



# Moreau Mews Town Square Public Open Space

Community-led Survey Tabled Report May 2025



City of  
**Melville**

## Summary

As part of Stage two of the Moreau Mews Town Square Public Open Space project, a separate survey was developed and circulated by the Canning Bridge Activity Centre Plan Review Council Reference Group (CRG) – an independent, self-appointed group.

A total of 96 responses were received through the CRG-led survey, with 20 respondents also participating in the City's official survey. While the CRG-led survey results have not been included in the formal engagement analysis, a summary of responses is tabled below. The summary includes a separate submission provided by the CRG prior to the start of the City's consultation period and in response to the March 2025 Ordinary Meeting of Council resolution.

The CRG-led survey presented the following options:

1. CRG Modified Concept 1 – Green open space, no car parking or retail, budget under \$4 million. *(Not included in the City's official survey.)*
2. Concept 1 – Green open space, estimated budget \$4–5 million.
3. Concept 2 – Focus on events and activation, budget \$5–6 million.
4. Concept 3 – Long-term vision with rooftop space and parking, budget \$10–30 million.

Results:

- 96 total responses
- 95 supported the CRG Modified Concept 1
- 1 supported Concept 3
- 20 had also completed the City's survey
- 10 open comments received
- 1 written submission received from the CRG.

Among the 20 participants who completed both surveys, several inconsistencies were noted, including differing preferred options. Four participants supported the inclusion of car parking in the CoM official survey; however, three of those had selected a no-parking option in the CRG-led survey. These discrepancies highlight the challenges of aligning parallel engagement processes, and reinforce the need for a consistent, coordinated consultation approach.

Respondents who submitted a CRG-led survey via the City's official email were informed of the formal engagement process and redirected to the official survey platform to support transparency and equitable participation.

## Tabled Comments

Number	Method	Name	Support option	Comments	Participated in CoM Survey
1	CRG-led survey	A Winchmann	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	No
2	CRG-led survey	A Brown	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	No
3	CRG-led survey	A Kengmel	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	No
4	CRG-led survey	A Siddique	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	No
5	CRG-led survey	A Crosby	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	No
6	CRG-led survey	A Mateu	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	No
7	CRG-led survey	A Skinner	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comment	No
8	CRG-led survey	B Miki	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	No
9	CRG-led survey	C Morris	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	No
10	CRG-led survey	C Guzman	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	No
11	CRG-led survey and email	C P Bruce	CRG Modified Concept 1	I strongly support the Community Reference Group (CRG) Modified Concept 1 with NO CARPARK and NO CAFÉ nor RETAIL OUTLETS. I believe limited open green space and tree canopy should not be sacrificed for carparking or commercial enterprises. Cars and children don't mix. Parking within the Town Square presents a safety hazard. Parking is not a priority, as high frequency public bus routes run nearby along both Canning Hwy and Kintail Rd. The Sabina towers, Forbes, Cirque 1 and 2, Grantham, Riviere and The Precinct, are all within easy walking distance of the Open Space. Alternative street parking, plus public parking within developments and shopping areas, are currently available should anyone choose	No

				to drive to the area. NO CAFÉ or RETAIL OUTLETS should be within the park site in order to maximise green open space and tree canopy. Cafes and retail can ideally be integrated adjacent to the park by private enterprise on the sites of adjoining towers when they are constructed. There are already three cafés in close proximity.	
12	CRG-led survey	C Tuohy	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	No
13	CRG-led survey	C Ryan	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	No
14	CRG-led survey	M Sanford	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	No
15	CRG-led survey	D Seet	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	No
16	CRG-led survey	D Dempster	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	No
17	CRG-led survey	E Local	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	No
18	CRG-led survey	E Simons	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	No
19	CRG-led survey	E Derrington	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	No
20	CRG-led survey	F Kennt	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	No
21	CRG-led survey	G Nagy	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	No
22	CRG-led survey	G Ennis	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	No
23	CRG-led survey	G Sandford	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	No
24	CRG-led survey	G Cribb	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	No
25	CRG-led survey	H G Pulker	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	No
26	CRG-led survey	H Cook	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	No

27	CRG-led survey	J Bolton	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	No
28	CRG-led survey	J Williams	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	No
29	CRG-led survey	J Fenix	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	No
30	CRG-led survey	J Gilchrist	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	No
31	CRG-led survey	J Williams	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	No
32	CRG-led survey	J Reed	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	No
33	CRG-led survey	J Lamb	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	No
34	CRG-led survey	J White	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	No
35	CRG-led survey	J and L Faequharson	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	No
36	CRG-led survey	J Thompson	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	No
37	CRG-led survey	J Pemberton	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	No
38	CRG-led survey	J Crosetta	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	No
39	CRG-led survey	J Siddique	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	No
40	CRG-led survey	K Isbell	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	No
41	CRG-led survey	K Genovesi	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	No
42	CRG-led survey	K Mair	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	No
43	CRG-led survey	L D Hair	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	No
44	CRG-led survey	L Berlach	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	No

45	CRG-led survey	L Outram	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	No
46	CRG-led survey	L Wong	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	No
47	CRG-led survey	L Ellis	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	No
48	CRG-led survey	M Kenny	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	No
49	CRG-led survey	M Finch	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	No
50	CRG-led survey	M Isbell	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	No
51	CRG-led survey	M Kalkhoven	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	No
52	CRG-led survey	M Petrossian	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	No
53	CRG-led survey	M Thompson	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	No
54	CRG-led survey	Morag E	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	No
55	CRG-led survey	M Durham	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	No
56	CRG-led survey	N Villapol	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	No
57	CRG-led survey	N Kalhoven	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	No
58	CRG-led survey	P Nagy	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	No
59	CRG-led survey	P Genovesi	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	No
60	CRG-led survey	P Jauncey	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	No
61	CRG-led survey	R Hair	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	No
62	CRG-led survey	R Pulker	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	No

63	CRG-led survey	R Turnbull	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	No
64	CRG-led survey	R Anderson	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	No
65	CRG-led survey	S Winchmann	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	No
66	CRG-led survey	S Martou	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	No
67	CRG-led survey	S Dempster	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	No
68	CRG-led survey	S William	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	No
69	CRG-led survey	S Bradbury	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	No
70	CRG-led survey	T Kalhoven	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	No
71	CRG-led survey	T Winchmann	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	No
72	CRG-led survey	T Owens	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	No
73	CRG-led survey	V Seet	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	No
74	CRG-led survey	V Pulker	CRG Modified Concept 1	We do not need more concrete. Green space and canopy desperately needed, especially given the excessive development in the area	No
75	CRG-led survey	W Ennis	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	No
76	CRG-led survey	W Webb	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	No
77	CRG-led survey	B Sweeny	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	Yes
78	CRG-led survey and email	B Bell	CoM Concept 3	As an invested ratepayer and property owner living directly adjacent to the proposed open space, I strongly believe this precinct must be designed for the future—not just today’s needs. The area has experienced rapid, unprecedented growth in the past decade, and it would be short-sighted not to plan proactively for what’s clearly ahead. The council has an opportunity—and a responsibility—to	Yes

				show foresight by ensuring this space meets the evolving commercial, parking, and green space demands of the high-density housing that now defines the area. Dismissive comments like “there are already three cafés” fail to grasp the trajectory of this neighbourhood. Future residents will expect choice, vibrancy, and accessibility. Healthy competition is not only good for business—it sends a clear message that this is a thriving, welcoming hub for locals and visitors alike. Of the concepts presented, Concept 3—though over initial projected budget—comes closest to reflecting the diversity of the community. It goes beyond catering solely to families with young children, and instead recognises the real makeup of the area: professionals, retirees, and dual-income households without children. This design better aligns with the character of the current and incoming population. It’s time to invest in infrastructure that matches the scale and momentum of growth we’re already seeing. Anything less is a missed opportunity.	
79	CRG-led survey	B Flis	CRG Modified Concept 1	Council promised 100% public open space. Car park – open space.	Yes
80	CRG-led survey	B Morrin	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comment	Yes
81	CRG-led survey	C Rowe	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	Yes
82	CRG-led survey	C Young	CRG Modified Concept 1	I have a different idea. Why not sell the land to developers and sink the money into the block next to SOPYC and Heathcoat and turn it into an amphitheatre that could be used for many purposes like night movies, food van nights music and I'm sure many more. You would have to make the entire first level a car park and then build the Ampitheater on the first level. That solves parking and allows the shire to have a purposeful site for all to enjoy not some small park of which we have many that end up just for dog walkers.	Yes
83	CRG-led survey	D Sabatino	CRG Modified Concept 1	Given that concept 1 and 2 include a carpark – does not align with what the council open space framework.	Yes
84	CRG-led survey	D Kenny	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	Yes
85	CRG-led survey	E Bini	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	Yes

86	CRG-led survey	F Meyerkort	CRG Modified Concept 1	I am a long time resident of the COM, in (address removed) mt Pleasant. I our retirement my husband and I ( both retired GPs ) are really enjoying the POS that we are surrounded with. We have seen a lot of change and we embrace it . The site at Moreau Mews is so special . It was where our children attended play group in the 80s. To have the opportunity to enjoy 4000 sq m between Canning Highway and the Swan river, to take our grandchildren for a walk to sit under the new plantings and watch the trees grow is inspirational. Walking to an open space is desirable. And the buses will run you home at the end. COM council is to be commended for the Ogilvie Road enhancement that will lead to Moreau Mews . The Esplanade POS is coming along nicely .	Yes
87	CRG-led survey	G McLay	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	Yes
88	CRG-led survey	J Crane	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	Yes
89	CRG-led survey	J Groen	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	Yes
90	CRG-led survey	J Nota	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	Yes
91	CRG-led survey	M Flis	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	Yes
92	CRG-led survey	M Nel	CRG Modified Concept 1	We need green space. We don't need carparks, café's or retail as we have plenty of good transport options and many many cafes and retail close proximity. Our families need green space – more green space helps improve the overall health and fitness of the community you serve.	Yes
93	CRG-led survey	M Wong	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	Yes
94	CRG-led survey	P McMahon	CRG Modified Concept 1	I strongly support CRG modified concept to the (unclear word) is over developed and needs simple green space only with no commercial developed or carparks.	Yes
95	CRG-led survey	P Samson	CRG Modified Concept 1	100% public open space was voted and pass at the April 2023 meeting. There are plenty of privately run cafes within easy access from the park so no retail is necessary. State Government guidance 6.5sqm/per 50m. 8,000 people will be in high rise so Morea Mews	Yes

				(4,000sqm) plus The Esplanade (2,000sqm) is still on 10% of what is needed.	
96	CRG-led survey	S Flis	CRG Modified Concept 1	No comments	Yes

Canning Bridge Activity Centre Plan Review Council Reference Group (CRG) submission received 21 March 2025.

The CRG welcomes Council's commitment to the Moreau Mews/Kishorn Road Town Square. This area has long been identified as a Town Square both in the original CBACP and in the changes to the CBACP proposed by Council in April 2024. The CRG agrees with the City that this is a unique opportunity to do something iconic to enhance and future-proof the amenity, liveability and attractiveness of Canning Bridge.

The CRG suggests that this is best regarded as a two-stage process:

1. Develop the area into public open space (POS) by late 2026;
2. Integrate the Town Square into the developments that will come from the adjoining properties to maximise the impact of the Town Centre.

The two stages are both complementary and linked.

**Stage One:**

With one exception, Concepts 1 & 2, which were approved for public consultation at the March 2025 OMC, can form the basis of Stage 1 (amended as necessary following forthcoming public consultation). Consideration should also be given to an external peer review before finalising the Stage 1 concept.

The one variation is that the CRG believes there should be no parking on the Town Square site for the following reasons:

- This is a relatively small area, and the green area of POS should be maximised, as opposed to the heat generation and unattractiveness of a carpark,
- Carpark movements increase public safety risks in a park designed for free passage of pedestrians, groups of people, excited children coming and going, and children playing,
- In future there will also be a significant increase in traffic along Moreau Mews when all traffic from Sabina, Aurora and Tower 3 use it as their exit. (Traffic is already finding it very difficult to do a right turn onto Kintail Road during the morning peak times, particularly when Kintail Road is backed up to the Applecross Primary School.)
- This is increasingly an area with high population density within walking distance of the Town Centre and close to public transport, so walking, not driving, should be encouraged,
- Longer term, public parking, if an issue, can be dealt with in alternative ways to divert vehicles away from Moreau Mews (see stage 2).

At the March 2025 OMC, Council was advised by Officers that parking had been included (despite the previous Council decision that it should be 100% POS) because of community feedback wanting parking. This statement is misleading given that the only mention of parking in the Key Findings is: "While the majority of feedback was favourable, a small amount of negative input was received from local businesses,

primarily focused on current limited parking availability in the area...". The report does not say how many local businesses – outside of this "small" group.

Based on previous numerous public submissions in support of the CBACP Review showing 100% of this site as POS, the CRG believes there would be strong community support for no parking on the Town Square. In any case, a successful Town Square will be a major positive for local business by attracting people to the area. Regardless, the parking issue can be addressed in the longer term – see Stage 2 (much of the current public parking issues relate to the workforce involved in large developments taking place in Canning Bridge).

The building of the Town Square sends a clear message to surrounding property owners – the Town square exists, and developers can now confidently consider how best to integrate their developments into the Town Square – this leads to Stage 2.

**Stage Two:**

The development of the Town Square will greatly activate the precinct and add value to the adjoining properties. The adjoining properties, through creative integration, can also add value to the Town Square. This needs careful planning, creative and imaginative ideas, and sound commercial negotiation.

Concept 3 – described by the City as aspirational – should be seen as a developing concept that can build on Stage 1. It is developing because it will be influenced by how the surrounding properties integrate their developments into the Town Square. For example, it is likely that restaurants, cafes, small bars and retail shops will be on the ground floor of those developments, with outdoor areas opening onto the Town Square (this could also "increase" the size of the Town Square through the provision of alfresco dining on the adjoining properties). At the March 2025 OMC concern was expressed by some Councillors about the cost of Concept 3, but the cost is unknown at this stage and it is not clear that those costs should/will be borne by the City. \*

The City's current proposal for changes to the CBACP make a strong case for no bonus heights (and this is strongly supported by the CRG). However, and unfortunately, it is increasingly clear that the Western Australian Planning Commission (WAPC), while likely to agree to capping heights, will require some form of bonus heights – hopefully at the lower end of the scale. (Council is currently finalising the appointment of consultants to undertake the request for further information sought by the WAPC which will look at four bonus height scenarios – 0,0,0; 2,3,5; 3,5,10 and 5,10,15 (in the M10, M15 and the M15+ zones respectively). The CRG's concern regarding the WAPC approach to bonus heights comes out of the three meetings we have had with the Department, and we understand this can be confirmed by the City as a result of its discussions with the WAPC – most recently on Friday March 14, 2025.

This view of the WAPC is disappointing (and the fourth scenario of 5, 10, 15 is completely unacceptable and would repeat the mistakes of the past). However, if there are to be bonus heights it does provide opportunities through the requirement for developers to provide community benefits in return for bonus heights. This could play into the future development of the Town Square, particularly as the Town Square is in the M15+ zone.

For example, if there is a need for public parking – both for those attending the Town Square or more generally in Canning Bridge, then the provision of public parking in the adjoining developments could be the community benefit provided by the developer for the granting of bonus heights. This could be done in a way that removes traffic completely from the Town Square. This could also extend to other benefits for the Town Square – the provision of toilet facilities in the adjoining properties (as has occurred at Sabina and Cirque) freeing up space in

the town square, the funding of new features in the town square (something iconic, water features, stage for public performances, sensory walks, extending the town square footprint into the adjoining properties etc – use your imagination!).

Bonus heights are a very profitable part of any development. The City has very significant leverage to ensure that genuine and significant community benefits are provided in return for bonus heights. As we all know this has not happened in the past. Much community anger and frustration arises from the bonus heights provided to existing developments with meaningless community benefits – it has led the community to the view that no bonus heights are a community benefit! But if bonus heights are provided, then we must make sure there are genuine and significant community benefits in the future. This needs a new approach.

Stage two will be an ongoing project which will require ongoing attention. This will require very creative thinking in how to integrate the town square into the surrounding developments and experienced and professional negotiation skills with the surrounding owners to provide solutions that benefit both parties.

The CRG respectfully suggests that the City would benefit from some external advice and assistance with both the planning of the integration of the town square into the surrounding developments and with the inevitable commercial negotiation with surrounding landowners. There is an opportunity here to create a lasting legacy – let's not waste it.

**Canning Bridge Activity Centre Plan Review Council Reference Group**

**March 21, 2025**

*In addition to the discussion regarding the provision of community benefits by developers seeking bonus heights, the Federal and State Governments should be willing to support with funding the provision of POS so necessary with the increased density they are promoting.*