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1. INTRODUCTION

The City of Fremantle is in the process of developing a Strategy for the provision of diverse housing, titled “The Freo Alternative – Big Thinking about Small Housing.” Opportunities to create and provide for diverse housing in the City’s Local Planning Scheme are currently being explored in partnership with the Australian Urban Design and Research Centre (AUDRC).

The City is seeking collaboration, input and buy-in from the local community and stakeholders into the development of the Strategy.

City of Fremantle recognises that the housing needs of the community is expected to undergo much change over the coming decades, and wants to ensure that planning for the future address this.

Community Engagement

The City of Fremantle have engaged Creating Communities to advise their engagement process. This engagement process has included online engagement and collection of stories from the community; a survey; meetings with key stakeholders; a Dialogue Café, and will conclude with Focus Groups and an interactive Open Day.

Dialogue Café

On Thursday 8 October 2016 the City of Fremantle hosted a community workshop in the style of a Dialogue Café to discussion the future of the City of Fremantle, challenges, opportunities and priorities in the provision of diverse housing to cater for an evolving and growing population in the City in the coming decades.

This report presents the findings from the Dialogue Café, which will be used to help inform the development of the Strategy. This is an interim report which will form part of a final report on all engagement activities for The Freo Alternative.
2. METHODOLOGY

The Dialogue Café on Thursday 8 October 2016 that sought feedback from community members on the provision of diverse housing in the City of Fremantle. The session ran from 6.30pm to 9pm and was facilitated by Allan Tranter, Creating Communities.

Overall, 71 community members attended the dialogue cafe. City of Fremantle elected members (Councillors and Mayor) and City of Fremantle staff were also in attendance.

The Dialogue Café included a presentation on the history of housing diversity (or, more recently, lack thereof) in the City of Fremantle and a segment on the stories received from community members during an earlier phase of the engagement process.

Participants completed three key activities to obtain feedback, structured around a “Menu of Conversation” which was aligned with the courses of a meal.

**Group Activities**

In 13 groups of 5-10 people, participants completed three group activities, which were then discussed with the wider group.

**Activity 1 – The Future of Your Community**

In the *Future of Your Community* activity, participants worked in groups to respond to the questions:

1. *What will our community and the families/households who live there be like in 20 years’ time?*
2. *What are the implications for the provision of housing for future generations?*

**Activity 2 - Guiding Values – Reflection and Validation**

In the *Guiding Values – Reflection and Validation* activity, participants worked in groups to respond to the questions:

1. *What values do you agree with - and why? [of the following]*
   - Safe streets
   - Walkability
   - Street Trees
   - Greenspace and Nature
   - Private Gardens
   - Adequate Parking
   - Open Character
   - Streetscape
   - Local Food Production
   - Trees and Shade
   - Ownership

2. *What improvements or additions could we make to ensure the values provide a sound basis for future planning for diverse housing choices?*
3. *Are the any other general comments that you would like to make about the draft values?*
Activity 3 – Benefits, Opportunities, Challenges and Priorities

In the **Benefits, Opportunities, Challenges and Priorities** activity, participants worked in groups to respond to the questions:

1. **What might the benefits be of providing more diverse housing options in suburban areas in the City of Fremantle?**
2. **What are the key opportunities that should be considered as part any future planning for the provision of small housing options?**
3. **What might the challenges be that will need to be addressed in any planning for small housing options in the City of Fremantle?**
4. **Now that you have heard all the discussion, list the top five (5) priorities that the Freo Alternative Project should seek to address.**

Activity 4 (Optional) - Individual Feedback

At the conclusion of the presentation, participants were provided with an opportunity to give **individual feedback** using a feedback sheet. This included four questions: ideas regarding the provision of future housing; opportunities; challenges; and general comments.
3. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

3.1. Activity 1 – Future of our Community

Participants were asked to consider the future of their community and record their responses to the following two questions as a group:

- What will our community and the families/households who live there be like in 20 years’ time?
- What are the implications for the provision of housing for future generations?

3.1.1. What will our community and the families/households who live there be like in 20 years’ time?

This list below shows the most commonly stated themes of response and the specific responses which relate to that theme. The number in brackets shows how many times a similar response was stated. For the full list of responses see Section 4.1.1.

The most common specific responses for what the community will look like in twenty years overall are:

- Intergenerational living to form support networks (8)
- Communal/shared housing (8)
- Ageing (7)
- Fewer children / smaller families (4)
- Fragmentation and lack of connection (3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Specific Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Trend towards shared and/or intergenerational living (18) | Intergenerational living to form support networks (8)  
|                                            | Communal/shared housing (8)                                                        |
|                                            | Sharing of resources, knowledge etc. (2)                                           |
| Demographic change (18)                    | Ageing (7)                                                                         |
|                                            | Fewer children / smaller families (4)                                              |
|                                            | Multiculturalism (2)                                                               |
|                                            | More single occupants (2)                                                          |
|                                            | Diversity in race, income, sexuality etc. (2)                                      |
|                                            | Closer family units (1)                                                            |
| Negative social impacts (9)                | Fragmentation and lack of connection (3)                                           |
|                                            | Increasing income polarity / gentrification (2)                                    |
|                                            | Economic and employment issues (1)                                                 |
|                                            | Crime and safety concerns (1)                                                      |
|                                            | Cost for younger generation (1)                                                    |
|                                            | Need for medical health facilities (1)                                             |
| Vibrant and connected neighbourhoods (8)   | More interaction (2)                                                               |
|                                            | Better usage of community facilities and amenity including schools, playgrounds etc. (2) |
|                                            | Designs which enable connection (2)                                                |
|                                            | Balance of private and public space (2)                                            |
| Sustainability as a key concern (6)        | Renewable energy use (2)                                                           |
3.1.2. What are the implications for the provision of housing for future generations?

This list below shows the most commonly stated themes of response and the specific responses which relate to that theme. The number in brackets shows how many times a similar response was stated. For the full list of responses see Section 4.1.2.

The most common specific responses related to implication for future housing are:

- Shared and/or connected community spaces (5)
- Modular houses / movable internal walls (5)
- Tiny / mobile houses (5)
- Long-term (e.g. 20 year) leases (3)
- Co-operative housing (3)
- Car/transport sharing (3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Specific Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Changes in land tenure models (13)</td>
<td>- Long-term (e.g. 20 year) leases (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Co-operative housing (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Security of tenure (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Building code changes to allow tiny houses (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- More than two options - a) Own b) Rent (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Adoptive housing (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Air B’n’B (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Less investment in properties and re-selling (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More modular/flexible/mobile housing (11)</td>
<td>- Modular houses / movable internal walls (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Tiny / mobile houses (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Use roof spaces: roof balconies, roof gardens (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More shared community spaces (9)</td>
<td>- Shared and/or connected community spaces (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- “Semi-private space” (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Useful outdoor space – benches, ping-pong tables etc. (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Micro-communities with: centre, kitchens, co-working spaces, studios, edible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gardens, activated verges, bushfoods (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Greater community usage of schools eg. Libraries, drama centres, parks etc. (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in type/quality of built form (8)</td>
<td>- Consider house entrances via gardens rather than carports (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Retain high ceilings, position windows etc. oriented towards the North, ensure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>access for sea breezes (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Human-centred design (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Break our love of bricks (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Must be two-storey on small blocks (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3.2. Activity 2 - Guiding Values: Reflection and Validation

#### 3.2.1. What values do you agree with – and why?

The list below show project values in order of number of times participants stated that they agreed with that value. The number in brackets shows the number times that value was explicitly agreed with.

See Section 4.2.1 for a full list of additional values suggested by participants and comments explaining the reasons behind agreement with each value.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Draft Values provided by the Project Team</th>
<th>Values Suggested by Participants</th>
<th>Values NOT Agreed with (3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Greenspace and Nature (12)</td>
<td>• Community/social interaction (6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Safe streets (12)</td>
<td>• Creativity/Innovation (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Walkability (11).</td>
<td>• Sustainability (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Local Food Production (10)</td>
<td>• Alternative Tenure Models (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Streetscape (9)</td>
<td>• Public open space (2).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Street Trees (9)</td>
<td>• Identity and authenticity (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Trees and Shade (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Ownership (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Private Gardens (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Adequate Parking (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Open Character (4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Three groups indicated that they did not agree that adequate parking should be a project value.
3.2.2. What improvements or additions could we make to ensure the values provide a sound basis for future planning for diverse housing choices?

This list below shows the themes of answers to this question in order of frequency. The number in brackets shows the number of different responses related to this theme. For the full list of responses see Section 4.2.2.

- More communal/shared spaces and facilities (11)
- Encourage different Tenure Models (9)
- More trees (6)
- Increased community power and less developer power in planning and development control (6)
- Improve sustainability/self-sustainability (6)
- Safer Streets (5)
- Increase Equity and Accessibility (5)
- Protect/provide green space (4)
- Parking and parking’s relationship with transport (4)
- Promote walkability (4)
- Design methods to encourage open character (4)
- More local food production (3)
- More community gardens (2)

3.2.3. Are there any other general comments you would like to make about the draft values?

- Focus on Sustainability (8)
- Ensure a connection to nature (6)
- Encourage housing choice and diversity (6)
- Parking and traffic concerns (4)
- Recognition of importance of Council policies and laws (5)
- Development needs to benefit the community (4)
- Ensure heritage Retention (3)
- More co-operative housing (3)
- Consider benefits versus limitations of open character (3)
- Limitations caused by costs and externalities (2)
- Encourage community involvement and engagement (2)
3.3. Activity 3 - Benefits, Opportunities, Challenges and Priorities

Participants worked in groups to respond to the questions:

1. What might the benefits be of providing more diverse housing options in suburban areas in the City of Fremantle?
2. What are the key opportunities that should be considered as part any future planning for the provision of small housing options?
3. What might the challenges be that will need to be addressed in any planning for small housing options in the City of Fremantle?
4. Now that you have heard all the discussion, list the top five (5) priorities that the Freo Alternative Project should seek to address.

3.3.1. Benefits

This list below shows the most commonly stated themes of response and the specific responses which relate to that theme. The number in brackets shows how many times a similar response was stated. For the full list of responses see Section 4.3.1.

The most common specific benefits stated are:

- Connected communities (7)
- Services that meet the needs of a diverse community (6)
- Able to afford a home in Freo (4)
- Happiness (4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Specific Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Emotional and community health benefits (18) | • Connected communities (7)  
• Happiness (4)  
• Greater tolerance/inclusivity (3)  
• Diversity of cultures (3)  
• Better mental health for individuals (1) |
| More diverse/accessible services (9) | • Services that meet the needs of a diverse community (6)  
• Less maintenance time (1)  
• Access to transport (1)  
• Better access for the disabled (1) |
| Vibrant/thriving/expressive Freo (8) | • Freedom to express, youth empowerment (2)  
• Return of vibrancy in Freo (2)  
• More socialising in the street (2)  
• More arts and culture (1)  
• Every ecosystem needs diversity to thrive and be synergetic (1) |
| A diverse population (6)             | • Creates/maintains diversity of: age; income; family structure; ethnicity etc. (3)  
• Creative and interesting people (1)  
• Innovative; respectful; suitable living conditions for Indigenous perspectives (1)  
• Encourages large households – not necessarily large houses (1) |
| Access to/Affordability of Housing (6) | • Able to afford a home in Freo (4) |
3.3.2. Opportunities

This list below shows the most commonly stated themes of response and the specific responses which relate to that theme. The number in brackets shows how many times a similar response was stated. For the full list of responses see Section 4.3.1.

The most common specific opportunities stated are:

- Innovation/entrepreneurship (2)
- Attract interesting architecture eg. design charrette (2)
- Policy/laws to provide for diverse housing (2)
- Taking advantage of consolidated blocks for innovative community housing projects (2)
- Council owned land (2)
- Less industry, more housing eg. the Harbour (2)
- Incentives for sustainable/innovative projects (2)
- Different ways to create small blocks (besides battle-axe) (2)
- Community/self-building (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Specific Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning to support diverse housing (8)</td>
<td>Policy/laws to provide for diverse housing (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Well thought out structure plan (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New ownership models for low-income earners and singles/small households (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experiment with a “special economic zone” of no planning rules (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunities to build alternative small housing to strata communities (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-governance of sub-communities (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Streamlined planning departments (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential Land Available (8)</td>
<td>Taking advantage of consolidated blocks for innovative community housing projects (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council owned land (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less industry, more housing eg. the Harbour (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lots of land in Freo owned by other government departments for innovative sustainable development (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integration with Rottnest/water (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentivise sustainable/small housing (7)</td>
<td>Incentives for sustainable/innovative projects (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Different ways to create small blocks (besides battle-axe) (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Make it easier for Tiny Houses to be legally accommodated (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Allow building material re-use and move to lighter building materials (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Embedding sustainability into the planning strategy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.3.3. Challenges

This list below shows the most commonly stated themes of response and the specific responses which relate to that theme. The number in brackets shows how many times a similar response was stated. For the full list of responses see Section 4.3.3.

The most common specific challenges stated are:

- Change to behaviour of building industry and developers eg. incentives (5)
- Ingrained narrative and story (4)
- Segregation/conflict between groups (4)
- Diverse community expectations (3)
- Changing policy and laws/by-laws (3)
- Existing policy and laws/by-laws (3)
- Maintaining green space and trees (3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Specific Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Changing Existing Approaches to Development</td>
<td>Change to behaviour of building industry and developers eg. incentives (5) Good design (2) Sustainable/efficient design (2) More small houses/less large houses (2) Ensuring that development encourages beneficial trade-offs for the local community eg. A large development might vest some land for a community garden (1) Ensuring that values drive development (1) Architecture-led development (1) Avoid mass demolition by developers (1) Reducing the power/influence of developers (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing ingrained attitudes and expectations</td>
<td>Ingrained narrative and story (4) Diverse community expectations (3) Understanding that risk is good. Early 20s cost of living has made us risk-averse and greedy (2) Respecting non-financial values (2) Fear of change (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Involving community members in design/development (6)
- Community/self-building (2)
- Specific development sites for co-ops (1)
- Community agreement (1)
- Create formal engagement processes (1)
- Forming smaller action groups and sub-communities (1)

Opportunities for interesting design and architecture (6)
- Innovation/entrepreneurship (2)
- Attract interesting architecture eg. design charrette (2)
- Mix of grouped and standalone layouts (1)
- Challenge norms eg. Combine norms – allow washing machines in kitchens! (1)
| Planning Laws/Policies (11)                                      | • Changing policy and laws/by-laws (3)  
|                                                             | • Existing policy and laws/by-laws (3)  
|                                                             | • Move from rule-based to performance criteria-based approach (2)  
|                                                             | • Unclear how diversity could work if zoning rules etc. remain so prescriptive (1)  
|                                                             | • Political issues (1)  
|                                                             | • Restrictive building code (1)  
| Retaining what is liked (9)                                  | • Maintaining green space and trees (3)  
|                                                             | • Maintaining architectural styles (1)  
|                                                             | • Amenity loss (1)  
|                                                             | • Streetscape loss (1)  
|                                                             | • Maintaining diversity and vibrancy (1)  
|                                                             | • Balance of private and open space (1)  
|                                                             | • Where do the children go (and play)? (1)  
| Negative social impacts/attitudes (6)                        | • Segregation/conflict between groups (4)  
|                                                             | • Social dynamics of community (1)  
|                                                             | • Fremantle “too hip for own good” (1)  
| Parking and Transport Impacts (6)                             | • Parking (2)  
|                                                             | • Vehicle and transport types (2)  
|                                                             | • Transport infrastructure to accommodate population (2)  |
3.3.4. Priorities

Participants were asked to list their top five (5) priorities that the Freo Alternative Project should seek to address. Priorities from the thirteen tables have been tabulated below and ranked based upon the following system:

- Priorities are categorised by theme
- Themed priorities are ranked depending on how often the theme was mentioned. Higher priorities were given higher weights as follows:
  - Number one priorities are given a score of 5, number two priorities are given a score of 4, number three priorities are given a score of 3, number four priorities are given a score of 2 and number five priorities are given a score of 1.

The top 13 priorities are shown below. For the full list of responses see Section 4.3.4.

1. Sustainability (23)
2. Affordability and access to housing (19)
3. The “Freo” Identity (14)
4. Smaller houses (14)
5. Sharing of spaces, resources and facilities (13)
6. Implementation of City of Fremantle planning policies/laws (13)
7. Housing options for all demographics (13)
8. Trees and green space (12)
9. Parking and traffic management (8)
10. Innovative and creative thinking (8)
11. Cooperative housing options (6)
12. Values-driven planning (5)
13. Community involvement in planning (5)
4. DETAILED FINDINGS

This section lists all feedback from the Dialogue Café transcribed directly from the feedback sheets.

Figure 1. Most Common Themes. This Word Cloud shows the most commonly used words (with size corresponding to frequency) across all of the feedback sheets for all activities in the Dialogue Café.
4.1. Activity 1 - Future of our Community

4.1.1. What will our community and the families/households who live there be like in 20 years’ time?

This list below shows the answers to this question in order of how often the theme (in bold) was mentioned. The number in brackets shows the number of different responses related to this theme.

- **Trend towards shared and/or intergenerational living (18)**
  - Intergenerational living forming support networks
  - Communal/co-housing.
  - Shared living/accommodation.
  - Older people/generations sharing.
  - Sharing of households, resources, knowledge.
  - Older and younger living together.
  - Intergenerational living.
  - Would like to see cross-generational living.
  - More age diversity/inter-generational living.
  - Multi-generational.
  - Communal living/co-housing.
  - More age diversity/inter-generational living.
  - Inter-racial/greater social diversity/refugees.
  - Shared houses will continue to be sought after – we need to seek the community.
  - Housing co-ops influence.
  - Single-occupant and connected to other households.
  - Increased community living.
  - Whole living communities participating in local initiatives – social/practical/economic.

- **Demographic change (18)**
  - Ageing population.
  - More pets, less kids.
  - Fewer children per household.
  - Differing family patterns because of multi-culturalism.
  - Larger number of single and older people.
  - An aged population – demand for smaller and suitable housing for this age group.
  - Ageing population – greater support.
  - Need to be providing for older communities.
  - “More like Europe” – multicultural.
  - Can be diverse (population/race/income/sexuality.)
  - Smaller families.
  - Diversity.
  - People living by themselves.
  - Would like to see closer family units.
  - A moving bell curve showing the distribution of ages of population in Fremantle.
  - People living longer – new household combinations with 1/2/3/4 generations.
  - Number/ratio children per household decreasing.
  - Families smaller than now.

- **Negative social impacts (9)**
  - Where it’s heading: Less diversity due to economics of gentrification.
  - Increasing income polarity.
- Increased social problems – loss of our humanity, economic pressures, and employment issues.
- More single parent families – less connected to neighbours – feel less safe.
- Families fragmented geographically due to globalisations.
- Social issues – crime and safety.
- Younger generation cost.
- Suburban areas – longing to connect and be connected in neighbourhood.
- Need for medical health centres etc. and services localised and providing for a diverse range of ages and needs.

**Vibrant and connected neighbourhoods (8)**
- Vibrancy.
- People on the street.
- More face-to-face interaction – or less green space and character? In which direction will we move? Better usage of educational facilities, particularly schools – changing start times.
- Would like more connected neighbourhood (by IT and by personal connection.)
- Forms that connect and privacy with a little positive friction.
- Designed to enable connection.
- Shared amenity/food production/play areas.
- Own space and shared community space.

**Sustainability (6)**
- Small clusters of small, connected, solar-powered houses off the grid.
- Hoping to see trends increasing in sustainable, self-sufficient, off-grid housing.
- Would like to see more sustainable intelligent communities, however, more likely to see more affluent and pompous housing.
- Solar energy and better usage of natural resources – ie. The sun off roofs, streets – these resources should be better managed.
- Beginnings of ecological corridors.
- Renewables.

**Changes in transport / transport technology (5)**
- Transport innovations such as autonomous cars/bikes/electric/peak oil/car share may change house design and the way we live.
- Would like to see improved accessibility to transport – public and private.
- Would like to see reduced reliance on cars OR the car being the main dominating focus of the design.
- Transport – public and private.
- Far fewer cars on the road, more community transport and newer versions of transport.

**More small households and houses (5)**
- Looks like more small households in the future – need to keep our greenery.
- Smaller, single houses, more conscious and sustainable.
- Smaller still.
- Would like to see a vibrant community in smaller houses.
- Greater connectivity but smaller households, the basic and recreational services.

**Modular/versatile housing (5)**
- Modular and adaptable – changes as you need change.
- Individual and community space – “I choose which I want when.”
- Shorter relationships – more flexible size.
- Flexible designs so that houses can be divided or buildings used by different people in different ways.
- Container houses will be more popular.
• **Availability of new technologies (4)**
  - New technology in sound-proofing.
  - Technological innovations ie. Robot gardeners, robot washrooms.
  - Would like to see plug and play infrastructure: electric cars, bikes, “toys.”
  - Integrated technology – does it free people up?

• **Loss vs. retention of open/green space (4)**
  - In danger of losing green spaces – need to keep them eg. King’s Square.
  - Public open space – need lots of it.
  - Community parks and gardens – less concrete areas.
  - Need greenery for both oxygen and our mental health.

• **Urban form and planning changes (4)**
  - Good grain.
  - Changing expectations of planning requirements and planning codes to up creativity.
  - The scale of suburban development will be significant.
  - Would like to see better quality of less.

• **Building engineering (3)**
  - Manage sounds between small houses.
  - Building engineering standards.
  - More efficient buildings.

• **Changes in density (3)**
  - More two-storey houses – more effective? Or domino effect?
  - Not too many high-rise apartments as it is harder for people to meet and make friends.
  - Possibly see narrowed, dense apartments – do it all alone.

• **Changes in the nature of work (3)**
  - More people working from home.
  - Flexible work arrangements.
  - Busy lifestyle – working longer hours.

• **Local food production (3)**
  - Community gardens – connection, food security, community kitchen
  - Community gardens
  - Vege gardens valuable

• **Communal uses of possessions and resources (2)**
  - Sharing of vehicles and appliances.
  - Would like to see more shared resources, not necessary to own everything eg. laundries, however, more likely to be homogenous and following trend.

• **More renting and less ownership (2)**
  - More persons renting.
  - Not striving that “more is more” – back to older ways, enjoy “simple things,” “opting out,” “downsizing.”
4.1.2. What are the implications for the provision of housing for future generations?

This list below shows the answers to this question in order of how often the theme (in bold) was mentioned. The number in brackets shows the number of different responses related to this theme.

- **Changes in land tenure models (13)**
  - Land tenure structure? Liberation of planning policies and regulations. Building code changes to allow tiny houses.
  - Need security of tenure – especially lower income and rentals.
  - More than two options - a) Own b) Rent.
  - Different ownership models – lease long term.
  - Type of ownership ie. Communities, shares, co-ops.
  - Tenure models (own/rent/10 year plan).
  - More care-co-ops.
  - Adoptive housing.
  - Rentals ie. Air B’n’B.
  - Implications – flexible finance and ownership.
  - Easier long term (eg. 15 years) leases.
  - Break myths of re-selling and wanting people to buy.

- **More modular/flexible/mobile housing (11)**
  - More mobile housing – take your home with you eg. Tiny house.
  - Options and flexibility.
  - Where to keep many tiny houses? Provision of infrastructure. Tiny house “rack n stack.”
  - Different funding models for modular homes.
  - Tiny houses and transportables on leases corridor land.
  - If “Tiny Houses” then communal common areas.
  - More flexible housing.
  - Move internal walls.
  - Change space.
  - Roof spaces used – roof balconies, roof gardens.
  - Build big dwellings with construction/plumbing in-situ to change footprint configuration eg. To duplex.

- **More shared community spaces (9)**
  - Offering “semi-private space” to invite community interaction, walkable community.
  - Shared community space.
  - Connected communal spaces.
  - Shared spaces between houses.
  - Shared communal spaces – “courtyard design”/shared back gardens – no personal backyard.
  - Usefulness of outdoor space – benches, ping-pong tables.
  - Hubs.
  - Greater community usage of schools eg. Libraries, drama centres, parks etc.

- **Changes in type/quality of built form (8)**
  - Consider house entrances via gardens rather than carports.
  - Retain high ceilings, position windows etc. oriented towards the North, ensure access for sea breezes.
  - Human-centred design.
• Break our love of bricks.
• Must be two-storey on small blocks.
• Lack of design consistency.
• Expertise in compact designs: architects, horticulturalists, community building.
• Variety of different houses.

• Encourage walking / public transport and discourage car use (7)
  • Plan both homes and neighbourhoods to enhance walking/cycling/prams/wheelchairs – adaptable houses
  • Planning for good grains.
  • Traffic flow.
  • Shared transport.
  • Car sharing.
  • Integrated transport systems.
  • Will driverless cars and technology mean shared locality cars? eg. One carport per three houses.

• Changes in household structures/behaviours (6)
  • Single people remaining in large premises.
  • People will be more settled or more transient.
  • Mix up aged: “in Homeswest Joe Sleeman Ct South Fremantle I was the only person in 16 units who could change a lightbulb – everyone else was too elderly.”
  • Family generations remaining in property.
  • Village modelling (intergenerational).
  • Ageing in place – renovate internally to suit ongoing family structures.

• Provision of parking (5)
  • Public parking provided – underground for residents.
  • Put carparks under new houses – hide them.
  • Don’t park at houses – no garages. Put parking in different areas – incentivise this.
  • Less parking: shared transport, official transport, improved sustainable public transport, teleportation device.
  • Parking.

• Creative changes in planning policies (5)
  • Creative planning policies: culture, education, coordinated building methods.
  • Policy and systems work to house all people.
  • Building code for trees.
  • Building by-laws need to be changed ie. Car bays that take away verge garden space.
  • Developers take advantage of static Council policies.

• Impacts of densification (5)
  • Need to ensure current homes don’t lose their access to light etc. (eg. If a 3 store townhouse is built behind yours.)
  • Loss of area through density (reduced green cover).
  • Services/utilities overload.
  • There is a limit to the amount of people – not unrestricted growth.
  • Balance the amenity versus development.

• Retention/provision of nature and green space (5)
  • People still want a place in nature – green space, community gardens.
  • Healthy wild areas.
  • Green space.
  • Green.
  • Larger properties = smaller dwellings and more spaces.
• Negative social impacts (3)
  o Disaffected youth, homelessness.
  o How to design-out poverty and disadvantage?
  o Mental health issues.

• Accessibility (3)
  o Universal access.
  o Less fences.
  o Integrated, accessible childcare.

• Changes in the nature of work (2)
  o More people working from “home” – liberation from the workplace due to technology.
  o Is it the end of full-time work?

• Facilities for changing demographics (2)
  o Need to build in facilities for the elderly etc. ie. Wide, safe paths, wider doorways etc.
  o More accessible homes for ageing population – less garden maintenance and careful design.

• Affordability and availability (2)
  o Make it affordable and available.
  o Affordability.

• Demographic Changes (2)
  o Higher income demographic will take over areas with better amenities and transport.
  o Diversity of communities.

• Systems thinking / “Bigger picture thinking” (2)
  o What supports humans and planet to thrive?
  o Systems thinking needed.

• A need for a sense of community (2)
  o Needs strong sense of community in innovation.
  o Safety – trust in community.

• Smaller houses (2)
  o Smaller homes.
  o Smaller housing could cause ghettos.

• A focus on sustainability/self-sustainability (2)
  o Sustainability will become a major focus.
  o Off-grid viable in suburbs – legislatively allowable?

4.2. Activity 2 - Guiding Values: Reflection and Validation

4.2.1. What values do you agree with – and why?

The number in brackets beside the value indicates the number of times that value was explicitly agreed with. The points below the theme are comments indicating why that value is agreed with.

Listed Values

• Greenspace and Nature (12)
  o Green space for community interaction.
  o Wellbeing – emotional and mental; ecological diversity and responsibility; animals; play; safety.
  o Design of green space important to foster good community interaction (not just public open space). Include nature play and water play.
  o Greenspace for mental health and connection to nature.
Ownership of verges: green space.
Greenspace and nature = quality of life.

- **Safe streets (12)**
  - Safe streets most important.
  - Connection between neighbours; redesigning streets to be people-focused; walking; cycling; playing; move beyond car dependency; holistic healing facilities.
  - Community interaction; meeting places.
  - They are safe if there are people on them.
  - Community friendly.
  - Safe play; less crime.
  - Safety: safe to walk at night.

- **Walkability (11)**
  - Reduce car dominance of landscape.
  - Community; safe streets; belonging.
  - Ability/opportunity to connect/meet within the community.
  - Exercise; engage with neighbours; makes streets safer.
  - Walkability good as a way of fostering community interactions.

- **Local Food Production (10)**
  - “Giving money to the right people”; reduced food miles; enjoying fresh food from garden.
  - Environmental benefits, reduced transport, reduced underemployment.

- **Streetscape (9)**
  - Streetscape – consistency but not bland.

- **Street Trees (9)**
  - No lawn, native gardens, fruit/nuts on verge.
  - We need a diversity of trees including fruit trees, trees for biodiversity, trees for shade (improves walkability, negates urban heat effect).

- **Trees and Shade (7)**

- **Ownership (6)**
  - Equity; stability; choice; re-define our cultural idea of ownership; maybe “lease.”
  - Security of tenure; not necessarily traditional ownerships.
  - Options to buy or rent.

- **Private Gardens (6)**
  - Private gardens OK incl. veges. Discourage private lawn. Use local park, community gardens etc.

- **Adequate Parking (5)**

- **Open Character (4)**
  - Open character – not a feeling of a “locked fortress.”

**Values Suggested by Participants**

- **Community/social interaction (6)**
  - Social Connection and activation.
  - Community interaction.
  - Consultation
  - Crowd fund/investment – eg. fundraise.com
  - Make tourists feel welcome – especially cruise ships.
  - Empathetic, social.
  - Friendliness.

- **Creativity/Innovation (4)**
  - Creativity. (2)
Innovative and cutting edge.
Courageous and innovative.

- **Sustainability (3)**
  - 4 returns: environmental, social, $ to place, inspiration.
  - Living and building sustainably.
  - Let’s make these places good for people and the earth.

- **Alternative Tenure Models (3)**
  - Autonomous housing co-ops.
  - Security of tenure.
  - Alternative ownership models – for people on low income.

- **Public open space (2)**
  - Public open space.
  - Balance of public and private space.

- **Identity and authenticity (2)**
  - Authentic.
  - Identity (sense of place) and character (unique to Freo, not the character of elsewhere).

- **Integrated health and social outcomes (1)**
- **Liveability (1)**
- **Accessibility (1)**
- **Texture and grained (1)**
- **Human scale (1)**
- **Heritage protection (1)**
- **Amenity preserved (1)**
- **Cleanliness**: of streets and pavement – important; bins in public parks emptied regularly (1)
- **Growing soil** (improving it so more can grow) (1)
- **Sympathetic design** and materials with amenity of area (1)

**Other Comments (8)**

- **Agree with all (3)**
  - We agree with all because they are essential for healthy living for all of us.
- “Like Lakeway Development” Claremont.
- Only agrees with values that promote a sense of community.
- Values do cross-fertilise.
- COMBINE Green – streetscape provides food, trees and shade.
- Values should be different between public/community space and private dwellings.

**Values NOT Agreed with (3)**

- **Adequate parking (3)**
  - Adequate parking will not be required as autonomous cars arrive.
  - Parking is given too much priority.
  - NOT Adequate parking.
4.2.2. What improvements or additions could we make to ensure the values provide a sound basis for future planning for diverse housing choices?

This list below shows the answers to this question in order of how often the theme (in bold) was mentioned. The number in brackets shows the number of different responses related to this theme.

- **More communal/shared spaces and facilities (11)**
  - Communal facilities.
  - Emphasis on communal development/living.
  - Shared space.
  - Sharing.
  - Joint community spaces.
  - Council can facilitate shared spaces for meetings and sharing resources.
  - Provision of communal gardens linked with accessible commercial kitchen to preserve, bottle, ferment etc. in a safe environment.
  - Improve areas of private space to incorporate shared/public space.
  - More emphasis on mediated spaces.
  - Shared living/working spaces.
  - Connectivity.

- **Different Tenure Models (9)**
  - Different ownership models: tenure models; strata titles; membership via contribution.
  - New and creative alternatives to ownership.
  - 99 year lease of government property.
  - Tenants and renters rights!
  - Security of tenure for renters and buyers.
  - Change government rules to enable long leases (eg. lifetime) to encourage sense of community – security of tenure.
  - More community housing eg. Swanbourne St.
  - Restrictions on rentals/short-term such as Air B&B in residential area.
  - Secure tenure – minimise investor properties.

- **Trees (6)**
  - More cultivation of indigenous trees and plants and protection of them.
  - More trees and greenery.
  - Way way more street trees: good for mental health; maybe pots where they can’t be in the ground.
  - Mandates for green cover and policies.
  - Tree tax/financial repercussions for removing trees/bonus for including substantial trees
  - Trees and shade assist walkability.

- **Planning and development control (6)**
  - More direct community involvement in housing planning and approvals.
  - Do not give into developers creating these enormous homes out of keeping with Freo landscape.
  - Understand developers and work with them to change practice. Don’t co-create results no one wants.
  - Limit size of houses and diversity.
  - Council reflects changing values towards housing type/occupation.
  - Focus on the values in planning and approvals.

- **Improve sustainability/self-sustainability (6)**
  - No black roofs, less concrete.
- Sustainability.
  - Increased experiential awareness of self as a part of ecology – systems thinking.
  - Independence from utilities (gas, water, heating).
  - Benefits and profits of land-use (home, industrial etc.) feed back into local community.
  - Apply life-cycle design.

- **Safer Streets (5)**
  - Lighting, safer footpaths (paving crossovers).
  - Crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED) and fostering walkability and community.
  - Passive surveillance integrated into urban environment.
  - Adequate street lighting for pedestrians and cyclists but not too bright (as in Stockholm).
  - Ensure people feel safe to walk at night.

- **Increase Equity and Accessibility (5)**
  - Accessibility for different age groups.
  - Every person homed.
  - No monocultures.
  - All voices are heard (especially small voices) to achieve a clear picture of need and vision.
  - Policy that supports the true purpose of housing (which surely must be housing!) and regenerative spacing.

- **Protect/provide green space (4)**
  - Protect existing greenspace.
  - Every space turned green: more awareness of encouraging birds and animals and insects.
  - “Public Open Space” needs to be changed to mandate greenspace for biodiversity, shade etc. POS cannot be all paved etc.
  - Greenspace does not necessarily need to be a big park – mature trees can give a similar sense.

- **Parking and parking’s relationship with transport (4)**
  - Community parking.
  - Rather than adequate parking – provide creative parking.
  - Be more creative with parking: sharing; let people lease their land for parking; more public transport; more car pools; CAT bus etc.
  - Parking - incorporate strategic transport planning to reduce reliance on cars and therefore parking.

- **Walkability (4)**
  - Walkability and cycling to public transport eg. 5 Min City.
  - Walking routes should be developed.
  - Seating and shade.
  - As much shade as possible.

- **Open Character (4)**
  - Less/less imposing/lower fences.
  - Diversity of fencing arrangements eg. no fences for shared gardens.
  - No drive-in garages.
  - Improve planning and stop approval oversize housing which blocks out sunshine, privacy, gardens and play areas.

- **More local food production (3)**
  - Fruit trees.
  - Encourage food production-friendly verges (maybe via grants).
  - Permaculture and holistic approach (WGV Model).

- **More community gardens (2)**
- Community gardens.
- Community gardens in all localities.
- Other (3)
  - Hire a poet.
  - Keep railway line litter free.
  - Workspace relatively close to home – office/workshop.

4.2.3. Are there any other general comments you would like to make about the draft values?

This list below shows the answers to this question in order of how often the theme (in bold) was mentioned. The number in brackets shows the number of different responses related to this theme.

- Sustainability (8)
  - Sustainable, addressing climate change, consider demographics, return to youth.
  - Stop paying lip service to sustainable living and just do it!!!!
  - Apply life-cycle design to existing planning – we need to change the block-by-block approach and honour holistic sustainable values.
  - Encourage solar energy and water retention and better management of existing water resources.
  - Bonuses to developers more liveable (sustainable, solar, wind, water, passive) designs in housing stock.
  - Sustainability does not mean build new, big scale, high-rise that alienates people from interacting with members of the community.
  - Plan stormwater to water parks.
  - Housing design: allow passive solar to vege garden/outdoor space.

- Connection to nature (6)
  - Turn down lights at night so we can see the stars (and save power).
  - More roof windows.
  - Greenspace and nature: birds.
  - Trees planted for max shade, passive solar, plant for “bird streets” including nesting requirements.
  - Being able to see a treetop so I know what the wind is doing.
  - To hear the wind in the trees – “I have to cycle three kilometres to Mosman Park Council Depot just to hear the wind in the trees.”

- Housing Choice and Diversity (6)
  - Diversity. (2)
  - Choice: value of freedom; to create/maintain diversity.
  - Flexibility, room for individuality, respect and traditions of traditional Indigenous land owners, people.
  - Flexibility.
  - More family-sized apartments that aren’t priced as penthouses just for having more rooms.

- Parking and traffic (4)
  - Rationalise our roads – more one-way and more roundabouts to improve traffic flow.
  - Angle parking – see Cambridge UK traffic flow model.
  - Parking is often the problem: too much area; too much paving; dominated design too much; adequate parking might be communal in the future including solar power-up options.
  - Tell Transperth having tall trees to shade asphalt won’t interfere will all carpark surveillance/safety.
• Council policies and laws (5)
  o Ensure Council comply with policies.
  o Council: need to develop parks, open spaces, bicycle paths commensurate with density/development approvals. More trees, better access to parks eg. In North Freo foot/cycle bridge over Stirling Highway and Curtin Ave... so you can get to the beach or train.
  o Flexibility of planning options – case-by-case creativity.
  o Planning: set ratio hard re: green space.
  o Independence from utilities requires political willingness to change new planning of by-laws.

• Development which benefits the community (4)
  o Not development for the sake of development.
  o All development should provide some enhancement of the area - or for those in it – in some form, not subtract from the community.
  o Developers have performance-based outcomes (5% of pop. Uses 40% of health budget because of homelessness) – integrated health outcome and social outcomes.
  o Targeted density eg. Near public transport, share the views. Walk the neighbourhood and choose where 2/3 storeys should go.

• Heritage Retention (3)
  o Respect and incorporate heritage and traditional values.
  o Maintain heritage housing and embrace innovation - have regulation support this.
  o Core culture of Freo must be respected and enforced by development – not diminished – so that it’s character and heritage buildings of past social cultures 1827 – present day.

• Co-operative housing (3)
  o More co-op living - designing community housing.
  o Diversity of ownership encourages co-op ownership and long leases (secure rentals).
  o Aged care and student accommodation combined for mutual benefit and connectedness.

• Consider benefits versus limitations of open character (3)
  o Passive surveillance came up as a key theme: visual interactions between neighbours and community – sense of belonging and responsibility.
  o Open character vs. Middle-East lifestyle of high walled garden where people drag carpets outside and sleep outside in hot weather.
  o Privacy must also be taken into consideration.

• Costs and externalities (2)
  o Externalities are massive.
  o Our planning costs money in all government budgets.

• Community involvement and engagement (2)
  o Real consultation.
  o All ideas circling around community.

• Other (4)
  o “The problem is so much bigger than planning.”
  o Sustainable population to maintain amenity, safety and community lifestyle.
  o Ownership/investment: financial and legal vs. sweat equity and social commitment.
  o Public transport, walkability, disability access should be accessible in most important times of your life (elderly/children).
4.3. Activity 3 – Benefits, Opportunities, Challenges and Priorities

4.3.1. What might the benefits be of providing more diverse housing options in suburban areas in the City of Fremantle?

This list below shows the answers to this question in order of how often the theme (in bold) was mentioned. The number in brackets shows the number of different responses related to this theme.

- **Emotional and community health benefits (18)**
  - Healthier and happier community with increased connectedness.
  - Happier people.
  - Happier and easier care and connectedness.
  - Happier state of mind of the community as a whole.
  - More happy.
  - Healthy diverse cultures.
  - More community connection through: incidental street encounters; community gardens/allotments; shared working/play spaces. Resulting in mental health benefits especially for the elderly and for stay at home parents.
  - Better mental health for individuals and less social problems.
  - Social inclusion.
  - Vibrant, healthy, excited and motivated communities.
  - Community will thrive.
  - Greater tolerance.
  - Diverse community.
  - Culture and community connecting.
  - Community connection – community building.
  - More connected.
  - More diversity/inclusivity.
  - Great social mix which in turn promotes community spirit and therefore individual empowerment.

- **More diverse/accessible services (9)**
  - Diversity in culture, age groups, incomes, skills and services.
  - Planning needs to recognise services required/needed by residents.
  - Less maintenance time.
  - Meeting the needs of a diverse community.
  - Access to transport.
  - Better access for the disabled.
  - Cater for population.

- **Vibrant/thriving/expressive Freo (8)**
  - Every ecosystem needs diversity to thrive and be synergetic.
  - Return of vibrancy in Freo.
  - Socialising and activity increase.
  - Keep Fremantle tourism vibrant.
  - More people in the street, not in cars.
  - Arts and music/vibrancy/culture.
  - Vibrant: energy; youth empowerment.
  - Freedom to express in healthy grassroots communities.

- **A diverse population (6)**
- Maintain city’s diversity: age; income; family structure; ethnicity etc.
  - Mixed income brackets.
  - Space for different lifestyles: creative and interesting people; student housing.
  - Create diversity.
  - Diverse communities: innovative; respectful; suitable living conditions for Indigenous perspectives.
  - Encourage large households – not necessarily large houses (increased higher occupancy).

- **Access to/Affordability of Housing (6)**
  - I might actually be able to afford to own a home!
  - Maintaining affordability of housing.
  - Stabilises those who rent, lower income families with long-term tenure needed.
  - More affordable blocks in the short term.
  - Affordability.
  - Flexibility to move/relocate.

- **Benefits when Ageing (6)**
  - Diverse generations.
  - Legislating multigenerational living to allow for it.
  - Allow for residents to age in place.
  - Retirement/downsize.
  - Intergenerational living.
  - Have the security and lifestyle for next life chapter. Connection and independence = healthy ageing.

- **Economic Benefits (5)**
  - Diverse income.
  - Happier economy.
  - Sustainability for local businesses with larger resident populations.
  - Innovation.
  - People, owners/centres, occupiers.

- **Diversity and Creativity of Design (5)**
  - Creative multi-use public buildings eg. Schools.
  - Not just about housing – more diverse land use eg. Corner store, café, appropriate scale/complementary uses.
  - More interesting streetscapes.
  - Innovative housing.
  - Greater streetscape and diversity and engagement.

- **Attracting new people to Freo (4)**
  - Draw more people because it’s more interesting and appealing than suburbia.
  - Attract people to our community who share Fremantle values, “keep Freo weird.”
  - Supports diversity of families.
  - Cultural diversity – attract people from overseas to choose Fremantle.

- **Food Production (3)**
  - Diverse food.
  - Happier tummies.
  - More food growth.

- **More sharing (3)**
  - Different age groups share generational knowledge, stay in place longer (growing in place).
  - Greater sharing of resources and sense of community – more meaningful lifestyle.
  - Smaller houses mean more local collective provision of outdoor work/play space and collective use of large household items eg. Lawnmower, camping equipment, car share etc.
• Freo to lead the way (2)
  o Serve as an exemplar or case-study.
  o World leading in urban development.

• Sustainability (2)
  o Achieve sustainable objectives.
  o Land stewardship and ecological regeneration – heal the world.

• Benefits of ownership (1)
  o If people have “ownership” whether it be long term lease or monetary ownerships: they become more respectful of their own space; creative (explore their own inner); sharing their space; tolerant of neighbours if they’re happy with their space.

• Cleanliness (1)
  o Less clutter.

4.3.2. What are the key opportunities that should be considered as part of any future planning for the provision of small housing options?

This list below shows the answers to this question in order of how often the theme (in bold) was mentioned. The number in brackets shows the number of different responses related to this theme.

• Planning to support diverse housing (8)
  o Legal guidelines, building guidelines need to be expanded.
  o Strict policy guidelines and adherence.
  o Well thought out structure plan.
  o New ownership models for low-income earners and singles/small households.
  o Experiment with a “special economic zone” of no planning rules and see what people do i.e. Shanghai within China.
  o Opportunities to build alternative small housing to strata communities.
  o Self-governance of sub-communities contributing to the bigger picture.
  o Streamlined planning departments.

• Potential Land Available (8)
  o Taking advantage of consolidated blocks for innovative community housing projects eg. Homeswest in White Gum Valley.
  o Big land owners working with City of Freo for a better outcome.
  o Lots of land in Freo owned by other government departments for innovative sustainable development.
  o Council owned land.
  o Less industry, more housing.
  o Council owned land (eg. Quarry St Community) provide opportunities for community/co-operative housing discussions – and to exclude other community groups.
  o Integration with Rottnest/water.
  o Move Harbour, make housing.

• Incentivise sustainable/small housing (7)
  o Incentives for sustainability: protecting trees; renewables; footprint.
  o Encouraging different designs for infill – not battle-axe.
  o Make it easier for Tiny Houses to be legally accommodated: no concrete pad; less destructive to the environment; diverse streetscape.
  o Allow building material re-use and move to lighter building materials.
  o Government subsidies for innovative projects.
  o Embedding sustainability thinking into the planning strategy.
- **Involving community members in design/development (6)**
  - Opportunities for self-builds.
  - Development sites only for co-ops.
  - Community building: authentic; flexible; individual.
  - Community agreement.
  - Create formal engagement processes.
  - Forming smaller action groups and sub-communities.

- **Opportunities for interesting design and architecture (6)**
  - Design concepts for 4-6 storey suburban developments that maintain Freo character eg.
    - Courtyards, staggered heights – sympathetic with context.
  - Attract interesting architecture – design charrette.
  - Grouped vs. standalone: diverse layouts.
  - Innovation.
  - Entrepreneurship.
  - Challenge norms eg. Combine norms – allow washing machines in kitchens!

- **Creating access and openness between neighbours (4)**
  - Creating “positive friction” - a little uncomfortable but better for us eg. Not driving = more connection.
  - Gates in fences – create “lil hacks” that allow individual privacy and social moments where you want – “busy” sign on fence gates “I’m swimming naked so don’t come and pick lemons now.”
  - Reducing the size of blocks: community gardens; communal facilities; sense of security.
  - Shared community infrastructure eg. Co-working sheds, studios, greenspaces.

- **Access to housing (4)**
  - Create a more egalitarian society.
  - Support for all life-stages.
  - Housing becomes a right rather than a privilege.
  - Co-housing opportunities to create housing that meets people’s needs.

- **Value/vision-driven planning provisions (3)**
  - Value-driven guidelines rather than strict rules which cut out creativity and innovation.
  - Planning approvals should be based on values not land size/house size/parking and turning circles.
  - Connect to long-term regeneration visions of Fremantle.

- **Learning of skills (3)**
  - Sharing, learning of skills – re-skilling.
  - Inter-generational exchange of knowledge and skills.
  - Provision of training and education for homeless people and others to build their own homes.

- **Long-term leases (3)**
  - Look at other options rather than mortgages or shortish leases.
  - Long-term lease options that allow occupiers to live securely for 10-20 years and make their mark on their own space. They pay for their own fit-out spending their own money. They respect their property and feel ownership/happier/part of the community. “Spaces” need to give the “occupier” freedom (of expression of how they want to live).

- **Student/ageing/intergenerational housing (2)**
  - Supporting student housing (Murdoch, Notre Dame).
  - Student housing – combined with aged care – in old Freo Hospital.

- **Tiny houses and/or houseboats (2)**
  - Creation of tiny house communities.
  - Houseboat living.

- **Disincentive large housing (2)**
• Re-think accepted norms – does every dwelling need a double garage?
• Disincentivise McMansions.

• Other (9)
  • Internal subdivision of existing large dwellings – encourage this.
  • More play, less work.
  • Invest in building social fabric.
  • High-rises.
  • Vibrancy attracts more vibrancy.
  • Engaged holistic management.
  • Noise.
  • Wave power.
  • Rental restrictions – Air B&B.

4.3.3. What might the challenges be that will need to be addressed in any planning for small housing options in the City of Fremantle?

• Changing Existing Approaches to Development (16)
  • Pressure of greedy developers.
  • Current rewards and incentives for developers. Have a policy design lab.
  • Don’t let developers create terrible living spaces “because we’re grateful anyone would put anything here”
  • Change to behaviour of building industry and developers.
  • Having different development models eg. Geoffrey London’s model of architecture-led development.
  • Ensuring that development encourages beneficial trade-offs for the local community eg. A large development might vest some land for a community garden.
  • Ensuring that values drive development.
  • To maintain existing housing avoid mass demolition by developers.
  • Many entrenched ideas of many contemporary builders who favour large houses with theatre room etc. etc.
  • Balance of quality and profit.
  • Changes in attitude and mindset eg. Everything must be separate/individual.
  • Reducing the power/influence of developers.
  • Good design.
  • Efficient design.
  • Ensure that new housing stock are built to highest sustainable level.
  • Trade: we want smaller houses with more green space, public cycleways, parks etc. instead of big houses with huge garages and no garden.

• Changing ingrained attitudes and expectations (12)
  • Fear of change.
  • Litany.
  • Systems and structures, worldview, “narrative” all form an iceberg.
  • Ingrained narrative and story.
  • Thinking creatively.
  • Managing those “Gen Now” spoilt brat expectations. P.S. We know there are some good ones out there they need to spread the word.
  • Diverse community expectations.
  • Consumeristic conditioning.
  • What could form a new story and world view? How do we embed this?
Risk is good. Early 20s cost of living has made us risk-averse and greedy.
- Respecting values other than just financial.
- Conflict between vibrancy and people wanting “quiet living.”

### Changing Existing Planning Laws/Policies (11)
- Coming up with a flexible planning framework.
- Move from rule-based to performance criteria-based approach – needed but is more difficult to assess.
- Unclear how diversity could work if zoning rules etc. remain so prescriptive.
- Government regulations.
- Review planning and zoning by-laws.
- Changes to by-laws.
- Political issues.
- Need for legislative change.
- Restrictive building code.
- Policy and laws.
- By-laws.

### Retaining what is liked (9)
- Maintaining architectural styles.
- Amenity loss.
- Streetscape loss.
- Maintaining ecology and landscape.
- Keep the green canopy.
- Fremantle lost “diversity” visible: The artistic community of 7-8 years ago is now visibly replaced by homeless people.
- Developing land and maintaining greenspace.
- Balance of private and open space.
- Where do the children go (and play)?

### Negative social impacts/attitudes (6)
- Segregation.
- Social tension.
- Conflict between age groups.
- Social dynamics of community.
- Too hip for own good – pushes out the people who make it colourful.

### Parking and Transport Impacts (6)
- Parking.
- Vehicle and transport types.
- Transportation.
- Parking complaints from residents.
- Traffic issues from higher density.
- Transport infrastructure to accommodate population.

### Financial Costs for Council (4)
- Financial pressures for Council.
- Economic.
- Budget.
- Financial means to make it happen.

### Concerns about cost of small housing (3)
- Affordability – of good design (perceived).
- Ensure small dwellings aren’t so expensive that single parents etc. can’t afford them.
- Financial pressures for Individuals.
- **Services and facilities required (3)**
  - May need more schools etc.
  - Infrastructure support for tiny houses.
  - Allow “car-space-free” developments only if there is a caveat on the property to provide compulsory undercover bike storage.

- **Concerns about impacts of small/mobile housing (3)**
  - Concerns re: property values (perceived “slumification”)
  - Ghettos from high concentration.
  - Stopping Tiny Houses on wheels in suburbs.

- **Community Involvement/Engagement in Planning and Development (2)**
  - Ensuring public participation.
  - More community involvement in planning and implementation of new dwellings.
  - Having meaningful community engagement and consultation i.e. not token or lip service.
  - Hearing what people are saying/wanting/need.

- **Flexible housing (2)**
  - Flexibility.
  - Abuse of aforementioned flexibility.

- **Accessibility (2)**
  - Universal accessibility for the disabled – don’t build unsafe spaces.
  - Think about the client group requirements eg. Aged people and too many steps.

- **Other (1)**
  - Footprint of a new home in relation to block size.

---

4.3.4. Now that you have heard all of the discussion, list the top five priorities that the Freo Alternative Project should seek to address:

**PRIORITY 1**

- **Implementation of City of Fremantle planning policies/laws (2)**
  - Streamline the planning process. Get experts talking to each other more. Quality neighbourhoods, not slipshod houses as a starting point. Make sustainability non-negotiable.
  - Need to address Council implementation of future planning and rezoning rules etc.

- **Sustainability (2)**
  - (Self)/Sustainability.
  - Sustainability. Moderation with development proposals – develop many more cooperative housing projects. Population: Fremantle capacity is limited and when population grows along with tourism the amenity for all could be negatively affected.

- **Trees and green space (2)**
  - Keeping green canopy. Ties in public and private spaces. Very important for the “missing middle.”
  - Regenerative greenspaces (protection of existing greenspace and cultivation of future greenspace.)

- **Housing options for all demographics (2)**
  - Diversity and inclusiveness.
  - Make living in Freo attainable for people at all stages of life, people who choose to come here from elsewhere.

- **Values-driven planning (1)**
  - Values (community, diversity, greenery, affordability, innovation) drive planning! “Can do attitude!” Performance criteria rather than concrete rules.

- **Community involvement in planning (1)**
More direct and ongoing community involvement in future planning, approvals and implementation. Recognise Fremantle’s historical significance and maintain it.

- **Affordability and access to housing (1)**
  - Affordability.

- **Smaller houses (1)**
  - Creation of Tiny House communities.

- **Parking and traffic management (1)**
  - Parking and traffic management.

**Priorit 2**

- **Affordability and access to housing (2)**
  - Affordability, tenure models, cost of living.
  - Affordability and accessibility.

- **Sustainability (2)**
  - Sustainability – includes liveability – green canopy.

- **Smaller houses (2)**
  - Value small. Small does not equal crap! Maintains affordability. Can be well designed, beautiful, sustainable, energy efficient, aesthetically pleasing. Green walls and roof gardens.
  - Closer look at pre-fab housing and similar constructions.

- **Sharing of spaces, resources and facilities (1)**
  - Shared, active public spaces eg. Co-working, resource sharing, community gardens, play spaces, create passive surveillance.

- **Diverse land uses (1)**
  - Not just about diverse housing; also about diverse land use and appropriate scale and density.

- **Cooperative housing options (1)**
  - Developing building co-operatives owned and designed by the residents.

- **The “Freo” Identity (1)**
  - Loss of amenity and heritage.

- **Balance of public and private open space (1)**
  - Quality design of public/private outdoor space – need both. Set minimum requirements. Quality of build for medium/high density eg. Neighbour’s noise.

- **Vibrancy (1)**
  - Vibrancy.

**Priorit 3**

- **Innovative and creative thinking (2)**
  - Creativity and flexibility.
  - Innovation – challenge accepted norms eg. Cars/parking.

- **Affordability and access to housing (2)**
  - Affordability.
  - Maintaining the affordability of housing for all.

- **Street design (1)**
  - Improve street design – safety, angle parking, trees for shade, water street trees, public trees and benches etc. More roundabouts, one-way streets.

- **Density done well (1)**
Density done well – interesting architecture that develops design concept for 4-6 storey suburban developments. Allowing diverse housing options eg. Tiny Houses (clear guidelines).

- **Sustainability (1)**
  - Sustainability, localisation, local food production.

- **The “Freo” Identity (2)**
  - Maintain the “Victorian” street and building-scape of Fremantle city.
  - Village atmosphere. Green spaces as a priority not an afterthought. Local shops, pub, a town square, pathways, cycleways all in one neighbourhood.

- **Parking and traffic management (1)**
  - Pushing risk of owning a car onto owners – developers don’t specify how many car parks are required. Ensure transport options are available.

- **Implementation of City of Fremantle planning policies/laws (1)**
  - Respecting existing local area policies.

- **Alternative land tenure options (1)**
  - Look at different types of strata titles.

**PRIORITY 4**

- **Sharing of spaces, resources and facilities (3)**
  - Community space/connectivity.
  - Community gardens and facilities – incentives to encourage residents to live in smaller spaces eg. rate reduction. Improved vision and versions of communal life.
  - More schools, parks, trees, public spaces, use of schools by communities.

- **The “Freo” Identity (2)**
  - Keeping “Freo” identity – the layers of mystery, diversity of nationalities.
  - Maintain cultural heritage, awareness.

- **Challenge attitudes of developers (2)**
  - Reducing the influence and power of developers.
  - Challenge to the power of developers. Empowering grassroots community initiatives.

- **Sustainability (1)**
  - Environmental sustainability - trees, shade, walkability, energy storage.

- **Trees and green space (1)**
  - Increase greenspace, tree canopy and protecting the same on private property.

- **Consistent Design (1)**
  - A consistent design approach eg. All the buildings in a similar style eg. Colonial or iron or rammed earth. Diversity between nodes.

- **Innovative and creative thinking (1)**
  - Creativity.

- **Avoid creation of “slums” (1)**
  - Careful not to build ghettoes of the future or trailer parks (not on wheels – must be conventional housing).

**PRIORITY 5**

- **Housing options for all demographics (3)**
  - Increase housing options for all eg. Indigenous, homelessness, cultural diversity.
  - We need to provide for diverse cultures and community groups.

- **Sharing of spaces, resources and facilities (3)**
“Co-unity.”
Co-sharing community space, resources, and facilities.
Sharing of skills, learning and knowledge to empower people when it comes to their own homes.

Cooperative housing options (2)
- Opportunities for co-op housing of different sorts including transition schemes such as shared garden, driveway etc.
- Diversity of housing options: single/shared/co-op.

Connected communities (2)
- Streetscapes that foster connection and sense of community – low fences, no drive-in garages.
- Connectedness: Walking, created walkways; Cat buses moving people around without cars; bikes; facilities in neighbourhoods – shops not malls.

Smaller houses (1)
- Support Tiny Housing and pre-fab options.

Design guidelines (1)
- Strict design guidelines implemented and enforced. Architect approved.

PRIORITY 6 (added by group)
- NEVER use the Esplanade and other major greenspace for events. Always have parks available to be used as a park.

4.4. Individual Feedback

4.4.1. Do you have any other suggestions or idea regarding the provision of housing for future generations?

- Challenge existing rules and revisit why they exist.
- Well-defined planning.
- Structure plan.
- Similar to Cockburn with Coolbellup and Hamilton Hill zone change and R-Codes.

4.4.2. Are there any other opportunities that you haven’t already listed in the workshop that could be addressed by the Freo Alternative?

- More transparent community consultation – especially around wording for public forums.
- Could Freo develop a resource for those wanting to build/retrofit sustainability fittings – new ideas/products, where to find them, Choice rating etc.?

4.4.3. Are there any other challenges that you haven’t already listed in the workshop that could be addressed by the Freo Alternative

- Use Herald advertising for Q2 [opportunities] and Q4 [general comments].
- Current rules say that strata owners can’t have a granny flat but this should not be an issue of title but block size or performance – many older stratas are quite big!
4.4.4. Other general comments

- Spell out to community change to LPS4 for tiny housing 120m² blocks and full guidelines.
- Provide good lifestyle.
- Walking circuits, 5 or 10 minute (walk) access to park or “parklet” (trees, BBQ, swing on trees).
- Plan spaces for big trees i.e. 10m or more. Have planning ratios for trees in building codes eg. x 4m trees per 3 bedroom house, x 6m trees per duplex.
- Nature is calming.
- Plan tree spaces deliberately eg. To shade asphalt.
- Significant trees at entry points to suburbs.
- Adaptable inside/outside areas – mobile extendable walls/roof canopies.
- “Wet” art areas eg. tiled combined laundry/broom cupboard/fabric dying.
5. APPENDICES

5.1. Visual Feedback for Activity 1

Figure 2. What will our community and the families and households who live there be like in 20 years' time?

Figure 2. What will our community and the families and households who live there be like in 20 years' time?
Figure 3. Tiny House Rack 'n' Stack

Figure 4. What will our community be like in 20 years' time? Some people will be more transient whilst others will be more settled.

Figure 5. Links between Human-Centred Design and Tenure Models.
5.2. Visual Feedback for Activity 2
Figure 8. Changes to the Draft Guiding Values.
5.3. Visual Feedback for Activity 3

Figure 9. Challenges. Worldview, systems and structures form an "iceberg."

"Narrative"