

Public submission summary – draft Public Open Space Strategy

Submission theme/matter	# submissions raising this theme	Officer's response
OBJECTIONS/CONCERNS		
<p>Miller's crossing</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposed to the removal of Miller's crossing POS • The Town should consider this land in the context of the service it provides as a passive space. The surrounding POS (Lathlain Park, Zone 2X are very active spaces). • Removing this POS is contrary to the Town's stated position on the Climate emergency. • The importance Miller's Crossing should be considered in the context of the variety of POS available in the area, not the distance to POS. • There is still an overall shortage of POS and this should be factored into the decision. • The POS contributes to a green link/corridor • The POS should be considered in the context of the fauna it supports • The POS plays a role in encouraging and facilitating neighbourhood relationships. • The removal of Miller's crossing should be considered from the perspective of POS fragmentation. 	3	<p>The POSS does not make a recommendation regarding the Town's decision to purchase the land known as Miller's Crossing. The role of the POSS is to provide information only that will guide Council's decision in the future. The POSS highlights that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Town does not currently own the land and it has been offered to the Town for purchase. • Miller's Crossing is not located within a 'gap' in POS provision so would not serve to reduce the gaps in the Town's supply of POS; and • Should the land be developed in the future, the Town should advocate for the retention of the significant trees that are on site. <p>Councillors will receive a separate council report at a future Ordinary Council Meeting asking them to make a decision on the purchase of this land. At this point, information contained within the POSS will guide the decision making along with other relevant factors.</p> <p>The POSS has not been amended in response to these concerns as it currently provides an analysis of the provision of the POSS to inform a future Council decision regarding Miller's Crossing.</p>
<p>Jirdarup Bushland Precinct</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The absence of Jirdarup Bushland Precinct from the draft POSS needs to be rectified. 	1	<p>The Draft POSS was updated following the council resolution at its Ordinary Council Meeting on 17 September 2019 to approve the draft POS and Appendices contained within Attachment 1, for the purpose of public advertising subject to the following amendments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That the draft POS reflect a Council resolution made at its meeting held on 15 August 2015, supporting the creation of a single bush precinct names the Jirdarup Bushland Precinct by incorporating the Kent Street

		<p>Sandpit, the Kensington Bushland and George Street Reserve.</p> <p>Following this resolution the draft POSS and its appendices were updated to clearly identify and include the Jirdarup Bushland Precinct prior to advertising. There is nil follow up action to this submission as a result.</p>
<p>Kent Street Sandpit (Jirdarup Bushland Precinct)</p> <p><i>General Feedback</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Desire for Kent Street sandpit to become the most beautiful, imaginative, best-designed, well-used and widely admired public open space in Perth (after Kings Park). • This would be an ideal location for the Town to meet the commitments of the Urban Forrest Strategy. 	2	<p>The POSS identifies the value of the Kent Street Sandpit and identifies that the community favoured an environmental outcome for the site during the public engagement undertaken to prepare the document.</p> <p>It is important to note that the Council at its 19 December Ordinary Council Meeting resolved to prepare an investigative report for the Kent Street Sandpit, as is recommended by the POSS, ensuring that the recommended option(s) for the site:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Is consistent with its zoning as a Parks and Recreation Reserve under the provisions of Town Planning Scheme No.1. b) Considers the past recommendations and decisions made in relation to the Kent Street Sand Pit site. c) Culminates in a plan for the Kent Street Sand Pit site including (but not limited to): <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Design considerations (if any) ii. Site preparatory works iii. Environmental considerations iv. Community engagement v. Funding, staging and delivery considerations <p>The future of this site is subject to the outcomes of this work. The POSS recommends for this piece of work to occur so no change has been made.</p>
<p>Kent Street Sandpit (Jirdarup Bushland Precinct)</p> <p><i>Specific Feedback – Naming protocol</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Kent Street Sandpit is referred to as a number of names throughout the document (i.e. Kensington Sand Pit). All documents should be updated to use the correct term "Kent Street Sandpit". 	1	<p>Strategy and appendices have been amended to ensure correct terminology has been used – Kent Street Sandpit.</p>
<p>Kent Street Sandpit (Jirdarup Bushland Precinct)</p>	1	

<p><i>Specific Feedback – Measurement of current POS</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Page 14 of the POSS outlines the current public open space provision. In this section it outlines that special consideration has been given to Miller’s crossing and the Kent Street verge. Both sites are not owned by the Town but are managed by the Town and included for the purpose of measuring the current provision of POS in the town. The Kent Street Sandpit is not included (a disclaimer on Figure 4 states as such) as it is “currently unusable and provides no natural value in its current state.” It is requested that the Kent Street Sandpit be given special consideration and be included in the measurement of current POS provision. • A disclaimer on Figure 4 notes that Kent Street Sandpit has been excluded from calculations given it is currently unusable and provides no natural value. Concern was expressed that this statement needed to be included on all relevant maps where calculations are referenced, not just Figure 4. It was also requested that the document provide guidance on the future of the site, being the contemplated revegetation and acknowledge it being a semi-public site (providing use for Apiarists) 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While zoned as ‘Parks and Recreation’ under the Town Planning Scheme the Kent Street Sandpit is currently inaccessible, unusable and does not provide environmental value (beyond use by apiarists). As a result, the site cannot be identified as Town POS in Figure 4 and the accompanying dataset. The report has however been changed to identify the site as future POS. This is based on the Council resolution of 19 November 2019 whereby the Council resolved to prepare a report for the Kent Street Sandpit for options that are consistent with its Parks and Recreation zoning. • This disclaimer has been removed as a result of the change to the classification of Kent Street Sandpit to ‘future POS’.
<p>Kent Street Sandpit (Jirdarup Bushland Precinct)</p> <p><i>Specific Feedback – Requirement for a masterplan</i></p> <p>Within Appendix C, the Strategy recommends that a both Jirdarup Bushland Precinct and Harold Rossiter Park be guided by the preparation or implementation of a masterplan. It is suggested that once masterplan could be prepared for both sites, given their proximity and the opportunities to protect and enhance the natural habitat of the entire area.</p> <p>It is also suggested that the strategy clarify the objectives and desired outcomes of a (single) masterplan, given that management plans are the key actions for Kensington Bushland and George Street Reserve.</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>The POSS identifies that a masterplan is required for each POS, but this does not prohibit a larger masterplan being prepared that includes both sites. Any future masterplan proposals for POS will consider potential efficiencies and opportunities that could result in a rationalised masterplan including adjoining POS. The manner in which the POSS currently lists the requirements for a masterplan to be prepared allows for the flexibility of that decision to be made on a case by case basis. Nil change has been made.</p> <p>The POSS does not list objectives and desired outcomes of a masterplan for any POS where that is the recommendation. The project proposal for each masterplan should determine this in the context of that POS and therefore it would be pre-emptive to do so in the POSS . Nil change has been made.</p>

<p>Kent Street Sandpit (Jirdarup Bushland Precinct)</p> <p><i>Specific Feedback – Site dimensions and measurements</i></p> <p>Appendix C, Jirdarup Bushland Precinct, states the size of the Precinct as 17.9ha. The submissions seeks to clarify the sizing and measurements as there is previous evidence of the site measuring 18.9ha and various other documents stating different measurements for the site. It is also requested that whilst the site is listed as a whole, it should be broken down into individual sizes for the three sub areas with sources quoted for measurement purposes.</p> <p>The mapping shown in Appendix C for the Jirdarup Bushland Precinct needs to be revised to accurately differentiate between Kensington Bushland Bush Forever Site 48 and the Kent Street Sandpit.</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>The text in this section has been updated to show the overall precinct measurements as well as the individual sub precincts. The measurements are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jirdarup Bushland Precinct – 17.9ha • Kensington Bushland – 12.65 (Including the bush forever site at 9.1ha) • George Street Reserve – 2.7ha • Kent Street Sandpit – 2.55ha <p>The plan that outlines the Jirdarup Bushland Precinct has been updated to show the precinct as a whole and its sub precincts being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kensington Bushland • George Street Reserve • Kent Street Sandpit. <p>The areas shown in the plan have been updated in accordance with Bush Forever boundaries and all other maps within the document have been updated to reflect this change.</p> <p>It is noted that the measurements included in the report have been determined as part of this project work, and are not externally sourced. Whilst previous reports and briefing forums have given measurements for the different sub precincts, this POSS has taken to opportunity to accurately determine measurements and will be the source of information moving forward. The accuracy of previous information cannot be verified at this point. The stated measurements utilise Bush Forever boundaries and general mapping to determine the size of the site.</p>
<p>Kent Street Sandpit (Jirdarup Bushland Precinct)</p> <p><i>Specific Feedback – Mapping of three sub precincts in Appendix A</i></p> <p>Appendix A '4.0 POS Classification' shows and classifies the Jirdarup Bushland Precinct as its separate sub precincts being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kensington Bushland • George Street Reserve • Kent Street Sandpit. 	<p>1</p>	<p>It is agreed that the Jirdarup Bushland Precinct should be treated as a whole and as such the whole POSS has been updated to reflect George Street Reserve being classified as a District Park to be in keeping with the remainder of the Jirdarup Bushland Precinct.</p>

<p>It is requested that the precinct be classified together resulting in George Street Reserve being classified as District Park in lieu of a District Park.</p>		
<p>Kent Street Sandpit (Jirdarup Bushland Precinct) <i>Specific Feedback – Jirdarup Bushland Precinct POS Function</i></p> <p>Appendix C, Public Open Spaces functions maps the current function of each POS in the Town. It is requested that based on the definition, George Street Reserve should be classified as 'Environmental' (Currently shown as Passive) and the Kent Street Sandpit be identified as 'Future Environmental' (currently shown as passive).</p>		<p>The POSS has been updated to show George Street Reserve as Environmental. It is noted that it is currently in a state of transition from a passive space to an environmental state.</p> <p>The POSS has not been updated to show Kent Street Sandpit as 'Future Environmental'. The purpose of this plan is show POS as they currently exist. In its current state, the Sandpit is made up of mostly turf, with a small amount of trees and sand patches. This is in keeping with the definition of 'passive' as outlined in the POSS.</p>
<p>Kent Street Sandpit (Jirdarup Bushland Precinct) <i>Specific Feedback – Use of table structure to outline proposals for the site</i></p> <p>Appendix C utilises a table structure to convey the difference approaches being recommended by the strategy for each specific POS. The Jirdirup Bushland Precinct does not utilise a table and presents recommendations for the site in a general text format. It is requested that Jirdirup Bushland Precinct utilises the table format to present its recommendations.</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>The POSS generally uses the table format to convey the proposed strategies for each POS within the Town. However, where a master plan, management plan or other such document exists (or is imminent) to govern and guide the future of a POS, it is not appropriate to use the table format. In those instances, it is more appropriate to use a format that allows the POSS to acknowledge the broader requirements of the site and direct attention to the masterplan or management plan.</p> <p>In the instance of Jirdirup Bushland Precinct, more flexibility is needed to allow for the complex nature of the site. In addition, during the advertising period, Council made resolution on 19 November to prepare an investigative report for the Kent Street Sandpit, as is recommended by the POSS, ensuring that the recommended option(s) for the site:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> d) Is consistent with its zoning as a Parks and Recreation Reserve under the provisions of Town Planning Scheme No.1. e) Considers the past recommendations and decisions made in relation to the Kent Street Sand Pit site. f) Culminates in a plan for the Kent Street Sand Pit site including (but not limited to): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> vi. Design considerations (if any) vii. Site preparatory works viii. Environmental considerations

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ix. Community engagement x. Funding, staging and delivery considerations <p>It would be pre-emptive to complete the table structure prior to this work being done but instead use a more flexible structure that highlights the future governing documents for this site.</p>						
<p>Kent Street Sandpit (Jirdarup Bushland Precinct)</p> <p><i>Specific Feedback – Literature Review</i></p> <p>It is requested that the following documents also be listed within the Appendix A, '10.0 Literature Review':</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 11 July 2000, OCM minutes, reservation of Kent Street Sandpit • Bush Forever Site 048 'Kensington Bushland • Town of Victoria Park Remnant Vegetation Management Plan (2004) • Town of Victoria Park environmental Plan 2013- 2018 (2013) • SERS 'Site management plan' (2017) and DWER Letter – Contamination assessment and Reclassification report. • 11 August 2015, OCM minutes, creation of Jirdarup Bushland Precinct • Kent Street Sandpit (Site 71752) Reclassification by Department of Water and environmental Regulation • Town of Victoria Park Strategic Community Plan 2017 – 2032 (2017) • Kensington Bushland Management Plan (2018) • Urban Forest Strategy (2018) • Contaminated Sites Act 2003 Basic Summary of Records 	<p>1</p>	<p>It is noted that the literature review does not contain the documents listed by the submission. The purpose of this literature review is not to list every document relating to every POS in the Town, only those that are critical to informing the outcomes of this high level strategy. For this reason the Towns response to each document is as follows:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1167 539 2078 1385"> <tr> <td data-bbox="1167 539 1621 1107"> <p>11 July 2000, OCM minutes, reservation of Kent Street Sandpit</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1621 539 2078 1107"> <p>These minutes resolve the reserve Kent Street Sandpit for passive recreation and cultural purposes. The site is zoned in the Town Planning Scheme as Parks and Recreation which is accounted for in the POSS. The resolution has therefore been actioned. The critical informing document would now be the Town of Victoria Park Town Planning Scheme No. 1 (TPS No.1) which has been given due regard. The POSS has been updated to include TPSNo. 1 in the literature review.</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1167 1107 1621 1286"> <p>Bush Forever Site 048 'Kensington Bushland</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1621 1107 2078 1286"> <p>This document has informed the POSS. The POSS has been updated to include this document in the literature review.</p> </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1167 1286 1621 1385"> <p>Town of Victoria Park Remnant Vegetation Management Plan (2004)</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1621 1286 2078 1385"> <p>This document has informed the POSS. The POSS has been updated</p> </td> </tr> </table>	<p>11 July 2000, OCM minutes, reservation of Kent Street Sandpit</p>	<p>These minutes resolve the reserve Kent Street Sandpit for passive recreation and cultural purposes. The site is zoned in the Town Planning Scheme as Parks and Recreation which is accounted for in the POSS. The resolution has therefore been actioned. The critical informing document would now be the Town of Victoria Park Town Planning Scheme No. 1 (TPS No.1) which has been given due regard. The POSS has been updated to include TPSNo. 1 in the literature review.</p>	<p>Bush Forever Site 048 'Kensington Bushland</p>	<p>This document has informed the POSS. The POSS has been updated to include this document in the literature review.</p>	<p>Town of Victoria Park Remnant Vegetation Management Plan (2004)</p>	<p>This document has informed the POSS. The POSS has been updated</p>
<p>11 July 2000, OCM minutes, reservation of Kent Street Sandpit</p>	<p>These minutes resolve the reserve Kent Street Sandpit for passive recreation and cultural purposes. The site is zoned in the Town Planning Scheme as Parks and Recreation which is accounted for in the POSS. The resolution has therefore been actioned. The critical informing document would now be the Town of Victoria Park Town Planning Scheme No. 1 (TPS No.1) which has been given due regard. The POSS has been updated to include TPSNo. 1 in the literature review.</p>							
<p>Bush Forever Site 048 'Kensington Bushland</p>	<p>This document has informed the POSS. The POSS has been updated to include this document in the literature review.</p>							
<p>Town of Victoria Park Remnant Vegetation Management Plan (2004)</p>	<p>This document has informed the POSS. The POSS has been updated</p>							

			to include this document in the literature review.
		Town of Victoria Park Environmental Plan 2013- 2018 (2013)	This document has informed the POSS. The POSS has been updated to include this document in the literature review.
		SERS 'Site management plan' (2017) and DWER Letter – Contamination assessment and Reclassification report.	This is detailed information that is relevant to consider at the masterplan phase of Jirdarup Bushland Precinct. It did not directly inform the POSS.
		11 August 2015, OCM minutes, creation of Jirdarup Bushland Precinct	The report refers to the Jirdarup Bushland Precinct. It is not however necessary to list the decision to name it as such as part of the literature review. This is simply part of the history of the site.
		Kent Street Sandpit (Site 71752) Reclassification by Department of Water and environmental Regulation	This is detailed information that is relevant to consider at the masterplan phase of Jirdarup Bushland Precinct. It did not directly inform the POSS.
		Town of Victoria Park Strategic Community Plan 2017 – 2032 (2017)	This document is already included in the literature review.
		Kensington Bushland Management Plan (2018)	The POSS has acknowledged this document exists, however does not delve into its detail. It is therefore not necessary to list in within the Literature Review.

		Urban Forest Strategy (2018)	This document is already included in the literature review.
		Contaminated Sites Act 2003 Basic Summary of Records	This is detailed information that is relevant to consider at the masterplan phase of Jirdarup Bushland Precinct. It did not directly inform the POSS.
<p>Kent Street Sandpit (Jirdarup Bushland Precinct)</p> <p><i>Specific Feedback – Requested additional information for inclusion or minor changes</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The document should list information about all relevant council resolutions, strategies and management plans plus documents relating to the Sandpit contamination status, listing restrictions including key facts from the <i>Contaminated Sites Act 2003 – Basic Summary of Records and SERS Site Management Plan</i> It is recommended to add an appendix document that lists all POS within the Town with its location and size. Appendix C has a note on each POS that states ‘Refer to Phase Two of the POSS for detailed information’. This is a circular reference and does not provide access to detailed information. Appendix A ‘6.0 Public Open Space Setting’ refers to Kensington and Hillview Terrace Community Bushland as important spaces. It is recommended this be updated to <i>“Jiradup Bushland Precinct, with Kensington Bushland at its heart, and Hill View Bushland Reserve.”</i> The Kent Street Sandpit should be identified in Appendix B ‘2.0 Addressing the Gaps in Supply’ as underutilised public realm 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The document lists all documents reviewed as part of the preparation of this POSS in Appendix A ‘10 Literature Review’. Many of the documents provided as examples provide a level of detail that is relevant to consider at a detailed planning stage, such as during the preparation of a masterplan for the site. It would be onerous to do so as part of this high level POSS for Jirdarup Bushland Precinct, and resulting for each POS within the Town. Nil change has been made to the POSS. Appendix C lists each POS within the Town and provides its size and location details. It would not provide any additional benefit to the POSS to list them again. Nil change has been made to the POSS. The POSS document was restructured prior to advertising to ensure information was presented in the most succinct and accessible manner. This note should have been removed as part of this restructure as it refers to the old document structure. The entire POSS has been updated to remove these references. The text has been updated to refer to the Jiradup Bushland Precinct, as is in keeping with the correct terminology for the site. The purpose of this plan (Figure 1, Appendix B) is to identify gaps in POS supply, calculated by mapping the walkable catchment to each POS in the Town. The plan does not account for underutilised POS and it would not be appropriate to do so. No changes have been made to the POSS. 	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The text and plan (Figure 8) in Appendix B '4.2 POS for Environmental Use' identifies the Jirdarup Bushland Precinct as its separate sub precincts, being 6) George Street Reserve and 7) Kensington Bushland. This should be updated to collectively read 'Jirdarup Bushland Precinct. • Appendix B '4.5 Heritage' maps sites with Heritage significance. It is requested that an explanation in the text is requires and that the source provided. • Appendix E '2.0 Workshop 01 – Community Reference Group' and '3.0 Workshop 02 – Community Reference Group' crops out the Kent street Sandpit recommendations from the images. This should be rectified. 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The text already reflects the requested change. Nil change has been made. • Figure 10 that maps the heritage sites, lists each site as either a Municipal Heritage Site, State Heritage site, or Aboriginal Heritage site. The text explains that the plan maps sites of heritage significance. This is considered to be sufficient source information and explanation. Nil change has been made. • It is noted that the images as shown for general information only. At each workshop there were several plans produced by different groups at different tables. The images are used as examples of the activity only. It does not impact the outcome of the report to change the cropping of this image, and the content of the consultant has been captured within the POSS itself. Nil change has been made.
<p>Hillview Bushland</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is wrongly classified as a Bush Forever site. • The size of the site must be clarified as different sources and documents range from 0.87 to 1.2 ha. • The naming of this POS must be clarified as various Town documents refer to it in different ways. Note that it is situated on Hill View Terrace, hence Hill View Bushland would seem to be the correct naming. • Appendix C utilises a table structure to convey the difference approaches being recommended by the strategy for each specific POS. The Hillview Bushland POS does not utilise a table and presents recommendations for the site in a general text format. It is requested 	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The POSS has been updated to reflect a correction of this mistake. • The POSS has been updated to identify the size of this site as being 1.01ha. This is in keeping with the <i>Hillview Bushland Reserve Management Plan</i> and Intramaps which list the site as being approximately 1.01ha and 10147sqm respectively. • The management plan for this POS names the site as Hillview Bushland. This is consistent with annotations on Intramaps and appears to be the accepted naming of the POS. The POSS has been updated to ensure all references refer to this POS as Hillview Bushland. • Hillview Bushland is governed by a Management Plan, being the <i>Hillview Bushland Reserve Management Plan</i>. This management plan was updated and recently adopted by Council at its 19 November 2019 Ordinary Council Meeting. It is appropriate for the POSS to refer to the management plan

<p>that Hillview Bushland utilises the table format to present its recommendations.</p>		<p>when identifying future development/management of the Hillview Bushland. Furthermore, the table referenced highlights the strategies proposed by this document to guide the future of a POS. As such, it is not appropriate to utilise the table format to discuss the approached used to guide the future of this site. No change has been made to the POSS.</p>
<p>10% Target for POS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The POSS '2.3 Acquiring Land' suggest that the requirement for 10% of subdividable land to be designated as POS may be incorrect as it was developed in 1955, and that the target may be higher than necessary. However, the type of density currently in the Town could not have been predicted in 1955 and therefore the suggestion is likely to be wrong. This is evidenced in community angst over recent park developments and the future population projections for the Town. 	<p>1</p>	<p>The POSS suggests that the 1955 metric of 10% has not since been adjusted to take into account current trends in recreation, lifestyles, and housing typologies. It is important for the POSS to note such shortfalls in the metrics it applies.</p> <p>It suggests that this metric be used as a guide only, and that the Town be informed by both this, and community surveys and monitoring of usage. Such an approach would give the Town more tailored metrics that are appropriate to the current context. No change has been made to the POSS.</p>
<p>Repurposing of Sumps</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The strategy does not acknowledge the opportunities of repurposing the Water Corporation drains at Bishopsgate Street, Beatty Avenue and Bank Street as POS. 	<p>1</p>	<p>Appendix B '2.0 Addressing the gaps in supply' discusses the repurposing of sumps as a method to address the gaps in supply. This section in particular prioritises those sumps within areas where there is an evidenced gap in supply.</p> <p>In relation to the mentioned sumps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Beatty Avenue sump – is not located within a gap Bishopsgate Street sump – is located on the border of a gap Bank Street sump - is located on the border of a gap <p>Whilst the POSS has taken the approach of planning for Town owned or managed land only, this section has been updated to acknowledge the Towns role in advocating for repurposing of those sumps where they would serve to reduce a gap in supply.</p>
<p>Green Corridors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The concept of 'green corridors' linking remnant wildlife habitats features strongly in the Urban Forest strategy, but not so prominently in the POSS, creating a disconnect between the two documents. The POSS identifies 'Park Streets', being made up of both Active Streets and Environmental Streets. It appears Environmental Street is the term 	<p>1</p>	<p>Appendix B '3.4 Park Streets – Active & Environmental' outlines the proposed response to the concept of green corridors as proposed by the Urban Forrest Strategy. The Urban Forrest Strategy promotes the use of green corridors to improve urban ecology, by connected fragmented parcels of land that assist native fauna access and freedom of movement. It is noted that green corridors are not included in the Urban Forest Implementation Action Plan.</p>

<p>used in lieu of Green Corridors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed Environmental Street is supported as long as trees are suitable to support wildlife, and birds in particular. • At the public workshops two green corridors were strongly supported, with the second being along Kent Street/Miller Street/Roberts Road through to Orrong Road. • The town owns many properties along this second corridor and could purchase Millers Crossing to extend it. • This corridor would be popular with the boarder community, based on the Millers Crossing Your Thoughts Survey and would make a valuable contribution to the Towns tree canopy and support wildlife movement. • A third option is for a green corridor along the length of Etwell Street connecting Jirdarup Bushland precinct to Higgins Park. Etwell Street is wide enough for mass tree planting and would an exciting and popular Urban Forrest Strategy community development opportunity. 		<p>The POSS proposes two levels of green corridors, being an Active Park Street and an Environmental Park Street. These are characterised in the following ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active Park Street – has a focus on the provision of amenities for pedestrians and increasing green infrastructure where possible. • Environmental Park Street- aims to create a substantial green corridor, encouraging movement of fauna, providing key flora connections and pedestrian links. <p>Both types of park streets will act as green corridors, however the POSS places emphasis on moving flora and fauna from the regional habitats. In this case, being from the river foreshore, through to the Canning River Regional Park, via Jirdarup Bushland Precinct. The more local green corridors through the Town utilise the opportunity to also improve internal movement throughout the Town for pedestrians through the creation of Active Streets. It is noted that the Miller/Roberts road corridor discussed in the submission is included as a Park Street, with Kent Street forming part of the Environmental Street.</p> <p>Whilst there is scope to consider the inclusion of Etwell Street as a green corridor, it is noted that it would only connect two POS spaces, and would likely be difficult to ensure it functions properly as a green corridor.</p> <p>Nil change has been made to the POSS.</p>
<p>40% canopy target</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submission felt the 40% canopy targets were too high for a banksia woodland biome, and should be removed. • Without clearly referenced research to indicate why this target was suggested it is believed that it would be better to have a broader objective of 'maximizing tree canopy where possible' so that the Town can achieve desired objectives rather than a having a hard target with an ill-defined reason. • The Urban forest strategy already has overarching targets tied to 	<p>1</p>	<p>Appendix B '4.3 Tree Coverage' nominates a 30% tree canopy target for active POS, 40% target for tradition POS and 60% target for environmental POS. It also recommends that in line with the Urban Forest strategy, the town aim for a 20% canopy cover by 2020.</p> <p>Whilst the targets have not been adjusted, in light of the submission, the text has been amended to state that these targets are subject to certain factors and will be implemented on a case by case basis. This allows the Town the flexibility to adjust as needed, if needed, whilst still being aspirational.</p>

<p>ecosystem services and I believe that that document it better placed to discuss those objectives.</p>		
<p>Prioritisation of Actions in Carlisle</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Disappointed that Carlisle, already under provisioned by POS and with see no increase or significant investment until the medium term. Given that Carlisle holds approximately 17.5% of the population of the Town and that population is increasing along the transport corridor which includes Carlisle, especially with proposed TODs. The submitter would like to see a serious commitment from the Town to increase public open green space in the short term 	<p>1</p>	<p>Section '2.8 Carlisle Implementation Actions' does list all actions as medium term, with the exception of the working with Metronet to seek opportunities (which is listed as short term). On review, the following action has been reprioritised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Archer Street Active Street – Short Term. The Town is currently working on a project to see this come to fruition. <p>All other actions are more realistically to be achieved in the medium term, being a 2 to 5 year timeframe.</p>
<p>Consultation Process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Six weeks would have been a more appropriate timeframe for public submissions. It is not clear if this was advertised appropriately in October/November 2019 to the regional community. It is not appropriate for the Town to ask "<i>what makes Victoria Park unique/what is our defining character?</i>" It was hoped that staff were able to decipher and cancel out the response of selfish and greedy residents. The response rate to consultation activities was not very high and may not be representative. The survey methodology has given tainted results. <p>It is disappointing that only six consulted stakeholders responded to the Towns invitation to take part in the strategy preparation.</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>The council report, to which this table forms an appendices details the consultation process undertaken to prepare this POSS. In all instances, the Town went above the legislated timeframes for advertising periods, and reached out to its community in the formats widely used (including the local newspapers). As with all consultation, the Town is able to reach out and encourage residents to engagement with the project, but cannot force them to do so. The number of responses has in this instance been enough to inform the POSS. Nil change has been made to the POSS.</p>
<p>Lack of Actions for St James & Welshpool</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Town is ignoring St James and should be creating new local and neighbourhood parks. There is a clear under provision as is evidenced in the mapping. 	<p>1</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed actions for each place area are a result of thorough analysis and an application of strategies across the Town. Analysis of St James indicates that it is well serviced by POS, with only a small gap. The POSS recommends prioritising procurement of POS within the gap areas, as would apply to the gap in St James. The existing POS in Welshpool is

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is inappropriate to not consider any actions for Welshpool and is missing opportunities to improve pedestrian, cycling and bus connections to Welshpool rail platform. 		<p>planned for individually in Appendix C. No change has been made to the POSS.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Welshpool railway station is located outside of the boundaries of the Town of Victoria Park, but is within close proximity. Improving access to this station is not the role of the public open space POSS and would be dealt with by the Towns Integrated Movement Network Strategy. The submission has been forwarded to the relevant staff dealing with this project. Existing POS in Welshpool is planned for individually in Appendix C. No change has been made to the POSS.
<p>General Feedback</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is disturbing when a local government authority tries to augment existing public open spaces and create new public open spaces to promote the corporation. The objectives of the strategy should better reflect the fact that the land of the Noongar people was settled, seized and stolen by colonials. Parks outside of the Towns boundaries should be colour coded. The Towns 2015 POS Assessment should have been provided as an appendices to the report. Additionally, council reports prior to 2005 and council agenda items should have been referenced. Has the Town been deliberate in not including? Projected population figures in some suburbs are much lower than what will occur. 	<p>1</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noted. No change has been made to the POSS. The POSS acknowledges the Noongar history of the Town and states the importance of using heritage as a basis for developing POS (Public Open Space Strategy '1.5 Ensuring High Quality Public Open Space'. No change has been made to the POSS. The Town is not in the position to plan for the future of POS outside of its own boundaries. As such, the POS is acknowledged in the plans to give regional context, however more detailing of these spaces would be inappropriate. No change has been made to the strategy. The 2015 POS Assessment is not a council endorsed and public document, simply a collection of facts and information about the number and type of POS in the Town. This information has been updated and included in the POSS. It has been listed as a reference, but is ultimately eclipsed by the POSS which contains similar but updated information. No change has been made to the POSS. The population projections used within the POSS are sourced from Forecast.id. They are the best known forecasts available to the Town and other government agencies looking to work with projections.

Submission theme/matter	# submissions raising this theme	Officer's response
SUPPORT		
<p>Development requirements for POS</p> <p>All new medium and high density development should be required to provide additional public open spaces.</p>	2	<p>Noted. The POSS considers and supports this concept as outlined in Appendix B '2. Creation of POS as part of Future Development'. In addition to the above, the Town has opportunity to implement mechanisms that sit within State Planning Policy 7.3 'Residential Design Codes'. This document contained requirements for communal open space and development incentives for community benefits, of which public open space is considered to be a benefit.</p> <p>The POSS has been updated to include text around the implementation and utilisation of the appropriate planning mechanisms in SPP7.3.</p>
<p>Repurposing of Sumps</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sumps should be cleverly maintained with planting, benches and for drainage purposes if this is still required. • Support drainage sumps being converted to sumps. • Requested that the sump at 3 Westminster Street, East Victoria Park be considered for conversion. 	1	<p>Noted. The repurposing of sumps is in keeping with the recommendations of the POSS Appendix B '2.0 Addressing the gaps in supply'. It is also noted that the sump at No. 3 Westminster Street is not considered surplus to the drainage infrastructure, and is therefore not currently considered for repurposing for the POSS. Should a review of drainage infrastructure in the future determine it to be surplus, this sump could in fact be considered for repurposing.</p> <p>No change has been made to the POSS.</p>
<p>Greening</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree with the concept to green the Town through increasing the tree canopy and amount of POS. • Full support is given for the development of Park Streets along Albany Highway, Archer Street and Mint Street. • Full support is given for turf removal and replacement with native plants in high maintenance/difficult/high profile locations. • It is encouraging to see a focus on environmental values and outcomes in the draft POSS and an effort to link the strategy with the Town's Environmental Plan and Urban Forrest Strategy. 	4	<p>Noted. No change has been made to the strategy.</p>

MISC

Millennium Kids – Sump repurposing

- Millennium kids are a youth led environmental organisation.
- A resident and member of millennium kids have been working for one and a half year, to take a drainage basin in the Town of Vic Park and turn it into a green space for everyone (particular basin has not been stated, only identified as being near the submitter’s house).
- This will help solve problems of there not being enough green space, kids not feeling included in the decision making process, help to increase or prevent loss of habitat for black cockatoos and help to combat the problems of climate change.
- This idea has been submitted so that it can be included as part of the public open space strategy.
- The Millennium kids project has undertaken a significant amount of consultation with their networks and have found that the most important things to include in the space would be:
 - Trees;
 - Round swing;
 - Swings;
 - Zipline;
 - Basketball court;
 - Picnic table;
 - Wildlife habitat;
 - Bins;
 - Climbing ropes; and
 - Natural walkway.

The repurposing of sumps is in keeping with the recommendations of the POSS Appendix B '2.0 Addressing the gaps in supply'. No change has been made to the POSS.

In addition to considering this submission as part of the POSS submissions, it is important that the Town acknowledge and work with programs such as Millennium Kids. This submission has been forwarded to the relevant people in the Town for consideration for further action. It is understood that the Town has attempted to help with this project in the past, and it is possible that the POSS will create more opportunities for the project to be achieved in the near future.

Naming of Parks

- Park names should be more adventurous with a register kept to record suggestion from residents

1

At its Ordinary Council Meeting on 19 November 2019, Cr Vicki Potter raised a Notice of Motion to request a report on the commemorative signage and ultimately the identification and naming of parks and important places. This submission has been forwarded to the team dealing with this notice of motion. No change has been made to the POSS.

<p>Park Design</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good design can be defined by spaces that are beautiful, functional, safe, sustainability, restful (quiet) and productive. • Parks do not all need to be the same. They can feature different plantings and purposes. 	1	<p>Noted. This is in keeping with the recommendations of the POSS and would be further defined by the development of concepts or improvements in each POS as it is completed. (Public Open Space Strategy '1.5 Ensuring high quality public open space' and '1.6 Approached to achieving high quality public open space').</p> <p>No change has been made to the POSS.</p>
<p>Verge planting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There should be a strong push to increase the verge tree numbers. 	1	<p>This matter is not dealt with by the POS directly and would be dealt with under the banner of the Urban Forrest strategy. This comment has been forwarded to the relevant staff.</p> <p>No change has been made to the POSS.</p>
<p>Furniture contributions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residents should be able to contribute towards the cost of seating, trees or landscaping in memory of someone they loved. 	1	<p>This matter is specifically dealt with by Council Policy 11 Commemorative Recognition and as such is considered not to be within the scope of the POSS. The current policy does not preclude the suggested practice, and should the policy or its implementation be reviewed, this should be considered.</p> <p>No change has been made to the POSS.</p>
<p>J A LEE Reserve – Fitness Equipment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggest that an area of body weight fitness equipment be installed at J A LEE reserve to suit the users of this space. 	1	<p>Appendix C of the POSS detailed that J A Lee Reserve should continue to be used for sporting use. It is possible to consider body weight fitness equipment in this location.</p> <p>The text in this section has been updated to include fitness equipment as an option for its diversification in sporting use. Any such project would be subject to community consultation to ensure that this was supported by more than one person and would be considered in the context of its current and future loading of use.</p>
<p>POS with water features</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water features are noticeably absent from POS in the Town and the community and environment could greatly benefit from such projects. 	1	<p>Noted. Where a concept plan or master plan is developed for POS, the Town is able to consider all design aspirations for the site. The POSS also highlights the approaches to achieving high quality public open space (POSS '1.6 Approached to achieving high quality public open space'). These approaches do not preclude water features and in fact promote:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • POS that supports and enhances the natural environment and its broader ecological region;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • POS that enhanced treatment of water and soil management; and • POS that provides a healthy environment to support a healthy community. <p>When POS design is conceptualised it is possible to consider water features if they meet these needs. No change has been made to the POSS.</p>
--	--

Government Department Submissions		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overall assessment is very positive, in particular the approach to dog use of POS in St James and Welshpool. • The City is developing a Dog Spaces Strategy with an approach that is consistent with the Towns recommendations. • Commend the Towns ambitious targets in the strategy. • Recommend that the Town could analyse access to POS based on the road and footpath network for greater accuracy. 	City of Canning	Noted. Nil changed has been made to the POSS.
<p>The main strategy document would benefit from the inclusion of some of the key information contained in the Appendices. For example the figures in Appendix A, especially Figure 14 would be better placed in the main document. The appendices appear to form a key part of the strategy and are not just explanatory or complimentary to the main document. As such the information would be better placed in the body of the main document, which most people will refer to and review. We realise this will likely increase the length of the main POS Strategy document, but the document as a whole will benefit.</p>	DPLH	<p>The POSS contains an enormous amount of information and in its original form, was compiled as one document, with minimal appendices. This document was difficult to navigate.</p> <p>As a result, the draft POSS is structured with a series of appendices that contain contains a range of technical and informing information. This is a more accessible format for a complex and large amount of information.</p> <p>Nil change has been made to the POSS.</p>
<p>The POS Strategy briefly discusses Millers Crossing, and the Department of Planning Lands and Heritage (DPLH) is mindful of the current situation with this area of land. Whilst DPLH do not have any objections to the POS Strategy in its current form, it should be noted that this does not indicate any level of support for the recommendations being made within the document in relation to Millers Crossing or the ceding / retention of the land or vegetation on the land.</p>	DPLH	<p>The POSS does not make a recommendation regarding the Towns decision to purchase the land known as Miller's Crossing. The role of the POSS is to provide information only that will guide Councils decision in the future. The POSS highlights the facts, in that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Town does not currently own the land and it has been offered to the Town for purchase. • Miller's crossing is not located within a 'gap' in POS provision so would not serve to reduce the gaps in the

		<p>Towns supply of POS; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should the land be developed in the future, the Town should advocate for the retention of the significant trees that are on site. <p>Councillors will receive a separate council report at a future Ordinary Council Meeting asking them to make a decision on the purchase of this land with the relevant detailed information. At this point, information contained within the POSS will guide the decision making along with other relevant factors.</p> <p>The POSS has not been amended in response to these concerns as it currently discusses facts only, and does not provide a decision on the matter.</p>
<p>The strategy, in its current form, has limited reference to public open space contributions and the role these play in providing funding for the maintenance, improvement and provision of POS within the Town.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The references currently made are not considered sufficient to be used to justify the possible requirement for POS contributions to be applied on smaller subdivisions of 3 lots or more. Given the infill nature of subdivision within the Town, consideration may need to be given to whether or not contributions for smaller subdivisions is required or will be required in the future. Should the Town determine that POS contributions are required from smaller subdivisions of 3 to 5 lots, this will need to be supported by a strategic framework identifying the need for the contributions on smaller subdivisions in order for the WAPC to apply conditions in this regard. 	DPLH	<p>This is noted. The Towns Local Planning Strategy will detail the information required by the Department to inform this requirement, should the Town determine it desirable. This is in keeping with the provisions of the Development Control Policy 2.3 Public Open Space.</p>
<p>Several maps show POS within adjacent local government areas shaded grey, however Wilson Park is not shown (located at 100 Gerring Court and 128 Kooyong Rd, Rivervale). This is reserved Parks & Recreation under the City's Local Planning Scheme.</p>	City of Belmont	<p>The POSS has been updated to acknowledge Wilson Park where relevant.</p>
<p>Place Area Lathlain: recommends a medium priority to improve the Maple to Newey Street overpass (over Orrong Rd). It is suggested this is considered with other potential improvements to pedestrian/ cyclist</p>	City of Belmont	<p>Appendix B '3.1 Safe Pedestrian Street Crossings' detailed the proposed priorities for updated pedestrian street crossings in the Town. It does not at present identify any crossings into the City of</p>

<p>crossing points of Orrong Road, at the time of the upgrade of Orrong Road. For example, a pedestrian/ cyclist crossing point at the Orrong Road end of the proposed "active street" along Archer St/ Mint St would provide greater access between the Town of Victoria Park and City of Belmont. The City's Sustainable Transport Plan includes a recommendation to improve crossing of Orrong Road at Kew Street, President Street, Oats Street, Archer Street, Roberts Road and Francisco Street in conjunction with Main Roads and Town of Victoria Park.</p>		<p>Belmont, across Orrong Road. As the plan for the Orrong Road update is in its progresses, the Town will need to advocate for improved pedestrian links. This section has been updated to acknowledge this.</p>
<p>The City's Sustainable Transport Plan proposes investigation of the following as 'safe active streets' which could connect to active streets within the Town of Victoria Park:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roberts Road (Orrong Road to Acton Avenue); • Sydenham Street (Orrong Road to Belmont Avenue); 	<p>City of Belmont</p>	<p>Noted. Where possible the Town will work with the City of Belmont to achieve cohesion between the active streets in each municipality.</p>
<p>Place Area Burswood:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal to upgrade the overpass at Riversdale Road as a medium priority is supported. • The proposal to upgrade the underpass at Graham Farmer Freeway is supported, however it is suggested that this is increased from a medium to a high priority. • The proposal to upgrade Burswood Station to a "Town Square" is supported, noting this is within walking distance of Rivervale residents of The Springs. 	<p>City of Belmont</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noted. • Public Open Space Strategy '2.4 Burswood Implementation Actions' has been updated to increase the priority of improving the underpass to Graham Farmer Freeway from a medium to a high priority. • Noted.
<p>It is stated in the Introduction that this section only considers Town-managed POS, however Balbuk Reserve is included and this is primarily managed by the City of Belmont. The City of Belmont maintains the toilet block, carpark, boat ramp, grassed open area and foreshore within the City's municipal boundary, with a contribution from Town of Victoria Park.</p>	<p>City of Belmont</p>	<p>Appendix C 'Balbuk Reserve' has been updated to reflect the shared management/maintenance arrangement. A note has been provided within the text acknowledging the arrangement between the Town and City of Belmont and the need to work collaboratively on the planning and future improvements of this POS.</p>

<p>While this location could still be included, it is suggested that reference is made to the shared management/ maintenance arrangement.</p>		
<p>Additional comments in relation to recommendations for Balbuk Reserve include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include reference to the boat ramp and water ski area (sporting use) • The City of Belmont is not supportive of a formal dog park in this location, given the small size, nearby boat ramp and proximity to the river and associated wildlife • Ensure the Belmont Foreshore Precinct Plan 2018 is considered and City of Belmont is consulted, regarding any proposed upgrade or change to use of the POS 	<p>City of Belmont</p>	<p>The table contained within Appendix C 'Balbuk Reserve' has been updated with the following amendments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A reference to the boat ramp and water ski area has been included within the section highlighting sporting use. • The recommendation for a dog park has been removed. <p>To address a previous comment the need for collaborative approach has been added to the text. This will address the final dot point of this comment.</p>