

MelvilleTalks

Proposed Dog Swim Area Survey Responses

Community engagement period 1 February - 15 February 2022

Survey comments have been tabled into four sections based on Q.7 - If the City of Melville was to proceed with one (1) specific location, what would be your preferred option?

Section 1 - No support for either locations.

1) Beach Street/ Shelley Beach area . ENVIRONMENTAL - Wildlife and their habitat/ nesting areas would be threatened by deliberately introducing dogs into this area. Currently, dolphins and other bird life safely visit the area to forage among the rushes and reeds for nutrients. Dogs in the water disturb the habitat of the wild life that rely on humans for their protection and existence! HEALTH - Dog excrement is a health hazard. Poor tidal flushing of the Swan River would lead to 'barker's eggs' invading reed areas and nearby family swimming areas . PARKING - Blackwall Reach Parade is narrow and parking spaces are very limited. Extra cars parking would be to the detriment of current residents and their visitors. The existing Family beach does not need a dog beach nearby! 2). Pumping Station area : ENVIRONMENTAL - To suggest creating a dog beach so close to a public , family swimming area is environmental vandalism! A health hazard for wildlife and swimmers, especially when pollutants and 'barker's eggs' float across! PARKING - Extra parking in this area is a bad idea and would not be an option . Existing parking at Bicton Baths Reserve (and Braunton Street) is already at full capacity! A visit on Saturday mornings would be advised to confirm . Well used by the general public and families for junior Water Polo, sailing, scuba diving, picnicking, fishing canoeing, paddle boarding, fishing. It is not answer to suggest that a pumping station location for a dog beach makes use of this parking area ! It took many years for the Alfred Cove Nature Reserve and Attadale Marine Conversation Park to become a reality - residents , Swan River Trust, Council staff and Councillors all worked together to preserve this special environment for future generations to inherit and enjoy - let's keep protecting the special Attadale / Bicton foreshore and the wildlife! Other dog beaches are available to drive to . I do NOT support a Dog Beach on the river foreshore of Bicton or anywhere in the Swan River ! Environmental vandalism ! Unnecessary pollution shouldn't be encouraged by Local Government! The

1. Location 2 will become problematic with regards to parking, those two bays are a drop off/pick up 15 minutes only and already heavily utilised by mooring users and sup board users. 2. Beach street parking has already been affected with the addition of the new footpath along beach street between Point Walter Road and Blackwall Reach Parade. Lots of cars are parked along there for various reasons to access the river. I have seen instances where cars are parking both sides of the street whereby the rubbish truck and other large trucks and vehicles are unable to weave through. 3. Both locations are will become problematic with regards parking. Melville council has just finished putting a footpath along Blackwall Reach and with nowhere to park it will verge and footpath that will suffer.

1. The Bicton Environmental Action Group has carried out significant conservation and restoration of vegetation at the foreshore along Blackwall Reach Parade. 2. The proposed dog swim locations fall within the proposed boundaries for Stage 2 of the Melville Bird Sanctuary. Dog Swimming in both locations will require dogs off leash which will have a significant negative effect on birdlife in the area. There are already several dog beaches nearby.

1. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the most recent attempt to have a beach area dedicated for dogs. ch. 2. What is it with the "dog lobby"? They obviously put their selfish wants above the needs of all others, particularly the toddlers and young children, and have no regard for magnificent recreational amenities that that have been provided by the City for residents and visitors and obviously funded by generations of ratepayers. What few sandy beaches there are in this narrow river channel are unique and the waters are pristine and provide an amenity that could not be engineered. If their dogs need large area of sand to romp and play they

City of Melville - Proposed Dog Swim Area- Tables Comments

<p>should obviously take their dogs to an ocean beach. 3. We have had seven days since being notified of the survey to research the back story and consider the suggestions. We now know that fiasco all stated with a photo of one stand up paddle boarder proudly advertising his wares in a local rag and that this “news” has been hijacked and now snowballed into a public debate. It has already become clear that this is a private initiative of one elected member with little or no input from the technical members of the City’s Management. 4. We have lived adjacent to Bicton Quarantine Park and Bicton Beach for over forty years and have had a unique opportunity to participate in the development of the area and observe the behaviour many dog owners, both responsible and irresponsible. I am also a well-qualified local government officer, now retired, with thirty years’ experience and can claim to know the difficulty that dog control presents. 5. It is also clear that a gerrymander has been conceived by way of concerted effort over recent months to swing the result by numbers alone as proposal before us defies all logic. I trust that the City of Melville will give this matter the attention it deserves and reject this impulsive proposal and therefore reaffirm previous resolutions that were made after genuine advertising, genuine consultation, advice of officers and informed debate. 6. There are the countless species of birds, fish and animals that have made the Bicton foreshore their home for thousands if not millions of years. 7. Is the City going to be party to the destruction of natural habitats so that dog owners do not have to take their animals to existing sites that have been created in nearby locations? 8. Bicton Jetty area is increasingly popular with families with noticeably young</p>
<p>2 existing locations are more than sufficient.</p>
<p>A dog swim area in either of these proposed areas is ridiculous. They are both closed to homes, roads and walkways. The Proposal 1 is absolutely ludicrous. Right next to the road, right next to houses and a tiny beach. In Burke Drive, dogs are frequently getting hit when they run onto the road and the dog area there is much further away from the road compared to these proposals in Bicton. The noise pollution for residents along Blackwall Beach Parade is unfair, not to mention the excretions of the dogs, which are already evident along the walk path. It is just dangerous having dogs off lead so close to the road and people. There is a beautiful well thought out area but 5 minutes away in Burke Drive, well away from roads, house and walk ways. Why not just leave it at that ? The beach there is 100m long, whereas the beach in Proposal 1 in Bicton is tiny and in fact when the tide is high, actually non existent . Blackwall Reach Parade in the area of Proposal 1 can hardly accommodate " street parking " as alluded to in the proposal. The road there is barely 2 cars wide. The beach area in Burek Drive has 10 car bays off the road...a good</p>
<p>A facility such as a dog beach in close proximity to residences must have set hours of operation so that dogs incessant barking does not create a problem for the local community. Non stop barking from 5 am occurs at the Attadale site destroying the peace and tranquility of the nearby residents.</p>
<p>Absolutely disagree to this proposal. Both areas are widely used by people and and even if one dog is off its lead then the area is ruined for everyone else</p>
<p>All dogs need to be kept on leads in natural areas where native wildlife takes refuge, habitat or forages. Dogs do not need to swim, if people want their dogs to swim, take them to areas away from wildlife.</p>
<p>All the reasons for the rejection of the proposed dog swim area at Bicton in August 2003 should still apply (refer to council minutes) only today there are more dogs and less parking. 1How will the council control the present proposed dog swim area’s when there is little or no control over dogs off leads on the Bicton foreshore, swim area and jetty (no rangers available) 2 - Parking space is already a problem and will further increase the already congested area, should the proposal be open to all dog owners.3 - Confrontation between dog owners swimming and exercise their dogs off leads and the considerable number of walkers using this beautiful area to enjoy nature and wonderful bird life/swans and pelicans which feed in these area’s would be frightened off by swimming dogs and will inevitably cause problems between parties.4 - The current proposals for the dog swim areas on the Bicton foreshore must be rejected as there are suitable alternatives – Attadale dog beach with ample parking, dog beach and exercise area, also John Tonkin Park and dog beach both facilities within a 10 minute drive for locals. Please think carefully before handing over this environmental gem to the dogs as they are well catered for. Rejection of the proposal is a win for council not having to monitor the area with rangers and no amendment to the bylaws and a huge win for our fragile environment also unique bird life and their feeding grounds.</p>
<p>Already sufficient areas available</p>
<p>Anywhere on Blackwall Reach Parade is not suitable for an off the leash beach. Dogs off-leash in what is a fairly small area will destroy the vegetation and drive away birds as well as river dolphins. Dogs in the river so close to where people swim will be a biological disaster waiting to happen. This area is part of what has been suggested as Stage 2 of the Melville Bird Sanctuary as such a no-leash policy anywhere here is not appropriate.</p>

City of Melville - Proposed Dog Swim Area- Tables Comments

Area 1 and area 2 are both too close to residents in houses, there is little parking (2 bays) in area 2. Area 2 is used every day all year by families, kayakers, local families having picnics, swimmers and is so close to residents (across a narrow road) which is about to become even narrower due to the construction of the new
As a young person, I have seen far too many dog owners who disrespect public space. This includes leaving dog waste, not abiding by the restrictions and a disregard for those that don't like dogs. I've also seen dog owners allow their dogs to chase other wildlife off the lead. I like dogs, but owners just aren't disciplined enough with their dogs around young children. Please don't enable this.
As I advised councillor Glynis Barber in 2020 Hi Glynis We met during the week at the Bicton Pool with Peter Neesham I checked this morning on my walk and can confirm that the sandy beach adjacent to John Tonkin Park and Zephyr restaurant in East Fremantle is a designated dog exercise area. There is much more parking available nearby and I think more separate from family picnic areas than the foreshore area near the Bicton Pool through to Kent Street. Regards Graham Crosbie Further to this advice I strongly recommend that dog owners inspect the above dog exercise area and the advantages will easily be seen.
As there is a dog exercise area in Attadale which has a buffer area away from the river and houses, I do not believe that either of these locations is appropriate.
Attadale has a large dog area which has access to the river, no need for this in Bicton
Attadale has already had a dog exercise area opened up. This area on Blackwall Reach has limited car parking at the best of times. There are many families already accessing the river. Please do not add dogs and more cars to the mix. It's a recipe for disaster.
Bicton - the river is much better off with no dogs in it.
Bicton is such a small suburb with only one short water front street compared to Attadale and Applecross. And both proposed locations are all too close to the residents house. And it can cause noise too. Bicton dog owners can easily drive to Attadale and have a big exercise area too!
Bird and wild life need to be considered. There are enough recreation areas for dogs.
Bird life will be substantially damaged. Perth does not have enough space for birds to live free of humans and dogs.
Birds are already under threat from climate change, numbers are falling, we can't afford to degrade any of their precious habitat. My dog happily swims in the ocean and swimming pool thx.
Both areas are inappropriate for dogs because of the disturbance to wild life on the river and shore.
Both locations are already high use, with limited parking and with a large number of small children present. My family often frequent this area, and I would be reluctant to do so should it become by stealth an off leash dog exercise area, which it will over time become. There is already a large dog beach and exercise area, why is this required in a high public use residential area?
Both of these sites are not suitable 1. They are listed on the Threatened Ecological Communities Database (DBCA-038) for priority & threatened species 2. They are listed on the Aboriginal Heritage Places database (DPLH-001) as registered sites 3. They are listed on the Threatened and Priority Fauna (DBCA-037) for specially protected migratory birds. 4. Major safety risk- slices of land between river, footpath and road are too narrow for dogs to be off lead and under control. 5. Insufficient parking - there is little to no parking adjacent these sites. There is considerable and unacceptable risk to dogs, dog-owners, path-users and road users to use these sites for dog swimming. 6. Risk to local fauna and dogs. This is a deep water section of the river, known as a feeding zone for large fish and sharks. Dogs are at real risk of shark attack. Other sites should be considered, this area is close to the road, houses and already heavily used.
Both these small areas are currently well used by families and making them available for off lead dog use and swimming would not suit many users. The foreshore and waters are also very important for birdlife and river inhabitants, among them dolphins, osprey, swans, ducks and the endangered fairy terns. Local environmental groups are constantly working in adjacent areas in order to maintain connections for wildlife.
Concern for wildlife being disrupted by dogs in river. They don't need to be allowed in the river off lead, they can harm and stress natural fauna.
Control of dogs difficult when dolphins are feeding wildlife. Wildlife attract dogs but disturbs birds, feeding, raising young, Owners cannot control dogs when they are involved doing what comes naturally like chasing wildlife.
Dangerous for children and the many elderly that walk & swim in this area, The grass will never grow back in location 2 because of the unleashed dogs that visit there regularly, No to dogs off leashes along this special endangered fragile foreshore. Much more suitable areas for dogs but not along Blackwall Reach. Thanks for being

City of Melville - Proposed Dog Swim Area- Tables Comments

Dangerous on the precinct
<p>Dear Madam / Sir I understand that there is a proposal to turn the beach at the end of Beach Street, Bicton into a designated dog swim area. Living at 34A Blackwall Reach Parade, Bicton and retired, I spend a considerable amount of time sitting on my balcony which overlooks the area and I would like to comment as follows. The area presently requires dogs to be on a leash and on the occasions that this requirement has not been followed, I have over the years witnessed the following behaviours :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Dolphins that feed in the area being chased by dogs in the water 2. Pairs of and other swans that breed and extensively feed in the area being mercilessly pursued by dogs 3. To the immediate left of the beach is an area extensively used by fly fisherman for quiet enjoyment but dogs do like to swim that way as that is where I have witnessed them chasing the birds behind the trees 4. The grassed area is used by many families with young children and toddlers and it would be absolutely inappropriate to have unleashed dogs in the area 5. The path between the Bicton Baths and Kent Street has some of the highest foot traffic (many being young families) and also high cycling numbers. Unleashed dogs would be totally inappropriate and unsafe to others 6. Despite the existing regulations I have already witnessed dog fights in the area and this concerns me gravely considering the amount of young children at the beach. 7. The area is already extensively used by couples and families for picnics. 8. Water birds including Herons and Terns use the area extensively and can often be witnessed walking and feeding on the beach. The Osprey pair that nest in Point Walter Reserve often fish in the area and I have witnessed them teaching their young to fish in the area . 9. There is already an extensive dog playground area nearby in Attadale and a additional dog beach closer to Point Walter in Attadale . Both of these areas are in walking distance of any Bicton resident as I walk there myself and I am retired. This Attadale location is a much more suitable place as it is away from roads and not frequented by young families. From my experience cycling through that area, it can be challenging but at least there is more space and you can mostly see if a dog is going to run across the path in front of you . This vision would not be afforded to cyclists on Blackwall Reach Parade and on the path as the topography does not facilitate it and it is a much smaller area. 10. The beach is used by many Kayakers/paddlers as a launch point. Try to imagine launching a kayak amongst a whole lot of excited dogs floundering in the water - it just is not appropriate- I have witnessed chaotic scenes with dogs there and it is not even legal yet. Increase the numbers of dogs and I cannot understate the impending chaos <p>Conclusion I have lived at 34A Blackwall Reach Parade since 2011 and possibly observed what happens in the area more than anybody else and I believe the Council would be extremely unwise to approve a Dog Swim area at Beach Street both on Environmental grounds, and on Safe Recreation and Health and Safety grounds. I have witnessed what happens on a small scale and I cannot imagine what would happen if it became a designated area.</p>
Do not agree. Focus should be on the Bird Sanctuary. Dogs have two areas already set aside.
Dog owners don't pick up dog muck in Quarantine park so no new areas should be dedicated.
Dogs are well catered for with the Attadale dog beach and the John Tonkin park dog beach, which are in close proximity for locals . Would like to see Bicton foreshore left for the swans , pelicans and other bird life, which would be frightened off if a dog beach is declared.
Dogs attract sharks and there are nearby swimming areas that could be exposed to greater risks.
Dogs do not belong in sensitive estuarine environments like the Swan River. What is wrong with the good old backyard pool.
Dogs in my bar, dogs in my bunnings, dogs in my restaurants.... enough, where does it stop. Dogs always off leashes. Barking non stop next to my windows every night. Yesterday I was almost setupon by a dog in Super Cheap. Dogs belong in home owners garden and in dog parks only. No more! New Cage Road bar in Fremantle in port had dogs inside Off leashes..... laws for some not others. Do more about hoons in Hume Square Every Monday from 6 to 11pm. Come on Melville council, you can do better or don't charge me rates!
Dogs should not have areas near where people and children go

City of Melville - Proposed Dog Swim Area- Tables Comments

<p>Environment - The proposed 2 locations for a dog swim area are totally inappropriate. Background - both locations are in close proximity to the one which the Council by majority 8/4 determined should be deleted from the Officer's recommendation for a dog swim area, at its meeting on 21 September 2021. This followed a deputation by Peter Neesham at the previous week's ABF (14/9/21). At the Ordinary Meeting of Council on 21 September, the following words from the Officer's Recommendation were resolved to be deleted by a Council majority 8/4: "An area of approximately 263m² incorporating 25m of beachfront between the river side of the path and the mean high water mark off Blackwall Reach Parade commencing approximately 46m north east of the intersection with Crewe Street for an initial period covering the summer of 2021/2022 and will continue unless opposing feedback is received during this period." A subsequent amendment was then accepted resulting in a further Council resolution as follows: "That a new point be included as follows: Direct the CEO undertake community consultation for an alternative dog swim area on the Bicton Foreshore, such as timed seasonal sessions at Bicton Baths, on a three month trial basis and to report back to the Council at the December 2021 Ordinary Meeting of Council." Now, in the City's introductory comments to the current online community Survey, the underlined words below have been added to the above Council Resolution (the date of the Council Meeting has also been erroneously listed as 16/9 instead of 21/9) as follows: "At the Ordinary Meeting of Council held on Tuesday, 16 November 2021, the Council resolved to seek the community's feedback about a small proposed dog swim area on the Bicton Foreshore along Blackwall Reach Parade between Braunton Street and Kent Street" Why has the City added the words "along Blackwall Reach Parade between Braunton Street and Kent Street"? And left out words which were in the Council's Resolution "such as timed seasonal sessions at Bicton Baths"? Ultimately, a dog swim area implies dogs will be off leash—potentially unrestricted and uncontrolled. While the City has used the word 'small' to describe the size of the area proposed, it will be hard to prevent breaching of unfenced boundaries unless there is a ranger on duty. Friends of Melville Bird Sanctuary holds there should be no dog swim area on Blackwall Reach Parade foreshore. This is an area which both the City and the Bicton Environmental Action Group (BEAG) have been working to restore over a number of years. It also forms part of Stage 2 of our proposed boundaries for the Melville Bird Sanctuary (MBS). While formal discussions for Stage 2 of the MBS have not yet taken place, we provided these proposed boundaries to both the City of Melville and DBCA (names removed) in mid 2020. The Bicton foreshore and waters provide habitat for plentiful birdlife including Black Swans, Caspian Terns, White-faced herons, Egrets, as well as dolphins. We have grave concerns that part of such a location is being considered to become a dog swim area, with dogs off leash. Dog owners already have access to other foreshore and coastal swim areas. And there is an excellent designated dog beach at the Pt Walter end of Burke Drive which is a short distance away. What is being proposed will cause disturbance of wildlife, river contamination, trampling, damage and further degradation of foreshore vegetation which is vital for wildlife habitat, filtering toxins in the run-off to the river and</p>
Great idea but no parking or limited available think again
humans not dogs should have the priority - the locations will just end up as dog shit zones
I am a previous dog owner and love dogs but I see many dogs that are not under effective control by their owners. A small number of dog owners do not pick up after their dog. I have seen dog owners ignore 'dogs prohibited' signs along the foreshore within the Swan Estuary nature reserve where migratory birds gather! There are now so many dogs in Perth (many of whom are left on their own all day in backyards and houses which breaks my heart) that I think if local governments with river foreshores start to grant dog swim areas then over time the pressure will increase and the whole river and its environment and wildlife will bear the consequences.
I am concerned about the effect these locations will have on the local native wildlife. There are already other places that dogs can swim.
I am concerned about the impact of dog swimming areas on wildlife and the environment in this important area. There already plenty of other dog swim areas that this is not necessary in either of these locations.
I am dead against any dog area along the foreshore. There is enough space for the dogs to run at the park along Burke Drive in Attadale. I have enough irresponsible dog owners shitting on my lawn at the front verge. I live on Point Water Rd. I take my grand kids to the foreshore and they fossic along the beach and river's edge and I shouldn't have to worry about them stepping on dog shit or being licked in the face by some one else's dog. My grandson has a great fear of big dogs There is sufficient provision for dogs at the Attadale foreshore!!!!!!
I am in favour of maintaining the existing approach of dogs being allowed on paths only, on leads. Both proposed areas are used regularly by swimmers, including small children. Increased access for dogs would reduce the amenity for existing users of both the river and the paths. It would significantly increase the likelihood of dog waste. It also risks increasing traffic and noise in the area.

City of Melville - Proposed Dog Swim Area- Tables Comments

I am not in support as dogs will undoubtedly roam beyond the designated area(s) as they will not be kept on leashes by owners. The surrounding area is very well used by families and I have concerns with dogs interacting with young children. There is also the issue of owners not picking up dog poo when not supervising their dogs.
I am opposed to a dog beach in these areas due limitations on parking and already crowded use of the area.
I am totally opposed to either location due to both sites being very small unique river front sites that in this day and age of diminishing iconic river frontage should be protected at all costs and not given over to a dog beach. And if these sites were allowed to proceed parking would be an insurmountable problem. The Attadale foreshore is a doggy beach which is bad enough without adding to this degradation of the natural environment to the detriment of those of us opposed to dogs in public places, especially on land fronting the river. Give the dog owners a park not on the iconic river frontage.
I am very opposed to this. The area is too small to allow dogs off lead.
I am very strongly opposed to option 1 and 2
I believe City of Melville has provided enough dog swim areas and dog off-leash areas for residents and visitors. There are also nearby beaches where dogs can swim.
I believe that the location should be more towards Kent St, at the end of the car park (not jetty end) there is currently a small area there that people currently use, there is already too much foot traffic and people swimming in the other areas, the 2 parking bays you refer to are apparently only 10mins and is for boat trailers
I believe the bird life along our foreshore will be impacted further if dogs are allowed to run off-leash. We already know the impacts dogs have and how many people have no recall for their dogs if they attacked a bird.
I believe there are adequate areas for this activity nearby. I am concerned at the wide increase in dog access areas that are steadily intruding on on areas used by others. More consideration for those who do not like dogs or are afraid of them. More consideration for wildlife. Dog owners often overlap outside designated areas and cause distress to others who have to move to correct areas.
I do not support .There is ample room along Burke Drive for dogs to exercise without encroaching and fouling a pristine area such as Blackwall reach Parade. The proposal is absolutely disgusting.
I do not support a dog swim area along Blackwall Reach. I am a dog owner but I feel that we are already well supported with alternative facilities in other areas very close by, for example the dog swim area off Burke Drive and the large off leash exercise area on Burke Drive. I am very concerned that the abundant wildlife that utilize this strip of water and foreshore will be adversely effected by dogs running in and out of the water. We frequently see dolphins in very close to shore rounding up fish to eat. I see schools of fish travelling all along the strip along with a huge number of birds both on shore and diving into the waters to feed. There are also stingrays and crabs in the shallows. In addition, dogs off leash in one or two small strips will potentially roam further than the allotted area and I do not see how our Ranger resources would be able to traverse Blackwall Reach with the added burden of policing off-leash vs on-leash areas. This may be to the additional detriment of wildlife inhabiting the areas alongside the proposed swim zones. Having some dogs on leash and others off leash can at times lead to aggressive interactions between dogs, especially the ones leashed when approached by off leash dogs. I have myself witnessed a horrendous dog attack at the Bicton Baths beach strip (where no dogs are legally allowed to even be) and I hope to never have to see it again. I would extend that concern to the families with young children who come to the area in numbers to utilize the beach areas. Having dogs roaming either proposed location off leash could potentially pose a risk to those families. Parking is also inadequate to support either location. The Beach St location only has 2 parking bays for short loading/unloading of tenders, not parking for a dog beach. The only alternative in the near vicinity would be parking up on the verge or into Beach St itself. The alternative location has slightly more opportunities for parking in the Bicton Baths area and up on the grass area on Quarantine Park but none on Blackwall Reach itself apart from the couple of short stay loading/unloading bays. I also wonder how this proposal fits in with the previous move to protect vegetation and wildlife along Blackwall Reach Pde with the removal of all boat tenders several years back. Why now are we considering adding dog swim areas when stationary boat tenders were determined inappropriate for the area? I have been impressed with the Councils improvement of the footpath, fencing, revegetation and moves to protect against erosion along Blackwall Reach Pde. I understand that all of that work has been in line with the council's Forshore Restoration Strategy which refers to Blackwall Reach Pde in numerous places. I don't believe that we can confidently ensure that the flow on effects of a dog swim area won't undermine the work already put in and future Foreshore Restoration strategy implementation. In times such as these where we are continually attempting to improve our relationship with the land and wildlife and remediate our historical impacts on the environment, I strongly believe that this

City of Melville - Proposed Dog Swim Area- Tables Comments

I do not support a dog swim area or off-leash area at either location for the following reasons: This is an area that Bicton Environmental Action Group are working on to restore, and is part of the second stage of the proposed Melville Bird Sanctuary. The foreshore and waters provide habitat to much birdlife and river creatures, including dolphins, swans, ducks, osprey and the endangered Fairy Terns, to mention just a few. Our wildlife is greatly treasured by the community but they have nowhere else to go and will be diminished every time we take over their last remaining areas they rely on for feeding or roosting or resting. They will be disturbed every time a dog is swimming or running into the water, and will eventually disappear from the area. We saw this happen at Attadale foreshore off-leash area - only when dogs were forbidden from the water did swans and other bird life return. Furthermore, it is a narrow stretch of foreshore, already much used by community and families in particular. There are other dog beaches in the proximity eg the 200 metre stretch at Page St. on Burke Drive just a few minutes from Bicton + the dog exercise area at Zephyr's cafe in East Fremantle, also just round the corner – as well as Heathcote, Mosman Park and all the beach access on the coast.
I do not support any dog swimming areas so close to residential areas already well patronized, by people keeping fit, walking, jogging, families enjoying the river, fishing. In addition limited parking on Blackwall Reach Parade will make matters worse and Ranger compliance difficult with potentially out of control off lead dogs. Additionally both proposed areas are wildlife feeding areas for Dolphins, Cormorants, Pelicans, Ducks and Swans. Off lead dogs I believe will destroy this feeding habitat. In addition I believe that the inclusion of an off lead dog swim area will be very detrimental to the peaceful enjoyment of our dwelling.
I do not support as there are already two areas available at Attadale and between Jeff Joseph Reserve and Point Heathcote Reserve
I do not support because 1). These areas about nesting reeds for swans and other wild life who will be driven out within days of dogs being allowed to roam free 2). These are delicate ecosystems that should not be destroyed and befouled by dogs and their owners 3). As for other areas where dogs are taken such as Bicton Quarantine Park, the dog poo will not be cleaned up by owners 4). As seen in other spaces, dog owners are generally not good at keeping their pets under control when off the lead, placing everyone at risk 5). There is not enough parking and never can be for people coming into the area to befoul Bicton Beaches. 6). The City of Melville made a commitment to act on climate change and preserving the natural environment and delicate ecosystems is integral to that commitment. Bicton is clean. Let's keep it that way. This plan is at odds with what serves the ratepayers and the environment. Have any environmental bodies been consulted?
I do not support because I have seen the damage to the environment by dogs, and more so because I have been attacked three times in three months by off-lead dogs in the City of Bayswater. Once in the close proximity of a dog beach and dog off-lead area in City of Bayswater. Each time, the dog owners were abusive, no apology, or any other aid offered. My partner was recently attacked by two dogs, one on lead, one off-lead and suffered similar abuse. Dogs having priority over humans is abominable. There is no way I want this to happen to anyone else. Dogs have also killed each other and mutilated each other in our local Shearn Park
I do not support either of the proposed locations at all. The huge effect this will have on native marine life is outrageous. The Swan River is known for its beautiful black swans. Many of these black swans are seen nesting and feeding with their young along this foreshore and by introducing dogs freely into the water along this area would no doubt stop this. One of the other main animals that would be effected are the dolphins. Many locals will tell you stories of walking along Blackwall Reach and seeing dolphins coming in close to shore and sometimes even with their calves to feed and play. Dogs splashing in the water along the river will scare off dolphins especially any that are with their young. Dolphins and swans in the Swan River are already at risk from human actions such as pollution and development. Seeing as there is a dog beach already located at Point Walter that does not effect marine life, why would we create another one that with out a doubt negatively effect marine life
I do not support either of these areas as these are fragile areas which are being restored by increasing the vegetation in the area. This allows for the improvement of the health of the river. There are other dog beaches close to those locations anyway. There is a lot of erosion in the area and would affect areas for birds and other native fauna and flora.
I do not support either proposals even though I am a dog owner. There is so little of our wetlands left for birds to browse, breed and feel safe along the Swan/Canning River systems this development will lead to their demise. I do not support either proposal.
I do not support the additional disruption to local wildlife that dog ingress would cause.
I do not support the influx of dogs into a children's recreation area.

City of Melville - Proposed Dog Swim Area- Tables Comments

I do not support this proposal because there are other dog beaches in the proximity eg the 200 metre stretch at Page St. on Burke Drive just a few minutes from Bicton + the dog exercise area at Zephyr's cafe in East Fremantle and Heathcote, Mosman Park and lots of beach access on the coast. Also this is an area that Bicton Environmental Action Group are working on to restore, and is part of the second stage of the proposed Melville Bird Sanctuary. The foreshore and waters provide habitat to much birdlife and river creatures, including dolphins, swans, ducks, osprey and the endangered Fairy Terns. It is a narrow stretch of foreshore, already much used by community and families in particular. There are much better places for dogs to swim.
I do not want a dog beach along this stretch of the river
I don't support either area as although I have two dogs who love the water, there is no parking in either area that is suggested. I also paddle and the Beach St river precinct is difficult to get my boat through (on wheels) if there are cars parked along the road. I suggest that people use the East Fremantle Sailing Club space, this is where my dogs regularly swim.
I don't support either. They are already areas highly used for recreation, with minimal beach space and parking. There is already a dog beach/swim area nearby on Burke drive. The river ecosystem and foreshore is fragile, dog swimming areas are best located in the ocean!
I don't support more dog swimming areas. Even if you restrict these, the dogs will be everywhere. I've seen them swimming at Kent street jetty with kids everywhere. Also they've been at the north end of blackwall reach, in the bush. Again, swimming where kids were swimming, scaring them off.
I don't support this Parking is an issue along that stretch of road already
I don't support, I use this area to run and walk my dog on leash. It is very close to the road and there is also a lot of swans in this are. It's bad enough seeing children harassing the swans. We also use this area for swimming and paddle boarding. I love dogs but don't trust the owner, see enough off leash in areas that aren't off
I don't think a dog beach is appropriate in our back yard for a number of reasons. 1. Wildlife, I love to walk along the path and see dolphins, and bird life in the shallows all along this path, and would hate to see them chased away by the dogs. Especially endangered species like the Fairy terns etc 2. There would be an influx of non-residents attempting to park along the street which is not ideal, as there is no parking available. Parking is at a premium at Bicton baths anyway with people parking all the way up Quarantine park which in my opinion is not ideal. 3. Additional dog poo bins would be needed which are smelly and too close to houses in the area. 4. I think there are enough dog beaches in the area that don't impact negatively on the neighbourhood. Is not close to houses. 5. Yapping dogs are annoying at the best of times, but to then have them close to residents is unacceptable. I am a dog lover myself but I don't think this is an ideal location for a dog beach. My son has a dog which I take to the Burke Drive, Attadale foreshore which is perfectly adequate.
I don't believe we need a dog beach in such a small location along the Bicton foreshore. We already have enough problems with dog owners not keeping their dogs on lead and not picking up their dog excrement which is regularly left on my lawn which is not far from this area. I'm not convinced dog owners will clean up after their dogs thereby making it impossible for young families to enjoy these locations. Especially at the end of Beach Street where families go to enjoy the beach with their
I don't like the proposal for dog swim area at the Bicton foreshore. In addition to dealing with off leash dogs and their sometimes irresponsible owners I am concerned this proposal would have a negative impact on shorebirds and other wildlife in the area
I don't support either location
I don't support either of these areas as dog beaches. Families with young children visit these areas and dogs off leads pose a danger to our children, the elderly and to our wildlife. Swans, Stingray and Dolphins Feed and play in these areas, which if frequented by dogs off leads, they will soon disappear. We are so lucky to have these creatures in our river and should thus provide protection for them to flourish. There is also a public health issue with dogs leaving excreta and urine marking there territories. Owners don't always pick up excreta. Dogs also chase the water birds and there owners don't restrain them despite the fact that signs are in place for them to do so. There are adequate areas for people to exercise there dogs along Burke Drive with a buffer zone between the river and the residential area. Why do
I don't want to be disturbed by dogs and owners fighting, biting howling and generally being disruptive - especially Location 1
I feel that dog exercise areas are already adequate

City of Melville - Proposed Dog Swim Area- Tables Comments

I have owned a dog until my last one died a year ago. Dogs need exercise and most love a swim but I do not in any way support a swim area in the Troy Park area where there are many species of migrating birds There are so many other areas available eg along the river in Mt Pleasant/Brentwood
I have 2 dogs. I dont believe we need more exercise areas. Both areas don't have enough parking.
I have a dog and enjoy taking him swimming however these proposed areas are important for birdlife so would prefer them to remain protected from impacts from dogs. I volunteer for WA seabird rescue and have seen first hand how dogs off lead (even within areas signposted as on lead) can stress out and harm birds in their natural environment.
<p>I have been walking along this stretch of the river, and through the Pt Walter reserve usually daily, for most of the last 20 years. If there is one thing I have noticed about many dog owners it is that they have complete disregard for the rules. I have written to the Melville City council on many occasions complaining about the lack of consideration many dog owners have for people who do not wish to be around dogs. Let's face it, if dog owners bring their dogs to areas that are prohibited, it leaves those who don't wish to be around dogs nowhere to go. On top of that, I have young grandchildren whom I often take to the Kent St beach to recreate. Invariably I have to advise dog owners who ignore the signage to take their animals away from where I am with my grandchildren, as the last thing I want is for my grandchildren to be the victims of a dog attack. Most people are not aware, but there are more than 100 000 dog attacks in Australia each year, with about 15 000 of those requiring hospital/medical care. The vast majority of dog attacks are perpetrated by dogs that have never done that sort of thing previously, so owners who claim "my dog wouldn't hurt a flea" just don't know. There are many swans, ducks, cormorants pelicans, that feed in these areas. Dogs are predators, and allowing dogs to swim in this part of the river will just create another stretch of river that these native animals can't access without risk. The dog owners have a massive stretch of land in Attadale where they can recreate their dogs, and I see that they allow their dogs in the river there. There is a dog beach north of Leighton, where dog owners can let their pets loose to swim in the ocean. Basically, whatever rules you create, many dog owners will ignore them, and unless the MCC employs some rangers to strictly police the behaviour of these inconsiderate people, the dog problems along this part of the foreshore are going to multiply significantly, as a whole lot of people from outside of Bicton will realise a bit of a short cut to exercise their pets. Once that happens, the dog owners will expand the proposed areas and eventually take up all of the riverside along Blackwall Reach Parade, which, by the way, they do now anyhow. It's just that numbers will increase significantly. It is a rare day on my walk through the Fauna Reserve at Pt Walter when I don't come across a dog owner ignoring the very evident sign that prohibits dogs. I usually advise the dog owner of their lack of civic responsibility but most just say "oh, I didn't know". Somehow they missed the very obvious sign. Some, however, resent my advice and become hostile. I don't like advising people of their failure to comply, but I like even less stepping around the faeces in the park, and the impact dogs have on the wildlife there. If you encourage dog owners to use the river south of Pt Walter fauna reserve, and encourage mountain bike riders into the Pt Walter Reserve, which, incidentally, is supposed to be a "bush forever" site, it's not going to be long before the serenity of this wonderful fauna reserve is going to be negatively impacted upon. The dog</p>
<p>I have received letters regarding the proposed two areas to be available for dog swimming. I've lived in this river area for the past 36 years from 1986 to 2022 and during my childhood from 1955 to 1974. I've loved what this special area offers to everyone. The whole length of Blackwall Reach is extremely busy now and the number of people, cars and dogs has increased dramatically, especially in the last two ' Covid affected' years. I walk this river path on most days and I'm aware of the swans, dolphins and birdlife that inhabit this stretch. Also, so many groups of people are here crabbing at present, especially in the shallows of the Beach Street 'beach.' The extra hot weather and seen a big increase in visitors with their cars and dogs all along the Reach. Please don't allow legal dog swimming especially at the end of Beach Street(sadly people already let their dogs off the leash to swim and play and poop here amongst children on the sand and the swans and birds on the river.) Dog owners shouldn't have rights over other users. It will be so damaging to the river, reeds, beach and wildlife if dogs are allowed to run rampant. There is not sufficient parking and the dinghy drop off areas are already misused for longer parking. The purposed area near the Bicton Baths is a better option but it too is constantly used by families for picnics, swimming and paddling. Damage to reeds and wildlife are still issues. Dog owners are already allowed to exercise their dogs</p>
<p>I have seen dogs on river beaches crashing over nesting sites of shore birds and frightening breeding birds away. Our bird life and these possibilities are incompatible. This is a luxury for dogs versus a life- and -death situation for birds, as species and not just as individuals. This is a no-brainer to me.</p>

City of Melville - Proposed Dog Swim Area- Tables Comments

I initially supported this proposal but after reading a rejecting submission and thinking about the effect this could have on the bird life and natural habitat there I no longer think it is a good idea. I do have a dog and I walk here every day with her on a lead but I think allowing dogs off lead in this area would be detrimental, so I am against the idea now.
I live very close to both these locations. My family (we have two young boys) use the area recreationally. If it was turned into a dog swim area we would be unable to use it. Considering the attadale foreshore has a huge amount of land dedicated to off lead dogs, I feel this is more space that can't be used by the entire community. Specific dog areas smell of dog urine and poo and makes it terrible for non dog owners. Also what about the current wildlife living there?
I love dogs and used to be a dog owner. It astounds me at the lack of compliance by dog owners already and feel any further area's are unwarranted and will only encourage an even greater free for all along the foreshore and the bird life will suffer.
I love dogs but People don't clean up after their dogs. The dog areas that already exist in Melville and other areas are filthy with dog poo. I often pick up rubbish and have to avoid stepping in it or accidentally picking it up with plastics.
I object to both areas as the family of swans that inhabit the reeds there will disturbed
I strongly oppose this suggestion, as this piece of shoreline is teeming with bird life and this will be destroyed if dogs are allowed to roam free.
I think both areas do NOT have enough open space or parking or distance from housing to support a dog exercise in this area. Attadale area gives plenty of space between water and road.
I think dogs should be allowed off-leash in these areas as they are important bird habitats.
I think dogs should be allowed on a lead in these areas if you are out walking but not off lead and not swimming. There is already dogs off the leads at Kent St and it is annoying. There will also be a problem with parking and congestion.
I think it is totally unnecessary for dogs to swim, especially when most owners don't have effective control over their dogs when off leash. This will undoubtedly result in injured or killed wildlife. It will also stress the wildlife.
I think its disgraceful that after a concerted effort to remove tendors from the foreshore and encorourage widelife back to the areas (dolphins and Swans come within metres of shore near beach street) that we would destroy this by creating a dog swim area. Just 20 metres to the left of the proposed area at the end of Beach St is a sanctuary for Swans on a large number of occasions. Has the Swan River trust been engaged as part of this process?
I truly can't believe you have suggested this plan. There are numerous places for dogs to walk off the lead including swimming are. Are you aiming to make it so there are no places that humans can go without a dog being off the lead. And even worse the number of dogs off the lead in the areas highlighted plus at Bicton baths is already bad. This will make it worse.
I use the pathways between Bicton baths and Kent Street jetty regularly. Unfortunately, on almost every occasion I see irresponsible actions by dog owners. Therefore I oppose any initiative that may increase the number of dogs in this area.
I use the two areas to swim in the river and I don't wish these areas to be turned into dog beaches as I am not interested in swimming where dogs are swimming too. Aren't volunteers working and putting a lot of efforts in restoring the foreshore? Having a dog beach there will severely damaged if not destroy all what has been done. It is also an area used a lot by birds to feed and rest, having a dog beach will be very disruptive to the birds. I understand that dogs have needs but wildlife has needs too and these needs are too often overlooked if we consider the extent to which natural habitats are being destroyed all over Australia or severely damaged
I walk along the river road often and do not wish my walk to be spoiled by barking dogs who will not all be controlled by their owners. We have enough of dogs up and down our street all day every day, most controlled but certainly not all.
I walk and swim with my grandchildren from Beach st. through to Bicton baths.I have experienced many dog owners completely ignore the numerous signs which clearly state that dogs should be on a leash and not on the beach or water. I have been abused for pointing out to them these regulations. I cannot see how this will improve this situation. The same thing happens at Port beach which an adjacent dog beach at Leighton beach. I am definitely against this proposal!!

City of Melville - Proposed Dog Swim Area- Tables Comments

I walk this path regularly, at the moment most dogs are on leads and controlled by owners. I don't want dogs roaming freely and unsupervised moving onto walk path from river area. Some owners are oblivious to the fact that some people don't like dogs sniffing them, approaching them, barking at them, running after balls causing a tripping hazard. I'm uncomfortable with dogs being off leads and then moving onto pathways and getting in the way of bike riders, cars and pedestrians. I also do not want to see dog poo left anywhere in the area.
I would not like to have dogs playing and swimming in the identified locations. Over the last few years whilst enjoying Bicton Baths and surrounding areas near Beach Street, I have asked dog owners to put their dogs on leads as I have often had small toddlers with me. Many owners have been rude to me and not bothered to take any notice of my request. I regularly walk down Beach Street and along the pathways along the foreshore and I don't want to have to worry about dogs running up to me and knocking me over or frightening my grandchildren who are still little (young). In my opinion the Attadale foreshore is not far away and that seems a more suitable location for people to exercise their dogs. Also it is a pity that some of the park benches have been removed from the Bicton Baths area and also between that area and Beach Street. There are still many elderly residence who enjoy walking along the pathway and need to rest on park benches.
Incidents with dog being aggressive to the public & wildlife
It has been pointed out that the wild life, be it birds, dolphins or fish with feeding habitats in/on the river will be affected by the increase of activity in the suggested dog areas, let alone the increase of foot and motorised traffic in a narrow precinct. There are many local areas where dogs may run freely and not be a threat to the natural features of the Bicton area. Dog beaches are delegated in many areas along our coast. Blackwell Reach is a beautiful and peaceful area and it should be kept this way. Our suburbs are becoming more congested with blocks of flats and infill occurring. We walk along the river daily and feel at peace and enjoy the people and their dogs and families of children of different ages.
It is not appropriate to have dogs unleashed in an environmentally sensitive area like this. It is also too close to residences and there is already a parking problem in these areas. There are already 2 dog swim areas close by ie at Preston Point, East Fremantle and Burke Drive, Attadale where there is adequate parking and a buffer between residences.
It is not necessary to provide yet another dog beach in the two locations because we have already have dog beaches at Paige street, Burke drive, East Fremantle, Heathcote, Mosman Park plus beach access along our coastline
Its nice to be able to picnic and swim down there in the afternoon without having to worry about dogs coming up to you and shaking themselves on you after their swim, then getting a consoling 'sorry' from the dog owner
Letter to City of Melville outlining areas of concern to follow.
Local wildlife will be affected. People not picking up after their animals may become a problem as it is at most other dog beaches, parks, etc
Location 1 is too close to the main recreation area where there are often small children.
Mixing the public with unleashed dogs is not agreeable to me for safety to the public.
Neither of these proposed locations are suitable for dog swimming facilities. Both encroach on a well used picnic and swimming area and the area is already identified on the Melville Council website as PROHIBITED for dog use.
Neither. Don't. No need for dog swim area. Keep the river clean. A dog area in a high density residential area will not work. I have a daily dog problem created by others just on my strip of lawn.
No support for Beach Street option. That little beach is currently used by families with little children. Also it is reasonably accessible for the elderly. Evening picnics are popular, but dogs would make this activity unpleasant.
No support whatsoever
No support, an absolute disaster, to wildlife, people, noise, lack of parking. There is a huge dog area in Attadale, with ample parking and dog beach, which has ample room for more dogs and people come from willagee and all over Melville suburbs, so it is no trouble to Bicton residents to Page st. Blackwall Reach Parade is narrow for parking and in parts twisting. I visit friends in this area and need to park on the verge. An absolute insane proposal.
Not a suitable area to have dogs off their leads near a footpath and road nearby. There is not an adequate buffer zone between pedestrians and dogs. There is insufficient street parking available in both areas.

City of Melville - Proposed Dog Swim Area- Tables Comments

Not happy to let dogs of their Leed
Not supported at either location I use that area often and access is always tight for people so I do not support the additional expansion of use in the area dogs will conflict with people and children and the current rules in the area are sufficient to allow dogs on a leash. Plus dog swimming in the area will likely attract more bull
Not supportive
Numerous birds use this part of Bicton Foreshore to feed and roost. Birds are a vital part of our ecology, controlling insects and promoting mental health. We have lost so many species already. Please don't contribute to their further demise by allowing dogs to disturb their habitat, particularly when the City already provides other dog swim areas.
Off leash dogs are a nuisance/danger to wildlife and other dog walkers whose dogs are leashed.
Only concern is proximity to spit. Would not like to see bird nesting and breeding sites there impacted. Other than that have no definite preference
Opening up the beach to dogs with have detrimental effects on shorebirds. Dog walkers consistently ignore fenced boundaries especially as these beaches are not patrolled by council staff. There are many wonderful places I can take my dog and other beaches I can travel to without disruption to shorebird feeding and
Owners do not control their animals. They are the problem more so than dogs. Keep dogs at home
Parking along this road is already impossible on busy days and weekends due to limited parking bays along the whole foreshore. I'm not sure this would necessarily work to attract dog owners to these to very small and specific areas. Generally, dog owners currently seem to go to Quarantine Park where there is more space for parking and more space for dogs to run around. Unfortunately, most dog owners choose to ignore the rules about not taking them on the foreshore. I don't think these areas will serve their purpose to attract owners and dogs to walk along to these small sections of beach. They are also very close to the road and footpath where dogs off lead in such confined areas could disrupt pedestrians and cars. Also, my wife, who has a phobia of dogs after suffering an attack at a young age, takes our small children for walks along this stretch for the very reason this stretch of foreshore is not a dog beach. For dogs to be using such a confined space along here would stop
Parking concerns, no safe aces to park now. Concerns that our grandchildren will be swimming with dogs. Dogs do chase our swans each
Please do not place a dog exercise area in an area of conservation value. There are many options for dog exercise and few areas remaining for conservation.
Please protect the local birds that live in this area. There are already lots of places for dogs to swim.
Poor parking. Busy street. Disruptive to vegetation and bird life
Proposal not supported. Lovely stretch of foreshore to relax for families and community, and to observe nature. Very little habitat left for wildlife, so this area should be protected from unnecessary disturbance
Quarantine Park is a dog park and that is enough!
So many issues - parking being one of them. Unfair on the locals - there are enough locals who frequent the area as it is. Both areas are too confined. They should use current dog beach in Attadale The grasses/reeds planted along the foreshore to prevent foreshore erosion (mostly done by BEAG) will be trodden on then die. I cannot for the life of me think why anyone would consider a dog beach in such a pristine area. People will leave poo bags everywhere and there will be those who don't even bother to pick up their dog's poo
Strong NO. enough dog exercise facilities already. Nobody enforces existing arrangements.Numerous occasions find: dogs off lead- evident in no go areas like Kent St to Pt walter cafe - golf course
Support wildlife. There are enough areas for dogs, and enough people creating havoc to the local area as it is. I do not believe more dogs need to take over areas where nature / wildlife / marine life needs to be supported and protected.
The area is sensitive to all types of flora and fauna and the heavy traffic of people and their dogs will support this. Not to mention the already very poor carparking provision in this area. There are designated dog locations less than a kilometer away. I cannot understand a council that would support this location
The area is too small and built up and the area is not suitable for the proposed dog park. Particularly Beach street as this will effect the use of the area which is currently used for Family activities.

City of Melville - Proposed Dog Swim Area- Tables Comments

The area of river from Bicton baths to Kent St has a high level of bird life which would be disturbed by concentrated dog activity. Area 2 is also a popular picnic area for families with children.
The beach at the end of Beach street is currently clean and accessible. Turning it into a dog beach would be disastrous. People DO NOT clean up after their dogs at designated dog exercise areas, nor do they control them when necessary. The dog exercise beach at Attadale, and the dog beach at Leighton, are testament to this. Please don't allow this foreshore to be denigrated by highlighting it as a dog beach. In addition, there is NO car parking available, and the parking would need to be monitored strictly by council once people start parking on verges and across the road from residents' driveways. It should also be reminded that this immediate area is a BULL SHARK BREEDING SITE. Encouraging numerous dogs to swim in this area would be an irresponsible.
The Bicton foreshore and waters provide habitat for many types of birds including Black Swans, Caspian Terns, White-faced herons, Egrets, and dolphins as well. A dog swim area, even though small in size, means dogs will be off leash, which will mean it will be impossible to prevent breaching of unfenced boundaries. Dog owners already have access to other foreshore and coastal swim areas - in Attadale for example. Why put our wildlife at anymore risk than they already are?
The Bicton foreshore and waters provide habitat for plentiful birdlife including Black Swans, Caspian Terns, White-faced herons, Egrets, and dolphins as well. I am very concerned that such a location is being considered as a dog swim area, which means dogs will be off lease..And while the area proposed may be small, it will be hard to prevent breaching of unfenced boundaries. Dog owners already have access to other foreshore and coastal swim areas. Why put our wildlife at more risk than they already are?
<p>The proposed riverside locations are not suitable for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is already a suitable dog beach a short distance away in Attadale which is part of a large dog exercise area. 2. Families with young children are increasingly using the area for picnics and swimming on the sheltered sandy beach. As Kent Street Jetty and Bicton Baths are becoming increasingly popular for recreational use, there is not enough space to also have dogs use the Bicton riverfront area safely. 3 The riverbank area is an environmentally sensitive area and home to a variety of wildlife including birds, nesting ducks, swans and turtles that may be attacked by dogs. 4 The proposed locations are too close to the sweeping road and footpath which is well used by many cyclists and walkers who may be injured by an out of control dog. 5 There is not enough parking to also encourage dog owners to use the area for recreation as parking is currently in short supply for water recreating such as standup
The river would be better without dogs in the water area
There are already enough areas to exercise dogs off lead. Dogs should remain on lead to paddle in the water.
There are already many areas of public space allocated for use by dogs.
There are already so many offleash swim areas. Too much wildlife at risk.
There are already two dog beaches within 5 minutes of the proposed sites in Attadale and East Fremantle. There are also dog beaches at Leighton and South Beach. Presumably dogs will be off lead at the two proposed sites. If that is not the intention it will still happen. Dogs are required to be on-lead in the areas immediately adjacent to those sites which seems appropriate as the path in both places is close to the road. It seems illogical to allow dogs to be off-lead at areas which are so close to the road particularly as the area near Braunton St can be busy at weekends.
There are enough dogs using this area without increasing the numbers. The dogs also disturb the wildlife and young families. The parking facilities are not adequate for the extra cars.
There are other options for dogs and this would negatively impact on other wildlife in these areas
There are parks and other areas to excise dog with in the bicton area and to spoil such a pristine small water front would be a major shame. Dog owners living close have a lovely waterfront to walk the pets and not interfere with the wild life and the quite enjoyment of locals and house abutting the areas. This will only cause the grief to the council ,rangers , and near by housing. I'm am total against this .

City of Melville - Proposed Dog Swim Area- Tables Comments

There are plenty of areas for dogs to swim. These areas have a diverse range of water birds who need protection from dogs. Dogs attack no day and can kill them plus disturb them In their own habitat
There are plenty of places to exercise dogs without having them destroy the fragile river ecosystem. Exercise them at a park or existing river / beach areas
There are several beaches and parks in or close to our area where owners can take their dogs. It's time we give the limited bird life in our area a break. Parents with young kids may also find this hard.
There are sufficient dog beaches in the area, I.e. Alfred Cove and East Fremantle. People still let their dogs out in Point Walter and Blackwall Reach anyway, regardless of the signs and unfortunately dog owners do not always do the right thing and the dogs will still venture in areas outside of restricted area. My daughter has a dog and no matter which dog beach we go to, there are plenty of owners that do not pick up their dog's droppings. Please keep Blackwall Reach pristine!!!
There is a dog beach on the other side of Pt Walter already and this is enough. I believe dogs will end up outside these areas where people are trying to enjoy the water without dogs. There are already enough dog owners that break the rules and bring their dog to Bicton Baths, this will only add to the problem.
There is a massive area in Attadale & Zephyrs in east freeo they can take their dogs. People already let their dogs roam free in these areas and there are young kids around. please don't do it!
There is a very large dog area at Leighton Beach. We do not need any more. Note that the foreshore at Attadale appears to have priority for dogs already.
There is already a dog beach on the other side of Point Walter Reserve (on Burke Drive) so this seems excessive. There are already major parking issues at Bicton Baths and this would just add to that.
There is lack of parking in the area as it is . Often difficult to drive up Beach St anyway because there's usually several cars parked on the side of the road. More people bringing their dogs down to swim would only make that worse.
There is nothing compatible about dogs using this area in conjunction with families, small children and wildlife. There is a public health issue with dogs leaving excreta and marking out their territory with urine. Not all dogs are friendly and some savage. In regard to wildlife owners are quite happy to see dogs chase birds away, thinking it is great fun for their dogs despite signs saying dogs must be on a leash, which they ignore. There is plenty of exercise area for dogs in Attadale and dog owners currently use parts of the adjoining beaches there for there dogs to exercise. The current areas proposed are small and sensitive to use and need to be preserved as is for their current use. Our birdlife in particular is really under pressure from people use and every effort must be taken to look after their needs. What about our small children who are afraid of dogs, particularly large dogs.
There is so little bushland left for native fauna and flora. There are already other places for dogs to play and swim. It is imperative that we look after our natural heritage. So very little remains.
There isn't enough parking at either location. There is already a great dog swim area a few minutes away in Attadale with adequate parking. I go there with a friend and her dog. Extra cars are disruptive to local residents.
There will be undue impacts on birdlife etc.
These areas are important feeding habitats for birds and allowing these areas to be accessed by off-leash dogs increases the risk to the birdlife that rely on the foreshore as foraging habitat. Secondly, increasing the number of off-leash areas for dogs reduces quiet enjoyment of these natural areas. Off-leash dogs can lead to conflict between recreation but also with other dogs.
These areas are too small and will impact on the work already being undertaken by the local friends groups. The impact of dogs is not going to encourage stability of area and surrounds. Birdlife will definitely be affected. Swans nest in these areas. Shorebirds settle here quite frequently. Lack of parking facilities is a huge problem as well. It's just not a suitable area.
These proposals are for the wealthy residents who live near by . There is little limited parking now . There are enough dog parks & beaches.
These small areas are utilised by parents with young children.
This is a family friendly beach. We enjoy using this beach when I am home, to watch sunset, picnic with friends and family, swim and paddle board, do yoga or read a book. It is a quiet and calming location. We enjoy watching the swans, ducks pelicans, other birdlife and dolphins that use this area. It would damage and impact on the wildlife environment and destroy their homes, feeding and breeding grounds.

City of Melville - Proposed Dog Swim Area- Tables Comments

This is not a good idea at all. This is not a suitable place for a dog beach

1. Parking is a major issue. There is already insufficient parking in this area. People using paddle boards canoes often cannot park next to the river. This would become impossible with added load of cars especially early morning or late evening when regular groups of paddlers etc come and launch boats. They need these spaces along with the users of the pools

2. City of Melville have large dog facilities already including beach access area and large (huge) dog park at Attadale. We do not need more

3. Dogs barking is an issue close to houses and these areas are close to houses.

4. One of the attractions of Blackwall Reach is the wildlife, and the dolphins - bird life will be affected. Dolphins often fish along these shores and will be affected

5. There is no good reason to add this dog area to this area at all - it should not be supported at all

This is the one part of the river you can come without being over run by dogs. I use this section if the river almost daily, and already have to deal with owners letting their dogs off leashes and crowding the footpath when I'm out running or walking. A swim area would just encourage even more dogs and their owners to the area, and greatly increase the risk of incidents. There is already a dog swim beach further round near Zephyrs - so not far. And multiple beaches they can access. Not everyone loves dogs and it feels like those of us who don't really want to be around dogs get little say. Plus very few owners keep their dogs on the leash even when they're supposed to, something Melville does not monitor or manage in this river area already. So that situation will get worse, and walking past there as a pedestrian will be simply frightening. Lots of dogs are apparently 'friendly' and plenty of owners get aggressive when told they should have their animals on a lead. The Kent St area is where kids go to jump off the jetty and many people fish. It's also where I had many kids birthday parties for my own kids and others. I would not do that if it became available to dogs, so it's just another area that becomes unusable for me and my family because dogs and their owners, seem to have more rights than anyone else. On top of that, the dogs - which will not be kept on leads despite signs - will end up in Blackwall reserve, which is protected and has high foot traffic. I already see many dogs in there off their leads and roaming about. Strongly oppose!

This issue was raised several years ago and it was decided not to go ahead with it. What has changed to warrant revisiting it? There are sufficient dog exercise areas nearby so there is no need for any more. Dog owners regularly exercise their dogs in front of the Quarantine Park OFF the lead when there are signs specifically prohibiting this. Why are the rangers not policing this. We also regularly have to pick up dog droppings in the Quarantine Park and on the areas you are suggesting designating dog exercise areas. Both those above things are evidence that 1 / Melville Rangers are not actively policing dog activity in the area 2/ Dog owners are not conducting themselves responsibly in these areas So why do you think they will act any differently if you permit them to exercise their dogs in the suggested areas The foreshore and the river in the suggested areas is frequented by much wildlife e.g. ducks and their young, swans, dolphins, wading birds, night herons. All of these would be disturbed by dogs exercising there. It beggars belief that Council would contemplate allowing dogs to exercise (and foul) these areas

this matter was reviewed at a council meeting last year and I support the comments made then by Peter Neesham We must make all efforts we can to preserve the natural environment

This stretch of riverside is heavily frequented by families and young children. The area should be maintained a family and especially children safe and friendly area. There are numerous dog attacks on vulnerable small children all the time. This is not a dog free area. Dogs also attract predatory marine species. This will increase the risk of attacks on people and children from these marine species.

This stretch of the river is used by feeding and resting birds. I do not believe a dog swim area is needed here as it is not compatible with bird life. There are existing dog swim areas on the river and the beach, but shrinking habitat areas for birds in urban areas

City of Melville - Proposed Dog Swim Area- Tables Comments

This submission is made by Swan Estuary Reserves Action Group (SERAG), a community based environmental group concerned with the restoration and rehabilitation of the riparian vegetation and adjacent bushland to the Swan Estuary Marine Park. Over the last 10 years SERAG has been involved in restoration work along approximately 4 kilometres of the river foreshore in the City of Melville. SERAG does not support the proposal to create either of these dog swim areas on the Bicton Foreshore for the following reasons.

Environmental issues

1. The two proposed dog swim areas on the Bicton foreshore are important feeding grounds for dolphin, for fish and for birdlife such as the Crested and the Caspian Terns and the endangered Fairy Terns, along with the resident Osprey. Swans and ducks rely on the seagrasses growing in the shallows there for their food. For its unique birdlife, this area has been nominated as part of the Melville Bird Sanctuary's second stage. State and local governments have indicated, at least at face value, that they support the establishment of the sanctuary. It is inconsistent with the efforts of governments and the community to protect this threatened birdlife, to reintroduce dog access to the river.
2. The Bicton Environmental Action Group volunteers have been restoring the foreshore vegetation in the area for many years. This rehabilitation work is essential for filtering run-off that carries nutrients and pollutants towards the river as well as providing habitat for birds and other fauna. It also adds to the amenity of the area for everyone who walks, cycles or passively recreates in the area. The experience at Attadale/Alfred Cove shows that this restoration work will be impossible if dogs are allowed off-lead to track with their owners back and forth across the foreshore. It was for exactly that reason and for the protection of birdlife that a decision was made some years ago to erect a small fence along the Attadale/Alfred Cove foreshore to keep dogs away from the river. It is important for Council to be seen to support the work carried out by volunteers who contribute thousands of dollars' worth of hours each year to rehabilitate degraded bush and foreshore areas. For these reasons, to now encourage dogs back into an area currently designated as "Prohibited (No dogs allowed)" seems illogical. Feedback received during the Attadale Alfred Cove Foreshore Master Plan process emphasised that a strong focus needed to be given to protecting the environment with less disturbance of marine areas. Those sentiments are no less applicable to the Bicton foreshore area. The creation of another dog swim area at the expense of the environment is no longer in line with the views of the wider community.

Existing facilities for dogs and their owners

The City of Melville has provided a number of facilities for dogs and their owners:

1. Dog beach at Applecross below Heathcote;
2. Dog beach at Attadale at the end of Page St & Burke Drive;
3. Large off-lead dog walking area at Attadale along Burke Drive (assuming this is retained under the Attadale Alfred Cove Foreshore Master Plan);
4. Numerous other parks where dogs may be walked on lead as set out in the City of Melville's brochure "Information about your Dog": <https://www.melvillecity.com.au/CityOfMelville/media/Documents-and-PDF-s/Information-About-Your-Dog-Brochure.pdf>

In addition, there are a number of dog beach areas less than 15 minutes driving time from the proposed sites on the Bicton foreshore including:

- Leighton Beach Dog Exercise Area;
- South Fremantle Dog Beach, Marine Terrace;
- North Fremantle Foreshore Reserve, Johanna Street;
- East Fremantle river foreshore at Jerrat Drive;
- East Fremantle foreshore at Riverside Drive, near Zephyr

Dog owners who use the Attadale foreshore off-lead dog area come from all over the City of Melville and from outside the Melville area. This suggests that a 15 minute drive is an acceptable travel time if you are not satisfied with the existing dog swim facilities and off-lead dog zones provided by the Council in your area. Feedback from dog owners who use the Attadale foreshore area suggests that the demand for river access for dogs is more likely to be at times of extreme heat. During summer, the dog walking area at Attadale is usually empty between the hours of 9am and 4pm because the heat is too intense. If the proposal in the Attadale Alfred Cove Foreshore Master Plan draft to place more trees in the grassed areas is approved, it may well result in a decline in the demand for dog swim areas.

Health and safety issues

Both proposed dog swim areas are situated in areas which are close to both the road and to the path popular with locals who walk or jog there, sometimes with a dog on its lead. Cyclists also travel along the road or path. At weekends, the area, particularly near Bicton Baths, is quite congested with traffic and parked cars. As the distance from the road to the water is very short, the risk of off-lead dogs causing accidents is greatly increased. The experience along Burke Drive supports this conclusion. Although there is a large open space at Burke Drive it is not an infrequent occurrence to see dogs on the road, especially if they are chasing birds. In the confined area along Blackwall Reach the likelihood of accidents must be greatly increased. The ability of City of Melville rangers to ensure that dogs are confined to the permitted swim areas must also be questioned. A walk along the Attadale foreshore clearly shows evidence of dogs in the prohibited areas. Furthermore, it is very rare to see any action being taken to ensure that people collect their dog waste, something which would be particularly important so close to the river. A walk on the Attadale foreshore or in any of the small bush parks in the Attadale area shows the failure of a number of people to collect their dog waste, completely ignoring the impact it may have on the health and well-being of other community members or their dogs.

CONCLUSION

SERAG urges the Council to have regard to the wishes of so many members of the community who value green areas and the protection of the environment above all other priorities. There are many existing facilities provided for dog owners close to the proposed dog swim areas. There is no overwhelming

City of Melville - Proposed Dog Swim Area- Tables Comments

This will impact negatively upon wildlife. There are plenty of other places to exercise our dogs
Unleashed dogs are very likely to attack/kill/ disturb wildlife in habitats close to these areas. I have witnessed this at other parks. I am not part of Melville Bird Sanctuary group, but agree there are many sites for dog recreation and swimming all over Perth, what a huge shame to choose an area adjacent to precious wildlife/
Unsupported as there are other areas available that I believe are adequate.
Use this area for picnics donot believe good idea for dogs in same area have plenty of dog parks already.
Very concerned that these areas are part of foreshore and should be reserved and kept natural. Dogs are not always well controlled. I have seen them running and disturbing birds.
Very tranquil areas at present. Walking the dog, as is now in place seems to be the right level of community freedom. Dog beaches generate levels of chaos which are only acceptable with lots of room.

We are concerned by and strongly oppose the proposal to allow dogs to swim in locations 1 and 2. There is an increasing body of work showing that the presence of dogs evokes a greater negative behavioural response to birds, particularly ground-frequenting or ground-nesting species, compared to recreational users alone (e.g. Gómez-Serrano 2020; Lord et al. 2001; Baudains and Lloyd 2007; Sastre et al. 2009). A study by Schlacher et al. (2015) suggests that the “environmental impacts attributable to dogs are more severe than those resulting from other recreational activities, except the highly destructive consequences of driving off-road vehicles (Schlacher et al. 2013d; Weston et al. 2014b)”, with the potential for dogs to create a landscape of fear and detrimentally change the behaviour of wildlife species. Dogs have been identified as a major threat to coastal wildlife utilising beaches across Australia and controlling dogs in coastal reserves is essential for maintaining ecosystem function (Williams et al. 2009; Schlacher et al. 2015; Maguire 2018). Disturbance of beach-nesting birds by dogs significantly increases the risk of clutch failure (Maguire 2018). The presence of dogs and their behaviour of chasing adults can lead to prolonged absences from the nest, increasing the potential for thermal stress and predation of eggs and chicks – either by the dogs themselves or by predatory birds, such as gulls (Maguire 2018; Maslo et al. 2016; Baudains and Lloyd 2007). Furthermore, dogs crush and predate on eggs and chicks directly. After leaving the nest, it is 3 to 5 weeks, depending on species, before the chicks of beach-nesting birds can fly. This is a long time for chicks to be safely avoiding dogs on beaches in their nesting area without impacting on either their direct survival or their ability to feed and grow to fledging. Unfortunately, dogs – leashed or not, are seen as predators by birds. Best outcomes are achieved by prohibiting dogs, year-round, rather than encouraging and relying on responsible dog ownership/control such as leashing (Maguire 2018). As you know the area has many species of birds using this area with the exceptional Point Walter, a stones throw away, where you provide great support for the Fairy Terns. Our members have seen a wide variety of shorebirds and other wildlife special to this area including seals, dolphins and sharks. WE believe this area is NOT the correct place for dogs to be and so destroy such an important part of the Swan River. There is an excellent 200 metre designated dog beach at the Point Walter end of Burke Drive a very short distance away, which is a large area and where there is room for running and swimming with least impact to the environment and other walkers. Our community is well catered for and do not need these beach areas to be given over to the destruction which would occur. As you know dog ownership is increasing and we are adding the the plight of our own native flora and fauna that we spend all our time trying to regenerate and replenish for future generations. We don't need this proposal to succeed. We simply ask you to abandon this idea of a few dog owners for the betterment of our beloved Swan River and the species that rely on it so much. References Baudains T. P. & Lloyd P. (2007) Habituation and habitat changes can moderate the impacts of human disturbance on shorebird breeding performance. *Anim. Conserv.* 10, 400–407. BirdLife Australia (2020). BirdLife Australia, Birddata. Occurrence dataset. Available online: <https://birddata.birdlife.org.au/> [Accessed 13 December 2021]. Department of Agriculture, Water and the Environment (2021) National Reserve System protected area requirements. Available online: <https://www.awe.gov.au/agriculture-land/land/nrs/about-nrs/requirements> (Accessed 5 December 2021). Baudains T. P. & Lloyd P. (2007) Habituation and habitat changes can moderate the impacts of human disturbance on shorebird breeding performance. *Anim. Conserv.* 10, 400–407. Dunlop J. N. (2016) Local Fairy Tern conservation strategy for the south west coastal region. Perth, Western Australia. [online]. Available from: <http://www.ccwa.org.au/fairyterns>. Gómez-Serrano M. Á. (2020) Four-legged foes: dogs disturb nesting plovers more than people do on tourist beaches. *Ibis* 163, 338–352. doi: 10.1111/ibi.12879. Gillson, J., 2011. Freshwater flow and fisheries production in estuarine and coastal systems: where a drop of rain is not lost. *Rev. Fish. Sci.* 19, 168–186. Grimes, C.B., Kingsford, M.J., 1996. How do riverine plumes of different sizes influence fish larvae: do they enhance recruitment? *Mar. Freshw. Res.* 47, 191–208. Lafferty, K. D., Goodman, D., & Sandoval, C. P. (2006) Restoration of breeding by snowy plovers following protection from disturbance. *Biodivers. Conserv.* 15, 2217–2230. Lord A., Waas J. R., Innes J. & Whittingham M. J. (2001) Effects of human approaches to nests of northern New Zealand dotterels. *Biol. Conserv.* 98, 233–240. Maguire G. S. (2018) A review of dog impacts to beach-nesting birds and management solutions. Melbourne, VIC. [online]. Available online: http://birdlife.org.au/documents/Dogs_and_Beach-

City of Melville - Proposed Dog Swim Area- Tables Comments

<p>nesting_Birds_Management_Solutions_Nov2018.pdf. Maguire G. S. (2008) A practical guide to managing beach-nesting birds in Australia. Birds Australia, Melbourne, Australia. Maslo B., Schlacher T. A., Weston M. A. et al. (2016) Regional drivers of clutch loss reveal important trade-offs for beach-nesting birds. PeerJ 4:e2460. doi: 10.7717/peerj.2460. Sastre P., Ponce C., Palacín C., Martín C. A. & Alonso J. C. (2009) Disturbances to great bustards (<i>Otis tarda</i>) in central Spain: Human activities, bird responses and management implications. Eur. J. Wildl. Res. 55, 425–432. Schlacher T. A., Weston M. A., Lynn D. et al. (2015) Conservation gone to the dogs: when canids rule the beach in small coastal reserves. Biodivers. Conserv. 24, 493-509. doi: 10.1007/s10531-014-0830-3. Western Australia (2021) National Parks, Marine Parks and Conservation Areas: information for approvals required for operating in National Parks, Marine Parks or Conservation Reserves. Available online: https://www.wa.gov.au/organisation/departments-of-jobs-tourism-science-and-innovation/national-parks-marine-parks-and-conservation-areas (Accessed 5 December 2021). Whitfield, A. & Elliott, M. (2011). Ecosystem and Biotic Classifications of Estuaries and Coasts. In Treatise on Estuarine and Coastal Science (Wolanski, E. & Melusky, D. S. eds), pp. 99-124. Waltham: Academic Press. Whittaker, R. H. & Likens, G. E. (1975) The biosphere and man. In Primary</p>
<p>We feel sufficient space is available without coming into Bicton. It is also very popular for families and children</p>
<p>We hear dogs barking just walking along the river front all day. A swim area would increase this noise dramatically. Also the bins will stink as no one takes their dog poo away. Would you want your neighbour opening a kennel where you live ? I don't think so. I completely oppose this plan any where along the bicton foreshore.</p>
<p>We in Perth are in a delicate migratory zone for wet birds, and presence of dogs in the area is a threat to their safety. This territory belongs to these birds, and should not be threatened by dogs.</p>
<p>We've already had numerous negative encounters with dog owners disrespecting the 'dogs on leash only' signs. There are so many spaces dedicated to dogs already, part of the reason we love this area so much is it's one of the few places to relax without being disturbed by dogs (*when people respect the rules)</p>
<p>When I owned a dog I would take it to the dog beach which was excellent. The two proposed areas are totally unsuitable for the number of dogs likely to use it.</p>
<p>Why I don't want a dog beach at the bottom of beach street Bicton.</p> <p>1: on any given day there are people and children seen enjoying this beach Dogs off lead will create havoc. Are you putting dogs before people!!!!</p> <p>2: fly fishermen are regularly seen thigh deep in water fly fishing , fish will disappear with dogs in the water</p> <p>3: a lot of people do not pick up their dogs excrement</p> <p>4: there are 2 swans that are constantly feeding in the shallows Dogs will swim out to them and they will disappear from our beloved foreshore</p> <p>5:the Melville council have spent some time constructing a footpath along beach street to enable prams , small children , swimmers , people taking kayaks down to the beach st bottom of beach street where will they go if this beach becomes a dog beach!!!</p> <p>6:the beach is too narrow and road there is dangerous Dogs off lead will run up onto pathway to other dogs being walked along the pathway , Dogs off lead will be able to run onto the road , there will be a accident in no time and the council will have to deal with that</p> <p>7: there is no parking other than two 15 minute bays used by people putting dinghy's in as you are not allowed to have a dinghy on the beach !</p> <p>8; I as a resident and ratepayer enjoy sitting on the bench looking out on the river reflecting , watching the odd sunset , enjoying the company of my grandchildren around me playing in the water , on the sand I cannot do that if this tranquil beach becomes filled with dogs off a lead</p> <p>9: not every dog owner has control over their dog once it's off a lead, there will be dogs attacking dogs I would father hear people the laughter of people enjoying themselves sitting on the beach rather than dogs fighting which will happen if this beach is a "dog beach"</p> <p>10:dogs off the leash will run up into the foreshore trees and shrubs which the council have spent years trying to reestablish , dogs off the leash will destroy these trees and shrubs that provide habitat for so much wildlife.</p>

City of Melville - Proposed Dog Swim Area- Tables Comments

<p>Will impact on birdlife/wildlife. - will impact on natural river vegetation and destroy beach small area. - will impact on breeding and feeding grounds of swans, ducks, and other birdlife. - Dogs will and do chase birdlife as we already witness from this beach, (which is not a dog beach). - will impact on dolphin hunting ground, as they herd schools of fish to this section of foreshore. (Beach St). - Parking major concern, as the two parking parks (mentioned), have already be allocated to accomodate the boats pick up/drop off area. - Arguments occur as people overstay their allocated time of 15mins parking only. - Verge parking and river verge parking already a great problem. - Will impact on families with young children and babies who picnic, swim, sit and enjoy this area. - Children, babies and running dogs who are excited - "do not mix well together" this is a major safety concern. - Already dog fights occur over at river. Have personally experienced a few occasions as have assisted to break up dog fights, then calm owners down. - Area too small to accommodation dog swim beach. - Area too close to road. - Will impact on other walkers using footpath if dog runs up to them (especially if they are walking their own dog on a leash). - Increase dog droppings as owners sometimes do not pick up after or miss that their dog has gone to the toilet. - Increase smell from already smelly dog bin, which has not been washed out in twenty three years. - Increase noise from barking dogs. - Increase noise from people gathering in large numbers. - Fears Melville City Council will not manage this space properly or efficiently. As seen with cars over staying their time limit of 15mins. Sometimes cars are there for two or three days if boat owner has gone to Rottnest. - Beach St foreshore should be for everyone to enjoy, not just dog owners. They do have the option of the other dog exercise areas and beach allocations within the City of Melville and they also have the option of the allocated dog beach areas at South Beach and just north of Leighton Beach where the dogs have large amounts of open space to swim and run, without impacting on other users. -The birdlife/wildlife, river vegetation and the Swan River environment should not be compromised. The number of black swans have increased over the years and for just this reason alone, the Melville City council should not entertain the idea of a dog beach at these two locations.</p>
<p>Would rather restore natural foreshore and protect wildlife than have a dog swimming area. The dogs can go to the beach already.</p>
<p>Wrecks the water and smelly</p>
<p>You need to take action to keep dogs away from sensitive areas. Your signage is ignored regularly and I never see a ranger there. Applecross Jetty area and Point</p>

Section 2 - Location 1 - 54-58 Blackwall Reach Parade - River side

1. The Bicton Foreshore, and in particular the stretch of beach area at the end of Beach Street, identified above as Location 2, is home to a wide variety of wildlife. It provides a livelihood to many species and is most inappropriate as a dog swim/beach area for the following reasons: 1. Dolphins regularly use the shallow water off the beach at the end of Beach Street, where they feed among the moored boats. Currently there are two adults and their baby using this area for that purpose. If there are off-lead dogs constantly in the water because the Council has approved a dog swim area, this feeding area will be disturbed and disrupted and dolphins in general will stay well away. These beautiful creatures that we are so privileged to have living in the Swan River are a regular and wonderful sight for the people who use this foreshore area.
2. Black Swans with their young feed on the weed beds along this stretch on an almost daily basis, close to shore and even now are threatened and often forced out of the area by dogs that are encouraged into the water by their owners, in spite of the 'Dogs Prohibited' signage already in place
3. Every day Caspian terns and other species of tern use this stretch along the Beach Street beach area for feeding. They can be seen diving at height and at great speed into the water to catch fish. Some of these tern species, including Fairy Terns that nest on Point Walter spit, are threatened. If dogs are allowed into the water here, they will be disturbing an established and important feeding area.
4. White-faced herons and egrets even now, without a designated dog swim area, often struggle to find a place to land on the foreshore in order to forage for food, due to heavy usage of the area and are also at constant risk from off-lead dogs who will give chase to wildlife.
5. Local ospreys, another threatened species, like to use the foreshore trees and taller understorey to survey the river in this area and these too would be threatened by an increased off-lead dog presence.
6. Various species of duck use the beach area, especially in the winter when the run-off of fresh water from the drain accumulates and creates a small lagoon in which to swim and drink. This is also used by the black swans.
7. An influx of people and off-lead dogs to this area of foreshore at Beach Street especially, would, by the trampling and damage of everyday use, further degrade the foreshore vegetation which is so vital as habitat for the wildlife as well as for filtering toxins in the run-off into the river. There is currently a large sign on the Beach Street beach, installed last year by the Department of Parks and Wildlife, which says ' Help Protect Your River Foreshore vegetation. Vegetation prevents erosion, provides vital native animal habitat and offers shade". It is hardly appropriate to designate this area as a dog swim area when this is clearly already a designated area for environmental protection.
8. Dogs often foul the water from excitement when they chase balls thrown for them to retrieve. This is another deterrent to the wildlife which will leave an area where a dog has left its mark.
9. This particular beach is used all the time by the community for picnics and general recreation, including families with young children and if made a dog swim area would inevitably be fouled with dog excrement that hasn't been picked up by owners. This is a public health hazard.
9. Multiple dogs running off-lead on a public-use beach, already used especially by young families, puts children and others at risk of attack.
10. Dogs running off-lead alongside a 'dogs on lead only' footpath encourages dog attacks on both people and other dogs.
11. Dogs already have access to many foreshore and coastal swim areas and are well catered for: There is an excellent 200 metre designated dog beach at the Point Walter end of Burke Drive a very short distance away, which is a large area and where there is room for running and swimming with least impact to the environment and other walkers. In addition, there are other nearby designated dog beaches at Heathcote, East Fremantle - adjacent to John Tonkin Park and Zephyr's cafe just down the road, Mossman park and many along the coast.
12. We rarely see Rangers patrolling this foreshore area. How will a designated dog swim/dog beach, which will cause an influx of people and dogs to an already

City of Melville - Proposed Dog Swim Area- Tables Comments

heavily used area, be policed? This area is immediately adjacent to two 'on-lead only' footpaths. There is a conflict of use here.
13. The beach area at the end of Beach Street has no parking facility apart from two 15 minute park bays. A designated dog swim area here would also cause problems for the residents and other users due to inappropriately parked cars on the verges, causing further damage to these grassed verges and traffic congestion in an area where there are very few open spaces.
14. This stretch of foreshore is already heavily used by walkers with and without dogs, cyclists, and joggers and families. The river is heavily used for recreation by kayakers, boats, stand-up paddle-boarders and people fishing. The road and verge area, which is confined, is lined with parked cars, especially on hot days, and if there is an event at the Quarantine Park/Bicton baths end of the road. Designating a dog swim area would add to the existing congestion and take a completely unnecessary and unacceptable ADDED TOLL on the local environment and wildlife as well as on the amenity of the area.
15. Looking after the environment begins on our doorstep. This is where the whole community can make a stand against degradation of habitat, loss of wildlife and the looming threat of climate change. Dogs in our community in general are well - catered for and do not need another swim area on the Bicton Foreshore. Our wildlife has to make a living from the environment it lives in. It has no other choice. I sincerely hope that the city of Melville does not allow these dog swim areas to go ahead,
100 per cent support
100 percent needed. So many dogs in this area and the amount of times being told off by the ranger for allowing my dog to swim fully leashed has increased tenfold.... so many dogs live in this area and require room to move - socialise and swim freely.
100%
100% support and am in favour of either / both locations
100% support one or both proposed areas
Allowing dog swimming in either area would cause extra traffic in the area, and would put increased pressure on the very limited parking available.
Another option would be in between EFYC & Bicton Baths.... As away from traffic/roads.
Area 2 is used by people with kayaks, inflatables and ribs to get access to boats. This is not a good area for dogs.
As a non dog owner, I strongly support having adequate well defined dog recreation areas, so that those of us who may be anxious around dogs can enjoy ourselves while being fair to dog lovers.
Both are great.
Both areas are good but more parking is needed
Concerns regarding location 2 due to lack of parking
Concerns that off leash dogs will disrupt bird life
Confining Dogs to a restricted area is difficult. Area 1 seems to be easier to confine Dogs within the boundaries. Wildlife/Birdlife should be a priority with as little disturbance as possible. Less frequented by people for relaxation. Area 2 is a larger open beach area, people often picnic and swim here so prefer no Dogs here, fouling of the beach area. Clear signage and boundaries need to be visible.
Dogs frequently swim in both areas so I wonder what all this is about and is there a need for such consultation. Surely the council has more pressing needs (such as Blackwall Reach Reserve rehabilitation, speeding bicycles on shared use paths etc) upon which to spend its limited resources.
Dogs need an area on that side to swim on these hot days
Either is fine by me. All my dogs in the past have been keen swimmers and I always thought it a shame that when walking along Blackwall Reach Pde I couldn't let them have a swim but had to load them in the car to take them elsewhere. We want to reduce reliance on cars so let's provide opportunity locally. Although I don't have a dog at the moment I do look after other people's pets.
Either or both locations seem fine to me
Full support
fully support any activity that gets people and their pets out exercising
Fully support more areas for exercising dogs

City of Melville - Proposed Dog Swim Area- Tables Comments

Great for the dogs and their owners.
Great idea. We need more spots for our dogs. Dogs help give us good mental and fitness health.
Great idea. Get it done.
Great to have another dog beach, however on observations at the Point Walter dog beach many owners do not follow clear instructions for where dog beaches start and end. We need clear enforcement of this.
Great to have more dog friendly areas. We go to Bicton Baths all the time with my family and frequent the Water Polo. It would be great to have another reason to
High level
High level of support
High level of support
High support of No.1 but No.2 may have parking related issues.
Highly enthusiastic on both locations
Highly supportive.
I am a big supporter of dog exercise and swimming areas along the river. There should be more.
I am against both locations because of the threat to wildlife (dolphins, swans, terns, herons, egrets, pelicans, ospreys, rays, ducks, fish) who are always in the area living and feeding. There is insufficient parking for any more activities on Blackwall Reach parade (only two spots at the bottom of Beach Street). There are risks to health from dog poo (already there is more of this since the survey was announced) and from dog attacks particularly on young children who often play on the beaches. The footpath nearby requires dogs on lead, and this is already being breached, and will become unenforceable. There are already dog swim areas at Zephyrs, Attadale, Heathcote, plus many in the ocean.
I approve of both sites to become doggy friendly areas but prefer and fully support Blackwell Parade. As so many people are animal lovers we do need more recreational areas for our pets
I believe a dog swim area at either of these locations is needed. There's a lot of dog walkers in the neighbourhood but nowhere for dogs to swim. It will also keep dogs from swimming at Bicton Baths which is currently not allowed
I constantly have an 85 yr old man's dog to help take his dog for a swim. Blackwall reach would be perfect
I do not feel this area has enough parking or safe access for the people and cars it would bring for a dog swim area. There is an area in Attadale and beaches that dogs can swim at. I also feel these are close to areas that families and kids use and I don't like the idea of putting dogs close to children. The risk to them and also the dog poo that will likely come as every other dog area locally has a poo problem
I do not support location 2 due to risks to birdlife and foreshore vegetation and environment.
I do support location 1 as it is close to parking area, I do NOT support location 2 as there is no parking which will cause friction with residents. Location 2 is already used heavily by families swimming and parking issues already exist
I don't understand why dogs are currently not allowed to swim. It does not harm anyone for dogs to swim.
I don't want to spoil the beautiful beach we have at beach st location 2
I don't have a dog at this stage but I do support having both of the areas so that there's plenty of room for all the dogs
I don't think a dog beach is justified but if a dog beach is approved then I believe area 1 is the better location as it is seldom used by the public, has parking nearby. location 2 should not be used as it is one of the few sandy beaches with a sandy shallow bottom safe for children, there is very little parking available. area 2 should not be used as a dog beach.
I feel location one is better as it is closer to quarantine Park facilities and parking. I would support either as it is much needed.
I have a small dog and we love to walk along Blackwall Reach Pde. It would be great to be able to take my dog for a swim on our walk.

City of Melville - Proposed Dog Swim Area- Tables Comments

I have lived in Bicton since 2006. My dog loves the water and at the moment I have to walk or drive to the dog beach in East Freo. Either location in Bicton would be great, a short 10-15 mins walk from my home.
I meet so many dog owners in the City of Melville catchment and we regularly discuss additional areas that can be accessed on the water front. The areas would be used often.
i prefer location 1 as there will be more parking
I prefer location 1 but would like to have dog pop bags & a bin provided adjacent to the site. My concern with location 2 is destruction to the foreshore as paths across the beach/vegetation to the river become more permanent. Access to the river at location 1 is more confined by the steps leading down to the river.
I prefer option 1 as this has less impact on other foreshore users. Option 2 is a beach used for launching kayaks and for young kids to play. No dog poo wanted!
I prefer to have neither of the proposed dog swim areas. If I had to choose one of them, I would choose the one at Braunton St.
I support an area for dogs 100%. I am always very respectful with my dog down there and having a spot where he is allowed to swim would be a game changer
I support but am uncertain of whether there is enough beach / sand in the area. Otherwise this is a perfect spot for a dog swimming area.
I support Location A and B
I support the Beach Street one
I support this area being designated a dog beach. It should reduce the number of dogs at the other recognised people swimming areas
I think due to parking option 1 is better
I think it's a fantastic idea, especially important with the very hot weather to enable our furry friends to cool down.
I think it's a wonderful idea! I often walk my dog along Blackwall Reach Parade and on a hot day she would love a swim
I think its a great idea - but I am not familiar with either place. I will definitely visit both - but on paper they look similar. I like the idea of 1 - as rocks will likely restrict dog movement effectively - I am not sure if vegetation will be as effective
I would likely use location 1, but closeness of road traffic to location 2 would be of concern as road can be very busy, especially on weekends.
I would love to see another dog swimming area in the city of melville. The one at Attadale is a shared area with Kite surfers and this sometimes means the area is unsuitable for dogs.
I would recommend more dog bags and another bin..
I've had difficulty making your survey work for me. It seems to go in a loop. But, yes, we think the Dog Swim Area is a brilliant idea. We favour Proposal 1 for its longer beach which is great for the larger dogs and a little more delineated by the natural rock walls. We are residents and ratepayers in the City of Melville and we are dog owners – albeit of non-swimming dogs. I would like to take this opportunity to compliment the City of Melville for the terrific way you manage dog parks, walking areas and the extensive dog-owning community. It provides a terrific source of social communication, interaction and exercise in this electronic era. I've lived all over Perth (and the world) and Bicton is the most fabulous of all.
If the Council implements this proposal, it will attract non residents and we have enough trouble with cars parking as it is. The Beach Street proposal is our local beach and with small children, including my grandchildren, that use the beach I have concerns with dogs off the lead. One of my grandchildren is very scared of dogs following an incident and having dogs on leads as required in the area helps managing this.
I'm in support of the council providing more off lead areas for dog exercise, especially for large breed dogs.
It is the easiest area to get to.
It will be annoying for residents, barking, deros etc. attadale forshore or east fremantle away from housing better option
It would be good to change Applecross foreshore to a dog off lead area.
It would be great to have more areas where dogs can enjoy the shallow water
It would be nice for the dogs to have a swimming area.
It's good for the dogs and owners to have a variety of local exercise options

City of Melville - Proposed Dog Swim Area- Tables Comments

Location #2 is a lovely quiet area used by residents to have picnics and sit by the river. Our family would be really disappointed if we could no longer go to our special spot due to too many dogs frequenting the area. I feel location #1 is a little less used by families for picnics etc.
Location 1 - parking. After the revamp of parking at Bicton Baths it's still very difficult to get parking. We often have to park on the grass going up the hill on quarantine park. So many areas in Bicton are dog free, I'm not so sure a dog beach destination is a great idea. Location 2. I do not support because the parking will be the Kent Street jetty. That whole area needs support including improved parking and a toilet. Please focus on maintaining what is already there before driving more traffic and people to the area.
Location 1 (supported): a. there is some parking close to this location for dog owners who do not walk to the location noting that some people already park on the grass and/or half park on the footpath at times and it is only a short walk from the large carpark at Bicton Baths. b. The location is very rarely used by people other than sitting on the grassed bank/bench (usually at sunset); and c. There are already a set of steps giving easy access to/from the proposed location. Location 2 (not supported) a. There is no parking at this location other than two spots at the end of Beach Street; b. Parking on the narrow Beach Street is already problematic and at times unsafe for people and vehicles moving up and down the street; c. Any additional potential congestion on Beach Street may hamper access to driveways (narrowing turning circles and/or alignment to some battleaxe block driveways); d. Both (sandy) beaches identified in Location 2 are often frequented by people (without dogs) including families and small children/infants. This could lead to a problem of dog/people interaction and potential liability.
Location 1 is a safer area as the dogs will not be able to run onto the road as in location 2. It is close to Quarantine park where the dogs can run, plus plenty of parking. Location 2 is a beautiful area for families with small children who would not like dogs running off lead into the water. The area is too accessible to the road for excited dogs who may run into traffic.
Location 1 is more suitable as it is closer to Quarantine Park, and appears to have more by way of public parking. It just seems more accessible. However, location 2 looks to be a good size and is a slightly nicer section, even if it is a bit harder to get to in terms of parking / being more residential.
Location 1 is underused so would make a perfect spot. Location 2 is used by many people with families for picnics and water sports so is not as a good a location.
Location 1 seems ok - not Location 2. By the way there are already plenty of dog swim areas along the river so not sure why there should be more.
Location 1 would be great. Location 2 - parking is a concern for this location.
Location 2 is on a bend, not save for dogs running off the leach, not enough parking, canoe rowers and fishermen park there at the moment and every year there are swans breeding there
Location 2 is too close to area used by families and kayakers to enter water. Not enough parking
Location 2 is used by wildlife such as black swans, dolphins, herons and ducks to name a few, for feeding and nesting. The wildlife in the area is already struggling and so we need to atleast protect the areas they have. Dogs in location 2 would cause great disturbance to the wildlife and would make it too dangerous for them to remain in the area. However location 1 is already without vegetation and so is not used nearly as much by wildlife and so less environmental disturbance would be caused. We own 2 large dogs and love taking them to the beach however we also appreciate the importance of protecting our wildlife, not to mention there are already numerous other dog beaches and locations close by where dogs have access to the river and off-lead range. Another concern of mine is that we have a baby and think location 2 is a perfect beach for little ones. It is a sheltered spot with calm, shallow water and lots of shade. If it becomes a dog beach we would not be able to use it with our baby due to the risk of dog attacks, dog faeces and just generally not being able to set food out on a picnic rug on the ground without it being set upon by some dogs. We have seen many young families enjoying the beach also and so losing this would be a big shame. Location 1 is already very close to Quarantine park and Bicton baths and is already frequented by dogs whether they are allowed or not. Also location 1 has a wall which would help to contain the dogs and stop them from running onto the road. Location 1 also has a lot more nearby carparking as it is very close to Quarantine park carpark. Location 2 only has 2 parking bays and I think the corner there would become very dangerous if cars were to bank up on the verge. I definitely think location 1 would be a much more viable option as a
Location 2 may seem a bit close to the road unless some form of fencing is provided
Love it

City of Melville - Proposed Dog Swim Area- Tables Comments

Many families utilise the small beach at the end of Beach Street. The recent footpath facilitates safe travel down Beach St. Our three granddaughters regularly use this area for picnics, surf paddling and swimming. Their mother was attacked by a large dog when she was a teen. Our daughter is 44 years old but still has a fear of large dogs. Two large Pelicans regularly feed just off this beach. Only about 10 metres east in front of Sheoaks . Swans have also started to revisit. There are only two car bays so parking will be a problem. Dog faeces is not compatible with beach use. Not everyone picks up after their dog. I strongly appose location 2. Burke drive has a wonderful dog beach and is well known. Parking is freely available at Burke Drive. Children and families are more important that dogs on this special small beach. Save this beach for our families
More people are looking for safe ares in which to exercise their dogs. Separate ares for large and smaller dogs is ideal but I know this is difficult.
My concerns with area 2 is there will be more residential disturbance from people not living within walking distance to this area. Cars will have to park up beach street and into Malsbury. With the Area 1 Location, cars will be able to park at the car park provided or as per on weekends, up on the verge on Braunton street Quarantine Park.
My wife and I are very fond of Bicton and have considered relocating there, but the absence of a dog-swim area has been the primary road block for our family. We'd love to see this happen.
Needed
Not enough parking. Area too small for dogs. Families and elderly people use the small foreshore for picnics.
Our dog lives the water. We often walk along and around the river and we would all love our dog to cool off.
people dont control their dogs adequately
Quarantine park is heavily utilised by both the public and dog walkers which given its size does pose issues when dogs are running around and people are using the BBQ facilities. It would be great if there are other areas which dog users can
Rather have specific areas for dogs and better police areas so that dogs are not permitted where people swim.
Small children swim off Beach Street beach. I think they will be knocked over by excitable dogs and a danger.
The Beach street location attracts a lot of bird life and it is used by lots of families. Location 1 is less used by families and would be ideal.
the overall car-people-dog access to area 1 is far better than area 2 .And, area 2 is too close the bush access where their are no dogs allowed (never policed)!
There are a lack of places for dogs to swim in the area. I strongly support the proposal to introduce a place for dogs to swim
There are very limited options available for dogs to enjoy the water
this is an amazing idea that will help to foster a sense of community amongst residents of the city of Melville.
This is very needed! Thank you
Traffic heading down Crewe st and Kent is already bad particularly speeding. With the amount of cars parked on the side of the road and no footpaths leading down it will become dangerous.
Very happy to see this site used for a dog swimming area. Much needed in Bicton.
Very high - much needed
Very high as option 2 will impact our family
Very keen for a dog beach in Bicton and I see others with dogs in area wanting same
We are past dog and cat owners
We need more areas for our dogs
We still frequent location 2 with our children and kayaks. Making this a dog beach will stop that and I've gone there since I was 3yrs old.
We strongly oppose any proposal for a dog swim area at Location 2. In addition to impact to surroundings, there is a large amount of marine life in the shallows of this area.
We've lived in the area since 1992 and used to be able to walk and swim with our dogs all along Blackwall Reach Pde. We now only have one dog but would very much like to have more than 1 option where we would be able to walk and swim on the foreshore.

City of Melville - Proposed Dog Swim Area- Tables Comments

Whilst I am not against the proposed dog areas, I am of the view that why bother with this as many dog owners will do whatever they want and take their dogs wherever it is convenient to them. This is demonstrated by those dog owners using the dog area along Bourke Drive. Whilst there is a fence separating the nature reserve along the river, most times I go along the path there are dogs in the nature reserve despite the fence and the signs. This is despite there being a dog approved area only a few hundred metres away. If anything is said to these owners many become aggressive. So instead of providing more dog areas either just allow free reign or start policing the existing areas.

Would absolutely love to have an off lead dog area. It's such a beautiful spot and I just know so many dog owners would enjoy this!

Would appreciate anything

Would be great to have a dog beach area, that we can easily walk to and let the dogs enjoy the river whilst we also have a swim. The two proposed areas are not used by people for swimming as majority use the Baths or at the end of Kent Street. With so many dogs in the area this would be very much a welcome relief.

Section 3 - Location 2 - Corner of Blackwall Reach Parade and Beach Street - River side

A dog swim area along the Bicton foreshore is a much-needed addition dog owners in Bicton have to currently travel out of the suburb. Any location in Bicton is much needed
A dog swim area is highly desirable. However, I prefer Location 2 as it will not interfere or compete with the the amenities and broad range of use at Bicton Baths and the Pool, such as parking, swimming, canoeing, diving etc.
Absolutely 100% support
After the recent install of the wonderful accessible path down Beach Street location 2 will enable excellent direct connection to the foreshore. If there were future access ramp to the dog beach every person in the community will have the opportunity to access the water and with their four legged companion. Location 1 is also good as it is near a popular park and people can increase their duration of stay on the foreshore because there are multiple ways to recreate
Always happy for dog friendly parks and river access
An area of sandy beach for easy access is needed.
Any of these locations would be perfect
Anywhere is good... very much needed
Anywhere we can take our dogs in this area off lead is appreciated
Area 2 looks good due to the sandy beach
As a dog owner I would like to see more off leash dog exercise areas
As access to point Walter has been removed for dogs it would be awesome to gain access to a new area to enjoy with our dogs
As per my submission to Council for change to dog laws and discussions with Glynis Barber. Area 2 is what I suggested for many reasons first, new safe path access from suburb down Beach Street, no unsafe steps so everybody has easy access (frail /disabled/young families), excellent grass area for dogs to socialise. Bins and bag area already set up in Area 2. Half way along Blackwall reach to stop and allow dogs to cool off away from busy path with cyclists and families walking. Concerns for Area 1 include parking non existent on busy weekends. Steps down to area challenging for some in community (frail/elderly/young family's with prams, Small beach area with no grass area to allow dogs and owners to sit down or socialise except wooden seat. From my understanding dogs are not allowed off leash near BBQ areas and high family use especially with playgrounds. Area 1 is located very close to such an area in Quarantine Park and foreshore. This area gets especially busy on hot days and during Volleyball competitions during the week and Saturday mornings. Area 2 has no such BBQ or playgrounds close and no sporting events to make it too busy to park and access safely.
At present, the only areas I can take my two dogs are small sections that do not allow for longer walks or extended exercise. If we had more options available this would benefit the dog owners of Melville by having variety.
Beautiful dog lead walking area with the potential of having a dog swim benefits all responsible dog owners and interactions with the community. We do need more places. You just need to see how many are down at the dog beaches, thousands. Its also a great way meeting , greeting people and socialising the doggies.
Being a local, it saves driving elsewhere for dogs to have a swim.
Better parking, larger beach.
Bicton Dog Swim area is much needed. Support Location 2 as also provides beach area for owners to stand, sit, dry dog etc. Location 1 does not provide enough area.
Bicton has such a long river coast line with very little dog access area. East fremantle and Applecross are getting my coffee money multiple times a week by me taking my dog to their off-lead beaches.
Blackwall Reach Parade is the narrowest part of the Swan River with its banks under repair, dinghies along the edge banned because of the damage they are deemed to cause. Dogs will cause more damage than chained dinghies. Paddled boarders and kayak paddlers use these sandy areas. Once dogs are off leads, it is highly likely they will then be left off leads on the pathway. This is a quiet part of the river with a special habitat. It should remain this way. It is one of the few areas children can access without being frightened by dogs. I have always had dogs - swim yes, but not along the short length of Blackwall Reach Parade.

City of Melville - Proposed Dog Swim Area- Tables Comments

both are great to let the dog cool offs during a walk along the path
Both areas are too small but location 2 is larger
Both areas look ok. Not too bothered which one used.
Both areas seem suitable for dog recreation without impacting on the multitude of non dog areas surrounding.
Both have my support however, Location 2 is supported above Location 2
Both locations are great for well behaved dogs and would be well utilised as they were in the past before the area was signed 'dogs on lead on path only'. Lots of local residents who walk their dogs daily in this area so would be fantastic to have a legal off-lead swimmable zone. THANK YOU 😊!!!
Both locations are viable options.
Both locations are well suited to exercising dogs and not impacting on others.
Both locations never have people swimming there and are perfect areas for a dog beach
Both spots are not used by ppl and suitable for dogs
Concerns with access to site one and amount od beach on site one. Concerns with lack of fencing on site 2
Dog owners and dogs would be very appreciative of this initiative - it would be a stimulating addition to the lovely on-lead walk along the foreshore, in all weather. Would suggest that barrier fencing is erected at each end of the proposed areas to prevent people from continuing along the fragile shore shore joining the two areas. The water is usually very calm, shallow, even at high tide, and therefore safe for all breeds of dogs.Great idea!
Dogs are family members and overall there is not a great deal of swim spots for dogs in the City of Melville and I feel this could be improved greatly
Dogs need somewhere to run off the lead and swim and these two spots are both good
Dogs 🐕 are popular pets & require exercise as do their owners / carers. Both areas are suitable. Accessible parking is important.
Don't mind which one, both are great options
Don't see any reasons why this would be a bad idea and would stop many of us going to Fremantle to take the dog for a swim
Ease of access - rather than the wall
Easier for our dog to enter the water
Excellent idea, either location would be welcomed.
Excellent to have more dog swimming areas
Fantastic initiative! Both areas should be dog swim areas as they are very small strips of sand.
First location is near the jetty where everyone fishes, noise may scare away sea life lowering the amount we can catch
Form in mail.
Full
Fully support as it's important for dogs to have an area to exercise on a beach and water environment. The more locations the better.
fully support both areas as there is a need for a dog friendly area.
Fully support either location. Prefer beach street.
Fully supportive of option 2.
Good access
Good Idea to let dogs have a place to play on the water.
great about time our dogs have somewhere local to have a swim ihave lived in bicton since 1986 and have always owned a dog and they used to have a swim at the little jetty at the end of street
Great idea in a good location. River needs this.
Great idea!
Great locations, my dog would love these beaches. Excellent areas to paddle board with my dog too.

City of Melville - Proposed Dog Swim Area- Tables Comments

High level of support. These both are great locations within Bicton & both will contain the dogs in those selected areas.
High need. Full support for either location.
High support for location 2
Highly support
Highly support this proposal. There are not enough areas in the city of Melville to exercise dogs that have access to water. Having an area in bicton would be great!
huge support!
I am 100% behind these two proposals
I am concerned with the Location 1 being close to the park/reserve- some dog owners tend to expand their dog roaming into adjacent non-off leash areas despite signage. This happens frequently in the dog beach area east of Point Walter reserve
I am immensely in favour of a dog beach near my home. My dog and I usually travel to north Fremantle to the river or to South Fremantle dog beach so having one close would be ideal.
I am in favour of either location
I am the owner of two small dogs and they love swimming daily. It is lovely to walk along Blackwall Reach and have a quick dip in the river to cool off.
I believe it appropriate to provide this option to dog owning residents of the City.
I believe option 2 is a good choice due to its location
I believe that Location 1 is too close to an extremely busy family area and the chance of interaction with dogs and young children is too risky.
I believe the area should extend from beach st to Kent st jetty area
<p>I don't agree with either site, but more specifically I do not support proposal 1 at all. Reasons being :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The beach is too close to (a) the road = danger for cars, dogs, dog owners chasing dogs as they run across the road and cyclists on the roads, (b) too close to the walk/cycle path = danger to walkers and cyclists (often children) if dogs run off beach up to path (c) too close to houses = noise/air pollution from dogs' excretions, which dog owners often don't pick up 2. There is NO parking in the area. The 2 car bays stated in the proposal are often taken by people swimming in the baths or the pooler picnicking in the area. Street parking would essentially reduce what is barely a 2 car width road = BWRP to one car width = dangerous to road/car users, cyclists and residents trying to reverse out of their drives. 3. The beach is barely wide enough at low tide, with less than 1 metre width of sand , and at high tide, there is no beach. In addition there is next to no grassed area in the vicinity 4. Dolphins often swim in close to the shore, which brings pleasure and has been enjoyed by visitors to the area for ever. Dogs will only scare aware these beautiful creatures who are in their own habitat 5. This is a swan breeding area. Residents have already observed dogs chasing swans away in this area. 6. The area is very small, compared to say the dog swim area 5 minutes drive away at Burke Drive which is much bigger 7. The dog swim area already set up and established in Burke Drive in Attadale , is only 5 minutes drive away. The area is everything a dog swim area should be : far from the road, cars, cyclists, walkers, walk/cycle paths and houses. The area has a massive grassed area close by and there is plenty of beach. This area is not a swan breeding area. Do we need another dog swim area when we have one but 5 minutes away which is perfect for this use? 8. There are many boat moorings in this area. With dogs swimming in this area it would potentially spell disaster for the dogs and boats with the risk of people in their tenders/tinnies/boats colliding with dogs in the water
I feel location 1 is a bit close to the road. Location 2 is nicer for both the dog and the family.
I feel that Location 1 is to close to the Natural Bicton Baths where dogs need to be on a leash!
I fully support both areas. They are not common swimming areas for children so they are good locations for dogs.
I fully support more area's for dogs to swim locally.

City of Melville - Proposed Dog Swim Area- Tables Comments

I have 2 dogs and strongly swim areas for them
I heavily support the idea of more dog swimming areas in the City of Melville.
I like the larger area because dogs that are confined to small areas feel penned in and become aggressive
I live in Beach St and often take my dog swimming at the proposed area. It is perfect for the dogs. I walk my dog down on her lead and then let her off for a quick swim. She loves it.
I live on the river and see many people letting their dogs swim in areas that have been re-vegetated which is wrong. I like location 2 as it is the least used by families. Location 1 in is too close to Bicton baths and jetty which is highly used by young families. It is better to have an area set aside for dog use so young families and swimmers can have more space without worrying about dogs.
I prefer location 2 as it's bigger and nicer for dogs, but would be very happy with either location as any additional place for dogs to swim would be very welcome.
I prefer Option 2 as it is slightly bigger, but either is good
I sometimes look after dogs and it would be nice and close to take them for a swim
I strongly believe that Bicton requires an exercise area for dogs that can be appreciated with families too.
I strongly support any area of the river so close to home, for my dogs who absolutely love to swim, to splash around in and enjoy
I strongly support both proposed locations. I need to go to either Attadale or East a Fremantle to provide my dog with access to water. It would be fantastic to be able to do this in my own suburb. I also believe the proposed areas take conservation into consideration.
I strongly support location 2. As a local dog owner who often walks our dog on lead in that area, it would be fantastic to have a dog swim area. My children recently completed VacSwim lessons within the Bicton bath jetty and on two seperate days people allowed their dogs to swim within that area despite the number of children in the water. My concern with Location 1 is it's proximity to a swimming area for families that is already very busy at times. Thanks for this proposal.
I strongly support this area as there is a need within our community for an area to safely exercise our dogs.
I support a dog beach. Beach street has a strip of green from the road leading to the beach I think that's a better location. It would be lovely to have a dog beach in bicton so either location is supported by me just in case one gets my preference than the other.
I support both but Location 2 first.
I support both of these locations due to the fact that people do not usually swim there.
I support both options although option 1 is usually under water and only accessible at low tide, this may make the area not suitable for a dog exercise area, option 2 would be more suited to a dog exercise area.
I support both options. Hopefully dog poo bags and bins will be provided so that people do the right thing
I support either location and think it would be a wonderful asset to the Melville community as many dog walkers walk their dogs around here as it is such a beautiful walk and would love the opportunity for their dogs to have a dedicated swim area.
I support responsible dog ownership. I feel that dogs and owners alike should have access to enjoy the river in a environmentally safe way
I think a dog beach is desperately needed. Both of these are very small. I am concerned that these will be impacted by the phase 2 proposal of making the region between Bicton Baths and Pt Walter a protected zone.
I think both locations would be great - it would be an extremely convenient place for my dog to swim and I really hope that this plan goes ahead!
I think it's a great idea
I think this is a great idea as the waves are smaller and less dangerous than the beach. Also much more accessible than beach
I think this is preferable as it is further away from picnic areas and bicton baths, less risk of issues with dogs being around a busy recreational area.
I TOTALLY SUPPORT there being one area along that stretch of river where dogs are allowed to access the water. Prefer it is not near an area with parking, so that it is for locals who walk their dogs there. If people want to drive their dogs to river, they can go elsewhere.

City of Melville - Proposed Dog Swim Area- Tables Comments

I very much like the idea of a convenient location for people to let their dogs swim. It will often mean that people won't need to drive their dog elsewhere - less car use. It's also very pleasant to see dogs playing in the water. I can't visualise the two locations but from the photos, it seems Location 2 is the only one with beach access. My preference is that the location will allow people to be in the water with their dogs if they choose to.
I walk my dog frequently in that area.
I walk past this area most days and it is an ideal place for dogs to be able to swim
I was told by a ranger about 20yrs ago that location one was a dog beach. It is a crap location full of large rocks that can cut the dogs paws and also if we want to sw and play with the dog. Also there is no shade. It is completely useless for any sort of recreation unless the council are going to remove all the holders. I definitely will not be using it unless I can send you the vets bill for injuries caused from these boulders and rocks. When did it stop becoming a dog beach anyway? Location two is a little better but still lots of rocks etc in water. Why can't we use the Kent street jetty are where there is lots of shade and most people with dogs have families who want to enjoy the are together. It's not very hospitable at the other two locations to sit for an afternoon having a picnic etc. You have got the Bicton Baths for people who don't like dogs but having lived in the area for over 30yrs most people bring their dogs down to the foreshore in afternoon/evenings to enjoy sunset etc. it isn't fair that they cannot be included as they are a valuable part of the family. What's more, there are no facilities at the dog beaches - toilets or showers, we are treated like second class citizens! At present I go to the one at Burke Drive but that is not very nice if one wants to spend an afternoon there with family. Water very shallow and muddy at times and now on high tide there is very little beach as being washed away. In fact, you are about to loose one of the two trees that give shade down there. You need to put a groin or something in to save it and the beach. Send one of your inspectors down to check it out. Last night there was very little beach as the tide
I would be happy with either location. My dog just died but when I get another will be good to know it is in walking distance to ta ke the dog
I would like to see another dog swimming area, there are not enough for the dogs. It is good exercise for my dog, especially when it is too hot for a long walk. It is a way for both my dog and I to enjoy the river.
I would prefer Location 2 as their is more parking and the small beach area.
I would strongly support either or both options as an off lead dog exercise area.
I'm concerned by the lack of beach access in option 1, hence I think option 2 would be better,
I'm I'm favour of more off lead dog exercise areas in the city of Melville the larger the areas the better in my opinion
If I could have a printout to distribute to local dog owners to help this cause along I would be very grateful.
If we have two beaches we have a better distribution of dogs at any one time and potential overcrowding can be avoided.
Insufficient parking for dog walkers at the proposed site if location 2, will result in off street parking which will annoy residents around. However, removing vegetation to make room for parking is not the solution. The short length of beach access for location 1 will deter visitors as attadale has a larger dog beach exercise area, perhaps extending the proposed area in location 2.

City of Melville - Proposed Dog Swim Area- Tables Comments

<p>1.It is a very short beach of only 40m or so. There is some beach coves further up, but these are not as accessible due to the fencing along the adjacent footpath. I expect this fencing is to protect the existing flora and fauna along this section of foreshore. The relevance of the short beach length is that it is simply not capable of withstanding more than a handful of dogs at any one time. There is simply not the length or depth of the beach to accommodate the number of dogs that a dog beach would be expected to carry.</p> <p>2.The beach is also very narrow, with a very narrow section of grass, which directly abuts a busy footpath which is hard against the kerb of a very narrow stretch of road. There simply is not enough separation between vehicles, pedestrians, cyclists and residents. Particularly given that most dogs are quick on their feet and don't have instant recall when excited at the beach. Any risk assessment conducted will identify there to be a high risk of inter-use conflict.</p> <p>3.Bringing unleashed dogs to this beach will certainly compromise the existing amenity, condition, and environmental value of the beach. Particularly in relation to water birds. Not to mention the other impacts of noise and traffic congestion such a use will also bring.</p> <p>4.High boat area – no need to mention this. I have two water loving dogs who only go out as far as I hit the tennis ball. Most dogs won't go further than 20m into the river, so this isn't really an argument of much substance</p> <p>5.The subject beach is not consistent with other beach requirements of existing dog beaches within Melville. Both the Applecross and Attadale locations has significant distance between house and the beach, there is considerably more parking at both these locations, and pedestrians and cyclists have good separation from the dog beach. Approving a dog beach in this location would set an undesirable precedent for other marginal river locations in Melville. In particular Melville Beach Parade in Applecross, and The Esplanade in Mount Pleasant with have similarly sized small beaches which then could arguably be used as dog beaches.</p> <p>6.Impact on other use groups like recreational fishers, crabbing, kite surfing, stand up paddle boarding etc will be considerable. It is a highly desirable location for all these users, therefore the impact on additional congestion needs to be taken into account.</p> <p>7.The argument that there are no dog beaches in Bicton is not a strong argument. There are no dog beaches in Mt Pleasant, so all dog owners take their dogs to Applecross or Attadale. No reason why Bicton should be any different.</p> <p>8.Noise from the dogs on residents is a very large issue, particularly when there are several dogs at once. Given the prevailing wind will blow all noise directly into the adjacent residences, the impact of noise generated is very real.</p> <p>9.Dogs will certainly compromise the ecological value of the beach. My understanding is both the Bicton Environmental Action Group and Swan Estuary Reserves Action Group are against any dog beach along this section of the river.</p> <p>10.Lack of car parking a major point, and given how busy the existing parking at the bottom of Quarantine Park already is with existing river users, adding another group to use the parking facilities is putting too great a load on these services, and indeed the residents who have to contend with the existing traffic.</p> <p>11.From a safety perspective, drivers are already forced to concentrate on cars parked on the street, pedestrians, cyclists, and reversing vehicles from adjacent homes, so adding loose dogs into the mix increases driver stress significantly, not to mention the risk of incidents involving any number of the aforementioned.</p> <p>12.Increased Ranger patrols will be required to ensure the new users (dog beach users) are adhering to what we would expect to be very strict requirements. This will require additional resourcing from the City to maintain, monitor and control.</p> <p>13.And finally, the impact on existing residents should not be understated. You already have to contend with a high density recreational land use area, which is at peak demand on weekends. This is of course already understood when you bought into the area, but to increase the impact and demand on local residents is unfounded, unfair, unnecessary and unacceptable. Therefore, the key items we need to hit on are: 1.Safety 2.Traffic congestion 3.Environmental degradation 4.Impact on fauna 5.Noise impacts 6.Overutilisation of existing resources, facilities and services 7.Parking shortfall 8.User conflict 9.Increased impact on existing residents 10.Cost efficiency for the council is very low 11.Low capacity / threshold for proposed dog use</p>
It would be great to formalise where so dogs go into the river anyway
It would be great to have a place where my 🐕 can swim in the summer. I think I would prefer location two as it would be a bit quieter than location 1. Location 1 is already very popular for people with kiddies 😊.
It's a great idea. Love to have more dogs in the neighborhood.
Larger area at area 2.

City of Melville - Proposed Dog Swim Area- Tables Comments

Limited parking
Location 1 would be best location but not sure on ease of access to the beach there. Location 2 has the best beach access
Location 2 is the more suitable
Local resident, currently would have to utilise the Attadale. Can walk from home. Great idea. More convenient, possibility moving forward. Point Walter is very limited, and is used for multiple uses and competing needs/priorities.
Location 1 - not a lot of beach for those dogs that just like the sand or for owners to sit on. A lot of people use location 2 anyway, and I doubt that would change if location 1 was chosen. Location 2 - nice stretch of beach and lawn, already quite well used by locals with dogs. Not much parking but I think this dog access would mainly cater to people walking their dogs from nearby anyway so would suit the purpose. The Attadale dog beach has more parking and is a bigger beach close to a huge off leash dog park, that could be more of a "destination" dog beach people drive to. I think locals are just looking for a non prohibited beach at a walkable distance (so lack of parking not an issue).
Location 1 - too difficult to stop dogs going round end and on to Bicton Baths. Location 2 appears to have 'end points' to the beach so that dogs won't be able to access other beach areas. Don't forget - dogs can't read the dog prohibited sign (classic mistake at dog beach Pt Walter) where the beach continues on, but dogs go past the
Location 1 does not have sufficient beach space at high tide.
Location 1 does not have natural access, no beach and is very rocky.
Location 1 has limited beach area especially when tide is high. Also access could be difficult for some people. Location two can be accessed from the path and there is a good sized beach area.
Location 1 has many sharp rocks under water and this will lead to injuries to dogs running through the water. Location 2 has a sandy beach and fewer obstacles underwater, so is much safer for pets.
Location 1 has restricted access to the water. It is mostly rocks.
Location 1 is a much smaller area and would be difficult to restrict dog exercise in such a limited space. Location 2 is a larger area and more practical for dog exercise.
Location 1 is a regular feeding area for Swans and other native birdlife, due to the presence of seagrasses and other material on the riverbed on which they feed. We live close by and witness them feeding throughout spring, summer and autumn. Establishing a dog swim area in this location is incompatible with providing habitat and protection for the native birds in this section of the river. It would be a tragic loss to drive this birdlife away.
Location 1 is a relatively small rocky/small sharp shell beach and would not be suitable for dog paws. When there is a high tide there is little beach at all. It abuts a heavily populated beach adjacent to Bicton Baths. A small beach for lots of small children. Small children and dogs do not mix. My small grandson has been snapped at on this beach, even though it is not a dog beach. Dogs and owners can easily move across to this area if the designated location is not found to be suitable at any time. Location 2 is a larger area and is more suitable. People are more likely to be walking along the path and take the opportunity for a dog to swim. It is not really an area to drive and park for this purpose. We were dog owners for 19 years. We used designated dog beach areas. Currently you can find dogs swimming where ever owners feel like it. Regardless of whether there are children about or not - and chasing river birds from the foreshore. Also dogs are often on and off leashes in the Blackwall Reach Reserve, swimming there as well. Some further dog beach areas could be designated, but please can they not impinge on popular people beaches.
Location 1 is close to quarantine park which is dog friendly. I live in the northern end of Bicton which has no dog friendly park. Location 2 would provide this and spread out the dog friendly zones across the suburb. -location 1 already experiences significant car park congestion due to the proximity of Bicton baths. It would just get worse. - the wider beach at 2 allows dogs/and owners to distance safely - there is already a dog refuse station at location 2
Location 1 is under water at high tide which means dog owners would then walk the very short distance to the beach to the south. This is a popular beach for families and not suitable for unleashed dogs to be fetching balls, sticks and swimming.
Location 1 is very close to Bicton Baths, so parking when the weather is nice would be difficult for dog owners. Hence the preference for Location 2.
Location 1 too close to where toddlers play.
Location 2 appears to provide more of a buffer to traffic so this would be my preferred location. Great to have a dog swim area here!

City of Melville - Proposed Dog Swim Area- Tables Comments

Location 2 gives easier access and control for dog owners.
Location 2 is a better option for those dogs who like to paddle in the water and not swim. More child friendly area for families with a dog
Location 2 is a preferred location due to the size of the land proposed. It would also be good to have alternative swimming options for dogs
Location 2 is more open & and a better spot for dogs and owners alike
Location 2 is suitable.
Location 2 is the better of the two
Location 2 is the only sensible option.
Location 2 is the perfect location. People can WALK to the location and enjoy the space with their dog. There is limited parking at this location, however this should not effect the area as this is not a destination are or a destination dog swim area. People in the area feel they own the foreshore, and i'd hate for these people to carry on and stop other community members enjoying the space.
Location 2 looks like a safer option for more than one dog to be river bank at any one time.
Location 2 will provide an area where dogs will be less prone to injuries due to the surface level and no rocks where accidents can happen
Location 2 would be best. Bit further from Bicton baths
Location one has limited beach area and may not provide enough space for dogs. Particularly when the river is higher. Location two is a good beach but lacks parking and supporting infrastructure. Fine if it's locals walking to the area.
Love to see more dogs
Many owners already run their dogs in area 2. Area 1 is a bit hard to access
May get a dog in future and would like to have an area close by where it can exercise
My concern is the effect on the flora and birds and parking.
My immediate family live on crewe st and its nice to go down to the river on an afternoon, even better if we can go and take our dogs without having to have them on
My preference is Location number 2 where it is more accessible.
Need for more dog exercise allocated areas and also encourages owners to get out and about
Nice to have a spot Different to point Walter river
Not a dog owner but do dogsitting 3 out of 7 days. Would be great for swimming there.
Not enough dog areas around there which we frequent often
Only reservation is parking if owners drive to the area and not walk. Parking in this area is always difficult
Option 2 preferred
Option 2 preferred. Has Council considered making both areas dog friendly?
Parking is going to be required at location 2 and location one should be extended to include beach.
Perfect for dogs and areas rarely used by general public
Prefer 2nd area as I believe it is easier to access for older people like myself (no stairs) but also older dogs
Prefer location 2. Mind dogs occasionally, happy to have another spot available.
Prefer the 2nd as a bigger area
Preference is location #2
Proposed location 2 is ideal for dogs as it gets minimal use otherwise, is a good size for dogs to run around and has relatively easy access. Proposed location 1 is smaller and more subject to infringement by high tides. Also access is not as good.
Provided it does not impact bird nesting and people pick up excrement, this would be great

City of Melville - Proposed Dog Swim Area- Tables Comments

Restricting dogs to the proposed area available in area 1, plus the rock wall across most of the area, makes it impractical. Area 2 is ideally suited, with a wide area for dogs to swim etc, attracts very few people swimming.. a personal observation from daily dog walking.., and is fully self contained without likely overlap into regular use or a defined swimming zone for people. It also has a dog poop bin centrally placed. Shallow water zone ideal for smaller dogs, shady trees etc.. great location!!
Safe area for dogs, there is limited access to foreshore in the Bicton area
Safe areas for dogs to swim are fantastic.
Section at the end of Beach St is ideal for a dog swim area
Site 2 has a larger area of beach sand.
Slightly larger area with more available beach sand hence the whole family can enjoy
Street parking in the area is limited.
Strong. There are too many recent restrictions on dogs.
Strongly support
Strongly support
Strongly support a dog swimming area, prefer location 2 but would be happy with either
Strongly support both locations. Location 2 is better re access and greater area.
Suggest installation of fresh water tap at all dog swim areas, for drinking and rinse off purposes.
Support both locations. I think it's a great idea. Although our Labrador is an assistance dog, so would be better located where accessibility/paths are easier to navigate
The 1st location doesnt suit my dog. 2nd has more sand access but is used by quite a few water sport people
The area is accessible to dogs but disconnected from the swimming areas to the north and south
The dog friendly river beaches are very limited considering the large river frontage area in the City of Melville. On a hot day, the parks are not suitable for dog outings. But a swim at a river beach is perfect.
The further away from the more popular areas close to Bicton Baths the better. That the Bicton Baths area be considered "dog-free" (including leashed) or a "dog-free" area be designated somewhere (it works for most beaches, all of Rottneest).
The proposed location 1 has a wall which makes it difficult for both me and my small dog to access the water safely. There is also less space out of the water and it is very close to both the footpath and the road making dangerous interactions with both pedestrians, cyclists and cars more likely. Location 2 has a gentle slope into the water where smaller dogs can paddle safely and also more space on the beach and grass to allow drying off and owners to supervise their dogs better.
The sandy area is better than the rock area which may be harder for elderly to access
The second location is safer for the dogs- there is less traffic, as well as less children in that area.
There are not enough dog beaches in Melville council area. I would support any and all access to the water by dogs.
There is a need for more swimming areas for dogs in Melville. Many areas are too shallow for swimming and very limited. Creating more space for dogs to go to a local beach and swim would benefit many people in Melville.
There is desperate need for a dog swim area on this foreshore in the City of Melville, Currently there is nothing but a tiny, unshaded awful and tiny area, near the Bicton Baths - forcing dogs and dog owners into the hot sun, no shade, and nowhere decent to swim. DOgs are our family, and they are animals we need to take care of, which means socialising them and having local places where they can get cool, enjoy themselves and be with THEIR family. The foreshore is not damaged by dogs, what the foreshore is damaged by is the development(huge grotesque housing) that has decimated nearly all of the flora right up to the waters edge. North Fremantle (which has also been damaged by development) has nearly the entire rivers edge as dog friendly. Do better Melville. Make the foreshore an inclusive place for all people, those with dogs, and those for whom dogs are their most treasured companion. What is more, do better for our animals, it is anthropocentrism that is destroying our ecological communities, a way through this, is to have people recognise and understand at a visceral level, that nature is not a playground or sports ground for humans, it is a place for ALL animals, dogs included.
There is more space in option 1 and the road is generally quieter on this end

City of Melville - Proposed Dog Swim Area- Tables Comments

There is only street parking outside location 1, making it unsafe for passing traffic and residents to come and go from their homes. This area is a feeding location for black swans and other native wildlife. Black swans frequently bring their signets there to feed. Dogs off leashes have been regularly seen rushing into the water after the feeding swans. With regard to location 2, this area is also a feeding area for river wildlife.
There needs to be somewhere more family's can go with their 4 pawed family members for outdoor enga
These areas are small and secluded enough to still give others a chance to enjoy the non dog areas. Also dogs are no longer allowed on the jetty or Bicton baths areas and have limited areas on lead only
Think this is a great idea as neither area is used currently
This area is not used for swimming by locals or others and has a small beach front that would be ideal for dogs to cool off.
This is a necessity, make it happen asap
This is an excellent idea and I support it completely. We really need such areas in Bicton. The Attadale beach is terrible - my small children hate going there (& they are usually with us). It's very shallow, smells, and frequently has blow fish and other nasties/dangerous things for dogs. Not good at all for a proper swim for people or
This is an ideal location with good visibility and a reasonable length of shallow beach and a grassed area for families to sit.
This is long overdue
This is very close to the road and path. Will there be any enclosure?
This will be a wonderful resource for dog walkers along Bicton foreshore.
This would be great.
Very happy to see this proposal
Very keen to have somewhere for our dog to have a swim in the river nearby.
Very keen.
Very pleased that another area, other than Bourke Dr is considered as it is frequently overcrowded on hot days, forcing people to spread into bird reserve areas. Very limited shade & constant conflict with cyclists. Quarantine park is a beautiful park to enjoy too.
Very popular area for walking dogs and would be fantastic to be able to allow dogs off the lead and into the water.
Very strong support. Both areas need to be included.
Very supportive of more public space for off lead dog exercise.
Very supportive.
Very supportive. Particularly in the warmer months no access to cool your dog down by walking in the water.
We absolutely support the dieas of a dog beach in the area just as important as a people beach and please note I will not be swimming mine as they are too small for that.
We love to recreate in Bicton, but often find it frustrating that it is so limiting if you are a dog owner.
What an amazing idea! We would love a safe calm spot for our puppies to play :)
Whilst I support both locations - location 2 is safer for dogs/owners to access the water at all stages of the tide. Location 1 becomes more difficult at high tide.
whole a small area, it would be nice to be able to utilize these areas for the dog to be able to be let off the leash and go for a swim.
Would be great to have a area for dogs
Would be great to have somewhere for our dog to be allowed to swim
Would love to be able to let my beagle enjoy a dip along our daily walk. Instead I have to get him in a car and drive to dog areas
Would prefer sandy area for dogs to allow digging etc
yes agree would be good

Section 4 - Preferred location was not answered.

I am an animal lover but not a dog owner. It has become accepted that dogs run freely on almost all green space in City of Melville. I regularly walk on the green space adjacent to Booragoon Aquatic facility. Most dogs are fine but as a non dog owner it gets tedious when dogs race up to you, jump on you and generally take over. Owners seem to think this is fine. I think a dog area needs to be contained so it does not become another area where you have to contend with dogs off the lead.

I find this quite concerning as a resident on this narrow stretch of road and river front. I am a dog lover and enjoy the dogs walking with their owners along the street and have been a part of this myself for many years. I am opposing this and listing some of my reasons below. Some of the Issues I can see: There is considerable birdlife ie: Swans with their cygnets, (at the moment, February 2022, there are pairs of swans swimming between Kent and Beach Street which has always been their natural environment. Ducks and their ducklings also some Pelicans which will be constantly disturbed even chased and harassed by the dogs. There is NO parking for people to park to get to these areas as verge side parking has been removed. (Beach street especially now is very congested by cars parked on both sides of the road) People accessing the river at the bottom for paddling and accessing their boats. And the Kent Street carpark is often full with use by families for get togethers, picnics and for recreational activities on the water. The closeness of the houses and road along this street. (At least Burke Drive dog swim and exercise area has a huge buffer between the river and road to the homes.) There is often people come down with their dogs to swim (even though not a gazetted dog swim area) and the dogs continually bark as they chase balls and sticks. Their owners don't seem to hear. Dog fights and badly behaved dogs (or their owners) will make these small areas not a good environment for children and people to use as the recreational area it has always been. I do enjoy the dogs running and playing in Bicton Quarantine park, and the East Fremantle Oval area which are huge areas for them to play. And of course, the main hate along the riverfront is people that come down and not pick up after their dogs. Many people come along here late at night let their dogs run free and never pick up.

I support in the hope that other locations will cease being used by dog owners. I take my baby and toddler down to enjoy the foreshore and swim and constantly dodge dog poo that people leave. For some reason people don't think they need to collect their dog poo from sand areas.

Ideally, it would be good to have both areas combined.

It may have an impact on wildlife breeding in the areas ..It is an identified problem by Cockburn Council..

Option 1 is a ridiculous option, there is limited, if any, safe access to the water it is hard to understand why it has been suggested. Option 2, whilst convenient, does not have adequate parking on Blackwall reach parade, and parking is already a problem on beach street. You have not suggested options a) close to Kent Street, which has good parking facilities. Or b) close to Bicton bathes EFYC grassed area that's also has good access to parking. Please forward me a copy of my

There are plenty of dog beaches on the ocean