

Planning for Public Open Space

Introduction:

Public Open Space (POS) provides many essential benefits including enhancing local neighbourhoods, people's lifestyles and improving health outcomes. POS takes many forms and serves a range of functions but are typically identified as a park.

The Western Australian Planning Commission is advertising the draft new planning policy on public open space, intended to replace *Development Control Policy 2.3 – Public Open Space in Residential Areas*.

Please complete the following survey to provide your feedback, which will be used to inform the final policy.

Abbreviations:

Public Open Space (POS): land that is set aside, used as, and managed for public recreation purposes and reserved for public open space in a local planning scheme.

Note: *For issues relating to the current management of your local parks, please contact your local government as this is outside the scope of this draft planning policy consultation.*

What happens next

As this is a draft Planning for Public Open Space Operational Policy, there is no immediate change to existing planning controls for public open space.

The WAPC will consider all submissions on the draft Planning for Public Open Space Operational Policy before releasing a final Planning for Public Open Space Operational Policy to guide public open space allocation and planning. The current review of Liveable Neighbourhoods will be aligned with the provisions in this operational policy.

Consultation

Question 1 - About you

1. What is your name? *(required)* _____
2. What is your email address? *(required)*
3. Are you responding on behalf of an organisation? *(required)* Yes No
 Organisation name:
4. Submissions may be published as part of the consultation process. Do you wish to have your name removed from your submission? *(required)*
 Yes No
5. What region are you from? *(required)*

Please select only one item

- Perth
- Peel
- Gascoyne
- Goldfields
- Great Southern
- Kimberley
- Mid West
- Pilbara
- South West
- Wheatbelt

Question 2. Do you (or your organisation) think there are adequate and convenient parks for recreation and local amenity in your suburb?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

If applicable, please comment on what is lacking in terms of adequacy of parks, adequacy of park facilities or accessibility to those parks.

Question 3. Public open space (POS) is important for recreation, health, education, local amenity and quality of life.

Do you agree with maintaining the existing minimum contribution requirement of 10 per cent POS land as a general standard for all suburbs? (10 per cent is a proportion of the gross subdivisible area, generally applied to residential type zones)

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

Do you have any other comments on this approach?

Question 4. Do you think it is reasonable for all subdividers of residential lots (blocks of land) that create new additional lots to contribute towards public open space (parks or park facilities) regardless of their location?

(Fact bank) Notes:

This contribution can either be by land for new public open space (parks) or by cash to be spent on upgrading existing parks and can depend on what is practical, as guided by the local government.

Two lot subdivision applications cannot contribute as cash due to restrictions in law and contributions of land is typically not practical. These subdivisions therefore do not usually contribute to public open space.

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

Do you have any other comments?

Question 5. Non-residential (e.g. commercial, tourism, industrial) and rural living land uses can also be required to contribute towards POS (not necessarily at a 10 per cent rate), only on an as-needed basis where justified, and when outlined in a publicly available planning document. Are you in favour of this approach?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

Do you have any other comments on this approach?

Question 6. Many established suburbs (infill areas) already contain parks that meet some of the existing community's needs.

For this reason, it is proposed to enable POS contributions to be reduced to a minimum of 5 per cent (5%) of the residential subdivision area in infill (established) areas unless varied in a local government planning strategy or alike. It is envisaged that this contribution would commonly be in the form of cash to be spent on upgrades to existing POS, as determined by the local government.

Are you in favour of this approach?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

Do you have any other comments on this approach?

Question 7. The draft policy proposes the ability to reduce the 10 per cent (10%) POS contribution in a few other scenarios. These include some strata and community title scheme subdivisions (such as apartments and villa complexes) where publicly accessible but privately owned open space is provided; for sites comprising a mix of land uses (such as a shopping precinct); and for regional areas where justified.

Do you support the ability to vary the 10 per cent POS contributions proposed?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

Do you think there should be other scenarios where the 10 per cent POS contribution should be varied? Please explain.

Question 8. The draft policy proposes that POS contributions collected as monetary contributions instead of land (known as cash-in-lieu) are spent within the suburb or adjoining suburb from which it was originally collected, and ideally within a 5 year timeframe. Are you in favour of this change?

(Required)

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

Do you have any other comments on this approach?

Question 9. Currently any required cash contribution to POS in infill areas (established areas) is calculated as a percentage of the value of the land being subdivided. The contribution amount therefore varies depending upon the value of the land.

Would you support a change to the way the cash contribution amount is calculated in infill areas to a standard set fee per lot instead?

- Yes
- No
- Unsure

Do you have any other comments on this or have a suggestion on an alternative approach to implementing POS contribution?
