

Floreat Visioning Open Day Session 21

March 2024 – Feedback Form Comments

Question:	Do you feel your views on the future of the Floreat Activity Centre are reflected? If not or partially, please provide details why.
------------------	---

	Answer	Comments
1	Partially	Consultation appears rushed. There are many more issues. Why has the Council not consulted earlier and been transparent?
2	No	Why did Cambridge Council not seek the opinions of Hornsey Road residents and other streets affected by the Councils new LPS plan. This plan assumes the residences are agreeable to development. If consultation did occur when please? Why did the Council change the Endowment Lands restriction on development without resident consultation?
3	No	What is actually DRIVING this proposed development? - State Government - APIL / Commercial Interests - Town of Cambridge It is certainly NOT the residents and ratepayers!
4	Yes	N/A
5	Partially	Final plan should be of architectural merit that enhances/compliments high architectural standards of several iconic homes in Floreat. The final plan for external aspects of building must pass security by Council/ratepayers - we want is to look good outside - don't make it a big box.
6	Partially	It has been presented as if this is happening as shown - a BIG worry!
7	Partially	Please note I am not talking about the proposed APIL plans. Agree with Council adopting it's own PSP - aged care was mentioned as an option for part of the site when the LPS was being written, yet no mention of that now? The local residential care facilities are few and far between (and difficult to get in to). With the aging local population this would be a great use for part of the site. Either a residential care facility or suitable over 65 housing. Towers are not the answer.
8	Yes	N/A
9	Partially	The shopping centre itself must be redeveloped totally to allow apartment living above it, and underground parking for apartments and shops. The current centre is not structurally suitable for this development.
10	No	Redevelopment of the shopping centre has to be part of the plan. Ideally any new accommodation (blocks) must include same format shopping centre on the lower (ground) level.
11	Partially	The comments appear to be a wish list!! While good, the requirement for transport, car parking, restrictions on height. Overlooking of neighbours primary school. Increased school capacity do not appear sufficiently firm.

Floreat Visioning Open Day Session 21

March 2024 – Feedback Form Comments

12	Partially	I think the development should be ambitious and iconic in terms of being intelligently designed and integrated into the suburbs. It should be a benchmark building for the area. It goes without saying that the APIL plan is the opposite of this.
13	Partially	Low stories above the shops I want to see a stronger commitment to completing a community-led PSP <u>before</u> the APIL one is submitted.
14	No	You have developed a plan that the WAPC will reject outright. You are trying to make the community plan completely unrealistic.
15	Partially	Density is positive --> done well! Should have transition to lower density.
16	Yes	I think you have done a good job of collating diverse range of feedback. What is presented on the boards is ok.
17	No	Way too overdeveloped. - Too high - Too much Not what we chose when we decided to live in Town of Cambridge.
18	Partially	More on impacts on parking and road transport that is already not coping.
19	Partially	Soft and/or environmental issues are looked at, but the lack of detail about how existing homes would be "bowled over" is lacking. Save Floreat's character and do not blindly accept 900 - 1250 new residences on this site.
20	No	We should not be allowing APIL have much say in this - they are not a local entity and are only interested in financial gain. As is TOC after increased revenue from rate payers money. You are trying to rip the heart out of the community.
21	No	All of these proposed suggestions/pictures are preparing an inner city hub which is NOT the reason I paid top dollar for a house in Floreat. I wanted a suburban life which is near the actual city if I wanted a vibe. Development of the shopping centre seems to be lost in the rush for residential infill.
22	No	You cannot build this many dwellings in a suburb that has no transport infrastructure to cope. The impact on water pressure / schools / services is completely unrealistic!! There are many other places to spread the density around, not JUST in one place.
23	No	To expect 950 - 1200 dwellings on this site is ludicrous! Increased density should be spread across TOC and particularly near train stations / public transport.
24	N/A	I feel my views are shared by fellow residents but not anyone at TOC. Why is TOC being so passive in this process? It should not have taken community outrage to mobilise.
25	Partially	Couldn't see reference to schooling. Reopen City Beach High.

Floreat Visioning Open Day Session 21

March 2024 – Feedback Form Comments

26	No	The refurbishment of the Floreat Shopping Centre itself has been disregarded. The development of high-rise towers the emphasis!
27	N/A	Council need to develop a plan. Not sit back and negotiate on APILs plan. Work for residents.

Floreat Visioning Open Day Session 21

March 2024 – Feedback Form Comments

Question: What do you strongly like or agree with on the presentation boards?	
	Comment:
1	Max. 8 storeys, must have excess parking spaces, plan must integrate adequate transport links, link green spaces.
2	Key community concerns have appropriately captured main issue of need to maintain "garden suburb" character and make activity centre accessible/enjoyable for all parties. Important to keep building height lower (max. 6-8 storey) to maintain consistency. Need graduation. Public transport, parking and school safety important.
3	I think it's great that this process has started. The Floreat Forum is well overdue for a redevelopment. I love the focus on the 'green' vibe of the area.
4	Keeping things low. Keeping things green - lots more trees. Environmental and Sustainable emphasis.
5	Nothing. Small works needed for the forum itself first.
6	Agree with the development stepping up away and with setbacks to respect residential dwellings. 6 'storeys' max in my opinion. Agree with integrated greenery.
7	I like the idea of 8 storeys maximum (and step-down).
8	I don't think you should consider building anything the infrastructure e.g. crossing of railway line; north south access has been sorted. I don't have a problem with the development. I have a problem with the traffic problems that will ensue!!!
9	Greenspaces, lower building heights than the original proposal, underground parking.
10	The surrounding aspects on infrastructure must be addressed by the future development. This particularly includes public transport and minimising the traffic into the surrounding suburbs.
11	Development above the shopping centre (max. 5 storeys above), does not overlook or overshadow the school, sustainable, greenery, multiuse, do not close the library increase library and multiuse activity.
12	Limit buildings to MAXIMUM 8 storeys but ideally 4-6 storeys to maintain the character of our suburb and reduce the negative impacts on surrounding residents and community.
13	The infrastructure required for a development of this size needs to be looked at first to determine if the development can occur. Water, sewerage, drainage, electricity, public transport, parking and roads. Otherwise you end up with a dreadful redevelopment and disgruntled residents and shop owners.

Floreat Visioning Open Day Session 21

March 2024 – Feedback Form Comments

14	Development needed, density done well is good, height not a problem.
15	To show diagrams depicting 5 or ? Stories is deceiving. Letting us down.
16	Lower height, lower density in Hornsey Road (my street), redeveloped Forum, parking and transport considered.
17	The shopping centre must be redeveloped.
18	Please do NOT allow developers free reign in our suburbs. Their standard aim is to maximum profits and they do not act in the best interest of our suburbs and community. Density should be spread across the suburb not concentrated in high rise buildings that have numerous negative impacts on the built environment.
19	Agree max. 8 storeys.

Floreat Visioning Open Day Session 21

March 2024 – Feedback Form Comments

Question: What do you strongly dislike or disagree with on the presentation boards?	
	Comment:
1	I'm concerned about people living on the flats are going to complain about the lights and noise from Reabold Tennis and Padel Perth. How are you going to assure leisure activities continue as it's until 10.30pm when people live so close?
2	Lack of residential aged care that was discussed as an option when the LPS was being written. No time frame for the LPS. What are the total density targets for the Town of Cambridge? We don't need to exceed these for the sake of Developers and decreased amenity for local residents.
3	Increased traffic is not addressed as an issue or particular concern. Increased density will come with increased traffic. Brookdale Street is particularly busy and gridlocked at times in morning traffic. Safety for children crossing busy roads particularly Oceanic Drive has not been considered.
4	There is a huge problem with parking at Howtree Place for people who need to use Reabold Tennis Club. Please make sure you increase parking lots because when morning Howtree Place is full of staff as parking is not opened.
5	Why should residents trust the Council to do what residents request, when the CEOs and Council removed the restrictions on development within the Endowment Lands without resident consultation?
6	Why are the green spaces bordering Oceanic Drive not used to take some of the burden of house development? The 2 parcels in one place are out of proportion for the whole developments green space. Their use may decrease density elsewhere.
7	There should be a person at every board to explain/rationalise - those around weren't identified, so how do we know who to ask?
8	My cynical response is that community opinion is never counted. It's a ticked that box! Big business only will benefit - unless TRUE public opinion considered and listened to.
9	Transport issues have not been adequately covered. There is limited bus services which are already extremely busy in peak hours. No further capacity here for 900-1200 additional dwellings! Should higher density not be considered nearest to a train station where large amounts of people can be quickly transported.
10	Overlooking primary school, overcrowding primary school and parking, bringing more people / more potential for crime! Floreat is NOT a shanty - town!
11	Height must be limited to 6 storeys.

Floreat Visioning Open Day Session 21

March 2024 – Feedback Form Comments

12	This isn't answering the question, but I think it worth commenting that it is extremely disappointing to see APIL lodge a plan that is clearly not aligned with the LPS. It is disingenious for them to claim it is. They must have known 20 storeys would never be acceptable, but gambled in achieving a compromise of a level that is still far too high.
13	Would be great to also have access to more detail now. Much better than APIL's render which was inconsistent with the LPS. ? Primary school - more green buffer / setback to provide relief. ? If overlooking eliminated. Possibly an underpass or overpass to provide safe connection to school. Interconnected principal shared pathways into neighbouring areas.
14	The "green" aspect of the what's proposed is not realistic, you only have to ee what the current "greening" of the existing centre is like to know that there will be minimal green aspect to a future development.
15	Loss of current shopping centre.
16	Parking problem? Shopping? 1250 units? High rise?
17	Not enough setbacks, not enough consideration for traffic (in particular around school and 1200 new residents driving out of Floreat on main arteries (Grantham, Oceanic), not enough 'activity', what is available for families, kids, teens, elderly, planning out of the area around the Forum (not just the APIL footprint).
18	The level of proposed high rise - 8 storeys - ridiculous! General congestion to our village: traffic, people, noise pollution.
19	The shopping centre has no heritage value and any development should incorporate.
20	Expectations need managing on the realistic ability of APIL to redevelop the Forum like this. Density relocation to the East of Floreat Avenue may be required to achieve density targets.
21	8 storeys is too high. How will the local roads cope with this? They won't.
22	The PSP and ToC implication idea on planning boards show a large amount of greenery - trees / parks / roof top gardens etc. The current owners of the Floreat Forum do not maintain the green space at all, and the Town's commitment to planting and maintaining street trees on Howtree Place is dismal. We are in a drying climate - native trees / grasses / plants do not have the level of "green" shown in the plans. More browns, olives, greys and silvers.
23	The new tower overlook the school which is a big no no. We don't need that many people in our suburb.
24	Traffic issue not addressed, surrounding streets already very busy! Need to have stronger focus on what would be best for school. Not just overlooking but also extra density would bring capacity issue / there is no room to expand. Many local residents themselves went to local primary school.

Floreat Visioning Open Day Session 21

March 2024 – Feedback Form Comments

25	8 storeys - should be less.
26	Everything is based on living with the original 900 - 1250 dwelling types. This is simply too high and should be rejected - build new stations.
27	Your photos and pictures are completely random! Pictures of a European city square and a 'Beijing' look-a-like is supposed to suggest WHAT??? It all feels like T.O.C are doing due diligence consulting the community but in reality you don't care what we think.
28	You have developed a plan that is completely unrealistic which will be rejected by the WAPC. The feedback said 8 storeys across shopping centre i.e. like Claremont Quarter.
29	The excessive height, density of development which could potentially occur. A high density core (8 storeys) with transition to low density preferred.
30	Height and bulk on residential streets need to be lower and blend in on your plans propose medium density.
31	Do not include existing residential area. Shopping centre area is big enough.