

Comment Number	Comments	Officer's Response
1	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I see you have erected a sign detailing your intention to erect a totally insufficient dog park in Jacaranda Springs. 2. However although you have a similar plan for Hartfield Park you have not erected a sign. Could this be that you are hoping to go ahead with this plan, knowing it is extremely unpopular with those who make most use of the area ie. Walking their dogs off the lead and the fewer who know the better. I look forward to your reply. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted. 2. As part of the advertising process, the City placed a sign on each of the proposed sites to inform residents of the proposal, and to receive feedback regarding the proposed sites.
2	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed enclosures for dogs are a safety risk as they are left to defend themselves as the owners are outside the enclosure or walk around the lake for exercise. I, for one will not leave my dog enclosed with other dogs in case he is attacked and has no means of escape from the enclosure. 2. All the dog owners I have spoken to at the park, do not want these changes and all have said they would not be using the facility if these changes are brought in. 3. The above proposal is unacceptable. Our dogs have access to the whole area where they will mix with all other dogs – socialise, chase a ball etc while they walk with their owners – we walk in a group while the other owners have made friends also. I have made wonderful friends at the dog park over the 30 years I have used the park. the dogs and owners get to exercise and socialise together. I therefore request the park remain as it is – a “haven” for all + freedom. 4. What the park truly needs is more shade trees, park benches in the shady tree areas to rest sometimes + have a chat. Also the grass needs watering as these areas are severely dry. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The intent of the proposed fenced dog exercise areas is so that dogs and their owners can utilise the facility. The areas are large enough so that owners can go in too and consists of walking paths and benches for owners to utilise. Under the Dog Act 1976, a dog shall not be in a dog exercise area unless the dog is being supervised by a competent person who is in reasonable proximity to the dog. 2. Noted. 3. Objection to proposed fenced dog exercise park at Federation Gardens, Hartfield Park in Forrestfield noted. 4. The proposed landscape concepts incorporated the addition of existing trees, benches and additional turf area at Federation Gardens. 5. Noted. The lake does not include the scope of this project. 6. Letters were sent out to all landowners and occupiers within a 400m radius of each proposed sites. The

	<p>5. The lake itself needs “topping up” with water as it is turning “green” + smelly due to the hot weather. I am sure the resident ducks and moon hens would appreciate clean water.</p> <p>6. I would also like to know why a letter wasn’t sent out to <u>all</u> dog owners in Forrestfield as a courtesy – I was unaware of this proposal until it was pointed out to me by a friend who had seen it on the shire website.</p> <p>7. My suggestion is – what isn’t broken, don’t fix. We love our park (dogs too) the way it is – please leave it be.</p>	<p>proposal was also advertised in the local newspaper, signage was placed on both of the proposed sites and was available on the City’s engage website.</p> <p>7. Objection to proposed fenced dog exercise park at Federation Gardens, Hartfield Park in Forrestfield noted.</p>
3	<p>1. Dear Sir/Madam I walk my dog every day round Jacaranda Park, there are always lots of dog walkers I support dog exercise parks at Elmore Way Park, it would be great for the dogs to have some where to run & socialise. Hopefully it will be approved.</p>	<p>1. Support for proposed fenced dog exercise park at Elmore Way Park noted.</p>
4	<p>Hi, I have the following queries and provisional objections to the proposal:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Query – what would be the total cost of constructing and maintaining the proposed facility including staff costs? 2. Query – what is budget provision for undertaking this project within current year’s budget? 3. Query – what is the total number of rate payers in the city and how many houses will benefit from the proposed facility? How was the number of residents benefiting from the proposed facility being counted? 4. Query – who will construct the proposed facility and how will they be selected for constructing the proposed facility? 5. Query – what are the other priorities/ future projects/ proposals that could be considered if this proposal doesn’t progress forward? 6. Provisional objection – if this proposal public facility is intended to benefit less than 20% of the residents then I would object to this proposal. Alternatively, this expense may be avoided and instead 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. An opinion of probable cost (OPC) was prepared for each site. The estimated cost for Elmore Way Park in High Wycombe is approximately \$300,000; and the estimated cost for Federation Gardens, Hartfield Park, Forrestfield is approximately \$450,000. 2. An allocation of \$15,000 was included in the 2018/19 Budget for the purposes of undertaking background research and preparing landscaping concepts with the OPC’s. Approximately \$9000 has been spent on concept plans and the OPC to date. Future budgets are yet to be determined by the Council. There is also opportunity for the fenced dog exercise park at Elmore Way Park in High Wycombe to be funded through Public Open Space (POS) Cash in Lieu funds. 3. There are approximately 24,000 ratepayers within the City. In 2017/2018 the City undertook a comprehensive

	<p>all residents can benefited by passing on the reduced expense to rate-payers in terms of reduced council rates</p> <p>Kindly let me know on my queries and provisional objections</p>	<p>consultation process through the City's POS Strategy in which significant feedback was received from the community regarding dog exercise areas. In addition to this, the City has received multiple queries raised by residents in relation to the need for a fenced dog facility including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Concerns about larger dogs injuring smaller dogs. 2. Lack of dog agility and obstacle course equipment. 3. Decreasing lot sizes, limiting private open space areas for dogs. 4. Dogs escaping from unfenced areas. <p>In 2017, the Council (OCM26/2018), requested an investigation into the validity and process associated with a fenced dog park and in May 2018, the Council considered the allocation of funds for progressing feasibility investigations as part of the 2018-19 budget.</p> <p>The locations of the proposed fenced dog exercise parks were chosen based on opportunities and constraints, facility need and individual site assessment. The locations have also been chosen based on the high density of dog ownership surrounding the sites, meaning that the facility will provide a greater benefit and use from the local catchment.</p> <p>Whilst there is no specific number for how many residents will benefit from the proposed facility, the proposals have been in response to multiple enquiries from residents who wish to see an area where they can exercise their dogs safely. The proposed locations have also been narrowed down and chosen to ensure the facilities will provide the most amount of benefit as</p>
--	--	---

		<p>possible, to a large amount of residents and visitors. The City also undertook community consultation to ensure the facility, and the location of the facility is suitable and appropriate, and to take into consideration any concerns that the community may have.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. In the event that the Council resolve to progress with constructing a fenced dog park, there will need to be a request for tender process and ensure that the selection criteria considers the contractor's relevant experience, capacity, understanding, delivery timeframe, price and any other selection criteria chosen by the City. 5. This will be a future consideration depending on community feedback and Council's decision. The City has a number of ongoing and future projects, however they are not dependent on whether the dog park progresses or not. Each of the City's projects needs to be considered on an individual basis factoring in the City's budgets over a number of years and also factoring other sources of funding that may be available to the City other than municipal funds. 6. Noted.
5	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. My only feedback (apart from 'Hooray! It's finally happening! Thank you!') is that I'd be a bit nervous about the gates that connect the big and small dog areas. It kind of defeats the purpose of have separate enclosures according to size. I'd always be worried about the pitbull in the big enclosure being let in to the small one so he can 'play' with my small dog. This is based on past experience at John Dunne park in Kelmscott... 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support of the proposed fenced dog exercise parks noted. The intent of the central gate crossing is to ensure there are multiple entry and exit points to ensure the safety of both visitors and dogs. The central gate crossings ensure for Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) features to be incorporated into the design of the proposed fenced

		dog exercise parks to enable users to have full movement throughout the sites.
6	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> I have a question about the Federation Gardens fenced dog exercise proposal. It isn't clear whether the area that is currently off lead will remain off lead with the addition of the fenced areas? I.e. Will dogs still have access to the lake? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal is an addition to the existing park and does not restrict dogs from using the rest of Federation Gardens. It is an option for residents who wish to use the facility.
7	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> We have noticed the signage re the concept of changing the Hartfield Park. For years we have been walking our dog in this area and cross the park on a daily basis. From the information available it is not clear whether the park will only be accessible to the enclosed area?.. We think there is no change necessary as the dogs can play whether it's enclosed or not and is a complete waste of tax payers money. We are completely against enclosed areas as it restricts the use of the park and it's not suitable for every dog. Will we still have access to the lake for our dog to have swim, especially in hot weather ?..Hopefully there won't be any changes and we don't have to find another area for our outdoor activities. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed location and concept plans were advertised as an addition to the already existing off leash area. The advertising process was to enable the City to understand whether the fenced dog exercise park at Federation Gardens would be an addition or whether it would restrict users to a certain area of the site. Objection to the proposed fenced dog exercise park at Federation Gardens, Hartfield Park in Forrestfield noted.
8	<p>Hartfield Park Dog Exercise Area</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> We are against the fenced dog park as we have been taking our dog (previously dogs) to the off lead area for 10 years now. Currently there is a lovely group of people and dogs who meet there most evenings and the dogs play together and the people socialize. There are big dogs, medium and little dogs all playing together and this would not be possible with the separate fenced areas. Our dog is a medium size so where does he go? Part of taking our dog to the off lead area is that we get exercise while walking 4-5 laps of the pond. Walking around a small fenced area would not benefit the humans. When the dogs get hot or thirsty they can swim in the pond, which is good exercise for them too. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Objection to the proposed fenced dog exercise park at Federation Gardens, Hartfield Park in Forrestfield noted. Federation Gardens was chosen as a potential site to facilitate for a fenced dog exercise park due to the existing facilities available and its locational and physical characteristics enabling this facility to be provided. In addition to this, the site was chosen in order to clarify the areas within the whole of Hartfield Park which are and are not restricted dog exercise areas. The intent of this proposal was to encourage users to utilise the facility in Federation Gardens as opposed to the multiple sporting facilities which are restricted to dogs. The proposed location and concept plans were advertised as an addition to the already

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. We would like to know if the rest of the park is still going to be off lead? We have good control of our dog off lead and keep him away from any dogs that are on lead unless the other dog owner indicates that their dog is friendly (usually on lead due to lack of training). It seems like these changes have been planned because some people are not following the rules - perhaps more signage at the entrances to the park and enforcement by rangers would solve the problem without taking away our off lead area that we love. There are other parks where dog owners who can't control their dogs can take their dogs and keep them on lead. Perhaps you could add a fenced area to those parks to provide an option for those owners. 3. We are happy enough for the park to be developed, we would just still like to be able to let our dog play freely with the other friendly dogs. Can you please present our concerns at the Council meetings on this topic? We would appreciate being kept updated on the outcome of any meetings as well. 	<p>existing off leash area. The advertising process was to enable the City to understand whether the fenced dog exercise park at Federation Gardens would be an addition or whether it would restrict users to a certain area of the site.</p>
<p>9</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I walk my Dogs every afternoon at the Federation Gardens Dog Park Forrestfield. I meet many other dog owners and we all chat and walk together around the lake while our dogs (big and small) socialise and paddle in the lake. In my opinion segregating dogs in different fenced sections is not going to work at Federation Gardens and I am truly opposed to it. Myself, my dogs and the people we meet down there have enjoyed the sense of freedom the park has offered for many years. 2. I am all for spending money on the park, as it dry and sandy and the lake is very low in water and in need of maintenance. There is only one bench in the sun, so more benches and shade would be gladly welcomed. 3. PLEASE DON'T FENCE IN OUR DOGS CITY of KALAMUNDA. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Objection to the proposed fenced dog exercise park at Federation Gardens, Hartfield Park in Forrestfield noted. 2. The proposed concept plan for Federation Gardens that was proposed additional trees to the site as well as shaded seating options. 3. Objection to the proposed fenced dog exercise park at Federation Gardens, Hartfield Park in Forrestfield noted.

<p>10</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We recently brought a house in Forrestfield, where we had lived as tenants a couple of years ago and one of the main reasons of where we brought the house was due to the Hartfield dog park. Along with the awesome Jorgensen Park and other on-leash walks and open spaces within this beautiful Shire. We would even drive up from Kelmscott (our previous home) to visit Hartfield as our dogs love the bush and lake. Therefore, myself and other dog owners whom I have talked to are amazed and dumbfounded at the new proposal of a fenced in dog park at Hartfield! 2. Firstly the 'information proposal' sign – was not placed in the park or even near the entrance of the park – it was placed on the corner next to the bowling club. Why? Would it not be better placed where the actual work was going to take effect. The sign for the new hockey field and facilities was placed inside the park! Are you trying to hide the fact that this proposal may not go down too well. Considering that the dog park actually gets used a lot more than the hockey field! Whilst we are talking about the hockey field, the gate that is in farthest corner and within the dog park, with the clear sign NO DOGS (and I agree) is constantly broken – so is unable to be placed on the catch – is this because some bright spark in your department decided it would be a good idea to put a high pressure reticulation point right next to the gate – so of course the pressure washes it open and therefore breaks the flimsy lock. May I recommend that you get this fixed – and then aim the retic point away from the gate – so that dogs won't run into the field! And also make it self-closing for those that don't like closing gates (mainly the hockey players who run from one field across the road to the other for warm up training!) 3. But back to the fenced in dog park – on the web site – engage.kalamunda – it states – “pawsome facilities for our furry friends”– do any of the people who 'designed' this “pawsome” facility actually own a dog? Or put any thought / leg work into the design, or do you just cookie cutter a plan from another boring, 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted. 2. The Federation Gardens advertising sign was placed on the corner of Hartfield Road and Morrison Road. This was the nearest entrance to Federation Gardens enabling those who enter the site from this entrance and those who drive or walk by to be able to see the sign. The signage was placed in this particular spot to capture a larger range of feedback. The hockey field does not form part of this proposal, but the feedback regarding the lock has been noted. 3. The proposed location and landscaping concepts were advertised from 17 January 2020 to 21 February 2020. Letters were sent out to all landowners and occupiers within a 400m radius of each proposed sites. The proposal was also advertised in the local newspaper, signage was placed on both of the proposed sites and was available on the City's engage website. 4. Objection to the proposed fenced dog exercise park at Federation Gardens, Hartfield Park in Forrestfield noted.
-----------	---	---

	<p>non-dog owner designer? Do you not research to find out what dogs actually enjoy doing, and by any chance have you come down to the area you are replanning for and take a census of the dog owners there over a period of a say a week, at all different times/days so you can truly find out their view. It seems from the placing the sign (next to the bowling club) a week ago, in a position no one can read and posting out survey forms to households less than 5 days ago – to obtain ‘everyone’s’ feedback by 21st feels like you are trying to slip this through. Are you trying to get it passed without much pressure from the actual residents who are pay their rates and enjoy the park as is!</p> <p>4. Rather than “listening” to the few, who are probably complaining – please listen to an owner of 2 dogs and also some comments from fellow dog owners that I have spoken to about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Dogs love trees, bush and spaces to roam – they do not enjoy a vanilla park with a few ‘agility’ items – in a park which is actually designed by boring humans for humans comfort! b) Dog owners are responsible for dogs and their training/manners – majority of dog owners know that – however there are a select few that don’t and hence the few complaints. c) In the past 6 years since I have been coming to the park – I have only seen one incident and heard of another. Unfortunately those were more to the lack of human training rather than the actual dog. d) Have a ranger come to the park to check on registrations, picking up after a dog etc on regular but varied times, may be more productive in enforcing the laws, and more cost effective than building a fenced park and caging the animals in. Or have deputy rangers – who are dog owners and walk there regularly and can help enforce the regulations with some authority behind them maybe. e) The space at Hartfield is large enough – and open enough that if a dog owner wishes to remove their dog from a situation – then they 	
--	---	--

	<p>can, and they do. In a fenced in area – the only way to go is out of the dog park!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> f) The freedom in Hartfield Park allows small, medium and large walks – a fenced in area does not allow this variety. g) Urban planning has gone silly – we have a beautiful wide open nature park – and they want to turn it into a boring enclosed play area, bloody ridiculous! h) It is advertised as an off-leash dog park – why don't they have more poop bins at the walk in entrances (there are 4 entrances) and only 3 bins located close together inside the park! Having them on the way in/out makes more logical sense for those of us that walk to the park! i) Put up an information sign (they've put up signs about nature) reminding people of the laws/regulations within the park – they would do that with a fenced in one! Also have larger signs at these entrances to say it's an off-leash dog park – so those with families and walkers are fully aware that there will be dogs running around and probably running up to them to greet them with wagging tails. j) Talk to the dog owners, don't hide behind desks and make their evil plans that don't affect them! <p>I could go on, but believe you get the picture.</p> <p>Please take all of the above into consideration and PLEAESE DON'T turn this wonderful wide open space into yet another ridiculous waste of money!</p> <p>Thank you for your time.</p> <p>I will be posting this on social media to make others aware.</p>	
11	<p>1. The website design is poorly constructed in my opinion. Firstly, when I went to give my comments it came up the HW park when all I am interested in is the FF one. After some time and after hitting save etc it went on the FF one I wanted. Not the real clear.....there is 2 hyperlinks for each which I assumed was the</p>	<p>1. Noted.</p>

	<p>form but no, it was the concept plans, which I already saw on prior pages.</p>	
<p>Late Submissions (submitted after 21 February 2020)</p>		
<p>12</p>	<p>Thanks for your response, I really appreciate the timely response and detailed information provided. I am really happy & grateful that Kalamunda city has such professional and diligent staff which, as an immigrant to Australia, who never ceases to amaze me with their excellent customer service every time I engage with you folks. Where I come from, its next to impossible even identifying the right department/ personnel for such community matters, much less getting such thorough responses to my enquiries. So just want to encourage the team to continue doing the great job they are doing in managing the city affairs and taking care of its residents.</p> <p>With regards to the fenced dog exercise park, I would like reiterate my objection for following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is no clear understanding of exactly how many rate payers will benefit from this, and having a very vague justification would neither be a prudential nor responsible basis for council members spending almost half a million dollars and more in coming years. Avoiding this one single project could potentially reduce the annual rates by \$20, equivalent of the whole WARR levy 2. The incremental operational cost for maintaining this facility in future has not been worked out, even in part-time FTE terms? 3. It appears another fenced dog park facility is present in close vicinity, i.e. at the Harmony Fields in Maddington, which for most residents of Wattle Grove suburb would be closer than Elmore park <p>I have the following additional queries:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. How many active/ current dog registrations are there in Kalamunda city? 8. How many council members would potentially directly benefit from this facility, in terms of being pet owners themselves? 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The fenced dog exercise park at Elmore Way park is proposed to be funded through public open space cash in lieu. The objectives of cash in lieu for POS is to ensure that all residential development in the State is complemented by adequate, well-located areas of public open space that will enhance the amenity of the development and provide for the recreational needs of local residents. Development Control Policy 2.3 – Public Open Space in Residential Areas outlines that the acceptable expenditure for cash in lieu funds may be for clearing, seating, earthworks, spectator cover, grass planting, toilets, landscaping, change rooms, reticulation, lighting, play equipment, pathways, fencing, walk trails, car parking, and signs relating to recreation pursuits. The provision of a fenced dog exercise park at Elmore Way Park in High Wycombe meets the criteria for the acceptable expenditure for cash-in-lieu. 2. Noted. The amended OPC for Elmore Way Park has incorporated an estimate of the annual maintenance cost. 3. Elmore Way Park has been chosen as a suitable location to facilitate for a fenced dog exercise park due to its locational and physical characteristics. The site is located within proximity to a high density of dog ownership and consists of nearby facilities which will enable to site to be successful.

	<p>9. How will my objection be considered in the decision-making process by council members?</p> <p>10. Is it possible to understand what has the community response been so far on this proposal, in terms of number of positive/ supportive responses and number of objections/ negative responses?</p> <p>11. How can I be kept informed on the progress of this proposal and be provided an opportunity to speak with council members before any decision is made to proceed with developing such a facility?</p>	
--	--	--