

**LOCAL PLANNING POLICY COMPARISON TABLE**

<b>CITY CENTRE</b>		
<b>CURRENT POLICY CONTENT</b>	<b>PROPOSED CONTENT</b>	<b>CHANGE NOTES</b>
<p>The <b>City Centre Local Planning Policy (LPP)</b> provides a comprehensive planning and urban design framework to guide development within the City Centre (Regional Centre zone). The policy seeks to reinforce the city centre as the primary commercial, civic, cultural and residential focus for Greater Geraldton by encouraging higher-density, mixed-use development that delivers high amenity, strong pedestrian environments and long-term economic vitality.</p> <p>The policy establishes objectives and performance-based design guidelines for <b>land use mix, building height and setbacks, built form, heritage conservation, pedestrian connectivity, transport and parking, sustainable building design, community safety, and the assessment of additional height (bonus) provisions</b>. It promotes residential living in the city centre, active street frontages, high-quality architecture, protection of heritage and significant view corridors, and improved integration with public spaces, transport routes and the foreshore.</p>	<p>The proposed <b>City Centre Local Planning Policy</b> provides an updated and streamlined framework to guide development within the City Centre (Regional Centre zone). The draft policy continues to position the city centre as the primary focus for higher-intensity, mixed-use development in Greater Geraldton, supporting residential growth, economic activity, walkability, and high-quality urban design outcomes.</p> <p>The draft City Centre LPP represents an <b>evolution rather than a shift in policy direction</b>. It maintains the existing intent and strategic objectives, while modernising the structure, tightening language, and aligning assessment more closely with contemporary planning practice and the Residential Design Codes.</p>	<p><b>Clear objectives</b> focused on reinforcing the city centre as the region’s principal multi-functional activity centre, strengthening pedestrian connectivity, minimising car-dominant streetscapes, encouraging mixed land uses, promoting inner-city residential development, and protecting heritage values.</p> <p><b>Simplified development requirements</b>, structured around land use permissibility, ground-floor activation, building height, setbacks, pedestrian links, transport planning, and development near heritage buildings.</p> <p><b>Building heights and setbacks</b> defined through explicit tables and plans, providing greater certainty for applicants and decision-makers, while retaining opportunities for landmark and gateway development at key locations.</p> <p>While the underlying intent of the draft policy is consistent with the current policy, the draft policy differs in the following ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The draft <b>significantly simplifies and condenses</b> the policy, removing extensive aspirational narrative and detailed design guidance that previously sat alongside statutory controls.</li> <li>• Development requirements are presented in <b>clear, tabulated standards</b>, improving readability, certainty and ease of application for both applicants and decision-makers.</li> <li>• The draft adopts a more <b>regulatory and streamlined tone</b>, focusing on implementable standards rather than broader place-making philosophy.</li> </ul>

## DESIGN GUIDELINES - GERALDTON AIRPORT TECHNOLOGY PARK

CURRENT POLICY CONTENT	PROPOSED CONTENT	CHANGE NOTES
<p>The <b>Design Guidelines – Geraldton Airport Technology Park Local Planning Policy</b> provides a comprehensive framework to guide the orderly development of the Geraldton Airport Technology Park as a high-quality, modern commercial and aviation-related estate of regional significance. The policy supports the establishment of the Technology Park as a <b>strategic aviation and employment hub</b>, accommodating a wide range of aviation-support and compatible non-aviation commercial and industrial uses, while ensuring that development does not adversely affect airport operations or future growth.</p> <p>The policy places strong emphasis on <b>environmentally sustainable design</b>, requiring buildings and landscapes to minimise energy and water consumption, manage stormwater on-site, encourage recycling, and incorporate endemic, water-wise landscaping that does not attract bird life hazardous to aviation operations. Mandatory measures include rainwater reuse for toilets, on-site stormwater retention, and minimum landscaping provisions.</p> <p>Clear guidance is provided on <b>architectural character and built form</b>, promoting contemporary, high-quality design outcomes that contribute positively to streetscapes and establish a strong corporate identity for the estate.</p> <p>The policy also recognises the <b>heritage significance of the Geraldton Airport</b>, including its World War II infrastructure, and requires conservation, documentation and interpretation of remnant heritage features as part of development where these occur.</p>	<p>The <b>draft amended Local Planning Policy 4.2 – Design Guidelines for the Geraldton Airport Technology Park</b> provides an updated land use and design framework to guide development within the Technology Park.</p> <p>The draft policy maintains the established vision and intent of the existing policy while strengthening its usability, readability and regulatory clarity. The changes are evolutionary rather than transformational and are intended to improve implementation outcomes without altering the fundamental planning objectives for the Technology Park.</p>	<p><b>Key areas of continuity include:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• promotion of aviation-support and compatible industrial and commercial land uses;</li> <li>• emphasis on contemporary architectural character and high presentation standards;</li> <li>• environmental sustainability measures, including water reuse and stormwater management;</li> <li>• protection of airport operations through height and lighting controls; and</li> <li>• recognition and protection of WWII heritage values.</li> </ul> <p><b>Key differences and refinements</b> The draft policy primarily represents a <b>refinement and modernisation</b> rather than a substantive change in intent. Notable updates include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a <b>restructured and simplified policy format</b>, improving clarity and consistency with current local planning policy practice;</li> <li>• tighter and clearer wording of development standards, reducing duplication and ambiguity;</li> <li>• updated references to contemporary expectations, such as <b>end-of-trip facilities</b> and clearer sustainable design measures; and</li> <li>• improved alignment with <b>Local Planning Scheme No. 1</b> and the Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations.</li> </ul>

## R-CODES - ANCILLARY DWELLINGS

CURRENT POLICY CONTENT	PROPOSED CONTENT	CHANGE NOTES
<p>The <b>R-Codes – Ancillary Dwellings Local Planning Policy</b> provides local guidance to support the assessment of ancillary dwellings by varying specific <b>deemed-to-comply provisions of State Planning Policy 3.1 – Residential Design Codes (the R-Codes)</b> where a local need has been identified.</p> <p>The policy’s primary objectives are to <b>clarify what constitutes an ancillary dwelling</b>, limit the <b>visual and amenity impacts</b> of such development through controls on size and location, and provide locally relevant development standards for their implementation.</p> <p>Key provisions of the policy include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) confirming that ancillary dwellings are associated with a single house and generally considered after completion of the main dwelling (with provision for concurrent construction);</li> <li>(b) requiring ancillary dwellings to be located within <b>10 metres of the main dwelling</b>;</li> <li>(c) setting <b>maximum plot ratio and roof area limits</b> that vary depending on residential coding or zoning; and</li> <li>(d) defining ancillary dwellings as <b>self-contained dwellings</b> with independent kitchen, bathroom and toilet facilities.</li> </ul> <p>Overall, the policy provides greater certainty for applicants and decision-makers by setting clear local parameters for ancillary dwellings, while remaining consistent with the intent and framework of the R-Codes and the City’s Local Planning Scheme.</p>	<p>The <b>draft amended Local Planning Policy 1.1 – Ancillary Dwellings</b> updates the City’s local framework for the assessment and exemption of ancillary dwellings, consistent with the <b>Planning and Development (Local Planning Schemes) Regulations 2015, Local Planning Scheme No. 1</b>, and the <b>Residential Design Codes Volumes 1 and 2 (R-Codes)</b>.</p> <p>The draft policy does not represent a change in policy direction, but rather an update that ensures the City’s ancillary dwelling framework remains <b>current, legally robust and aligned with the contemporary R-Codes</b>, while continuing to support housing choice and efficient development outcomes.</p>	<p>The draft amended policy is <b>strongly aligned with the intent of the existing R-Codes – Ancillary Dwellings Local Planning Policy (Version 4, 2015)</b>. Both policies share the same core objectives of facilitating ancillary dwellings as a form of additional housing, providing locally responsive variations to the R-Codes, and managing visual and amenity impacts through controls on size and built form.</p> <p><b>Key areas of continuity include:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• reliance on the R-Codes as the primary assessment tool, with targeted local variations;</li> <li>• control of ancillary dwelling size through maximum floor area and roof area limits;</li> <li>• application across a range of residential zones where ancillary dwellings are permitted; and</li> <li>• maintenance of amenity and liveability as key policy considerations.</li> </ul> <p><b>Key differences and refinements</b> While the strategic intent remains unchanged, the draft policy represents a <b>refinement and modernisation</b> of the current policy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• it responds directly to <b>recent State amendments to the R-Codes (April 2024)</b> by removing redundant or deleted provisions and avoiding duplication;</li> <li>• it places greater emphasis on <b>exempt (no development approval) pathways</b>, clarifying when ancillary dwellings can be constructed without development approval;</li> <li>• it restructures the policy into a clearer and more concise format, improving usability and consistency with current local planning policy drafting practice; and</li> <li>• it strengthens alignment with <b>Local Planning Scheme No. 1</b> and the Regulations by clearly identifying scope, application and replacement deemed-to-comply provisions.</li> </ul>

## R-CODES - SETBACK VARIATIONS

CURRENT POLICY CONTENT	PROPOSED CONTENT	CHANGE NOTES
<p>The <b>R-Codes – Setback Variations Local Planning Policy</b> provides local guidance to vary and clarify specific <b>deemed-to-comply setback provisions of State Planning Policy 3.1 – Residential Design Codes (the R-Codes)</b> where local circumstances warrant a different approach.</p> <p>The policy’s primary purpose is to facilitate flexible and practical residential development outcomes while protecting neighbourhood amenity. It focuses on clarifying when reduced setbacks may be supported without requiring development approval, provided adjoining landowner consent is obtained.</p> <p>Key matters addressed include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) <b>walls built up to a lot boundary</b>, including height, length and finish standards;</li> <li>(b) <b>surface finishes of lot boundary walls</b> to ensure acceptable presentation to adjoining properties;</li> <li>(c) clarification of how <b>garage and carport setbacks</b> are to be interpreted where inconsistencies exist within the R-Codes;</li> <li>(d) <b>reduced setbacks for patios</b> in higher-density residential areas; and</li> <li>(e) <b>rear setback reductions</b> for specified residential coding categories.</li> </ul> <p>The policy also establishes circumstances where development approval and neighbour consultation are required and where proposals may proceed without approval, providing greater certainty for applicants, neighbours and decision-makers while maintaining appropriate amenity outcomes.</p>	<p>The <b>draft amended Local Planning Policy 1.3 – Setbacks</b> updates the City’s local framework for varying and clarifying selected <b>deemed-to-comply setback provisions of the Residential Design Codes Volume 1 (R-Codes)</b>.</p> <p>The draft policy maintains the established intent of the current policy while improving clarity, statutory alignment and ease of application. The changes are evolutionary and administrative in nature, aimed at improving implementation rather than altering development outcomes.</p>	<p>The draft policy is <b>strongly aligned with the intent of the existing R-Codes – Setback Variations Local Planning Policy</b>. Both policies share the same fundamental objectives of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• facilitating reasonable flexibility in setback standards to reflect local conditions;</li> <li>• protecting neighbouring amenity; and</li> <li>• ensuring lot boundary structures contribute positively to streetscape and dwelling presentation.</li> </ul> <p><b>Key areas of continuity include:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• reliance on the R-Codes as the primary assessment framework, with targeted local variations;</li> <li>• use of neighbour consent as a key mechanism where reduced setbacks or boundary walls are proposed;</li> <li>• retention of controls on boundary wall height, length and finish; and</li> <li>• continued differentiation of standards by residential density coding.</li> </ul> <p><b>Key differences and refinements</b></p> <p>The draft policy represents a <b>refinement and modernisation rather than a change in policy direction</b>. Notable differences include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a <b>restructured and simplified format</b>, improving readability and alignment with contemporary local planning policy drafting practice;</li> <li>• clearer articulation of <b>replacement deemed-to-comply provisions</b>, directly mapping R-Codes clauses to local standards;</li> <li>• improved clarity around the treatment of <b>lightweight structures</b> (e.g. patios and carports) versus boundary walls; and</li> <li>• strengthened consistency with <b>Local Planning Scheme No. 1</b> and recent <b>R-Codes amendments</b>, reducing ambiguity and duplication.</li> </ul>

## SIGNAGE

CURRENT POLICY CONTENT	PROPOSED CONTENT	CHANGE NOTES
<p>The <b>Signage Local Planning Policy</b> provides a comprehensive framework to guide the assessment and control of signage across the City of Greater Geraldton.</p> <p>The purpose of the policy is to ensure signage contributes positively to the visual amenity of the district, does not compromise traffic or public safety, and is appropriate to the character and function of its location.</p> <p>The policy establishes a consistent set of <b>standards and assessment criteria</b> for a wide range of sign types, including freestanding, wall-mounted, illuminated, pylon, roof, verandah, vertical and horizontal signs, as well as banners, flags, development signs and property transaction signs. It identifies matters to be considered in determining applications, including sign scale, location, appearance, impact on amenity, and potential effects on traffic safety, while allowing the local government discretion to support variations where acceptable outcomes can be demonstrated.</p> <p>Clear guidance is provided on <b>where signs should not be located</b>, particularly in relation to parks, heritage places, residential amenity, pedestrian movement and road safety. The policy also discourages <b>remote advertising</b> to avoid visual clutter and proliferation of signage across the municipality. Remote advertising is the placement of a sign advertising goods or services that are not available on the site on which the sign is located. Pylon signs on a rural road advertising a restaurant in a nearby town is an example of remote advertising.</p> <p>Importantly, the policy specifies a detailed list of <b>sign types and circumstances that are exempt from development approval</b>, subject to location, size, illumination and heritage considerations. These exemptions provide certainty for businesses, residents and community uses while maintaining control over larger or more visually prominent signage.</p> <p>Overall, the Signage Local Planning Policy balances the needs of businesses and community facilities for identification and advertising with the protection of streetscape character, amenity and safety across the City.</p>	<p>The <b>draft amended Local Planning Policy 3.3 – Advertising Signage</b> provides an updated and consolidated framework to guide the assessment and exemption of advertising signage across the City of Greater Geraldton.</p> <p>The draft amended Advertising Signage LPP retains the established intent of the existing policy, while enhancing clarity, consistency and ease of administration. The changes are largely administrative and procedural, designed to improve implementation outcomes without materially altering the City’s approach to signage control.</p>	<p>The draft amended policy is <b>strongly aligned with the intent of the current Signage Local Planning Policy</b>. Both policies share the same core purpose of managing advertising signage to protect visual amenity, support traffic safety, and ensure signage is appropriate to its context, while providing clear exemptions to streamline approvals.</p> <p><b>Key areas of continuity include:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• reliance on deemed-to-comply standards with discretion for variations;</li> <li>• ongoing discouragement of <b>remote advertising</b>;</li> <li>• retention of similar size, height and location controls for major sign types; and</li> <li>• continued emphasis on amenity, safety and character considerations.</li> </ul> <p><b>Key differences and refinements</b></p> <p>The draft policy represents a <b>refinement and modernisation</b>, rather than a change in policy direction. Key differences include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• improved <b>structural alignment with the Regulations</b>, clearly linking exempt signage to the deemed-to-comply framework;</li> <li>• clearer and more logically organised <b>sign categories and standards</b>, reducing duplication and ambiguity;</li> <li>• updated terminology and formatting to improve usability and statutory clarity; and</li> <li>• inclusion of <b>illustrative material</b> to assist interpretation and application of the policy.</li> </ul>