



Gladesville Campus Master Plan

Stage Two
Consultation Outcomes Report





Document Reference Table

Revision	Date	Prepared by	Reviewed by	Approved by	Remarks
1.	081111	LHP, KJA	MSch, KJA		
2.	111111		JMcC, WP		
3.	221111	LHP, KJA	MSch, KJA		

KJA document name & location

u:\client files\worley parsons\gladesville masterplan\consultation\stage 2\stage 2 - consultation report - 221111.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	Community response to the draft Master Plan	4
2.2	Future land uses	5
2.3	Heritage	5
2.4	Transport, traffic and parking.....	6
2.5	Feedback on consultation.....	7



1 Introduction

NSW Health is undertaking 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.

Previously, as part of the preliminary design process, the project team led by Worley Parsons undertook three workshops. These workshops tested the guiding design principles and provided an opportunity for community members and stakeholders to share their views and ideas for the future of the site. The feedback provided by over 120 participants at these workshops was used to inform the development of draft master plan options.

A second round of consultations was held to present and seek feedback on the draft master plan options developed by Worley Parson and Randles Straatveit.

Three community information sessions were held over two days at the Conference Room in the Sydney Cochlear Implant Centre, Gladesville Campus. The sessions occurred as follows:

- Thursday 3.30pm – 5.30pm, 42 people attended
- Thursday 3 November, 6pm – 8pm, 30 people attended
- Friday 4 November, 10am – 12pm, 21 people attended.

The information session format is outlined below.

- Presentation outlining the consultation process and introducing the project team (Michelle Schofield, *KJA*).
- Presentation on the Master Plan process (Jan McCredie, *Worley Parsons*).
- Presentation on design options (Brendan Randles, *Randles Straatveit*).
- Question and answer time, including time to fill in feedback forms.

Individual work sheets were provided on each table at the community workshops to ensure all ideas and feedback were accurately captured. Participants were asked to consider:

- Whether the options meet the expectations of current and future generations? How or how not?
- What they do and don't like, and why?
- Whether there were any further issues to be addressed in the Master Plan which had not yet been considered.

Feedback from the workshops will be used by the project team to refine the high level concept plans for the site and finalise a draft Master Plan. A summary of outcomes follows.

Note: As the exhibition period for the Master Plan will include a process for formal submissions, the feedback below is not a statistical analysis of all feedback, or an exhaustive report on the full range of views held by all people within the local community.



2 Outcomes

Participants supported the way the agreed design principles have been practically applied in the design options presented.

Many expressed their approval for the sympathetic design response to the existing buildings, landscape and surrounds.

“Overall a very sympathetic and holistic approach.”
- Community member

Community members expressed a high level of satisfaction regarding the way that their comments from previous consultation had been incorporated into the design options. The Plan’s emphasis on maintaining and improving public access was strongly supported by participants.

Community members and stakeholders emphasised that the previously identified constraints were significant issues for the future of the site. These were:

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

Issues which community members identified as needing further consideration in the Master Plan were:

- Liaison with existing tenants throughout any future change process
- Tenure of existing tenants
- Public transport, parking and traffic in and around the site
- Pedestrian movement throughout the site
- The financing of any future development and restoration of existing buildings
- Heritage, particularly moveable items and Indigenous heritage
- Infrastructure requirements e.g. energy/power supply

2.1 Community response to the draft Master Plan

There was strong support expressed for the sympathetic treatment of the site and suggested placement of new buildings.

Many of those who supported the Master Plan expressed concerns that the positive aspects of the Master Plan could be eroded over time or parts of the Campus sold off, creating a disjointed, disharmonious whole. They emphasised the need for a consistent and balanced treatment of the entire site.

“My biggest concern is that Government and Health do not accept the Plan.”
- Community member

Aspects of the design which received positive support from a large proportion of participants included:

- The sympathetic approach to placing buildings in the landscape
- The retention of, and emphasis on, green space and the landscape
- The commitment to maintaining public access
- Education and appropriate boutique hospitality as possible future uses
- Treatment of the site as a whole, without fracturing it, or selling it off piecemeal
- Maintaining open vistas to the water.

Some participants noted that there needed to be more consideration of the site’s relationship with the river and nearby National Park.

“Redevelopment of this area should clearly be sensitive to the adjacent NPWS Bedlam Regional Park.”
- Community member



2.2 Future land uses

There was general support for educational uses on the site. Some people asked whether there was an existing indication of interest from any educational institution.

Participants supported the inclusion of an auditorium, particularly if it were accessible to the community for creative and educational uses. It was suggested that there be more investigation into demand for such a facility in this area.

There was a mixed reaction to the suggestion of residential buildings on the eastern and western edges of the site.

- There were concerns expressed about density and height of any proposed residential development, particularly the impact of traffic and parking, visual amenity on neighbours and quality of design.

“This area should remain open to the water to give good views to the water. Large buildings will block vistas and remove vegetation cover.”
- Community member

- Housing in the existing area near Crown Close was viewed as less problematic than the potential for housing to be placed off Punt Road where there are existing cottages.
- Some participants preferred to transform the area near Punt Road into parkland if the cottages were removed.
- Some participants supported the residential components, due to the thoughtful scale and placement, especially if the proposed heights were in keeping with existing buildings on the site.

“I like the low rise buildings in harmony with topography and existing buildings.”
- Community member

- Some participants supported a mix of housing, to support an ageing population with appropriate housing choice in the area.
- One participant wanted the campus to be “maintained, controlled and adapted by NSW Health... as the hospital provides a ready made facility for many potential health uses..”

“I like the provision of housing that would introduce housing choice and allow people to age in place.”
- Community member

Other suggestions for land use included:

- Aquatic centre
- Health and wellbeing centre
- Aged care facility
- Museum.

2.3 Heritage

While participants appreciated the extensive investigation into the build and health-related history of the site undertaken to date, they requested that more investigation be done into Indigenous heritage on the site.

Participants reiterated the importance of respectful treatment of built heritage items.

“I’m impressed with your planning of buildings to complement, not obscure the current historic buildings.”
- Community member

Representatives from the SPASM Museum noted the need to maintain a space to preserve and present the moveable heritage items of the site.



Some community members requested that the Master Plan include a provision for recognition of those who died and were buried at the hospital (and in most cases are still interred on the grounds). One possible solution suggested was a memorial wall including name plaques which commemorate the people buried there. An example provided was the All Saints' Cemetery in Parramatta.

Participants emphasised the importance of onsite heritage interpretation for visitors in any future development. In particular, participants thought that while the presentation deals ably with the physical heritage items, there is a need to address heritage more broadly.

While not being the specific planning instrument to direct such detailed works, the Master Plan should endeavour to ensure that there is space and opportunity for future heritage interpretation.

The Master Plan is focussed on ensuring the structure is right, but the project team also noted that the social history needed to be addressed. Examples of this were:

- Retention of moveable heritage on site
- Maintaining informal pathways
- Use of design installations to reflect the history

“Would be good to have clearer strategy articulated regarding cultural history embedded in this plan.”
- **Community member**

One participant requested that the Conservation Management Plan be made available, preferably online.

One participant wanted NSW Health to take responsibility for building restoration.

2.4 Transport, traffic and parking

As in the previous consultation, residents emphasised that traffic and parking is limited and in need of improvement.

“The traffic in Punt Road is already awful and the left hand turn into Punt Road will need to be handled better.”
- **Community member**

Nearby residents were concerned that any future development may create congestion and further limit parking, particularly along Punt Road. Punt Road is an important access way to the National Park, Banjo Patterson Cottage Restaurant and homes. This highlights the need and an opportunity to rethink Punt Road as a whole.

“I would like infrastructure to be addressed – more use of ferry transport would help traffic, perhaps. Victoria Road cannot cope now with traffic.”
- **Community member**

Participants identified a need for any future development to comprehensively consider the parking requirements of onsite uses, as well as nearby neighbours.

Participants supported the inclusion of terraced roof gardens, to provide more floor space and opportunities for parking and other underground uses while optimising open space and strengthening sight lines. It was noted that this could be a costly exercise.



2.5 Feedback on consultation

Generally participants were pleased with the consultation process and with the way that their feedback from Stage One had been incorporated in the design responses.

One participant criticised the process for a lack of transparency.

Others congratulated the team for their sensitivity for the site and responsiveness to issues raised by the community.

“The results and the options presented genuinely addressed many competing issues in the most constructive manner. So take this as a ‘very well done’ compliment and keep up the great work.”

- *Community member*