



**PRESERVING OUR HERITAGE**

PO Box 85, Hunters Hill, NSW 2110  
[www.huntershilltrust.org.au](http://www.huntershilltrust.org.au)

**FAO: The Mayor, Councillors & General Manager**

## **SUBMISSION ON THE DRAFT COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE PLAN 2020**

The Hunters Hill Trust makes the following comments on the above Plan:

This document is described as a blueprint for action *“around a network of facilities including provision of three community hubs/precincts”*. It is claimed that the strategy is underpinned by a set of principles to *“guide implementation and funding mechanisms to support initial delivery as well as financially sustainable models into the future”*.

However the first principle to be applied to this strategy should have been a full needs analysis of the proposed changes with options presented to the community. A business case could then be developed with an indication of cost/benefit comparisons. Without this, and a clear financial risk assessment, a case for these proposals has not been definitively made.

It is already clear there is a level of change being proposed that demands more time, consultation and transparency than has so far been afforded to residents. Council's survey in relation to this Plan was deficient in asking only for comment on the *usage* of spaces already proposed rather than genuine community input, giving a sense of 'fait accompli' for the proposals.

The Trust is aware of concerns amongst our membership that the special characteristics of Hunters Hill could be seriously impacted or lost if this Plan is adopted - our heritage, low-key open space and significant mature trees. Transparency in this process has been deficient and it appears that an unjustifiable level of secrecy has surrounded the development of this strategy. The presentation of arguments within a glossy document puts residents further at arms-length. This is the wrong playbook for Hunters Hill and does not inspire trust.

We strongly advocate that a series of public meetings is required with a high level of detail presented, before any proposals are progressed. We ask: what is hidden from view behind the 51 pages of marketing language and rhetoric? What is being put at risk if the proposals included in the Plan are not revealed with the layers of missing detail and lack of meaningful participation? Residents need to hear more straight-talking from Council about its development proposals.

For this reason the Trust prepared our own survey based on the Draft Plan and the results are attached, together with comments where members have chosen to make them. A Position Statement compiled from the responses is also below. Although the survey was only open for 10 days, a response rate of 41% from those contacted, showed that residents are sufficiently concerned to readily engage with us in order to have their voices heard.

Yours sincerely

Alister Sharp  
President  
Hunters Hill Trust

# HUNTERS HILL TRUST'S POSITION STATEMENT

With no schemata or drawings within the Draft Community Infrastructure Plan showing the scope and scale of any of the 'Hubs', the Trust Committee and its members are extremely concerned about over-development and loss of green space. The following key messages have been drawn from membership responses to our survey plus our suggestions for further testing of ideas where there isn't strong support for a proposal.

## Hub 1 - Gladesville Road/Figtree Park

- This is not the appropriate location for intensive development and would be out of character for a 'village green' particularly as it would destroy the existing village atmosphere.
- The business case for more residential development/offices/retail here has not been made nor justified.
- The streetscape on Gladesville Road should be retained and options explored for the Sydney Community Services buildings to be enhanced or adapted to make them fit for purpose as a more sustainable approach to development.
- There is overwhelming support for Figtree Park to be retained in its entirety with no loss of green space or trees.
- The problems of additional traffic adding to the current congestion in this area have not been addressed in any way.
- There is little support for moving Council administration to this site and no justification or cost implications given for separating Council administration from Council chambers.
- There appears to be little support for a Library in this area (or at the Town Hall) so another location should be tested.
- The Croquet Club and Green is a valued space that has been in daily use - particularly important in the current pandemic. The heritage club is part of the charm of Hunters Hill and modern versions of the game are now increasing in popularity.
- Figtree Park is already used extensively every day by the community for recreation and passive enjoyment and does not need 'activating' with the exception of a children's playground which should be reinstated in its previous location.
- Access from Gladesville Road should be improved and signposted and an appropriate fence along Ryde Road added to make the park safer.

## Hub 2 - Town Hall, Council Administration Centre and Works Depot

- The Town Hall as a cultural hub is supported but space and parking issues will need to be properly assessed.
- Preservation of the Town Hall heritage building is paramount.
- A business case has not been made to move the Town Hall administration from its current location and the proposed move does not appear to be supported by the community. We ask, what is the benefit to the community of these changes, particularly when retaining it here is strongly supported? Has the cost of refurbishing Council administration versus moving it to a new location been ascertained as part of this exercise?
- There is overwhelming support for the museum to be retained in the Town Hall precinct.
- Using the admin section of the Town Hall for leasing is not well supported and the lack of parking and access to public transport could make it difficult to achieve commercial returns. In addition there is no indication of the scale of financial return required to sustain these changes?
- There is community ambivalence about the Works Depot remaining behind the Town Hall but strong opposition to re-developing this space for residential accommodation. However this location is seen as having merit as part of a cultural hub and options should be explored.
- There is support for the theatre and music clubs to continue to be located in the Town Hall precinct perhaps housed in a re-developed Depot site.
- An art gallery could be housed in a more accessible location with parking, either in a re-developed Depot space or at the Henley Precinct.

## Hub 3 - Henley Precinct

- As the population grows, this site could become a valuable location for shared experiences and passive recreation.
- This area should be permanently retained for public amenities, cultural events and open air activities such as art/music/markets/community gardens, plus a café and play spaces.
- This location has parking, access to main roads and public transport.
- The community gardens are highly valued and must be retained/expanded in this location.
- The Bowling Club building is in demand as a popular location for community activities and social events and should be renovated to enable greater use and some income generation in the short term.
- Improved amenities for sporting activities not catered for elsewhere would be suitable for this site.
- The replacement of turf with synthetic surface is not supported.
- There is strong opposition to residential development that would alienate the waterfront.

# HUNTERS HILL TRUST'S SURVEY RESULTS

## Hub 1 - Gladesville Road/Figtree Park

### Q1 Would you like to see:

|   | Yes    | No     |
|---|--------|--------|
| Preservation of the cottages and streetscape on Gladesville Road?                         | 86.89% | 13.11% |
| Preservation of the Croquet Club and Green?   | 89.06% | 10.94% |
| Preservation of Figtree Park in its current form with no encroachment by new development? | 92.06% | 7.94%  |
| A mix of heritage and new development?  | 45.45% | 54.55% |
| A new development to replace the cottages and hall for Sydney Community Services?         | 28.57% | 71.43% |
| Additional community facilities at Figtree Park?  | 26.23% | 73.77% |
| Some current community facilities moved elsewhere?  | 26.79% | 73.21% |
| Residential accommodation as part of the commercial development?                          | 15.52% | 84.48% |
| Space for an office/commercial hub/flexible work space?                                   | 20.34% | 79.66% |
| A library located here?   | 42.37% | 57.63% |
| Council Administration located here?  | 17.24% | 82.76% |
| A cafe  | 25.93% | 74.07% |
| A children's playground?  | 62.50% | 37.50% |
| A fence along Ryde Road so that children can play safely?                                 | 64.91% | 35.09% |
| Additional activation of Figtree Park eg special events?                                  | 37.29% | 62.71% |

### ADDITIONAL FEEDBACK:

- I do not want to see a reduction of the park - it is already small
- This survey is misleading. Please outline the intent of the questions
- Without understanding what it implies I'm reluctant to say either Yes or No to 'Additional activation', but assuming it means 'loss of grass or plants I've answered NO
- It's impossible to think of this piece of remaining green space being redeveloped for residential and/or commercial purposes. Surely there is enough along Gladesville Road to satisfy need? Matthew Street, sandwiched between Ryde and Gladesville Roads is congested enough and it is unthinkable how much worse it would become if these proposed developments go ahead. Please leave it as is for the benefit and wellbeing of the community you are there to represent!
- Absolutely against all these proposals. There are enough Cafes and congestion already in that vicinity without Council allowing / adding even more development, traffic, traffic delays and congestion
- It's a lovely park that needs fencing. The last thing the Hunters Hill over pass needs is more development. The heritage has already been comprised immensely. This park will become increasingly important for passive open space
- without seeing proposed development drawings it is too hard to say "yes" or "no" to some of these questions especially in regard to preserving the cottages and adding new structures It might be too large to accommodate all that they propose to have here
- The proposal is over developed
- See through fence. There is already a cafe.
- I suggested to Zac Miles at least two years ago, when it was announced in Council Meeting Minutes that he was appointed to oversee possible uses for Figtree Park. I suggested a monthly, fortnightly or weekly small Farmers' Market on the site to enable local residents to purchase fresh produce within walking distance. We have lost Joe and Sons green grocer long ago, who provided excellent fresh produce, and IGA's offerings are inadequate. I have never heard back from Zac, or Council, regarding my suggestions. Why spend money on community surveys if none of the responses are acknowledged or open for discussion?
- The building don't have any real heritage value. My main point is the current configuration is poor leading to underutilised space. Suggest new buildings border Ryde Rd to Matthew Street, and the rest is flattened and opened up to parkland directly up to Gladesville Road. That would create a beautiful open space and should appease the residents on Matthew St.

- Figtree Park is a delightful small piece of quiet open space - increasingly required as densities around it increase. It needs a picket fence for safety and definition. There are too many competing functions proposed. New housing, commercial development, a library, Admin functions of Council which will overwhelm the Park and destroy its ambience and charm and increase congestion. This is not the place for any of the new proposals. We don't need a Village Square! We don't need another library - we have a new arrangement with an existing local library; Leave C administration in the Town Hall. Don't destroy streetscape along Gladesville Rd. Retain Croquet Club. Retain setting and mature trees and the leafy canopies. No underground carpark! Leave trees and deep soil - grass over the top of an excavated carpark is not the same! The proposals conjure up a city Mall not a small and beautiful local suburban park. The proposed scale of proposal is appropriate for HHC. No sale/lease of Public land here under any circumstances.
- Hard to answer some questions because the nature of the proposals is not clear. In short, I oppose any development that reduces parkland and increased buildings. I don't mind redeveloping existing buildings for other uses but details of the proposed changes should be clearly stated.
- Absolutely NO encroachment into Figtree Park with possible exception of children play area
- We do not object to remodelling the buildings along Gladesville Road provided the footprint and height are not increased. We strongly support the comments made in David Salter's letter to Council.
- Any development in the proposed area would reduce the amenity of Figure Park and make even worse the awful traffic problems along that stretch of Gladesville Road and at the intersection with Ryude Road.
- The present Council Administration facility has just been refurbished and should now be fit for purpose for another fifty years at least.
- I am not familiar with Fig Tree Park, but I would like to see more "Village' events and socialising bringing people together, Dog show, flower show, Easter parade, Coffee etc.
- I don't actually think there is enough space here for Council's vision. Also, office space for Council staff will need to be split. Where is the new Council Chamber? Is there a "theatre" here that would suite?
- Keep the heritage buildings and adapt and add to them. Add a fence to enable safety for children and the elderly and a small playground for young children. This would support a low cost increase in activation.
- I am not averse to upgrading the accommodation of Community Services, and making access from Gladesville Rd easier, but don't wish this to be at the expense of losing grass and trees.
- Please [leave] this small area of trees, space as it is. The locals use this area with children and older people - any development here will ruin this green gem and create havoc with traffic.
- Another cafe certainly not needed. Parking will be a problem if office/commercial space built - underground parking not appropriate.
- I have no detailed knowledge of present areas mentioned and do not wish to comment on.
- Any residential development must be lower than 3 storeys and be stepped back from both the park and the street with no loss of green space. Parking must improve and traffic needs to take into account the mainly elderly residents living along Gladesville Rd.
- The park and croquet club are important spaces that need to be maintained. I am happy for low rise development for council/community services to replace the old cottages.
- The Park is small and should not be further reduced in any way.
- more seating in the park
- Remaining largely as open space is the most desirable, with possibly more planting along the Ryde Rd edge.
- Upgrading existing community facilities is important but not at the expense of Figtree Park and the croquet green. Under the guise of providing better community care, the Plan hands over a big parcel of land to developers to build yet more retail and more housing in this sensitive and low rise village area.

## Q2 Are you concerned about:

|   | Yes     | No    |
|---|---------|-------|
| Loss of green space?                            | 100.00% | 0.00% |
| Loss of Trees?                                  | 98.33%  | 1.67% |
| Scale of development and how it will be funded? | 96.72%  | 3.28% |
| Impact of traffic and parking?                  | 98.36%  | 1.64% |

## ADDITIONAL FEEDBACK:

- No reduction of the park
- The overpass area is already over developed and traffic and ease of living in the area is at its capacity! Enough development!
- Again there currently is so much traffic along the surrounding roads around there....where is a proposal regarding traffic management
- Hunters Hill is one of Australia's oldest municipalities. The heritage of this suburb makes it highly unique. Hunters Hill is not Ryde. Whilst the state government longs for it to be part of that suburb, that has failed time and time again. New development should be kept to a minimum and existing open space should be respected and retained. People want to live in Hunters Hill for a reason. It's time that ambitious councillors realise that.
- there is no mention of where extra car parking space will occur to accommodate for so much extra proposed community activity
- More is not better.
- I am also fed up with notifying Council of the dangerous driving antics of visitors to the cafe precinct. I have had very close calls (as a pedestrian) in that vicinity as drivers do very dangerous U-turns and 3 point turns OVER unbroken white lines, which is illegal, and without any regard for pedestrians and other traffic. I also suggest that the last two parking bays on Gladesville Rd (on both directions) be removed. They open doors, unload children, and risk being hit by cars travelling in both directions. On the northern side of that strip, (adjacent to what was originally Three Beans Cafe) the last two parking bays prevent traffic endeavouring to turn right or left at the lights from lining up at the red light, causing two or three failed attempts to exit on the green traffic light due to the congestion. Again, no answer back from Council, but I note that the Council Ranger still does a regular sweep to book parked cars along that strip who have overstayed the time limit. Surely the dangers in that area warrant the attention of Council before revenue.
- Concerned about Scale of development if they want to add residential but not concerned about how it will be funded?
- This is an already congested and busy precinct. I vehemently oppose the reduction of any green space/trees in Figtree Park. I also oppose the expansion of HH Council administration to this area.
- No business case. No consultation that is meaningful. No debate just a series of thought bubbles.
- Traffic in this area is already very congested
- Parking is already a major problem and traffic on and around Matthew St is already a dangerous disaster
- Mini busses at regular pick- up points to avoid car congestion
- The scale of development proposed for this community green space is not needed or justified.
- The proposal would increase the need for carparking, possibly resulting in an underground carpark, and increasing traffic congestion.
- The traffic created here with any development will create a nightmare for residents and traffic flow havoc, these areas are already difficult to manoeuvre with school traffic and general traffic.
- Heritage character of the park and surrounds must not be lost. Open space essential in view of the number of extra residences - dual occupancy/units - already built.
- Very much doubt that all of Council's plans can be achieved without unacceptable building heights and densities.
- Parking is already difficult so underground parking will be required.
- Traffic is chaotic in the extreme already with the existing number of cafes and unit accommodations. The calm village that used to exist is already ruined!
- Increasing awareness of the value of green space and trees and the impact of vehicles is ignored by this potential overdevelopment.

## Hub 2 - Town Hall, Council Administration Centre and Works Depot

### Q3 Would you like to see:

|   | Yes    | No     |
|---|--------|--------|
| The Town Hall site become a cultural hub?   | 62.26% | 37.74% |
| Council Administration stay at the Town Hall?   | 90.91% | 9.09%  |
| Council Chamber (where Council meets) remain at the Town Hall?  | 94.74% | 5.26%  |
| The Museum remain at Town Hall  | 94.55% | 5.45%  |
| The Council Works Depot remain behind the Town Hall?  | 53.85% | 46.15% |
| The Works Depot be redeveloped for housing?   | 10.91% | 89.09% |
| The Works Depot be redeveloped as part of a larger cultural precinct with the Library and other cultural activities such as an art gallery? | 48.15% | 51.85% |
| A library located at Town Hall?   | 44.64% | 55.36% |
| Hunters Hill Theatre and Music Clubs located at the Town Hall?  | 85.45% | 14.55% |
| The administration section of the building used for commercial leasing/offices (if Council administration not retained here)?               | 22.22% | 77.78% |
| The administration building kept and retrofitted?   | 76.47% | 23.53% |
| The administration building knocked down and a new build here?  | 3.85%  | 96.15% |

### ADDITIONAL FEEDBACK:

- To remain as it is the town hall
- Why does council need new facilities? Please state the case when there is so much more we could spend money on.
- Theatre and Music Clubs located at the Town Hall? I understand they need assurance of long term bookings and more back-of-house space, and would support this. Admin location: I wouldn't begrudge improvements to the admin offices if these are really required: maybe within the current Works Dept.
- The council building is in an important icon Hunters Hill. If you were to make changes to the council depo then it should be kept by the council and it should be turned into public space. By the community for the community.
- What reason and financial gain is there in relocating the Council chambers and Council Works moving from the peninsula to Gladesville?
- The Town Hall is the Town Hall! No monkeying. Parking problems bad enough when school is in.
- Hunters Hill Town Hall is a Heritage item and is already in a significant group within the Conservation Area - congregational church, historic school, and surrounding picturesque streets. The Town Hall and the Administration Functions, staff and records of the Municipality must remain together under one roof in its current location. The Town Hall must not be emasculated physically or symbolically by and for development interests!! I am astonished Council is proposing this - it is not in the Community's interest nor respectful of our Heritage. The Town Hall is already a cultural hub home to the Art Show, Community events, School events, HH Theatre, Music concerts and the museum. The status quo should remain and if some modest supporting spaces are required assist these current uses they could be accommodated subtly within the depot site. Perhaps some elements of the Depot should be retained on site? I am totally against alienating the site's ownership either by sale or long term lease (exactly the same thing) for any commercial or domestic use what so ever - not housing, not aged care, not commercial. This is public land! This is a fragile and important component of the HH Conservation area. Madeline Street, Alexandra Street all the surrounding streets and lanes are quintessential Hunters Hill. The Depot site, if it is cleared, should remain in public ownership and largely turned over to open space. Quite apart from issues of principle. The peninsula is dense enough. Traffic flow mornings and afternoons is already at a standstill. No more density can be contemplated. Council should be behaving as custodians not developers!
- Why does Council deem it necessary to arrange more space when the Municipality has not increased, therefore, not requiring more Council Staff. I also resent being questioned at length, as to why I wish to speak to someone in a particular department about a personal enquiry. The matter is of interest to myself as a ratepayer, and the person in question. I also have experience the problem of my phone messages not being acted on at all, and can only conclude that certain staff on the front desk may not passed them on. I feel that cultural and Administration should remain connected to the Council and the Town Hall.
- The administration building knocked down and a new build here? Don't have enough detail on this.

- Hard to say. What is a cultural hub? An auditorium, a museum, a library and an art gallery? How much would it cost? The present hall is not good for a theatre but a new one would require replacing the building, which is likely to be costly. I would not like to support redevelopment unless there were detailed plans and costings (which would also be expensive). Hunters Hill is a small council so grand designs are likely to be unaffordable.
- Keep 50% of council staff here. Make new chambers if required.
- I feel that cultural and Administration should remain connected to the Council and the Town Hall
- I am concerned about Council depot being moved to Lane Cove and making it more difficult for the parks and gardens staff. to operate locally with efficiency and easy access to their equipment and also other HHC staff
- Council is currently reconfiguring its administration office space, and with the possibility of eventual amalgamation with other councils it would be rash to spend more money here.
- Do a rebuild at Henley where Theatre, Music, Museum, Library and large hall such as is heavily used for the Bridge Club can be used. Lots of parking available over there instead of trying to cram everything right on the peninsula or very close by and creating a traffic nightmare. Locate Works Depot there also. Can't get in and out of HH as it is.
- If works site redeveloped MUST be low-rise and in keeping with surrounding building
- While I agree with the notion of a cultural hub I am concerned about traffic and parking and would like to see Council Chambers and administration remain where they are.
- It is difficult to answer as perhaps these services will relocate to the Gladesville Road hub and therefore be irrelevant.
- The Town Hall and all its current functions should remain largely intact.

#### Q4 Are you concerned about:

|   | Yes    | No     |
|---|--------|--------|
| Developing parcels of the site?   | 94.74% | 5.26%  |
| Preservation of the Town Hall heritage?   | 94.83% | 5.17%  |
| The scale of financial return required to sustain these changes to the Town Hall? | 96.30% | 3.70%  |
| Council's Works Depot being offered for a 99-year lease?                          | 78.18% | 21.82% |

#### ADDITIONAL FEEDBACK

- I would prefer to see the Works Depot being retained to crowding Council activities onto the Figtree Park site
- A 99 year lease is the same as selling it. That's highly concerning. Margaret Thatchers governance proves that selling off public assets for short term gain is never a good idea. Neoliberalism and council governance should not go hand in hand. The council's role is to protect and preserve the community and our heritage, not reduce our assets. Reducing the council's assets is short-termism and must struck down with great gusto.
- No empire building at our loss!
- Any new building within the depot site should be excellent in design, and appropriate low key infill, respecting the significance of the surrounding residential character in scale, materials and design. It should introduce a garden setting into the site as public open space. This site must remain public land for use by the Municipality. Also the notion of "lazy" assets, mentioned in the draft infrastructure plan shows a particularly lopsided understanding of public space. Assets and land do not need to be "busy" to be useful to the community or worth keeping as open space. This philosophy has helped to disfigure Sydney in recent years. Passive open space is increasingly important as cities grow in size and population. It is essential for mental health, quiet enjoyment and for conservation of natural environment.
- The job of Council is to provide its services to the ratepayers as efficiently as possible. It should not seek to become a developer or landlord.
- Works Depot would make an excellent nursery. Council could get money selling plants.
- Moving the works depot to Lane Cove is the first cut in the 'Amalgamation by a thousand cuts' process.
- This is Community owned and should not be sold or developed for private use.
- 99-year lease on Works Depot inappropriate - should be retained by Council for its use with a low-rise building.

## Hub 3 - Henley Precinct

### Q5 In association with the sporting facilities - would you like to see:

|   | Yes    | No     |
|---|--------|--------|
| Improved amenities for sporting activities - storage, change rooms, etc?  | 75.00% | 25.00% |
| Replacement of grass field with synthetic field/s?  | 13.21% | 86.79% |
| A shared Sports and Community Facility?   | 75.51% | 24.49% |
| A gym to service users and local sporting clubs as part of the new amenities?                                       | 27.78% | 72.22% |
| A café to service users and local sporting clubs as part of the new amenities                                       | 55.56% | 44.44% |
| A cafe/restaurant to service visitors to the reserve?   | 57.41% | 42.59% |
| The current cricket pitch relocated either elsewhere on the site or, subject to agreement, to another site?         | 26.92% | 73.08% |
| Meeting rooms to cater for community groups with associated back of house facilities such as kitchen and amenities? | 65.38% | 34.62% |

### ADDITIONAL FEEDBACK

- Improved amenities for sporting activities - storage, change rooms, etc? If current amenities are seriously inadequate then it's OK to improve them. I strongly oppose the replacement of grass field with a synthetic surface: I understand synthetic surfaces are hot, cause 'burn' injuries, and are very expensive to replace after a life of only 7-10 years. Meeting rooms to cater for community groups: these can be provided within the old Henley Bowling Club premises
- Turning beautiful natural grass into a synthetic soccer field is unbelievably tacky and wrong. Somewhat reflective of the overall proposal. Australia is going through a transitional period. The climate is changing at a rapid rate. We have a responsibility to preserve the natural environment. The more carbon captured, the better. We should not be replacing grass with synthetic plastic which is known to get immensely hot (potentially causing injuries to kids who will play on it). That is not smart planning.
- WHAT new amenities? Decisions before community opinions?
- I think any new buildings and development of the parklands should be modest and kept to a minimum. See my comments below on co-locating some of these concepts in existing superfluous buildings.
- My family home was in Henley for 60 or more years and I am very familiar with the Henley Bowling Club's history and historical usage by my parents and other residents as a result. It clearly needs some renovation and refurbishment, but as was originally intended for that site when established in the 40's and 50's it must remain for community use. There is enough exclusive waterfront multi housing for the wealthy in this city.
- A gym to service users and local sporting clubs as part of the new amenities? not a commercial gym though.
- Have existing sports facilities been found deficient? If so, then a specific proposal could be considered but I am not in favour of development unless a specific need has been identified.
- The Henley site needs careful and considered thought before any commitments are made. There are too many inter-related options to reduce to a simple yes/no choice.
- Make a park and ride under croft commuter car park and put the synthetic turf on top. Do it once and do it well.
- Not sure about night time movements and social activities taking place.
- There should be careful consideration of current and future sporting needs.
- I particularly oppose a synthetic surface for the cricket/football/soccer field: my granddaughters tell me synthetic surfaces are hot in summer, and cause grazing when you fall. Moreover, I understand they have a limited life in spite of being very expensive to install. Meeting rooms already exist in the old bowling club, but probably need to be upgraded.
- This site should NOT be used for housing. It should be used totally for community based activities, halls, community rooms, museum, NO CAFES, there are enough of these around already, space would be better kept for people to have a picnic! There are enough Gyms in the area, I dont believe a gym should be put here.
- An not familiar with the site so no comments
- If short term, then an absolute misappropriation of rate payers money. Build, then bulldoze? Seriously?

## Q6 In association with the Henley Bowling Club site - would you like to see:

|   | Yes    | No     |
|---|--------|--------|
| Produce/craft markets?  | 91.23% | 8.77%  |
| Community Gardens expanded?   | 98.18% | 1.82%  |
| Provision of infrastructure to enable the staging of outdoor music/cultural events? | 58.82% | 41.18% |
| Community playground?   | 72.22% | 27.78% |
| An additional preschool   | 28.00% | 72.00% |
| Increased childcare centre capacity?  | 42.55% | 57.45% |
| Additional public amenities?  | 70.00% | 30.00% |
| A residential development?  | 12.73% | 87.27% |
| Better access to the waterfront?  | 67.31% | 32.69% |

## What would you like to see the Henley Community Centre (Bowling Club Building) used for?

- Community Gardens expanded? Yes, if the operators wish to expand Provision of infrastructure to enable the staging of outdoor music/cultural events? I would prefer this support to be provided as required, per event, as for Food&Wine Festival at Boronia Park Community playground? Yes, but not just for infants: we need suitable playgrounds for adolescents! An additional preschool? Increased childcare centre capacity? I can't answer these without knowing whether these are required, and what would be the impact on the site. Additional public amenities? My answer would depend on what amenities were proposed.
- Community space for seniors activities and for catered events in the future. An art hub with art exhibition both inside and in the surrounding grounds.
- Returned to parkland ....but possibly with a Community Centre and Library
- Community meetings and events e.g. concerts
- Bridge, yoga, art classes, drama classes, chess, quilting.
- Would be good to see a detailed plan
- Don't know
- Perhaps the existing building on two levels, could be used for some/all of the new development suggested above - community facility, meeting space for community groups, small cafe in a largely outdoor setting, storage and change areas for sporting activities (many of these are already being provided in \$2.5m Development at Boronia Park - don't need duplication). A Gym should not be developed on public land - there are numerous fitness facilities in the Municipality. A produce market is good but don't duplicate an existing one at Riverside. The waterfront bushland needs some bush regeneration to remove weeds, but should not be rezoned for residential sale in future. Waterfront bushland here and in little pockets all over the municipality (eg old wharf sites along the rivers) should be kept for public access and not quietly offered for sale to adjacent private landowners. I think there needs to be a better assessment of the use of synthetic grass to replace turf on sporting fields. Quite apart from the environmental issues, synthetic grass is known to melt in extreme heat and cause very nasty burns to children's skin - extreme weather is predicted to increase - so sounds like a poor investment.
- Community clubs, such as Probus, UA3 (Fairland Hall has become inadequate as outside UA3 groups are increasingly attending meetings outside of their local area), Chess club, Bridge Club and so on.
- Better access to the waterfront? depends on the plan and impact on the area. Shared workspace needed too.
- Additional pre-school and increased childcare capacity.
- For the community for gatherings, meetings, classes
- If HH needs a theatre, art gallery, museum, concert hall, this may be the place for it.
- Community use
- This is such a major refurbishment of the site that a design competition would be needed to get the optimum solution
- More community activities like art and bridge classes
- Residential Development/ Council chambers
- Art classes , pottery, craft, Gallery and pop-up facility with refreshments and amenities.
- Meeting rooms to cater for community groups with associated back of house facilities such as kitchen and amenities.
- Some of the above
- local community groups/volunteer networks plus small start up enterprises that support community wellbeing
- The Bowling Club building should be upgraded for the item above: 'Meeting rooms to cater for community groups with associated back of house facilities such as kitchen and amenities?'
- We don't need another market here. Leave the space for the community gardens. Outdoor staging can take place at Clarkes Point or within the grounds of the Gladesville Hospital Grounds. A new building here would have the museum, Library, facilities for the large no. of bridge players heavily utilising the hall now and smaller rooms for smaller

community groups to meet. Site is large, good access and plenty of parking. Location better suited to childcare, preschool than gym and outdoor staging of events.

- Activities providing support for parents and carers of young children, and a place for casual socialising for the elderly and less connected residents.
  - A Cafe or restaurant would be great, the view would be perfect.
  - Meetings as now
  - Social events such as wedding receptions, birthday parties, yoga classes etc.
  - Perhaps a recreation centre for senior classes and groups. Activity centre for mothers groups and refugee centre for English classes Community meetings and low-key events mainly.
  - An upgraded building for community use and plenty of open space for markets and outdoor events.
- 

## Q7 Do you have any additional concerns?

- I would like to see outdoor gym equipment similar to Morrison Bay installed in a number of council areas including the DOG park area riverglade
- None of these changes can be considered without assessing how they fit Council's financial plans. I'm opposed to anything that requires the loss or alienation of public land.
- That this may be a stepping stone for council to allow the development of apartments and a private function centre in the community area.
- Where is this supposed money coming from? Something stinks.
- Over development is always the greatest concern. Without seeing proposed drawings it is difficult to enlarge on ones opinions of what can be done with such a lovely sight.
- The draft Infrastructure document is full of non-specific ideas. It is filled with graphs and bibliographies and computer generated images of what things might look like but no detail. It is hard to read between the lines and understand the ramifications are of any of the proposals - What would stay what would go; what would the outcomes would look and feel like. What is the business case for any or all of it. I assume it involves sale or lease of a lot of public assets to private interests - so a one off it to Council's cash flow and permanent loss to the community. There must be more detail and explanation before there is debate and before decisions are made. There must be public discussion and Town Hall sessions - Most rate payers wouldn't even know of the document or understand the consequences. (As a PS, I dislike the term "Hub".)
- My main concern is the increase of traffic in my immediate area (Richmond Crescent/Mary Street) since the cafes were introduced at the Gladesville Rd/Ryde Rd intersection. It is becoming impossible for local residents to obtain a parking spot to shop at local shops, where we should be supporting our local businesses. I looked for a parking spot for 15minutes this week to simply have a prescription filled at Burt's Chemist. It's getting ridiculous. It's not always practical to get in the car to shop at Gladesville Shopping Centre, Top Ryde etc when there are local shops on our doorstep which have served us well in the past.
- Need parking, ideally underground.
- Don't squander the green space.
- My main concern is that we retain areas of green space, keeping nature and areas for families to visit.
- The threat to open space is obvious.
- Make the under-croft of the oval Park and Ride and get funding from TfNSW.
- Parking, security
- This is important waterfront community land and should not be developed for housing.
- I strongly believe this land should remain for community uses and that there should not be any housing here at all.
- Not familiar with the Henley precinct so no comments
- My general concerns lie with the less able, the disconnected, and the rate payers who seem to always remain either uninformed or misguided.
- The swimming pool - could this become an ice rink?
- That the development is not huge and in keeping with the surrounding area. That all green spaces and trees are retained.
- The Happy Hens community gardens should stay permanently and enlarged.
- Potential for overdevelopment.