



Gladesville Campus Master Plan

Stage One:
Consultation Outcomes Report





Document Reference Table

Revision	Date	Prepared by	Reviewed by	Approved by	Remarks
1.	230911	LHP	UJ, KJA		
2.	280911	LHP	Jan McCredie		
3.	300911	LHP	NSW Health		

KJA document name & location

u:\client files\worley parsons\gladesville masterplan\consultation\stage 1\stage 1 - consultation report - 270911.docx

This material is copyright; no part may be copied or used unless you have written permission from KJA Pty Ltd.

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	3
2	Outcomes.....	4
2.1	Summary	4
2.2	Design principles.....	4
2.3	Future land uses.....	5
2.3.1	Educational purposes	5
2.3.2	Sport and recreation	5
2.3.3	Health related purposes.....	5
2.3.4	Tourism/ Heritage Appreciation	5
2.3.5	Cultural purposes.....	5
2.3.6	Community uses	5
2.4	Constraints and opportunities	6
2.4.1	Traffic and parking	6
2.4.2	Heritage management	6
2.4.3	Financial sustainability and revenue sources	6
2.5	Consultation and Master Planning Process	6
2.6	Other	6



1 Introduction

NSW Health has commenced a master planning process to guide future uses on the Gladesville Campus. NSW Health is committed to being a responsible and inclusive caretaker for the site and recognises the site's community and heritage significance.

The project team, led by Worley Parsons, is currently undertaking site investigations and feasibility studies. As part of the preliminary design process, the project team undertook Stage One community consultation.

This comprised a series of preliminary workshops held on the Gladesville Campus site.

The purpose of these workshops was to:

- give information on the background of the project;
- introduce the rationale for a new site master plan;
- test the guiding design principles; and
- provide an opportunity for community members and stakeholders to share their views and ideas for the future of the site.

Three workshops were held in total.

- Monday 19 September 3.30pm to 5.30pm for tenants and stakeholders – 26 attendees.
- Tuesday 20 September 6pm to 8pm for community members – over 60 attendees.
- Wednesday 21 September 10am to 12pm for community members – 30 attendees.

The workshop format is outlined below.

- Presentation outlining the consultation process and introducing the project team (Daphne Sider, *KJA*).
- Presentation on the project brief, design approach and design principles (Jan McCredie, *Worley Parsons*).
- Presentation on site investigations to date (Brendan Randles, *Randles Straatveit* [RSA])
- An interactive workshop, testing the design principles and exploring opportunities and constraints on the site.
- Report back, in which tables shared their discussion outcomes.

Opportunities for general questions to the project team were available after each presentation.

Individual work sheets and feedback forms were provided on each table at the community workshops to ensure all ideas and feedback were accurately captured. Feedback from group discussions were scribed by table facilitators and tested with the table group before being reported back to all participants.

Feedback from the workshops will be used by the project team to develop high level concept plans for the site. A summary of outcomes follows.



2 Outcomes

2.1 Summary

The key issues for workshop participants are listed below.

- Ensuring a unified, holistic approach to the site – whether that manifest as a single owner, purpose, umbrella user group or careful site management.
- A high quality outcome which considers existing neighbours and tenants.
- Preservation of and respect for heritage – built forms, landscape, flora, site layout, vistas.
- Maintaining public access over the whole site; in particular the connection with the river and regional park components of the site.
- Sourcing appropriate funding to achieve the above.

Participants were generally satisfied with the design principles, although they suggested some slight changes to the design principles (see 2.2 below).

Participants suggested a range of appropriate future uses, which fell under the following broad themes:

- Educational
- Health-related
- Cultural
- Sports and recreation
- Tourism
- Heritage
- Community uses.

Community members and stakeholders identified a range of current and future issues which may act as constraints on future planning for the site. These included:

- traffic and parking;
- heritage management; and
- financial sustainability and revenue sources.

2.2 Design principles

There was general support for the design principles.

Key feedback about the design principles included:

- edit all principles to use active language and communicate a firm commitment or action; and
- strengthen emphasis on heritage layout, flora and social history – perceived that heritage principle focussed unduly on built forms without adequately considering other aspects of ‘heritage’.

Additional principles included:

- social justice;
- horticultural protection;
- a commitment to preserving the beauty of the site; and
- Ensure high quality design of additional development.

The updated principles are as follows:

- That public access is available throughout the site, to enable everybody to enjoy the area and understand its history
- That access to the harbour and regional parklands is maintained
- That heritage buildings, their related spaces and the landscaped setting are conserved and enhanced
- That the level of change to existing buildings respects, and is related to, their heritage significance
- That links to northern side of the Gladesville peninsula and former hospital grounds are strengthened
- That the cemetery is conserved and its value is enhanced as an important part of the site
- That the design solutions reveal the layers of the site and reflect its history
- That the site achieve long term sustainability
- That the master plan encourages a diversity of uses and activities on the site



2.3 Future land uses

A range of appropriate future land uses was suggested, with the proviso that future uses should not preclude or limit public access to open space and the harbour.

Generally participants desired a unified feel with a diversity of uses. Some participants suggested that a single umbrella user group or a complementary set of users overseen by site management would best suit the nature of the site.

Achieving a unified feel throughout the whole site is a high priority for any future development of the Gladesville Campus.

Examples of heritage precincts which have been well treated and could be looked to as examples of success included:

- Cockatoo Island;
- Sydney College of the Arts (SCA);
- National Art School (NAS); and
- Quarantine Station on North Head.

Participants suggested the following potential uses:

2.3.1 Educational purposes

- Tertiary education providers such as a University, TAFE or Community College.
- Sports and recreational educational campus.
- School camping and outdoor education.
- Students Arts Centre and exhibition space.

2.3.2 Sport and recreation

- Strengthen current sports uses and support with additional facilities.
- Upgrade existing pool.
- Sports institute.
- Open space for casual community outdoor recreation.

2.3.3 Health related purposes

- Extend existing uses to include Department of Health offices and a range of services providers/ health related offices.
- Rehabilitation or recovery centre.

2.3.4 Tourism/ Heritage Appreciation

- Interpretive history signage, e.g. discovery gardens with history emphasis.
- Local history tours, ghost tours.
- Short term accommodation – appropriate fit to area:
 - Boutique hotel;
 - Youth hostel; or
 - Conference/ reception centre, combined with public gardens.
- Museum.
- New cafes/ hospitality offerings.

2.3.5 Cultural purposes

- Cultural precinct including artisan working spaces, boutique shops, learning and teaching spaces, markets.
- Outdoor performances, including but not limited to opera, theatre, concerts, cinema.

2.3.6 Community uses

- Walking paths and tours.
- Active recreational uses.
- Improved cycle connections.
- Access to the local history and open spaces.
- Access to facilities and spaces for local community groups.



2.4 Constraints and opportunities

Community members and stakeholders identified a range of current and future issues which may constrain future planning for Gladesville Campus. They also suggested ways to mitigate or overcome these constraints.

2.4.1 Traffic and parking

Existing parking on and around the site is considered limited and in need of improvement.

Nearby residents were concerned that any future development may create congestion and further limit parking.

The site is generally considered well serviced by public transport by way of bus and ferry; however there is a need to increase awareness of these services.

Suggestions to mitigate potential impacts included the following:

- Improved walking links within the site and to surrounds.
- Improved cycle links, including tunnels and links to Ryde LGA cycle paths.
- Upgrade ferry wharf.
- Local shuttle buses to Hunters Hill shops.
- Tunnel link under Victoria Road to be kept open at all times.
- Underground parking, to limit visual impact and encroachment on open space.

2.4.2 Heritage management

There was a high level of concern about the deterioration of heritage buildings and the need for a large capital injection to properly restore and maintain buildings of high heritage significance.

Participants were generally in favour of respectful adaptive reuse. Some participants emphasised the importance of keeping the buildings in use to ensure they remain relevant and looked after. Other believed the most significant buildings should be maintained as history pieces without reuse.

Participants noted that it was important to consider heritage in all its guises – not just the built forms. This includes the flora, fauna, building layout and relationships and vistas to and from the site .

Participants identified many opportunities for heritage management. These can be found above at 2.3 and, in particular, 2.3.3 above.

2.4.3 Financial sustainability and revenue sources

Concerns about financial sustainability generally related to the need for funds to maintain and restore heritage items.

Participants felt financial responsibility for the site should be shared, – potentially between NSW Health, State Government and Council.

2.5 Consultation and Master Planning Process

Some concern was expressed by participants about the limited timeframe for this process. Participants questioned whether a quality outcome and sufficient community consultation could be achieved in the allocated time.

2.6 Other

Other feedback received from participants included the following:

- A desire for planning on the site to consider social justice principles.
- Minimise and consider impacts of change on neighbours.
- Any new built forms should be innovative, fit with the area, complement existing built forms and be appropriate for intended use.
- Interest has been expressed in continuing existing residential agreements on site.
- Improved cycle connections with neighbouring local government areas.
- Need to manage security of and safety on site.



More investigation was requested into the following.

- Likely future population of residents and workers on the site.
- The level of development.
- NSW Health's project intentions/ agenda.
- Impacts on current residential and business tenants.
- Budget of this project and cost projections for realisation of the master plan over time.
- Other potential site custodians such as the Sydney Harbour Foreshore Authority (State) or Sydney Harbour Federation Trust (Commonwealth) and the management models of these agencies.

DRAFT