



# Park Avenue site

## Summary of engagement findings – Phase Four

- **Presenting the Draft Masterplan**



# Character and heritage



- Maintaining the heritage value of the site, through retention of the heritage buildings, was seen very positively by respondents.
- Feedback from attendees reflected very positively that the key objectives around character and heritage had been achieved.
- A key issue is the need for sensitivity when designing the interface between the existing Park Avenue building and the proposed new residential tower.

## Positives

Of the **community members** who provided written feedback, the main positives raised were:

- The retention of heritage buildings (67% of those who provided feedback).
- The protection of Indigenous heritage (20%).

Of the **staff and students** who provided feedback, the most common areas of support were for the retention of heritage, culture and its surrounds, with the cultural narrative being seen as a positive aspect of the masterplan.

## Issues and concerns

Of the **community members** who provided written feedback, the only key concern raised was ensuring there was a guarantee of the development not encroaching upon the proposed open space or connections (13%).

Two (2) participants raised anecdotally that they believed the existing auditorium should also be considered for retention.

Of the **staff and students** who provided feedback, there were no common concerns raised regarding character and heritage.

## Suggestions

Of the **community members** who provided written feedback, there were no common suggestions raised in relation to character and heritage.

Of the **staff and students** who provided feedback, there were no common suggestions raised in relation to character and heritage.



# Landscape and public open space



- The high percentage of the site being proposed as landscaping and open space was seen very favourably by a large proportion of attendees. Feedback also reflected that having small building footprints and underground car parking contributed to this outcome.

## Positives

Of the **community members** who provided written feedback, the main positives raised were :

- Maximising retention of public open space (53% of those who provided feedback)
- The proposed facilities, i.e. Café (20%)
- The retention of trees (20%)

Of the **staff and students** who provided feedback, the most positive aspect was that they supported the provision of large amounts of public open space.

## Issues and concerns

Of the **community members** who provided written feedback, the only key concern raised was how the level of open space proposed could be protected and ensured if the site was developed by parties other than UWA. i.e. a developer (20% of those who provided feedback)

Of the **staff and students** who provided feedback, there were no common concern raised in relation to the landscape and open space.

## Suggestions

Of the **community members** who provided written feedback, there were no common suggestions raised in relation to landscape and public open space.

Of the **staff and students** who provided feedback, the most common suggestions were:

- Include even more greenery.
- Improve community spaces (e.g. more community presence, provide more than a café)



# Traffic management



- As with previous engagements, traffic impact remained by far the most commonly noted key concern with community members, however it did not register either positively or negatively with staff and students.
- In addition to the primary concern of increased traffic volumes, some community members noted that the area around the site already experienced traffic issues and this development would exacerbate the existing problems and potentially increase safety issues.
  - Some attendees suggested that consideration should be given to making Park Avenue and Crawley Avenue one-way and limiting parking on these roads.

## Positives

Of the **community members** who provided written feedback, the main positive raised was:

- Multiple entry points to the Park Avenue Site (20% of those who provided written feedback)

Of the **staff and students** who provided feedback, there were no positive comments raised in relation to traffic management.

## Issues and concerns

Of the **community members** who provided written feedback, the main issues and concerns raised were:

- The increased traffic in the local area (67% of those who provided written feedback)
- The need for improved safety treatment to cater for increased volumes of traffic and pedestrians (20%)

Of the **staff and students**, who provided feedback, there were no common concerns raised in relation to traffic management.

## Suggestions

Of the **community members** who provided written feedback, the main suggestion raised was:

- There should be a one-way / better traffic system through Park Avenue and Crawley Avenue (20% of those who provided written feedback)

Of the **staff and students**, who provided feedback, there were no common suggestions raised in relation to traffic management.



# Parking



- There was strong support for underground parking.
- There was a diversity of views about the provision of additional car bays on site than what is required in State Planning Policy. Some supported the additional bays advising that it will help to ensure there is less parking on the streets, while some others suggested that additional car parking will attract more cars. Some local neighbours suggested removing street parking off Crawley Avenue.

## Positives

Of the **community members** who provided written feedback the main positive raised was:

- Underground parking (80% of those who provided written feedback).

Of the **staff and students**, who provided feedback, there were no common issues and concerns raised in relation to parking.

## Issues and concerns

Of the **community members** who provided written feedback there were no common issues and concerns raised in relation to parking.

Of the **staff and students** who provided feedback, there were no common issues and concerns raised in relation to parking.

## Suggestions

Of the **community members** who provided written feedback, the main suggestions raised were:

- One way traffic system through Park Avenue and Crawley Avenue (43% of those who provided written feedback)
- Limit / ban street parking around the site (29%)

Of the **staff and students** who provided feedback, there were no common suggestions raised in relation to parking.



# Building heights



- As with previous engagements, building heights remained an issue of key concern for community members, in particular the 34-storey tower proposed for Park Avenue, with some respondents stating that the heights were too high.
- However, many respondents did not raise building heights as an issue, with some attendees to the engagement sessions commenting about their support for taller, slender buildings (in a precinct with existing taller buildings) in order to maintain a smaller building footprint that enables the provision of a large amount of open space.
- Conversely, while building height was noted as a negative by some staff and students, it was seen as a positive by a greater number of these attendees. This may reflect changing generational expectations.

## Positives

Of the **community members** who provided written feedback, the main positive raised was:

- Small building footprint / slender buildings (53% of those who provided written feedback).

Of the **staff and students** who provided feedback, a high number were supportive of the building heights/form, particularly if it resulted in the retention of more open space.

## Issues and concerns

Of the **community members** who provided written feedback, the main issue/concern raised was:

- That the height of the 34-storey building was too high and not proportional to the rest of the precinct. i.e. where the tallest building is currently 24-26 storeys (33% of those who provided written feedback).

Of the **staff and students** who provided feedback, a small proportion raised a concern about the height of the buildings, particularly the 34-storey building being too high.

## Suggestions

Of the **community members** who provided written feedback the following was raised in open comments as a key suggestion:

- To lower the height of the buildings / tallest building (33% of those who provided written feedback).
- Of the **staff and students** who provided feedback, there were no common suggestions raised in relation to building heights.



# Site connection and access



- Site connection and access was generally viewed favourably by many of the attendees however there were some suggestions focused on improving site connection and access to the Swan River.

## Positives

Of the **community members** who provided written feedback, the main positives raised were:

- The site is accessible (20% of those who provided written feedback).
- Links to tourist areas i.e. Kings Park (20%)

Of the **staff and students** who provided feedback, the most common positive was the easy access to Kings Park and the links through the space.

## Issues and concerns

Of the **community members** who provided written feedback the main issue/concern raised was:

- That there is no proposed pedestrian connection to the Swan River (13% of those who provided written feedback)

Of the **staff and students** who provided feedback, a small proportion raised a concern about the site layout and access.

## Suggestions

Of the **community members** who provided written feedback the main suggestion raised was:

- Provide a pedestrian connection to the Swan River (13% of those who provided written feedback)

Of the **staff and students**, very few made suggestions for improvements, however those who did suggested improving access to King's Park and provide better pedestrian access to the river/across Mounts Bay Road.

**Note:** Engagement attendees who discussed issues regarding connections across Mounts Bay Road to the Swan River were advised this was a pre-existing precinct-wide issue and could not be included in the Masterplan, as it was outside the control of UWA and requires resolution at State and Local Government level. However, it was noted that the Masterplan does not preclude for that such connection to occur – should there be support in future State and Local Government planning for this connection to be established.

## Other issue: Masterplan delivery and validity

While various community members (anecdotally 18% from the community engagement) and the City of Perth Western Suburbs Residents Association voiced strong concern that UWA may not be able to prevent future developers / development from deviating away from the Draft Masterplan, this was reflected slightly lower (13%) on the community engagement written feedback.

Of the **community members** who provided written feedback the main issue /concern raised was:

- That the developer won't keep within what is being proposed (13% of those who provided written feedback)

Of the **staff and students** who provided feedback, there were no common suggestions raised in relation to the Masterplan Delivery and Validity.