

Canning Bridge Precinct Vision

Summary of briefing to Elected Members of City of Melville Tuesday 27 July 2010

Anna Kelderman of GHD Consultants, provided a brief summary of the submissions that had been received on the Draft Canning Bridge Precinct Vision and of other actions that had occurred since the last briefing on 17 May 2010. Points covered included

The context of the study, in relation to the need to accommodate the Directions 2031 target of a 29% population growth.
To ascertain the communities expectations and prepare a 40-50 year plan for future development
The document being prepared for presentation will be a non-statutory set of concepts to guide later Town Planning Scheme Amendments.
The process so far has included
Preliminary opportunities and constraints.
Community open day July 2008
City of South Perth community workshops in August and September 2008
Transport Forum November 2008
City of Melville community workshops February 2009
Transport Workshop mid 2009
Draft precinct vision formal public comment period – February – April 2010.
Submissions reviewed (400+)
Transport Workshop 4 June 2010

During the public submission period on the Canning Bridge Precinct Vision , which ran from 2 February to 1 April, 410 submissions were received, of which 171 were from the City of Melville.

Matters canvassed in the City of Melville submissions included:

- Supportive – Vision overall; Manning Road Southbound ramp and Tunnel under Canning Bridge
- Opposing – Building heights and Density; Traffic Congestion (& traffic study), Parking Issues, River development, poor consultation (elements not discussed), Boundary zoning changes.
- Neutral – Improvements to the precinct, Improvements to Canning Bridge – or tunnelling Canning Highway, Improvements to community facilities, Vision extending beyond original boundaries, Extend heights along Canning Highway.

Key Issues in the City of Melville submissions included :

Do nothing - there is still room for increased density within the current scheme, however the community benefits, planned growth and design guidelines being required by the vision can not be enforced.

River redevelopment and environmental concerns – Swan River Trust has given general support subject to the normal process being carried out. There are also statutory requirements that will need to be followed and community working groups will be created beyond the Vision endorsement to consider the finer details.

Traffic and Parking – this is subject to detailed analysis and fundamental to further planning.

Intensity and heights – Subject to detailed design guidelines. The main area of concern is the height limits between Canning Highway and the river (near Cassey Street). Community working groups will be created beyond the Vision endorsement to consider the finer details.

Consultation – Consultation options showed a number of height options, including buildings of significant heights. There is a commitment to ongoing consultation subsequent to Vision endorsement.

A transport Technical forum was held to consider a wide range of related issues brought up during through the submissions. The forum arrived at some preferred options which are being considered for the final vision.

Changes to the Vision being considered by GHD

- Changes to the bus station and bus bridge location and changes to the image and text to better illustrate timing;
- Showing an illustration of a concept for the Kintail Road intersection;
- Show improved pedestrian/cyclist accessibility;
- Amendments to the heights in the vicinity of Cassey Street;
- Other minor changes including more focus on continued community engagement

The next steps in the process for the Canning Bridge Precinct Vision are:

- Finalise submissions report
- Review Canning Bridge Precinct Vision Reports and update with required changes
- WAPC and Council briefings and subsequently endorsement.
- Begin implementation plan including traffic studies and design guidelines.

At the conclusion of the presentation, Elected Members raised questions and discussion took place on a number of aspects of the study, including the following:

What were the main concerns with the consultation process? Were suggestions made as to how this could have been changed to satisfy the concerns of those who mentioned it in their submissions?

Number of submissions was relatively small, considering the number of affected residents and the potential impact of future development in the area.

Who will pay for the bus bridge and bus station? Is this concept the most accessible for pedestrians?

Heights on the boundaries of the study area.

The timing of development on the boundaries of the study area.

Kintail Road and Canning Beach Road Intersection with Canning Highway

Within the report can we be specific in mentioning design guidelines and the interface between different levels.

We need to give more prominence to the staging of the implementation especially where it relates to the encroachment into the residential area. This should be the last stage of implementation.

The performance based development should indicate a maximum height and a minimum lot size. A comment should be made in the submission report and in the vision report to point out that the current zoning allows a lot higher density than what has occurred.

Plans should call for innovative design concepts for high rise buildings.

Mention of light Rail should be made.

What are the opportunities for development to occur sooner rather than after the amendments go through?