



Urban
Growth
NSW

Community stakeholders Briefing

Central to Eveleigh Urban Transformation and Transport Program

19 AUGUST 2015

ISSUED FOR: COMMUNITY

ISSUE DATE: SEPTEMBER 2015

DISTRIBUTION: COMMUNITY

ISSUED AND AUTHORISED BY: URBANGROWTH NSW





Central to Eveleigh



On Wednesday 19 August 2015, UrbanGrowth NSW held a workshop for representatives of community interest groups and service providers. The purpose of the meeting was to provide a briefing on the progress of the urban transformation strategy and some of the draft implementation plans being developed for the Central to Eveleigh Urban Transformation and Transport Program. The briefing session was held at Yaama Dhiyaan, 255 Wilson Street Darlington from 6.00pm to 9.00pm.

This summary report provides an outline of the workshop outcomes.

Agenda

The workshop agenda covered:

- Report back on the current status of the urban transformation strategy
- Presentation and discussion regarding spatial plans being prepared to interpret the vision and key moves as two-dimensional planning maps
- Presentations and discussion on three draft implementation plans:
 - Open space
 - Community facilities
 - Arts, culture and heritage.

A copy of the agenda is attached in Appendix 1.

Attendance

In total, seven representatives of community groups or service providers attended the session. The following organisations were represented:

- Chippendale Residents Interest Group
- REDwatch
- University of Sydney
- Counterpoint Community Services INC
- Alexandria Residents' Action Group
- City West Housing
- Redfern Local Area Command.

Presentation: Report back and spatial plans

To provide context for the workshop discussion, Troy Daly from UrbanGrowth NSW recapped the vision and key moves for the Central to Eveleigh Urban Transformation Program..

He presented the feedback from the May 30 Community Workshop at Carriageworks and reiterated the broad support received for the vision and key moves. Key points from the presentation:

- There is a diversity of views regarding density in the corridor and the need to talk more about density and associated tradeoffs
- The community wants more active transport rail crossings, not more road crossings
- It is proving hard to get young people to turn up to have their say
- There is wide knowledge of the Program within the community, but a need to continue to be on the ground to build community awareness.

Troy recapped the work done so far:

- Scenario testing has progressed to identify the capacity of social, economic and transport infrastructure and services
- Work is continuing with Transport for NSW on the strategic transport plan
- Sustainability assessment work is now complete
- Housing diversity work is continuing and UrbanGrowth NSW is working closely with the City of Sydney in this regard.

Troy then introduced the discussion on density. In response to community requests for 3D images, he spoke about potential massing along the corridor over the short-term and long-term and acknowledged that massing models were a work in progress and therefore adjusted regularly which is why the ones shown were different from those shown at the workshop on 30 May 2015. He presented several spatial plans that showed how key moves were translating onto planning maps.

Troy acknowledged that stakeholder input continues to help refine plans and that UrbanGrowth NSW continues to work on a range of scenarios and does not have job or housing targets for the Program.

The following questions and matters were discussed:

Q Is the economic transformation within the corridor about extending the CBD?

There are opportunities to renew Redfern Station, realise the vision for Australian Technology Park as a hub of innovation and technology jobs and improving connections with universities and the corridor from Ultimo to Eveleigh for innovation and creative industries.

Q How will ATP be a centerpiece for transformation when there is no guarantee a private owner will be committed to realising the vision for the park?

The tender process is not just about price, the assessment includes a large component of non-financial considerations and is structured to ensure tenders define how they will realise the vision for the park.

Q The recent media article about Atlassian suggests the company may not be able to establish at ATP even though they are a hi-tech software developer and this use fits with the vision.

Atlassian has options available to participate at ATP, but the details cannot be discussed because of the commercial-in-confidence nature of the tender process. UrbanGrowth NSW would like to retain the technology focus at ATP and extend it into Redfern and Eveleigh.

Q. Has the Grenoble model for hi-tech business parks been considered? This model is working overseas and business has doubled with 16,000 scientists working on site.

There are lots of international models that have been considered and aspects from several models need to be combined to suit local circumstances. Grenoble is focused on a medical research center supporting innovation and as with all models there are lessons to be learnt, but that may not transfer directly to an Australian context.

Q With 20 year vision the community often does not realise that works start sooner than they think. As an example, Central Park consultation started in 2000. Construction started a few years later and has been ongoing for eight years with three more years of construction planned. Communities have become cynical and trust is reduced when developers make changes to approved plans.

The urban transformation plan is being developed to provide a stronger layer of guidance for future development, it will sit above precinct and master plans. It has the potential to assist communities to maintain the vision for the area into the future and this is why there is an emphasis on developing this collaboratively.

Q What is the planning pathway for the urban transformation strategy – through changes to the Local Environment Plan (LEP) or through Section 117 Ministerial Directions?

The first step we are considering is a Section 117, that sets objectives and planning principles for the area but does not rezone or set control heights and floor space; these are achieved through changes to the LEP at the next stage.

Q What is the status of plans for Redfern Housing Estate developed by the Government Architects Office?

The plans for Redfern have not yet been resolved because the financial viability of the renewal has not yet been achieved.

Q New development on Redfern Street will destroy the character of the street.

The focus would be on activation of the Street.

Q Are there plans to underground Cleveland Street to create a green strip?

No, there is no plan to underground Cleveland Street, the plans take some artistic license to show the principle of greening the area and creating a green corridor.

Q Can copies of the maps be provided?

Provisionally yes, but they are a work in progress being presented for discussion, given the feedback from this group, we have some work to do to make sure they can be understood.

Q. What transport and road support development at Waterloo?

Renewal of the Waterloo Estate is dependent on a suitable public transport intervention being identified to support transformation.

Q. How does Waterloo link with Green Square?

We would use Waterloo as another major activity centre like Green Square and Redfern.

Q. How are plans for job creation going to support sustainable growth – ground floor activation with cafes will not deliver significant jobs?

Activation can also be achieved with smart residential design and we also have a more detailed economics and industry study being undertaken that will help inform our direction on this.

Q. How will fine grain be retained if the diversity of lot sizes is lost with superlots all given to one developer?

The intention is that UrbanGrowth NSW will deliver the public domain, civil works and heritage restoration works and then package up lots of different sizes to attract a diversity of developers.

Q. Are the assumptions around growth in the area, particularly massing and scale, wrong, and should options for reduced development and increased open space be provided to the community. Does UrbanGrowth NSW have development targets and can these be met considering the limited open space.

Sydney needs to accommodate significant growth and the corridor provides opportunity to deliver homes close to jobs and transport services. UrbanGrowth NSW has been asked by the government to identify a balanced scenario that delivers strong job and housing outcomes alongside public benefits. There are no targets; we are working with scenarios to test the capacity of local infrastructure. This work is ongoing and will be further tested during more detailed precinct planning. Feedback to date through community consultation has been many people do not object to height and there are a variety of views about density, where infrastructure is planned appropriately.

Q. Are the plans for open space insufficient and do they comply with the City of Sydney's Development Control Plan?

The City of Sydney recognises the challenges associated with open space provision and is working with us.

Other comments from the stakeholders included:

- Without sun, organic communities can't grow, so solar access is an important design consideration
- There is a huge waitlist for affordable housing (low-medium income earners) and an urgent need for more affordable housing
- A crossing across the tracks from Carriageworks to ATP is important for maintaining a technology focus
- The community has waited a long time for Redfern Station to be upgraded and is still waiting for a lift to be installed to make it more accessible.
- A request for traffic modelling to include numbers from WestConnex

- Podiums should be considered to minimise wind tunnel effects.

Activity: Feedback on Spatial Plans

Taking into consideration the vision and key moves, attendees grouped together and provided feedback on draft spatial plans. Stakeholders were asked to consider the following.

- *What are your initial reactions to the spatial plans? Is anything surprising?*
- *Do the maps make sense?*
- *Are there things we need to consider?*

Stakeholders made the following comments in response to the maps:

Overall plan comments

- Maps should acknowledge that the two options for metro stations are undetermined
- Capacity of train services to service growth in Erskineville needs to be recognised, considering the Ashmore development will impact services
- A priority crossing of the railway corridor is between North and South Eveleigh at the southern end of ATP to connect with the university and a second priority crossing is between Macdonaldown and Erskineville
- The urban centre of the western end of the corridor is not clear on the maps
- Recognition that the twin arterial roads (Regent Street/Botany Road and Gibbons Street) form a barrier and require a creative solution to improve accessibility. Opportunities should be considered for a-grade structures to facilitate crossing.

Parks

- Maps should recognise that open space at the university is accessible for community use
- Need to build and promote links to schools and the universities to utilise their open space facilities for community use
- Charles Kernan Reserve is at times an over-used park
- Recognise that small pocket parks add value to the area. They break up the built form, add light and green, provide connection points for community interaction, help to absorb heat and many are enclosed and provide safe play spaces for children
- Support that larger parks are being made more accessible
- There is an opportunity for a Red Square as a civic heart to Redfern that could link with Pemulway and Lawson Street
- The proposed green connection between Redfern Street and Wilson Street is not clear on the maps and should be clearly shown.

Study area

- The map should shade the Erskineville area to indicate flexible land use within conservation area consistent with Darlington and Chippendale.
- New high rise development is already being established on Regent Street and around Redfern Station. Clear controls for separation distances and solar access are needed.
- The Redfern Street design studio by university students in 2014 produced ideas for infill development that complimented the diverse urban fabric of the street and increased density while retaining and enhancing the street's texture.

- Consider a community hub at Pemulway
- Recognise that business viability is impacted by traffic congestion and limited parking
- Competition - previous attempts at mixed use have not been successful because there was not enough population to support retail strips.
- There were mixed views about impact of new high rise buildings on Regent Street, ranging from making the area soulless to activating the area and making it safer.

Presentation and discussion: Implementation Plans

Kerrie Symonds presented the open space and the community facilities implementation plans. Vanessa Gordon presented the arts culture and heritage implementation plan. Stakeholders raised the following questions and discussion points.

Open space

Q. Open space needs to be well designed to ensure access is easy and that it is useable. The open space at the Platform Apartments is unusable because it does not get enough sunlight. Other parks do not have play spaces. Need a network of buses, like in Perth, providing access to parks.

Yes, open space has lots of layers that need to be considered through the design process. It is about park design and greening street corridors. Light rail is one of the transport options being considered by Transport for NSW.

Q. Can stormwater and solar energy be collected in parks?

Yes, there is potential for stormwater harvesting and solar panels to be installed in parks.

Q. Is the park in North Eveleigh being reduced in size from the 2008 Concept Plan?

No.

Stakeholders also noted access to green space is critical for community wellbeing.

Community facilities

Q. Can school facilities be used after hours for community uses? Artarmon and Umina noted as examples.

In principle yes, subject to negotiation with the Principal.

Q. How do plans align with the City of Sydney's community hub strategy?

The City of Sydney supports a community centre being located at the heart of each precinct.

Stakeholders also noted:

- Need to consider capacity of schools and hospitals to support population growth
- Need to plan for schools as community centres

- The transport services in the area mean that Alexandria Park Community School has a lot of students from out of catchment, but also a lot of students within the area go to schools outside the catchment
- Childcare centres need play spaces

Arts, culture and heritage

Q. The site in Parramatta for the Powerhouse may no longer be available, what is the intent for the Powerhouse Museum, will it be a digital enterprise hub?

There is a lot of talk about enterprise hubs. To work they need to be co-located to support incubation of ideas. A patchwork of hubs, or a precinct, could evolve through the area.

Q. Will university connections to ATP continue over the long term?

Yes, there is an 85 year lease. Opportunities are also being considered for similar approaches that will provide more space for start-ups across the precinct.

Q. Resources are needed for place making programs. For example, the Roll-Up Redfern campaign needed a pool of funds to get shop owners to comply and the City of Sydney had a grants program for community initiatives.

There may be opportunities for matching grants for small business to be considered in partnership with the City of Sydney. Stakeholders also noted:

- The Seymour Centre at the University of Sydney is also part of the cultural fabric of the area and should be acknowledged
- The University of Sydney is doing work to develop Aboriginal design principles for green space and buildings
- The university has events and museums, including the Macleay Museum that has more visitors than the Australian Museum
- Cultural facilities need to be planned for the whole community, many of the newer facilities like Carriageworks do not 'connect' with the old Redfern community.

Feedback from attendees:

The majority of attendees agreed that they found the briefing interesting, information was well presented, had the opportunity to participate and have a good understanding of the urban transformation strategy process. The things attendees most liked about this briefing was the opportunity for interaction and free discussion and seeing the vision and moves translated onto maps. Things attendees least liked about this briefing were the need for more time to enable detailed discussion. Attendees requested to be sent a copy of the power point presentation from this session.

Appendix A – Agenda



AGENDA

Central to Eveleigh Urban Transformation and Transport Program: Community Interest Groups Briefing

Wednesday 19 August 2015, 6:00-9:00pm
Yaama Dhiyaan, 255 Wilson St, Darlington

Time	Item
6:00	
6:05	Welcome and introductions
6:10	Report back and community feedback
6:25	Spatial Plans
6:35	What do you think?
7:10	Implementation plans - Places and Open Space, Kerrie Symonds - Community, Kerrie Symonds - Arts, Culture and Heritage, Vanessa Gordon
7:40	What do you think?
8:45	Report back
9:00	Thank you and close.

Attendees:	Troy Daly	UrbanGrowth NSW
	Vanessa Gordon	UrbanGrowth NSW
	Kerrie Symonds	UrbanGrowth NSW
	Abbie Jeffs	UrbanGrowth NSW
	Lucy Cole Edelstein	Straight Talk (facilitator)
	Jeanette Brokman	Chippendale Residents Interest Group
	Geoff Turnbull	REDwatch
	Julie Parsons	University of Sydney
	Michael Shreenan	Counterpoint Community Services INC
	Gary Speechley	Alexandria Residents' Action Group
	Rene McKenzie-Low	City West Housing
	Marie Flood	Redfern Local Area Command