

Report on Community Engagement Stage 2 Future of Mount Pleasant Bowling Club Site

18 August 2017

Project Summary

The Council resolved that the Mount Pleasant Bowling Club will move to Tompkins Park when the new integrated bowls facility is ready at the end of 2018. The site will become vacant when the Club relocates. A plan to guide the future of the site is therefore required.

There were two stages of community engagement to get to this point of the project:

1. Stage 1 Community Engagement was conducted from 15 February 2017 to 13 March 2017. It sought feedback for the future use of the site on the expectation that the bowling club would be relocated from the site.
2. Stage 2 Community Engagement was conducted from 18 July 2017 to 9 August 2017. It sought feedback on the three concept plans that were prepared for the future redevelopment of the site.

There is a separate report available on the Stage 1 Community Engagement process, which is available at <http://melvilletalks.com.au/MountPIDevelopment>.

Stage 2 Community Engagement

The Council resolved to approve the Tompkins Park Concept Plan at its Ordinary Meeting held on 20 June 2017. The Concept Plan includes the relocation of the Mount Pleasant Bowling Club from its current site to Tompkins Park when the new bowls facility becomes operational.

The first stage of community engagement and Council's direction provided at its Special Meeting held on 28 November 2016, helped informed the preparation of three potential concept plans for the site.

The three concept plans are based on 70% of the site being used for housing and 30% of the site being used for a new park.

The plans are based on an R20 density (average lot size of 450m²). This is the same density coding as the surrounding residential area. The future building heights would be based on the requirements of *Local Planning Policy 1.9 – Height of Buildings*. The relevant heights for this site would be the same as most of the City of Melville's suburbs, being:

- Eaves - 8.0 metres
- External Wall (Concealed Roof) - 9.0 metres
- Overall - 10.5 metres

The funding raised by the proposed housing development must be spent on recreational and community infrastructure, which would include:

- Developing a new park on the 30% of the site
- Upgrades to streetscapes around the site (footpaths, street trees, new verges etc)
- Upgrades to Shirley Strickland Reserve
- Other community and recreational infrastructure (if any funds are leftover following the above works)

The City would also need to purchase the land from the State Government for the project to proceed.

Alternatives that were not in the Concept Plans Prepared

- A concept plan showing the whole site being retained as public open space was not prepared as this potential option was considered by the Council at its meeting held on 28 November 2016 as an amendment to the Officer recommendation, but was not supported at that time by the Council.
- A concept plan showing the retention of the bowling club on the site was not prepared as the Council resolved at its meeting held on 20 June 2017 that the Mount Pleasant Bowling Club would be relocated to Tompkins Park.
- A concept plan showing the provision of community meeting rooms or community spaces on the site was not prepared as the site is not an identified community hub and there are other community hubs / facilities in the vicinity, including:
 - Shirley Strickland Reserve, a recreational, sporting and social hub approximately 700 metres to the north
 - The Civic Centre and Civic Square Library, a civic, cultural and social hub approximately 900 metres to the south-west
 - Blue Gum Reserve, a recreational, sporting and social hub approximately 1,200 metres to the south-east

Purpose of the Community Engagement for this Project

To engage with citizens on the future development of the Mount Pleasant Bowling Club in ways that are fair, transparent and can be linked to final outcome/s of engagement.

Objectives of the Stage 2 Community Engagement

The objectives of the second stage of community engagement were:

- To inform internal stakeholders about the future redevelopment of the site and the circumstances in which it has arisen by email, in the Elected Members Bulletin and providing relevant information.
- To inform citizens living within the walking catchment of the site and Shirley Strickland Reserve about the three draft concept plans for the future redevelopment of the site and the circumstances in which it has arisen by direct mail, six large signs placed around the site, hosting information sessions on-site, newspaper advertisements, targeted social media etc and how they will be able to provide their feedback and participate.
- To involve interested citizens in seeking their preferences for its development and any issues/concerns they may have by setting up a page on Melville Talks for that purpose.

Who was engaged in Stage 2?

The second stage of engagement sought community feedback on the three draft concept plans for the future redevelopment.

Stage 2 Community Engagement was conducted from 18 July 2017 to 9 August 2017. The primary focus for the community engagement was the people living around the site who may be most affected by any future redevelopment. The public advertising and community engagement methods included:

1. 1,219 letters sent to local residents in the local area
2. Information and discussion forum on the Melville Talks webpage
3. Six large signs placed around the perimeter of the site with six sticker overlays stating *3 draft concept plans now available for comment. View online at www.melvilletalks.com.au*
4. 2,000 printed information flyers
5. An 'About Melville' local newspaper advertisement on 18 July 2017
6. Information and a link to Melville Talks on the City of Melville website
7. Two information sessions held on-site – one held during the day on Wednesday 26 July 2017 and one in the evening on Monday 31 July 2017
8. Emails to 107 people and the project update database
9. Frequently Asked Questions
10. A video about the project and what is happening on Melville Talks
11. A letter and email sent to the Mount Pleasant Bowling Club
12. A letter sent to the Department of Lands for information purposes
13. Social media posts on Facebook and Twitter
14. Hard copy information at the Civic Centre
15. Four artist's impressions of possible redevelopment scenarios for the site
16. The Melville Times also printed an article on the project and the opportunity for public comment on Tuesday 1 August 2017.

The following feedback was received during the second stage of community engagement –

- 59 comments from people on the Melville Talks discussion forum (provided in Attachment 1)
- 30 written submissions (provided in Attachment 2)
- Verbal feedback

There were mixed views in the responses received:

- 41 comments on Melville Talks or written submissions supported one or more of the concept plans
- 11 comments on Melville Talks or written submissions provided comments or concerns on the proposed redevelopment
- 37 comments on Melville Talks or written submissions objected to the proposed redevelopment of the site

Response	Number	Percentage
Support one of the three concept plans	41	46%
Comments	11	12%
Objections to the proposed redevelopment of the site	37	42%
TOTAL	89	100%

The Australian Bureau of Statistics calculated that the Estimated Resident Population of Ardross was 4,270 in 2016. The Stage 2 response rate represents 2% of the Estimated Resident Population of Ardross.

The concerns raised in the engagement process included:

- The bowling club should be retained on the site
- Community meeting or social spaces should be retained / provided on the site. The existing facility was seen to serve as a social hub and not just a bowling club for some of the community
- Most or all of the site should be provided as parkland

Concepts 2 and 3 were clearly the preferred development options based on the feedback from respondents:

Concept Plan Preferences

	1 st preference	2 nd preference
Concept Plan 1	2	0
Concept Plan 2	20	2
Concept Plan 3	21	1

Note: Some respondents nominated more than one concept.

Next Steps

Thank you to everyone who provided feedback through Melville Talks or who sent letters or emails to the City in both Stages 1 and 2 of this community engagement process.

The next step is to refer a report to the Council on the project and the feedback from the community. This is scheduled to be considered by the Council at its meeting to be held on 22 August 2017.

Map of the Area Where Letters Were Sent during Stage 2 Community Engagement



--- Letters were sent to residents within this area

Attachment 1 - Comments on the Melville Talks Discussion Forum

A total of 59 comments were received by individuals on the Melville Talks discussion forum as follows.

1	<p>CastleCanna Posted on Aug 9, 2017</p> <p>Support Concepts 3 or 2 with some modifications</p>
	<p>Out of the options provided we like option 3 and 2. However we would like to see the park area be increased to 6000sqm. Whilst i would like to see over 55 aged housing, there may be complaints from this group about noise from kids playing on equipment at the park. I would love to see some sort of club meeting room facilities for our local elderly residents incorporated into the upgrades at Shirley Stickland. I would like to see it stipulated that the green space does incorporate some park play equipment aimed for older children (to ensure it is not like the Baldwin Avenue park in Mt Pleasant which is devoid of play equipment),and also a tennis wall.</p>
2	<p>RC Posted on Aug 8, 2017</p> <p>Object</p>
	<p>I'm against the closure of the bowling club. It is a good community hub. This is just a money crab by the council with no regard to the future.</p> <p><i>Comment on Post 1 Posted on Aug 9, 2017</i></p> <p>All the play equipment you could ever use is already sitting ideal in the unused parks in the local area. Kids are too busy on devices now. Another park in place of a well used bowling club is not good for the community.</p> <p>Response to Post 16 on Aug 9, 2017</p> <p>The council is acting like a Payday Lender. The club has a \$170,000 loan which the council will write off so it can get its hands on the site then sell off the site for \$8,000,000.</p>
3	<p>Andy Posted on Aug 9, 2017</p> <p>Object</p>
	<p>I don't like any of the concept plans they're all very similar. All houses and a boring park. How about making it more vibrant. We're being advised to use our minds and bodies more so let's have a space that does that. Make the place attractive to a range of ages. Keep a couple of greens for social bowls, reconfigure the clubroom into flexible areas for other activities, build some varied houses for a range of different people, etc. Don't take the easy option - think outside the box!!!!</p>
4	<p>Jacob Posted on Aug 9, 2017</p> <p>Comments</p>
	<p>Go Andy. Some fresh thinking I like it</p>
5	<p>HelenD Posted on Aug 9, 2017</p> <p>Object</p>
	<p>I'd like to see the bowling club stay and be renovated. Can the vacant land at the end be used for housing</p>

6	Cindy Posted on Aug 9, 2017 Comments
	Although I love the concepts and the parks for my kids it would be sad to see a place that my parents use be closed. Can't there be an option that keeps the bowling club?
7	Paul W Posted on Aug 9, 2017 Object
	Keep the bowling club intact. It was a great place to get social interaction and exercise, until the council put up the "For Sale" sign.
8	CannaWay resident Posted on Aug 9, 2017 Object
	I am against options 1, 2 and 3. Are these our only options? I would prefer not to loose a community asset. Once gone it is gone for good. Very short sighted council. However, if it is at the stage where it is too late to change the council from going down this path then option 3 which has the lowest number of lots would be my choice. If having a bowling club is no longer an option then my vote is for the area to be made into a park.
9	AN Posted on Aug 9, 2017 Object
	If the council want to move Melville Bowling Club for the Wave Park why not merge them with Mt Pleasant on this site? The \$9 million upgrade to Tompkins Park wouldn't be needed and the money could be spent on upgrading Shirley Strickland Reserve as an active sport centre and upgrading Mt Pleasant as a passive sport centre.
10	JohnG Posted on Aug 8, 2017 Object
	I agree with Mattsuma and Chrissie. Retaining the existing club with greens A, B & C as the recreational space leaves approximately 40% of the site for over 55 Class 2 accommodation. The sump could have a deck over it to make better use of the space. This concept would house as many people as Concepts 1 & 2, would be cheaper to develop and less hassle to complete. This concept would also create a greater opportunity for allied businesses to help fund the club.

11	<p>Bruce Uren Posted on Aug 8, 2017</p> <p>Object</p>
	<p>This land is simply NOT FOR SALE! The council must not sell public assets to feed it's insatiable appetite for money to waste on rubbish public art & Robin Hood which are ephemeral. Public land is forever. There is an ever increasing need for public land as the density of living increases with the continuing subdivision of original sized blocks. We need more parkland not less to service denser housing. To suggest there is an excess of open space is just ridiculous. We fought hard to get the new park bounded by Baldwin, Ogilvie & Clive streets now the Council wants to sell other land that can be open space or used for some other community purpose.</p> <p>I seriously object to respondents not needing to identify themselves. If you want to speak publicly you must identify yourself. How else would know if the responses are skewed by one person making multiply submissions. It's this sort of behavior which gives the council a bad name & makes citizens cynical of the process.</p>
12	<p>Brave Scot Posted on Aug 8, 2017</p> <p>Object</p>
	<p>I do not particularly like any of the concept plans as I believe the whole area should be developed as a park. Once there is housing on the site, the opportunity to retain the whole area as a park will be lost and gone forever. Why is the City railroading this matter in a very narrow direction which is contrary to the policy of the City to create urban forests?</p> <p>I am suspicious of the direction Melville Council is heading in with this and other current projects as I believe they are not in the interests of existing ratepayers. In future, I will be much more careful about who I vote for in Council elections.</p> <p>Concept 3 of the best of the concepts on offer. This does not mean that I support it, however, if it is to proceed, it should be with fewer larger blocks and flipped so the park borders Glencoe Road. Under no circumstances should the current zoning density of the area be compromised.</p>
13	<p>CannaWay resident Posted on Aug 9, 2017</p> <p>Object</p>
	<p>I agree (with Post 12)</p> <p>I agree there are other opportunities to keep the bowling club where it is. For example, only sell a minimum part of the land to have houses built and this money could go towards getting the bowling club out of debt.</p>

14	<p>Mike Posted on Aug 8, 2017</p> <p>Object</p>
	<p>Proposed coverage of 30% for parkland in all 3 concepts is just silly and short sighted. With all the high density housing planned around Garden City and adjacent areas, there is no need to further compress housing. Think what this will be like in 10 or 20 years time. If there is an opportunity to provide a significant parkland on this site it should be embraced wholeheartedly. What is the rush to relocate the club - it sounds like there may be vested interests.</p> <p>To the Council, go back to the drawing board, start the financing with applications for grants etc based on vastly reduced R20 housing and increased parkland of at least 60%. The opportunity will not come again.</p>
15	<p>Chrissie Posted on Aug 8, 2017</p> <p>Object</p>
	<p>Like others, I do wonder about removing this community facility.</p> <p>Out of the options provided, I am most in favour of Option 3. I think that accommodating aged residents is really important. However, I would like to see a plan that doesn't require removing the existing community hub, but instead works with what's already there. For instance, I imagine having senior residences near the bowls club would increase both use of the club and social opportunities for the residents, which would be a win-win.</p>
16	<p>KC Posted on Aug 9, 2017</p> <p>Object</p>
	<p>I agree! (with Post 2 objection)</p> <p>Comments Posted on Aug 8, 2017</p> <p>I am extremely against taking away community facilities. Once lost they will never be returned.</p> <p>Rather than move the bowling club, some of their existing space should be given a different use (squash, tennis, basket ball, knitting club, theatre etc) that will bring in the needed funding for the site's upkeep.</p> <p>Furthermore, the options you are suggesting have extremely inadequate parking allocated which will result in street parking.</p> <p>Option 1: 22 lots so likely to be 44 resident cars (plus extra for visitors) yet you are only planning 16 car bays.</p> <p>Option 2: 21 lots so likely to be 42 resident cars (plus extra for visitors) yet you are only planning 16 car bays.</p> <p>Option 3: 18 lots so likely to be 36 cars (plus visitors). How many car bays are allocated for this option?</p> <p>With Garden City being increased there could already be extra people parking in this area when they come to shop or work there.</p> <p>Does make you wonder if they think people over 55 are too old to drive.</p>

Senior Strategic Urb | Posted on Aug 8, 2017

Response to Post 16

Hi KC,

Thanks for providing your thoughts.

In response to your queries about car parking, each future housing lot would be required to provide for its own car parking in accordance with the Residential Design Codes. This would mean that each house would need to provide two cars bays at the R20 zoning in this location.

The 16 car bays shown on Bedford Road would be provided just in case someone drove to the park. The park would be designed for local people, so it is not expected that many people from outside the area would drive to the park.

17 Greg Samson | Posted on Aug 7, 2017

Object

The whole concept of “redeveloping” the existing Mt Pleasant Bowling Club site is wrong on so many levels. It’s not about how many lots can be created, how big the park will be or how much money the Council makes; it’s about the facilities we and future generations of local residents will need and use to provide a healthy and engaged society.

The Mayor states “we are heading toward a time where there will be more ageing adults in Australia than there will be children”. Reports state the population in the area will grow by more than 40% over the next 20 years. The Council claims they provide “an inclusive environment that contributes to the wellbeing and personal growth of our older residents”. If the Council is correct and can be relied upon then why is a facility that is and has the capacity to provide for an ageing population into the future being destroyed and replaced by houses and a token park?

The Council’s stated growth projections and commitment to servicing the increasing number of seniors as the demographic changes seems to be at odds with the reasons for the redevelopment of this site. The Council have not done a thorough review of the Club to identify how many people beyond pennant bowlers use the club and the value the facility has in the broader society. The Council state this project is independent of other projects in the area. However they want to relocate the bowling club to Tompkins Park where the facility will be upgraded due to the relocation of Melville Bowling Club. The Council also states the revenue generated from the sale of this site will be used to fund Shirley Strickland Reserve upgrade. I don’t know what to believe anymore.

Ever since the Council dangled the loan extinguishment carrot before the Committee they have managed the process to achieve their desired outcome. Look at the three similar concept plans. The park is there for three reasons, none to do with servicing the local community. The main reason is to satisfy the State’s requirement to have a recreational space as part of their redevelopment application; secondly to make use of the drainage sump; and third as a distraction to make people feel good and take the focus off the underlying issue. There are six parks/playing fields within 700 metres with most underutilised at present as kids don’t seem to play outside much anymore. If a park is needed on this site why hasn’t the Council already worked with the Club to beautify the drainage sump and adjacent unused land?

As for subdividing the land into building lots, surely the local area zoning and private investment will provide the community with enough suitably diverse housing in a timely manner. There is adequate land already available in the area without selling off this site to create more. I doubt the Council will be offering any of the subdivided lots at a discount price as it will want to maximise its return. I wonder if they have had any unsolicited approaches yet from developers.

If the Council gets its way and the Club is forced to relocate to Tompkins Park the Council has stated the redevelopment will take some time. As an indication the Town of Vic Park forced Carlisle-Lathlain Bowling Club to merge with Vic Park BC over 15 years ago and the old site is still vacant land home to weeds and anti-social behaviour. New age parents often talk about “nature playgrounds”, I’m not sure if that is what they had in mind!

17 Cont.	<p>Why would the Council want to sacrifice a good community facility used by an increasing demographic to pay for upgrades to Shirley Strickland Reserve and Tompkins Park? Surely if these sporting facilities are so well patronised the Council would have already made financial provision through the normal budget process. It's interesting to read Council reports on the management of upgraded facilities that they have identified risks with bigger facilities and larger sporting associations. There is a potential for the Council to directly manage these facilities. If this is the fear why force Mt Pleasant Bowling Club to relocate? Why not assist the Club to develop a contemporary business plan to make better use of the facility to meet the growing needs of a changing environment?</p> <p>It is easy to close facilities, relocate clubs and sell off the assets. The Council loves to say they do that so they don't have to raise the rates. It doesn't appear to be working as I can't recall the last year rates didn't rise. Once the assets are gone they are gone forever. It's time for a longer term plan.</p>
18	<p>Jeff Posted on Aug 7, 2017</p> <p>Comments</p>
	<p>Concept plan 3 is my preferred option, however all plans show a 'micro-park' which seems to be at odds with Melville City Council's "urban forest" strategy. MCC should forego some potential rate revenue and reduce the number of blocks so the park size can be increased. The community is losing a valuable recreation facility in the bowling club reserve and deserves something equally valuable in return. Once it's gone ... it's gone forever !! I agree with the inclusion of a playground for young children, and with the over-55s residential proposal.</p>
19	<p>Lyd Posted on Aug 7, 2017</p> <p>Support Concept 3</p>
	<p>I feel that concept 3 is best as it is more open and inviting to the community as a large park area is much needed in this suburb. It would be best suited for families (not dogs as there is Shirley Strickland Park for this).</p> <p>I would like to see:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - a good playground with lots of play equipment suitable for toddlers and young children. - exercise equipment for adults - a community veggie garden would be great - shade cover and seating - over 55's dwelling

20	<p>mattsuma Posted on Aug 7, 2017</p> <p>Object</p>
	<p>Their is enough space to</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. retain the existing bowling club with greens A,B and C. 2. The area designated in option 3 for park land and existing unused green D can be used for two level over 55 modern apartments. 3. in between apartments and bowling club gardened coffee and eating places for the whole community (we can see how popular the small coffee place at corner of queens and Reynolds rd is). <p>My views on the wave park is that it is a huge financial risk, and moving bowls to Tomkins Park is going to result in a reduction of space for other sports.</p>
21	<p>Kate Posted on Aug 7, 2017</p> <p>Support Concept 3</p>
	<p>I think concept plan 3, I think the incorporation of the over 55's housing is well thought out and encouraging an inclusive community.</p> <p>The park space is encouraging for families and people with children to use the park and there's space to run and climb!</p>
22	<p>Johnny Posted on Aug 6, 2017</p> <p>Support Concept 3</p>
	<p>I agree with Jo on 21/7/2017: Definitely concept plan 3.(I've varied and made additional comments below)</p> <p>Plan 2 will end up being hemmed in and used mainly by the no doubt two storey houses looking onto it .A lot of people would be uncomfortable using a space so overlooked by the houses surrounding it.</p> <p>Siting the park on the corner allows for prevailing winds to blow through cleanly and gives a much bigger visual impact to the green space. It will also be safer to be able to see across the park, less cover for would be thieves, an unfortunate but very real consideration these days.</p> <p>The inclusion of homes for the over 55s seems good</p> <p>The PARK should be for children and families and not dog walking (there's Shirley Strickland and foreshore for that). I'd like to see a community vegetable garden. I'd also like to see an adventure playground and shade for parts.</p> <p>The inclusion of basketball and netball practice areas as well as a wall for tennis practice is a good idea as there are a lot of primary school aged children in the neighbourhood who could benefit. The park would be used for after school activities also, not just during the day by toddlers and those not at work.</p>
23	<p>David Posted on Aug 4, 2017</p> <p>Object</p>
	<p>I think the existing facilities should be left as they are. This is a well used community facility. We have no need to increase the density of housing in the area. Once this facility is lost it is gone forever and merging the bowling club with the Melville Club at Tomkins Park is a bad idea. Therefore, none of the concept plans appeal to me.</p>

24	Jane Posted on Aug 4, 2017 Object
	I prefer Option 2 but without the housing along Barrisdale Rd. Actually I would prefer the whole site be turned into 1 massive park (like Kadijiny Park) but the Council hasn't put that forward as an option, due to their need to recoup costs I guess.
25	andrew_booth Posted on Aug 4, 2017 Support Concept 2
	I like Option 2, as it gives better access for Canna Way residents to the park. If planning for Over 55's I think that the zoning should be increased to R100 for that lot only to allow some Class 2 construction of one bedroom units in a building up to three storeys, with limited carbays so that residents use the public transport on Coomoora Rd and on Riseley St.
26	DD Posted on Aug 4, 2017 Support Concept 3
	Concept 3, without the aged housing and the park area should be increased and less housing with bigger blocks similar to rest of the area. Also the park area needs to accommodate for dog walking as well the area has a large amount of dogs that are walked and yes there is the park at Shirley Strickland but not many other areas and why not make the park multi use.
27	tanyac Posted on Aug 4, 2017 Support Concept 3
	I prefer concept 3 as the park space is bigger. I agree with some of the previous comments regarding concept 2 that the park would be overlooked by houses and therefore not feel as open. Any housing in the complex needs to be in keeping with the local area, not high density housing/apartments. The current bowling club provides facilities used by all of the community not just seniors. for example families go to the club on Fridays and at the weekend for a meal. Could the park have some form of café, it would work for parents with children in the park but also give a place for seniors to continue to socialise.
28	Rob Posted on Aug 4, 2017 Support Concept 3
	All 3 plans look all very similar. Plan 3 appears to be the best with a slightly increased amount of public space but there was no mention of parking. Surely this can't be true? I like the over 55's dwellings. It would have been more progressive and sensible to have a greater amount of public space and less dwellings so that more people can use the area- just as it has been for years.
29	Sandra Posted on Aug 3, 2017 Support Concept 3
	Concept 3 looks great!

30	<p>TR Posted on Aug 2, 2017</p> <p>Support Concept 3</p>
	<p>Concept 3 is better as the open space is not in the middle of houses. There are still too many lots and need to be reduced by at least 6 lots.</p> <p>The open space cannot become a dog park. The open space will for sure affect the peace, sleep and quiet of residents especially if kids are using the open space very early or late at nights. I assume most of the construction will be 2 storey houses which once again creates a vision of building congestion.</p> <p>High density leaving is not really the way to go in this suburb. Have a look at the traffic/parking chaos we are having with the development approved at the cnr Queens and Reynolds Road, Mt Pleasant. Hope Council learn from this.</p>
31	<p>Liesl Posted on Jul 30, 2017</p> <p>Support Concept 3</p>
	<p>Concept 3 is my preference, as it would give a more "accessible" park for everyone in the area, as opposed to a park surrounded by houses which would possibly feel more like an exclusive private garden. While I support the concept of having a number of residences for seniors included, I'm not sure that putting those residences next to a park where kids are going to be playing is a great idea as it most likely will disturb the seniors (especially if they are retired and at home often during the day).</p> <p>I'm very disappointed that none of the concept plans have at least one whole third of the area devoted to parkland. In this area, we have very poor access to parkland. If my children want to go to a nice local park, they have to walk 5 to 10 minutes and cross busy roads, such as Coomoora Road or Bedford road. With small block sizes and no space for gardens in this area, parkland should be considered an asset for the area that will attract local families, community engagement and increase property values. Please consider increasing the space available for the parkland</p>
32	<p>Simon Posted on Jul 30, 2017</p> <p>Comments</p>
	<p>Bigger housing blocks are needed to align with rest of the neighbourhood, and have minimal impact on all current property value on properties surrounding the current site, all concepts show little room for greening trees in yards, and if families have more than 2 cars with teenagers/ extended families, where will they park? Ardross streets are crammed with cars from infill now, and as such, navigating some streets has shown Ardross has changed from open space to high density with the census showing over two thousand more people living in the suburb.</p> <p>A community building should be added with seniors losing another facility in the area, the park is small, and by definition what? The usual city of Melville grass/gum tree/ random bench in the sun? Are facilities like BBQs shade areas garden beds and tables being provided as a place of community meeting?</p> <p>I thought providing footpaths and street trees is considered 'normal' not and 'upgrade'.</p>

33	Alison Posted on Jul 27, 2017 Object
	I like the idea of the adventure playground however I think we should keep a community facility there, the number of facilities in the area, especially for seniors have been closed down in recent years. I believe the housing numbers need to be reduced to keep a family friendly facility in the area. Once is goes it can never be returned. I also believe the decision to amalgamate the Melville and Mt Pleasant bowling clubs was premature and incorrect. Whilst commenting on council decisions I believe the wave park decision is ridiculous.
34	Bailey Posted on Jul 26, 2017 Support Concept 2
	Concept 2, because the park land breaks up density of the housing.
35	vicki Posted on Jul 25, 2017 Support Concept 3
	Concept 3 - Creates a feeling of meandering further along the park. New housing at northern end integrates well with existing housing. Has better street appeal at southern end and has allowed for various age groups in the community.
36	rozandleo Posted on Jul 25, 2017 Support Concept 2
	Concept 2. Better balanced and access to more no right of way. But 3 is good because of the aged accommodation as well. Sad that as you age people have I leave area they familiar with. Though sad bowling club is moving option 2 or 3 would be my choice. Definitely not option 1
37	Tristan Posted on Jul 24, 2017 Support Concept 1
	Concept one has the best balance between the different site constraints. However I believe the density is too low, Mount Pleasant already has plenty of lots in this traditional size range and could benefit from some more compact lot sizes.
38	MelvilleandMore Posted on Jul 23, 2017 Support Concept 3
	Concept 3 seems the most inclusive design allowing other people to make use of the park without feeling as if its a private area for the buildings surrounding it in concepts 1 and 2. The flow looks better overall.
39	Alice you Posted on Jul 21, 2017 Support Concept 2
	I prefer concept 2
40	WendyD Posted on Jul 21, 2017 Support Concept 2
	I like concept 2. Bigger block sizes are better and I like the shape of the park. It all just looks more balanced than option 1 or 3. I don't like the right of way idea in concept 1.

41	SeanE15 Posted on Jul 21, 2017 Support Concept 2
	Plan 2 seems the best use of the space and would fit in with the surrounding area with the least impact.
42	SW Posted on Jul 21, 2017 Comments
	very disappointed when I saw the concept designs. Why would not the park be in the middle with 6-7 lot each side all having an opportunity for park views. I was looking with interest to purchase because I assumed that would be the logical design, but even to consider an over 55's is ludicrous, we need to Invigorate the city with professional families who earn good money, not and can raise the standards. MOUNT pleasant, Brentwood and Ardross are now tired looking other than location to the river and city, are loosing appeal to those with money to spend and could be a lot more attractive.
43	Jo Posted on Jul 21, 2017 Support Concept 3
	<p>Concept 3 but with more parking.</p> <p>Definitely concept plan 3.</p> <p>Plan 2 will end up being hemmed in and used mainly by the no doubt two storey houses looking onto it .A lot of people would be uncomfortable using a space so overlooked by the houses surrounding it.</p> <p>Siting the park on the corner allows for prevailing winds to blow through cleanly and gives a much bigger visual impact to the green space. It will also be safer to be able to see across the park, less cover for would be thieves, an unfortunate but very real consideration these days.</p> <p>The inclusion of homes for the over 55s is wonderful .I agree with Darrin and Sue Darbyshire, there is a great need for aging residents to be able to live in the area they are familiar with and have continuing access to their long established services such as Doctors.</p> <p>The inclusion of basketball and netball practice areas as well as a wall for tennis practice is a good idea as there are a lot of primary school aged children in the neighbourhood who could benefit. The park would be used for after school activities also, not just during the day by toddlers and those not at work.</p>
44	John Posted on Jul 20, 2017 Support Concept 3
	<p>I like concept 3 the best.</p> <p>Having the park on the corner gives the park a more spacious feel about it and greater visibility. In concept 2 the park feels like it is "hemmed in" between the housing which will most probably be double storey. It seems unusual to have a park (in concept 2) that is not located on a corner site. I can't think of any comparable parks in Ardross or Mt Pleasant.</p>
45	Chow Y Posted on Jul 20, 2017 Support Concept 2
	Would love to see Concept 2 implemented. Kids love the idea of walking to the nearby playground. Good stuff!!! ;-)

46	Glen G Posted on Jul 20, 2017 Support Concept 2
	Concept 2 looks good. Good to see more public park in the suburb.
47	Thomas Kim Posted on Jul 20, 2017 Support Concept 2
	I prefer concept 2
48	Tress Posted on Jul 19, 2017 Support Concept 3 or 2
	<p>I prefer Concept 3 or 2. I don't like the vehicle right of way in Concept 1.</p> <p>I'd like to see details of the park please. Most of the parks in this area cater for very young children (1 - 6 years) and there is a real need for park equipment for older children. Could we have more adventure and high activity based equipment please. Could also include some exercise equipment for adults. Or even some low options such as basketball and netball practise area and a brick wall for tennis practise.</p> <p>A community garden area would be another great idea.</p> <p>Very supportive of the incorporation of aged person dwellings.</p> <p>Senior Strategic Urb Posted on Jul 20, 2017</p> <p>Thanks Tress.</p> <p>We will certainly be keen to hear the community's feedback on the future design of the park. But that process might not begin for a few years yet. In broad terms, the major stages for the project are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Project start - Ordinary Council Meeting 28 November 2016 2. Community engagement on future of the site <p>Stage 1 - Feb/March 2017</p> <p>Stage 2 - July/August 2017</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Council to decide on preferred concept plan following community feedback 4. Prepare Business Case to Department of Lands to purchase the site from the State Government 5. State Government approval for the City to purchase the site 6. Rezoning of the portion of the site where future housing would be developed 7. Subdivision plan and detailed design of the park 8. Sale of housing lots and construction of the park, upgrades of streetscapes etc 9. Houses are built
49	jo Posted on Jul 19, 2017 Comments They all look the same to me

50	Andrew Pollard Posted on Jul 19, 2017 Object
	<p>Definitely agree the City of Melville is jumping the gun at this point with the Wave Park to be fully approved and with up coming council elections. There are still many other options to consider and the first would be retaining the Bowling Club and from the 'Concept Plan Option 01', add in the park design. This would cater for everyone. Now if everything did go through, another concept could be having the park against Glencoe Road. This just centralises it a bit between other existing parks, allows for traffic to view back and forth down Glencoe and Queens Road as it a bit of a dogs leg and would give the park twice as many car park bays being those on Canna Way and Bedford Road. Also the sewer connection and ROW as displayed on 'Concept Plan Option 01' would be retained, basically the plan reversed giving us 'Concept Plan Option 04'. Finally an 'Over 55's Grouped Housing' area is a must to allow people to remain in a neighbourhood that they have grown up in and to downsize, thus potentially freeing up some bigger blocks for subdivision that's on the City of Melville's agenda. Please don't go locking in concept plans to soon :-)</p> <p>Senior Strategic Urb Posted on Jul 19, 2017</p> <p>Hi Andrew,</p> <p>This project isn't linked to the proposed Wave Park.</p> <p>The Mount Pleasant Bowling Club will be moving to a new multi-use community facility at Tompkins Park, Alfred Cove. You can refer to a full report to Council's Ordinary Meeting 20 June 2017 for more information http://www.melvillecity.com.au/about-melville/coun...</p> <p>Both bowling clubs have agreed to relocate to the new bowls facility to be built at Tompkins Park. So that is why the concept plans don't show an option with the bowling club being retained on the site.</p> <p>The concept plans aren't "locked in" at the moment. We are seeking feedback on what people like and don't like on the three draft concept plans. We are very happy to hear about other ideas, including those that you have mentioned. It is possible that we can incorporate different ideas into a "concept plan 4".</p>

51	<p>ARGG Posted on Jul 19, 2017</p> <p>Support Concept 3</p>
	<p>I quite like Concept 3 but Concept 2 is also good</p> <p>With the trend towards rooftop solar and the developments on local battery storage, I wonder if the redevelopment of this site should consider a community storage battery similar to that which Western Power is experimenting with at Iluka (I think).</p> <p>Battery storage of solar power seems to be increasing, but the complexities of local storage for an average householder are large, with maintenance, periodic replacement and reliability all looming in the future. A community battery storage system with appropriate credit and debit systems in place might go some way to alleviating these issues whilst preserving the concept of cheaper, environmentally friendly, reliable power.</p> <p>A small reservation on the Bedford road site might be ideal for a such a storage solution. Has the council had any discussion with Western Power future planners on such a thought?</p> <p>Senior Strategic Urb Posted on Jul 19, 2017</p> <p>Fantastic idea ARGG!</p> <p>There are community-based organisations and private businesses looking into this kind of idea around Australia. It probably isn't something local governments would do though as we don't have expertise local energy networks and power generation. It will be interesting to see how quickly these kinds of concepts can become feasible.</p>
52	<p>Darrin Posted on Jul 19, 2017</p> <p>Support Concept 3</p>
	<p>Concept 3 is the best. It provides good park access for existing residents south of Barrisdale as opposed to concept 2 which seems more like a private park for new residents. I agree with Sue Darbyshire - Housing for over 55's is a fantastic idea and I would really like to see the council provide the opportunity for our elderly residents to stay in the area they are familiar with and where many have raised their families.</p>
53	<p>Sara Posted on Jul 19, 2017</p> <p>Support Concept 2</p>
	<p>I prefer concept 2... more park frontage for homes with residents able to walk straight out onto the park.</p>

54	<p>Julie Posted on Jul 18, 2017</p> <p>Object</p>
	<p>Isn't this jumping the gun a bit? This assumes Wave Park is going ahead which will displace the Melville Bowling Club which then sets up the merger of the 2 bowling clubs. As I see it there are still many obstacles for that to happen. If the Wave Park does not get the go ahead, then the Melville Bowls won't need to move and nor will the Mount Pleasant club.</p> <p>Senior Strategic Urb Posted on Jul 19, 2017</p> <p>Good question Julie.</p> <p>This project isn't linked to the proposed Wave Park.</p> <p>The Mount Pleasant Bowling Club will be moving to a new multi-use community facility at Tompkins Park, Alfred Cove. You can refer to a full report to Council's Ordinary Meeting 20 June 2017 for more information http://www.melvillecity.com.au/about-melville/coun...</p> <p>Both bowling clubs have agreed to relocate to the new bowls facility to be built at Tompkins Park.</p> <p>This site will become vacant when the bowling club moves, so that's why we are planning for what happens to the site in the future.</p> <p>Julie Posted on Aug 2, 2017</p> <p>You say that the two projects aren't linked but I smell a rat.</p> <p>I also don't believe the two clubs agreed to the merger but were coerced, or at best misled and bullied!</p> <p>RC Posted on Aug 8, 2017</p> <p>Yes Julie, there are many unanswered questions with all these "unlinked" sites.</p>
55	<p>alysia_back Posted on Jul 18, 2017</p> <p>Support Concept 2</p>
	<p>Concept 2. Looks great City of Melville! The less road traffic close to the park, the better. One major concern is a significant lack of parking- that is not nearly enough to accommodate 4000+ sqm playground. I feel it will cause serious issues with locals with street parking etc (we Live in Mt Pleasant but not easy walking distance.) If extra bays are not possible maybe look at "no parking" on one side of the road?</p>
56	<p>Resident Posted on Jul 18, 2017</p> <p>Support Concept 2</p>
	<p>I believe concept 2 is the most suitable. The central location of the park provides a nicer outlook along with being more accessible for the dwellings immediately surrounding the area, whilst providing a 'softer' feel to the whole area by having a central park to break up the dwellings.</p>
57	<p>Ying Posted on Jul 18, 2017</p> <p>Support Concept 2</p>
	<p>Plan 2 is my favourite, the playground is safer surrounded by houses than being completely visible from the road</p>

58	<p>Sue Darbyshire Posted on Jul 18, 2017</p> <p>Support Concept 3</p>
	<p>Concept 3 is my preference as it provides housing for Over 55s and I think it's very important to offer this type of housing to members of our community. My preference, ideally, would be for all the building area at the site to be developed into an over 55s, retirement, low care, high care facility so we could provide this type of facility and care to our elderly residents so they can stay in the area they have lived and are familiar with.</p>
59	<p>DF Posted on Jul 18, 2017</p> <p>Support Concept 2</p>
	<p>Concept 2 is my preference as it provides the most direct park frontage for dwellings maximising overlooking and therefore surveillance, safety and the park general wellbeing.</p> <p>It would be even better if density was increased further, opportunities may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> / reducing lot sizes on Barrisdale, 15m and 17m frontages are very large and 6 x lots will fit with average of 12.88m and still provide double garage, space for on-street parking and circa 425m² lots. These lots will also be cheaper increasing market accessibility (ie broader market and increased owner diversity); / the 4 x lots directly to the north of the park could be amalgamated into one multi-dwelling lot that allowed development up to say 3 floors with design guidelines that ensured maximum views over the park and roads. This would increase surveillance, use of the amenity and also allow for increased product diversity in the area (something hugely lacking). Apartments could be considered suitable for the older population, downsizing etc, therefore meeting the outcomes that would be offered by Option 3. <p>Other comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> / if the park is going to be good, a bit of a destination, 16 x parking bays is not enough. Consider adding a parking based access way, even if it doesn't go right the way through; / will design guidelines be created and enforced? For example the two current lots on the northern edge of the park must be required to address the park for say 70% of their southern boundary, not just put up a fence or have the homes' utilitarian areas such as laundry on that side. Similarly for the Barrisdale lots park frontage fencing and room orientation; / to take the pressure off Deep Water Point, the park design should cater for pop up amenity such as a coffee van on weekends.

Attachment 2 – Written Submissions Received During Stage 2 Public Advertising

The 30 written submissions are detailed below.

No	Comments
1	<p>Support Concept 2</p> <p>a. Draft concept plan number 2 is the best option for several reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Having the park in the middle makes it more accessible to all surrounding homes and residents. • Locating the park in the centre splits up the housing which will be better for numerous reasons including noise and heat reduction and a more open living feeling (which will increase the value of the land for the Council when they sell). • The layout of plan 2 is the best use of the existing road infrastructure and will ensure the development does not impact on traffic flow of surrounding roads. • Having the park in the middle will also create a safer environment and play area for children as it only has a small section of road on one side of it. • The larger blocks along Barrisdale with park access will be appealing to buyers and fit nicely with existing homes along Barrisdale. <p>b. We strongly object to Concept plan number 1. As previously mentioned, we do not want to see Bedford Avenue connected to Canna Way. Even though this is being called a 'right of way', it will encourage drivers to cut through the housing estate making it noisy and dangerous for residents and people accessing the park. It will also increase traffic on the hill part of Canna Way which has many families and young children and is currently a very quiet street. Additionally, it will create a pocket of housing down the north end which will be 'disconnected' to the park area, decreasing the value of these blocks and making it just another cluster of huge houses on small blocks.</p> <p>c. We are not opposed to the concept of the Aged or Dependent Persons dwellings, we just don't like the way draft concept plan 3 dog legs the park and still would like to see the park in the middle of the site rather than tucked down the south end.</p>
2	<p>Support Concept 3</p> <p>a. As a long term resident of Mount Pleasant for 35 years, I am supportive of concept 3, which incorporates some over 55 housing next to a small park and not too far from Garden City.</p>
3	<p>Support Concepts 2 and 3</p> <p>a. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the redevelopment of Mt Pleasant Bowling club. <u>Option 2</u></p> <p>b. The positives for this option are the allocation of bigger blocks and the park in the middle, which softens the density issue. <u>Option 3</u></p> <p>c. The positive for this option is the inclusion of the group housing, which I deem to be totally necessary for the changing demographics of this area.....that is we are all getting older.</p> <p>d. Can we have a mixture of option 2 and 3,?? that is, the park in the middle and inclusion of the group housing. If I had to choose one option, it would be #3 as I am very much in favour of the group housing concept.</p>

	<p><u>Open Space</u></p> <p>e. With the upgrade of Shirley Strickland oval, this open space @ Bedford Rd, should be for low key leisure - the emphasis should be for people to gather, rather than provision for full recreational activities. Shirley Strickland oval provides more intensive recreational activities and should remain focussed on that.</p> <p>f. Having experienced inner city living in Sydney, these little parks are so essential for community building and high density living. I shall look forward to enjoying this facility as I know how beneficial they are in a higher density community. Can it include a mini bowling green?? It would lovely for the “old” members who live around this area, and possibly would be unable to join the new bowling club @ Alfred Cove, to still have an opportunity to go down and have a “bowl” and a natter.</p> <p><u>Parking</u></p> <p>g. I think the plans provide enough parking as this recreational area should be for locals and not aimed at bringing in large number of people.</p> <p>h. People within walking distance should be the target, not people from other suburbs as they should have parks closer to them to enjoy.</p>
4	<p>Support Concept 2</p> <p>a. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the development of the Mt Pleasant Bowling Club.</p> <p>b. Looking at the proposed plans, I am in favour of the park being in the middle of the building development.</p> <p>c. It would be wonderful to have “over 55” housing - single storey, included in the plan, to cater for the ageing population.</p> <p>d. It is essential to have sufficient off road parking for each of the houses, as the 3 surrounding roads are narrow. and Bedford Road being a thorough fare.</p>
5	<p>Object</p> <p>a. I would like to lodge my objection to all of the City’s concepts to re-development the Mt Pleasant bowling club – which I and many rate payers I speak to did the last round of ‘consultation’ – but which the City has obviously chosen to ignore.</p> <p>b. I do not believe there is any justification for the City’s proposed re-development and re-location of the Mt Pleasant bowling club. Indeed, with the ageing population of the area and the withdrawal of services, the need for a local facility like the bowling club will increase. Remember, the club caters for both bowlers and social members (which the City seems to brush over in its propaganda).</p> <p>c. So I would like you to add a fourth option – leave the club as is. I’m sure that if you added this option it would trump your re-development options.</p> <p>d. Please City of Melville – start listening to what the rate payers are thinking and start thinking about the best use of the infrastructure we have in Melville – rather than trying to tear it down and/or move it out of the local context.</p> <p>e. For the record I am not a bowler or a member of the Mt Pleasant Bowling Club. However, for some time I have contemplated joining the 'local' club and having a go at bowling. My desire to do so is 1.the sport and 2. the fact that the facility is local and I can walk there. If the facility were to re-locate to Tomkins Park I very much doubt that I would bother using it. What the Council will achieve is removing valuable public infrastructure away from the rate payers.</p> <p>f. A couple of other messages that you can feed back to Council and your executive - have they taken the time to considered the current political climate. The new government is looking for any opportunity it can identify to find money. If the City of Melville offer up the Mt Pleasant site there is probably a strong possibility that they will wish to retain any revenue generated by the subsequent sale of the land. What great outcome that would be for the bowling club and the ratepayers in Melville. Not only will the facility be lost but the ratepayers will then need to fund the proposed development at Tomkins Park - a loose loose result!!!!</p>

	<p>g. Finally, you state that 'the bowling club have approved the relocation to Tomkins Park'. I surmise that the club either had no choice, were coerced by the City of Melville into that position, or were presented with untenable options like the move to Shirley Strickland reserve. Now this so-called approval by the club is now being banded around as a fait accompli by the Council and its Executive. If this is the case, your responses to ratepayers such as myself should not try and represent the view of the club.</p>
6	<p>Comments</p> <p>a. What is the status of upgrades to Strickland Reserve? Seems to have stalled completely. Not even any upgrades to the verges?</p> <p>b. Concept plans for MPBC look fairly staid. Where is the vibrancy and biodiversity we need in CoM and discussed when I dropped in at the open discussion community night during the planning phase? Who would visit the future CoM version? It is hardly a destination to entice and engage people.</p> <p>c. Did you see the plans for a sustainable Fremantle/White Gum Valley facility in Wed paper The West? Fini? That would be ok in my neighbourhood with some park space.</p>
7	<p>Comments</p> <p>a. We have received in the mail information in regard to the concept redevelopment of the above and now a request from the council for more 'feedback' and/or comment.</p> <p>b. The 'community engagement process' in my opinion has been enlightening and disappointing. I am of the opinion that the City of Melville does not fully embrace its rate payers. The reason I have come to this conclusion is because the City of Melville does not show that it is really interested in what the community who live in this area have to say nor does the City of Melville listen to what the people of this area are saying.</p> <p>c. From my observation in having attended several meetings at the City of Melville, the engagement of the community is only a token measure in order that the process can be seen to have been done. I do not believe that there is anything to be gained by 'having a say' as the City of Melville will do as they please - regardless.</p> <p>d. We have lived in this area for a few years and I have come to the conclusion it is time to look for a local Council in which I wish to live (not in the City of Melville), a local area that will embrace forward planning for the rate payers and not necessarily forward commercial business development.</p>
8	<p>Support Concept 2</p> <p>a. Quick feedback to say Option 2 is my preferred option with the parkland in the middle as I like the idea of having some blocks back onto the parkland</p>
9	<p>Support Concept 3</p> <p>a. My preferred option is plan 03. I think this provides the most protection for houses bordering on the site. Also, I like the idea of some Over Fifties housing.</p>
10	<p>Object</p> <p>a. We as rate payers attended the previous Council meetings regarding this matter, and despite very well informed arguments against this proposal, it was made very clear that the Council was fixed on this decision.</p> <p>b. The land in question is currently a C Class reserve, is it owned by the council or government? I suspect the latter, so it would need to be rezoned in order to allow this proposal to go forward, we as ratepayers are categorically against this.</p> <p>c. Why not with more community support & input, improve the existing amenity and develop a children's adventure playground as well. A true community asset for all ages! We trust you will seriously consider our suggestions.</p>

11	<p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. I have been living in the district for several decades and driven past or utilised the facilities at the above. It is a social place for gathering and activities. The site has been used extensively. b. The new plans do not appeal to me. The council's investment at this planning stage must be substantial and I am not aware that is what residents living in and around the area instigated. c. Not everything new is beneficial to the community. d. The site belongs to the State Government and the City may have an opportunity to purchase the site following the relocation of the bowling club if it can establish a good business case. e. It seems to me that the business case is not certain and appears to be driven by the Council getting more money in rates and taxes. The decision option to purchase may not eventuate depending on the political situation at the time. f. There are a number of other points such as reducing amenity area, closing down facilities for seniors with a trend for an aging population. g. Hence my disagreement and protest voice.
12	<p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. After 37 years residence, and several years service as a volunteer for the Council, there have been a series of events which caused me disappointment. b. The site is a reserve and should remain a reserve.
13	<p>Support Concept 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. I have considered each of the three options suggested for the site redevelopment and although all three seem to be reasonable at this time, I rather have a preference for option one. b. However, in view of my earlier message of concern regarding the drainage sump which is a significant feature of the site, I am alarmed to see no reference to what action is being considered to overcome what is already well overdue for attention. c. The fact that each proposal completely ignores its significant presence and indicates a park area as if it does not exist, leads one to wonder what other aspects are being brushed over. d. When details of how it is intended to address this problem and that of the significantly sunken North West corner of the site, a more informed opinion will be possible. e. When is it likely that such detail might become available, or is it considered more convenient to sidestep such considerations until the die of consultation has been cast. f. Since the last over-enthusiastic deepening of the sump, and in spite of your earlier statement that no significant subsidence had resulted, as one of the owners of adjoining properties I am well aware of what is happening. g. Unless, some sensible plan is implemented, there will likely be similar threats to some of the new properties. I look forward to your assurance that this has not been just a convenient oversight.

14	<p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. We have been ratepayers since 1966 and are hereby voicing our preferences as to what is expected from our council. b. The clubrooms should stay ... yes stay. It has become our community centre. The oldies get together with their families, the children play there safely while the mums watch on. We can have meals there, play a board game, share our craft ideas and maybe we could have a gentle exercise class for the old and young. It just needs a bit of tender loving care by you "our council". c. The rest of the area should become a lovely park, where oldies can walk and site and children play in a safe playground. There should be no houses. d. There should be enough room for the oldies to stretch their legs and sit down for a rest on a few benches and a "no bikes" sign at every entrance. e. No houses – make the park the jewel in the crown! f. Keep Melville Bowling Club where it is. Those oldies have been there since the beginning, when we were told about the Garden City development would be. g. With 22 houses crammed together, there would be no green in sight. Only traffic and parking problems. h. Therefore we say no houses! We want parkland! The loss of our bar amenity will also be felt by many.
15	<p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. We write to express our concern and opposition to plan re-development of the Mount Pleasant Bowling Club. b. This land is owned by the State Government as and zoned 'C' class reserve (public open space). We believe that this should remain public open space and not be rezoned for development. Dense housing with a very small park is not the right direction for this area. c. Our community will lose yet another important public open space which we can ill afford to lose. It is crucial for this land to be a park (a good example is the new park in Archibald St, Willagee) which young families including the elderly could enjoy.
16	<p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. I am writing to say I would like to see the Bowling Club stay where it is. b. I do not play bowls but live close by and always think what a good situation it is in and if I was able would love to join. c. For seniors I think it is in a fantastic position It easy to get to for this area and the parking is so easy and there is plenty of it. That is the reason I think it should stay where it is. d. We are an ageing population and parking is a major concern as we get older so why disrupt the members of the club just to build more units etc. e. I think the suggested plan is lovely but why disrupt folk just to put in units? There are units going up everywhere so I don't feel there is a shortage at the moment. f. Melville is a great place to live, so don't take away the advantages we have and are serving such a good service.
17	<p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. I am against this development, mainly because of the young families coming into the area. We need more parkland, not units. b. The Bowling Club could be improved with parkland surrounding it – certainly not moving it away.

18	<p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. I would like to vote against this plan. b. This will mean the community losing a valuable asset where one can meet and relax for all residents in this area. c. We need an adventure style children’s playground and other amenities for all ages of people in the community to be able to relax. d. The present playground in Strickland Oval is really unsuitable as very small and uninviting for children in the areas to use. Also for older people. In the weekends sport groups use these areas and no where for residents to go and enjoy the fresh air and relax. e. There is growing number of young children in this area and we should be encouraging them to be in the sun and fresh air to develop healthy bodies. Compared to other residential areas, our area is lacking in outdoor activities for the well being of the residents. f. It seems that this council is only thinking of more money not the well being of residents children and families in this area.
19	<p>Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Due to the increasing population density in the area, for example the apartment towers at Canning Bridge and lots being subdivided, we need more public recreation areas, not less. b. Our first proposal would be to turn the whole site into a park for everyone to enjoy. c. Secondly, due to a lack of options for over 55s housing, an alternative option is for an over 55s community independent living. Or a 50/50 spread of the above options.
20	<p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. We are residents of Mt Pleasant and write to express our dismay at the proposed destruction of the Mt Pleasant Bowling Club. We now live in St Michael Terrace and frequently view the Club and before that we lived in Riverview Terrace which was slightly further away but still near enough for us to observe what was going on. b. Melville is a wonderful city and has the great good fortune to be very well endowed with many areas of natural vegetation and breathable air. It has a large river frontage and magnificent parklands such as Wireless Hill and Piney Lakes. These facilities are excellent for the whole population. c. The younger members of the community need in addition ample areas for strenuous sporting activities and the city is also reasonably well served in this regard. The older members of the community need rather less strenuous sporting facilities as well as amenities of a more sociable kind. d. Our observation over a period of nigh on fifty years is that Mt Pleasant Bowling Club has magnificently provided such a well used amenity. e. We note that the population of the area is soon going to expand quite considerably due to the construction of many high rise developments in the neighbourhood of Canning Bridge. It is surely the height of folly to destroy an amenity of this quality in favour of yet more housing.
21	<p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. We write to express our opposition to any development of the Mt Pleasant Bowling Club site (“the Site”) that involves the creation of more residential lots and the reduction of community space. Our reasons are: b. The Council states that the public open space tool identifies that Ardross has 25% public open space (slightly less than the City of Melville average), not including the Site. We assume that the Council does not contend that that is too much.

However, the amount of public open space in the City of Melville largely was determined decades ago based on a population and housing style very much different to what we have today.

- c. We note that the 25% figure includes Applecross High School and Ardross Primary School. Whilst we accept that schools are included in the model used, we suggest that the result is somewhat skewed because those two adjoining schools happen to be in Ardross, and government owned schools are not the same quality as council assets.
- d. Infilling, lot reductions and multi-storey developments have seen an exponential growth in the number of people living within the City of Melville.
- e. The council's allowances on plot ratio means that many new houses in the area, particularly in the vicinity of the Site, are being built with no space to cater for external activities, such that public space becomes more necessary.
- f. 25% public open space was arrived at with planning ideas not contemplating the much greater demand now created.
- g. The increased population is creating greater traffic congestion, particularly in the morning on arterial roads leading to major roads such as Leach Highway and Canning Highway. The current use of the Site has no effect on traffic at peak or busy times.
- h. Congestion will become a further problem by reason of such decisions as the Woolworths' site on Reynolds Road.
- i. Once public open space is lost it cannot be recovered.
- j. Whilst we accept that the Site was not public open space per se, it presently is a community asset which supports recreation and community involvement. The Site presents a rare opportunity for the Council to produce a space which can continue to achieve that objective as well as provide open space much needed in the contemporary planning environment.
- k. We have not been able to find any realistic elevations of the buildings planned for the Site, however the plans indicate that the houses will, once again, be large houses occupying the whole site, once again creating further need for public open space.
- l. We anticipate that the houses to go on the Site will all be two-storey (at least) and hence the bulk of the development will be a visual issue, particularly given that they will occupy 70% of the Site.
- m. In so far as the Site is to accommodate "over 55s grouped housing", again, there is no adjustment to public amenity to respond to that planning concept.
- n. Your planning representative has referred to the concept as a "fabulous plan". Is occupying 70% of the Site with the same old/same old houses really "fabulous"? From our perspective, none of the proposed plans are aspirational. On all three plans all the public open space has is "Adventure play area set amongst new tree plantings". Hardly "fabulous".
- o. Further, as an additional matter, the Council's track record in maintaining public areas in the region is not good. The area at the top of Polglass Way, between Portree Way, is an adventure play area asset amongst tree plantings. It is dreadful and has been for the 20 years that we have lived on Polglass Way. Our children were never motivated to visit it. The park on the corner of Ardross Street and Coogee Road is another example.
- p. We cannot see why the Council should have to sell the land at the Site to fund redevelopment at Shirley Strickland Reserve. In effect, nothing has been spent on that site in decades. The Council has been looking at doing improvements at that site for years. Ultimately the Council's plans for that site are modest. Properly fiscally managed, any works there should have fully been budgeted by now, and from existing revenue streams.

	<p>q. In essence, the plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Creates more problems for the area. ii. Lacks vision. iii. Does not cater to community needs. <p>r. The Council should fully revisit the concept and take this unique opportunity to provide open space and a valuable community resource for the rate payers.</p>
22	<p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. My wife and I have been living in Mount Pleasant for the past 40 years and are totally disappointed with the City of Melville (Council) to convert/demolish the current bowling facility into housing development. b. The Mount Pleasant Bowling Club has been a landmark and provides handy community amenity to the residents of Mount Pleasant and Ardross. c. It is really a shame that such a facility is to be demolished for the financial gain of the Council. If financial gain is the objective of the Council as against retaining/providing community amenity for the residents, you are driving your goal in the wrong direction, i.e. short of direction and achieve only short term gain. No sensible objective of any Council is to put financial gain as against providing amenity for residents. d. If the current bowling club (MtPBC) on its own is not operating financially well due to a low membership, there is no reason for the land to be developed into housing. AS said, the main objective of the Council is to provide community amenity to the residents and if the operating entity is not financially sound, community consultation should seek to see if alternative activities can be added to improve the situation. e. All told, I object to the Council proposal to put housing on the current site. If the current bowling club is to be moved, the land should be reserved for community use and not for housing. f. Look in 20 years the value of the current community land owned and controlled by the Council and enjoyed by the residents, especially seniors, families and future generations, as against a few private individuals. Hope the Council will work out a good outcome for the community and surrounding residents.
23	<p>Object</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The City of Melville Residents and Ratepayers Association (Inc.) opposes the development of the site and make the following comments. b. The Mt Pleasant Bowling Club has been the source of delight for many in our community for many decades, particularly those in their later years. Even now there is always something happening at the club, not just for the senior citizens, but all age groups. We are aware the even Mayor Aubrey has visited the Club on many occasions over the years. The loss of the Mt Pleasant Bowling Club as a community centre will be a loss for generations to come. c. The City often heralds that it is in tremendous financial shape and we, as residents and ratepayers, have seen little evidence that the City is proactively looking for ways to cut costs to keep rate rises at or below inflation; we are horrified that the City has yet again recently passed through more above inflation rate rises. We do not understand the business case as to why the City appears to be "selling off the farm" now, to the detriment of future generations, when there appears no financial necessity to do so at this point in time. d. Population densities with the City are rising rapidly, as the City often states. In order to maintain the City's amenity and the level of community facilities we would have thought the City would be looking for ways to increase public space and community facilities rather reduce and consolidate them.

	<p>e. In the event the Mount Pleasant Bowling Club does vacate the facility we would like to see the land kept as public open space, either passive recreation or partly revegetated. We note that the City appears to have omitted these options from its community consultation process.</p> <p>f. The Mount Pleasant Bowling Club has been a recreational centre for many Mount Pleasant and Ardross seniors interested in bowling. Over the past couple of years the club has been broadening its appeal and there is a growing awareness within the community and the members that the site on which the club sits is a community facility that needs to provide additional facilities for the broader community. The community is looking towards the city to build these community amenity areas for future generations.</p> <p>g. The community is aware that the city has accumulated considerable reserves and these community facilities such as the bowling club that should be as part of an amenity enhancement program being upgraded incorporating facilities that will be used by residents from across the community spectrum - young families as well as grandparents seeking facilities for grandchildren. The community is wishing to see these crucial amenity areas being enhanced and saved for future generations.</p> <p>h. With population densities to inevitably increase it is crucial to maintain the existing amenity areas otherwise the city will not be able to maintain the level of facilities that the current community and future generations will expect.</p> <p>i. Quite simply history has demonstrated that once an amenity area is lost it is never recovered.</p> <p>j. There is considerable scope to enhance this amenity area (a "C" class reserve) into a facility that will serve the Mount Pleasant/Ardross communities for the next 40/50 years. This can not happen if the reserve's current status is not maintained and the city does not rethink its direction.</p>
24	<p>Object</p> <p>a. My family lives in Mt Pleasant and my children attend the local primary school and will attend Applecross High School. I have lived in the area myself for over 30 years, never left once.</p> <p>b. As a family with children it is very difficult to find a place that you can go to and socialise with the community. Other families and their children etc. The Bowling Club has provided this facility for local families to go and catch up. It provides a huge sense of community. The hope was that in the near future a playground of some sort would be established at the site to allow social interactions for children and the adults whilst the children are playing.</p> <p>c. Our feedback when initially raised was to sell off one of the greens and use that money to develop the remaining property into a beautiful community facility. There are no others around like it. The area of Mt Pleasant on the west side of Reynolds Rd has very limited parklands. Shirley Strickland and Karoonda Reserve are the only open areas and always occupied with sporting events on the weekends. There are no local areas with decent playgrounds within our home. If you visit the local primary school on the weekends, you will see an example of lots of locals there as there is nowhere else for the kids to play and hang out.</p> <p>d. We understand to fund these changes money must be raised, which is why we suggested the partial land sale. However to develop 2/3 of the property as housing and only leave 1/3 for public access is appalling. Where else are we supposed to get together?</p> <p>e. There are no kid friendly restaurants in this community. When I was younger there was Camelot which provided a great location for families to get out. There is nothing like that now. We used to travel to the High Road Hotel for family catch ups but that has now been bulldozed.</p>

	<p>f. The push is to get kids off screens and back outside, this can't happen if we are all living on smaller blocks with no public play areas that are safe for our children to access.</p> <p>g. I feel we've been pushed into loosing a community facility and it being replaced by a 1/3 of the size park???</p> <p>h. To say we are very disappointed in the City of Melville is an understatement. It feels like we are not being heard. We understand there are financial constraints but surely building 20 odd more homes is not the solution for our local area.</p> <p>i. We urge you to re-consider the plans and think about the wider impact on the community. It is not just affecting the seniors, although we do really feel for them. Many don't drive and will not be accessing the proposed Tompkins Park Facility.</p>
25	<p>Support Concept Plan 2</p> <p>I went to one of the informal sessions at the Mt Pleasant Clubrooms last week to have a look and chat about the plans of the club. Of the three concept plans I liked the Option 2 the best as the park was in the centre of the future dwellings.</p>
26	<p>Object</p> <p>a. We are residents on Mitchell Street and as local area residents, we are against the closing of the local bowling club, which is enjoyed by many seniors and families in this area.</p> <p>b. As local residents, we do not wish to see this area being more densely populated. As it is, there are already heaps of apartment blocks being built around Garden City, and perhaps soon to be the Ardross business area near Riseley Street and Canning Highway. We would much prefer that the site be kept for our lovely seniors' and families' use. Please kindly reconsider other options.</p>
27	<p>Object</p> <p>a. I am writing to object to the current proposals of placing housing on the current Mt Pleasant bowling club site. The bowling club and its facilities are an important part of the community which has many happy memories for many of its residents, myself included. It is where my family celebrated my daughter's Baptism and it is where I was hoping to celebrate her first birthday and my 30th as it is a fantastic family friendly club with excellent amenities.</p> <p>b. As an architect I am usually very much in favour of urban infill development, however, in this case I don't believe the community gains any benefit from these proposals, only loses. The site has so much potential which the current schemes fail to take advantage of. More sub divided blocks with a pocket park is not what the area needs more of but what would be of benefit is revitalising the site with more family friendly amenities that connect with the existing club facilities such as children's adventure playground, small waterpark/ feature (such as the one at Hyde park in Mt Lawley.) and BBQ area. What makes Mt Pleasant such a lovely area is that there is such a diversity in ages that live here so providing a space on the site where everyone can come together will be of huge benefit to the community.</p> <p>c. I have viewed the three proposal for the Bowling Club and the proposal for the Shirley Strickland Reserve development as the two developments are in close proximity to one another and it is councils intention to use funds from the subdivision to revitalise Shirley Strickland Reserve. My concern is that none of the schemes provide a place for local residents to meet all year round which is a very important element when Place- Making. With this in mind I would like to put forward the following suggestions:</p>

	<p>d. Retain the club room building at Mt Pleasant bowling club and renovate to make it a more flexible multi- functional space. For example; could it incorporate a cafe area so the area can be used by the wider public during the day? There is obvious need for cafes in the area as Coco Belle on Queens Road is always busy so another one overlooking the future children's adventure playground would be an interesting possibility. Could the space be rented out for art classes, sport classes (karate, dancing etc) or as a space for a play group?</p> <p>e. From what I have read, Bowling Club memberships were in decline. Can the number of bowling greens at the club be reduced to cater for this lower number and in doing so will allow for the new adventure playground, small water park and BBQ facilities so it can be near the renovated club house?</p> <p>f. Housing at R20, as proposed can still be incorporated on the site, but by retaining and renovating the club house and the remaining bowling greens, the number of lots may need to be reduced slightly. Despite this, by renting out part of the club house as a café, the development may still be financially viable and generate income to help maintain the park and its facilities into the future.</p> <p>g. Thank you for your time and I hope you will consider this more dynamic and community engaging proposal/ suggestions that would incorporate the existing Mt Pleasant Bowling Club and it's clubrooms.</p>
28	<p>Comments</p> <p>a. I am a resident on Glencoe Road and I have not spoken to anyone who wishes for more housing in this area. The current traffic flow at the junction of Glencoe Road and Riseley Street particularly at busy times is already problematic and with the future expansion of Garden City Shopping Centre it will become a nightmare.</p> <p>b. Regarding the bowling club reserve, it would be advantageous to the local residents if the premises were to be retained and modified to provide a social facility for all age groups. The remainder of the area to become a beautiful parkland where everyone could walk and relax and enjoy the fresh air and sunshine. The combination of a children's adventure playground would add to the attraction – a beautiful concept.</p> <p>c. If this idea is rejected, my alternative choice would be Concept Plan 2, with the parkland placed in the centre of the development and not at either end, so all homes would have maximum benefit of the beauty of the park.</p>
29	<p>Comments</p> <p>a. We have recently purchased a property on Strickland Road some 200 metres from the above Reserve.</p> <p>b. Among the many features that attracted us to the Ardross area was the lovely trees, parks and reserves, plus the proximity to the river.</p> <p>c. We have been able to use the facilities at the Mt Pleasant Bowling Club for Friday evening meals and other social events.</p> <p>d. Since taking up residence in Strickland Road in April we were disappointed to learn of the proposed redevelopment of the Bowling Club site and the cessation of this Club and its facilities to exist on this site.</p> <p>e. However, having reluctantly studied the plans and spoken to Council representatives who attended the briefings, could we suggest that in the event that the “move” does go ahead that more emphasis be given to housing for “over 50s” as opposed to more of the same two storey mansions. At the same time we would like to see consideration be given to a much larger area of park land than currently shown on the three alternative plans.</p>

Object

- a. Submission on the City of Melville's proposed change of a "C" Class Reserve.
- b. We oppose this change to a "C" Class reserve.
- c. Such a change in the attitude of our Council towards its senior citizens. Over the years efforts were made for them to stay in their homes and have easy access to their interests.
- d. Now we see a flat out denial of this freedom. Together in groups, in small accommodation areas – is the in-thing.
- e. OK you can take our beloved bowling club, but what will you give us in return? A group of housing, all the same, together in ghetto-style, morbid colours. Concrete bases and low ceilings.
- f. A shallow-filled sump. No place for a toddler or a mother with a baby in a pram. No decent trees or birds around.
- g. Many more driveways coming onto Glencoe Road. This straight footpath is used by many children and adults going to school and buses. Walking dogs and exercising.
- h. The entrance and exit was here, on the green, at the corner of Glencoe Road and Canna Way. This was a big traffic hazard. No parking signs were used in this area of Glencoe Road.
- i. This area is more than a bowling club. Many go through the doors to play bowls and enjoy the social occasions put on for all.
- j. Why must there be constant pressure for pennant bowlers?
- k. Surely Council members know that these folk have health problems they are trying to overcome.
- l. Why can't they just come for friendly bowls, laugh and enjoy time with friends?
- m. Why this pressure for a sporting hub?
- n. What will happen to the bowling memorial garden?
- o. Upon speaking to many people in the area it has been made clear what they want. They want a seniors exercise class, a craft class, a level park and no bikes so folk can walk safely. A children's playground area. A coffee area. An area they can walk or drive to. But mostly they want the bowling club to stay. More encouragement for new members and bowling lessons.
- p. With the increasing number of seniors, please make this a freedom area for them. Give us back what your Council has taken away with the closure of the seniors amenities in our area.
- q. Yes, Dean Cracknell, a lot of us will have gone from this area or died in the next two years. But our families want to live here.
- r. They have been to corporate bowls, darts etc. They want the bowling club to stay. They want this facility to be kept and used by all.
- s. This "C" Class Reserve must be kept for a bowling club and vested in the City of Melville. We need your help, support and encouragement to make it so.
- t. The Mount Pleasant residents planned and formed this club before Ardross homes were built. Why is that no letter drops were made by the Council to these citizens? So giving them information about the bowling club area?
- u. We have received phone calls of concern for this bowling club from Mount Pleasant residents.
- v. In February when I first started talking with surrounding residents, on one wanted to see the bowling club leave its premises. If it had to move they wanted all parkland. How is it that the graph shows a change to housing? What information was fed to these residents for them to change their mind? I would appreciate a reply at your earliest convenience.