

---

**Section -**

---

**POLICY - PEDESTRIAN ACCESSWAYS****AUTHORITY**

This policy has been prepared in accordance with clause 8.11 of the City of Joondalup's District Planning Scheme No.2, which allows Council to prepare planning policies relating to planning or development within the scheme area.

**OBJECTIVES**

Council recognises that a variety of problems may be experienced by people living adjacent to Pedestrian Access Ways (PAWs), but also recognises that they provide important non-vehicular movement through the area for the benefit of the local community.

With this framework in mind this Policy has the following objectives:

- 1 To ensure that a safe, convenient and legible pedestrian movement network is provided and maintained.
- 2 To minimise any anti-social behaviour that may be associated with PAWs.

**Application of Policy**

To achieve the objectives, this policy provides guidance on the:

- Inclusion and design of PAWs in new subdivisions;
- Assessment Criteria for closure of a PAW.

**Policy Statement****1 Provision of Pedestrian Access ways in New Subdivisions**

The creation of new PAWs is generally not supported. The City does acknowledge however that there may be instances where the creation of PAWs are warranted or are the only solution to providing a convenient and legible pedestrian movement network. In these instances, the following requirements will apply:

- (a) The applicant must provide written justification for the inclusion of the PAW and illustrate how the design will minimise opportunities for anti-social behaviour;
  - (b) The length of a PAW shall not exceed 70 metres;
  - (c) Minimum width of 5 metres where connecting one minor road to another;
-

---

**Section -**

---

- (d) Where the PAW is located at a cul de sac head that almost abuts a major road, parkland neighbouring development, or area with future development potential the PAW shall be equal to the road reserve width of the minor road;
- (e) Consideration must be given to the gradient of the PAW, particularly its impact on use, safety and security;
- (f) To increase security for those lots abutting the PAW and the safety of pedestrians using the PAW, uninterrupted sight lines shall be provided for the entire length of the PAW;
- (g) The PAW shall be designed and finished at the applicant's expense in a manner, which makes them safe attractive and convenient:
  - (a) Landscaping, including trees, is encouraged but shall not consist of bushes and other elements that would create a visual barrier or harbour illicit activity.
  - (b) Lighting should illuminate the length of the PAW in a way that does not lead to excessive glare into neighbouring properties. Lights should be provided at both ends of the PAW and where possible in intervals through the PAW.
- (h) The PAW must be designed to generally prevent use by vehicular traffic (emergency access should be considered) and designed to limit the speed of cyclists and other users to ensure a safe but convenient link. Barriers which force users to dismount their bicycles are discouraged.
- (i) The PAW should be integrated with the local pedestrian movement network and where ever possible orientated to reinforce the visual link between local landmarks and local attractions to assist in orientation of pedestrians and other users. (If the network is on street as it may be in streets with less than 300 vpd it is still to be integrated with this system and where there are footpaths it should be integrated with them).

**Development of Land Adjacent to Pedestrian Access ways**

Where a PAW is created in a new subdivision area, adjacent lots should be developed to maximise use and surveillance of the PAW. This shall be encumbered on the developer of the lot through the creation of Detailed Area Plans (DAP) for PAW abutting lots (See Liveable Neighbourhoods Edition 2 page 57) to be incorporated into an appropriate agreed structure plan under District Planning Scheme No.2. DAP for these lots shall include the following provisions.

---

**Section -**

---

**Dwelling Layout**

Main living areas should be located to ensure that views of the adjoining PAW are maximised.

**Building Facades**

Building facades facing PAWs should contain major openings to habitable rooms. Large expanses of blank wall should be avoided.

**Fencing**

Fencing along common boundaries of PAWs/private property should be designed to be visually permeable. Fencing should be 'open in nature' and a maximum of 1.8 metres in height with the solid portion of fencing, a maximum of 750mm in height.

**2 Closure of Pedestrian Access ways**

Where PAWs form important links in the pedestrian movement network closure shall not be supported except as a last resort in extreme circumstances.

In considering applications for the closure of PAWs, the following assessments will be conducted:

**(a) Urban Design Assessment**

An Urban Design Assessment shall be undertaken to determine the importance of the PAW in the pedestrian movement network. Factors to be considered are:

**Access to Community Facilities**

Where a PAW is considered to provide an important access route to a community facility closure shall generally not be supported. Examples of facilities include schools, shops, public open space, bus stops, libraries, churches and rail stations. Other community facilities may also warrant this consideration.

**Availability of Alternative Access Routes**

A safe, clear and direct alternative route must exist which provides access to community services and facilities.

---

**Section -**

---

**Relationship to the Pedestrian Network, Bikeplan and 'Safe Routes to Schools'**

Closure of a PAW will not be supported where it forms part of:

- A designated pedestrian network (eg forms part of a continuous PAW access network);
- The City's Bikeplan;
- A designated 'Safe Route to School'.

**Assessing Changes to Level of Access**

To illustrate the impact that closing a PAW may have on access to a community facility a walking catchment diagram in the form of a Ped-Shed, shall be prepared. A 400m catchment will be provided for a PAW close to community facilities and 800m where the PAW is close to a Town Centre or Major Transit Terminal (e.g. Rail Station). This diagram will demonstrate the effects on walking distance and times before and after closure of the PAW.

Following completion of 'Urban Design Assessment' the importance of the PAW in the pedestrian movement network shall be rated as low, medium or high.

**(b) Nuisance Impact Assessment**

Where the reason given for requesting closure is anti-social behaviour, a Nuisance Impact Assessment shall be undertaken. The City will assess any evidence provided by the applicant. Additional information (e.g. Ranger reports and City's records) may be accessed to determine the degree of anti-social behaviour being experienced. Based on points such as:

- Frequency of occurrence;
- Number of offences;
- Nature of offences.

The level of anti-social behaviour shall be rated as either low, medium or high.

**(c) Community Impact Assessment**

A Use Assessment shall be undertaken to gather information from surrounding residents to determine the PAW's level of use. Comments will be sought from local residents within the vicinity of the PAW and users of the PAW. This will consist of the erection of a sign at either end of the PAW for a minimum of 30 days. Correspondence in the form of a letter and questionnaire will also be forwarded to surrounding landowners within a 400 metre radius of the PAW. The following additional steps may be undertaken:

- Insertion of notices in local newspaper;
- Liaison with local community groups.
- An on-site assessment to count pedestrian and cyclists movement.

## Section -

---

### Access for Disabled and Seniors

The impact of closure on residents in accommodation for aged or disabled persons located in the vicinity, particularly where the PAW provides access to community facilities or services shall be given special consideration.

The level of use shall be rated as either low, medium or high.

#### (d) Final Assessment

The results of each individual assessment will enable a final determination to be made via cross-analysis of the three assessments.

##### Case One

Closure is not supported where following urban design assessment the PAW is considered of high importance.

##### Case Two

Where, following urban design assessment, the PAW is considered of medium importance, closure will be supported when nuisance is high or medium and use is low.

##### Case Three

Where, following urban design assessment, the PAW is considered of medium importance, closure will be supported when nuisance is high and use is medium.

##### Case Four

Closure will not be supported where urban design assessment of the PAW is considered of medium importance, and both use and nuisance is low.

##### Case Five

Closure is not supported where urban design assessment of the PAW is considered of medium importance and both nuisance is considered medium or low and use is medium.

##### Case Six

Closure is not supported where urban design assessment of the PAW is considered medium and use is high.

##### Case Seven

Closure is supported where urban design assessment of the PAW is considered low and nuisance is considered high, medium or low and use is low or medium.

---

---

**Section -**

---

**Case Eight**

Closure is not supported where urban design assessment of the PAW is considered low and use is high.

**(e) Referral to Ministry for Planning and Department of Transport**

The results of the assessment will be referred to the Ministry for Planning and the Department of Transport for comment. The proposal will be referred to Council after comments have been received.

**3 Alternatives to Closure**

Where a determination is made not to support an application for closure, which was submitted on the grounds of anti-social behaviour, upgrade of the PAW may be considered. Such improvements may include:

- Improvements to lighting;
- Improvements to appearance;
- Increasing fence heights to 2.2 metres;
- Increased security patrols.

Where a significant security problem is shown to exist for dwellings abutting the PAW, but closure cannot be supported, Council will give consideration to alternatives or initiatives raised by landowners abutting the PAW. Any options raised shall only be considered where the proposal is:

- Considered to significantly improve security;
- Supported by abutting land owners;
- Deemed to have no significantly negative impact on the amenity of the surrounding area;
- Deemed to have no adverse impact on traffic management.

**4 Advertising Procedures**

Where the City has carried out an assessment for closure and is in support of closing the PAW, the proposal must be advertised. Comments will be sought from State Government and Utility Agencies such as:

- Department of Land Administration (Also to provide land purchase price to be met by abutting land owners);
- Water Corporation;
- Western Power;
- Telstra;
- Alinta Gas.

Comments from local residents will be sought during the assessment phase of the proposal.

---

Section -

---

Previous Policy No:  
Amendments:  
Issued:  
Related Documentation: