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Foreword

The ‘What we thought would kill us series’ examines some of Perth’s most controversial developments, which have generated large amounts of community opposition either during the approval or development stages. In doing so, the Committee for Perth aims to remind us all that what was once controversial can become an accepted part of our community.

This case study is the fifth in the series, and examines the Raffles Waterfront Development, a controversial high density residential development constructed within what has become known as the Canning Bridge Precinct.

The approval process for ‘Raffles’ was anything but straightforward and involved more than the usual public concern and opposition, multiple complex issues, a large number of stakeholders and two development approval bodies.

Yet, despite such large amounts of controversy and concern at the time, today Raffles could be argued to have provided a positive example of a high density residential apartment development in one of Perth’s leafy, green riverside suburbs, which has helped to facilitate a positive shift in community opinions.

A stand out building and a landmark for the Canning Bridge Precinct, Raffles looks spectacular set beside the Swan River. I hope you enjoy reading about the project and that it contributes, one way or another to adding to an increasingly high standard of residential high rise developments that Perth residents can be proud to call home and work to ease urban sprawl.

Marion Fulker
CEO, Project Manager

## Case Study 5: The Raffles Waterfront Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Context – History of Density in Perth</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Planning Context</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Melville Planning Context</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Historic Raffles Hotel</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Application and Approval Process</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Concerns</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Raffles Waterfront Development</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution to the Canning Bridge Precinct</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 1: Researchers</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 2: Committee for Perth Membership</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix 3: References</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This case study seeks to examine and articulate the controversy surrounding the Raffles project, the context of this controversy; community concerns; the impact on the development process; and the final outcome.
Introduction

This case study examines the Raffles Waterfront Development (Raffles) a high density residential and commercial development in the City of Melville. Located approximately 8 km from Perth’s city centre, Raffles is an example of high density residential development in an area and region that traditionally accommodated low to medium density development.

Raffles was a controversial project. Opposition from the local community and the local Member of Parliament punctuated and delayed the approval phase of the project, with concerns about the building height; impacts on the heritage listed Raffles hotel; and potential effects on local character, traffic congestion and the environment being expressed by the proposal’s opponents.

The location of Raffles adjacent to the Swan River and the inclusion of a heritage listed building added to the project’s complexity and to community controversy. The need for the project to take into account a myriad of issues and varying concerns of multiple stakeholders resulted in amendments to the project design and heightened concern about the potential for negative impacts on key local and regional assets.

In addition, the local and regional planning framework at the time of the application did not promote high density residential development and there was a distinct lack of other high quality, high density residential projects in the Perth metropolitan region, particularly outside Perth’s city centre. This reduced the potential for the long term local and regional benefits of high density residential development to be properly communicated to and considered by decision makers and the community, and meant that local residents were concerned about poor development outcomes.

Yet, once approved, Raffles proceeded without notable dispute and local demand for the high quality, high density apartments exceeded expectations. Today the building is generally regarded as a local landmark and a positive addition to the Perth region.

Furthermore, since the Raffles development there has been a documented shift in government policy and public opinion towards future high density development in the Canning Bridge Precinct, which has followed a long term, collaborative public consultation and planning process conducted by the Western Australian Planning Commission in collaboration with the City of Melville and the City of South Perth.

This case study seeks to examine and articulate the controversy surrounding the Raffles project, the context of this controversy; community concerns; the impact on the development process; and the final outcome. It also considers how public attitudes towards high density residential development can change - and the implications of this shift for the delivery of a more sustainable future for the Perth metropolitan region.
Perth’s preference for single residential homes has prevailed for most of the past century.
Context – History of Density in Perth

Perth is a low density region with a strong preference for single residential homes. In 2001, 88% of homes in Perth region were single residential dwellings - a figure which decreased only slightly to 86.1% in 2011. Alternatively, the proportion of flats, units or apartments in Perth is very low - 3% in 2001 rising slightly to 5.2% in 2011.

Greater Perth Housing Stock

Figure 1. Perth Housing Stock by Type.

Perth’s preference for single residential homes has prevailed for most of the past century. Aspirations to achieve the ‘great Australian dream’ of owning your own home on its own lot underpinned twentieth century land use planning and development in Perth. This ideology was largely fuelled by British settlement and the transfer to Australia of the British suburban philosophies founded to address the substantial challenges encountered during the industrial revolution.

This resulted in a dominance of low density housing and low to medium rise commercial development in Perth, particularly following the widespread adoption of private motor vehicles in the middle of last century - reflected in the fact that, by 1961, the proportion of single residential homes in Perth had reached 93%.

Subsequently, during the 1960s to 1980s, the very small proportion of higher density housing projects that occurred were often associated with social housing developments, some of which, such as the 10 storey residential towers incorporated in the Brownlie Towers precinct, became known for delivering poor quality community outcomes. High rise commercial development was also uncommon outside the Perth central area with a preference for car reliant suburban shopping centres and business parks.

As a result relatively few high rise or high density developments have historically occurred outside Perth’s city centre with some exceptions including South Perth and Crawley where high rise construction occurred c1960s during a period of post war expansion. These developments provided accommodation within close proximity of the city centre and the University of Western Australia and were built to capitalise on sweeping river views.

Other notable exceptions include the well-known Rendezvous Observation City, developed in 1986 by Bond Corp. This 25 storey hotel and commercial development sparked widespread community controversy, with people concerned about the height of the building and the impact on their coastal views. Often described as ‘ugly’, ‘drab’ and ‘dominating’, the building raised substantial community concerns about high rise development in the Perth region.

---


Metropolitan Planning Context

In 2002 there was little strategic imperative for urban infill or for increasing residential densities in the Perth metropolitan area.

The strategic metropolitan plan for Perth at the time of proposal was Metroplan (1990). While Metroplan did address issues of urban infill and increasing densities, it did not promote the type of high density, high rise residential development proposed for Raffles. Rather, Metroplan focused on maintaining the benefits of a ‘suburban city’ and ‘relaxed lifestyle’, with density targets for new residential areas remaining low, at nine dwellings per hectare.

However in 2004, the State Government released a new strategic plan for metropolitan Perth, Network City. Network City ‘differed from earlier regional strategic plans in that it proposed that a significant amount of growth would occur within the existing built-up urban area.’

10 Department of Planning and Urban Development, 1990, pg 3.
...there were few examples of high density or high rise development ... [and they] were perceived negatively.
In 2002 Community Planning Scheme No. 5 was the operative planning scheme for the City of Melville. This remains the current planning scheme for the City of Melville today. Under this Scheme the Council was required to make a discretionary decision in regards to the Raffles proposal, as it exceeded the generally enabled plot ratio and height restrictions for the area.

In 2001 the City of Melville was a distinctly low density suburb with single residential houses making up approximately 87.5% of the housing stock; 10.2% of houses being semi-detached; while flats, units or apartments made up only 2.0%. Since this time, the proportion of flats, units or apartments in the area have increased to 3.8%. Figure 2 below displays the City of Melville housing stock in 2001, 2006 and 2011.

City Of Melville Housing Stock

Figure 2. City of Melville Housing Stock 2001-2011\textsuperscript{12}.

In this context Raffles was proposed at a time at which the Perth region and the City of Melville was overwhelmingly dominated by low density development; there was little regional or local planning framework for urban infill or for high density residential development; there were few examples of high density or high rise development outside the Perth central area; and some notable previous examples of higher density residential and commercial development outside the central city were perceived negatively.

As a result, the Raffles proposal faced considerable community opposition - more opposition than perhaps would be applied to a similar building proposed today in light of the recent growth in higher density development and a growing understanding of and support for Perth’s changing strategic planning focus.

The inclusion of the heritage listed Raffles Hotel... was a source of significant concern to a number of shareholders and community members.
The Historic Raffles Hotel

The inclusion of the heritage listed Raffles Hotel in the Raffles proposal was a source of significant concern to a number of stakeholders and community members.

The Raffles Hotel has been a licensed venue since 1896, then known as the Canning Bridge Hotel. The hotel was originally used as a venue for social events and sporting groups including the W.A. Hunt Club.

In 1937 the Hotel went through extensive remodelling, although much of the previous form was kept and it was then renamed the Raffles Hotel[13]. Designed by architect William G. Bennett, the Hotel is reminiscent of Inter-War Art Deco and Inter-War Functionalist style, which makes the building highly valued as a heritage place.

Included in the remodelling was the establishment of what was believed to be Perth’s first biergarten and an addition of an upper storey on the eastern and southern wings which featured large curved loggias on both levels which fronted the riverside[14].

The Hotel was further extended in 1959, which included the addition of a double storey building accommodating 20 rooms, giving the building a motel-like function. In c.1985 a fire destroyed the original tiled roof and damaged the first floor, however much of the original structure remained in place[15].

In August 1995 the Raffles Hotel was earmarked for demolition to make way for redevelopment by Davenport Campbell.

This proposal was accepted by the City of Melville, sparking protests from stakeholders and interest groups including the Art Deco Society of WA, the Melville Conservation Group and the Melville Ratepayers Group[16].

The Art Deco Society of WA was particularly strong in the opposition of the demolition, and in their submission to the City of Melville they supported the retention and restoration of the building, with any future proposal to be mindful of the heritage value of the site[17].

In 2001 the Raffles Hotel was approved by Environment and Heritage Minister Dr Judy Edwards to be listed on the State Register of Heritage Places.

[14] Ibid.
[15] Ibid.
[17] Ibid.
Subsequent to receiving a briefing from the Heritage Council the Heritage Minister acknowledged the building “as one of the few surviving examples of a hotel in the Inter-War Functionalist style, the Raffles Hotel has significant heritage value. It deserves the protection of the State’s heritage laws.” This ensured that the Hotel would be protected and that any proposal for development of the site must first be approved by the Heritage Council.

However at this time the Raffles Hotel was in need of renovation, as prior to this it had been described as ‘rundown’ and ‘jaded’ and anecdotal evidence suggests that the redevelopment and renovation of the historic hotel as part of the Raffles project has delivered increased amenity to the Canning Bridge Precinct.

Today the Raffles Hotel consists of:

- The remnants of the 1896 Canning Bridge Hotel as the single storey Federation style building.
- The 1937 remodelling, which includes the two storey eastern extension.
- The River Lounge, which sits on the former site of the biergarten.
- A drive-in bottle shop on the western side of the building.

---

19 Ibid.
23 City of Melville Mayor Russell Aubrey, 2015, pers. comm, 22 April 2015.
the Raffles Hotel was in need of renovation... [and] had been described as ‘rundown’ and ‘jaded’
In October 1999 the Western Australian Planning Commission (WAPC) deemed that the site of the Raffles Hotel was of metropolitan significance and it withdrew the Melville City Council’s delegated authority to approve development on the site under the Metropolitan Region Scheme.

This meant that any development application for the site would require approval from the City of Melville under the local planning scheme and from the WAPC under the Metropolitan Regional Scheme. Resulting from this decision was the preparation of planning and urban design guidelines for the site which would provide guidance for any future development in terms of its form and design24.

The development application for the Raffles Hotel site was submitted to the City of Melville on 4 October 2002 by Multiplex Constructions Pty Ltd (now known as Brookfield Multiplex).

The original proposal consisted of one 17 storey tower (58 metres high), two five storey towers and one six storey tower in total accommodating 147 new apartment units. Also included in the original proposal was the provision of three commercial tenancies for cafes and restaurants, one office facility and ancillary facilities including a pool and gym for use by apartment owners/occupiers. These additional facilities were to be provided within the existing Raffles Hotel structure while the residential units would be part of the new development. The proposal also included two levels of basement car parking providing 301 car bays.

In light of the controversy surrounding the previous 1995 application for development of the Raffles Hotel site as well as earlier controversy associated with proposals for development of the nearby Majestic Hotel site in c.1984 and the sale of State Government land at Heathcote, media coverage at the time predicted that the Raffles proposal would be controversial25.

However then City of Melville Mayor Katie Mair committed that “Council will consider all stakeholders’ interests and make a decision that is best for the community”26.

The City of Melville community consultation period commenced on October 5 2002 and was scheduled to run until November 1st. This provided the opportunity for members of the public to provide feedback on the proposal through comments and submissions.

In this case media predictions proved accurate. A large number of submissions were received opposing the project and the proposal attracted vehement opposition from the then Member for Alfred Cove Dr Janet Woollard MLA along with other third party groups.

---

24 Conditional Approval for Raffles Proposal 5 March 2003
26 Ibid
The City of Melville extended the consultation timeframe by one week in response to community concern and, by the time consultation period closed more than 1,800 submissions had been received, 85% of which were objected to the proposal27. The biggest issue of concern by objectors was the height of the proposed tower.

On 10 December 2002 the Raffles Hotel application was considered by the City of Melville’s Development and Neighbourhood Amenity Committee. The Committee approved the development however the height of the proposed residential towers was limited to 15, nine and five storeys. The approval was also subject to a number of conditions28.

Notable conditions of the approval included a minimum requirement of 1,000m$^2$ for commercial purposes, continued maintenance of the river foreshore, development of the nearby Civic Forecourt to include a water or art feature and street furniture, and the requirement of Multiplex Pty Ltd to enter into an agreement with the Heritage Council as part of upgrading and maintaining the original Raffles Hotel29.

However as previously outlined, the application also required approval from the WAPC under the Metropolitan Region Scheme.

The WAPC was scheduled to consider the application in January 2003, however this was delayed due to an appeal under the Environmental Protection Act submitted by local member Dr Janet Woollard and the Conservation Council30. The appeal questioned the decision of the Environmental Protection Authority not to make a formal environmental assessment of the application however the appeal was dismissed by the Minister for Environment31.

The consideration of the application by the WAPC was further delayed in February 2003, when the local member, with the support of the Raffles Action Group, called on the State Government to remove the proposal from consideration until it had been determined whether Multiplex’s application process had met legislated requirements.

At the time Dr Woollard was quoted as saying that she believed several requirements of the redevelopment application system had not been fulfilled. “The Government is there to ensure that legislation which is passed is carried out correctly,” she said.

Then Planning Minister Alannah MacTiernan MLA passed on the group’s concerns to the Planning Commission and was quoted as responding “I have asked them to ensure these allegations were dealt with and there was no breach in the application or anything that would undermine the lawfulness of any decision,”32.

The WAPC considered and approved the Raffles development on 5 March 2003. Unlike the City of Melville approval, the Commission approved one 17 storey tower and three five storey apartment buildings. The primary reason given by the WAPC approving the 17 storey proposal rather than the 15 storey variation approved by the City of Melville was the need to adhere to the urban design guidelines for the site which promoted the development of a regional and local landmark for Perth and expressed a preference for height rather than bulk33.

---

28 Ibid.
29 Ibid.
31 Ibid.
32 Ibid.
33 City of Melville, 2003, Conditional Approval for Raffles Proposal 5 March 2003
According to Minister MacTiernan the WAPC believed that “… we will get a much better aesthetic and architectural outcome by having a 17 storey and a five-storey configuration and completely eliminating the nine storey portion of the redevelopment. In its view a more slender structure will add more to the aesthetic value of the site” 34.

This resulted in a complex situation in which there were two current separate sets of approvals for the development, neither of which could go ahead.

The need to resolve this matter led to the WAPC, the City of Melville and Multiplex Pty Ltd entering into negotiations to resolve the issue – a process which was questioned by Dr Woollard during parliamentary question time as an attempt to “…ram through a compromise deal so that the redevelopment can go ahead without any further community consultation or government accountability” 35.

Minister MacTiernan defended the negotiation process, highlighting that “The only other strategy that would be available is for the developer to lodge an appeal against one or other - or, indeed, both - of the applications. If it were to do that, of course, the first part of that process would be mediation. I can assume only that what they are attempting to do now, without activating that legal process, is mediate and get a reasonable outcome so that they can go forward” 36.

Negotiations proceeded. Then City of Melville Chief Executive Officer John McNally represented the Council during the mediation process, and eventually recommended to Council that approval be given for a 58 metre, 17 storey tower and three five storey buildings 37.

During a Town Planning Appeal Tribunal on 10 September 2003 the City of Melville gave its approval for a 17 storey structure, which was articulated through a Consent Order 38.

While it is noted that the final development was not the City of Melville’s preferred outcome and did not incorporate some of the amenity improvements Council had hoped to achieve, anecdotal evidence suggests that today the height of the building is generally considered to be acceptable 39.


35 Ibid.

36 Ibid.


... “we will get a much better aesthetic and architectural outcome by having a 17 storey and a five storey configuration and completely eliminating the nine storey portion”...
Community Concerns

A record number of submissions were received by the City of Melville in response to the development application from both the general public and from referral agencies.

A total of 1,824 public responses were received by advertising closure on 15 November 2002 signifying greater than usual community interest in the proposal.

The majority of responses were in opposition of the proposal, with 85% of submissions categorised as “object”. Only 40 submissions were of the opinion that the 17 storey tower was of an acceptable height, while 1,216 submissions specifically stated that the tower was too high. Additionally, 963 respondents supported a development of six storeys or less.

Further major concerns captured within the public submissions were as follows:

- 644 of the submissions thought that the residential density of the development should be coded as R60 or less (60 dwellings per hectare);
- 663 of the submissions believed that the building would be out of character with the heritage listed Raffles hotel;
- 781 responses viewed the development as not in keeping with the adjacent residential area;
- 746 respondents believed the development would impact on local traffic and further increase congestion; and
- 722 submissions commented on the lack of environmental study for the development, stressing their environmental concerns.

A number of external stakeholders were also asked to comment on the development application by submission to the City of Melville.

Those in general support of the development included the Swan River Trust and the Heritage Council of Western Australia, however support of both bodies was subject to a number of conditions.

Notably, a number of key stakeholder groups opposed the development application, with concerns mostly based on factors of height. Those generally opposed to the development included the National Trust of Australia, the Art Deco Society, the Melville Conservation Group, Friends of Deep Water Point and Melville History Society (Inc.).

It is therefore evident that there was significant community opposition to the Raffles project, both from within the community and third party stakeholder groups.
It is therefore evident that there was significant community opposition to the Raffles project...
The Raffles Waterfront Development

The Raffles Waterfront Development was completed in 2006 by Multiplex Pty Ltd. The completed development consisted of one 17 storey tower and three five storey towers on a 9581m² located on lots 176, 177 and 15, at 71 Canning Beach Road in Applecross. The finished development comprises of 116 apartments, with one, two and three bedrooms ranging from 63m² to 480m² in floor space. Included in this development was the provision of basement security car parking for residents, storage space, a concierge, common pool and gym facilities and a function room for residents. The design of the new structures incorporated elements of the Raffles art-deco heritage style.

Following completion of the surrounding development it was clear that the opinions of some community members towards the new buildings had shifted.

The penthouse apartment achieved the then highest ever sale price in Perth, sold to the late car dealer Brian Gardner for $6.7 million. The remaining apartments had similar appeal, and the majority were sold prior to project completion. It is also notable that most purchasers were local to the Applecross/ City of Melville area, indicating significant latent local demand for high quality apartment lifestyle opportunities.

Today anecdotal evidence indicates that the Raffles is considered to be a local landmark and is generally accepted as a positive addition to the Canning Bridge area.

The Raffles Development has been described as a “shining example of what can be achieved with thought-provoking design” and has been recognised for being “constructed in such a way as to accentuate the sleekness of the building”.

In 2010 Raffles Waterfront was awarded in the Planning Institute of Australia’s inaugural Hard Won Victory award which “recognises the positive effect of hard-won victories by professional planners, citizen planners, or both working under difficult, challenging, or adverse conditions”.

Raffles Waterfront was awarded a Special Commendation in this category and was stated as being “well regarded by the judges as having benefited the greater community good with consolidation of an important Transit Oriented Development activity centre over a risk of local self-interest”.

---

42 Mr Chris Palandri, Regional Managing Director – Brookfield Multiplex, 2015, pers. comm, 28 April 2015.
43 City of Melville Mayor Russell Aubrey, 2015, pers. comm, 22 April 2015.
Today anecdotal evidence indicates that the Raffles is considered to be a local landmark...
The Raffles development has arguably set a precedent for the future development of the Canning Bridge Precinct. In March this year the City of Melville and City of South Perth adopted the latest Structure Plan for the Canning Bridge precinct. The Structure Plan and associated design guidelines for the area are the outcome of a long term collaborative planning project involving the Western Australian Planning Commission, the City of South Perth and the City of Melville.

The process included a detailed planning analysis of the Canning Bridge Precinct to determine a long term vision for the area, specifically as a Transit Oriented Development and a major activity centre. It also incorporated an extensive community consultation process, which included a community information day and hosting three and four community forums respectively.

The vision and proposed structure plan recognises the Canning Bridge area as providing significant opportunities for mixed use development incorporating residential, civic, office, retail and entertainment uses.

A number of locations have been identified for higher density development, with proposed building heights reaching a maximum of 20 storeys along Canning Highway up to its intersection with Sleat Road, then gradually decreasing from 10 storeys to a maximum of 5 storeys.

During the extensive Canning Bridge Precinct consultation process community members expressed a range of views regarding higher density development in the area.

The current Canning Bridge Structure Plan was advertised from the 28 October 2014 to 12 December 2014 and strong community support was shown throughout the advertising period. Forty-eight (48) submissions were received, 39 of which were in support; five were neutral; and three opposed.

This indicates a shift in attitude towards height in the Canning Bridge area in the decade since the Raffles development. Rather than oppose height per se, the primary concerns expressed to the City of Melville in regarding future development in the Canning Bridge Precinct related to ensuring appropriate design and local amenity and minimising potential negative impacts on the existing neighbourhoods.

Anecdotal evidence suggests that this shift has occurred as a result of increasing community understanding of the growth pressures faced by Perth and the need for Perth to incorporate infill and higher density development as part of delivering a more sustainable urban future. It is also evident that up front community education and engagement was an important component of increasing public acceptance of the need for higher density development within the traditionally low density location.

There is also evidence of significant unmet demand for higher density housing choices, particularly in Perth’s inner suburban locations.
For example, beyond Canning Bridge, other recent projects and research suggest that attitudes towards higher density development in some locations in metropolitan Perth may be starting to shift:

- Recent consultation regarding the proposed Scarborough Master Plan, which is proposed to incorporate high rise development of up to 18 storeys has not generated significant public opposition or controversy.
- The 2012 Committee for Perth, Perth Perceptions Survey 2012, which found that approximately 75% of respondents did not believe that ‘low density lifestyles’ were important for Perth’s future.
- The recently released ‘What Perth Wants’ report by the Property Council of Australia in collaboration with the Conservation Council of Western Australia (CCWA) and Psaros identified shifting attitudes towards density in Perth, especially when concentrated around transport hubs and inner city areas and found that 73% of people surveyed “do not believe that the benefits of a separate house and garden outweigh the benefits of inner city living”\(^\text{52}\).
- The 2013 ‘The Housing We’d Choose’ report commissioned by the Department of Housing and Department of Planning found that location was the most important factor when deciding housing choice and the most preferred location to live in the Perth region for all age groups was the ‘central sub-region’, making it important for Perth to be able to accommodate more people in these areas through increased density coupled with improved housing affordability\(^\text{53}\). It is noted, however that this report identified semi-detached dwellings as the type of higher density housing preferred by the majority of Perth residents.

However it remains clear that increasing residential densities within existing low density suburbs remains controversial, as evidenced through controversy associated with the proposed rezoning of Waratah Avenue in Dalkeith\(^\text{54}\) and, more recently, community opposition to proposals to enable infill development in some locations in the Town of Cambridge\(^\text{55}\). This highlights the need for strategic, regional, participatory approaches to identify locations suitable for infill development.

... there remains potential for future infill and higher density development projects to be delayed or derailed...
Conclusion

The Raffles Waterfront Development was clearly a highly contested and controversial project, which attracted significant community and stakeholder comment and opposition at the time, but today is generally considered to deliver positive outcomes.

The development approval process for the Raffles development was complex and involved multiple stakeholders, issues, and two approval agencies. The proposal also included the redevelopment of a heritage building, and was located adjacent to the Swan River, which heightened public and stakeholder concerns.

While it is likely that certain community concerns expressed during the approval process would remain the same if the development was proposed today, the delays caused by the requirement for approval by more than one agency would not, due to the subsequent introduction of Development Assessment Panels (DAPs) in Western Australia which consider applications of certain types and above certain value thresholds.

However this research also identified that the major community concern regarding Raffles was the proposed height of the building – and recent research suggests that as a result of subsequent growth and change in Perth; shifting regional planning policy; community consultation; and an improved understanding of the need for the Perth region to accommodate higher density housing options in strategic locations; community opinions towards higher density development in some locations such as Canning Bridge may be starting to change.

Yet many community members remain concerned about high density development in the region, particularly in traditional low density suburban locations. There is therefore a clear need for extensive, collaborative community consultation process, similar to that undertaken for the Canning Bridge Precinct, to be undertaken in strategic locations throughout the Perth region to identify the most appropriate locations and height limits for higher density infill development.

While some development projects will always be controversial, without clear regional and local strategic guidance, prepared through a rigorous, public process, there remains potential for future positive infill and higher density development projects to be delayed or derailed – reducing the capacity to deliver a more sustainable future for the Perth region.
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Finbar Group             Transfield Services (Australia) Pty Ltd
FJM Property             TRG Properties Pty Ltd
Gold Corporation          Urbis Pty Ltd
Hames Sharley            West Coast Eagles Football Club
HASSELL                  Western Australian Cricket Association
HopgoodGanim            Woods Bagot
WSP

Local Government Members

City of Armadale         City of Perth
City of Canning          City of Rockingham
City of Fremantle        City of South Perth
City of Gosnells         City of Subiaco
City of Melville         City of Wanneroo
Appendix 3: References


