

Community Panel Workshop Two

Central to Eveleigh

Urban Transformation and Transport Program

AUGUST 2015

ISSUED FOR:COMMUNITY ISSUE DATE:SEPTEMBER 2015 DISTRIBUTION:WEB AND EMAIL TO PANEL MEMBERS ISSUED AND AUTHORISED BY: URBANGROWTH NSW





The Central to Eveleigh team is developing a draft urban transformation strategy that will outline how a vision for the Central to Eveleigh area can progressively be achieved over the short, medium and long term.

On the 15 August 2015, UrbanGrowth NSW held a workshop for the community panel, to discuss spatial plans and implementation plans associated with the urban transformation strategy. The workshop was the second time the community panel has met, since it was established in April. Given the resounding in-principle community support for the vision and the key moves, the focus of the workshop was on aspects of implementation.

The panel is one part of a larger program of community engagement activities being undertaken to inform preparation of the urban transformation strategy.

This summary report provides an outline of the workshop proceedings and outcomes.

Background to community panel

The community panel is a group of nearly 40 residents who live around the Central to Eveleigh corridor. Panel members are everyday residents who were selected at random. The Central to Eveleigh team will meet with the panel several times during the preparation of the urban transformation strategy.

Over time, panel members will develop in-depth knowledge of planning concepts and be able to provide considered feedback about planning issues that the project team can then explore with the wider community.

Our aim is for the group to be broadly representative of people who live in the local community.

The panel is one of a range of community engagement activities being undertaken. While not a decision making body, they provide valuable feedback to the project team during the planning process.

Workshop agenda

The workshop agenda covered:

- Welcome and introductions (group activity)
- Report back and recap on vision and key moves (presentation)
- Community stakeholder groups (quick presentations and round-robin group discussions)
- Tradeoffs and spatial plans strategies for transformation (presentation and group work)
- Draft implementation plans i) community facilities, ii) open space, iii) arts, culture and heritage* (presentation and group work).

*Significant work is underway to prepare other implementations plans and strategies relating to economics, housing diversity and transport. Once this work has progressed it will be presented to the panel for discussion.

A copy of the agenda is attached in Appendix 1.



Activity: Key take-outs

The warm up activity enabled panel members to get reacquainted and to meet new members. Panel members discussed the most significant thing 'take-out' from their first meeting. The activity identified:

• The need for social and physical infrastructure, particularly transport to be delivered upfront to support new development.

A significant effort was made to recruit people following the first meeting, as a number of demographics were underrepresented. Several new members joined the panel for the first time, including three people who lived around the northern end of the corridor (around Central Station), several who were unable to attend the first meeting and a younger person. Several other younger people who had committed to participate did not attend.

Presentation: Project context

Troy Daly from UrbanGrowth NSW recapped the vision and key moves to provide context for the discussion. He reiterated that broad support was received from the community panel and the wider community for these, but acknowledged the Panel's request at the first meeting for more detailed understanding of how the moves would be implemented to realise the vision.



Presentation and discussion

Representatives from four local community interest groups provided a short presentation to share their thoughts on priority issues for urban transformation and planning. The following people presented:

- Darren Jenkins, Friends of Erskineville
- Gary Speechley, Alexandria Resident Action Group
- Geoff Turnbull, Redwatch
- Jeanette Brokman, Chippendale Residents Interest Group.

Key points from the presentations were for the panel members to:

- Be aware of vital infrastructure needs, with references to train and bus services, power, sewerage, drainage services, school facilities and ensure infrastructure is scalable, adaptable and maintainable
- Contribute to a long term vision that will stand the test of time 100 years
- Seek help to understand complexity of information and not to rely on UrbanGrowth NSW's information alone and get independent advice
- Not be afraid to challenge assumptions and consider alternatives
- Be aware of the history of planning in the area with five different organisations all having played a role over last 12 years
- Recognise that 6,000 7,000 public housing dwellings may be renewed and currently support people with high needs
- Understand the concerns about the potential sale of ATP and the risk that its technology and innovation focus will be compromised and may end up being residential if developers fail to deliver the vision for a technology hub
- Consider opportunities to be gateway to Sydney, green, bold, sustainable, beautiful and to bring water to the area to connect to the harbour
- Examine areas such as Ashmore in Erskineville and Green Square as being areas where infrastructure has not been planned to support growth
- Be aware of the difficulty in ensuring and measuring design excellence and architectural innovation to contribute to healthy, living, flourishing, sustainable communities.
- Consider of impacts of density on open space overshadowing and wind tunnels etc
- Beware of the future potential of privatisation of roads and open space in developments.

They also raised that the Panel had a role in:

- Helping UrbanGrowth NSW get the plans right upfront the foundation for change
- Establish a clearer focus and vision
- Seeing that heritage was an asset not liability in this area

In addition Janette Brokman also invited the Panel to visit a new independent Central to Eveleigh information page on Facebook that she had established.

Following the presentations, community group representatives participated in a round-robin discussion so members of the community panel could ask questions and discuss issues openly.

Copies of presentations are attached.

Activity: Feedback on spatial plans

Troy Daly presented how the vision and key moves had been translated into spatial plans as a basis for discussion. Panel members then critiqued the plans to provide feedback.

The general feedback on the spatial plans was that they were hard to understand. The following comments were made about the format of the plans:

- Include context markers to enable orientation:
 - Identify key roads (e.g. Cleveland Street, King Street, Wilson Street)
 - Identify key destinations/Iandmarks (Broadway Shopping Centre, The Block, ATP)
- Macdonaldtown Station should be marked on all maps
- Potential new stations should not be marked the same as existing stations
- Existing and proposed parks and open spaces should not be marked the same
- Include a north arrow on all maps
- Include more legends
- Include more 3D diagrams
- Ensure maps are to scale or indicate if they are not
- Show more detail at the precinct scale to provide a more realistic understanding
- Heights map should include upper height limit (i.e. 18 33 storeys) because just indicating 18+ storeys does not give a clear indication
- Maps should show medium term development potential as well as long term development potential to indicate the likely progression of transformation
- Maps do not translate on the ground.

The following was discussed about the specifics of draft plans:

- Multiple 18+ storey buildings around Macdonaldtown Station is not sound the skinny one-way roads cannot cope, area is not accessible, the safety and practicality of so much density in this location is questionable
- Planning needed to consider and understand major traffic movements
- Need to understand the location and capacity of primary and high schools and afterschool care the capacity of education facilities not apparent
- Need to understand how many children live in Central park and where they go to school
- Existing towers at Waterloo need to change as they are not good places to live

- Need to engage with Sydney University to activate street frontages in Darlington and ensure safety at night
- Need better links to Seymour Centre
- Concern about overshadowing from tall buildings on eastern side of Central to adjoining lower scale buildings and open space, including Price Alfred Park. Proximity of high rise buildings to open space is unclear – 3D mapping will give a better impression of overshadowing. Need 3D models to show whether buildings will overshadow public spaces
- Maps highlight major built form change to some areas that are currently predominantly two storey terraces 'frightening', 'crazy'
- Can not see much green space at southern end of the corridor
- Need to understand treatment of heritage, beyond proposals for adaptive reuse of main buildings. The area has a heritage 'vibe' and it is not clear how this will translate given the scale of change shown on maps
- Need to understand the impact new growth will have on services at Erskineville Station, especially given the metro
- Public transport improvements must be delivered first, before new development. Need to understand the capacity of transport infrastructure trains and roads
- Capacity of stormwater infrastructure
- Integration with neighbouring areas needs to be more articulated and visible. Transition of height along Railway Parade is not clear.
- Need to provide context of change on adjoining areas i.e. what does the change look like next to Surry Hills etc
- Need to understand the cumulative impact and projections for growth when plans for Central to Eveleigh are placed in context of long term plan for the whole inner west. Growth projections need to be articulated within the context of the Sydney Metropolitan Strategy
- Concerned outcomes will be compromised by future changes of government
- Need to understand why growth and change has to be so intense in one part of Sydney felt the capacity of the corridor is subjective
- Preservation of heritage and iconic buildings is very important
- The emphasis on residential use which will impact roads, schools etc
- Commercial space is limited job creation, employment clusters need to be more apparent on the maps
- Existing land use not easily recognisable hard to imagine the before and after
- The intensity of activity is confronting
- Not clear why so much height is needed need information on where demand is coming from

Activity: Implementation Plans

Summaries of draft implementation plans were presented to provide an outline of the principles and targets identified to support delivery of the vision:

- Kerrie Symonds community facilities
- David Apostpolidis open space implementation plan
- Vanessa Gordon arts, culture and heritage.

Panel members then discussed the strengths and weaknesses of the plans and identified gaps or ideas for consideration. They also were provided with roles to help critique the plans from the perspective of different demographic groups within the community, e.g. older people, people from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds, students. Appendix 2 includes the transcripts of the comments related to needs of specific demographic groups.

Implementation Plan: Community facilities

Strengths

- Support proposal for 9-5 new childcare centres there is a real demand for childcare in the area
- Like community facilities in centre of each place local scale facilities are better than district scale because they are more accessible
- Support for funding toward the City of Sydney libraries
- Like the idea for shared facilities support proposal for multi-use/multi-purpose facilities for multiple groups.

Weaknesses

- Concern about capacity of health and education facilities feeling that the hospitals and schools are full.
- View that decisions about capacity of facilities are subjective and concern that quality of
 education will not be upheld if schools are overcapacity. Need a clear understanding of
 how facilities can and will be expanded, including the temporary arrangements during
 building works i.e. arrangements for students when construction to develop high rise
 schools is occurring
- Question accuracy of the assumption that only 50% of children will require childcare given the number of working families it seems low
- Need clarity of ongoing funding for maintenance of facilities and programs. Also need clarity on funding when existing cuts are resulting in services being scaled back. It is not clear how funds will be provided to expand services and deliver new facilities
- Need to ensure before and after school care is considered
- Need to ensure that all community facilities are deigned to look like they are open and accessible
- Concern that there is a risk that funds could be siphoned off to consolidated state revenue and not used to deliver community facilities and services cynicism
- Need clarity on use or purpose of community centre/cultural centres
- Concern that sporting facilities are lacking need to ensure sports facilities are considered tennis courts, swimming pools etc.

Gaps

- Facilities needed for aged care and aging population eg. Nursing homes/ assisted living aging at home is supported but it is important to recognise it is not always possible; housing diversity must include nursing homes and aged care facilities
- New developments need apartments designed for all universal design older people to look after themselves. View that universal design can impact development feasibility and even if a proportion of all new apartments meet universal design guidelines there is no guarantee they will be available for those that need them. There is a need to ensure funding provision for apartments to be modified eg. developer puts funding aside for future modification of apartments
- Need to balance needs of high need communities and affluent communities.

Suggestions

- Recognise that community facilities enable community interaction which helps create a strong sense of community and place.
- Recognise childcare centres need open space they cannot all be new centres in high rise towers
- Locate community facilities so they are easily accessible by public transport
- Consider transition to digital technologies in provision/ upgrade of libraries and facilities
- Improve training and access for older residents if emphasis is placed on digital technologies
- Locate childcare centres close to places of work
- Enable shared use of school facilities
- Consider specialty community facilities with different uses, rather than generic multi-use facilities in each neighbourhood
- Ensure facilities are open and accessible to all consider UrbanGrowth NSW managing instead of council and ensure they are built and operated so they don't feel like they belonging only for the use of residents to the building they are in, but for everyone
- Central Park (when it was there) and Pine Street noted as good examples of facilities
- Link community facilities to existing community groups and NGOs with experience and skills.

Implementation Plan: Open space

Strengths

- Like idea of well designed parks to cater for multiple users
- Support the idea of pedestrian and cycling links taking precedence
- Like identity of spaces
- Support idea of improving access to parks within walking distance for everyone
- Support open spaces to bring in wildlife to the city
- Support retention and upgrade of existing assets
- Support plans to renew South Rotary Park because it is underutilised and not well known
- Like the hierarchy of spaces the 'heart' of parks with community facilities.

Weaknesses

- Concern about potentially prohibited uses limiting enjoyment of open space. Most parks currently have signs prohibiting flexible use e.g. no skateboarding, spaces need to enable flexible use. Some signs are council and some are private
- Concern that there is not enough new open space more open space needs to be identified
- It is not clear how much new space is being added or whether the proposal is simply changing the configuration of the existing open space.

Gaps

- Need toilets to be provided at parks
- Need more sporting fields including for school use
- Need clarity on whether developer contributions being collected are being used or whether contributions are being stockpiled and also clarity on how efficiently contributions are being targeted at improving outcomes at the local level or whether they are being used for city-wide projects. The potential for contributions to not benefit local areas will be higher if councils amalgamate.
- Need to recognise the role of wildlife, biodiversity, environmental benefits and impact of development on wildlife
- Opportunities for bridging across the rail corridor to provide open space need to be considered.

Suggestions

- Parks connected to community centres need to be designed to ensure they provide soft and hard spaces not all hard
- Consider dog friendly parks (including potential conflicts between off leash areas, BBQs and playgrounds)
- Consider safety of off leash areas and children's playgrounds need to be semi-enclosed
- Consider more community gardens
- Consider skateboard parks
- Ensure spaces do not attract feral animals and rats
- Promote use of underutilised open space in the area, including spaces at Australian Technology Park and University of Sydney work with university and ATP to encourage public access
- Consider reducing proposed building density and increasing open space it is critical not feasible to go higher than proposed, but the projected population is not yet fixed and there is opportunity to reduce densities to ensure a more liveable outcome for all. View that the area is already taking more than its fair share of growth and that more open space than proposed is needed to ensure quality of life for existing and new residents
- Need to define open space and how it differs from green space and public/private open space. Confirm whether public open space is land that is simply open and visible
- If open spaces can enhance the quality of the built environment parks designed with a view to complement built form will help people feel more comfortable with the plan
- Consider improving connections and smart infrastructure to utilise existing open space assets better.

Implementation Plan: Arts, culture and heritage

Strengths

- Support recognition of existing cultural strengths and building on existing arts and heritage assets
- The outline of initiatives had rich content and was well considered
- Support each little hub having a statement piece of art/offering
- Like proposed embedded requirements for developers to add to art and cultural landscape
- Recognition of Aboriginal heritage and contributing to the Eora journey
- Like proposal to maintaining heritage aesthetics of area.

Weaknesses

- Funding for provision and for maintenance of arts and cultural initiatives not clear ongoing enrichment, maintenance and sustainability of public art and cultural programs/facilities who is responsible, particularly if councils amalgamate
- Need to specifically address how to mitigate impact of gentrification loss of trend setters and young people due to housing affordability
- Loss of anchor institution nearby e.g. Powerhouse Museum.

Gaps

- Multiple use of facilities is important- different groups/users
- CALD groups often interact in their own circles/facilities Chinese culture not well known in Alexandria temple/ market gardens and needs to be celebrated
- Affordability and equity is not recognised interesting artistic people can no longer afford to be here. Need to address how to save spaces for these city makers in the area so they can continue to underpin the cultural base of the area.

Suggestions

- Italian/ Greek/ Lebanese waves of immigration have added to our culture and can be better recognised
- Green bans/rent strikes working class culture and history could be included in the heritage themes and better documented for future generations
- Plan smaller local community facilities that are accessible, not large regional ones that can become inaccessible
- Utilise existing assets better and enable use during day and night
- Need to ensure arts and cultural opportunities are accessible for everyone in terms of cost and safe access
- Need more space for local artists to do their creative work and also more opportunities for local residents to participate in artistic classes/pursuits eg. Greenland developers
- Improve opportunities to access heritage and find community facilities -including private way finding such as apps
- Engage the indigenous community to share their creativity encouraging participation
- Provide spaces with flexibility to allow for popups, galleries
- More grants systems and sponsorships.

Feedback from panel

Feedback from panel members indicates that they enjoyed the workshop, found it interesting and felt it was well organised. Many members identified that they enjoyed hearing from the community stakeholder groups and the opportunity to review more detailed maps.

Several members reiterated their concern for the proposed heights and densities. While others were more able to contemplate trade-offs associated with proposed densities almost all members identified the need for transport plans to be discussed to help them understand the potential impact of growth on traffic flow and public transport services. The need for integrated land use and infrastructure (particularly transport) planning was a key point panel members consistently reinforced throughout the workshop. Additional information requested by the panel included:

- Transport modelling and transport plans
- Infrastructure plans particularly schools
- 3D drawings, more detailed maps and fly throughs at a precinct scale
- Flowchart of the planning process showing role of developers and land and environment court and other agencies
- Detail about how feedback from the panel is considered through the planning process.

While a number of members appreciated the shorter workshop duration, multiple members noted that they didn't feel there was enough time for review and detailed discussion. Members had mixed preferences about future workshops being held on weekday evenings or during the day on weekends. The need to provide sufficient advance notice of the next workshop date was agreed.

Some members requested more vegetarian food and more active facilitation of small group discussions to ensure equal participation.

Appendix 1 – Agenda

Role/Perspective	Community Facilities	Open Space	Arts, culture and heritage
Person of culturally and linguistically diverse background	Education of what is available regarding facilities Access to interpreters Availability of transport Friendship groups where stories can be shared Mentoring within the community eg. within street, older with younger, Anglo with non-English background residents	Availability of open space Available facilities for all ages Safety awareness within open space Signage in various languages	Invitation to facilities cultural/ arts activities Access to heritage/ stories of previous people of same culture Encouragement and support to share cultural background
	Connect to local community through these facilities		
	Suitable meeting places Schools for culturally diverse inclusiveness - different religions Community access + info in different languages	Suitability to other cultural practices eg. Drinking in public places For family oriented activities Safety issues	To preserve heritage façade so that people can find out/ take pride
Indigenous Person	24/7 use of school facilities <u>mentor</u> by grandparents and others	Community gardens Accommodate local interests for recreation and sport - skateboards. Identification of what is Available for public use of parks	Encourage participation of local communities - more cultural grants and sponsorship from developers incorporated in agreement as part of infrastructure
			Different focus on cultural communities in each area Integrated in to whole environment Employ a curator to run it
	Question need for so many community facilities	Needs to be safe and community friendly	Indigenous should be catered for in Eveleigh Street - pop up notice boards/ statues at places of historic events
Person with a disability	More classrooms at existing schools Upgraded medical facility in Redfern Childcare - 5/9 centres Community centres - Nth Eveleigh, Sth Eveleigh, Waterloo	Ramps within park to be able access to different areas if wheelchair bound Type of equipment if children have disability	Accessibility Provision of facilities to enjoy cultural opportunities by blind people - so access to verbal descriptions/ talking explanations
Older person	Worried about lack of aged medical facilities and accessibility	Needs to be close and longer walks	Historical focus on local style

Role/Perspective	Community Facilities	Open Space	Arts, culture and heritage
	Age care facilities, health care facilities Accessibility Available nearby Training and access to modern digital technologies eg. Surry Hills library on Crown Street BRILLIANT EXAMPLE	Close by - not able to move too far Well maintained paths - need safe walkways Able to be reached safely - difficulty crossing major roads or stairways Safety from petty criminals Lots of seating Walkways - wide and well maintained, no bad cracks/ trip hazards	Accessibility due to mobility - stairs, hazards
University student	Technology centres Study spaces Support services eg. Mental health Cheap entertainment/ sporting facilities Employment services Childcare facilities	Quiet spaces Socialising spaces/ sport spaces	Art facilities/ creative spaces
	Health Libraries Community Centres	Safety - security Benches Shelter Wi-Fi Community garden - fruit/ veg etc.	Technology More cultural activities Affordability
	Student accommodation Community hall/ centre Library Bike racks/parking Metrorail Station Light rail stops Bus stops	Parks and gardens Sports oval Swimming pool Study areas Bus and train connectivity	District or University museum Art gallery Creative space to lease Artist in residence spaces Workshops and collaborative areas
Socially disadvantaged person	Facilities for meals on wheels Opportunity for switching/trading of used goods(instead of buying) Rent of gallery/studio spaces for emerging artists (innovative) PCYC Support services for grandparents who care for grandchildren	Engage with Sydney University to utilise their open space Skateboard park/ bike path through the development for kids	When the series Redfern premiered it was shown on the vacant land in the block. It would be nice if there was an opportunity to enhance this. Make sure levies are not so high that there is no opportunity for culturally diverse residents Opportunities for temporary art exhibitions in the outdoor/urban environment A Pine St art centre

Role/Perspective	Community Facilities	Open Space	Arts, culture and heritage
School Student	Access to existing sporting facility One stop shop for student welfare and mentoring	Night sporting competition at existing assets: eg. Touch football at Erskineville oval, Sydney University	Retrofit buildings for multiuse day/night Select certain community "heritage" building in each precinct for retrofitting - range of different sized rooms flexible for different types of activities Facebook Spotify
Person with a disability	Vital for community engagement Education needs to have access for a variety of needs Respite care for families needed. Community are not always places you visit for a short while, sometimes they need to be for longer needs	Questions about accessibility + safety Mental health issues/ needs - positive impact of open space Community open spaces (eg. Community gardens) need to be accessible for people with a disability	Access to sites + events - physical access; financial access; variety of access to meet a variety of physical needs