

Agenda Briefing Forum 10 June 2025

Item E25/71 Moreau Mews Town Square Public Open Space Development

CRG Deputation – No Car Park at Moreau Mews Town Square

The CRG strongly supports and welcomes Council's commitment to the long-awaited development of the Town Square for the Canning Bridge Activity Centre, however we are strongly opposed to inclusion of public parking within the Town Square.

During the latest public engagement, which closed on 4 May 2025, the Council Reference Group (CRG), reviewed the three Moreau Mews Town Square concepts proposed by the City of Melville for the Moreau Mews/Kishorn Rd site ("Site"), all of which contained a large area of onsite carparking plus retail space.

Based on previous extensive public engagement conducted by the City of Melville during the CBACP Review, and residents' petitions, Council resolved at the April 2023 OMC to convert 100% of the Site into public open space, due to the indisputable need for POS in the Kintail quarter of the CBAC, of which there is none. The clear and obvious intent of this resolution was for no hard stand car parking to be retained on Site.

Consequently, the CRG devised a **Modified Concept 1** with **NO CARPARK and NO CAFÉ & RETAIL OUTLETS**. Based on years of public feedback, and the ever-diminishing tree canopy in the Kintail Quarter of the CBAC, the CRG believed no green space should be sacrificed for car parking or retail enterprises, including for the following reasons:

1. Cars and children don't mix. Frequent car movements within the Town Square present an unnecessary safety hazard, particularly to children, the elderly, people with disabilities, cyclists, and pets.

Idling cars, and queues of cars both entering and exiting the carpark, especially during special community events and popular periods, right next to the children's playgrounds, present respiratory risks from emissions for children and adults with respiratory conditions such as asthma, plus is likely to arise in hazardous traffic congestion in Moreau Mews and Kishorn Rd, and is not best practice, aside from the unsightliness and heat effect of concrete car parks.

Best safety practice is to eliminate the risk (and liability) where possible. That is possible here by having no parking on the Town Square.

2. Retaining Parking on-Site is counter to CBACP Objective 7, which promotes that: *"access to and through the CBACP should be maximised by walking, cycling, and public transport, while **reducing** public car trips"*.

Parking is not a priority in this location, 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.

Alternative street parking, plus public parking within developments and shopping areas, are currently readily available should anyone choose to drive to the area.

In answer to a Public Question put to the April 2025 OMC, which appears in the May 2025 OMC Agenda, the City confirmed that there are **690** City-controlled marked bays for public parking (inclusive of the current 36 bays on this Site); plus **143** privately controlled marked bays for public parking, both within 500 metres of the Site.

The photographs in the power point taken on a Thursday afternoon in April 2025 at about 3.00pm show that many of the vehicles using the City-controlled public car bays are tradesmen's utilities and commercial vehicles related to the construction of the Riviere Apartments at the corner of Moreau Mews and Canning Beach Rd, and other developments.

The City should not sacrifice much-needed green space for the convenience of the temporary workforces of developers. Under the City's Construction Management Plans Policy, developers should be required to direct their workforce to park in areas where the local amenity is not being continually eroded.

Given that the State Government is much more likely than not to retain the concept of bonus heights in exchange for community benefits in the current CBACP Review, additional parking as may be required in future can be negotiated with developers of nearby properties in exchange for bonus heights, to provide a genuine community benefit.

The City has not demonstrated why it is necessary to retain a large concrete car park on this Site (nearly 25% of the area for 35 bays), given the large number of car bays currently freely available in surrounding streets and complexes, even if there is a reduction in on-street bays due to street renewal works. The need to reduce street parking for street renewal has also not been adequately made out by the City.

The answers to the April 2025 OMC public questions in the May 2025 OMC Agenda also fail to demonstrate that there is sufficient demand for parking to be retained on this Site, other than stating that: *"a small amount of negative input was received from local business"*, especially given that only **4.46%** of responders identified that they owned or operated a business in the first round of engagement; and there were no questions on individual elements within this survey, so the City could not provide a more specific answer on how many local businesses want parking on-Site.

The results of the latest public consultation with respect to parking (when combining the two surveys – and after removing the 20 who responded to both) is 38.1% of respondents want parking, 52.8% want no parking, and 9.1% are unsure. There were in total 417 responses (after removing the 20 who responded to both) and there is a majority, 220, who do not want parking. Those 220 individual residents or ratepayers made it clear in either the City's survey or the CRG survey that they do not want parking on the Town Square (and this despite the City survey asking for feedback on three options that all contained parking).

The City failed to respond to that part of public question 6 as to whether the City-owned and privately owned public car bays were all at capacity, so the City has failed to make a sufficient case for the need to provide more parking in this location, given the over 800 bays within 500 metres of this Site.

There is therefore no information provided by the City to support the need for more parking, or to contradict the inference from the power point photos which show many free bays in surrounding streets. It is never difficult to find parking near this location at any time, especially on the weekends when offices and businesses are closed and the Town Square would likely be more heavily used.

If more bays become necessary in the future, developers and/or the City and State Government also have the option to acquire several stranded assets in the nearby area to develop car parks in conjunction with other facilities.

By retaining car parking on-Site, the City will destroy the exciting potential for the only surrounding lots on two sides of the Site to have ground floor alfresco cafes, dining and retail space adjacent to, and safely opening onto, the Town Square enhancing both the Town Square and the surrounding developments. The other two boundaries of the park are surrounded by roads.

The notion that this town square must have an ugly concrete car park onsite is frankly abhorrent: think Federation Square in Melbourne, Trafalgar and Piccadilly Square in London, the great piazzas of Italy and Prague, none of which have on-site parking, but which safely accommodate many thousands of visitors every year.

The level of public support given for Concepts 1, 2 and 3 in the May 2025 public engagement was unfairly skewed, and strongly influenced, by the fact that no Concept Plans were presented by the City without car parking. Therefore there was no other viable option provided by the City.

The City must maximise and future-proof the provision of green POS on this Site, which will still be undersupplied even if there is no carparking or retail on-Site.

The population targets in the City of Melville part of the CBAC is approximately 5000 people by 2031; and 15,000 people by 2051 (based on an average of only 2 persons per household as estimated in the CBACP). Using the State Government POS guideline shown in the slide of 6.5m² per person, this equates to a need for at least **32,500m² of POS by 2031 for 5000 people**. Even with the proposed 2000m² park at The Esplanade, Mt Pleasant, south of Canning Hwy, when combined with 100% of the 4000m² Town Square Site in Moreau Mews, this is still only **18.5%** of what is needed in such a high-density activity centre.

The reputational damage to the City in failing to implement the April 2023 Council Resolution for 100% POS, by retaining a massive 25% of the Site as a car park, and in its long-standing failure to meet public open space targets in the CBAC, is exacerbated by the strong concern of residents that the City is intent on land banking the proposed car park area of the Site to keep open the option of further commercial development on this portion of the Site in the future.

Council is urged not to forfeit this rare and hard-fought opportunity to provide maximum green public open space on this Site as an iconic place for residents, workers, and visitors to rest, play and socialise in shady surrounds. 100% green space with no car park is the best

way to activate the area and attract better buildings and investment, by improving the public realm in order to lift the character of the area from its current state of concrete, lifeless urban ghetto.

While the CRG also opposed any commercial development on the site, we are willing to accept and support the Alternative Concept without parking developed by the Officers. We urge Councillors to support the "Alternative Concept – Without Car Park" as set out in the Agenda at Attachment 6.

Thank you,

Council Reference Group (for the review of the CBACP).

June 10, 2025