

FROM : JUDI HURST
URGENT;FAX NO. : 94010792
THIS MAY AFFECT YOUR LIFESTYLE

Mar. 02 2004 10:19PM F2

AMENDMENT 20 TO THE DISTRICT PLANNING SCHEME No2.
LOT 124 COOK AVENUE , HILLARYS.

Currently the City of Joondalup is advertising an amendment to the Town Planning Scheme. This may have a major effect on your property and the surrounding areas.

The area in question is not being REZONED to residential as the immediate area currently is. It is being zoned to URBAN DEVELOPMENT which may contain LAND USES that are not found in a RESIDENTIAL ZONE in which you currently live. These uses are to be listed in the STRUCTURE PLAN that is also being advertised and indicate that RESIDENTIAL HOUSING is to be on the site. This may take the form of shortstay apartments , residential buildings for temporary or permanent habitation , grouped dwellings and units etc not just single housing.

The site is currently coded R-20 but is to be left without a code under this amendment or structure plan.

The Submissions close soon and should you wish to comment on the amendment a form is attached and should be returned to the City of Joondalup by the 3rd March 2004 You may contact Helen Griffiths at the City of Joondalup on 94004429 should you have any queries

Some areas you may wish to comment on are;

- The structure plan does not support a zoning to URBAN DEVELOPMENT ZONE as the existing fully developed area is a residential zone.
- The structure plan does not support or designate a coding to R-25 and R-40. This proposed amendment does not need to be uncoded but recoded to R-25 and R-40 and a RESIDENTIAL ZONE adopted not a URBAN DEVELOPMENT ZONE.
- Residents should not support an UNCODING but a recoding to R-25 AND R-40. A new coding should be appropriate to the existing surrounding land uses.
- An Urban Development Zone is not complimentary to a Residential Zone.
- Contrary to the Amendment Report a structure plan could still be required by Council in a RESIDENTIAL ZONE under clause 9.1 of the District Planning Scheme No2 rather than an Urban Development Zone. Thus providing certainty in land use for the existing residents of the locality.
- The amendment report states this amendment is to required to facilitate residential development and therefore should be zoned RESIDENTIAL.
- Labelling this site Urban Development is not a transparent process as the intended land uses are not defined or explained in the structure plan.
- Lot 124 Cook Avenue is approx 4 hectares and does not support an URBAN DEVELOPMENT ZONE as this is not a large tract of land. Areas such as Hillary's and Iluka structure plans were 95ha and 47ha and supported an urban development zone.
- There is no explanation of what the associated residential land uses are with in the context of the amendment nor structure plan.
- The site, under the structure plan , may not get a recoding but be left uncoded. This is unacceptable to existing residents in the locality is not proper or orderly planning and provides no certainty to the existing residents of the immediate or broader community.

FROM : JUDI HURST

FAX NO. : 94010792

Mar. 02 2004 10:20PM P3

URGENT;**THIS MAY AFFECT YOUR LIFESTYLE.****PROPOSED STRUCTURE PLAN.****LOT 124 COOK AVENUE , HILLARYS.**

Currently the City of Joondalup is advertising a structure plan for the vacant site at lot 124 Cook Ave Hillarys. This may have a major effect on your property and the surrounding areas. A structure plan is to facilitate the sub division and development of a specific area.

The Submissions close soon and should you wish to comment on the amendment a form is attached and should be returned to the City of Joondalup by the 3rd March 2004. You may contact Helen Griffiths at the City of Joondalup on 94004429 should you have any queries. Documentation can be viewed on the City's web site or at the City's Whitfords customer desk.

Some areas you may wish to comment on are:

- The structure plan map (plan 1) indicating applicable R-Codes may not be part of the structure plan only the explanatory text. Meaning the site may be uncoded and this is not desirable for the existing residents and does not provide certainty under the Urban Development Zone. Residential areas are to specify the density code as part of the planning framework. Uncoded can leave a default of R60.
- The variety of residential housing land uses are not specified. There is no planning definition for "Housing" and therefore there is no certainty provided to existing residents in the locality, under this structure plan. Short stay medium stay or residential buildings can be developed and are not controlled by the relative R code.
- No contours for the finished ground levels are shown. This may be far higher than existing ground levels and lead to development being a minimum of 3.5 meter higher than could be expected. This would have a detrimental effect on the existing residential zone. Finished floor levels indicated are only indicative.
- Visual bulk and scale would then be out of character with the existing areas. This cannot be amended during the consultation stage as this STAGE has already occurred and this structure plan is to become LAW.
- The development area is within an existing residential area and the existing Height and Scale policy should apply to maintain the existing residential character and view corridors of the locality. 11 meters maximum height instead of 8.5 meters under the policy is not acceptable. This does not include the Tower Elements on corners either or raised ground levels. Community consultation identified view corridors and amenity as main issues and these issues have not been adequately addressed by the developer. The existing height and scale policy should be retained.
- If all occupiers and visitors parking is provided on site why does the structure plan indicate there are 48 car bays minimum available in Willandra, New England and Ferndene Mews. What are these car bays for? Some sought of development that draws more people into the immediate area such as mixed use development or for an under supply of internal parking requirements. All parking should be provided on site to prevent disruption to the existing areas amenity. There is no plan that indicates the number of on site bays provided.
- There is no definition of "Single Residential Housing Zones" or what the

FROM : JUDI HURST

FAX NO. : 94010792

Mar. 02 2004 10:19PM F2

URGENT!THIS MAY AFFECT YOUR LIFESTYLEAMENDMENT 20 TO THE DISTRICT PLANNING SCHEME No2.
LOT 124 COOK AVENUE , HILLARYS.

Currently the City of Joondalup is advertising an amendment to the Town Planning Scheme. This may have a major effect on your property and the surrounding areas.

The area in question is not being REZONED to residential as the immediate area currently is. It is being zoned to URBAN DEVELOPMENT which may contain LAND USES that are not found in a RESIDENTIAL ZONE in which you currently live. These uses are to be listed in the STRUCTURE PLAN that is also being advertised and indicate that RESIDENTIAL HOUSING is to be on the site. This may take the form of shortstay apartments, residential buildings for temporary or permanent habitation, grouped dwellings and units etc not just single housing.

The site is currently coded R-20 but is to be left without a code under this amendment or structure plan.

The Submissions close soon and should you wish to comment on the amendment a form is attached and should be returned to the City of Joondalup by the 3rd March 2004 You may contact Helen Griffiths at the City of Joondalup on 94004429 should you have any queries

Some areas you may wish to comment on are;

- The structure plan does not support a zoning to URBAN DEVELOPMENT ZONE as the existing fully developed area is a residential zone.
- The structure plan does not support or designate a coding to R-25 and R-40. This proposed amendment does not need to be uncoded but recoded to R-25 and R-40 and a RESIDENTIAL ZONE adopted not a URBAN DEVELOPMENT ZONE.
- Residents should not support an UNCODING but a recoding to R-25 AND R-40. A new coding should be appropriate to the existing surrounding land uses.
- An Urban Development Zone is not complimentary to a Residential Zone.
- Contrary to the Amendment Report a structure plan could still be required by Council in a RESIDENTIAL ZONE under clause 9.1 of the District Planning Scheme No2 rather than an Urban Development Zone. Thus providing certainty in land use for the existing residents of the locality.
- The amendment report states this amendment is to required to facilitate residential development and therefore should be zoned RESIDENTIAL.
- Labelling this site Urban Development is not a transparent process as the intended land uses are not defined or explained in the structure plan.
- Lot 124 Cook Avenue is approx 4 hectares and does not support an URBAN DEVELOPMENT ZONE as this is not a large tract of land. Areas such as Hillary's and Iluka structure plans were 95ha and 47ha and supported an urban development zone.
- There is no explanation of what the associated residential land uses are with in the context of the amendment nor structure plan.
- The site, under the structure plan, may not get a recoding but be left uncoded. This is unacceptable to existing residents in the locality is not proper or orderly planning and provides no certainty to the existing residents of the immediate or broader community.

URGENT;**THIS MAY AFFECT YOUR LIFESTYLE.****PROPOSED STRUCTURE PLAN.****LOT 124 COOK AVENUE , HILLARYS.**

Currently the City of Joondalup is advertising a structure plan for the vacant site at lot 124 Cook Ave Hillarys. This may have a major effect on your property and the surrounding areas. A structure plan is to facilitate the sub division and development of a specific area.

The Submissions close soon and should you wish to comment on the amendment a form is attached and should be returned to the City of Joondalup by the 3rd March 2004. You may contact Helen Griffiths at the City of Joondalup on 94004429 should you have any queries. Documentation can be viewed on the City's web site or at the City's Whitfords customer desk.

Some areas you may wish to comment on are;

- The structure plan map (plan 1) indicating applicable R-Codes may not be part of the structure plan only the explanatory text. Meaning the site may be uncoded and this is not desirable for the existing residents and does not provide certainty under the Urban Development Zone. Residential areas are to specify the density code as part of the planning framework. Uncoded can leave a default of R60.
- The variety of residential housing land uses are not specified. There is no planning definition for "Housing" and therefore there is no certainty provided to existing residents in the locality, under this structure plan. Short stay medium stay or residential buildings can be developed and are not controlled by the relative R code.
- No contours for the finished ground levels are shown. This may be far higher than existing ground levels and lead to development being a minimum of 3.5 meter higher than could be expected. This would have a detrimental effect on the existing residential zone. Finished floor levels indicated are only indicative.
- Visual bulk and scale would then be out of character with the existing areas. This cannot be amended during the consultation stage as this STAGE has already occurred and this structure plan is to become LAW.
- The development area is within an existing residential area and the existing Height and Scale policy should apply to maintain the existing residential character and view corridors of the locality. 11 meters maximum height instead of 8.5 meters under the policy is not acceptable. This does not include the Tower Elements on corners either or raised ground levels. Community consultation identified view corridors and amenity as main issues and these issues have not been adequately addressed by the developer. The existing height and scale policy should be retained.
- If all occupiers and visitors parking is provided on site why does the structure plan indicate there are 48 car bays minimum available in Willandra, New England and Ferndene Mews. What are these car bays for? Some sought of development that draws more people into the immediate area such as mixed use development or for an under supply of internal parking requirements. All parking should be provided on site to prevent disruption to the existing areas amenity. There is no plan that indicates the number of on site bays provided.
- There is no definition of "Single Residential Housing Units" or what the

FROM : JUDI HURST

FAX NO. : 94010792

Mar. 02 2004 10:20PM P4

- If this is a residential development why does the required criteria indicate that "advertising , signage and hoardings will be permitted in accordance with the city's policy. There is no Signage , hoardings or advertising required in a residential area except for home businesses. What land uses (Mixed use development) will be needing these adverts or signage. The scope of this plan has not been advertised or clearly identified.
- There is conflict between part 1 and the explanatory text of the structure plan. The structure plan talks about medium and low density and the explanatory text and community consultation only mentions medium density. Are we getting only a medium density development (ie R-30 to R-60)? Where is it definite that it be R25/R40
- There is no communal open space for the Multiple Housing precinct only balconies yet the explanatory text shows plenty of area available around the indicative floor plans. Public open space has been combined with the drainage system giving a bonus to the developer but not inhabitants of the locality. No bonus should be given as communal open space is waived and for health and well being. Open space should not be further reduced.
- Public open space requirements of 10% should be provided or if not available cash in lieu should be mandatory for areas not provided.
- Residential subdivisions may require a structure plan as a prerequisite for development under clause 9.1 of the District Planning Scheme and an Urban Development Zone is not warranted. The acceptable development identified by the community through consultation was residential dwellings ie. For human habitation on a permanent Basis.
- This is not an infill redevelopment as indicated in the explanatory text , but a vacant land subdivision. There is no district plan that identifies this area as INFILL and there has been no discussion with the community on an infill area for any future use other than Dwellings.
- Long term maintenance of the public open space has not been addressed and future costs should not fall upon the City's ratepayers.
- It is unsure if the developer or the ratepayers will be funding the alterations to Cook Avenue as the management report is not included in the structure plan. All costs should be borne by the developer.
- At the beginning of Part One of the Structure Plan it should clearly state
Metropolitan - zone: Urban
Structure Plan - Zone: Residential
Land Code: R25/40
Use Classes: Single Dwellings
Grouped Dwellings
Multiple Dwellings

FROM : JUDI HURST

FAX NO. : 94010792

Mar. 02 2004 10:21PM PS

FORM NO. 4

REGULATIONS 16(1) AND 26(2) TOWN PLANNING
REGULATIONS - Town Planning and Development Act 1929

To: Chief Executive Officer
City of Joondalup, PO Box 21, Joondalup WA 6919
File ref: 59549

SUBMISSION ON SCHEME AMENDMENT NO 20

NAME: _____

ADDRESS: _____
_____**Subject of Submission**

(State how your interests are affected, whether as a private citizen, on behalf of a company or other organisation, or as an owner or occupier of property).

Address of Property Affected by Scheme (if applicable)
(Include lot number and nearest street intersection)

Submission (Give in full your comments and any arguments supporting your comments
- continue on additional sheets if necessary)

Date: _____ Signature: _____

Please be advised that all submissions will become public record, however the City will not publish your name and address if a written request is received.



City of
Joondalup

Urban Design & Policy Services

File Ref: 26349

Forward to: Chief Executive Officer, City of Joondalup, PO Box 21, Joondalup WA 6919
Email to: info@joondalup.wa.gov.au

NAME: _____

ADDRESS: _____

Subject of Submission: **DRAFT COOK AVENUE STRUCTURE PLAN**

(State how your interests are affected, whether as a private citizen, on behalf of a company or other organisation, or as an owner or occupier of property).

Address of property affected (if different from above)

Submission (give in full your comments and any arguments supporting your comments – please continue on additional sheets if necessary)

Date: _____

Signature: _____