



Kearns Crescent Streetscape Upgrade

Tabled Public Submission Report October 2024



City of
Melville

Summary

To support the continued development of the Riseley Centre as a vibrant and accessible local hub, the City is progressing streetscape improvements along Kearns Crescent. The upgrade aims to create a more welcoming and pedestrian-friendly environment by enhancing footpaths, introducing additional greenery, and providing inviting spaces for people to pause and connect.

In May and June 2023, the City engaged with the local community and business owners to review and refine three initial concept designs. This collaborative process informed the development of a draft concept plan that seeks to balance improved amenity with parking needs.

From 18 September to 2 October 2024, the City invited community feedback on the draft concept design through a formal engagement period. A dedicated project page was hosted on Melville Talks and promoted through a combination of digital and traditional communications. Community members were encouraged to provide submissions and indicate their level of support using a four-point scale: *I love the plan, I like the plan, I can live with the plan, and I don't like the plan.*

A total of 78 valid submissions were received. This report presents a summary of the support levels and provides a detailed analysis of community feedback to inform future planning and decision-making.

Engagement findings

78 submissions were received, with 58.97% of respondent indicating they do not support the concept plan.

Don't like the plan	Can live with the plan	Like the plan	Love the plan
58.97%	8.97%	23.08%	8.97%

Communication and engagement participation and reach

 How we communicated	 How we engaged	 Participation and reach
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Website <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Melville Talks engagement webpage ○ Engagement update • Direct email to businesses and past participants • eNews publications (Melville Talks, corporate) • Herald newspaper ad • Perth Now Melville newspaper ad • Social media (Facebook and Instagram) • Onsite signage 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Online submission form • Hard copy submission form • In person at CIVIC Building • Over the phone 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 79 Submissions received (including 1 duplicate) • 1,715 Melville Talks page visits • 195 direct emails issued to businesses and past participants • 18,784 eNews subscribers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 12,740 Corporate subscribers ○ 6,044 Melville Talks subscribers • 4,062 Facebook reach <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 1937 Instagram reach ○ 1937 Instagram reach

Participant demographics

To ensure the engagement/public comment process reflects the City's diverse community, participants/submitters were asked to share demographic information.

- 70.51% of participants informed us they live in the City of Melville
- 55.13% identified as a ratepayer
- 21.79% identified as a business owner/operator
- 44.87% had participated in previous stages of engagement

From the 78 submission received, 38 participants were involved in the previous stages of engagement.	I love the plan	I like the plan	I can live with the plan	I don't like the plan
Community Values and Vision survey (November 2022)	-	4	3	6
Interactive Map (November 2022)	-	6	3	9
Interactive Community Workshops (May 2023)	2	3	-	8
Business Focus Group (May/June 2023)	2	4	1	10
I have not been involved	4	7	1	31
No selection	1	-	-	-

Analysis of submission content

Submissions were reviewed to identify key themes and concerns raised by community members. The analysis reveals a predominantly negative sentiment toward the proposed rate increase, with several recurring issues consistently highlighted across responses.

Thematic analysis

Theme	Mentions	Summary	Example comments
Parking loss and access	60+	A large majority of comments expressed strong concern about the reduction of on-street parking. Respondents, particularly local business owners and older residents, fear reduced accessibility will negatively impact business viability and convenience.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "Parking is already difficult – this would make it worse." - "My elderly parents won't be able to walk from Wilcock Street." - "Removing bays to add seats no one uses is not practical."
Business impacts	45+	Many respondents flagged the risk of reduced patronage to local small businesses, with fears that the changes will deter customers who rely on convenient vehicle access.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "This will kill small businesses." - "We need both trees and parking, not one at the expense of the other." - "If people can't park, they'll go to Garden City instead."
Safety and traffic flow	25+	Several responses raised concerns about traffic speed, visibility, and the need for better	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "That corner is dangerous – needs better sightlines."

		pedestrian safety features such as crossings and clearer signage. Some supported converting to a one-way system.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "One-way would make traffic calmer and safer." - "Please consider speed bumps to stop people racing through."
Support for greening & amenity	20+	Respondents who supported the plan appreciated the addition of trees, wider footpaths, and street furniture, noting it improves walkability, aesthetics, and social connection.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "Love the idea of more greenery and places to sit." - "We need more shade and less concrete." - "The bird sculpture and extra trees make it feel like a proper main street."
Consultation & transparency	15+	Some respondents felt there was a lack of early engagement or clear information (e.g., how many parking bays would be lost). Concerns also included whether businesses or property owners were adequately consulted.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - "No one told the property owners about this." - "There's no clear count of how many bays we're losing." - "Businesses should have had more say before this went out to the public."

Sentiment Analysis

Support level	Count	Dominant sentiment	Notes
I don't like the plan	46	Strong negative	Comments overwhelmingly focused on parking loss, business risk, and access concerns. Many were highly detailed and emotive.
18	45+	Positive/constructive	Many supportive of greening and footpath improvements, but still raised parking or access concerns.
I can live with it	7	Mixed	Supportive of improvements in principle, but highlighted design clarity issues and made specific improvement suggestions.
I love the plan	7	Strong positive	Clear support for increased greenery, walkability, and a shift to a more vibrant streetscape. Most from residents or pedestrians.

Tabled comments

Number	Level of support	Submission comments
1	I don't like the plan	You are removing too much of the street parking. I will be reluctant to support businesses in Kearns Crescent if it is difficult to find parking.
2	I can live with the plan	<p>It is unclear what is being proposed because there is no legend or labels on the plan. The few dot points and "inspirational images" of furniture and streetscapes is not sufficient, and more detail is required. It is hard to distinguish between the existing vs new trees (the symbols are practically identical), and the proposed changes to access, walkability, or parking are not obvious. Some labels on the plan would really go a long way, including for the connecting laneways. The intersection of Kearns/Chortis/Teneriffe remains a hazard for pedestrians and drivers alike, and it is unclear how this is being addressed; site lines are terrible at this location, and it really needs a designated pedestrian crossing which would also encourage drivers to slow down. The streetscape section provided has no context or labels to explain what is being proposed and where.</p> <p>The City really needs to provide a revised concept plan that provides more detail on what is being proposed as part of the streetscape upgrade for more effective consultation.</p>
3	I can live with the plan	Riseley Street from the highway to Kearns Crescent should be included. It would provide a gateway to Kearns Crescent and a visual invitation to the precinct.
4	I can live with the plan	I would consider changing the vehicular access along Kearns Crescent to one-way (accessing onto Kearns from the eastern junction with Canning Hwy or Chirtis Lane, and exit onto Canning Hwy either from Riseley Street or the western junction of Kearns Crescent & Canning Hwy). This would likely reduce the number of unnecessary vehicles using Kearns Crescent, and narrowing of the street will allow for greater verge footprint, which could be used for more benches & increased vegetation canopy. Additionally, it would reduce vehicles backing up when looking to turn onto Riseley Street, as vehicles will not be able to turn south onto Riseley from the western side of Kearns Crescent.
5	I can live with the plan	Kearns Crescent would be a safer street to navigate the parking if it were a one way street.
6	I can live with the plan	still need a crosswalk over Riseley st to connect the two sides, its very dangerous walking over that street during the day, not sure what its like at night. turning cars generally do not give way to pedestrians here as its busy and have limited gaps to pull into.

7	I can live with the plan	The plan for Kearns Crescent is fine as far as it goes. The problem is the privately owned car park. This is where the greenery and al fresco seating really needs to be but I doubt you'll ever convince the owners of it.
8	I can live with the plan	Willcock St car park doesn't seem to have any acrod bays marked. There are only 2 on Kearns Crescent. That's not enough for the aged population of this area trying to access this precinct. I struggle to park in this area consistently. As the alternative to Acrod parking bays are so small/narrow I like many other people can't use these bays. People with Acrod stickers need to open their car door to their full extent to exit the vehicle. Normal bays are so tight I can't open my car door fully to exit my car as the car parked next to me is so close. It's very frustrating not being able to park to access the area and I can't walk long distances to park outside the area. I have never seen people use that seating area that took up 2 parking bays on Jearns Crescent. I have seen cars come very close to reversing into it. It's a very narrow awkward (visually) road to park in. I love the concept of tidying up the area and having alfresco dining.
9	I don't like the plan	I think this is going to have a huge impact on the patronage of businesses in Kearns Crescent. Parking is already hectic in the area, and with all the small businesses (buildings 18 and 20 are full of small businesses providing healthcare, legal, accounting etc) such as mine and cafes/restaurants we need ample parking for our clients/patients.
10	I don't like the plan	We cannot afford to lose parking. I do not agree with the design. Less parking means people won't come to the restaurants and shops and the area will loose customers and it's lovely neighbourhood vibe.
11	I don't like the plan	It is very difficult to find parking in this area at most times. Removing the parking will not alleviate this problem, the proposed additional parking is to far away to be of any benefit. The only benefit of this waste of ratepayers money would be to the occupants of the apartment building. Also the new parking meters are unusable, the one we had today was not working and you have to almost kneel down to be able to read the display
12	I don't like the plan	1. Parking should be on the other side of the road, allowing al fresco outside seating for the restaurants to be incorporated into the design 2. Council shoul buy aland to develop and provide parking. Current availability is already woefully inadequate

13	I don't like the plan	There is ZERO point removing car parks for streetscape nonsense. You did that on the corner near the C15 cafe and it's a disgusting mess. You allow all these businesses to open and provide no parking. It looks like you will be opening an open air car park but don't do that at the sacrifice of street parking as well. We need both. And it should be two hours free. We should be allowed to eat and recreate in our local area for no cost.
14	I don't like the plan	Like many others, my family love the kearns Crs cafe and restaurants. We are a regular there. The striking disadvantage I see in this plan is the lack of parking!!!! With so many new apartments and new residents in the area, the lack of parking for this new plan (half the amount of bays it seems) would be impractical and would negatively impact the small business owners as well as the neighbourhood. This proposed plan is not practical for families who have always enjoyed and valued the parking and easy access of kearns Crs
15	I don't like the plan	The "sitting area" concept, such as the one located in Kearns Cres west near Riseley Street is a comprehensive failure and, as it turns out, a waste of ratepayers' funds. In summer it is too hot to sit there, in winter it is open to winds and rain. I have never seen anyone using it. Much needed parking space was sacrificed for this. I suggest Council thinks very carefully before introducing even more of these unnecessary and un-used constructions.
16	I don't like the plan	Please do not proceed with this ridiculous idea. I regularly visit businesses in ie Kearns Cres ie hairdresser, fashion shop and cafe and parking is already almost impossible. I have NEVER eveseen anyone use the current seating area so please remove it . Thank you [name removed]
17	I don't like the plan	Less parking would be a nightmare.
18	I don't like the plan	The plan takes extreme measures in eliminating a number of current parking places. I visit, shop and use this area regularly. The lack of parking would deter me from patronising this business area.
19	I don't like the plan	I do not agree with removing parking bays as it is difficult to find a bay now when I am shopping in the area. This will make it very difficult for customers and I think will have a detrimental effect on small businesses in the area.

20	I don't like the plan	<p>This is a business focused precinct. it is not a leisure or parkland precinct. removing parking bays to widen footpaths beyond what is necessary or installing seats that will rarely be used is ridiculous. Removing straight on car bays and replacing them with parallel bays is completely unacceptable. theres already parking problems as it is and you want to reduce the amount of parking spots further...</p> <p>Again this is a buisness focussed precinct. Further more my father who owns a large property on kearns that contains many office businesses as well as his own, knows nothing about this proposal. The first time he is hearing about this is from me. Why have property owners not been informed and consulted? You might have consulted businesses but they arent necessarily the owners...</p>
21	I don't like the plan	<p>I love that you have put in more trees and pathways - especially trying to walk a family from the private car park to Grill'd on a Friday night is a nightmare. Someone is going to be injured if something isn't done. Yet that private car park is terrible, dysfunctional, and someone is making a lot of money without investing to improving it. Parking is terrible at peaks times in this area. This plan improves the street, but fails to address the need for more parking, without simply replacing what has been removed in this design. I feel that improving the street is great, but without functional parking, especially for all the food delivery services to stop and go at the restaurants, people will stop coming to this area and business will decline.</p>
22	I don't like the plan	<p>I'm worried there won't be parking close to my work and I work early mornings and late nights, I often finish at 11pm when it can be unsafe especially if I have to walk further to my car in the dark.</p>
23	I don't like the plan	<p>Less parking space would be harder for people who work around the area, and also to go to the businesses and establishments. Changing to one-way streets I think would be harder to also get into the area.</p>
24	I don't like the plan	<p>The area for sitting faces west and will only be utilised by very few as most of the year will be too hot . Also only workers would use it not the public. The parking is unsuitable and too far away , these businesses will slowly die as the public will keep going to another area for food and hairdressing , massages , elderly people and people with smaller children won't use .</p>
25	I don't like the plan	<p>This will kill businesses. The proposed extra parking is too far away from the main shops that rely on the previous parking set up. They are already always full. This would stop businesses running at an ideal capacity and would deter me personally from going to the businesses without convenient parking. And I love this strip</p>

26	I don't like the plan	I regularly visit kearns crescent for work and recreation/ dinner with friends and parking has always been an issue. I was disappointed when they added the payed parking and now the plan is to reduce the number of spots. I think I'll have to take my self somewhere else.
27	I don't like the plan	The plan is going to take away much needed car bays that supply convenience to the area & is already not enough parking. Creating areas such as uncomfortable bus stop seats for people to sit in the sun. But unfortunately that there will be no people to enjoy it because they can't park their car conveniently . Also the business owners wont have customers because they cant get parking. So this will cause many problems for small businesses. The alternative parking on Wilcock street is not a solution as it too far from the shops for people to feel safe to park.. also this plan look similar to other plans rejected last year. Not sure why this is the proposal.
28	I don't like the plan	I disagree with removing the car bays on the Eastern side of Kearns Crescent and providing parking on Wilcock street approx. 250m away. My clients already have difficulty finding parking bays in close proximity to my office and removing car bays will make it even more difficult.
29	I don't like the plan	Serving the healthcare needs of our local City of Melville community for over 60yrs, our patients would be impacted with the reduction of car bays, especially those with mobility issues and young families. There is a greater risk of accident/incident if they were forced to walk from additional parking located on Wilcock St. As the population increases, local businesses who support the community must be supported by making access convenient and ultimately benefiting our local residents. City of Melville is fortunate to be spoilt with parklands and seating, however as the population density increases, parking is a value of convenience to the local businesses around Kearns Cres. Most residents drive & park to take advantage of multiple local businesses in the precinct. Local community decisions need to be for the greater community good, limiting access & increasing risk to visit local business will have a detrimental impact to the precinct, City of Melville residents and local community businesses.
30	I don't like the plan	It looks like parking will be drastically reduced which will affect all businesses and customers in the area.
31	I don't like the plan	It is already difficult to park in this area. I come regularly to Shendals hairdressers and also other places there

32	I don't like the plan	I use the area to shop and frequent the cafes and need to drive a car to get there. It is a great shopping precinct. There are already not enough car bays for the number of visitors to the area. If there were less car bays, I would probably go to a different shopping area with less parking hassles. I have never seen anyone using the street seats that are currently in the area, what would more seats achieve?
33	I don't like the plan	I already park a far way away from my work place, once there are even less car parks I would have to park even farther away. This a problem because I feel unsafe walking so far due to my work starting very early, or finishing work very late. Also, we already have many patients complaining how hard it is to get a parking to visit our pharmacy. Reducing the already very limited number of bays will have a detrimental outcome for businesses in the area, because people will feel it is not a place of convenience to frequent.
34	I don't like the plan	As a [name removed] we have many elderly patients who often aren't very mobile. The car park at the pharmacy is often overflowing so if we reduce the amount of parking on kearns cre this means they may have to park several blocks away which is not ideal. Also we are open to 11pm every night, having to walk any further than our carpark at the back of the means the security guard cannot accompany us to our car. There is often scary people outside so reduced parking is a great concern.
35	I don't like the plan	Making it one way only will make it more difficult for our patients to access the pharmacy and having to turn onto Canning Highway can be very frustrating as it is always busy at that junction! Patients already complain about getting into the car park and I think this would make it worse. The changes to the parking will also limit places where myself and other staff can park, especially late at night when we work until 11pm. This could make it unsafe for use when we are leaving.
36	I don't like the plan	More preference to parking for the many businesses in this area should be the bigger focus. So many of the small businesses require time to be able to attend them and parking at times is impossible find between businesses with allotted parking and others parked for dining. Dining venues alert already have seating areas for food and drink consumption. It would be better to improve and make local parks more inviting for family and friend get togethers than jeopardise the small businesses that rely on a travelling/parking customer base. The current timed parking has been a good initiative.
37	I don't like the plan	I am always struggling to find parking and need the continuous closer parking for convenience to help with my regular visits to the complex.

38	I don't like the plan	I do not agree with the concept as I need the parking for my visits to the small businesses in the area. If the plan goes ahead including the removal of parking. This will effect the businesses negatively as no parking will make people resort to going to a large shopping centres which is less small businesses and more large chain stores.
39	I don't like the plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - although the design may looks good, reducing the parking close to business will reduce the convenience for shoppers to come to and thus make the 'upgrades' redundant - need more parking bays -> firstly for patients/customers to continue to draw them into the area and the business to thrive. without this we will have vacant buildings and less reason for people to come - need more bays -> staff, parking at willcock street free , this is close and safe especially for early morning and after hours staff. free up the bays for more people coming into the area

40	I don't like the plan	<p>Parking is a problem now, I do weekly shopping at Scutti Fresh vegies, Pharmacy 777, local hairdresser. Don't need chairs to sit on around the boundary. There are enough trees in and around the area already. Extra parking in Willcock Street is far too far away to walk to the shops.</p> <p>Garden City is a nightmare to park and shop that is why I choose to support my local shops.</p> <p>Why aren't the developers who are building the apartments that Kearns Crescent is being upgraded for providing space on their property for parking. Looking at the one apartment complex on Kearns crescent they have provided no parking bays, yet they have multiple commercial stores in the building further adding to parking requirements. The more apartments that get built the more commercial stores that are approved who require parking for staff and customers, yet they are providing no parking and putting further strain on current paring options. Please think of the locals that will lose the opportunity to just drop in for a few minutes to do their shop. We are not getting any younger and would prefer more acrod parking bays also.</p> <p>We don't need chairs to sit down at the Centre. The group I sat with at one of the meetings were only thinking of themselves. They live in one of the block of units and would love somewhere to sit outside as they haven't anywhere on their land, and especially parking, they use the parking area for personal parking not for shopping etc They are not thinking of anything other than what can be done to help their problem in their own complex.</p>
----	-----------------------	---

41	I don't like the plan	<p>Thank you for your work on the Kearns Cres Streetscape Upgrade. As a resident, business owner, ratepayer and community group member I'm actively involved and interested in ways we can work together to make the places we live and work more vibrant, inclusive and accessible.</p> <p>Background: There was a meeting in June 2023 with some business owners in the Riseley Centre, after which there was to be a review of the concept plan. I appreciate that the team at the council working on this have listened to the business owners from that June meeting. It would have been beneficial after that meeting for the businesses to have dialogue with the design team before this concept was then reviewed and put out for public comment. We live and work in this precinct every single day, we are acutely aware of the needs of the residents who use the centre, we listen to them every day. We listen to people who drive here, who work here and who live here.</p> <p>Accessibility: The biggest concern that still remains is that parking is being reduced considerably. The Riseley Centre requires a great number of people who live outside the immediate area to visit and frequent the businesses to make it a thriving precinct. I estimate there are tens of thousands of visits to the centre every week and the vast majority arrive by car. What happens when car bays convenient to the businesses are reduced significantly? There will be a reduction in customers visiting the area because they aren't able to access the centre. This reduction will affect business viability and in turn not create the thriving centre we are striving to achieve. Things are tough for businesses, many properties in the Riseley Centre are empty and 'for lease'. If the centre is made more difficult to access more businesses will go under resulting in more empty tenancies. The Riseley Centre vision is for a vibrant, active and accessible centre. If car bays are reduced close to businesses the centre won't be accessible.</p> <p>Below is an excerpt from the Structure Plan for the Riseley Centre: The State Government has allocated the City of Melville a target of providing for an additional 10,830 dwellings by 2031. As detailed in the City's 'Local Planning Strategy', a portion of this growth has been designated within the Riseley Centre which is forecast to yield 'an additional 300 dwellings by 2031.' 300 additional dwellings in the next 7 years will not make the Riseley Centre a thriving hub that relies on foot traffic, rather than people arriving by car. We must take into account the actual needs of the residents and businesses who already make the Riseley Centre a fantastic community. In the Integrated Transport Plan Engagement (2019) Outcomes section, it stated "Most people still prefer to rely on their cars, even when going to local shops within walking distance of home." This says the community prefer to use their car, shouldn't we be designing based on what the community</p>
----	-----------------------	---

want, not taking away what they want? Do we need 100 trees along Kearns Cres, do we need more chairs? If you were to ask those people who come to the Riseley Centre what's more important to you in Kearns Cres, a car bay that enables you to conveniently use the centre, or a tree? I'm confident that almost 100% would say the car bay. I'm supportive of greening the city and providing shade, but it needs to be in the right place and not at the expense of the number 1 priority for people using the Riseley Centre which is convenience and accessibility. I think 55 trees in Kearns Cres is already enough.

Willcock St Parking:

This parking area does not help customers because it isn't convenient to where the majority of businesses are. A customer is not going to park in Willcock St and walk to pick up their pool shop chemicals, dry cleaning or groceries. This parking area would be perfect if it was free for staff who work in the area. This will really help move more staff cars out of the closer bays and improve accessibility. Can we work together to make this a win:win?

Residential developments:

Carparking is being removed on Kearns Cres to allow for wider footpaths, 45 more trees and chairs. This is effectively being done to prepare Kearns Cres for developers.

- Why are ratepayers paying for community amenity that the developer should be paying for?
- Why aren't developers being advised that they need to set their buildings back further to allow for a footpath, trees and chairs? Instead, ratepayers are paying for this and losing car bays.
- Why aren't there setbacks that allow for more green space, trees, places to stay, both in between and at the front of these developments?
- Haven't we learnt from the Canning Bridge developments?

Residential development – current example:

There is 1 high rise development in Kearns Cres, 'The Matheson' (22-24 Kearns Cres Ardross). The developer provided a chair, 2 trees and some shrubs. There is also 1 car bay. I can see this is the vision of what the council want to see around the outer ring of Kearns Cres. To achieve this 5 car bays were lost.

This one development has added 3 new commercial tenancies that have provided NO parking bays for their staff or customers. Where do they park? There is now only 1 car bay in front of their building. Where do the visitors of the residents in the building park? They don't park under the building as it's a locked garage, they park in whatever bays are left on Kearns Cres or the private bays of the businesses.

Imagine what Kearns Cres and the Riseley Centre will look like when there are more developments. Where do the staff and customers of the commercial tenancies park (there could be up to 15-20 extra commercial

		<p>tenancies). Where do the visitors of the residents park? We must be looking at this practically, with an increase in population there is an increased need for car parking not a reduction. People who live and work in these developments will only increase the need for car parking. Yes, the residents will want open space, trees for shade, chairs etc, but they must be provided by the developers not by the ratepayers. Plus, we cannot lose parking and in turn accessibility because these developments will only add to the requirement for more parking bays.</p> <p>How many car bays are being lost? Unfortunately, nowhere on the website relating to the Kearns Cres Streetscape Upgrade does it tell you how many parking bays are being lost. This is very important information. It's difficult to get a thorough response from residents, ratepayers and businesses if they aren't given all the information.</p> <p>Support the businesses: The businesses in the Riseley Centre are the heart beat of the centre, we need thriving businesses to have a thriving Riseley Centre. It is so important that the focus of this upgrade is to support the businesses as they attract the residents/customers which then helps create the vibrant community, which will lead to more development. But if accessibility is diminished the businesses will suffer and the centre will not thrive. With more development in the centre, there will only be a larger need for car parking close to the businesses. The future commercial and residential properties will put an extra strain on the already difficult parking conditions. We need more bays to be available (Willcock St) on top of what is already there, not instead of what is there.</p> <p>I appreciate being able to provide written feedback, can I ask for the opportunity for the businesses in the Riseley Centre to meet with the Open Space Design Team or the Environment and Infrastructure team before the concept is finalised. We'd like to share the practicalities of how the centre is used by residents, customers and staff and what we see happening as the Riseley Centre becomes more developed.</p> <p>Many thanks for your understanding and consideration.</p>
--	--	--

42	I don't like the plan	<p>I am writing to express my concerns regarding the proposed changes to parking regulations on Kearns Crescent in Ardross. As a business owner for 32 years on Kearns crescent and regular user of this area, I believe that the current plan may not serve the best interests of our community. My feedback is structured to highlight specific issues with the proposal, potential consequences, and alternative suggestions that could better accommodate both residents and visitors.</p> <p>Current Parking Situation Kearns Crescent currently provides a balance between residential needs and visitor access. The existing parking arrangements allow residents to park conveniently near their homes while also accommodating visitors who come to enjoy local amenities. This balance is crucial for maintaining the vibrancy of our neighbourhood.</p> <p>Concerns with Proposed Changes</p> <p>1. Increased Traffic Congestion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed changes are likely to lead to increased traffic congestion in the area. By altering parking availability, more vehicles may be forced to circle around looking for parking spaces, which can create unnecessary delays and frustration for both residents and visitors & even visitors leaving the shopping area due to no parking. <p>2. Impact on Local Businesses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many local businesses rely on foot traffic from visitors who park along Kearns Crescent. If parking becomes limited or less accessible due to new design, it could deter customers from visiting these establishments, ultimately harming their economic viability. <p>3. Safety Concerns</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes in parking regulations can impact pedestrian safety. If vehicles are forced into narrower lanes or if parking is moved away from certain areas, it may increase risks for pedestrians, particularly children and elderly individuals who frequent this neighbourhood <p>.</p> <p>4. Loss of Community Character</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The character of Ardross is defined by its community-oriented atmosphere. Restricting parking could diminish this sense of community by making it less welcoming for visitors and reducing opportunities for social interactions among residents. Also there is a need of public toilets for visitors & for disabled is not on the current plan this is really disappointing this needs to be a priority.
----	-----------------------	---

		<p>5. Lack of Consultation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• It appears that there has been insufficient consultation with residents and business owners regarding these changes. Engaging with the community before implementing such significant alterations would ensure that all voices are heard and considered in decision-making processes. As I attended other meetings & a lack of attendance & feed back was very limited. All businesses owners were very concerned to loose any parking but yet the plan presented is removing parking on one side of Kearns crescent. <p>Alternative Suggestions</p> <p>1. Maintain Current Parking Arrangements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• I strongly recommend maintaining the current parking arrangements and adding new parking on Wilcock street will be more beneficial rather than removing parking off Kearns crescent as there is already a lack of parking. <p>2. Community Engagement Initiatives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Establishing regular forums or surveys where residents can voice their opinions about local issues would foster a stronger sense of community involvement and ensure that decisions reflect collective interests. <p>In conclusion, I urge the City of Melville to reconsider the proposed changes to parking on Kearns Crescent in Ardross. The potential negative impacts on traffic congestion, local businesses, safety, community character, and resident engagement warrant a thorough reevaluation of this plan. By prioritising open dialogue with our community members and considering alternative solutions that maintain accessibility while enhancing safety, we can work together towards a more favourable outcome for everyone involved. Thank you for considering my feedback as part of your decision-making process regarding this important issue.</p>
--	--	--

43	I don't like the plan	Less parking is unacceptable will greatly impact on business in the immediate vicinity. A lot of the businesses are reliant on parking with close proximity to shops examples 777 Pharmacy for scripts Scutti Fresh Market, Fussy Meats and Fresh Fish shop are reliant on customers being able to park as close as possible. My Family built and developed this Shopping Centre back in 1962 and has benefited the Community for over 62 years it would be very sad to see businesses fold in the future if parking is taken away.
44	I don't like the plan	The extra parking at willcock is too far away, we already struggle to find parking which makes it difficult when carrying heavy 10-20kg pool salt bags and chlorine. My grandad struggles to walk to the pharmacy from longer distances which he enjoys as a weekly outing to interact with his local pharmacists. More chairs in places that are nice like around parks and the river is great however most people visit here to park and go shopping, or go to the quarter Acer for lunch (which I am already avoiding due to parking difficulty)
45	I don't like the plan	i have a number of concerns - reduced parking for people staff customers and reducing likely further growth because of it. -one way is Highly negative and EXTREMELY DANGEROUS,considering all cars entering from Risely St and BIG TRUCKS it will be a massive problem.
46	I don't like the plan	I bring my parents from Como to the local pharmacy and shops weekly, I am very concerned about the lack Of parking , they are elderly but don't qualify for ACROD parking They do not want to sit and view a streetscape or stay for coffee. They want their medication and vegetables then taken home. We have a near by river for coffee and views

47	I don't like the plan	<p>I am not in favour of several aspects of the Kearns Crescent Street scape upgrade and in particular the amount of car bays that will be lost. More car bays are needed NOT LESS. I feel that the business owners at the Centre are not being listened to and after all without these businesses there would be no Centre.</p> <p>In May 2023 I attend the meeting with Council to assist draft and provide feedback on the proposed upgrade. At this meeting I got the feeling that this upgrade was to appease people living in the new apartments rather than to promote more businesses to the Centre. Most people use the Centre for convenience and drive a car to get there. By removing car bays it will reduce the ability of people to use the Centre and cause them to shop at a different Centre due to restricted parking. It is a problem on most days to get parking. Most people prefer to shop where parking is easy and available. Loss of shoppers to the Centre will no doubt greatly effect the viability of the business and if the businesses are not profitable will have to close their doors or relocate away from the Centre. We don't want to see a huge amount of money spent on the upgrade and businesses disappear from the Centre. Yes, more trees will assist with greening Melville but there are already enough trees in Kearns Crescent.</p> <p>I don't see where providing chairs being helpful or needed at the expense of losing car space area. They'd prefer to find parking their motor vehicle than somewhere to sit. Improvements should be made to encourage more shoppers to the Centre. The extra parking at Willcock St. is too far away. Carrying heavy shopping bags over this distance would not be welcomed. I am a regular shopper at the Centre(age 81) and if I can't find a parking bay close, I will not patronise the Centre. I require Acrod parking and consider that providing more Acrod parking bays to be important. I hope that my feedback will be given due thought in respect to the proposed street upgrade.</p>
----	-----------------------	--

48	I don't like the plan	<p>I strongly oppose the decision to move ahead with this plan. I can recognise the need to improve the uneven footpaths and create a more 'pedestrian-friendly' access, however I can't understand why you are wanting to take away MORE parking when there are limited spaces as it is. I have great concerns for our elderly customer base who will no longer be able to secure a spot out the front of our business, and will therefore simply stop coming. They are not capable of walking all the way from the proposed additional parking at Wilcock Street. Furthermore, there is simply no need for extra seating and recreational areas - the ones we already have do not get used. Moving forward with this plan would severely impact business' in this area. By taking away the parking you would stop people from coming to visit various retailers and shop owners due to their frustration at not being able to find a car park - thus costing them business. If anything, you should be exploring options on how to give us more parking spaces.</p>
49	I don't like the plan	<p>I have reservations about the ability of the City to maintain the extensive paving in a safe condition to avoid trips and falls by pedestrians of all abilities. ie. Disabled, elderly, children, vision impaired. Links avenue paving is very hot. Please ensure kerbs are safe barrier profile, not Semi-mountable or mountable, for safety of stepping up down, and parking safety (Austroads)</p> 

50	I don't like the plan	<p>My level of support should be "could tolerate" as it is better than the existing. However the focus on retaining 90 degree parking serves the narrow interest of some current businesses rather than the community as a whole. Riseley Centre has the potential to be a destination where people shop, buy coffee, have their hair done etc, rather than dash down in the car for a specific purpose and leave quickly. Particularly with increasing density in the area, the plan should look to future use. People who shop at Westfield go there partly to enjoy a number of different experiences in an environment where they are safe from cars, and often walk some distance from their parking place to their principal destination shop. Kearns Crescent should offer a similar experience with the added benefit of an alfresco feel. My daily walks to and from the Riseley Centre over the last decade suggest that many businesses are struggling and that the retail and service range is narrowing. I think it needs more than a minor cosmetic upgrade to reverse this trend.</p>
51	I don't like the plan	<p>We [name removed] business owner have said 10000 times we disagree with the new plan as we are going to loose many parking space. Very very sad to see our council had no consideration 😞</p>
52	I don't like the plan	<p>We are writing to express our concerns about the recent changes to Kearns Crescent. As residents and businesses in the area, we are particularly worried about the following issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reduced Parking The reduction in available parking spaces will negatively impact both residents and businesses, especially those who rely on customer accessibility. With multiple delivery services and businesses operating under minimal leases, the lack of adequate parking bays makes it challenging to operate effectively. 2. Loading Zone We currently do not have enough designated loading zones, which are essential for the regular deliveries our businesses receive. More loading zones will help ensure smooth operations without disrupting traffic flow. 3. Trees and Environmental Concerns The additional trees has also caused concern, as no one seems to be looking after the greenery <p>We respectfully request that the Shire reconsider these changes, particularly by increasing the number of parking bays and ensuring that loading zones are available.</p>

53	I don't like the plan	With the new parking regime I'm completely against it. Local business will get effected if the new regime goes ahead. There's not enough parking to begin with so I'm not sure as to why creating less parking will Benefit the area when it's the actual business in the surrounding areas brining the public in. You're doing them a disservice.
54	I like the plan	Can the parking bays be bigger. Cars are really getting smaller these days - would suggest the reverse.
55	I like the plan	Its a nice and very very necessary upgrade to the area. I am a frequent visitor. I do wish there was even less parking honestly but I understand there might be a lot of stink about that. I hope that the businesses along the street are allowed to put up parklets in lieu of parking in the future for greater alfresco dining space
56	I like the plan	Plants & shrubs are fine. Please do not include any graffiti or designs on the road, as on Risley Street as these add confusion to drivers. Would like the current colourful designs to be removed.
57	I like the plan	The concept is great EXCEPT - if the parking was predominately on the other side of the road, it would allow for Alfresco dining for all the cafe's and restaurants - there are far more eateries on the side where the parking has been put, which to me is not logical. Also, the side where the cars are is where there is more summer shade - perfect for Alfresco dining. In addition, pulling out of parking spaces on the inside curve is more hazardous than doing so on the outside curve due to better vision. I understand there are a few more trees on the outside curve but they are not particularly nice box trees, so losing some to parking wouldn't be a great loss - better trees could be planted on the inside curve that would project their shade across the street anyway. Loving the concept, just feel swapping the parking around would work better.
58	I like the plan	It looks quite nice. Shame the carparks are privately owned as they could do with some sprucing up. :)
59	I like the plan	Tree positioning and car bays needs to consider vehicle sight distance particularly along the north side. The road curves making it hard to see oncoming vehicles. Also suggest adding more speed bumps on the east part of Kearns Crescent to deter people from using that side as a shortcut from canning Hwy onto riseley Street. Reducing unnecessary vehicle traffic through the area will improve safety for pedestrians.

60	I like the plan	<p>Definetley like the plan of more seating and trees. Not sure if the parking gains spaces or loses some</p> <p>The straight edge timber bench seats on top of concrete don't look as nice or as comfortable as the curved ones outside Melville shopping centre with a plant inserted in the side. They actually fit in and don't look like an after thought. The random cube blocks both coloured and concrete look like an add on and won't be utilised in fact at night might be a hazard Closed in bench seats aren't practical and harder to get in and out off.</p> <p>The painting on risley st road is distracting, vibrancy can be atmosphere with more seating and trees ,not just colour randomly placed. Love the bird sculpture just like the other one.</p>
61	I like the plan	<p>As owners of nos [address removed] crescent west we would like to be certain that our crossovers for access to our buildings are retained</p>
62	I like the plan	<p>I am a part owner of [number removed] Canning Highway Applecross (cnr Kearns Crescent). The owners of [number removed] Canning Highway Applecross strongly support the parking outside our shops remaining the same ie. angled parking. My communication with one of your officers confirmed that there will also be no loss of parking lots in the concept plan. We would also like to see an improvement in the style of bin outside Subway and surrounds. The mural on the wall of our building in Chortis Lane will in the near future require a refresh or replacement.</p>
63	I like the plan	<p>It was an issue I raised during the interactive community workshop, its impossible to satisfy everyones wants and needs. The biggest pain point which the plans address is the inconsistent foot path on the south side of kearns (outter ring). I like that you've kept the road two way, as that was a huge concern of mine. It it unfortunate for the businesses that they'll be missing out on customer parking however I feel this is the best solution.</p>
64	I like the plan	<p>Much better choice than we have currently, We would still like to see no entry from Canning highway turning left into Kearns Crescent (Subway food/ VINNYS entry)as it is used as a rat run at speed to beat the traffic lights bottom of Riseley Street.. At the minimum it needs several traffic calming fixtures (humps in the road) to slow traffic down.</p>

65	I like the plan	We live in the big apartment building at [number removed] Kearns Crescent. I'm the Chairperson of the Council of Owners. There are so many near misses (car accidents) with people driving very fast from canning highway into the crescent, confusion and bad visibility trying to get in and out of the central private parking area where you enter the chemist and Scuttis, and the intersection between Riseley street and the crescent is a nightmare for near misses and people not giving way when they should. Suggestions - can it be one way through the crescent to stop people using it as a short cut around the lights (ie - if you're travelling towards Fremantle on Canning Highway you couldn't turn into the first part of the crescent, you'd need to go to the Riseley street lights then turn left into Riseley then left again into the crescent, speed bumps to slow people down and a roundabout at the Riseley street intersection? Happy to discuss if you'd like the perspective of the residents in the street.
66	I like the plan	Looks easily achievable and a good compromise as i guess you cant change the privately owned areas. So yes I like it, better footpaths , trees all good! Would really like to all the private shops and parking areas redeveloped as those private paring areas are ugly accident prone and seem very inefficient.
67	I like the plan	I think turning the block on Willcock St into a carpark is a great idea, however I have some recommendations regarding traffic volumes and road safety. Cars currently accelerate off the bend when heading west on Willcock St and likewise accelerate following the speedbump heading east, just as they come off Canning Highway. If there is to be a carpark entrance in between, traffic needs to be considerably slowed or there will be accidents. The current carpark off Willcock St also experiences a high volume of cars and has poor surfacing such that they are filling potholes on a frequent basis. Can this whole area please be resurfaced when the works are done as it is dangerous for pedestrians, particularly those using mobility aids, to walk through this area. the rea has been looking very rundown of late with lots of rubbish so some streetscaping with trees and the odd rubbish bin would be great!

68	I like the plan	<p>I think more can be done to reduce the amount of right-angled car parking on Kearns crescent. The city should work with the private owners of the adjacent large carpark (near Scutti's, 777 Pharmacy) to re-design this and encourage visitors to park there (leaving a smaller amount of parallel parking bays on Kearns Crescent itself). The current large carpark is very poorly designed, stressful to navigate and an inefficient use of space.</p> <p>Entry to and from this carpark near Bad Apples and adjacent to Hoodburger is also very dangerous due to narrow roads, limited visibility and the 2-way nature of these areas. Please incorporate adequate lighting on the paved areas and in the new seating planned as this would make the area feel much more welcoming and safe at night. Lowering the speed limit to 40 or 50km/h on Riseley St between Wilcox St and Canning Hwy, and paving the road to encourage drivers to slow down, would create a far more 'Main Street' vibe and reduce the disjointedness of the 2 halves of Kearns Crescent.</p>
69	I like the plan	<p>I like the concept and a great improvement to what is there now. Well done. Can you advise the difference in Council on and off road car parking now and with this concept. Its a pity Riseley Street between Willcock St and Canning Highway was not an integral part of this as it currently divides the two sections of Riseley Square and Kearnes Crescent. This section of Riseley St needs to be changed to make it safer, easier and more convenient for people to cross on foot and so more readily use all the facilities, activities and services on both sides as one integrated entity.</p>
70	I like the plan	<p>Add more trees</p>
71	I like the plan	<p>I like the concept but I have some questions. As part of the upgrade I assume we will get a new crossover to the street. Can this be confirmed? And while that is happening will we have access to our carpark area? I also want to ask if work will extend to improving Petrosian lane as it will get more use. Will there be signage included to direct people to the new parking area? Thanks</p>

72	I love the plan	Please consider: a) one way street traffic through the eastern Kearns Crescent section. I.e. Traffic entering at Bad Apples, exiting at the Subway end. This would avoid the very dangerous situation we have with cars coming (at speed) off Canning HWY and the many near-misses to pedestrians and parking cars, near to the Subway/Applecross Pizza/Ohnamaya. Section. B) exercising caution that the street furniture is not designed in a way that encourages late night loitering.
73	I love the plan	Any plan that involves planting an extra 45 trees and providing seating and artwork gets my tick of approval.
74	I love the plan	Looks great. I am hoping the trees/shrubs we are looking to plant will be native species
75	I love the plan	[no comments applied]
76	I love the plan	I would still like to see a one way system on Kearns Crescent. I live on Kearns Crescent and on a number of occasions have seen and heard cars travelling at speed as a rat run from Canning Highway to avoid and beat the traffic lights on Risely street. It would also reduce car horns and foul language heard from my apartment.
77	I love the plan	I am a regular user of retail and coffee shops on Kearns Crescent. Whenever possible I walk as I find car parking tight and congested. The emphasis on greening the area, additional grouped seating and wider, level walkways, are all to be welcomed. Additional Council-owned parking on Wilcox Street is also a great idea, given private businesses control the parking within the crescent. These business-owned parking areas always looked neglected and chaotic. My husband has a disability and easier movement in wheelchairs and on trikes, via wider level pathways on both sides of the crescent, plus minimal kerbs, will encourage us to use this area together more.
78	I love the plan	I like making Kerns Cres a one-way vehicle road (Concept C)