



Good evening, Madam Mayor, Councillors,

Thank you very much for the opportunity to speak to you tonight regarding the creation of the Moreau Mews Town Square.

As we have just heard, by any standards, Canning Bridge Activity Centre has only a fraction of the public open space required for the density of population that is coming. This current proposal of alternative concept 6, is our opportunity to move towards the balance required.

I would like to address the recent community engagement process and then a couple of the perspectives raised in conversation with the City's elected members and officers:

Despite the very best efforts of the officers in achieving an extremely high level of community reach with this engagement project, public response was disappointingly low. The community is seemingly underwhelmed with online surveys. Feedback that we have received highlighted the disappointment and frustration with both the lack of a concept reflecting the timely creation of 100% open space; and that the concept which best represented this, concept 3, came with a \$30 million price estimate; a price, which to many, was clearly not achievable, nor sensible. A further point of contention was the wording of the question regarding parking in the final design. This wording was found to be confusing to many respondents. All three concepts contained parking, any of them presumably could have been chosen as final. Feedback has been: that this question caused many people to abandon their responses all together.

Accepting that the two modes of feedback on the Town Square cannot be combined due to the incompatibility of process, it is nevertheless more than a shame that the feedback from 76 residents is not being included in the Yes/No parking question. Failing to include these would mean ignoring the views of a significant number of residents who **have** taken the trouble to respond. Extracting and combining the numbers from both feedback surveys, does change the result. The inclusion of these 76, respondents shows: Yes 38%, No 53% and unsure 9%. Presenting a quite different picture. However, again, we note that the overall response to the engagement was indeed very low.

Broad community support for significant green space and public amenity in Canning Bridge Activity Centre has previously been thoroughly demonstrated. A large petition in 2022 was answered by this chamber with the April 2023 resolution to create 100% public open space on the council owned properties on Kishorn Road and Moreau Mews. The foreshadowing of a possible motion rescinding this decision in 2024, galvanised both a special electors meeting and a 3000 strong ratepayer petition asking for the creation of 100% public open space in Canning Bridge. Additionally, Letters of Support for the city's Lotterywest application for creating the Esplanade Park were endorsed by 19 community groups. This confirms the broad support for 100% public open space in this rapidly developing area.

It has been suggested to us that 3000 m² is enough for a park... and that most places have less. But surely this is precisely the point. This is the opportunity to demonstrate the City of Melville as a cut above the rest. We are talking about **our** Town Square, the central feature of what is rapidly becoming a satellite city to the Capital of our State of Western Australia. We surely want to take this opportunity to maximize that statement.

It has been explained that any car park constructed on the new Town Square, can be removed. The suggestion has been that such negotiations would involve the developer removing the car

park and providing car parking underneath their project. We would suggest that spending \$350,000 on building a car park, and then negotiating for someone else to remove it, is not a good use of resources and not a good use of the public benefit negotiation potential. We should be requiring very significant amenity in return for bonus heights and integration with, or proximity to, our Town Square. We suggest that the outcomes of such negotiations would be far more desirable if it was simply integration with the open space next door, unencumbered. Indeed, the prior existence of a public carpark would make already difficult negotiations, even more so. Leaving the northern end of the Town Square as open space puts the ball directly into the developer's court for them to provide public parking.

Can I please bring your attention to the screen – we have placed both concepts side by side, and in the same proportions. I would like to point out that the No parking option attachment 6, does in fact have street parking along the verge – amenity which was not present on any of the concepts 1,2 or 3. I believe discussions are already proceeding for integration of the Town Square along the western boundary. I'd like to point out that the carpark is clearly crowding the playground down into the vicinity under discussion.

There is a reticence in this chamber to forgo the income potential of the city's holdings at Moreau Mews. Hence the move to recoup this by including parking. Of course, commercial development pressure will always exist, but must surely be reconciled with the undeniable need for public amenity.

It is reasonable and strategic to reinvest a portion of rate revenue into the very community that contributes it. This income we speak of here is not insignificant. Every ratepayer understands the advantages for the City in converting the area of six or eight existing ground level rateable properties into a tower which contains hundreds of rateable dwellings. This multiplying effect on rates revenue is not lost on residents and ratepayers.

Yes, in a sense, these high-density developments are the answer to a lot of the City's broader fiscal issues – however, squeezing the Canning Bridge cash cow, at the expense of vision and design, is not delivering anything that looks like the tourist attraction some are dreaming of...

Duane Cole from the consultancy firm Hatch Roberts Day, specifically mentioned the benefits of investment now, in delivering long term gains to the City. Utilising the entirety of this 4000 sq meter space, without sacrificing space for parking, will allow for multiple recreational uses and attract and allow for the integration of development in a manner that will deliver a superior quality of urban landscape, enhancing liveability, demand and ultimately more appropriate, high-quality development.

Such an outcome not only benefits the residents and visitors, but would stimulate economic activity and uplift the city's profile as a whole. If we can get the allure of this honey pot right – the very best of development will follow.

The surrounding area already offers ample parking—so let's focus on the vision and full potential of a vibrant meeting place and community hub. Imagine a lively meeting place adjacent to cafés, restaurants, and bars; an open space for a moving feast of artistic, cultural events and seasonal festivities like Christmas markets, local festivals, and community gatherings.

Is this really so difficult to imagine? Or is it, in fact the essential vision that our community deserves?

Please, we sincerely ask that you vote to adopt the officer's alternative concept Attachment 6 with maximised street parking. Thank you.