



Claisebrook Cove Community Reference Group (CCCRG)

Meeting Minutes

Meeting Date	20/01/2026	Time	5:30pm – 7:30pm
Meeting Venue	Council House – Level 7 Meeting Room		
Topic / Meeting Name / Meeting Title	Claisebrook Cove Community Reference Group Meeting (CCCRG)		
Meeting Objective/s	Review and provide feedback on the updated draft plans for the Claisebrook Cove Revitalisation (Stage One), which will be presented at the meeting		
Facilitator	Andrew Watt - Consultant (City of Perth)		
Scribe / Minute Taker	Andrew Watt / Dana Salamon (City of Perth)		
Attendees	<u>CCG Members</u> Linley Jade Brow Ross Fitzgerald Christopher (Nobu) Jee Tze Hong Helen Kinsella Bob Kucera Ravi Mahato Robert Marshall Kara McPheat Paul Reid John Syme Keyon Yang	<u>City of Perth</u> Andrew Watt (Consultant) Felicity O'Neill (Project Manager) Craig Best (Alliance Manager) Dana Salamon (Stakeholder Engagement Officer)	
Apologies	Beth McDonald Peter Hayward Tara Monaghan		

MINUTES

1. Lighting

1.1 Strong themes were presented from last meeting:

- Need for a hierarchy of lighting.
- Lights must be controllable and appropriate to each space.
- Lighting should encourage activation but not anti-social behaviour.

1.2 Current status:

- Urban design layout is being firmed up.
- Electrical designers now running detailed lighting studies.
- No material to show yet; outcomes will be brought to next presentation.

2. Heritage Interpretation & Signage

- A heritage “layer” should be incorporated in new designs.
- Urban design team is doing an opportunity study:
 - Treating signage as a whole (wayfinding + heritage).
 - Previous group feedback did not support extensive regulatory signage; design should encourage correct behaviour. City looking to co-locate and / or integrate regulatory signage if it is required.
- Heritage and signage work is progressing on a different track/timeline and will return to the group when there is material worth reviewing.

3. Cyclists & Pedestrians

3.1 Key principles from previous meeting and consultation:

- Desire for separation of movement modes where possible.
- Pedestrian-only zones preferred on the southern edge of the lake (dining precinct).
- Use materials and finishes to:

- Slow speeds.
- Signal appropriate behaviour.
- Make pedestrian spaces “uncomfortable” for cyclists, rather than over-relying on signage.
- Support for minimal regulatory signage; behaviour to be led by design.

3.2 Updated Design:

- Primary cycle route on northern boardwalk; southern boardwalk as pedestrian / dining space.
- In-situ concrete “sweep” curve:
 - Cantilevered over the lake, guiding cyclists from the underpass to the northern boardwalk.
 - Noise concern: minimise “bikes on timber” by confining timber to middle section, further away from residential properties.
 - Western pedestrian bridge converted to concrete to encourage cyclist movement west to east to also use the northern route. Other pedestrian bridges retained as timber to signal a slower environment.
- Pinch points at entrances to southern boardwalk:
 - Achieved through integrated timber seating platforms around trees.
 - Aim: narrow the space, make it feel like a plaza where you sit and walk, discouraging cyclists from entering.
- Northern lawn:
 - New bridge connection proposed (offset rather than direct) to balance access and avoid interfering with potential performance use of the shelter/terracing.

3.3 Wheeled Usage survey (“Super Tuesday” 7–9am at underpass / Plain St):

- The survey covered Trafalgar Footbridge, Trafalgar Road/ Royal St, Shared path east of footbridge, underpass at Plain Street.
- In total 111 users were identified, of which 102 were bikes, ~9 scooters (~8% scooters).

- The peak usage period was 8.00- 8.15am where 18 cyclist/e-bikes/e-scooter users were identified at underpass at Plain Street.
- There was a strong male dominance.
- Comment: numbers not huge but still significant commuter use.

3.4 Discussion & Comments

General theme:

Broad support for separating cyclists from the southern dining edge, but concern that the proposed concrete curve and surface treatment may unintentionally create a high-speed bike path.

Concerns:

- A visually continuous, smoother concrete strip through the tunnel and around the lake “looks like a bike path” and will encourage speed.
- Comparison to Elizabeth Quay where rough, mixed materials slow cyclists; one person argued similar approach is needed here.
- Suggested that if you want to go fast, cyclists should use Royal Street or future east-west links, not the cove. NOTE: A member who cycles in the precinct advised cycling on Royal was not safe.
- Others supported that material change alone (smooth vs rough) may be enough to signal a “cycleway” and invite faster riding, especially for e-bikes / e-scooters.

Counter-points / support/ nuance:

- Support proposed plan to make cyclists feel invited to use the northern path.
- Don’t agree that the material is an invitation to speed as the turning circle of the curve, narrow tunnels and other features all discourage speeding.
- If people are so scared of cyclists – then why not cut it off all together?
- Ask WHY – cyclists use this route? Where they travel from and where they travel to?
- This is the missing link between the cycle path from Bayswater/River to the City – provide an alternative.
- Not providing a legible cyclist route may result in riders weaving through pedestrians in the busiest zones, which is more dangerous.
- Little chance of river collision with River East side

- The aim is not a PSP (no red asphalt, no dashed lane lines) but a “least bad” route that manages the cyclists who already use the space.
- Consider diverting the water underneath the path and back – use a small creek to divide from the tunnel east entrance at the Royal.

Surface treatment discussion:

- Avoiding red asphalt and explicit cycle lane markings.
- Proposal to:
 - Use urban stone or similar pavers consistent with the rest of the precinct, potentially with pattern / colour variation to suggest the curve without signaling a formal bike lane.
 - Consider less rideable concrete finishes (e.g. exposed aggregate, broom-finished) so it is smoother than timber but not “premium” PSP-like.
- Access & Inclusion Advisory Committee feedback:
 - Strongly opposed cobbles, citing difficulties for wheelchair users and slip risk when wet.
 - Cobbles rejected as a speed-control tool.

Tunnel treatment & separation:

- Question raised: is there any demarcation in the tunnel (Plain St underpass)?
- Response:
 - Concrete continues through the tunnel on one side, with paving on the other to create some separation.
- Suggestions:
 - Extend timber deck into the tunnel on the southern/pedestrian side so pedestrians “start” on timber and continue south; cyclists naturally prefer concrete.
 - Consider pavement markings or subtle visual cues if intuitive separation isn’t enough.

Pinch points & physical barriers:

- Strong support for pinch points (especially where paths meet near dining and play space) to force slow cycling.

- Still not supportive of signage and physical barriers other than pinch points
- Ideas:
 - Sculptural seating / planters that narrow paths and function as roundabout-like elements to:
 - Force cyclists to deviate and slow.
 - Get pedestrians to look before stepping out.
 - Potential low-level barriers or steps as deterrents to riding in some zones, balanced with wheelchair accessibility.

Southern boardwalk & businesses:

- Several members emphasised:
 - Priority is a high-quality pedestrian / alfresco precinct on the southern edge.
 - Extend or visually continue timber boardwalk treatment close to businesses, even if technical constraints (tree roots, levels) mean full timber can't reach thresholds.
 - Encourage outdoor dining to push out towards the lake, naturally discouraging cycling and drawing people through to support local businesses.
 - One example cited: existing separation success near Partisan/Toast, where cyclists rarely ride through top terrace areas.

Safety for children near the play space:

- Concern that:
 - Kids moving between playground and lake may inadvertently step onto the main cycle path.
 - The area is already activity-rich; with added play elements, pedestrian volumes may increase.
- Responses:
 - Northern route is intended as least uncomfortable route for cyclists, not the creation of a PSP, speed and volume of cyclists is not intended to increase.
 - Use of pinch points, material changes, and careful alignment around the play space proposed to reduce conflict.

Future broader cycle network context:

- City staff advised:
 - A \$3m project (city + DoT) is imminent to improve the commuter cycle link between Matagarup Bridge and the rail crossing at Moore Street, primarily via Wittenoom St / Nile St, not Royal St.
 - This should reduce pressure for high-speed east-west commuting through the cove itself.

4. Play Space & Intergenerational Use

4.1 Design Presented

Existing concept (from previous meeting):

- Nature-based play area (small-scale, active play).
- Picnic / BBQ area adjacent.
- Timber terraced seating into the lawn.

Refinements since last meeting:

- Following Access & Inclusion feedback:
 - Some shelters now have hardstand for wheelchair access.
- Updated plan:
 - Shorten some terraced timber seating and add a small retaining wall to:
 - Provide noise buffer from Brook Street.
 - Create a separate zone for resistance / exercise equipment targeted at older users.
- Example equipment options shown:
 - Low-impact resistance & balance equipment designed for seniors but usable by all.
 - More specialised therapeutic circuit equipment (European examples) which:
 - Is highly senior-targeted.
 - Requires power and is much more expensive (e.g. ~\$30–40k per item).

4.2 Discussion & Comments

Overall character & scale:

- Strong support for:
 - Nature-based, small-scale play that fits the local context (no “destination” playground).
 - Recognising local constraints: no toilets, no large car park, so avoid Wellington Square-scale draws.
 - Making the space feel more “Australian” rather than “Little Britain”:
 - Use native planting, natural materials, and a rougher, more organic feel.
 - Desire for visual/planting continuity with Wellington Square, Victoria Gardens, and recent native corridor plantings on Thomas St and around the CBD.

Playground Equipment

- Unanimous support for the proposed nature play elements proposed for the play space.
- Majority state that children’s play elements are the primary priority over resistance equipment.

Resistance / exercise equipment – necessity & location:

- Many members questioned whether resistance equipment is needed, with little support for its provision:
 - Area is small and already busy with play, BBQs and circulation.
 - Surrounding precinct already has gyms, Tai Chi sessions, and other outdoor exercise equipment along the riverside / other parks.
 - Therapy equipment will likely reduce usage.
 - Concern that bold, bright equipment (e.g. large green units) will attract kids more than seniors and clash visually with nature-based play.
 - Some noted their own or observed behaviour: most people do not use such equipment regularly even where provided.
- Several people suggested:

- Majority were not supportive of the resistance equipment as it is a high cost for what could be minimal use. If included, it should be minimal, low-key items only (e.g. a chin-up bar, bench for sit-ups).
- Ideally separated from the main children's play to avoid:
 - Shirtless, sweating adult exercise taking place right beside a young children's area.
 - Children climbing on equipment intended for seniors.
- A few members were open or mildly supportive:
 - Some older residents might appreciate local low-impact equipment.
 - Could support intergenerational use if carefully designed and not dominant.
- Cost considerations:
 - Basic cluster (e.g. simpler senior-friendly set) might be \$10–15k.
 - “Smart” or specialist imported equipment could be \$30–40k per piece – not favoured by the group.

Shading, noise, and landscape buffering:

- Strong support to:
 - Increase shade (mature trees or large canopy species) particularly around grassy picnic and play areas, reflecting how cool existing shaded stretches feel compared with exposed ones.
 - Use dense shrubs / plantings and/or low walls along Brook Street and adjacent roads to:
 - Reduce traffic noise.
 - Create a sense of an “enclave” similar to parts of Queens Gardens or Victoria Gardens.
- Specific suggestions:
 - Develop the upper green strip along the road into a substantial garden rather than left as open grass.
 - Consider a limestone wall at footpath level:
 - Height around 1–1.2 m, will need to be balanced with sight lines and Crime Prevention and Through Environmental Design (CPTED) principles

- Double as seating and a storytelling surface (plaques for heritage narratives).
- Planting in front to soften it and improve acoustics.
- Recognise that this, combined with timber platforms and walling near the playground, would significantly improve amenity and safety (children less visually and physically exposed to road).

Usage:

- Park should primarily serve local residents and businesses, not become another “Kings Park”.
- Facilities should be modest but high-quality, supporting everyday local use and nearby hospitality.

5. Lake, Fountains, Cascading Stream & Water Systems

5.1 Technical Context

Lake depth & irrigation role:

- Lake to be increased from ~1 m to ~3 m depth:
 - To improve water quality and reduce biological growth.
 - To increase water storage capacity for irrigation.
- Current aerator fountains:
 - At end of life; require divers to service in-lake pumps.
 - Deeper lake means existing fountains do not provide effective deep aeration (only move surface water).
- Consultant recommendation:
 - Use submerged or surface bubblers for aeration and mixing.
 - Consider fountains as decorative only, not for functional aeration.

- Water source & treatment:
 - Main source: stormwater off-take from Claisebrook Main Drain, via gross pollutant traps and CDU units, then into the lake.
 - Water for the Greenway stream will be treated to a higher standard (via UV) as a “play contact” water.
 - Lake water itself remains an uncontrolled body and cannot realistically achieve more than medium exposure due to bird life and open conditions.

Cascading water feature to the cove:

- Existing situation:
 - Water only flows when the lake overflows the weir, which is currently rare (mainly large winter events).
 - Long summer periods with no flow, resulting in mould, odour and poor visual amenity.
- Options presented:
 1. Dry creek bed:
 - Redesign the channel as a naturalised dry creek, consistent with upstream Greenway planting/boulders.
 - Only flows during occasional large events.
 - No closed-loop pumping (avoids ongoing water & energy use).
 2. Continuous flow:
 - Tee off existing stormwater/lake system and pump water into the top of the cascade.
 - Collect water downstream and pump back up in a closed loop.
 - Achieves continuous visual/sound amenity but has energy and water loss (evaporation) implications.
- Technical note:
 - A small trickle (like current irrigation off-take) is insufficient; modelling suggests ~5 L/s is needed for acceptable visual and cleanliness outcomes, which accumulates in water and energy cost.

5.2 Fountain in the Lake – Discussion

Provision of a fountain:

- Multiple members:
 - See the fountain as an important, unique, visual and acoustic amenity.
 - Believe it can become a feature / identity marker for Claisebrook.
 - Pointed to European and UK cities where feature fountains are central civic attractions.
- Some other members:
 - Is this the place for the City of Perth to invest in a statement art installation for what is small neighbourhood park – suggest not.
 - Don't think it is value for money and is a lesser priority than water quality and ecology investments
- Suggestions:
 - Treat fountain as a public art opportunity, not just a utilitarian spout:
 - Potential commissioning under Percent for Art funding.
 - Reference examples such as Kings Cross fountains, LED-lit sculptural works, or the swan fountain at Crown.
 - Integrate lighting for night-time presence; possibly modestly choreographed water + light sequences. (NOTE: Officers advised that electrification will not be possible)
 - Possibly cascading over rocks; vegetated rain garden or other materials
- Water Quality & Ecology Priority
 - Several members emphasised that water quality & ecology must remain top priority:
 - Subsurface aeration and treatment must be designed first.
 - Fountain to sit on top of a robust water quality strategy, not substitute for it.
 - Some health concerns raised about aerosolised droplets from untreated lake water; officers noted:

- Fountain scale will likely need to be smaller than current to comply with exposure standards.

Priorities if budget is constrained:

- A number of members explicitly ranked the priorities as being:
 1. Water quality & environmental health (including bird life, breeding habitat).
 2. Functioning stream / cascades that tell the heritage story.
 3. Fountain as a desirable but secondary element.

5.3 Cascading Stream / Heritage of Claisebrook – Discussion

Heritage significance:

- Several members (particularly heritage-focused):
 - Emphasised that the stream and cascade represent Claisebrook / “Clause Brook”, historically an important watercourse.
 - Argued that the existing sequence of features – source, weeping walls, punched-through paving, tea tree pools, lake, and cascade – is a coherent designed narrative of water “emerging” through the city.
 - Concerned that turning lower reaches into a permanently dry feature would:
 - Erode the central heritage element of the place.
 - Undermine earlier significant design work and associated Aboriginal and colonial narratives.
- Some members believed Claisebrook was historically a permanent creek, others cited sources describing it as an ephemeral watercourse (i.e. Ephemeral streams are water courses that flow only for short periods, typically after rainfall or during wet seasons. They do not have continuous water flow and may remain dry for most of the year) Hence remaining dry at times during the year is historically correct.
 - Some members supported the ephemeral creek bed approach to lower cost and increase sustainable benefits, with improved environmental impacts being their priority.
 - There was agreement that the City should check historical and Indigenous records for clarity and help decision making.

Differing views on continuous vs intermittent water:

1. *In favour of keeping water flowing (higher heritage weight):*

- Arguments:
 - Continuous flow (or at least frequent flow) is vital to “celebrate Claisebrook” and maintain the designed narrative.
 - Children and families enjoy interacting with running water near the cove; it is part of the charm and identity of the area.
 - Drying it out is seen as a backwards step and part of a wider pattern of heritage erosion.
 - Preference, if budget forced choices:
 - Keep the creek flowing first, then consider fountain; some would sacrifice fountain or even playground enhancements before losing the stream.
- Some members suggested:
 - Investigating lowering the weir slightly to allow more regular flushing from tide events.
 - Ensuring any redesign of downstream channel continues the naturalistic, seepage-like aesthetic found upstream.

2. *Open to / supportive of a dry creek bed (balancing sustainability):*

- Arguments:
 - A well-designed dry creek:
 - Can be strongly Australian in character.
 - Offers habitat opportunities (e.g. for frogs, native planting) and playful stepping-stone / exploration value.
 - Reflects the ephemeral nature of many Australian waterways and possibly of pre-colonial Claisebrook itself.
 - Avoids substantial ongoing energy and water consumption from pumping, aligning better with City sustainability goals.
- Other comments:

- If the visual design is high-quality and the creek still flows during major events, the heritage story could be retained through interpretation, planting and form rather than constant water.
- Some would prefer money saved on pumping to be spent on public art, planting and local amenity.

Biodiversity & health considerations:

- Points raised:
 - Flowing water provides habitat for water birds; some members worried that drying the cascade would remove a used habitat.
 - Others emphasised the need to prevent stagnant or mouldy water conditions for both health and aesthetics.
 - City officers confirmed:
 - Improved depth and subsurface aerators will address lake stratification and odour.
 - Greenway stream water will be treated to a safer standard for children's contact.

Relative priority: stream vs fountain (if trade-off required):

- Multiple members clearly stated:
 - If forced to choose, keep the Claisebrook stream/cascade functioning over having a large decorative fountain.
 - Others were open to a smaller fountain + dry creek compromise but still stressed that water quality and heritage interpretation must not be compromised.

6. Other Business

6.1 Lighting on Brook Street (between the lake and Royal Street):

- A member reported this stretch has been in total darkness for years.
- Officers clarified:
 - Responsibility sits with Western Power, not Main Roads.

- A fault had been logged; members were encouraged to also submit reports via Western Power's online map for redundancy.

5.2 Solar & sustainability opportunities:

- Question about using solar panels on wider traffic islands / bridge structures to:
 - Power auxiliary pumps and lighting associated with the lake and streams.
- Response:
 - Project already aims to maximally integrate **solar** where feasible.
 - Further investigation to align technical constraints and funding will be undertaken.

7. Next Steps & Actions

7.1 Consultant team to:

- Integrate feedback on cycle route materials, pinch points, tunnel treatment and separation strategy.
- Refine play space to prioritise nature-based elements, shading, landscape buffering and possibly minimal or no resistance equipment.
- Develop options for:
 - Lake fountain (as decorative art piece) consistent with water quality standards.
 - Cascading stream solutions (continuous flow vs dry creek bed) including sustainability and cost implications.
- Progress design towards 80% submission, including updated cost estimates.
- The City to check historical and Indigenous records for clarity on whether the stream was historically ephemeral or not.

7.2 Next meeting (Tuesday 17 March 2026 – 5:30pm to 7:30pm)

- Agenda to be provided in advance.

7.3 Minutes & scheduling:

- Minutes of this meeting to be circulated.
- A calendar placeholder to be sent for the next Community Reference Group meeting.