

## **Section 3.2 - Urban Design**

### **POLICY 3.2.7 - 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 [pedestrian and cycle](#) ~~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 [the impact of any](#) anti-social behaviour that may be associated with PAWs.

#### **Application of Policy**

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

- [Configuration](#) ~~Inclusion~~ and design of PAWs in new subdivisions;
- Assessment Criteria [to be used](#) for closure of ~~a~~ PAW [applications](#).

#### **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 [remaining design](#) solution ~~in order to provide 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~~[8](#) metres where connecting one minor road to another;

---

## **Section 3.2 - Urban Design**

---

- (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 constructed finished at the applicant's expense in a manner, which makes them safe, attractive and convenient and shall include the following:-
  - (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 to should illuminate the length of the PAW in a way that does not lead to excessive glare into neighbouring properties. Lights shall be provided at both ends of the PAW and through the PAW to AS 1158.3.1.1999 (and as amended).
- (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 and cycle movement network and where ever possible orientated to reinforce the visual link between local landmarks and local attractions to assist in the 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.~~

Where a PAW is proposed as part of a new subdivision, the design of the PAW and development adjoining the PAW This shall be considered by the developer at the preliminary subdivision stage in accordance with the provisions of this policy and ~~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.

---

## **Section 3.2 - Urban Design**

---

Where subdivision and/or development is proposed adjacent to an existing PAW the following assessment criteria will apply: ~~—DAP for these lots shall include the following provisions.~~

## **Section 3.2 - Urban Design**

### **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.



**Figure 3: Fencing**

## **2 Closure of Pedestrian Access ways**

PAWs are an important element in providing a safe, convenient and legible pedestrian and cycle movement network, particularly in suburban locations designed with cul-de-sacs ~~Where PAWs form important links in the pedestrian movement network and~~ 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 ~~undertaken~~conducted:

### **(a) Urban Design Assessment**

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

---

## **Section 3.2 - Urban Design**

---

### 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 community facilities include but are not limited to 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~~exists which provides access to community services and facilities.

## **Section 3.2 - Urban Design**

### 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 ~~key designated~~ pedestrian network (eg forms part of a continuous PAW access network);
- The City's Bikeplan;
- ~~AA~~-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, ~~is shall be~~ prepared. A 400m catchment ~~applies to 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 ~~is 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 ~~is shall be~~ undertaken to substantiate claims of anti-social behaviour occurring within the PAW. The City will assess any evidence provided by the applicant. Additional information (e.g. Ranger/Police/City Watch reports and City's records) ~~are may obtained and used be accessed~~ to determine the degree of anti-social behaviour being experienced. Assessment of nuisance impact is assessed upon: Based on points such as:

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

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

#### **(c) Community Impact Assessment**

A 'Use Assessment' ~~is shall be~~ undertaken to gather information from surrounding residents in order - to determine the PAW's level of use by the local community. Comments will be sought from local residents within a 400-metre radius of the subject the vicinity of the PAW. This is based on a 5 minute walking distance 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 and- 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 public consultation steps may be undertaken:

---

## **Section 3.2 - Urban Design**

---

- Insertion of notices in local newspaper;
- Liaison with local community groups.
- An on-site assessment to count pedestrian and cyclists movement [through the PAW](#).

### **Access for Disabled and Seniors**

The impact of closure on residents [particularly in accommodation for](#) aged or disabled persons [who reside in close proximity located in the vicinity, particularly where the PAW provides access to community facilities or services](#) shall be given special consideration [as the impact of the PAW closure upon these groups is likely to be greater.](#) :

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 [all 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.

---

## **Section 3.2 - Urban Design**

---

### 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.

### Case Eight

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

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

The results of the assessment will be presented to Council for consideration. Where Council supports closure of a PAW a full copy of the closure report will be referred to the Department for Planning and Infrastructure (DPI) Ministry for Planning and the Department of Transport for determination by the Western Australian Planning Commission (WAPC). ~~comment. The proposal will be referred to Council after comments have been received.~~

### **(f) Reconsideration of decision**

Where Council has considered a request to close a PAW and has determined that the PAW should remain open, Council's decision is final and will only be reconsidered were it is clearly demonstrated that the assessment has not been in accordance with the policy provisions. In the absence of a reconsideration being heard by Council a new application for closure may be submitted no less than 18 months of the date of Councils decision.

In circumstances where Council supports closure of a PAW, however the WAPC does not support closure, Council may request that the WAPC reconsider its decision. For a request for reconsideration to be initiated all landowners abutting the PAW are required to make a joint request, with the request being supported by 'new information' that addresses the matters raised by the WAPC in its decision. Council will then consider the request and forward the decision to the WAPC for consideration.

Once the WAPC has determined the request for reconsideration no further request for reconsideration can be made. The City will consider a new application for closure no less than 18 months of the date of the WAPC's decision on the reconsideration.

## **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, upgradinge of the PAW, -may be considered. Such improvements may include:

- Improvements to lighting;
- Improvements to appearance;



---

## **Section 3.2 - Urban Design**

---

- 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 State Government and Utility Agencies Advertising Procedures**

When ~~re~~ the City has received an application for PAW closure and all prescribed fees have been paid, the City will refer the proposal to 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 Information Administration (Also to provide land purchase price to be met by abutting land owners);
- Water Corporation;
- Western Power;
- Telstra;
- Alinta Gas.

Comments received from State Government and Utility Agencies will determine if essential services (i.e sewerage main) are located with the PAW and whether or not these services need to be relocated and/or an easement put in place should closure be supported. Comments can also be made for or against the proposal from local residents will be sought during the assessment phase of the proposal.

Previous Policy No:	N/A
Amendments:	CJ101-04/01, CJ318-09/01
Issued:	October 2001
Related Documentation:	

**URBAN DESIGN ASSESSMENT****High**

- PAW provides a direct route to community facilities
- safe, alternative route does not exist
- PAW part of a continuous PAW link - ie a chain of two or three PAWs and is linked to streets with existing path systems
- PAW is a designated 'safe route to school', 'bikeplan'

**Medium**

- PAW provides a route to community facilities but not direct
- An alternative route exists but some inconvenience
- PAW not designated as a 'safe route to school' or bikeplan

**Low**

- PAW not linked to any community facility
- a safe, reasonable alternative walkway exists
- PAW is not part of a continuous link to community facilities
- PAW is not designated as a 'safe route to school' or bikeplan

**NUISANCE ASSESSMENT****High**

- There is a high and consistent frequency in the occurrence of criminal activity and/or antisocial behaviour compared to elsewhere in suburb
- The number of different types of occurrences is high and is directly related to the PAW
- The severity of criminal activity and/or antisocial behaviour is considered higher than elsewhere in the suburb
- Occurrences substantiated by questionnaire respondents

**Medium**

- Frequent occurrence of criminal activity and antisocial behaviour compared to elsewhere in the suburb.
- There are several different types of occurrences that are directly related to the PAW
- The severity of criminal activity and/or antisocial behaviour is considered higher than elsewhere in the suburb

**Low**

- Occurrence of criminal activity or antisocial behaviour similar to elsewhere in the suburb.
- Types of offences are limited to antisocial behaviour
- The severity of antisocial behaviour is similar to elsewhere in the suburb

**COMMUNITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT****High**

- Significant portion of respondents not in favour of closures (over 50%)
- High portion of household use the PAW regularly
- High portion of users inconvenienced by closure (over 50%)

**Medium**

- Medium portion of respondents not in favour of closure (over 30%)
- Moderate level of households using the PAW
- Moderate portion of users inconvenienced by closure of the PAW (30-50%)

**Low**

- High number of residents in favour of closure (over 75%)
- Low number of households using the PAW
- Few users inconvenienced by closure (less than 30%)

---

## **Section 3.2 - Urban Design**

---

### **POLICY 3.2.7 - 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 pedestrian and cycle 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 the impact of anti-social behaviour that may be associated with PAWs.

#### **Application of Policy**

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

- Configuration and design of PAWs in new subdivisions;
- Assessment Criteria to be used for closure of PAW applications.

#### **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 remaining design solution in order to provide 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 8 metres where connecting one minor road to another;

---

## **Section 3.2 - Urban Design**

---

- (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 constructed at the applicant's expense in a manner, which makes them safe, attractive and convenient and shall include the following:
  - (a) Landscaping, including trees, but shall not consist of bushes and other elements that would create a visual barrier or harbour illicit activity.
  - (b) Lighting to illuminate the length of the PAW in a way that does not lead to excessive glare into neighbouring properties. Lights shall be provided at both ends of the PAW and through the PAW to AS 1158.3.1.1999 (and as amended).
- (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 and cycle movement network and where ever possible orientated to reinforce the visual link between local landmarks and local attractions to assist in the 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 proposed as part of a new subdivision, the design of the PAW and development adjoining the PAW shall be considered by the developer at the preliminary subdivision stage in accordance with the provisions of this policy and incorporated into an appropriate agreed structure plan under District Planning Scheme No.2.

Where subdivision and/or development is proposed adjacent to an existing PAW the following assessment criteria will apply:

## Section 3.2 - Urban Design

### 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.




Figure 3: Fencing

## 2 Closure of Pedestrian Access ways

PAWs are an important element in providing a safe, convenient and legible pedestrian and cycle movement network, particularly in suburban locations designed with cul-de-sacs, and 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 undertaken:

### (a) Urban Design Assessment

An Urban Design Assessment shall be undertaken to determine the importance of the PAW in the pedestrian and cycle movement network throughout the locality. 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 community facilities include but are

---

## **Section 3.2 - Urban Design**

---

not limited to schools, shops, public open space, bus stops, libraries, churches and rail stations.

### Availability of Alternative Access Routes

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

### 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 key 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, is prepared. A 400m catchment applies to 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 before and after closure of the PAW.

Following completion of 'Urban Design Assessment' the importance of the PAW in the pedestrian movement network is 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 is undertaken to substantiate claims of anti-social behaviour occurring within the PAW. The City will assess any evidence provided by the applicant. Additional information (e.g. Ranger/Police/City Watch reports and City's records) are obtained and used to determine the degree of anti-social behaviour being experienced. Assessment of nuisance impact is assessed upon:

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

The level of anti-social behaviour is rated as low, medium or high.

### **(c) Community Impact Assessment**

A 'Use Assessment' is undertaken to gather information from surrounding residents in order to determine the PAW's level of use by the local community. Comments will be sought from local residents within a 400-metre radius of the subject PAW. This is based on a 5 minute walking distance. This will consist of the erection of a sign at either end of the PAW for a

---

## **Section 3.2 - Urban Design**

---

minimum of 30 days and, a letter and questionnaire being forwarded to landowners. The following additional public consultation may be undertaken:

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

### **Access for Disabled and Seniors**

The impact of closure on residents particularly aged or disabled persons who reside in close proximity shall be given special consideration as the impact of the PAW closure upon these groups is likely to be greater.

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 all 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.

---

## **Section 3.2 - Urban Design**

---

### 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.

### Case Eight

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

#### **(e) Referral to the Department for Planning and Infrastructure**

The results of the assessment will be presented to Council for consideration. Where Council supports closure of a PAW a full copy of the closure report will be referred to the Department for Planning and Infrastructure (DPI), for determination by the Western Australian Planning Commission (WAPC).

#### **(f) Reconsideration of decision**

Where Council has considered a request to close a PAW and has determined that the PAW should remain open, Council's decision is final and will only be reconsidered were it is clearly demonstrated that the assessment has not been in accordance with the policy provisions. In the absence of a reconsideration being heard by Council a new application for closure may be submitted no less than 18 months of the date of Councils decision.

In circumstances where Council supports closure of a PAW, however the WAPC does not support closure, Council may request that the WAPC reconsider its decision. For a request for reconsideration to be initiated all landowners abutting the PAW are required to make a joint request, with the request being supported by 'new information' that addresses the matters raised by the WAPC in its decision. Council will then consider the request and forward the decision to the WAPC for consideration.

Once the WAPC has determined the request for reconsideration no further request for reconsideration can be made. The City will consider a new application for closure no less than 18 months of the date of the WAPC's decision on the reconsideration.

### **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, upgrading of the PAW, may be considered. Such improvements may include:

- Improvements to lighting;



---

## **Section 3.2 - Urban Design**

---

- 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 State Government and Utility Agencies**

When the City has received an application for PAW closure and all prescribed fees have been paid, the City will refer the proposal to State Government and Utility Agencies such as:

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

Comments received from State Government and Utility Agencies will determine if essential services (i.e sewerage main) are located with the PAW and whether or not these services need to be relocated and/or an easement put in place should closure be supported. Comments can also be made for or against the proposal.

Previous Policy No:	N/A
Amendments:	CJ101-04/01, CJ318-09/01
Issued:	October 2001
Related Documentation:	

## URBAN DESIGN ASSESSMENT

### High

- PAW provides a direct route to community facilities
- safe, alternative route does not exist
- PAW part of a continuous PAW link - ie a chain of two or three PAWs and is linked to streets with existing path systems
- PAW is a designated 'safe route to school', 'bikeplan'

### Medium

- PAW provides a route to community facilities but not direct
- An alternative route exists but some inconvenience
- PAW not designated as a 'safe route to school' or bikeplan

### Low

- PAW not linked to any community facility
- a safe, reasonable alternative walkway exists
- PAW is not part of a continuous link to community facilities
- PAW is not designated as a 'safe route to school' or bikeplan

## NUISANCE ASSESSMENT

### High

- There is a high and consistent frequency in the occurrence of criminal activity and/or antisocial behaviour compared to elsewhere in suburb
- The number of different types of occurrences is high and is directly related to the PAW
- The severity of criminal activity and/or antisocial behaviour is considered higher than elsewhere in the suburb
- Occurrences substantiated by questionnaire respondents

### Medium

- Frequent occurrence of criminal activity and antisocial behaviour compared to elsewhere in the suburb.
- There are several different types of occurrences that are directly related to the PAW
- The severity of criminal activity and/or antisocial behaviour is considered higher than elsewhere in the suburb

### Low

- Occurrence of criminal activity or antisocial behaviour similar to elsewhere in the suburb.
- Types of offences are limited to antisocial behaviour
- The severity of antisocial behaviour is similar to elsewhere in the suburb

## COMMUNITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

### High

- Significant portion of respondents not in favour of closures (over 50%)
- High portion of household use the PAW regularly
- High portion of users inconvenienced by closure (over 50%)

### Medium

- Medium portion of respondents not in favour of closure (over 30%)
- Moderate level of households using the PAW
- Moderate portion of users inconvenienced by closure of the PAW (30-50%)

### Low

- High number of residents in favour of closure (over 75%)
- Low number of households using the PAW
- Few users inconvenienced by closure (less than 30%)

**AMENDMENT TO POLICY 3.2.7  
SCHEDULE OF SUBMISSIONS FOLLOWING ADVERTISING  
(CLOSED 17 MARCH 2004)**

NO	NAME OF SUBMITTOR	DESCRIPTION OF AFFECTED PROPERTY	SUBMISSION SUMMARY	COUNCIL'S RECOMMENDATION
1	R & R Maudley-Willis	N/A	1. Object to the closure of pedestrian accessways (PAW) to Poseidon Park Heathridge. The PAWs provide an important access route for local residents to reach public transport and community facilities that are located in close proximity.	1. Noted. The objection is unrelated to the review of the policy, which proposes a number of changes to ensure the creation of PAWs in new subdivisions are in keeping with contemporary urban design practices and standards for the assessment of PAW closures are updated in accordance with current practices.
2	T Milst	N/A	1. Same as submission No.1.	1. Noted. See response to submission one.
3	S Blanchard	N/A	1. Same as submission No.1	1. Noted. See response to submission one.
4	N Bourke	N/A	1. Same as submission No.1	1. Noted. See response to submission one.