



Focus Group Outcomes - “Residential, Rural Living & Rural Zone” Community Workshop: Local Planning Scheme No. 4 Thursday 31 July 2014

Focus Group Table 1

➤ Residential

- Needs to be a balance between small blocks and larger; need choices
- Need to consider access to transport re: zone blocks
- Need to consider sense of community re: high density housing
- Need improved pedestrian access/cycle ways
- Consideration of pedestrian flow in town centre
- No traffic lights – bright neon sign?
- Limitation on height to 3 storey in town precinct
- Cycle
- Granny flats – sewerage capacity
- Minimum block size 500m² to 1000m²?
- Dual use – two residences on one block
- What is granny flat? Who resides – alternative; sub tenancy?
- Parking requirements
- Rates applicable
- Is holiday use considered for granny flats?
- Concern re business use – relating to ‘noise imposition’, ‘smell’ on local residences
- Parking use impact?
- Hours of regulation?
- Live and work in designated commercial/industrial zone
- Want mix land use
- Light pollution in town – mindful of – light; how

➤ Rural Living

- Like that these areas are in a clustered area – creates community
- Like covenants imposed on blocks re vegetation
- Should be able to have self supporting – re: water increase 150,000L; re best practice for sewerage impact
- Aware of changing environment area
- Support consideration of increased rural zones around nodal settlement and between Denmark & Bow Bridge area; awareness these areas near coastal could have negative impact
- Reconsider multiple occupancy on 40ha sites
- Lobby for homestead lots subdivision
- Downside – lose prime agricultural land? Impact on vegetation; conflict holding – undertaking agricultural activities (baiting, spraying, vermin, gas guns)
- Better to consider cleared farm for blocks
- Land use: holiday use available; commercial use with restrictions – noise, traffic
- Tree changers unaware of land management requirements
- 2nd bridge location to be positioned further of town

➤ Rural

- Include homestead in rural farming (require Council lobby/ied)
- Aware agriculture land will change to intensive land use

- Aware of increased imposts on land users influencing viability of current and future use
- Support for nodal and co-operative like kinds of agricultural use – e.g. 10 x 100 hectare lot (encourages like industry areas – e.g. upper Scotsdale)
- We value current rural land; concerned about pressures on ability to sustain continued uses
- Re effects of increased population
- Concern sustaining land vegetation and biodiversity
- Allow dual use and diversification
- We local rural halls – provide community and connection for rural members

Focus Group Table 2

➤ Residential

- Issue – significant % of lot is taken up by building/house; less vegetation/trees; drainage; increasing heat → set plot ratio
- Keeping the land form (working with topography)
- Subdivision with only 1 way in! Concern in fire/flood
- Sustainability
- Price Street, Welsh Street & Federal Street with reduced front setback → surveillance, sense of community = same sense/character as Peaceful Bay
- Provide for mobility (ped, cycle, gophers) & connections
- Liveability
- Lack of high rise and ostentatious in town centre
- Some larger/functional POS must actually be provided when cash-in-lieu has been paid
- Like clusters (not ghettos)
- 2 or 3 storey development = okay
- Like upper storey with greater setback
- Solar access (to be protected/maintained)
- Like 'residential' in town centre

➤ Rural Living

- Creating and innovative transport solutions – electric, solar, wind
- Building in energy & water, drainage, sewerage to all new subdivision
- Design for ageing population with access to and for emergency services
- Shared/multi services
- Design to be responsive to local topography condition
- False assumption that higher land less productive needlessly eliminates land close to town
- Consider resubdivision of some rural living development blocks
- Have a variety of block sizes in subdivisions
- Affordable blocks could families subdivide
- Support business development/cottage industries on rural living development including bed & breakfast, farm stay etc
- Less rules

➤ Rural

- Land uses – feedlots, piggeries & dairies = okay subject to buffers
- Should have opportunity for subdivision of unproductive/non-viable rural lots – can't clear rest of bush so have decreased agricultural value
- Smaller acreage properties should be able to be provided
- Not enough lots available for horticulture (so they have to buy bigger lot)
- Homestead Lots:

- Yes – some consider should be allowed in Denmark
- Another possible option = strata/caveat so it reverts back to family/company; consider sunset clause (similar to retirement village)
- Opportunity to divide/split if there is a road through rural land
- What is the future for farming - is it viable? Dairy? Cattle? Aquaculture – marron; Asian markets
- Opportunity for horticulture – especially as access/transport in Denmark is better than Walpole
- Planning rules/LPS to remain flexible/open to changing agriculture/horticulture/new markets & produce
- Support farmers markets
- Need more flexibility within guidelines – too rigid!
- Min lot size for rural 2nd house; consider more if it can be justified
- Land that isn't priority ag should be able to be used for other activities – chalets
- Question the State's assumption that there is adequate supply of smaller lots for emerging agriculture especially given soils and water/rainfall in Denmark

Focus Group Table 3

➤ Residential

- Like confined residential area – don't want 'suburbs'/sprawl
- Like granny flats
- Rural character in look of houses
- Limit per area of holiday homes – management/control of compliance
- Maintain rural feel – hiding urban development; preserve karris; 'tuck away' high density in lower parts of land
- Water – pressure
- Clearing of land – rules need to be clearer; accept risks

➤ Rural Living

- Topography – work with it
- Roads – capacity of existing roads
- Present size good
- Don't shoot roos/roos per acre
- Setback for rural vista
- Loss of agricultural production – pest control (increase rules), weeds (increase rules), fire control
- Limit volume of land allocated
- Preservation of ridges and karri trees
- Use 'rubbish' land (i.e. in town/cleared)
- More setback before development
- More access to services for older people to make retirement in large lots sustainable
- No entry statements
- Limit % of holiday homes
- Like fire brigade community
- Telecommunication

➤ Rural

- Must be maintained – expand priority agriculture area
- Long growing season, grass fed brand/free range and industries around that; protest ...
- Glad that Shire approach to State Planning Commission failed otherwise more valuable farmland would have been split up into unproductive rural lifestyle

- Farms are valuable for production but not necessarily viable; this must be recognised
- Mix of farming through areas
- No expansion of special rural
- Subdivisions put price of land up – harder for farmers to expand
- Okay for farmstays
- Prefer granny flat rather than homestead i.e more than 2 houses
- Homestead lease arrangement from original title
- Maintain Ag School – it is the best entry statement a rural town could have – take the ‘flag’ off
- Maintain rural approaches

Focus Group Table 4

➤ Residential

- Costs too much to subdivide
- Discourage small lot sizes
- Clusters of higher density close to town (aged people)
- Preservation of vegetation in residential lots
- No high rise – no more than 2 storeys
- Not enough low cost housing
- Allow rental of granny flats
- Buildings to conform to general character of town

➤ Rural Living

- Maintain rural aspect on entry to town
- Don't mix lifestyle blocks with productive farmland blocks
- Allow bed & breakfasts & farmstays but limit size
- Some commercial landuses – retain amenity of area; no retail – traffic problems
- Design specifically a special rural subdivision with commercial landuses in mind
- Granny flats should be allowable on special rural blocks
- Encourage productive uses of lifestyle blocks

➤ Rural

- ‘Homestead’ provision essential
- Ageing farming population
- Stop further subdivision of rural land
- Government purchased land should not be included in valuations
- Rates of rural land need to be monitored; kept to a minimum
- Make it easier for building chalets and other accommodation (e.g. no bitumen roads contributions; less red tape)
- Diversification – encouraging young people to farm; “first farm owners”

Focus Group Table 5

➤ Residential

- Like character – welcoming
- Like to – futuristic planning policy
- Like to keep character of older architecture
- High density development within Denmark CBD – mixed development
- Diversity of housing
- Multi purpose living accommodation
- Should be height restrictions
- Shouldn't be restrictions on height
- Appropriate use of land in residential areas

- Growing ad-hoc; no control
 - Low income housing
 - Ad-hoc planning
 - Residential areas – mixed density housing
 - Eco design
 - Sensitive housing design
- Rural Living
- 10m setback not unreasonable on 10,000m² block
 - Appropriate for inclusion of holiday homes
 - Special Rural – allows horses, chooks? Roosters, 2 pigs
 - Developers should provide sealed roads
 - Like the diversity of rural lots – variety & form
 - Fencing is necessary if critters are involved
 - Numerous granny flats should be allowed – without imposing on neighbours (NB: some dissension on this topic)
 - Rates? Should they be higher because of higher maintenance due to distance for rubbish collection, road maintenance etc? Yes probably, but work out a suitable formula
 - Should the Shire review some of the 360 rural lots for further sub-development? It is not fair to change the rules in view of present owners; community should have the right to apply to change the rule
 - B&B's, home occupation business; holiday homes (addressed earlier) – yes for professions or some trades; land use must acknowledge sensitivity of the community
- Rural
- Future: agriculture is minimal; “Farmers are earning their living off farm
 - Should we keep agricultural land for agriculture? 1 – no; 2 – no opinion; 3 – yes; good land is limited – good water, good soil, good climate
 - Appropriate land use
 - ? Tree Farms: no – a whole shire has paid dearly for approving tree farms
 - Tourist development should be allowed on unproductive land. How then does the farmer cope with spray drift etc? Farmers must be free to farm productively.
 - Homestead lots – does this affect the value of rural land? Homestead lots should be allowed.
 - Minimum lot size?
 - Yes – 100 acre; 40 hectares depending on viability
 - No – small lots are unsaleable
 - How many houses? Retain 2 houses per lot – yes
 - Is subdivision allowed each block to have 10-15% of bushland ; if not to be planted.

Focus Group Table 6

- Residential
- Like cycleways and footpaths connecting residential living as alternative to cars
 - Like residential to be more compact; less sprawl
 - Higher R-Code for inner town lots i.e. unit development
 - Don't like very small strata lots
 - Support development of granny flats – residential/rural or rural living
 - Support existing height restrictions

- Consideration of home occupation only to uses with low impact on the amenity of adjoining properties and neighbourhood
- Better fire protection

➤ Rural Living

- Homestead lots are logical; intergenerational living
- Preserve viable rural land
- Cluster housing on rural land – under 1 title; multiple occupancy; survey strata maintains block size for future agriculture
- Adequate setbacks to maintain rural feel
- Screening
- Greater environmental protection
- Need to keep land valuable, sought after
- One title or strata
- Special rural is in demand; 1-2 ha lots
- Special rural is not viable?
- Protection of watercourses
- Maintain dam restriction
- Yes to B&B's and commercial on special rural

➤ Rural

- Future vision – mixed horticulture; viticulture; diverse farming practice. Present farming – cattle etc. farming invaluable; tourism; diversity. Combined/contiguous rates for the whole farming entity.
- Appropriate - ecological farming; inappropriate – intensive farming re: piggeries, poultry
- Homestead lots – yes; VIP
- Minimum lot size policy is adequate
- Should additional dwelling on rural zoned be restricted in occupancy – should not be restricted on large farms (number of houses).
- Other ideas - extent of tourist development; yes but multiple dwellings rated accordingly.

Focus Group Table 7

➤ Residential

- Size of blocks
- Are blocks too small?
- Too much development on blocks?
- Green belt?
- High density where it will work
- Pedestrian access to town – cycle/foot/gopher
- Small granny flats % of existing dwelling
- Peace and quiet
- Country spirit
- Public open space – green virgin bush
- Residential impact on commercial activities
- Community spirit
- Height?

➤ Rural Living

- Other options to rural subdivision i.e. rural strata; multiple occupancy on rural land

- Dislike unmanaged small holdings resulting in weed control issue and loss of productive land
 - Fire management is an issue – current rules are confusing; parkland clearing
 - No subdivision on forested land
 - Limit lot size of lifestyle block
 - Agree to holiday homes on lifestyle blocks
 - Nodes of rural subdivision development
 - Try to create a sense of community in the nodes
 - Potential for services – i.e. shops in rural nodes
 - Businesses/large sheds should be allowed?
- Rural
- More accurate mapping of priority agricultural land
 - Subdivision of rural living will impact on rural land
 - Viability of rural land – is it economically viable
 - Assistance for rural landholders
 - Branding and promotion of local produce
 - Encourage Denmark markets – regional only produce
 - Biodynamic/organic zoning for local produce; local code of conduct
 - Green and clean image to be promoted
 - More knowledge within shire of how/what to farm
 - Subdivision of rural land – disagreement/boundary realignment
 - Agree to allow dwellings for seasonal workers
 - Farmstays okay; chalets okay – potential income source

Notes:

- *The above points are verbatim as written on the night by each Focus Group.*
- *They are a collation of everyone's ideas/comments from the Focus Group Tables – noting that the notes may not be reflective of the agreed position of that Focus Group Table for the workshops were not a forum for debate as such; aim was to capture everyone's ideas on the topics.*