

Attachment 1 - Submissions

| No. | Suburb | Share your thoughts about the proposed Major Land Transaction* | Upload an attachment (Max 4MB) |
|-----|----------------|--|--------------------------------|
| 1 | Ardross | I object to this proposal. The ground rent and rent review periods proposed are inadequate for this parcel of land. I would like to see alternate options presented including a potential sale of the lot. "... with market rent reviews on the 10th anniversary of the rental payment commencement date calculated by reference to an agreed independent valuation" There is only 1 "10th anniversary of the rental payment commencement date" yet this is a 49 year lease with two renewal options. | |
| 2 | Mount Pleasant | I fully support the councils proposal. Its a great site and will provide the elderly with a wonderful area to see out their days. I hope it does eventuate | |
| 3 | Mount Pleasant | I am interested in this local development. Advice on the land transaction before it takes place is most welcome and a good initiative to demonstrate new levels of transparency. I appreciate the time line being made clear and the opportunity to comment. | |
| 4 | Mount Pleasant | NO discussion on the Canning Highway and Canning bridge for traffic solutions. The current situation is appalling, poorly designed, and totally unacceptable. What are the plans for the City of Melville to cater to a remedy for the Bridge congestion, Bus Station (stopping in the middle of the road especially in peakhour allowing only one forward lane), Railway Station access, and entry and exist points to the Highway. Your reply would be most helpful. Thank You. | |
| 5 | Mount Pleasant | Is the council is obtaining the maximum benefit for ratepayers with this transaction? It seems much more suited to residential development. Aged care residents are unlikely to be able to use the surrounding facilities. It is likely to end up as a high cost facility for residents which means visitors are unlikely to be using public transport facilities. Council should be auctioning the land rather than designating for a specific use so that this is not another "wave park". | |
| 6 | Kardinya | The business plan mentions there were 4 proposals submitted, what were the other 3? How many aged care facilities do we have already in the city of Melville? Why do we need another one? What's make this location the right location? It's prime location, why should a an aged care facility be going there? You have an age friendly Melville plan which has set out initiatives, did that identify preferred locations for such facilities and why? | |
| 7 | Melville | Buildings for Aged Care should not exceed 30 metres for the following reasons; 1. Fire and emergency services mobile ladder height has a maximum height of 30 metres. ie. less than 10 storeys. 2. The confines and operation of elevators in multi storey buildings promotes the spread of viruses, something to be avoided with the vulnerable. 3. Elevators should be plentiful and dispersed in consideration of fire and virus spread and control. | |
| 8 | Mount Pleasant | What is the proposed building height for this development. As a resident of the Cirque Apartments I have Major concern of a over height development in front of my aspect. | |
| 9 | Winthrop | Support, we need more aged care facilities | |
| 10 | Mount Pleasant | Based on the existing dwellings each side of the proposed land transaction along the Esplanade, will the height restrictions remain inline with those existing? Then scaling up to 10 storeys at the Kishorn Road section of the land in question, in line with the M10 requirements. There is concern that height restrictions in this area have been ignored in the past with regards to Melville Council passing developments with twice the allocated height set by the CBDAP. | |
| 11 | Leeming | The business plan is manifestly deficient, because it does NOT include: - any analysis to compare the various options for disposal of the sites (e.g. outright sale, single or separate transactions) to enable Council to determine which is the most beneficial to the City - an assessment of the proposed ground lease terms against current market conditions - advice, nor reference to advice, from independent experts in the field as to whether the proposed terms of the ground lease are appropriate. | |

| No. | Suburb | Share your thoughts about the proposed Major Land Transaction* | Upload an attachment (Max 4MB) |
|-----|----------------|---|---|
| 12 | Bicton | I support the Major Land transaction, please refer attached document - | <p>I agree and support the proposed "Major Land Transaction". The proposal is highly beneficial through a number of elements, being –</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Solid financial return to the city, providing long term benefits to the residents, reducing yearly rate rise pressure. 2. Increased modern aged care facility incorporating an inter-generational childcare centre which has shown to enhance the lives of aged care persons. <p>I request that the city consider-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Contain parking onsite and taking into consideration the childcare parking requirements, city to consider the loss of parking in the are due to the developments. 2. The city to ensure the exterior is of a high level design utilising quality materials that enhance the design and add value to the area, this is to ensure the building is not bland nor featureless. |
| 13 | Mount Pleasant | As a resident and owner of an apartment in Cirque Apartments, Kishorn Road, I am concerned about the impact of the proposed development building height. I bought my apartment knowing that the M10 zone covered the future development height of buildings in front of our apartments. I therefore wish to advise that I would endorse the plan, provided that the M10 zoning is adhered to. | |
| 14 | Mount Pleasant | I sent through a feedback on the proposed development at 64 Kishorn Road/13 The Esplanade, Mount Pleasant. I am concerned about the proposed development's maximum height (in stories) as I bought my apartment at Cirque knowing that the zoning was under the M10 category. I wish to advise that I would endorse the plan for this development, provided that the M10 zoning is adhered to. | |
| 15 | Mount Pleasant | I hope the building is not too tall. It will not be fair to neighboring residents and an existing apartment block next to this proposal is about 7 storey, we should be the height in consistency and not affect the development behind. We should create a cascading low to high from the riverfront. | |
| 16 | Mount Pleasant | In principle the need for aged care in the City of Melville will be welcomed. Given that the land is being used as an off street carpark what is planned to mitigate the lack of parking around the Canning Bridge area ? | |
| 17 | Bicton | It is pleasing to see the Council taking action to redevelop the Kishorn St site for an aged care facility. Melville has an ageing population and there are simply not enough new developments to cater for demand to allow it's citizens to age gracefully in a familiar community. Initial plans, although some-what light on detail appears it will be very comprehensive and an asset to local residents/rate payers. The proposed facility has the hallmarks of being ideal for my wife and I (mid 70"s). | |
| 18 | Mount Pleasant | Don't agree that such prime land should be used for the proposed purpose. The project is too big for the area with massive traffic congestion likely to occur due to the frequent daily visitors to the center. The Canning Bridge precinct is already under traffic stress due to the many high rise buildings approved by the Melville Council. | |
| 19 | Applecross | I am concerned that this may impact on the parking available for people wanting to access the river foreshore and sporting clubs, such as Swan rowing club. Already there is much concern in these areas with the density changes | |
| 20 | Booragoon | I am totally supportive of the concept. I think the proposed development is ideally suited to the location and as a 69 y.o. long time resident of the City of Melville, I can see myself taking advantage of the facilities in the future, as I'm sure would a very large number of other ratepayers. | |
| 21 | Mount Pleasant | It is good to have a place for childcare, cafe, physio etc where it is an income for the council and good for the community. However with the traffic before covid19 it took me 30 mins from my place to the bridge. This will get worse with other big projects that have been completed recently and others in the pipeline. What will the council do to fix this problem? With this new plan, as long as it is less than 5 storey high and there is a plan to fix the traffic I will be happy to support it. | |
| 22 | Leeming | This land is currently used as a car park and in the aerial photo, it is full. As there already a shortage of parking in this area, surely the loss of this car park will make the problem a lot worse. Does not make sense to lose a carpark when parking is already a problem. | |
| 23 | Palmyra | I think this is a perfect location to develop this project but adequate parking would need to be considered | |

| No. | Suburb | Share your thoughts about the proposed Major Land Transaction* | Upload an attachment (Max 4MB) |
|-----|----------------|---|---|
| 24 | Mount Pleasant | Such a development will increase traffic which is already gridlocked in this precinct. Traffic on/off Canning Hwy and Helm /Sleat Street is already experiencing traffic congestion. We would request that council does consider these issues as we have new and proposed apartments increasing traffic over the next year or so. Development on a smaller scale is preferred, perhaps a low rise office building that would accommodate small businesses and would offer something to the community. | |
| 25 | Mount Pleasant | I am concerned about the parking & consider 10 levels sufficient | |
| 26 | Mount Pleasant | Already there is difficulty coming out of to Kishorn rd because of car parking in front of the entrance of Cirque apartment and along the road. Kishorn Rd should be made into a single lane, with traffic going out to Canning Hwy in order to ease the flow of traffic. | |
| 27 | Mount Pleasant | I am concerned about the additional traffic as already the Kishorn Road is narrow with existing car parks . Suggest entry and exit of proposed building 64 Kishorn Road be at the Esplanade Road where there is already a single lane on each opposite site Suggest the maximum level be 10 levels as indicated in the CoM Business plan . Any additional the Developer to pay at developer own cost . Thank | |
| 28 | Mount Pleasant | I am in favour of this proposal BUT stipulate that following conditions are met M10 zoning to max.32metres Traffic management within the area be reviewed and no extra traffic allowed on Kishorn Road due to safety issues the business plan is strictly adhered to- no bonus hieght allowances | |
| 29 | Mount Pleasant | I am in favour of this development BUT provided the following is strictly adhered to: M10 zoning to max. 32 metres Comprehensive traffic plan is developed in this overcrowded area No more traffic allowed on Kishorn Road during and after construction The Business Plan is strictly adhered to - no bonus height allowances | |
| 30 | Mount Pleasant | Please see attachment. | <p>I would like to comment on the proposed development on 64 Kishorn Road and 13 The Esplanade, Mt Pleasant. The concept of integrated aged care is good, but certain aspects of the proposed development would need Council's attention. 1) Traffic Hazard - Aged care facilities in Australia are mainly single storey residences in spacious lot sizes with well planned road access. Some have attached nursing homes for residents who require high dependency nursing care. There is a trend towards multi storey development for aged care accommodation, especially in Eastern states. Most of the existing multi-storey developments are below ten stories in height. The main concern with the proposed development is the traffic congestion and restricted parking space on Kishorn Road and The Esplanade, arising from a mixed development of aged care facilities and commercial premises, eg child care service, eating outlets, and ancillary health services. The risk of traffic accidents and delayed access to emergency care vehicles, eg ambulance, can be quite significant.2) Emergency Care - On the proposed business plan for the development, the developer intends to provide residential accommodation for "high dependency" senior citizens, as well as some NIDC recipients. A significant number of these residents will likely have multiple health issues, eg visual and hearing impairment, mobility problems, dementia and other health problems. Therefore, it is important to consider how an elderly resident living on a high floor (eg 10th level) is able to respond to an emergency, such as fire or power black out, and be able to make his or her way down to the ground level without the assistance of an elevator. Access to ambulance and other emergency services for the elderly needs careful consideration.</p> <p>It is advisable that Melville Council conduct a study of traffic flow around this proposed integrated aged care development and provide solutions for the anticipated traffic hazards. Currently, the proposed land is zoned M10 (Mixed use up to 10 stories) under the Canning Bridge Active Centre Plan. It is prudent that the building adheres to the M10 zoning regulation. An increase in the height of the building would lead to a higher population density. This will increase the traffic hazards around the area, and will compromise the well being of elderly residents in an emergency.</p> |

| No. | Suburb | Share your thoughts about the proposed Major Land Transaction* | Upload an attachment (Max 4MB) |
|-----|----------------|---|---|
| 31 | Mount Pleasant | This is of major concern due to traffic from visitors, ambulances ,workers and general traffic etc, etc. .A 10 storey maximm residential development with suite numbers not exceeded would make sense as prescribed by Melville Shire for the land use. Further more due to existing traffic issues on Kishorn both entry & exits would need to be placed onto the Esplanade. | |
| 32 | Mount Pleasant | Kishorn is effectively a one way st with rd side park only allowing 1 car to pass in either direction at a timeAny major impact on parking could deter possible com prop being leased for restaurants/shops these facilities will be vital for new res/ratepayers & avoid them using alternative locations & not spending their money locallyThis new building should be self sufficient with onsite parking for employees, residents visitors & DCare | |
| 33 | Mount Pleasant | We have added an attachment supporting our submission. In view of what we have written in our submission, we support the proposal as it would be very profitable for the council, PROVIDED THAT (1) it is kept to 10 levels (32m) ONLY as in the CoM Business Plan, and (2) all traffic enters and exits via The Esplanade as Kishorn Rd is severely constrained already due to parking bays and existing traffic flow as outlined in our submission. | |
| 34 | Mount Pleasant | SEE ATTACHMENT for comments. | <p>Canning Bridge is already a substantial bottleneck and the Esplanade & Kishorn roads extremely overburdened by traffic congestion. Adding an elderly care & child minding centre which require significant staff & visitor parking, ambulances, day care drop off & pick-ups is not conducive to the health & wellbeing of anyone and is in fact creating a hazardous environment for people's safety.</p> <p>With the thousands of people expected to reside in the existing Precinct, Sabina, Aurora, Edge, the Sanctuary & Cirque (to name a few) that are not yet or nearly fully occupied, and the existing commercial businesses who are losing patronage due to the congestion, we strongly believe the proposal has not been considered in its entirety.</p> <p>There are many other options & locations for aged care & child facilities within the Melville area that could have more space, would be fit for purpose, and be able to operate in a much safer environment.</p> <p>Kishorn Road cannot cope already with current traffic load, and the off-ramp from the Bridge to the Esplanade is also hazardous with rowers, cyclists, pedestrians and traffic. If the proposal was to go ahead in such a small confined space, the elderly, children, staff, visitors and the general public lose the right to reside in a safe place, and without doubt would be put at risk daily.</p> <p>There are already significant number of long term residents moving out because of the road and parking congestion. Please revisit the proposal and let sensibility reign in the decision making process, not just profiteering.</p> <p>How about creating public parkland/picnic area at the site, as there isn't a blade of grass anywhere near that area, and this could be used by everyone.</p> <p>Thank you for considering.</p> |
| 35 | Mount Pleasant | I am not objecting to a building going on the site but would like to stress that these points are critical *Access to building to be from the Esplanade only (Kishorn rd is already a 1 way flow of traffic due to street parking) *32 m height limit of building | |
| 36 | Mount Pleasant | I support the proposal with the strict proviso that the development is not allowed to exceed the maximum allowed height of 10 storeys,and that under no circumstances should the developers be granted any further bonus height. I do not support the suggestion that all traffic for this proposed development is managed on The Esplanade. The volume of traffic along the Esplanade is untenable - without the added extra volume of traffic the proposed development would inevitably engender. | |
| 37 | Mount Pleasant | We support the proposed development, but only if the following is implemented:The building is limited to a maximum of 10 stories and/or 32m as indicated in the City of Melville (CoM) Business Plan. All property driveways, entrances and exits are on The Esplanade. The development does not exceed the number of suites and apartments identified in the CoM Business plan.The developers contribute to infrastructure needs of the region, in full consultation with residents in the surrounding ares. | |
| 38 | Mount Pleasant | I hereby ONLY support the proposed development at 13 The Esplanade and 64 Kishorn Road, Mount Pleasant, if the Ground Lease clearly stipulates that the building is limited to a maximum of 10 storeys or 32m height including any rooftop structures as indicated in the CoM Business Plan, and all property entrances and exits are on The Esplanade. If these stipulations are not included in the Ground Lease, then I DO NOT support the proposed development. | |
| 39 | Mount Pleasant | see attached - unable to open attachment | |

| No. | Suburb | Share your thoughts about the proposed Major Land Transaction* | Upload an attachment (Max 4MB) |
|-----|----------------|---|--|
| 40 | Mount Pleasant | <p>I request an independent traffic impact assessment conducted in the proposed development as well as the recent developments in the area.</p> <p>The onus and cost to design and implement satisfactory traffic conditions will be on the developer and not on the council/rate payers or main roads.</p> <p>I would also like the height to be restricted to 10 storeys as it's on the waterfront and cause excessive shadowing of the waters and the esplanade.</p> <p>Thanks</p> | |
| 41 | Booragoon | <p>I would question how positive a community service a nursing home is, even one claiming to be better. Can we see floorplans? How much access to sunlight and garden areas do residents have? How easy is it for them to access them (eg level floors, keep-clear markings in front of doors). What is the concessional accommodation like? Do all residents get their own room? What meal choices are there? Is there choice of doctor? And what makes it a social hub?</p> | |
| 42 | Mount Pleasant | <p>Please see attachment.</p> | <p>i. I'm concerned about the loss of amenity due to additional traffic: 100+ care providers commuting to site, day visitors to those in Care, Deliveries of food and materials and removal of waste, Ambulance transport to and from hospital, 80+ drop-off and pickups morning and evening for Child care, Community Hub visitors etc. Consequently, the traffic will be far greater than an equivalent residential or office building. The road system is already overburdened – Kishorn Road (should be called Kishorn Lane) is a one-way street in daylight hours due to commercial parking bays; there is no access to Canning Highway from The Esplanade forcing traffic along Helm St and Sleat Road onto Canning Highway which is already a serious bottleneck (CoM survey data demonstrated that in 2016)</p> <p>ii. Without a limitation in height the area will become over-densified as there are already multilevel buildings in the proximity which will further impact on quality of life and property values.</p> <p>iii. Tall buildings on the foreshore have the potential to 'strand' development sites at a greater distance to the foreshore putting negative pressure on CoM to achieve additional population goals.</p> <p>iv. The current infrastructure does not support the level of proposed densification and unless the developers contribute the cost of upgrading infrastructure will be borne by the residents and ratepayers.</p> <p>I will SUPPORT the proposal PROVIDED</p> <p>v. the building is limited to a maximum of 10 stories and 32m as indicated in the CoM Business Plan - Not stated but inferred due to no mention of building height but submitted for an M10 zone.</p> <p>vi. All traffic enters and exits via The Esplanade as Kishorn is severely constrained due to parking bays and existing traffic flow.</p> <p>vii. The development does not exceed the number of suites, apartments etc identified in the CoM Business Plan.</p> <p>viii. The developers contribute to infrastructure needs</p> |

| No. | Suburb | Share your thoughts about the proposed Major Land Transaction* | Upload an attachment (Max 4MB) |
|-----|----------------|---|--|
| 43 | Mount Pleasant | Please see attachment | <p>i. I'm concerned about the loss of amenity due to additional traffic: 100+ care providers commuting to site, day visitors to those in Care, Deliveries of food and materials and removal of waste, Ambulance transport to and from hospital, 80+ drop-off and pickups morning and evening for Child care, Community Hub visitors etc. Consequently, the traffic will be far greater than an equivalent residential or office building. The road system is already overburdened – Kishorn Road (should be called Kishorn Lane) is a one-way street in daylight hours due to commercial parking bays; there is no access to Canning Highway from The Esplanade forcing traffic along Helm St and Sleat Road onto Canning Highway which is already a serious bottleneck (CoM survey data demonstrated that in 2016)</p> <p>ii. Without a limitation in height the area will become over-densified as there are already multilevel buildings in the proximity which will further impact on quality of life and property values.</p> <p>iii. Tall buildings on the foreshore have the potential to 'strand' development sites at a greater distance to the foreshore putting negative pressure on CoM to achieve additional population goals.</p> <p>iv. The current infrastructure does not support the level of proposed densification and unless the developers contribute the cost of upgrading infrastructure will be borne by the residents and ratepayers.</p> <p>I will SUPPORT the proposal PROVIDED</p> <p>v. the building is limited to a maximum of 10 stories and 32m as indicated in the CoM Business Plan - Not stated but inferred due to no mention of building height but submitted for an M10 zone.</p> <p>vi. All traffic enters and exits via The Esplanade as Kishorn is severely constrained due to parking bays and existing traffic flow.</p> <p>vii. The development does not exceed the number of suites, apartments etc identified in the CoM Business Plan.</p> <p>viii. The developers contribute to infrastructure needs</p> |
| 44 | Mount Pleasant | The development is acceptable as long as it adheres to the CoM Business Plan i.e. a maximum of 10 stories and/or 32 m, impact on traffic flow in Kishorn Rd is limited, the number of units/apartments/suits don't exceed the agreed number, and the area's infrastructure is supported by the developer. | |
| 45 | Mount Pleasant | No I DO NOT support this huge development this area . over crowded now. no room for more traffic. | |
| 46 | Mount Pleasant | I support the development, as long as its not over 10 stories high. | |
| 47 | Mount Pleasant | 1.I have no objections to the Zoning up to 10 storey height, being designated as M10. My main concern is the council will be pressured into giving bonus heights above 10 storeys. The traffic along Kishorn Road is already congested with street parking virtually turning it into single lane.The entry into the proposed development be only from The Esplanade.The exit and entry be strictly for emergency vehicles on Kishorn Road eg Ambulances and fire engines. | |
| 48 | Mount Pleasant | I do not support the proposed development. Overshadowing, congestion and loss of property value all not bringing any positive living conditions to those in the surrounding properties and why we strongly object. | |
| 49 | unknown | I have concerns regarding the proposal to provide 82 child care places at the development at 64 Kishorn Rd/13 The Esplanade. I do not believe the current traffic arrangements in this area would support the transportation of children to and from the proposed centre given the current congested nature of the roads. If council plans to approve a child care facility in this area then it needs to radically change the current traffic flow arrangements. | |

| No. | Suburb | Share your thoughts about the proposed Major Land Transaction* | Upload an attachment (Max 4MB) |
|-----|----------------|--|--|
| 50 | Mount Pleasant | <p>see attached. 500 characters totally inadequate. I have submitted my comments as an attachment online since the 500 character limit is far too restrictive. I attach a copy of that submission for your attention as I have been informed that you can assist us in ensuring that bonus levels are not misused on this occasion as they have been in the past. It is my contention that Oyrx Communities are property developers whose business plan is founded on the concept of making a profit. The fact that their business is coincidentally providing community benefit as defined by the City of Melville should not entitle them to bonus levels. I'm sure you are aware that once a 10 storey building is approved, the costs of adding an extra storey is not 10% of the projected building costs. It is significantly less and so the selling values attached to that space, usually being a premium compared to lower floors, delivers a massive windfall profit to the developer. I hope that you will be able to ensure that the proposed building does not exceed the M10 levels and height allowance.</p> | <p>We can see that the proposed Business Plan for the development of 13 The Esplanade and 63 Kishorn Road has all the hallmarks of desirable social development from the City of Melville's perspective. Particularly because it contributes rental and rates income as well as meeting part of the density target. As we understand it the proposed development includes a. 90-120 Aged Care Suites b. 10-20 fully serviced Independent/ Assisted living apartments c. 82 Intergenerational Childcare places d. A Community Health care hub. The Business Plan makes no reference the building height however; although it is in an M10 zone, expectations are that the developers will request between 15 and 20 stories to maximize the value of the business claiming bonus height through the provision of substantial social benefit - Aged Care, Child Minding etc. By way of comparison, Cirque has only 110 apartments and occupies 19 storeys, Sabina has 160 apartments and occupies 22 Storeys. It is hard to see how the developers will be able to achieve their objectives as well as providing parking facilities in a 10 Storey building. Our Concerns: 1. Loss of amenity due to congestion and over densification resulting in lower quality of life and reduced property values. 2. Adverse impact on the amenity of the area especially traffic congestion 2.1. More than 100 aged health care workers - where will they park? 2.2. Supply and Waste Management vehicles 2.3. Aged care visitors - where will they park? 2.4. Ambulance transportation to and from hospitals 2.5. Up to 82 Childcare drop-offs/pickups morning and afternoon. Where will parents be expected to park? 2.6. Health hub patient visits</p> <p>3.i If a higher height limit is approved it sets a precedent for other development sites along the foreshore. It is abundantly clear that the traffic will be far greater than an equivalent residential or office building. The Kishorn road system is already overburdened - Kishorn road is effectively a one-way street in daylight hours due to commercial parking bays; there is no access to Canning Highway (east) from The Esplanade forcing traffic along Helm St and Sleat Road onto Canning Highway which is already a serious bottleneck (CoM survey data demonstrated that in 2016) ii. Without a limitation in height the area will become over-densified as there are already multilevel buildings in the proximity which will further impact on quality of life and property values. iii. Tall buildings on the foreshore have the potential to 'strand' development sites at a greater distance to the foreshore putting negative pressure on CoM to achieve additional population goals. iv. The current infrastructure does not support the level of proposed densification and unless the developers contribute the cost of upgrading infrastructure will be borne by the residents and ratepayers. In the business plan, the Council are obliged to consider the effect on other persons. The below extract from the plan does not appear to give any consideration to us as residents of Cirque, nor to any other residents of Kishorn Road and the Esplanade.</p> |
| 51 | Mount Pleasant | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Concerned over traffic congestion and parking along Kishorn and surrounding areas 2. Height of new facility shd limit to 10 levels. Otherwise poses overcrowding issue when visitors and residents to the facility are coming in mostly during peak hours. 3. Noise pollution when it is over crowded. The area needs to maintain its tranquility and also the aim of allowing the aged patients to rest and recuperate | |
| 52 | Mount Pleasant | <p>I will only support the development if under 5 storey's - give other future developments an opportunity if we do a high rise on the Esplanade it blocks everyone's view behind for future developments - Lower to higher !!</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) They need to be able to provide adequate parking on site - parking is already dangerous and limited 2) No childcare facility due to extra noise and extra traffic 3) All entry points to be on The Esplanade as Kishorn Rd already dangerous and choked up with Traffic | |
| 53 | Mount Pleasant | <p>I am averse to the proposed building height for this area. My concern is with the additional noise and traffic associated with this build. I foresee traffic flow congestion and dangers on The Esplanade, lessening my ability to safely navigate walking outside my residency, as well as others who come to the foreshore to enjoy it. Can I be assured that my rates will not be raised to cover infrastructure costs associated with this build?</p> | |
| 54 | Ardross | <p>I am against a high rise build of 20 floors so close to the foreshore, but applaud the idea of child and elderly services incorporated into the design. However, that brings additional traffic flow issues onto an already busy location on the Esplanade and perhaps access through Kishorn could be considered at this location. Whilst, it will provide an income stream for Council, the approval process must also show particular concern for the local ambience and well-being of other ratepayers.</p> | |

| No. | Suburb | Share your thoughts about the proposed Major Land Transaction* | Upload an attachment (Max 4MB) |
|-----|----------------|---|---|
| 55 | Beaconsfield | Whilst I do not live in the immediate area I do use Canning Highway to travel to the city regularly. My key concern is the additional traffic generated by the location of the child care centre, which we can expect at peak traffic periods. | |
| 56 | Mount Pleasant | See attached file | We strongly object to any construction on the proposed site that is any taller than ten stories. As the complex will be built on an existing council car park all parking facilities required for the occupiers of the proposed building should be contained within the complex and all traffic into the complex should not be via the Esplanade as it is a high traffic road already plus used by many pedestrians and would make it very unsafe for the general public. Mr Gear should stick to his election platform in regard to high rise in this location. |
| 57 | Mount Pleasant | Please see attached photo (no attachment received) | |
| 58 | Mount Pleasant | <p>Main concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Congested roads (i.e Kishorn, Esplanade, Helm & Sleat). Roads in our area are already over burdened. - Overdensification affecting quality of life and amenity - Current infrastructure does not support the level of densification <p>I am in support of the proposal provided that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - building is a max. Of 10 stories and 32m. - Traffic enters and exits via the Esplanade. - Development does not exceed the number of suits identified in the CoM BP | |
| 59 | Mount Pleasant | <p>My biggest concerns, other than the view:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Congested roads (i.e Kishorn, Esplanade, Helm & Sleat). Roads in our area are already over burdened. - Overdensification affecting quality of life and amenity - Current infrastructure does not support the level of densification <p>I am in support of the proposal provided that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - building is a max. Of 10 stories and 32m. - Traffic enters and exits via the Esplanade. - Development does not exceed the number of suits identified in the CoM BP | |
| 60 | Mount Pleasant | Please find attached. | <p>I support the proposed development only under the following conditions:</p> <p>The Ground Lease stipulates that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The building is limited to a maximum of 10 storeys and/or 32m overall height including any rooftop structures as indicated in the CoM Business Plan, and ii. All property driveways, entrances and exits are on The Esplanade, with clear signage directing vehicles as such. To not increase the already severely constrained traffic flow and parking bays on Kishorn Road, and iii. The development does not exceed the number of suites and apartments identified in the CoM Business Plan, and iv. The developers contribute to infrastructure needs of the region, in full consultation with residents in the surrounding area. <p>Additional comments:</p> <p>My primary concern is of the traffic implications that this development will have on not just Kishorn Road and on the Esplanade, but on the entire area surrounding Canning Bridge. A comprehensive and realistic traffic management plan will need to be developed and proposed in order for this project to be viable at the current location.</p> |

| No. | Suburb | Share your thoughts about the proposed Major Land Transaction* | Upload an attachment (Max 4MB) |
|-----|----------------|--|--|
| 61 | Mount Pleasant | To my point of view, The location is not a suitable area for a residential care as this may cause traffic and and will be big hazard for the residents of Cirque apartment. The area has only limited spaces for parking that are currently used for the residents or visitors of Cirque apartment and other neighbours. The building will cause a number of problems for the whole street and all other close street. I hereby state my disagreement to lease the land for a residential aged care. | |
| 62 | Mount Pleasant | To whom it may concern, Regarding to the lease of land to an aged care facility, I think it may cause a lot of problems for the neighbours and Cirque apartment. The main issue would be traffic congestion which will affect not only neighbours and us but also may cause same issue for close streets. Generally it will be a good idea to construct aged care facilities in an uncongested area and this is beneficial for both. | |
| 63 | Mount Pleasant | Concern over increased traffic volume on Canning Highway, especially during morning and evening peak hours. | |
| 64 | Mount Pleasant | Please see attached file. | <p>1. There is no doubt that more tall buildings on the foreshore would brings additional population which results in huge negative pressure on the existing serious traffic issue. Kishorn Lane, I wouldn't called it Kishorn Road due to the commercial parking bays along the road which makes it becomes one lane only. Furthermore, along Helm St and Sleat Road onto Canning Highway which is already a serious bottleneck especially in the morning and afternoon, think about what happen when The Precinct is fully occupied in a little while, it sure will further deteriorate the traffic.</p> <p>2. Mental Health Issue - Existing residents will Lose Amenity and Loss of Quality of Life because of additional traffic, populations and activities in and out of the site: such as care providers commuting to site, aged care visitors, trucks or vans for deliveries of food, equipments and materials, ambulance transport, removal of waste, child care drop-off and pickups morning and evening, Community Hub visitors etc.</p> <p>Thank you for your kind consideration.</p> |
| 65 | Mount Pleasant | We don't want towering buildings overshadowing the foreshore recreation areas, dominating the skyline, adding to traffic congestion and devaluing and stranding development sites at a greater distance to the foreshore. CoM has a dreadful record of granting bonus heights with insignificant additional amenity to the community and great benefit to the developers, demonstrating total disregard for residents. Some of the buildings are just plain ugly - and do not embody the CBAC Plan | |
| 66 | Mount Pleasant | [I support the proposed development, as it has good community outcomes. I am concerned that the character and ambiance of this residential area will not be overly impacted by traffic congestion, noise, and facilities over-crowding etc. I would support if i The building is limited to 10 storeys as per the CoM Plan, ii Driveways, entrances and exits are on The Esplanade, so as not increase traffic flow on Kishorn Road, iii The developers contribute to infrastructure needs of the region, in full consultation with residents in the surrounding area. | |

| No. | Suburb | Share your thoughts about the proposed Major Land Transaction* | Upload an attachment (Max 4MB) |
|-----|----------------|--|--|
| 67 | Mount Pleasant | See attachemnt | I support the proposed development, as it has good community outcomes. I am concerned that the character and ambiance of this residential area will not be overly impacted by traffic congestion, noise, and facilities over-crowding etc. I would support ifi The building is limited to 10 storeys as per the CoM Plan,ii Driveways, entrances and exits are on The Esplanade, so as not increase traffic flow on Kishorn Road,iii The developers contribute to infrastructure needs of the region, in full consultation with residents in the surrounding area. |
| 68 | Mount Pleasant | I don't support the development in the proposed location. Should it proceed, further community consultation needs to occur confirming the max building height and how increased traffic to the area will be managed. During peak hour there is already extreme congestion on local roads which will be exacerbated with the coming and going of staff, visitors and parents with kids in childcare. This issue has to be addressed before allowing any more high rise development in the area. | |
| 69 | Mount Pleasant | My main concern is that the project be kept to a maximum of 10 stories as this is what the Council had set the zone to be. It sets a poor precedent for other developments on the foreshore to be above 10 stories. Council's approval of Bonus Heights is increasing the population at a rate that will have adverse impact on parking and already congested roads. | |
| 70 | Mount Pleasant | I DO NOT support this development and my reasons are detailed in the attached document. | <p>I. Very concerned about the loss of amenity due to additional traffic:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 100+ care providers commuting to site • Day visitors to those in Care • Deliveries of food and materials and removal of waste • Ambulance transport to and from hospital • 80+ drop-off and pickups morning and evening for Child care, Community Hub visitors etc. Consequently the traffic will be far greater than an equivalent residential or office building. • The road system is already SERIOUSLY overburdened – Kishorn Rd (should be called Kishorn Lane) is a one-way street in daylight hours due to commercial parking bays; there is no access to Canning Highway from The Esplanade forcing traffic along Helm St and Sleat Road onto Canning Highway which is already a serious bottleneck (CoM survey data demonstrated that in 2016). • It takes us over 30-40 minutes in the morning just to get from Kishorn Rd out onto Canning Hwy to get on the freeway. The light phase at Sleat Rd is far too short already, meaning only 3-4 cars get through before it turns red again. With traffic coming from the east, south and west onto Sleat Rd, to say it's an absolute nightmare in the morning is a serious understatement. • Sleat Rd is the only access to Canning Hwy should you need to get onto freeway or other. Needs serious revision anyway, and this new development will make it unbearable, not to mention when The Precinct and Sabina 1 & 2 are completed and fully occupied. • Serious concern over whether the Canning Bridge can handle the extra traffic and requirements this development will bring. <p>II. Without a limitation in height the area will become over-densified as there are already multilevel buildings in the proximity which will further impact on quality of life and property values.</p> <p>III. Tall buildings on the foreshore have the potential to 'strand' development sites at a greater distance to the foreshore putting negative pressure on CoM to achieve additional population goals.</p> <p>IV. The current infrastructure does not support the level of proposed densification and unless the developers contribute the cost of upgrading infrastructure will NOT be borne by the residents and ratepayers. We will SUPPORT the proposal PROVIDED:</p> <p>I. The building is limited to a maximum of 10 stories and 32m as indicated in the CoM Business Plan - Not stated but inferred due to no mention of building height but submitted for an M10 zone.</p> <p>II. All traffic enters and exits via The Esplanade as Kishorn Rd is severely constrained due to parking bays and existing traffic flow. Suggest traffic lights installed here to allow for incoming and outgoing traffic/access to Canning Hwy and freeway.</p> <p>III. The development does not exceed the number of suites, apartments etc. identified in the CoM Business Plan.</p> <p>IV. The developers contribute to infrastructure needs considerably.</p> |

| No. | Suburb | Share your thoughts about the proposed Major Land Transaction* | Upload an attachment (Max 4MB) |
|-----|----------------|---|--|
| 71 | Mount Pleasant | See Attachment | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The business plan only gives basic information of the proposed land use, and not on the issues associated with that land use. The issues which need addressing include: proposed height of development, potential traffic congestion and increased traffic flows, reductions in foreshore amenity and who bears the cost of development and infrastructure upgrades. • This is a commercial aged care and day care development. While these activities provide diversity away from the already completed primarily residential 18-30 story buildings, this development is not providing "community benefits" g. space for community clubs, community swimming pool, and so should comply to its M10 planning zone, ie, development height should be limited to a maximum of 10 stores or 32m. • The assessment of "community benefit" and the extra stories granted for the completed and currently approved developments by the Melville council planning officers has to myself been beyond comprehension, and a source of great consternation to local affected residents. • Melville city council needs to get this one right, even if it receives a reduced rent because the development is not enlarged to 15-20 stories, which might have been expected by the developer, based on the previous development approvals. |
| 72 | Perth | We fully support the proposed major land transaction as advertised. As part owners of the adjacent land at 66 Kishorn Rd, Mt Pleasant, we can see the benefits of a comprehensive redevelopment of Council's carpark for the proposed higher and better use by the nominated proponent Oryx Communities Melville Pty Ltd. | |
| 73 | Mount Pleasant | <p>As an owner at 21 The Esplanade, below are two major concerns relating to the proposed development.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Unsuitability of The Esplanade for entry/exit based on its inadequacy to cope with local and Freeway traffic , coupled with increasing groups of cyclists who present a constant safety hazard. 2. The Scale of development which, although listed as M10 zone, the City has a record of approving much higher levels based on "Bonus Height" benefits which rarely translate to community benefits. | |
| 74 | Mount Pleasant | The development should not be allowed to exceed at most 10 storeys, given its riverside frontage. It should include all parking requirements on site, as street parking is limited. Traffic will need to use Kishorn. The Esplanade carries additional traffic coming off Canning Highway. The proposed usage of the site for residential aged care and complimentary services is a sound proposal. | |