederville Primary School and the impact on service infrastructure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Individual Respondent</td>
<td>Letter 12 outlined concerns and proposed modifications/alternatives to each of the Scenarios which primarily aim to focus redevelopment along Cambridge Street and within centres, albeit with reduced building heights, and limited to no transition to surrounding residential areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Individual Respondent</td>
<td>Letter 13 outlines detailed commentary about the likes and dislikes of each of the three scenarios, with particular focus on Scenario A and the opportunities and constraints posed by the transportation planning outlined within the Transport @ 3.5 million plan. The respondent outlines their total objection to Scenario C, as they view residential infill throughout traditional suburban areas as a poor planning outcome not supported by transport planning and destructive to the character of these areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Individual Respondent</td>
<td>Letter 14 outlines detailed commentary with respect to each of the Scenarios, with a preference towards a hybrid approach with redevelopment focused on district centres and corridors along with surplus government land, and an opposition towards a change in density of residential areas within City Beach with some limited exceptions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Cambridge Residents Association Inc. (CRAi)</td>
<td>Letter 15 is a very detailed submission from the Cambridge Residents Association Inc (CRAi) which reviews the Consultancy Services Request for Tender (RFT) and provides commentary against each of the elements listed, in addition to providing a mark-up of each of the Scenarios and the Opportunities and Constraints plans for consideration by the project team. The mark-ups identify a number of questions and concerns with respect to the intent of notes listed adjacent plans and the manner in which proposals are to be implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Coastal Ward Ratepayers Association (CWRA)</td>
<td>Letter 16 is provided by the Coastal Ward Ratepayers Association (CWRA) and outlines concerns with the proposed expansion of inappropriate higher density housing throughout the City Beach and Floreat areas outlined within Scenario C, as this is considered to greatly impact upon the heritage, character and amenity within these residential areas, and is not considered to be supported by the State planning framework. The submission then proceeds into detail as to the concerns with the aforementioned elements of Scenario C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Individual Respondent</td>
<td>Letter 17 focuses primarily on redevelopment opportunities throughout suburban City Beach, with a view to allowing further subdivision, and concerns about traffic calming treatments being dangerous for motorists and a cause of congestion on major roads.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Individual Respondent</td>
<td>Letter 18 provides general support for development within City Beach to accommodate growth in population.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Individual Respondent</td>
<td>Letter 19 outlines opposition to the reliance upon West Leederville to accommodate a large proportion of population growth for the Town, raising congestion, public transport, schools and open space as primary concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Individual Respondent</td>
<td>Letter 20 raises specific concerns with respect to higher density development throughout the Town, and in particular focuses on demand for public transport, social space and provision of services, in addition to the mix of land uses and the built form outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ref</td>
<td>Respondent Classification</td>
<td>Summary of letter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Individual Respondent</td>
<td>Letter 21 raises concerns with respect to higher density development in West Leederville, with concerns about parking, traffic, schools, anti-social behaviour, privacy and visual blight.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Individual Respondent</td>
<td>Letter 22 raises concerns with proposed development in West Leederville, with all three scenarios not considered acceptable, and concerns about the West Leederville School and other local amenities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Individual Respondent</td>
<td>Letter 23 identifies support for further planning to consider the heat island effect of urban development, commercial development in the area of Herdsman providing greater density opportunities, and bike corridors and walking routes throughout the Town.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Individual Respondent</td>
<td>Letter 24 opposes increased residential density in West Leederville beyond Cambridge Street, and in particular the area north of Cambridge Street. The respondent raises issues of equity in the spread of densification opportunities, the potential for poor quality built form in new apartments and the need to consider the capacity of the local school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Individual Respondent</td>
<td>Letter 25 urges the Council to consider planning medium density residential development along major transport routes, considering opportunities for downsizing lots in City Beach and Floreat, and ensuring that infrastructure planning is in place to support residential development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Individual Respondent</td>
<td>Letter 26 urges the Council to consider the key drivers for people choosing a place to live, to consider the equitability of density loadings and opportunities throughout the Town, and to consider the broader context for infill development, inclusive the surrounding local government areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Individual Respondent</td>
<td>Letter 27 objects to all three scenarios on the basis that they too heavily rely upon West Leederville and do not propose sufficient redevelopment in City Beach and Floreat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Individual Respondent</td>
<td>Letter 28 provides support for some sub-division in City Beach to provide choice for changing demographics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Individual Respondent</td>
<td>Letter 29 objects to all three scenarios and makes the point that infrastructure planning needs to be undertaken prior to urban development occurring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-33</td>
<td>Individual Respondents</td>
<td>Letters 30 – 33 are identical and provide detailed comment on each of the scenarios, with some items supported and some items considered unacceptable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Respondent Classification</th>
<th>Summary of letter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Individual Respondent</td>
<td>Letter 34 outlines an objection to all three scenarios, with particular concerns regarding densification of precincts, residential transition, density comparisons and the need for services and infrastructure to support further development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Individual Respondent</td>
<td>Letter 35 outlines concern with respect to the equity of infill development across the Town under the Scenarios, and is particularly concerned with the reliance upon the Wembley and West Leederville wards to meet density targets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Individual Respondent</td>
<td>Letter 36 raises concerns with the process of advertising the three scenarios, the likely height of buildings to be developed, the distribution of density throughout the Town and the need for public open space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Individual Respondent</td>
<td>Letter 37 raises concern with the process being undertaken and particularly with the use of consultants over Town staff to prepare concepts and proposals, the advertising of only 3 scenarios without sufficient background information or statistical analysis, and the limited spread of infill development proposed throughout the City Beach area. The respondent then provides more detailed comment on each of the three scenarios.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Individual Respondent</td>
<td>Letter 38 provides a general objection to redevelopment within West Leederville.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>West Leederville Primary School Board</td>
<td>Letter 39 is provided by the Board of the West Leederville Primary School and raises concern with the potential increase in population of West Leederville and the consequent demand for places at the School, in addition to limited open space and school resources. The Board provides support for the preparation of a Development Contributions Plan to assist in funding upgrades in school facilities and/or local public facilities that can be utilised by the School.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Individual Respondent</td>
<td>Letter 40 provides no position on any of the scenarios or the preparation of a Local Planning Strategy, but instead provides commentary as to the affordability of housing, issues of recycling and general traffic concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Individual Respondent</td>
<td>Letter 41 provides a detailed submission which raises concern with each of the scenarios presented, and proposes an alternative scenario based on infill development along multiple corridors throughout the Town, in addition to corner lot subdivision throughout City Beach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Individual Respondent</td>
<td>Letter 42 outlines an objection to the three scenarios presented, and suggests a review of potential at Grantham Street and the City Beach coastal strip.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. RECOMMENDATIONS

In considering the submissions made by respondents during the advertising period Taylor Burrell Barnett would recommend the following actions be undertaken in preparing a ‘Community Preferred Scenario’ for infill residential development across the Town:

1. **Reassess expansion of the boundaries of the identified Wembley and West Leederville District Centres** beyond that already identified under their respective Activity Centre Plans.

   This will require further analysis of the likely built form and land use outcomes, and consideration of further planning that is required to support these areas, including demand for school sites, community infrastructure, service infrastructure and open space, in addition to impacts on the local and regional movement networks.

   This should be undertaken at a holistic level as part of the Local Planning Strategy, and then via detailed reviews of the Activity Centre Plans and any additional planning required to inform infrastructure delivery, public realm improvements and built form standards.

2. **Undertake further analysis of the Floreat District Centre** to establish indicative built form outcomes, land use mix and dwelling yields to assist in identifying a potential Activity Centre boundary, and inform the preparation of a future Activity Centre Plan and other detailed planning for the area.

3. **Undertake further analysis of the Cambridge Street / Oceanic Drive corridor** between Howtree Place (Floreat) and Oxford Close (West Leederville) to assess the capacity for higher density residential development at a scale appropriate to the surrounding context.

   Detailed planning for these areas should be undertaken prior to any Scheme provisions being drafted using indicative built form parameters including building heights and setbacks to ensure that access, overlooking, overshadowing and streetscape are given due consideration.

4. **Undertake further analysis of development opportunities at Local and Neighbourhood Centres** including Empire Village, Ocean Village, Birkdale Street, Harborne Street and Grantham Street centres. Detailed analysis should focus on the existing commercial sites themselves in the first instance, with transition to surrounding areas to be considered only where deemed appropriate and beneficial.

5. **Assess opportunities to encourage the development of ancillary dwellings (‘granny flats’) on existing residential lots to assist in allowing residents to ‘age in place’ without the need to subdivide or substantially redevelop existing residential areas.**

   Detailed planning and analysis of ancillary dwelling opportunities should include consideration of the size and scale of the dwellings, built form and site design considerations and access and parking implications.

6. **Further investigate surplus government land assets** in the ownership of the Town and/or the State Government as these appear to be a substantial opportunity for the Town to deliver on infill targets without potentially compromising existing residential areas, and may provide revenue to support further infrastructure development throughout the Town.

   These investigations are likely to take some time to progress, as they will require agreement from the agency responsible for the land and investigations as to site suitability, in addition to the preparation of a suitable statutory planning framework and detailed designs.

   These actions will be investigated at a holistic level as a component of the Local Planning Strategy, with further detailed planning and progression of opportunities to be undertaken by the Town over time.
APPENDIX 2
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Housing Distribution
APPENDIX 2
DISTRIBUTION OF HOUSING - YIELD ANALYSIS

The purpose of this memorandum is to provide an overview of a yield analysis exercise prepared by Taylor Burrell Barnett to support the preparation of the Town of Cambridge Local Planning Strategy.

The analysis demonstrates that within identified development precincts, and subject to the built form controls outlined being enshrined within the planning framework, the Town can accommodate between 6,850 and 8,950 dwellings over the next 20-30 years. The dwelling estimates for each are summarised in Table 1.

This memorandum outlines the key assumptions and projections for the individual development precincts to provide elected members with a comprehensive understanding of the projected built form outcomes within individual areas.

In considering this material the following has been provided for each precinct:

1. **Key Assumptions and Projections** - This outlines the key assumptions for maximum building height, average height of new development and proportion of new development floorspace built for residential purposes, along with the estimated dwelling yield based on these assumptions.

2. **Precinct Plan** - This represents the precinct boundary where this precinct is already defined within the planning framework. Where not defined by the Town, the Project Team has identified an assumed precinct for the purpose of the calculations.

3. **Indicative Cross-Sections** - The cross-sections prepared are based on the known or assumed built form parameters for new development, and are only intended to provide a snapshot of the size and scale of development potentially achievable based on the stated assumptions.

4. **Built Form Examples** - The imagery provided is intended to provide an indication of the size and scale of new development based on existing or proposed buildings of a similar size and scale. The imagery shown is not specific to the precinct or to the Town, and may include some built form outcomes that are not envisioned within the subject precinct.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Urban Consolidation and Infill Precincts</th>
<th>Dwelling Estimate Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Growth Estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activity Centres</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Leederville</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wembley</td>
<td>750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floreat</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,450</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cambridge Street Urban Corridors</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge Street East</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge Street West</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>650</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neighbourhood Centres</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gayton Street Neighbourhood Centre</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean Village Neighbourhood Centre</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>300</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Centres</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Centres - Wembley and West Leederville</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suburban Residential Areas</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latent Subdivision Potential</td>
<td>340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancillary Accommodation Potential</td>
<td>250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>590</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Existing Development Sites</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perry Lakes, Floreat</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ocean Mia, City Beach</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkside Walk, Jolimont</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Johns Wood, Mt Claremont</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,110</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potential Future Development Sites</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Quarry Site, City Beach</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus Golf Course Land, Wembley Downs</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Templetonia Cres and Civic Centre Site, City Beach</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration Centre Site, Floreat</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>700</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Estimated Dwelling Range</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,850</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SOUTHPORT PRECINCT

TOTAL DEVELOPMENT AREA
7.83 HECTARES

MINIMUM NEW BUILDING HEIGHT
2 STOREYS

MAXIMUM NEW BUILDING HEIGHT
8-10 STOREYS (SUBJECT TO PERFORMANCE CRITERIA)

ESTIMATED AVERAGE NEW BUILDING HEIGHT
6-7 STOREYS

PROPORTION OF NEW FLOORSPACE BUILT FOR RESIDENTIAL PURPOSES
40-50 PERCENT RESIDENTIAL

ESTIMATED NEW DWELLING YIELD
650-900 DWELLINGS

ASSUMPTIONS & PROJECTIONS

PRECINCT PLAN

INDICATIVE CROSS SECTION

BUILT FORM EXAMPLES (8-10 STOREY MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT)
LEEDERVILLE LINK PRECINCT

TOTAL DEVELOPMENT AREA
2.62 HECTARES

MINIMUM NEW BUILDING HEIGHT
2 STOREYS

MAXIMUM NEW BUILDING HEIGHT
8-10 STOREYS (SUBJECT TO PERFORMANCE CRITERIA)

ESTIMATED AVERAGE NEW BUILDING HEIGHT
6-7 STOREYS

PROPORTION OF NEW FLOORSPACE BUILT FOR RESIDENTIAL PURPOSES
60-70 PERCENT RESIDENTIAL

ESTIMATED NEW DWELLING YIELD
300-400 DWELLINGS

ASSUMPTIONS & PROJECTIONS

PRECINCT PLAN

INDICATIVE CROSS SECTION

BUILT FORM EXAMPLES (8-10 STOREY MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT)
KERR ST TO ABBOTSFORD ST PRECINCT

**TOTAL DEVELOPMENT AREA**

4.28 HECTARES

**MINIMUM NEW BUILDING HEIGHT**

3 STOREYS

**MAXIMUM NEW BUILDING HEIGHT**

6-8 STOREYS (SUBJECT TO PERFORMANCE CRITERIA)

**ESTIMATED AVERAGE NEW BUILDING HEIGHT**

5-6 STOREYS

**PROPORTION OF NEW FLOORSPACE BUILT FOR RESIDENTIAL PURPOSES**

100 PERCENT RESIDENTIAL

**ESTIMATED NEW DWELLING YIELD**

500-550 DWELLINGS

ASSUMPTIONS & PROJECTIONS

PRECINCT PLAN

INDICATIVE CROSS SECTION

BUILT FORM EXAMPLES (5-8 STOREY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT)
CAMBRIDGE HIGH STREET PRECINCT

TOTAL DEVELOPMENT AREA
5.01 HECTARES

MINIMUM NEW BUILDING HEIGHT
2 STOREYS

MAXIMUM NEW BUILDING HEIGHT
4-6 STOREYS (SUBJECT TO PERFORMANCE CRITERIA)

ESTIMATED AVERAGE NEW BUILDING HEIGHT
5-6 STOREYS

PROPORTION OF NEW FLOORSPACE BUILT FOR RESIDENTIAL PURPOSES
40-50 PERCENT RESIDENTIAL

ESTIMATED NEW DWELLING YIELD
350-450 DWELLINGS

ASSUMPTIONS & PROJECTIONS

PRECINCT PLAN

INDICATIVE CROSS SECTION

BUILT FORM EXAMPLES (4-6 STOREY MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT)
WEBSITE HOTEL ANCHOR SITE

TOTAL DEVELOPMENT AREA
1.22 HECTARES

MINIMUM NEW BUILDING HEIGHT
CURRENTLY NO MINIMUM APPLIED

MAXIMUM NEW BUILDING HEIGHT
7 STOREYS

ESTIMATED AVERAGE NEW BUILDING HEIGHT
6-7 STOREYS

PROPORTION OF NEW FLOORSPACE BUILT FOR RESIDENTIAL PURPOSES
70-80 PERCENT RESIDENTIAL

ESTIMATED NEW DWELLING YIELD
200-225 DWELLINGS

ASSUMPTIONS & PROJECTIONS

WEBSITE ACTIVITY CENTRE

PRECEINT PLAN

INDICATIVE CROSS SECTION

BUILT FORM EXAMPLES (5-7 STOREY MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT)
ANCHOR SITE 2 & 3

TOTAL DEVELOPMENT AREA
1.01 HECTARES

MINIMUM NEW BUILDING HEIGHT
CURRENTLY NO MINIMUM APPLIED

MAXIMUM NEW BUILDING HEIGHT
6 STOREYS

ESTIMATED AVERAGE NEW BUILDING HEIGHT
5-6 STOREYS

PROPORTION OF NEW FLOORSPACE BUILT FOR RESIDENTIAL PURPOSES
70-80 PERCENT RESIDENTIAL

ESTIMATED NEW DWELLING YIELD
150-200 DWELLINGS

ASSUMPTIONS & PROJECTIONS

PRECINCT PLAN

INDICATIVE CROSS SECTION

BUILT FORM EXAMPLES (5-6 STOREY MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT)
CAMBRIDGE STREET WEST PRECINCT

TOTAL DEVELOPMENT AREA
3.04 HECTARES

MINIMUM NEW BUILDING HEIGHT
CURRENTLY NO MINIMUM APPLIED

MAXIMUM NEW BUILDING HEIGHT
3-5 STOREYS

ESTIMATED AVERAGE NEW BUILDING HEIGHT
4-5 STOREYS

PROPORTION OF NEW FLOORSPACE
BUILT FOR RESIDENTIAL PURPOSES
70-80 PERCENT

ESTIMATED NEW DWELLING YIELD
200-275 DWELLINGS

ASSUMPTIONS & PROJECTIONS

WEMBLEY ACTIVITY CENTRE

PRECINCT PLAN

INDICATIVE CROSS SECTION

PROPORTION OF NEW FLOORSPACE BUILT FOR RESIDENTIAL PURPOSES
70-80 PERCENT

BUILTFORM EXAMPLES (3-5 STOREY MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT)
**Cambridge Street East Precinct**

**Precinct Plan**

**Indicative Cross Section**

**Built Form Examples (2-3 Storey Residential Development)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Development Area</th>
<th>Hectares</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum New Building Height</th>
<th>Currently No Minimum Applied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maximum New Building Height</th>
<th>Storeys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Average New Building Height</th>
<th>Storeys</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proportion of New Floorspace Built for Residential Purposes</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>90-95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated New Dwelling Yield</th>
<th>Dwellings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75-125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SALVADO ROAD PRECINCT

**TOTAL DEVELOPMENT AREA**
- 2.56 HECTARES

**MINIMUM NEW BUILDING HEIGHT**
- CURRENTLY NO MINIMUM APPLIED

**MAXIMUM NEW BUILDING HEIGHT**
- 4-6 STOREYS

**ESTIMATED AVERAGE NEW BUILDING HEIGHT**
- 4-5 STOREYS

**PROPORTION OF NEW FLOORSPACE BUILT FOR RESIDENTIAL PURPOSES**
- 100 PERCENT RESIDENTIAL

**ESTIMATED NEW DWELLING YIELD**
- 125-175 DWELLINGS

**ASSUMPTIONS & PROJECTIONS**

**PRECINCT PLAN**

**INDICATIVE CROSS SECTION**

**BUILT FORM EXAMPLES (4-5 STOREY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT)**
FLOREAT FORUM PRECINCT

TOTAL DEVELOPMENT AREA
4.39 HECTARES

MINIMUM NEW BUILDING HEIGHT
CURRENTLY NO MINIMUM APPLIED

MAXIMUM NEW BUILDING HEIGHT
7-8 STOREYS

ESTIMATED AVERAGE NEW BUILDING HEIGHT
6-8 STOREYS

PROPORTION OF NEW FLOORSPACE BUILT FOR RESIDENTIAL PURPOSES
60-70 PERCENT RESIDENTIAL

ESTIMATED NEW DWELLING YIELD
650-950 DWELLINGS

ASSUMPTIONS & PROJECTIONS

FLOREAT ACTIVITY CENTRE

INDICATIVE CROSS SECTION

BUILT FORM EXAMPLES (MIXED USE SHOPPING CENTRE DEVELOPMENT)
**CENTRE TRANSITION PRECINCT**

**TOTAL DEVELOPMENT AREA**
1.72 HECTARES

**MINIMUM NEW BUILDING HEIGHT**
CURRENTLY NO MINIMUM APPLIED

**MAXIMUM NEW BUILDING HEIGHT**
3-5 STOREYS

**ESTIMATED AVERAGE NEW BUILDING HEIGHT**
4-5 STOREYS

**PROPORTION OF NEW FLOORSPACE BUILT FOR RESIDENTIAL PURPOSES**
100 PERCENT RESIDENTIAL

**ESTIMATED NEW DWELLING YIELD**
175-200 DWELLINGS

**ASSUMPTIONS & PROJECTIONS**

**PRECINCT PLAN**

**INDICATIVE CROSS SECTION**

**BUILT FORM EXAMPLES (3-5 STOREY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT)**
**RESIDENTIAL TRANSITION PRECINCT**

**TOTAL DEVELOPMENT AREA**
1.85 HECTARES

**MINIMUM NEW BUILDING HEIGHT**
CURRENTLY NO MINIMUM APPLIED

**MAXIMUM NEW BUILDING HEIGHT**
2-3 STOREYS

**ESTIMATED AVERAGE NEW BUILDING HEIGHT**
2-3 STOREYS

**PROPORTION OF NEW FLOORSPACE BUILT FOR RESIDENTIAL PURPOSES**
100 PERCENT RESIDENTIAL

**ESTIMATED NEW DWELLING YIELD**
75-100 DWELLINGS

**ASSUMPTIONS & PROJECTIONS**

**FLOREAT ACTIVITY CENTRE**

**PRECINCT PLAN**

**INDICATIVE CROSS SECTION**

**BUILT FORM EXAMPLES (2-3 STOREY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT)**
**LOCAL CENTRE PRECINCT**

**TOTAL DEVELOPMENT AREA**

- 1.45 HECTARES

**MINIMUM NEW BUILDING HEIGHT**

- CURRENTLY NO MINIMUM APPLIED

**MAXIMUM NEW BUILDING HEIGHT**

- 5 STOREYS

**ESTIMATED AVERAGE NEW BUILDING HEIGHT**

- 4-5 STOREYS

**PROPORTION OF NEW FLOORSPACE BUILT FOR RESIDENTIAL PURPOSES**

- 70-80 PERCENT

**ESTIMATED NEW DWELLING YIELD**

- 75-100 DWELLINGS

**PRECINCT PLAN**

**INDICATIVE CROSS SECTION**

**BUILT FORM EXAMPLES (4-5 STOREY MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT)**
**MEDICAL CENTRE PRECINCT**

**TOTAL DEVELOPMENT AREA**
1.63 HECTARES

**MINIMUM NEW BUILDING HEIGHT**
CURRENTLY NO MINIMUM APPLIED

**MAXIMUM NEW BUILDING HEIGHT**
5 STOREYS

**ESTIMATED AVERAGE NEW BUILDING HEIGHT**
4-5 STOREYS

**PROPORTION OF NEW FLOORSPACE BUILT FOR RESIDENTIAL PURPOSES**
70-80 PERCENT RESIDENTIAL

**ESTIMATED NEW DWELLING YIELD**
75-100 DWELLINGS

**INDICATIVE CROSS SECTION**

**BUILT FORM EXAMPLES (HEALTH SERVICES 4-5 STOREYS)**

**CAMBRIDGE STREET CORRIDOR EAST**

**PRECINCT PLAN**
URBAN CORRIDOR PRECINCT

TOTAL DEVELOPMENT AREA
6.45 HECTARES

MINIMUM NEW BUILDING HEIGHT
CURRENTLY NO MINIMUM APPLIED

MAXIMUM NEW BUILDING HEIGHT
2-3 STOREYS

ESTIMATED AVERAGE NEW BUILDING HEIGHT
2-3 STOREYS

PROPORTION OF NEW FLOORSPACE
BUILT FOR RESIDENTIAL PURPOSES
100 PERCENT

RESIDENTIAL

BUILT FORM EXAMPLES (2-3 STOREY RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT)

PRECINCT PLAN

INDICATIVE CROSS SECTION

175-200 DWELLINGS

ASSUMPTIONS & PROJECTIONS

CAMBRIDGE STREET CORRIDOR EAST
## Local Centre Precinct

### Total Development Area
- **0.96 Hectares**

### Minimum New Building Height
- Currently no minimum applied

### Maximum New Building Height
- **5 Storeys**

### Estimated Average New Building Height
- **4-5 Storeys**

### Proportion of New Floorspace for Built for Residential Purposes
- **70-80 Percent Residential**

### Estimated New Dwelling Yield
- **75-100 Dwellings**

### Assumptions & Projections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAMBRIDGE STREET CORRIDOR WEST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOCAL CENTRE PRECINCT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL DEVELOPMENT AREA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>0.96 HECTARES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MINIMUM NEW BUILDING HEIGHT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURRENTLY NO MINIMUM APPLIED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MAXIMUM NEW BUILDING HEIGHT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image3.png" alt="image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5 STOREYS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ESTIMATED AVERAGE NEW BUILDING HEIGHT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image4.png" alt="image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4-5 STOREYS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROPORTION OF NEW FLOORSpace FOR BUILT FOR RESIDENTIAL PURPOSES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image5.png" alt="image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>70-80 PERCENT RESIDENTIAL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ESTIMATED NEW DWELLING YIELD</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image6.png" alt="image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>75-100 DWELLINGS</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Precinct Plan

[Image of Precinct Plan]

### Cross Section

[Image of Cross Section]

### Built Form Examples (4-5 Storey Mixed Use Development)

[Images of Built Form Examples]
**Assumptions & Projections**

**Total Development Area**
- **10.08 Hectares**

**Minimum New Building Height**
- Currently no minimum applied

**Maximum New Building Height**
- **2-3 Storeys**

**Estimated Average New Building Height**
- **2-3 Storeys**

**Proportion of New Floorspace Built for Residential Purposes**
- **100% Residential**

**Estimated New Dwelling Yield**
- **250-350 Dwellings**

---

**Urban Corridor Precinct**

**Precinct Plan**

**Indicative Cross Section**

**Built Form Examples (2-3 Storey Residential Development)**
Empire Village Neighbourhood Centre

**Total Development Area**
- 1.12 hectares

**Minimum New Building Height**
- Currently no minimum applied

**Maximum New Building Height**
- 4 storeys

**Estimated Average New Building Height**
- 4 storeys

**Proportion of New Floorspace Built for Residential Purposes**
- 50-60 percent residential

**Estimated New Dwelling Yield**
- 100-150 dwellings

**Assumptions & Projections**

**Precinct Plan**

**Indicative Cross Sections**

*Section on A - A*

- Residential
- Alban Road
- Neighbourhood Centre
- Landgra gardens
- Residential

*Section on B - B*

- Residential
- The Boulevard
- Neighbourhood Centre
- Gayton Road
- Beecroft Park
TOTAL DEVELOPMENT AREA
1.87 HECTARES

MINIMUM NEW BUILDING HEIGHT
CURRENTLY NO MINIMUM APPLIED

MAXIMUM NEW BUILDING HEIGHT
3-6 STOREYS

ESTIMATED AVERAGE NEW BUILDING HEIGHT
3-6 STOREYS

PROPORTION OF NEW FLOORSPACE BUILT FOR RESIDENTIAL PURPOSES
60-70 PERCENT RESIDENTIAL

ESTIMATED NEW DWELLING YIELD
200-250 DWELLINGS

ASSUMPTIONS & PROJECTIONS

PRESENT PLAN

INDICATIVE CROSS SECTIONS

PROPORTION OF NEW FLOORSPACE
60-70 PERCENT
REIDENTAL

ESTIMATED NEW DWELLING YIELD
200-250 DWELLINGS
ASSUMPTIONS & PROJECTIONS

TOTAL DEVELOPMENT AREA

0.80 HECTARES

MINIMUM NEW BUILDING HEIGHT

CURRENTLY NO MINIMUM APPLIED

MAXIMUM NEW BUILDING HEIGHT

3 STOREYS

ESTIMATED AVERAGE NEW BUILDING HEIGHT

2-3 STOREYS

PROPORTION OF NEW FLOORSPACE BUILT FOR RESIDENTIAL PURPOSES

50-60 PERCENT

ESTIMATED NEW DWELLING YIELD

50-100 DWELLINGS

PRECIPT PLAN

INDICATIVE CROSS SECTION

BUILT FORM EXAMPLES (2-3 STOREY MIXED USE DEVELOPMENT)
SURPLUS GOVERNMENT SITES

ASSUMPTIONS & PROJECTIONS

OLD QUARRY SITE, THE BOULEVARD

2.44 HECTARES
50-100 DWELLINGS*

SURPLUS GOLF COURSE SITES

13.08 HECTARES
450-600 DWELLINGS*

TOWN ADMINISTRATION CENTRE

4.75 HECTARES
150-200 DWELLINGS*

TEMPLETONIA CRESCENT LAND & CIVIC CENTRE

2.69 HECTARES
50-100 DWELLINGS*

* Dwelling projection based on an assumed net developable area and an average residential development density of R40-R60 respectively
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