

Statistical Analysis of Community Feedback from Issues Papers 1-7

As part of the review of the City of Joondalup District Planning Scheme No.2, a series of Planning Issues Papers were produced, requesting the District community to comment on a broad range of planning issues affecting the future of the city.

The initiative was advertised in local papers and Issues Papers Surveys were available on-line and distributed to letter-boxes in the district. The following data has been compiled from 156 surveys returned to the City from these sources. Not all residents commented on all issues, nor did they comment on all questions within an Issues topic. Those who answered most questions were those residents who filled out the letter-box survey. Those who answered on-line were more selective of the issues on which they commented.

The Issues Papers Surveys data presented in this paper was analysed using the *N vivo* social sciences analysis programme. Although a total of only 156 Surveys were returned, the following interpretation of the data was compiled from valid percentage figures, based on those who actually commented on that issue. Accordingly, the sample number (n) varies for each topic and is shown in each case. In addition, for ease of presenting the results, the 'strongly agree' and 'agree' categories, and the 'strongly disagree' and 'disagree' categories have been combined. Where there was a high percentage of 'strongly agree' or 'strongly disagree', these have been noted.

Issues Papers Survey 1 - Joondalup City Centre:

Residents visit the City Centre for:

	%	
Shopping	70.0	(where n=100)
Restaurants/ Cafes	44.4	(where n= 99)
Medical Appointments	43.4	(where n= 99)
Business	41.4	(where n= 99)
Cinema	30.0	(where n= 100)
Entertainment	28.3	(where n= 99)
Other	19.4	(where n= 98)
Health and Fitness	15.2	(where n= 99)

The City Centre has friendly, welcoming and safe places to meet friends:

Agree	50.6
Neutral	28.1
Disagree	21.3
Total n = 89	100.0%

The City Centre is easy to get around by public transport:

Agree	36.8
Neutral	34.5
Disagree	28.7
Total n = 87	100.0%

There are enough car parking areas and bays along the streets:

Agree	34.4
Neutral	21.5
Disagree	44.1
Total n = 93	100.0%

I like the look and feel of the City Centre – including the way the buildings look, their height and street layout:

Agree	52.6
Neutral	23.2
Disagree	24.2
Total n = 95	100.0%

There are enough employment opportunities in the City Centre:

Agree	20.5
Neutral	53.0
Disagree	26.5
Total n = 83	100.0%

There is too much emphasis on residential apartments in the City Centre:

Agree	29.5
Neutral	30.7
Disagree	39.8
Total n = 88	100.0%

There are enough public spaces to sit, think, relax:

Agree	40.0
Neutral	21.1
Disagree	38.9
Total n = 90	100.0%

Public art should be more of a feature of the City:

Agree	48.9
Neutral	33.7
Disagree	17.4
Total n = 92	100.0

Summary:

The City Centre is primarily visited for shopping, with the next most cited reason being restaurants / cafes. Residents find it a welcoming and safe place to meet friends. The majority are satisfied with public transport; neutral about employment; find there is adequate car parking; like the look and feel of the City Centre; would like more emphasis on residential apartments; and more public art featured in the City Centre.

Community Comment:

There were 102 residents who commented on the topic. Those residents commented on a broad range of issues including traffic and parking; limited shopping, lack of cafes/restaurants/bars; lack of cultural activities / markets sporting venues; better public transport, higher density

23 found parking difficult;
 18 thought traffic flow and traffic lights were a problem
 16 complained about road layout;
 14 thought there was adequate shopping
 13 wanted more cafes/ restaurants/bars
 13 wanted more arts/theatre/ exhibitions/markets;
 9 believed there was inadequate shopping
 8 liked higher density in City centre

c:\documents and settings\lesley\local settings\temporary internet files\olk2\110707gc attach 1.doc

Version No.	Date	Status	Amendments / Comments	Distributed by:

- 6 wanted a focal point for the city centre – plaza or active street-life
- 5 believed the city centre needed a department store
- 3 were against higher density in the City centre
- 1 wanted underground car-parks
- 1 complained of no street numbers on businesses
- 1 thought street fixtures were a hazard to cyclists
- 1 wanted surveillance cameras in the city

The Future City Centre:

Most respondents had positive images of the future of the City Centre. However, some thought there would be no change and some envisaged negative outcomes for the future. The following clusters of comments were drawn from the community:

- 24 Thought that the Centre would be more vibrant city with good social facilities
- 23 Envisaged a busy Shopping / Business hub
- 15 Saw the City as a Centre for Art and Culture, Entertainment and Recreation
- 13 Saw large growth / More intensively developed/ redeveloped inner city
- 13 Envisaged that the Centre would be Dead or saw Negative outcomes
- 13 Envisaged a mature city – like Perth now
- 10 Saw no change
- 8 Envisaged a Congested city
- 7 Saw an emphasis on walking and cycling
- 5 Envisaged better parks and outdoor recreation facilities
- 3 Envisaged a clean and spacious City
- 2 Thought there would be better parking
- 2 Thought there would be a good Public Transport System
- 1 Envisaged more employment
- 1 Envisaged a City with Iconic architecture
- 1 Envisaged a sustainable city
- 1 Envisaged the city's car-parks underground

c:\documents and settings\lesleyf\local settings\temporary internet files\olk2\110707gc attach 1.doc

Version No.	Date	Status	Amendments / Comments	Distributed by:

Issues Paper 2 Survey - Commercial Centres:**I would like to see more commercial centres in my area:**

Agree	20.4
Neutral	16.5
Disagree	63.2 (35% strongly disagree)
Total n = 103	100.1%

I would like to see fewer commercial centres in my area:

Agree	37.7
Neutral	26.7
Disagree	35.7
Total n = 101	100.1%

I can do all of my shopping within the Joondalup area:

Agree	55.3
Neutral	17.5
Disagree	27.2
Total n = 103	100.0%

I would like to see different services/activities offered at commercial centres – gyms, medical facilities, childcare centres:

Agree	44.5
Neutral	41.4
Disagree	14.2
Total n = 99	100.1%

I am happy with the overall appearance and feel of the commercial centres in my area:

Agree	57.9
Neutral	23.5
Disagree	18.6
Total n = 102	100.0%

I have no problem parking at commercial centres in my area:

Agree	59.6
Neutral	20.2
Disagree	20.2
Total n = 104	100.0%

I can access my local commercial centre by public transport:

Agree	37.9
Neutral	31.6
Disagree	30.5
Total n = 95	100.0%

Version No.	Date	Status	Amendments / Comments	Distributed by:

I feel safe when I use my local commercial centre:

Agree	69.6
Neutral	23.8
Disagree	6.7
Total n = 105	100.1%

There is too much parking available at the commercial centres in my areas:

Agree	6.8
Neutral	19.6
Disagree	73.5
Total n = 102	100.1%

Summary:

The majority of residents would like fewer commercial centres in their area. Their shopping needs are met within the Joondalup area; they would like more services such as gyms, medical centres and child-care centres at their local commercial centres; they are happy with the look and feel of their local centre, have adequate car parking, feel safe but agree there is not too much parking. Accessing the local commercial centre by public transport divided the sample, with 37.9% stating they could, and 30.5% stating they could not, meaning that there is room for improvement in this area.

Community Comments:

Forty residents made comments about their commercial centres. Concerns ranged from maintenance and security issues to the need for a department store and the creation of mixed use development in commercial centres.

- 6 were concerned with inadequate parking space or poor quality parking areas
- 5 were concerned with the maintenance of their local commercial centre
- 5 wanted a Department store at their local commercial centre
- 5 wanted more variety, including mixed use dwellings, cafes or taverns at their local centre
- 4 were concerned with security issues
- 3 were concerned with inadequate public transport
- 4 wanted smaller local food shops within walking distance
- 1 complained of congested shopping area (stalls etc)
- 1 wanted extended hours at their shopping centre
- 1 was a happy, contented shopper who wouldn't change a thing
- 1 wanted more vegetation around the shopping centre
- 3 of the comments related to the City Centre and were recorded in that section
- 2 comments were not applicable to this topic

Version No.	Date	Status	Amendments / Comments	Distributed by:

Issues Papers 3 Survey - Environment and Sustainability:

Parks should be designed and planted out in ways that acknowledge the impact of global warming:

Agree	83.5 (59.6 strongly)
Neutral	11.9
Disagree	4.6
Total n = 109	100.0%

Land, which is being built on in my suburb, is developed in ways that protect the environment:

Agree	41.9
Neutral	31.4
Disagree	26.7
Total n = 105	100.0%

Summary

Residents displayed a strong interest in the environment with a strong majority believing in planning parks with global warming in mind but only 41.9% stated enough is being done for sustainable development in their area.

Community Comments:

There were 54 residents who made additional comments on this topic. The comments covered a very wide range, with many of the comments made by only 1-3 residents. The following issues were raised:

18 Leave natural habitat / wildlife concern / anti-clearing / control developers;

12 Use native species for plantings;

6 Upgrade parks/ better POS / maintain POS / extend walk & cycle paths / better landscaping;

5 Build for climate;

5 Encourage rainwater tanks / grey-water recycling;

5 Minimise car use / encourage car pooling/ smaller cars;

4 Plant more trees;

4 Encourage more recycling / including green-waste;

3 Encourage household Solar / wind power generation;

3 Ban solid fuel heaters;

3 Promote City as green;

2 Prescriptive roof colours;

2 Promote long-life globes;

1 Compulsory pool covers;

1 No high density

1 Plan walkable centres;

1 Better storm-water management

1 Charge for super-market trolleys then refund;

1 Anti- native trees;

1 Licence bores;

1 Build another dam;

1 Limit chemical weed control;

1 Put power underground;

2 Tighter building regs;

1 Better public transport;

1 Introduce density incentives;

1 Encourage undercroft parking to maximize garden space;

1 Over population is the problem;

1 Encourage mix of densities / diversity in styles;

1 Believed that community bores would be good for resid. Gardens;

1 Preserve solar access

c:\documents and settings\lesley\local settings\temporary internet files\olk2\110707gc attach 1.doc

Version No.	Date	Status	Amendments / Comments	Distributed by:

Issues Paper 4 Survey - Home Businesses:**Home Businesses of all types should be encouraged within the City:**

Agree	56.6	(34.4 strongly)
Neutral	21.1	
Disagree	22.2	
Total n = 90	99.9%	

The rules for establishing home businesses are easy to understand:

Agree	45.5
Neutral	42.9
Disagree	11.7
Total n = 77	100.1%

The rules for starting home businesses are reasonable:

Agree	48.1
Neutral	41.6
Disagree	10.4
Total n = 77	100.1%

Obtaining approval for establishing a home business is a straight-forward exercise:

Agree	35.2
Neutral	50.0
Disagree	14.9
Total n = 74	100.1%

The present system used to classify home businesses should be reviewed and simplified:

Agree	39.5
Neutral	34.2
Disagree	26.3
Total n = 76	100.0%

Summary

The majority of residents believe that home businesses should be encouraged; the rules for establishing businesses are easy to understand; reasonable; but require review and simplification.

Community Comments:

Thirty-nine residents commented on this topic. The majority expressed concern re parking and noise to neighbouring properties. The following issues were commented on:

- 11 Concerns re impact of noise / parking on verge / commercial vehicles;
- 5 Wanted simplified / streamlined rules / system
- 3 Wanted council to have strict zoning
- 3 Pleaded ignorance re home businesses;
- 2 work from home but have never had licences;
- 2 Thought there should be fast internet connections;
- 2 Believed that, after the initial assessment the period of permit should then be 2 - 3 years;
- 2 thought there should be an initial rate reprieve in early stages of business;
- 2 Believed that the Council could offer storage rental for home businesses.
- 2 Support Home Businesses in residential areas;
- 1 Thought that there should be leniency re parking for home businesses;

c:\documents and settings\lesley\local settings\temporary internet files\olk2\110707gc attach 1.doc

Version No.	Date	Status	Amendments / Comments	Distributed by:

- 1 Believed that the Council should run information sessions;
- 1 Thought regular inspections were appropriate;
- 1 Believed that conflicts with neighbours over home businesses should be mediated;
- 1 Stated that no brothels should be allowed;
- 1 Thought that some classes of home business should attract free permits;
- 1 Believed that a category 1 business should be allowed anywhere in the city;
- 1 Stated that vehicle repairs should not be allowed and no car bodies stored;

c:\documents and settings\lesleyf\local settings\temporary internet files\olk2\110707gc attach 1.doc

Version No.	Date	Status	Amendments / Comments	Distributed by:

Issues Paper 5 Survey - Housing Density:

The City's housing density should remain as it currently is – between 500 to 800 m² / house:

Agree	55.8	(38 strongly)
Neutral	6.2	
Disagree	38.0	
Total n = 129	100.0%	

Lot sizes should vary to allow for different types and sizes of housing in each suburb:

Agree	72.3	(42.3 strongly)
Neutral	16.9	
Disagree	10.8	
Total n = 130	100.0%	

Lot sizes should be smaller in places where there are local facilities, such as shops, offices, public transport, medical and community facilities:

Agree	58.8	(33.6 strongly)
Neutral	16.0	
Disagree	25.2	
Total n = 131	100.0	

Summary:

The majority of residents believe that housing density should remain as it is currently - at 500-800 m² per house. However the community also believes that a range of lot sizes is desirable and that smaller lots (higher density) housing should be located near shops, public transport and community facilities.

Community Comment:

There were 70 residents who responded with comments, in addition to the survey on this topic. Of the 70:

- 48 supported higher densities;
- 32 believed in rezoning suburbs;
- 21 wanted a range of housing densities;
- 13 wanted no change to density;
- 9 considered the City Centre was the appropriate place for higher densities.

Version No.	Date	Status	Amendments / Comments	Distributed by:

Issues Paper 6 Survey - Public Open Space:**I am satisfied with the amount of POS in my suburb:**

Agree	85.2	(50 strongly)
Neutral	8.3	
Disagree	6.5	
Total n = 108	100.0%	

I do not believe there is enough POS across the whole of the City of Joondalup:

Agree	23.0
Neutral	19.0
Disagree	58.0
Total n = 100	100.0%

The facilities I want are available in POS in my suburb:

Agree	52.3
Neutral	21.0
Disagree	26.7
Total n = 105	100.0%

The facilities I want are available in POS across the whole of the City of Joondalup:

Agree	42.0
Neutral	33.0
Disagree	25.0
Total n = 100	100.0%

The POS in my suburb encourages local people to participate in both active and passive recreational activities:

Agree	70.2
Neutral	13.5
Disagree	16.3
Total n = 104	100.0%

The POS across the whole of the City of Joondalup encourages local people to participate in both active and passive recreational activities:

Agree	68.0
Neutral	23.3
Disagree	8.7
Total n = 103	100.0%

I feel safe and secure in POS across the whole of the City of Joondalup:

Agree	48.5
Neutral	35.4
Disagree	16.1
Total n = 99	100.0%

Version No.	Date	Status	Amendments / Comments	Distributed by:

There are enough parking bays near POS if I want to visit one that is out of walking distance:

Agree	52.0
Neutral	28.0
Disagree	20.0
Total n = 100	100.0%

Summary:

The majority of residents are satisfied with the amount of POS in their suburb and across the whole of the City of Joondalup. Residents have the facilities they want in POS, in their suburb and across the City of Joondalup; residents believe that the POS encourages both active and passive recreational activities, both within their suburb and across the City of Joondalup. Residents feel safe at POS sites across the City of Joondalup and believe there are enough parking bays at POS sites if they choose to drive to a POS out of walking distance.

Community Comments:

Thirty nine residents made additional comments on this topic. The following issues were raised by the community:

- 8 Commented on the well maintained and pleasant POS in the District;
- 5 Believed there are not enough toilets / close too early;
- 5 Wanted more seats in POS (not metal that freeze the bottom);
- 4 Were concerned re vandalism and graffiti in their area;
- 4 Wanted POS better maintained, including less litter;
- 3 Wanted POS left natural;
- 3 Wanted more facilities for youth – skate parks / roller blade paths / BMX track
- 2 wanted more BBQ's
- 2 Wanted more play equipment;
- 2 wanted POS integrated better with housing;
- 2 Wanted more Dog Bins / Bags
- 1 Believed that more parking is required at POS;
- 1 Wanted a stronger police presence;
- 1 Did not feel safe in POS;
- 1 Wanted more POS;
- 1 Believed that playgrounds should all be visible;
- 1 Wanted more bike paths leading to POS;
- 1 wanted Lake Joondalup paths finished;
- 1 Believed that windbreaks at playgrounds were needed;
- 1 Believed that POS should have more lawns;
- 1 Believed that Primary School grounds should be used as POS;
- 1 Believed that POS should be categorized to 'active' and 'passive';
- 1 Wanted the 'Friends of' system used for maintenance of POS;
- 1 Wanted more facilities in coastal areas
- 1 Believed POS should include Residential vegetable plots;
- 1 Wanted more public art in POS;
- 1 Believed that Performance areas should be included in POS;
- 1 Required cyclists to be restricted or separated from walkers on paths;
- 1 Believed that there should not be paid parking at beaches;
- 1 Believed that there were too many car parks;
- 1 Wanted POS protected – not to be alienated;
- 1 Wanted more POS for Currabine and Connolly;
- 1 Wanted more trees;
- 1 Wanted more paths and a viewing platform for Lake Joondalup.

c:\documents and settings\lesley\local settings\temporary internet files\olk2\110707gc attach 1.doc

Version No.	Date	Status	Amendments / Comments	Distributed by:

Issue Paper 7 Survey - Heritage:**Cultural Heritage in the city of Joondalup is protected:**

Agree	48.9
Neutral	35.6
Disagree	15.5
Total n = 90	100.0%

Including places or structures of heritage significance in the Planning Scheme will be of importance for the community:

Agree	77.0	(39.6 strongly)
Neutral	16.5	
Disagree	6.6	
Total n = 91	100.1%	

Conservation and/or restoration of places or structures of significant cultural heritage should be supported by incentives:

Agree	74.2	(44.1 strongly)
Neutral	18.3	
Disagree	7.5	
Total n = 93	100.0%	

Summary:

The majority of residents believe that cultural heritage in the City of Joondalup is protected. A strong majority of residents also believe that sites and structures of cultural significance should be included in the Planning Scheme and incentives for the conservation and/or restoration should be given.

Community Comments:

There were 40 residents who made additional comments on this topic. The following issues were raised or sites suggested for preservation:

- 10 Bush/ Walk trails / national parks Lake Joondalup/ Yellagonga Pk
- 8 Coastline
- 5 Indigenous sites
- 4 Pioneer dwellings
- 4 Archives of photos, film written history
- 4 Sporting / cultural venues
- 3 Perry Field
- 3 No heritage exists / over-rated
- 2 Surf clubs
- 2 Lakes wetlands
- 2 Community to pay cost
- 1 A violence – free community
- 1 Not Hillarys
- 1 Integrate Heritage with Tourism
- 1 Cockman House and Conti's Winery
- 1 Multi-cultural celebrations
- 1 Migration Trails

c:\documents and settings\lesleyf\local settings\temporary internet files\olk2\110707gc attach 1.doc

Version No.	Date	Status	Amendments / Comments	Distributed by: