

7 Well Street

Community Engagement Summary

November 2021



Contents

Overview	3
Next steps.....	3
1 Background.....	4
2 Definitions and scope.....	4
2.1 Related Council documents and consultations	5
3 Consultation process.....	5
3.1 Consultation purpose	5
3.2 Consultation methodology.....	5
3.2.1 Consultation phase.....	6
4 Participant profile	6
5 Consultation findings.....	7
5.1 Support for actions.....	7
5.2 Scope.....	8
5.3 Item-specific feedback	8
5.3.1 What is important in the Church Street Precinct.....	8
5.3.2 How the site could best be used for community benefit.....	8
5.3.3 Preference for activities if the site was used for a pocket park	11
5.3.4 Issues if the site was to become a pocket park	13
5.3.5 Other issues that should be considered for this space	14
5.4 Error corrections.....	15
6 Project evaluation.....	15

Overview

The purpose of the community engagement was to understand community views on the potential use of 7 Well Street for public open space. Specifically, the engagement aimed to:

- Generate ideas from the community of how we can improve the site at 7 Well Street for community use.
- Understand the level of community support for transforming the site to a pocket park or additional car parking or other community use.

The community engagement included extensive advertising of the online survey available for completion on Have Your Say.

The consultation engaged obtained a total of 619 survey respondents, 36 participants provided comments or replies via Facebook, and there were five email submissions.

The survey included a total of 619 respondents, of which 538 provided a response to the core question as to their preference for the use of site.

A strong majority (64%) supported Council's position that the site be used for a pocket park.

A little more than one-quarter (27%) preferred that the site be used for car parking, and a small number preferred a community building (5%) or affordable housing (4%).

A majority of both male and female respondents, as well as respondents of all age groups, and from all suburbs located within the City of Bayside had a first preference use of the site as an open space for community benefit.

A majority of three groups of respondents had a first preference that the site be used for car parking rather than for open space, those being respondents living outside the municipality (53% of 38 respondents), those working on Church Street (74% of 53 respondents) and those who own a business on Church Street (74% of 54 respondents).

The most common activities that survey respondents wanted to undertake if the site was used as a pocket park were activities consistent with passive open space, such as relaxation, sitting, and reading. A smaller proportion wanted to engage in more active activities such as children's playgrounds, a skate park, a dog off-leash area, or some sports.

The 65 comments and replies obtained through Facebook were generally consistent with the survey results.

Of the five email submissions, three preferred the site be used for car parking, and two preferred the site be used for open space.

Next steps

As part of this process, Council will also complete a study on the opportunities and constraints at the site for public open space. This study will consider relevant Council strategic directions including:

- [Bayside 2050 Community Vision](#)
- [Climate Emergency Action Plan](#)
- [Open Space Strategy 2012](#)
- [Biodiversity Action Plan 2018](#)

A report summarising community feedback will be presented at the December 2021 meeting for Council to make a decision on the next steps of the future use of 7 Well Street.

1 Background

We are undertaking community engagement to understand community views on the potential use of 7 Well Street for public open space.

Council purchased and demolished the residence at 7 Well Street to expand the existing car park at 5 Wells Street and provide an increase of 25 parking spots for the area.

The residence at 7 Well Street was purchased by Council in 2005, with the specific intention to construct additional car parking in the Church Street activity centre.

Parking improvements had been identified as a high priority in the 2018 Bayside Transport Strategy. The car park extension was intended to help improve parking accessibility to Church Street.

To facilitate this, Council was required to rezone the land before it could build a new car park. Council commenced a planning scheme amendment in 2019 to rezone the site to the Public Use Zone.

The Minister for Planning did not support the amendment as it lacked strategic justification - no Council policy or strategy document supported the site being transitioned to a car park.

At the March 2021 Ordinary Meeting of Council, a report was presented to enable Council to continue undertaking the strategic work necessary to support a car park at this location.

Councillors deemed that further work was needed to understand community views on how this site could be best utilised. Council resolved to investigate alternative land use opportunities at the site as part of a community engagement process.

Community feedback will focus on ideas for a possible solution that best improves community use of the space. Due to its size (700 sqm) the scope for improvement is limited.

As part of this process, Council will also complete a study on the opportunities and constraints at the site for public open space. This study will consider relevant Council strategic directions in, including the Bayside 2050 Community Vision, Climate Emergency Action Plan, Open Space Strategy 2012 and the Biodiversity Action Plan 2018 and study on opportunities to determine a future use for the parcel of land.

2 Definitions and scope

The consultation engagement was focused on residents of the surrounding suburbs, principally Brighton, Brighton East, and Hampton, visitors to Church Street, as well as those working in Church Street.

The stakeholders identified in the Future use of 7 Well Street Brighton Community Engagement Plan Overview are:

- Church Street Traders Association
- Local traders not in the Church Street Traders Association
- Brighton residents within walking distance
- The wider Bayside community
- Shoppers and visitors to the area
- Public transport users
- Young families

- Council committees and reference groups (Reconciliation Action Committee).

2.1 Related Council documents and consultations

As part of this process, Council will also complete a study on the opportunities and constraints at the site for public open space. This study will consider relevant Council strategic directions including:

- [Bayside 2050 Community Vision](#)
- [Climate Emergency Action Plan](#)
- [Open Space Strategy 2012](#)
- [Biodiversity Action Plan 2018](#)

3 Consultation process

3.1 Consultation purpose

The community engagement was undertaken to generate ideas from the community of how we can improve the site at 7 Well Street for community use, and to understand the level of community support for transforming the site to a pocket park, or additional car parking, or other community use.

3.2 Consultation methodology



The tools and techniques selected for this project were informed by the project content, stakeholders, and type of feedback sought. The impact of COVID-19 restricted our ability for face-to-face communication, as well as slower distribution of printed mail.

The key tools for communicating the community engagement project were as follows:

- Direct email to Have Your Say subscriber and key stakeholder groups.
- Flyers to nearby residents.
- Website news stories and This Week in Bayside e-newsletter.
- Advertising, including prominent signage and social media.
- Let' Talk Bayside magazine.
- Signage installed within the Church Street shopping precinct.
- Direct liaison with Church Street Traders Association and Bayside' Reconciliation Action Group Committee.
- Social media especially 'sponsored' posts to increase audience reach.

Interested participants could also engage directly with Council through the online engagement tool Have Your Say, including the opportunity to ask questions, as well as bookable meetings with key stakeholder groups.

The survey was available in accessible formats on request.

3.2.1 Consultation phase

Details	Activity
Online survey 618 respondents	The survey was available online at Have Your Say from the 7 th of October to the 7 th of November 2021.
Hard copy surveys 1 respondent	One hard copy survey was received by Council.
Email submissions 5 participants	A total of five email submissions were received by Council.
Facebook comments / replies 36 participants	A total of 65 Facebook comments (24) and replies (41) were received, with some participants providing more than one comment or reply.

4 Participant profile

The community engagement consultation received a total of 689 responses, including 618 surveys completed via Have Your Say, one hard copy survey, 65 Facebook comments and replies, and five email submissions.

The demographic profile of participants is only available for the 619 surveys (online and hardcopy), with the breakdown as follows:

	Demographic	Bayside 2016 Census	Participants (%)
Gender	Male	47.6%	36.2%
	Female	52.4%	61.7%
	Unknown	-	1.8%
	Other identity	-	0.3%
Age	10-14	-	2.4%
	15-24	11.5%	8.2%
	25-39	13.6%	16.0%
	40-49	16%	20.4%
	50-59	14.%	18.4%
	60-69	11.5%	18.3%
	70-84	9.9%	15.5%
	85+	3.7%	0.6%
	Undisclosed	-	0.2%

Suburb	Beaumaris	13.5%	3.2%
	Black Rock	6.5%	2.4%
	Brighton	24.1%	56.2%
	Brighton East	15.9%	11.7%
	Cheltenham	3.7%	1.3%
	Hampton	13.6%	11.2%
	Hampton East	5.0%	1.3%
	Highett	7.2%	2.1%
	Sandringham	10.5%	4.4%
	Outside Bayside	-	6.2%

The demographic profile of the sample of respondents was skewed towards residents of Brighton, reflecting the location of the subject site.

The survey sample was also skewed towards female over male respondents, and older over younger respondents.

The skew in the demographic profile of the survey will not have had a material impact on the core result of a strong preference for use of the site as a pocket park, however, it may have had a small influence around the preference for passive over more active uses of the open space (such as playgrounds and a skate park).

5 Consultation findings

5.1 Support for actions

The survey results clearly support Council's position that the site be used for a pocket park, with approximately two-thirds (64%) of the 538 of 619 survey respondents providing an answer to the question nominating this as their priority for the site.

It is noted that a majority of both male and female survey respondents, as well as respondents of all age groups, and from all the suburbs located within Bayside City Council nominated open space as their first preference use of the site for community benefit.

Importantly, there were three groups of survey respondents which had a majority preference for a use other than for open space. These were those living outside the municipality (53% of 38 respondents preferred car parking), those working on Church Street (74% of 53 respondents preferred car parking) and those who own a business on Church Street (74% of 54 respondents preferred car parking).

The most common activities that respondents would like to be able to undertake if the site was used as a pocket park was quiet relaxation and enjoyment such as is typically undertaken in passive open space.

There was some support in smaller numbers for a children's playground, a skate park, and a dog off-leash area.

5.2 Scope

The survey was not a random sample survey, and therefore the results cannot be viewed as a scientifically robust measure of the views of the entire population within the subject area.

The respondents to the survey reflect those in the community who were aware of the issue, were aware that the consultation was occurring, and who were sufficiently engaged in the issue to take the time to participate.

Most survey respondents became aware of the consultation via social media (28%), a Have Your Say email (26%), word of mouth (16%), or Council's website (10%).

In addition to the 619 survey respondents, the community engagement also includes five written submissions and 65 Facebook comments (24) and replies (41) to comments.

5.3 Item-specific feedback

5.3.1 What is important in the Church Street Precinct

Given the proximity of the site to the Church Street shopping precinct, survey respondents were asked what is important to them in the shopping precinct.

The five aspects of the Church Street shopping precinct that were most important to the survey respondents were shopping (75%), dining out (60%), socialising (56%), entertainment (41%), and relaxing (37%).

On average, respondents nominated three aspects each, which reflects the fact that people engage with the precinct for a variety of reasons and consider a range of aspects of the centre to be important to them.

5.3.2 How the site could best be used for community benefit

Survey respondents were asked to provide their ideas for how the site best be used for community benefit.

Overwhelming feedback suggests that the responders' first priority is open space (64%) as the most beneficial use of the site, followed by car parking (27%).

The most popular second choice for the site was for a community building (53%).

Preference for using the site for community benefit
Bayside City Council - 2021 Well Street Community Engagement
(Number and percent of respondents providing a response)

<i>Response</i>	<i>1st ranking</i>	<i>2nd ranking</i>	<i>3rd ranking</i>	<i>4th ranking</i>
Open space	64%	20%	10%	4%
Car parking	27%	15%	20%	44%
Community building	5%	53%	36%	5%
Affordable housing	4%	13%	34%	47%
Not stated	81	198	234	248
Total	619	619	619	619

- For the 386 respondents who ranked open space first, 65% ranked a community building as their second preference.
- For the 162 respondents who ranked car parking as their first choice, 58% ranked open space as their second choice.
- For the 32 respondents who ranked a community building as their first choice, 80% ranked open space as their second choice.
- For the 23 respondents who ranked affordable housing as their first choice, 48% ranked a community building their second choice and 43% ranked open space their second choice.

These results reinforce the view that the majority of survey respondents preferred that the site be used for open space, and for those who had a different first choice, most of those respondents preferred open space as their second choice for the site.

The following table provides a breakdown of the first choice for the site by the 619 respondents by gender, age, suburb of residence (including Bayside suburbs and all other suburbs), and relationship to the Wells Street / Church Street area.

First preference use for the site
Bayside City Council - 2021 Well Street Community Engagement
(Number and percent of respondents providing a response)

<i>Profile</i>	<i>Respondents</i>	<i>Open Space</i>	<i>Car parking</i>	<i>Community Building</i>	<i>Affordable housing</i>
<i>Gender</i>					
Male	218	57%	33%	5%	5%
Female	373	68%	23%	5%	3%
<i>Age structure</i>					
10 to 14 years	14	86%	0%	14%	0%
15 to 24 years	50	80%	4%	8%	8%
25 to 39 years	99	69%	18%	6%	7%
40 to 49 year	121	70%	23%	4%	3%
50 to 59 years	110	54%	35%	7%	4%
60 to 69 years	110	58%	36%	2%	4%
70 to 84 years	94	59%	35%	5%	1%
85 years and over	4	50%	50%	0%	0%
<i>Suburb of residence</i>					
Beaumaris	20	75%	20%	0%	5%
Brighton	340	64%	29%	5%	2%
Brighton East	71	69%	21%	6%	4%
Black Rock	15	80%	13%	0%	7%
Hampton	65	66%	15%	14%	5%
Hampton East	8	50%	25%	13%	13%
Highbury	8	62%	8%	0%	31%
Sandringham	23	52%	35%	4%	9%
Suburbs outside Bayside	38	42%	53%	3%	3%
<i>Connection to Wells / Church Streets</i>					
Live on Wells Street	33	79%	12%	9%	0%
Visit Church Street	357	68%	20%	6%	5%
Work on Church Street	53	26%	74%	0%	0%
Own Church St business	54	22%	74%	4%	0%

Attention is drawn to the fact that a majority of respondents of both genders, all age groups, and survey respondents who were residents of all suburbs located within Bayside had open space as their first choice for the use of the site for community benefit.

There were, however, three groups to report a majority first preference use for the site other than for open space as follows:

- Live outside the municipality (38 respondents) – 53% of these respondents preferred the site be used for car parking.
- Work on Church Street (53 respondents) – 74% of these respondents preferred the site be used for car parking.
- Own a Church Street business (54 respondents) – 74% of these respondents preferred the site be used for car parking.

Of the 36 participants providing Facebook comments and replies as part of the community engagement project, the preferred uses for the site were as follows:

- Passive open space uses (e.g., a pocket park) - 7 participants.
- Active open space uses (e.g., a variety of sports) - 5 participants
- Car parking - 4 participants.
- Community garden - 3 participants.
- Housing development - 3 participants
- Dog off-leash area – 2 participants
- Other uses - 4 participants
- Selling the land – 1 participant.
- Unrelated comments – 7 participants.

Of the five email submissions, four provided a first preference use for the site, with three preferring car parking and one preferring open space.

5.3.3 Preference for activities if the site was used for a pocket park

A key priority of Bayside's 2050 Vision is to provide more open space.

Respondents were therefore asked if the site was transformed to a pocket park, what would they like to be able to do there.

555 of the 619 survey respondents provided an answer to this question, at an average of approximately 1.5 ideas each.

By far the most common response was a park for relaxation, a space to sit, read, eat, enjoy the open space, with more than one-third (45%) of respondents.

Top 15 preferred activities if it was a pocket park
Bayside City Council - 2021 Well Street Community Engagement
(Number and percent of total respondents)

<i>Response</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Relaxation park / space to sit, read, eat / pocket park	276	45%
Children's playground / play equipment with seating	70	11%
Skate park	68	11%
Car park / underground car parking	64	10%
Community urban farm / garden	62	10%
Dog park / off-leash area / agility park	33	5%
Picnic space with amenities	23	4%
Bike jumps / tracks	17	3%
Location not suitable / too small / too busy area	15	2%
Open space for youth / teenagers to hang out	15	2%
Public art / sculpture	15	2%
Basketball court (incl. half court)	13	2%
No pocket park / open space	12	2%
Community space	10	2%
Other sports e.g. parkour, rock climbing	8	1%
All other responses	66	11%
Total responses	767	
<i>Respondents identifying at least one response</i>	555 (90%)	

A range of other activities and responses were provided by a up to 11% of survey respondents, including a children's playground / play equipment (11%), a skate park (11%), a car park or underground car park (10%), and a community garden / urban farm (10%).

These results confirm the importance of a passive open space function for the site for many respondents, although there was some support for active uses including a skate park, a dog park, and some other sporting activities.

There was some variation in the preferred activities nominated by respondents observed by the respondents' age structure, as outlined in the following table.

- Younger respondents (aged 10 to 24 years) were the most likely to want a skate park on the site, although it is noted that some younger and middle-aged adults (aged 25 to 49 years) also preferred this activity on the site.
- Older respondents, particularly those in their 60's were significantly more likely to want the open space for relaxation, a space to sit, read, eat, and similar activities.
- Older respondents (aged 50 years and over) were more likely to prefer use as a car park than younger respondents.

Top 15 preferred activities if it was a pocket park by age structure
Bayside City Council - 2021 Well Street Community Engagement
(Number and percent of total respondents)

Response	10 to 24 years	25 to 39 years	40 to 49 years	50 to 59 years	60 to 69 years	70 years and over
Relaxation park / space to sit, read, eat / pocket park	24%	39%	41%	42%	60%	53%
Children's playground / play equipment with seating	2%	18%	13%	11%	12%	8%
Skate park	47%	12%	13%	5%	2%	0%
Car park / underground car parking	0%	6%	7%	16%	12%	17%
Community urban farm / garden	3%	11%	12%	13%	12%	5%
Dog park / off-leash area / agility park	12%	8%	5%	8%	1%	1%
Picnic space with amenities	2%	2%	9%	6%	1%	1%
Bike jumps / tracks	8%	4%	5%	2%	0%	0%
Location not suitable / too small / too busy area	0%	3%	1%	4%	2%	4%
Open space for youth / teenagers to hang out	0%	2%	8%	2%	1%	0%
Public art / sculpture	0%	4%	2%	0%	4%	1%
Basketball court (incl. half court)	9%	4%	1%	0%	1%	1%
No pocket park / open space	0%	1%	0%	4%	3%	4%
Community space	0%	2%	3%	1%	1%	2%
Other sports e.g. parkour, rock climbing	8%	2%	0%	0%	1%	0%
All other responses	11%	6%	12%	11%	14%	12%
Total responses	82	124	167	141	144	109
<i>Respondents identifying at least one response</i>	<i>60 (91%)</i>	<i>88 (89%)</i>	<i>115 (91%)</i>	<i>99 (87%)</i>	<i>107 (95%)</i>	<i>86 (86%)</i>

5.3.4 Issues if the site was to become a pocket park

Of the 619 survey respondents, one-third (205 respondents) reported that they had concerns if the site was to become a pocket park.

It is noted, however, when interpreting the following table of results, that many of these survey respondents provided a further response which in fact highlighted that they preferred that the site be used for a park, and their concerns were around it being used for other purposes.

The most common concerns were that the site **should not** be used for a park and would in fact, be used for a car park. Eight percent of the total of 619 respondents outlined this concern. A further 5% simply outlined that they wanted the site used as a park.

The common concern about the site being used for a pocket park was that there was a perceived need for more car parking in the area (including underground or multi-level), with five percent of respondents outlining this concern.

A small number of survey respondents highlighted concerns about safety, security, and anti-social behaviour that might occur if the site was used for a pocket park, and a handful of survey respondents highlighted concerns if the site was used for active open space (including skating) or as a dog off-leash park.

Other issues to consider if site used as a pocket park
Bayside City Council - 2021 Well Street Community Engagement
(Number and percent of total respondents)

Response	2021	
	Number	Percent
No car parking / plenty available	52	8%
More car parking / underground / multi-level	31	5%
Open / green space / garden	23	4%
No building / housing / overdevelopment	16	3%
Safety / security / anti-social behaviour	14	2%
No asphalt / concrete	8	1%
No active space e.g. playground, skate etc	5	1%
No dog park / dog free area	5	1%
Noise / pollution from car park	5	1%
Skate park	5	1%
All other responses	74	12%
Total responses	238	
<i>Respondents identifying at least one response</i>	<i>201</i> <i>(98.0%)</i>	

These results clearly suggest that there was little significant concern expressed by survey respondents in relation to the site being used for a pocket park, although a small number were concerned that such a use would not help alleviate a perceived lack of car parking in the area.

5.3.5 Other issues that should be considered for this space

Respondents were asked if there was anything else that Council should consider for this space.

Approximately two-thirds (62%) of the survey respondents provided an average of a little more than one response each, with the top 13 categories of responses outlined in the following table.

The two most common responses related to a perceived need for more car parking, including either an underground or a multi-level car park (13%), and the perceived need for more open green space, including space with seating, tree cover, and similar (13%), or a skate park (7%).

Top 13 other things to consider for this space
Bayside City Council - 2021 Well Street Community Engagement
(Number and percent of total respondents)

<i>Response</i>	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>
More car parking / underground / multi-level	82	13%
Open / green space / garden with seating / tree cover	81	13%
Skate park	41	7%
No car park	21	3%
Affordable / emergency housing for poor	11	2%
Bike jumps / tracks	10	2%
Children's playground / play equipment	9	1%
Dog park / off-leash area / agility park	8	1%
Location not suitable / too small / too busy area	8	1%
Open space for events / displays / enter	8	1%
Public art / sculpture	8	1%
Safety / security / anti-social behaviour	8	1%
Sell the land and use funds for various	8	1%
All other aspects	161	26%
Total responses	464	
<i>Respondents identifying at least one response</i>	386 (62%)	

These results reflect the earlier questions, reinforcing the fact that many survey respondent prefer that this space be used for a park with open space and trees and greenery, whilst a smaller proportion highlight the need for more car parking.

5.4 Error corrections

Nil

6 Project evaluation

This Report has presented the findings from the analysis of the community feedback gathered from 7 October to 7 November 2021.

The community engagement consultation received a total of 689 responses, including 618 surveys completed via Have Your Say, one hard copy survey, 65 Facebook comments and replies, and five email submissions.

There was a total of 3,603 views of the Have Your Say page for the consultation, from 2,368 visits from 1,960 unique visitors, with 618 contributing by completing the survey.

The demographic profile of the survey respondents was slightly skewed towards older over younger respondents, female over male respondents, and focused on the local community (predominantly Brighton).

On average, survey respondents rated whether the site had the information they needed to provide feedback at 4.02 out of a potential five, with 71% rating the access to information at four or five out of five. A total of 46 of the 619 respondents (7.4%) rated how well they had the information necessary to provide feedback at less than three out of five.

The most common methods by which survey respondents became aware of the project were via social media (28.4%) and by a Have Your Say email invitation (25.9%).

Method of hearing the project
Bayside City Council - 2021 Well Street Community Engagement
(Number and percent of respondents providing a response)

<i>Method</i>	<i>2021</i>	
	<i>Number</i>	<i>Percent</i>
Social media	173	28.4%
Have Your Say email	158	25.9%
Word of mouth	95	15.6%
Bayside City Council's website	62	10.2%
Signage	60	9.8%
Flyer in letterbox	36	5.9%
Other	26	4.3%
Not stated	9	
Total	619	100%

The community engagement project was not a random sample survey of the community (including residents, workers, business owners, and visitors to the area), rather it was a self-selection consultation with a focus on registered Have Your Say participants.

Whilst bearing this important fact in mind, with the limitations that it places on the interpretation of the results, it is fair to report that these survey results are likely to be generally reflective of the views of the local community in relation to the proposed future use of 7 Wells Street.