

## Draft Social Infrastructure Strategy – Summary of Public Comments


No.	Do you support the proposed vision?	Do you have any comments about the vision?	Do you support the proposed social infrastructure planning principles?	Do you have any comments about the proposed social infrastructure planning principles?	Overall, do you support the draft Social Infrastructure Strategy?	Do you have any final comments about the draft Strategy?	Town response
1.	Yes	-	Yes	-	I'm unsure	-	Noted.
2.	Yes	-	Yes	-	Yes	-	Noted.
3.	Yes	is there a need to discuss and address the perceived "division" of Victoria-Park, east and west along the Albany Highway, as a result of the central locations of the car-retail-car-courts?	Yes	is there a need to discuss and address the perceived "division" of Victoria-Park, east and west along the Albany Highway, as a result of the central locations of the current car-retail-car-courts?	Yes	is there a need to discuss and address the perceived "division" of Victoria-Park, east and west along the Albany Highway, as a result of the central locations of the current car-retail-car-courts?	<p>Noted. The draft SIS lays out a social infrastructure hub hierarchy for the Town based on the principle that all residents should have access to a community focal point within a 10min walk of their home.</p> <p>The SIS hub hierarchy approach include primary hubs at the Macmillan Precinct, Lathlain Centre and Aqualife &amp; Oats Street with future hub investigation areas identified at Burswood Peninsula, Burswood South &amp; Victoria Park, Carlise Centre and the Centley Curtin Specialised Activity Centre.</p> <p>This approach will ensure a broad coverage of social infrastructure throughout the Town and will assist with mitigating against any perceived division between east and west.</p>
4.	Yes	-	No	-	I'm unsure	-	Noted
5.	I'm unsure	The small dog side of Tom Wright Dog Park is too small for its intended purpose. I have heard that the landscaped area with benches, lawns, etc. adjacent to it on the north side was originally meant as part of the dog park but was redrafted as a "picnic area" outside the dog park instead. I have never seen anyone having a picnic there and at the moment it's just a thoroughway from Planet Street to the sport courts on Bishopgate Street. Meanwhile a lot of neighbours and their little dogs come every afternoon/evening into	I'm unsure	-	I'm unsure	I haven't had the time for a thorough review of the draft Strategy. The main issue that I care about and which would greatly contribute to the social capital of the Town is the expansion of the Tom Right Dog Park by rejoining it with the land adjacent to its north fence.	<p>Noted. The SIS provides an overview of the needs and general principles for the delivery of social infrastructure, however, it is not for the purpose of detailed design of reserves or associated infrastructure. The design of the Tom Wright Dog Park is beyond the scope of the strategy.</p> <p>It is noted that extensive community consultation was undertaken during the design and delivery of upgrades to Tom Wright Park, between 2016-2021, to ensure the multifunctional</p>

		<p>the small dog park. The park is a social hub not only for dogs and their owners but also for other neighbours and kids from the nearby school who come on their own to enjoy watching the dogs. The park is much too small for these numbers of dogs and people visiting it at peak times every day. As a result there is a lot of wear and tear to the park (which gets closed from time to time to be repaired) and the dogs are constantly weaving their way through and at risk of running into obstacles and getting hurt. I am writing to ask that you consider the reintegration of the underutilised area outside the north fence of Tom Wright Dog Park into the small dog park. Doing so would create a much safer and more attractive area. This redrafting of the area would make an enormous positive contribution to the social infrastructure of the Town and foster social cohesion among its residents.</p>					space serves the needs of a variety of user groups.
6.	Yes	<p>The vision as a statement could be interpreted broadly, or narrowly, like all statements. Ensuring that this is applied in a manner that is appropriate is key.</p>	Yes	<p>Ensure accessibility to all facilities - i.e ensure there is wheelchair access to enclose, size divided dog parks in multiple locations.</p>	Yes	-	<p>Noted. Accessibility is considered within the guiding principles of the SIS.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Provide accessible and equitable opportunities for all residents to enhance social connectivity and provide a positive social impact.</i></li> <li>• <i>Ensure that social infrastructure is safe and healthy in their design.</i></li> </ul> <p>Universal accessibility is covered by the Building Code of Australia and the Australian Premises Standard and will be considered in the upgrades of all Town facilities.</p>
7.	Yes	<p>As long as diversity includes conservative values as well as progressive... I'm all for diversity, as long as it's true diversity.</p>	Yes	-	Yes	<p>I support equity of opportunity, not equity of outcome. There is a difference.</p>	Noted.
8.	I'm unsure	<p>The draft SIS document does not match the ToVP Public Open Space Strategy (POSS) (Dec 2019) in several regards. For example, the</p>	No	<p>Several dot points are unclear in the context of Local Government's responsibilities to the community. For example: "Ensure social infrastructure</p>	I'm unsure	<p>The document is very dense, over long and difficult to digest.</p>	<p>The differences between the annotation on the POSS and SIS figures are noted, however, notably these annotations are</p>


		land use classification system in both documents are different, and some Park/Reserve names don't match. Specifically: (1) Figure 1 of the draft SIS document, titled 'Public Open Space X function', should have a reference to Jirdarup Bushland Precinct, as in the POSS App C, p.69. (2) In the 2019 POSS, all 3 parcels of land that comprise Jirdarup Bushland Precinct are classified as 'Environmental/Bushland'. For some reason, the new document uses a DIFFERENT classification system and shows two of the Jirdarup sections as 'Nature', and one (George St) as 'Recreation'. This is incorrect as there is no difference in land use between the 3 sections of Jirdarup Bushland Precinct. (3) Part C of the draft SIS document ('Bentley-Curtin Investigation Area') should also match the POSS by referring to 'Jirdarup Bushland Precinct', instead of 'Kensington Bushland Reserve'. In contrast, Jirdarup Bushland Precinct is correctly labelled on p.81. (4) Point 58 on p.82 of the draft SIS is incorrect. The 'Kent Street Sandpit Design Opportunities' Report has been superseded and there is no amphitheatre planned for the site.		is financially viable with agreed funding parameters". What does this mean? Will community groups using the facilities be required to pay more? While the principle of 'multi-function' and 'co-located' is good in theory, should it apply to ALL social infrastructure or only some?			descriptions only and are not reflective of a formal land use classification (for example as applicable the Local Planning Scheme) therefore have little bearing on the implementation of the SIS.  Additionally, the POSS does distinguish between the areas of the Jirdarup Bushland Precinct labelling them as 'George Street Reserve', 'Kensington Bushland' and the 'Kent Street Sandpit' suggesting differences in the function of these spaces.  On this basis no modification to the SIS figure is recommended as the minor differences between the documents are not considered to adversely impact the interpretation or implementation of the POSS or SIS.
9.	Yes	-	Yes	-	Yes	-	Noted.
10.	Yes	Could replace the second 'diverse' with an alternative term i.e. 'Residents of the Town of Victoria Park enjoy access to safe, welcoming and diverse social infrastructure spaces that support a comprehensive/varied/inclusive range of activities to build a stronger community for everyone'	Yes	-	I'm unsure	-	Noted. The existing SIS vision is considered satisfactory in its current form. No modifications to the vision are recommended.
11.	Yes	I would like some mention of the fact that social infrastructure is publicly owned, and I would also like more of a focus on accessibility - public infrastructure spaces should be open to all.	I'm unsure	While I like the overall sentiment of these principles, I feel that the mention of 'financial viability' is a bit problematic in that it doesn't provide safeguards for those community services and facilities which may not turn a profit, especially libraries and support services. Perhaps it could be adjusted to something like 'Ensure social infrastructure is adequately	Yes	Thanks for the work you do.	Noted.  Universal accessibility is covered by the Building Code of Australia and the Australian Premises Standard and will be considered in the upgrades of all Town facilities.  The SIS principle regarding 'financial viability' also refer to

				<p>funded, with agreed funding parameters, according to community needs'. Community and the citizens should be the first priority - if the money isn't there to make that happen, that points to a fundamental failure in the way the local government system is working. I also feel some mention of social infrastructure development being guided (and its impact measured) by a 'return on investment' approach would be a useful addition. Finally, I feel that 'maximising the use' of existing facilities should be amended to 'maximise the use of existing facilities in ways which benefit the community' . If maximising use means turning these facilities into primarily profit-making devices, that would be a disservice to the community</p>			<p>'agreed funding parameters' which is inclusive of funding support for social infrastructure from the Town. Decisions regarding 'agreed funding parameters' will also follow the principle that "decisions on investment are to be evidence based" which include consideration for 'community need' and 'return on investment'. No modifications to the principle are recommended.</p> <p>The term 'maximise use' refers to patronage not 'profit-making'.</p>
12.	Yes	-	Yes	<p>Ensure that predictive modelling is included in identifying infrastructure priorities</p>	Yes	<p>Starting from page 41, the suburb profiles seem to site 2011 population statistics as the most recent. These seems very outdated, perhaps could be a typo? A very comprehensive document, perhaps could be worth having the action plan as a stand-alone document to download in addition to the full version. Really great to see such a detailed future planning document</p>	<p>Noted. Population statistics within the SIS are based on the ABS Estimated Residential Population 2020.</p> <p>If adopted the 'action plan' (ie Implementation and Recommendations) part of the SIS can be made available as a stand-alone document of the Town's website.</p>
13.	Yes	<p>Is it intended that social infrastructure is accessible to 'residents' only?</p>	Yes	<p>What is meant by 'financially viable'? I would assume that most social infrastructure is not self sufficient and requires subsidies?</p>	Yes	<p>I like the intent of the strategy but it seems to recommend a lot more investigating/planning rather than actually doing things</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>While it is noted that social infrastructure does not serve the Town's residents only residents are the primary uses of social infrastructure within the Town. The SIS has been prepared to respond to the Town's population growth patterns to aligns the planning, delivery and management of social infrastructure accordingly, therefore 'residents' being referenced as the primary user group within the SIS vision is considered appropriate.</p> <p>The SIS principle regarding 'financially viable' also refers to 'agreed funding parameters' which is inclusive of funding support from the Town or other sources in</p>

							<p>recognition that much social infrastructure often requires some degree of support funding. The purpose of the principle is to ensure that decisions on investment in social infrastructure consider what 'agreed funding parameters' are appropriate (ie are evidence based) and will include consideration for community needs and return on investment.</p> <p>The SIS details the Town's approach for the future planning and management of facilities but is not a prescription for facility delivery in its own right. The SIS prioritises initiatives for implementation over the life of the SIS and includes 26 'High' priority initiatives to be implemented within the first 1-3 years.</p>
14.	Yes	-	Yes	-	Yes	Great to see the council is thinking about future generations. There is a lot of detail in this strategy - it would be good if it was summarised more clearly at the start as it was too much to read the whole thing	<p>Noted.</p> <p>If adopted the 'action plan' (ie Implementation and Recommendations) part of the SIS can be made available as a stand-alone document of the Town's website with a short summary.</p>
15.	Yes	Town of Victoria Park should draw upon its strategic, accessible, location to generate better outcomes & benefits (socially and economically).	Yes	Take into account the people already being drawn to the area, AND leverage off the people already travelling through the area. This can add to the viability of certain social infrastructure projects.	Yes	<p>Yes, some changes are needed. See my 4 page effort I emailed Admin office.</p> <p>Hello <i>Town of Victoria Park</i>.</p> <p>I have read your draft document.</p> <p><b>Page 10.</b> Shared spaces agree. Yes the licenses need to be reviewed. Yes certain groups need to be mentored into transition to shared spaces.</p> <p><b>Page 11,</b> initiative 10. Yes plan for multi-purpose spaces. Yes adaptable for shopfronts that <i>Town of Victoria Park</i> can lease, to generate revenue.</p> <p><b>Page 14,</b> initiative 23. Yes potential for shared-use of school-sites, Important to have that done when planning for redevelopment of school-sites. Because that is when buildings can move, and spaces can be created on sides of school sites that were unavailable before. Priority should be high, currently discussing/talking now. Not low, discussions in far-future.</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. In this instance the 'Low' priority not reflective of the suggested timeline. As an advocacy action it is intended to be ongoing.</p>

					<p><b>Page 18</b>, initiative 39. Agree.          There is enough regional and local (through at least 4 suburbs) demand for <i>Town of Victoria Park</i> to upgrade its indoor courts facility/MacMillan Precinct to include more netball courts and more basketball courts. This upgrade should try to include a State League (district) netball team home, and a State League basketball team home. These would help promote the <i>Victoria Park Secondary Centre</i>, and draw in more participants (who might have been lost to other regional areas), and help activate the Sports hub. Also this would help in drawing in <i>WA State Government funding</i> (build funding, annual courts maintenance), based on past WA State Government behavior.          Yes the local benefit of a synthetic hockey turf has been shown &amp; proved (late 2020). Time to be delivered.          Yes new aquatic facilities need to be considered into the future. All options should be on the table, don't cement yourself into one decision forever.          Additionally I would say, that a State League swimming team and a State League water-polo team would again keep talent within the regional area, and help promote the regional area.</p> <p><b>Page 19</b>, initiative 40.          Agree with redevelopment. Think there are some great <i>WA State Government partnership</i> opportunities to fund. Expansion of indoor (current 1980s era) facilities is needed, into new, modern-constructed regional centre facility. <i>Victoria Park Secondary Centre</i> is a regional hub, does draw in users from beyond its regional boundaries, AND has a wide-ranging population within the local suburbs brimming with participants for expanded indoor sports facilities.          Should be a high-priority, with planning and talks with <i>WA State Government</i> occurring now (2022 onwards), not in mid-priority.          Agree arts, culture provision can be improved.</p> <p><b>Agree initiative 42.</b>          With a new McMillan Precinct, there would be plenty of <i>property developers</i> trying to leverage off it (through being in walkable proximity to it), so they should contribute a developer-contribution to it. Heck, they would be quoting it on their sales pitches, and listing 'new MacMillan ...' on their <i>For Sale</i> signs anyway.          Let's face it, With a Trackless tram form of transport in the near-future, many of the <i>property developers</i> would use it as advertising to increase the price of their apartments.          With the <i>current WA State Government</i> not having any new mechanism to 'value capture' off that, it is left to <i>developer contributions</i> from any <i>municipal authority</i> to</p>	<p>Noted. The Towns consideration of the suggested facilities will be guided by the principles of the SIS.</p> <p>Noted. Planning for the Macmillan Precinct Redevelopment is ongoing. Prioritisation of this initiative is reflective of the delivery timeframe envisaged for the project.</p> <p>Noted. Planning for the Albany Highway Precinct Structure Plan is ongoing, the prioritisation of this initiative is not based on timing.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---	---



					<p>get anything from the private price-gougers (who contribute nothing to new facilities, trackless trams, yet exert extra financial benefit for themselves. While possibly tax-deducting a whole host of things, including annual rates). Start working on it as a high priority, or you could miss out on contributions.</p> <p><b>Part B.</b> <b>Page 43,</b> 4.2.1. Table 4, 5th. spelling error, <i>to create "an" arts corridor.</i></p> <p><b>Page 44, Museum/Local History.</b> Some of this has been done by library service in recent years. Therefore should be appropriate to include enough space in a rebuilt library to include 'local history' of the Shepperton Ward area as it evolved, AND history of the 'Town of Victoria Park' municipal authority. Plus of course any history of pre-colonial settlement.</p> <p><b>Community Learning Space/s.</b> Believe they should be provided throughout <i>The Town of Victoria Park area.</i> Expect these spaces to also include access to digital catalogues (routed via State Agencies and Town of Victoria Park library), which are expected to increase into the future. These spaces also allow like-minded individuals to collaborate, share information, aid their research, aid their learnings. This sort of investment should not be ignored and passed off as left to '(commercial)coffee shops' and 'coffee shops chats'. Look for opportunities in each of your Town Centres. Clearly they would be aimed at persons 18+ (beyond secondary schooling), and available during the day and evenings.</p> <p><b>Part C.</b> <b>Page 62,</b> MacMillan Precinct District Hub. <b>2.4 Social Infrastructure approach.</b> <i>the Town should further investigate a developer contribution scheme and/or incorporating revenue-generating tenancies into the precinct to aid viability. Agree.</i></p> <p><b>Page 70, 4.4.</b> 2. Possible spelling error, <i>community centre "or" Lathlain Scout Hall.</i></p> <p>3. Don't believe the provision of a community gym at Lathlain should be linked to the retention/reduction/closure of current gym at Somerset Street. Think you should disconnect that decision-making and let the Lathlain decision be made alone.</p> <p><b>Page 71, 4.5.</b> Initiative 45 Agree.</p> <p><b>Page 79.</b> 1. Do you mean <i>Harold Rossiter Reserve "and"</i></p>	<p>Noted. Correction made.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. Correction made.</p> <p>Noted. This recommendation is for consideration only.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted. Correction made.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>at Curtin University?</p> <p><b>Page 80.</b> I think that <i>Town of Victoria Park</i> should be in discussions with land-owners of the various sites fronting Jarrah Road (north of Adie Ct to Cadden St) in regards to future redevelopment scenarios. A lot of those buildings are old brick (such as Activ site, Swan Care, TAFE). Why? There is a large residential population of St James across the road, that includes many who are not students, and are not seniors. They are going without, and seem to be directed to Albany Highway YET it is not that close in walking distance for most of them. The interface between that side of Jarrah road, to the other side is not great. (I note <i>Town of Victoria Park</i> through <i>Place Plans</i>, wants to get better walk links between it and Hayman Road.) Offer <i>development incentives</i> to reshape their footprints, to widen pedestrian avenues, to provide community space/s, meeting rooms. Possible <i>Town of Victoria Park</i> could purchase a small piece of land to deliver social infrastructure for St James.</p> <p><b>Page 81,</b> Yes you talk of the 'barrier' effect.</p> <p>Also it would be really helpful if real statistics be provided of suburbs such as St James that indicate how many people are not students, versus those who are merely study-students (currently enrolled at TAFE or university). I think there is a large population who are not students, yet are mistakenly assumed for by decision-makers (WA State Government, agencies, some metro local governments, regional decision-makers). The point being these residents do not have a short-term interest in the area (as those students do), so their social infrastructure unmet needs should not be continually brushed aside.</p> <p><b>Page 82. 6.5.</b> Initiative 57. I don't think it is going to happen. The WA State Hockey programs will most likely increase into the future. Plus international sides (from small nations and large nations) will continue to regularly visit and base themselves there for weeks.</p> <p><b>Thankyou for taking the comments onboard to improve your draft strategy.</b></p>	<p>Noted. The SIS initiative #62 recommends that the Town: <i>"Assess opportunities to secure social infrastructure for a future population, including through development incentives for community benefit and/or a development contribution plan through the implementation of the Bentley-Curtin Specialised Activity Centre Structure Plan."</i></p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--