

## What drives the CityVision plan?

Three key things drive this plan:

- the long-held desire to bring the city and the river together: a good city kisses its river;
- the desire to create an attractive and accessible place on the waters’ edge; and
- the desire to optimize the wonderful setting provided by the river front, nestling at the foot of Mount Eliza, at the doorstep of the City.

## Integrated, not competing: grand, not grandiose

The foreshore development should be a natural extension of the city centre, not an inward-looking competitor to it.

The notion of a critical mass of development at the waterfront is a myth. The waterfront will benefit from office development and apartments in close proximity, but not above.

The waterfront is a great place for a hotel and serviced apartments, great civic buildings like museums or opera houses, and of course, all the things that attract people and make for enjoyment, but major office and apartment buildings will just create congestion without adding to the buzz of the place.

“Critical mass” will be provided by the balanced nature of development, without overbearing high-rise buildings, as illustrated in the many current successful waterfront examples, including Barcelona, San Francisco, La Grande Motte, Opera House and Darling Harbour, and many others. If the Esplanade is to be utilised – and we think it should be – a large volume of development is still possible in close proximity while keeping to modest, compatible scale on the waterfront itself.

## Responding to the Landscape Setting and the Urban Form of the City

In terms of overall urban form and location of buildings, critical existing elements comprise the iconic view from Mount Eliza, including the sweep of the riverbank and the long view of the city centre, the view of Mount Eliza and views generally of the river from Riverside Drive and the spine of buildings along St George’s Terrace. New development, even if substantial, should aim to emphasise these values and not destroy them.

Our proposals expand the city fabric to the river from Supreme Court Gardens to the Convention Centre, but not beyond, with building heights in general dropping towards the river.

Extending the city grid at Howard Street and Sherwood Court, with new buildings lining Barrack and William Streets, provides a new riverside city park or “forum” at the old Esplanade, and allows traffic and pedestrian circulation to extend naturally from the city to the river.

We keep the sweep of Mounts Bay to the Narrows free of development, allowing the riverside environment to connect Mount Eliza to the river.

### **Extending William Street into the River and a site for an Iconic Building**

William Street – the main north-south spine of the city - extends into the river as a boardwalk, with a marina on its sheltered side, and a site for an iconic civic building on the Mount Eliza side – a perfect setting, comparable to the setting for Bilbao’s Guggenheim or Wellington’s Te Papa.

### **An Eco-Riverine Park between Mount Eliza and the River**

We retain and extend John Oldham’s world-famous landscape around the Freeway interchange, creating an eco-riverine parkland that connects visually, spiritually and physically with Kings Park.

### **Bringing the River to the City**

We propose a new water body, bringing the river into the Esplanade area, passing beneath Riverside Drive to join with the City.

### **Riverside Drive can live up to its name**

Riverside Drive was originally conceived as one of the great urban parkways of the world – extending from Burswood Island over the Causeway, along the City’s frontage, around Mounts Bay and Melville Water, around the Crawley and Dalkeith foreshores, all the way to Claremont. A big, great idea, and still valid.

The treatment of Riverside Drive is critical. It needs to maintain its traditional role of providing an important visual experience of the city and river.

Crossing the road is perceived as a deterrent to pedestrians, but it is not, if properly designed. Far from sinking the road, which in any case is not feasible, we propose extending the water beneath it, bringing the river and the city together in a further dimension, creating a feeling of ‘touching the water’ to passing motorists and giving new buildings on the Esplanade an immediate connection with the water.

### **Take the Concert Hall to the River, joining Supreme Court Gardens and Government House Gardens**

We agree with the City Council’s Concert Hall site proposals. Get rid of the surface car parks, extend Supreme Court Gardens and join them to Government House Gardens, creating a superb City Park, replete with heritage.

### **Open and Transparent Planning of the Project**

We love this great city of ours. And, like all lovers, we want the best for, and from, our beloved. So far, we haven’t got that. In fact, we have a long way yet to go.

CityVision rightly gave public praise to Landcorp at the beginning of this project, for its open and transparent consultative process. Sadly, it has been downhill from there, lapsing into the usual process of inviting public comment, but eschewing a genuine and continuing dialogue.

The next steps must involve open, transparent dialogue and planning, involving the community and the wealth of knowledge and talent that abounds in this place, to ensure the best for our city and its foreshore. This forum must not be the last of its kind.

We need to proceed as openly as possible. Landcorp, a developer with the agenda of a developer, albeit one owned by the government, must not have a monopoly on the design of a waterfront that belongs to all of us.

The changes that must be made to the recently published, and much criticised, plan, are too great not to be opened up to more public and independent expert scrutiny. The next version of the plan must be published as an evolving draft, not a final scheme, public dialogue and comment invoked, and a third Peer Design Review held. Further drafts should receive the same treatment, until we get it right. Political expediency has no part to play in this process.

We are all impatient for action, but we must take the time to get it right. We – and our children and grandchildren - will be living with the outcome for a long time to come.

CityVision

June 2008