Executive summary

In May 2015, UrbanGrowth NSW released the *Transforming City Living: The Bays Precinct* Discussion Paper for public comment. There were many opportunities for the broad community and stakeholders to have their say and provide feedback on the Discussion Paper over an eight week engagement period between 15 May and 10 July 2015.

The invitation to provide feedback attracted great interest from a wide range of people including residents from all over NSW, community groups, special interest groups, local Government, business, industry, professional industry associations, academics and school children. The feedback was diverse and comprehensive, and will be invaluable in the future planning of The Bays Precinct.

Feedback was provided in many ways: face-to-face at the Sydneysiders Summit and Leadership Forums, at a Community Workshop with a Statistical Representative sample of the community, online via a survey, in writing and on social media. Feedback was given about The Bays Precinct as a whole and about the seven priority Destinations.

Overarching objectives

The NSW Government has developed five objectives that will apply to the transformation of The Bays Precinct. Throughout the engagement period, the majority of feedback related to the three objectives of public benefit, housing, and mass and active transport. Overall the feedback was supportive of these objectives and many of the responses provided suggestions for how the objectives could be achieved. The objectives relating to jobs and design excellence received a lower number of responses. For jobs, the responses received were predominantly in support of the objective. There was support for the design excellence objective with a focus on sustainability and places for people.

Feedback Themes

The feedback received on the Discussion Paper is:

- knowledge-intensive jobs are highly supported
- strong support for public access to the foreshore with direct access to the water
- any future development needs to acknowledge the history and working harbour
- connected public open space - recreation and cultural facilities are essential
- well planned social infrastructure to support future population is necessary
- housing diversity with affordable housing targets is very important
- The Bays Precinct should be connected and accessible via active and public transport
- a strong and transparent governance structure that incorporates a whole of Government approach is necessary
- A clearly articulated planning framework to consider The Bays Precinct as a whole is necessary
- The Bays Precinct should be a future global hub.

The Discussion Paper includes plans for seven destinations of The Bays Precinct that will be transformed over the immediate, medium and longer term. Destinations identified as an immediate priority, within the next four years, are presented in the Discussion Paper with a proposed objective, features and a schedule of the possible mix of uses. The immediate priority destinations received a greater number of responses. For medium and longer term priority destinations, the Discussion Paper identified possibilities and the mix of uses proposed for the public to comment on.

**Immediate Priority Destination 1: Bays Waterfront Promenade**

There was significant support for the development of a continuous waterfront promenade. The majority of responses suggested that the proposed promenade be extended beyond that proposed in the Discussion Paper. The most common comment received was to include the Glebe Island Bridge as part of the Bays Waterfront Promenade. The contribution the Promenade could make to public benefit and as an important connector for mass and active transport were the other key themes for this Destination.

**Immediate Priority Destination 2: Bays Market District**

The rejuvenation of the Sydney Fish Market with an expanded fresh food offering was supported by the majority of responses received. For a large number of responses the rejuvenation was considered overdue and much needed. There was however concern that the authenticity of the market would be lost as a result of rejuvenation and prices would increase. Improved connections to Wentworth Park was one of the most significant themes regarding public benefit and it was suggested that Wentworth Park be included as part of The Bays Precinct.

**Immediate Priority Destination 3: White Bay Power Station**

There was general agreement with the objective that the potential of the White Bay Power Station should be unlocked, however the suggestions varied from that proposed within the Discussion Paper. Although there was some support for the area to be a hub of knowledge-intensive industries, suggestions for the White Bay Power Station focussed predominantly on activities that would have greater public benefit such as a cultural precinct, science museum or education centre or a centre for sustainability. Maintaining the area surrounding the White Bay Power Station as public open space connected to the foreshore was also a significant theme.

**Immediate Priority Destination 4: White Bay including White Bay Cruise Terminal**

Implementing solutions to the environmental and operational issues at the White Bay Cruise Terminal was supported across the responses received, however a large number of respondents disagreed with the objective and would prefer for the White Bay Cruise Terminal to be removed from its current location. Facilities and activities that would attract tourists and
residents to the area as well as improved public transport to the Cruise Terminal were some of the other significant themes to emerge from the responses received about White Bay.

**Medium Term Priority Destination 5: Rozelle Bay and Bays Waterways**

The potential of the Bays Waterways was the largest theme to emerge in this Destination with suggestions relating to recreational opportunities and access to the foreshore. The superyacht marina was an issue of concern for a large number of respondents particularly in relation to the potential for privatisation of the waterfront and safety.

**Longer Term Priority Destination 6: Rozelle Rail Yards**

There was general support for the Bays Precinct transformation to reconnect areas north and south of the Rail Yards, although a number of respondents suggested that the existing transport corridors should be preserved for future transport needs. The potential impact of WestConnex on the area and on the implementation of the transformation plan for The Bays Precinct was raised by a number of respondents.

**Longer Term Priority Destination 7: Glebe Island**

The possibilities for Glebe Island identified within the Discussion Paper focussed predominantly on the economic activities of the maritime industries; however the theme of public benefit received the greatest number of comments. The majority of responses received discussed the future of Glebe Island as a place for the community with public open space and recreational facilities.

**Feedback on the engagement process**

A range of responses were received in relation to current and future engagement processes for The Bays Precinct. Feedback included that public consultation should be ongoing during every stage of the project, there is a need to engage more with the Indigenous community, and there was a lack of detailed information available for people to provide comment on. Feedback on the Sydneysiders Summit was very positive with more than 90 per cent of surveyed participants rating the event as being ‘good’ or ‘very good’, with a similar number saying that they felt that they had the opportunity to have their say on the Discussion Paper.
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1. **Introduction**

**Transforming City Living: The Bays Precinct A Discussion Paper**

In May 2015 UrbanGrowth NSW released the *Transforming City Living: The Bays Precinct A Discussion Paper* (Discussion Paper) for Public comment. There were many opportunities for the Public to have their say and provide feedback on the Discussion Paper over an eight week period.

The Discussion Paper sets out UrbanGrowth NSW’s approach around priorities, timing and possible uses for The Bays Precinct as well as an overall ambition. The feedback received from Sydneysiders, people from regional areas, local government, industry and other government agencies, as well as the concepts drawn out through the Call for Great Ideas, will inform The Bays Precinct Urban Transformation Plan (Transformation Plan).

Feedback was sought on seven destinations described in the Discussion Paper. The table below lists the destinations, their priority and proposed timing for works to commence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Timing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Destination 1: Bays Waterfront Promenade</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
<td>Works commencing 2015 - 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destination 2: Bays Market District</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
<td>Works commencing 2015 - 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destination 3: White Bay Power Station</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
<td>Works commencing 2015 - 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destination 4: White Bay including White Bay Cruise Terminal</td>
<td>Immediate</td>
<td>Works commencing 2015 - 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destination 5: Rozelle Bay and Bays Waterways</td>
<td>Medium-term</td>
<td>Works commencing 2019 - 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destination 5: Rozelle Rail Yards</td>
<td>Longer-term</td>
<td>Works commencing 2022 and beyond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destination 7: Glebe Island</td>
<td>Longer-term</td>
<td>Works commencing 2022 and beyond</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Discussion Paper p21

**Objectives of this feedback report**

This report has been prepared as a record of Public feedback received by UrbanGrowth NSW in response to the Discussion Paper. The main objectives of this feedback report are to:

- Provide an overview of engagement activities and tools used to seek feedback from stakeholders and the community about the urban transformation objectives and possibilities
- Summarise the feedback received and outline how it relates to the overall urban transformation and destination specific objectives and possibilities
- Describe stakeholder and community feedback on the engagement process.
**Report structure**

This report is a summary of the feedback received. It reports on the views received from the Public regarding what they like and do not like about the urban transformation objectives and opportunities and highlights some suggested improvements for The Bays Precinct Urban Transformation Plan.

This section provides an outline of the process undertaken to analyse and report on the feedback. Section Two reports on the feedback received regarding objectives that apply to the whole Bays Precinct. Sections Three to Nine focus on the individual destinations identified within the Discussion Paper commencing with the immediate priority destinations. Section 10 provides feedback on the engagement activities implemented by UrbanGrowth NSW and an overview of the respondents who participated in these activities.

Within the Discussion Paper, the immediate priority destinations each have suggested objectives, features, and proposed mix of uses to guide the transformation. These destinations received a greater number of responses due to more detailed information being provided and also a greater emphasis being placed on these destinations at the engagement activities. In contrast, within the Discussion Paper, the possibilities and proposed mix of uses are suggested for future transformation of the medium and longer priority term destinations.

The responses received through the engagement process have been analysed into themes reflecting the overarching objectives outlined in the Discussion Paper. The data is qualitative in nature, there has been no attempt to determine statistical significance of the comments received, rather analysis has been undertaken to identify the strength of feeling associated with the various responses received. No one idea has more weight than any other idea. A count of responses received within each theme has been undertaken to gain an understanding of the popularity of an idea from those who participated in the engagement activities. Single responses received which sit outside the themes have been documented in verbatim in Appendix A.
Pie charts presented at the beginning of each section provide an overview of the themes most commonly raised for each destination. These charts are specific to each destination and should be viewed as a summary of the themes and objectives most frequently commented on in response to the ideas presented in the Discussion Paper. At the Summit, participants were asked to indicate through a post-it note activity what they liked, didn’t like or would change about the objectives and potential mix of uses proposed within the Discussion Paper. A count of the number of post-it notes received for each category and for each destination is provided in Appendix B.

All feedback has been treated equally, with no preference or weighting given to feedback, including who it was from or how it was received. This report does not provide responses to issues raised during engagement activities.

Respondent’s feedback has not been documented verbatim. Comments of a similar nature have been grouped and summarised to reflect the essence of what was suggested by the responses. Any commentary on the responses is presented in italics to distinguish between the feedback received directly from the Public and the analysis undertaken by the reporting team.

**How feedback was provided**

Approximately 1,200 members of the public provided feedback on the Discussion Paper through multiple activities and channels as summarised in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Bays Precinct Sydneysiders Summit (Summit)</td>
<td>16 and 17 May 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Forums</td>
<td>15 and 18 May 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online survey</td>
<td>15 May – 10 July 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written submissions</td>
<td>15 May – 10 July 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media</td>
<td>15 May – 10 July 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council workshops</td>
<td>4, 10 and 17 June 2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Workshop</td>
<td>26 May 2015</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following section describes these activities in more detail including the questions people were asked.
The main event through which feedback was received was The Bays Precinct Sydneysiders Summit (Summit) that was held over two days on Saturday 16 and Sunday 17 May 2015 and attended by 841 members of the Public. The aim of this event was to present information about the transformation of The Bays Precinct and encourage feedback from a broad range of community members and stakeholders on the ideas presented in the Discussion Paper.

Australian Technology Park’s Exhibition Hall was transformed into an interactive display of The Bays Precinct. Sydneysiders entered a venue that guided them through the history and current uses of the area. The event space was designed to bring the Discussion Paper to life.

The program for the Summit included a series of short talks, 'discovery' displays and other activities that gave Sydneysiders an opportunity to provide feedback on the priorities, timing and possible uses for The Bays Precinct.

Attendees at the Summit were encouraged to provide feedback through a range of activities as outlined in the table below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feedback walls</td>
<td>Walls with display materials including aerial photos, questions about the Discussion Paper and butcher’s paper where participants were able to place post-it notes or write on the butcher’s paper with their comments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking tables</td>
<td>A table set up within display area for each destination where participants could ‘talk’ - voice their opinions and ideas which were typed by UrbanGrowth NSW.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video feedback booth</td>
<td>A video feedback booth was available for those participants who wanted to have their views recorded in a video interview.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question and answer sessions</td>
<td>At each of the Leadership Forums there was a presentation by UrbanGrowth NSW followed by a question and answer session. These sessions were all recorded and are on the UrbanGrowth NSW YouTube channel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit survey</td>
<td>Prior to leaving the Summit participants were asked to use iPads to complete an exit survey regarding the Summit and their participation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All feedback received at these events was recorded and transcribed for analysis.

The table below lists the questions posed to Summit attendees about the destinations. Detailed questions were asked about the project objectives and features for the immediate priority destinations due to more information being available for these destinations. A general question was asked about the medium and longer term destinations as a means of drawing out ideas on the future potential for these destinations.
### All Destinations | Questions

**The Big Picture – All Destinations**

| Objectives of the transformation | Do you agree?  
|                                | Do you disagree?  
|                                | What else should be considered?  
| Proposed mix of uses for each Destination | Do you agree?  
|                                | Do you disagree?  
|                                | Any other comments  

**Immediate Priority Destinations**

| Destination 1: Bays Waterfront Promenade | What do you like?  
| Destination 2: Bays Market District | What don’t you like?  
| Destination 3: White Bay Power Station | What would you change?  
| Destination 4: White Bay including White Bay Cruise Terminal | Any other comments?  

**Medium-term priority Destinations**

| Destination 5: Rozelle Bay and Bays Waterways | What issues should be considered in future planning?  

**Longer-term priority Destinations**

| Destination 6: Rozelle Rail Yards  
| Destination 7: Glebe Island | What issues should be considered in future planning?  

### Leadership Forums

Three Leadership Forums (forums) were held on Friday 15 May and Monday 18 May 2015. An overview of each of the forums is provided below.

**Leadership Forum (Locality)**

A Locality Leadership Forum was held on Friday 15 May 2015 and attended by 44 people representing community groups, Councils, local businesses and other groups with an interest in The Bays Precinct. A presentation was delivered by UrbanGrowth NSW including key members of the project team. Immediately after the presentation, attendees were provided with the opportunity to ask questions of the project team through a question and answer session. All of the questions and comments received during this session were recorded and a transcript was made available to the reporting team.

**Leadership Forum (Local Schools)**

A Schools Leadership Forum was held on Friday 15 May 2015 and attended by 34 students from local Sydney schools. A presentation was delivered by UrbanGrowth NSW including key members of the project team. Immediately after the presentation, attendees were provided with the opportunity to ask questions of the project team through a question and answer session. All
of the questions and comments received during this session were recorded and a transcript was made available to the reporting team.

**Leadership Forum (Industry)**

An Industry Leadership Forum was held on Monday 18 May 2015 and attended by 284 people representing a wide range of industry stakeholders from areas including architecture and design, construction, development, finance, health, education, innovation, tourism and overseas. Activities at this forum included a presentation by UrbanGrowth NSW and a question and answer session. All of the questions and comments received during this session were recorded and a transcript was made available to the reporting team.

**Statistically Representative Workshop (Community Workshop)**

A statistically representative workshop (Community Workshop) that involved 142 community members was held on 26 May 2015. The aim of the workshop was to engage with a representative group of community members to gain a better understanding of their thoughts and attitudes towards the Discussion Paper.

Participants were randomly selected by an independent consultant using an existing research database, and were a demographic and geographic representation of the Sydney community. This recruitment method was used to ensure the group included a large proportion of people who would not otherwise be interested in attending an event of this nature. Activities undertaken during the Community Workshop included facilitated small group discussions, giving a destinations personality trait exercise and polling. Particular emphasis was given to the immediate priority destinations of The Bays Waterfront Promenade, Bays Market District, White Bay Power Station and White Bay including White Bay Cruise Terminal. Feedback provided during the destination personality trait exercise is presented as a word cloud in each of the Immediate Priority Destination sections of this report. Appendix C contains the list of questions asked at the Community Workshop.
Council workshops

Three workshops were held with UrbanGrowth NSW, Councillors and staff representing the City of Sydney Council and Leichhardt Municipal Council. The aim of the workshops was to engage with councils within the project area to gain a better understanding their views on the urban transformation objectives and possibilities. Council representatives were also asked to suggest potential improvements to the Discussion Paper. Each workshop focused on destinations within The Bays Precinct.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Workshop</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Destinations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4 June 2015</td>
<td>Bays Waterfront Promenade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10 June 2015</td>
<td>Bays Waterfront Promenade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>17 June 2015</td>
<td>Bays Market District, White Bay Power Station</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Online surveys

One general survey and seven destination specific surveys were available on The Bays Precinct Sydney website (www.thebayssydney.com.au) giving the Public an opportunity to provide feedback on the Discussion Paper. A total of 111 surveys were completed, with more than half the number of respondents completing general comments on all the destinations within the survey. A list of questions asked in each survey is contained in Appendix D.
Written submissions

A total of 27 written submissions were received providing feedback on the Discussion Paper; 13 submissions were submitted by individuals and 14 submissions by organisations. The following organisations made submissions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Written submissions - Organisations</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bays Community Coalition</td>
<td>All Hallows Catholic Primary School (students)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycle Network</td>
<td>Pyrmont Action Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackwattle Cove Coalition</td>
<td>Southern Sydney Regional Organisation of Councils</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Sydney</td>
<td>Sydney Harbour Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EcoTransit Sydney</td>
<td>Tourism and Transport Forum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leichhardt Municipal Council</td>
<td>Walking Volunteers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature Conservation Council</td>
<td>White Bay Stratas Committee</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Social media

UrbanGrowth NSW utilised YouTube, Twitter and Facebook to present information and gather feedback. The following table provides a summary of social media statistics from each of the social media channels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social media activity</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facebook posts by UrbanGrowth NSW (video/photo)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook post comments</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook post likes</td>
<td>3,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook post shares</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YouTube views of video content</td>
<td>146,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of #SydneysidersSummit on Twitter</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Approach to analysing feedback

To undertake a comprehensive analysis of the feedback received and prepare this report, GHD completed the following tasks:

1. Collate stakeholder feedback from various sources
   - The Bays Precinct Sydneysiders Summit
   - The Bays Precinct Leadership Forums
   - Community workshop
   - Council workshops
   - Online surveys
   - Written submissions
   - Social media.

2. Obtain agreement with UrbanGrowth NSW on the level of reporting detail and categories to be used for coding and analysing the feedback

3. Code the feedback from the various sources according to the agreed categories

4. Undertake a high level thematic analysis of the coded feedback

5. Prepare report on feedback.

There was regular contact with UrbanGrowth NSW to confirm the reporting format and receive clarification regarding the data provided.

Geographic location and demographics of respondents

People were asked to provide their postcode when attending engagement events or providing feedback. Figure 1 provides an overview of the geographic distribution of people who attended an engagement event or provided feedback via online survey or written submission. The map shows the geographic spread of respondents in Sydney. In addition to this, approximately 3 per cent of respondents listed their location as being from elsewhere in New South Wales, Australia or from overseas. Demographic data for a selection of respondents can be seen in Appendix E.
Figure 1 Geographic location of respondents across Sydney
2. **Overarching themes**

There were 1,111 responses received regarding the overarching objectives for The Bays Precinct as outlined in the Discussion Paper and listed below.

**Objectives:**
- To deliver a hub of export-oriented knowledge-intensive jobs that can increase Sydney’s global competitiveness
- To deliver enduring, socially inclusive and great places to benefit Sydneysiders and national and international communities
- To deliver housing choices, including affordable housing options, through design, finance, and construction excellence
- To deliver a world class mass and active transit and infrastructure solution that unlocks the economic and human potential of The Bays Precinct and demonstrates a model of environmental excellence
- To achieve building design excellence and quality urban design in all destinations.

Source: Discussion Paper p10

**Feedback on the objectives**

Of the responses received there was a fairly even distribution of comments across the objectives of housing choices, socially inclusive and great places, and mass and active transit, as shown in Figure 2. The two objectives that received a smaller amount of feedback included knowledge intensive jobs and design excellence. In addition to providing feedback on the objectives, respondents also provided comment on the implementation and governance of the Transformation Plan.

**Figure 2 Overview of responses received regarding the objectives**

![Pie chart showing the distribution of responses: Housing choices (21%), Socially inclusive and great places (26%), Mass and active transit (17%), Implementation and governance (17%), Design excellence (11%), Jobs (5%), Other (3%)](chart.png)
Objective: To deliver a hub of export-oriented knowledge-intensive jobs that can increase Sydney's global competitiveness

Overall there was a high level of support for the creation of a hub of knowledge intensive jobs; this was also supported by the acknowledgement that these jobs would be required to support the proposed increase in population. Not all of the responses received supported the objective, and a number of comments were received expressing concern that existing maritime related jobs in the area would be lost as a result of the transformation of The Bays Precinct. A small number of responses related to the specific type of jobs that would be provided within the Bays Precinct with respondents commenting that future jobs shouldn’t just be for those in knowledge based industries.

A hub for knowledge intensive jobs

The Bays Precinct has the potential to become a hub for creative and knowledge based industries - design, technology, arts and robotics. The creation of new jobs and job types will benefit Sydney and ensure that it is well placed to transition to a knowledge based economy.

More jobs are required for the proposed increase in population

The creation of more jobs is required for urban transformation to be possible. As the Sydney population increases, more jobs are required to ensure that unemployment levels do not increase. The creation of a stronger economy will result in more and a wider variety of jobs for the Public. Formal job targets should be established to demonstrate the Government’s commitment.

Existing maritime and industrial jobs should not be lost

Existing jobs in The Bays Precinct should be retained. Maritime related jobs such as yacht building, boat repairs and the various roles for workers at the port should not be lost due to urban transformation in the area. Knowledge based jobs are artificial and not as tangible as other types of jobs.

Creation of a wide range of jobs

Provision should be made for the creation of a wide range of jobs for people of all backgrounds. As well as jobs in knowledge based industries, additional jobs should be created in a range of areas including education, health, hospitality, tourism, retail and agriculture. Suitable job opportunities should also be available for people with disabilities.

Objective: To deliver enduring, socially inclusive and great places to benefit Sydneysiders and national and international communities

The objective for socially inclusive and great places received the greatest number of responses. The large majority of responses agreed with the objective and provided suggestions regarding the types of places that would benefit Sydneysiders and the broader community. Of these suggestions, the type of facilities that received a large number of comments included open space and recreation, access to the foreshore, heritage and recreational use of the harbour. Other suggestions included restaurants, entertainment, and arts and cultural facilities. A number of respondents commented that social infrastructure such as schools and health facilities should be planned as part of the transformation to cater for the needs of the additional population. A small number of responses were received regarding the recognition of Indigenous culture. Respondents also commented that accessibility for all ages and ability should be considered in the future transformation.
Open space and recreation to cater for the increase in population

More public open space will be required to accommodate the proposed increase in residents to the area. The Bays Precinct can be a critical part of the NSW Government Architects Office’s Green Grid program that aims to achieve the 202020 vision of green space across Sydney. One of the aims specified in *The Green Grid: Creating Sydney’s Open Space Network* is to increase access to open space at a local, district and regional scale. The vision requires an improvement and expansion of Sydney’s network of open spaces. Public open space should be used to connect the different destinations within The Bays Precinct integrating with public transport.

The public open space should allow for active and passive recreation and include facilities such as seating areas, bike tracks, playgrounds, exercise areas and off-leash dog areas. Any landscaping, particularly within the areas of public open space should include native plants.

Open space does not necessarily have to be within the traditional parks but should optimise the use of existing green areas. Grass verges alongside pedestrian footpaths could become activated through community gardens; other areas for greenery could also include vertical gardens and rooftop gardens.

The area should have a sufficient number of playing fields that cater for range of different sports. A recreational needs study should be undertaken to determine the recreation infrastructure required to service the needs of the potential future population. In addition to multipurpose sports fields, recreation facilities within the area could include a swimming pool, netball courts and cricket ovals.

A commitment to public access to all foreshore areas

A commitment to public access to all foreshore areas will greatly benefit Sydneysiders and this will flow on to an increase in tourism. The vision of public use of the waterfront is supported however care should be taken to ensure that the area does not just benefit the wealthy but is able to be used by all.

Acknowledge heritage within the area

Any redevelopment must acknowledge the working history of the harbour. The heritage assets and values within the area should be the generator of the local character rather than global brand blandness. The wharves and working areas of the harbour make The Bays Precinct foreshore unique to Sydney and they should be acknowledged and respected in the redesign. Where possible there should be adaptive reuse of heritage buildings or historical interpretation of their distinctive features. Funding has been an issue on other heritage sites such as Callan Park, and consideration should be given to ensuring that this does not prevent redevelopment from occurring.

Encourage recreational use of the harbour

Recreational use of the harbour should include:

- Accessible launch sites for kayaks/canoes and other facilities for non-motorised recreational boat access and safe access for rowers and dragon boats
- A diving station
- Sailing clubs for children.
Provide a range of cafés, restaurants, markets and entertainment

The Bays Precinct should include a range of restaurants, cafés and art galleries that attract people to the area. There should be a range of retail outlets including a fresh food market dedicated to local produce. There should be places for entertainment including playgrounds and parks catering for children and young people, such as a skate park or outdoor education facilities. Other entertainment facilities could include a cinema complex or barefoot bowling. There is concern that the inclusion of these facilities will result in the area becoming unaffordable. Consideration must therefore also be given to free activities that anyone can access.

Additional social infrastructure to cater for the increase in population

If the population is going to increase then additional social infrastructure such as schools, childcare and hospitals will need to be provided. Education facilities within The Bays Precinct area are currently at capacity. Additional primary and high schools will be required to address the needs of the future population. More information needs to be provided outlining how these facilities would be planned for prior to redevelopment. In addition sufficient health facilities also need to be provided, including hospitals and medical centres.

Ensure access for all ages and abilities

The Bays Precinct has to have universal access that will cater for people of all ages and abilities. Access should consider movement between the different areas of the Bays Precinct as well as external connections to other parts of Sydney.

Recognition of Indigenous culture

There should also be acknowledgement of Indigenous culture through the recognition of Indigenous sites. An Indigenous Cultural Centre could be included in recognition of the nation’s first people. The centre should be developed by the Indigenous community and could include a museum where you can experience the culture.

Art and cultural facilities to be integrated as part of the transformation

Art and cultural facilities should be integrated as part of the transformation of The Bays Precinct. Cultural facilities could include performance spaces, cultural centres, spaces for community events and public art. They could be promoted as a cultural and arts precinct that aligns with other creative cities around the world such as London, New York City and Berlin.
Objective: To deliver housing choices, including affordable housing options, through design, finance, and construction excellence

Of the feedback received regarding the objectives in The Discussion Paper almost one quarter related to the objective regarding the delivery of housing choice. The most significant theme in relation to housing related to the provision of affordable housing within The Bays Precinct and this theme was also discussed in most of the seven destinations. Comments regarding the provision of affordable housing related to affordable housing targets and a mix of housing types. The other strong theme in housing was density with many comments suggesting that high density should be avoided due to the potential for adverse impacts such as loss of view corridors and overshadowing. While the majority of comments regarding this objective focussed on either affordable housing or the type of housing to be provided within The Bays Precinct, a number of comments were received that did not agree with the objective including that housing not be provided at all within The Bays Precinct. A small number of respondents suggested that there should be a system for subsidising housing for artists in order to encourage culture within the city.

A commitment to affordable housing

The provision of affordable housing within The Bays Precinct should be a priority. Sydney needs a range of affordable housing options to meet the needs of the disabled, aged, Indigenous, low income earners and people in essential support services such as nurses, teachers and emergency service workers. Currently, there is no formal Government commitment to address housing affordability in Sydney. There is a strong need to implement formal affordable housing targets in The Bays Precinct, similar to other cities such as London and New York City. Formal affordable housing targets should be set in the order of 20 per cent to 50 per cent although close to 35 per cent is preferred. There should be separate targets set for social, public and support services housing. Having a beautiful development is wasted if no one can afford to live there and the area becomes a ghetto for the rich.
**Mix of housing choices**

There should be a mix of housing choices to cater for people of all incomes and professions. This should include a mix of quality low, medium and high density housing options such as studios, apartments and family friendly accommodation located in low and medium rise buildings. Appropriate open space and recreational areas should be available to support the housing choices put in place.

**Minimise high density housing**

Avoid the development of high rise apartment towers or other high density housing on the waterfront, as it may block views and create wind tunnels. Development of high density housing should be tightly regulated so it cannot be in place without sufficient social infrastructure. Recent development along the Glebe Foreshore and Blackwattle Bay through to Balmain has set a precedent for medium density housing; no greater than five storeys and this should be retained.

**No housing within The Bays Precinct**

The Bays areas are beautiful places that should be enjoyed by the public and should not be shut off to locals by putting in houses. There are already enough houses around The Bays Precinct without additional housing being built. Housing does not need to be everywhere and it should not be mixed in with areas used for industrial purposes. Additional housing should not be considered if there is not sufficient social and transport infrastructure in place to cater for the increased local population.

**Subsidised housing for artists**

A global city needs artists close to the urban centre of things. They add spirit to the mundane but will no longer be able to afford to live and work in these areas. Subsidised housing could be provided to artists or other in creative industries to encourage them to live, work and foster innovation in the area. This housing concept could be modelled on case studies in South Boston and Rotterdam.

**Finance arrangements for housing**

Various finance arrangements should be considered for low cost and affordable housing. This could include long term leases, corporation managed apartment buildings (as opposed to individual investors), co-op housing or the issuing of Government bonds to encourage investment in Government managed housing. Developer levies should be used to fund affordable/social housing.

**Objective: To deliver a world class mass and active transit and infrastructure solution that unlocks the economic and human potential of The Bays Precinct and demonstrates a model of environmental excellence**

The provision of improved mass and active transit systems were considered by many respondents to be critical for The Bays Precinct to demonstrate a model of environmental excellence. The majority of comments regarding this objective comprised of suggestions for improving the current provision of active transport infrastructure and improvements to the existing public transport system. Some of the comments emphasised the importance of The Bays Precinct being well connected to areas within The Bays Precinct, the CBD and the surrounding suburbs. A number of comments were received regarding the potential impact of future road projects such as WestConnex. Similarly, other comments queried how parking would be considered and future impacts on the surrounding road network.
A commitment to active transit

The implementation of a commitment to active transit will contribute to building a cycling culture. A financial investment into appropriate cycling infrastructure is required. This infrastructure should include cycle storage, bike tracks that are elevated over roads allowing express routes into the city, separate pedestrian and cycle paths to reduce conflicts between the two transport modes. There should also be bicycle hire facilities and a greater availability of bikes, electric bikes and scooters.

Cycleways should be provided directly onto ANZAC Bridge or Glebe Island providing a direct access route into the city. Cycleways and pedestrian friendly pathways that connect The Bays Precinct to the CBD will reinstate the human scale to the area. There has to be a commitment to active transit to ensure that cars don’t dominate.

Public transport should be the first priority

Public transport should be the first priority in order for The Bays Precinct to be of a global standard. The creation of great spaces can only be achieved if they can be accessed easily and are well connected to other parts of Sydney. Improved public transport to and from the area is required in order to reduce car and traffic congestion and reduce the need for parking.

Suggestions for improving public transport

- Improved ferry services connecting Balmain, Pyrmont, the Sydney Fish Market, Circular Quay and Darling Harbour. The Glebe ferry service should be reinstated.
- The existing light rail service should be extended through White Bay to the White Bay Cruise Terminal, Balmain Wharf/Mort Bay with direct connections to Circular Quay.
- Increase the capacity of the existing rail service by extending the western line underground from Burwood connecting to Barangaroo. A train station could then be built within The Bays Precinct.
- More effective use of transport on the harbour including vaporettos, ferry taxis and express boats Planning of public transport should be integrated with infrastructure. It should be provided first rather than as an afterthought.

All areas of The Bays Precinct should be well connected

The most effective public benefit in developing The Bays Precinct is ensuring that all areas are well connected to each other, the CBD and the surrounding suburbs. This should involve utilising the bridges, both Glebe Island Bridge and ANZAC Bridge, existing transport connections and linking to the Sydney ferry system.

Consideration of the impacts of WestConnex

How are the potential impacts of Westconnex being considered? The area is already congested and this will be further exacerbated by the cumulative impact of WestConnex. The WestConnex project should be cancelled and replaced with a new rail service to the inner west and western suburbs. There needs to be more clarity on the position being taken by UrbanGrowth NSW with regard to WestConnex. If WestConnex is constructed to the current plans then the development in the Rozelle Rail Yards will be significantly restricted.
Provision of car parking should be a consideration

There is already very limited public/private parking. An increase in residents and workers will exacerbate parking issues and increase the amount of traffic in the area. There needs to be a reduced reliance on private motor vehicles. The Transformation Plan should outline how car parking is being considered within Bays Precinct. In addition, as the area will become attractive to tourists, consideration should be given to where tourist buses will be accommodated.

Objective: To achieve building design excellence and quality urban design in all destinations

In comparison to the other objectives, this objective relating to building design excellence received substantially fewer comments. Those that were received acknowledged the importance of sustainability being considered in design. Design excellence would be critical to the success of the Transformation Plan; however some of the respondents expressed concern that the focus on design excellence would be at the expense of creating places that people want to spend time in. Some of the respondents provided case studies that should be considered as examples of design excellence.

Focus on sustainability

There should be a focus on sustainability within the development including the establishment of strong Ecologically Sustainable Design (ESD) principles and targets. An established target for sustainability would ensure that sustainability is not considered an ‘extra’ but is an integral part of staged development. The aim should be to achieve C40 climate positive certification. Best practice standards and guidelines should be complied with to protect the amenity of existing and future residential properties in relation to noise, fumes, air quality, vibration and flow through ventilation.

Design excellence is critical

Design excellence is critical in ensuring the success of The Bays Precinct Transformation Plan. To achieve this, there needs to be design excellence in the strategic thinking as well as the built projects. There should be different architects creating world standard designs on a number of buildings. The designs should be creative yet still connect to the local environment and Australian culture.

Design places for people

The focus should not be on the visual design of the building, rather built places that people want to spend time in.

The following areas should not be considered as case studies to be replicated in The Bays Precinct: Darling Harbour, Harold Park, Dubai, Barangaroo or Canary Wharf.

Respect the natural interface

Design should respect the natural landscape respecting the interface between the natural and built environment. Development of The Bays Precinct should include a mangrove habitat, integrated green network connecting open space corridors and a city farm. There should be a commitment to biodiversity within The Bays Precinct. Consideration should also be given to the increasing intensity of rainfalls and the implications of intensification of the built environment within the floodplain of the Parramatta River and Sydney Harbour.
Case studies should be considered

- Frank Gehry building at University of Technology Sydney.
- Darling Harbour for wide walkways and greenery.
- New York City for its planning of parks.
- Paris for medium level density.

Case studies of international best practice have to be interpreted in the local context. The plans for each destination should respond to their unique location and context while incorporating the best elements of lessons learned overseas.

Feedback on overarching themes

In addition to feedback on the objectives for The Bays Precinct, responses were received regarding some of the overarching elements of the Discussion Paper. The majority of these responses focussed on the planning process. A small amount of feedback was received regarding Sydney’s place as a global city.

Planning process and governance

There were two major themes that emerged from responses commenting on the planning process. The first related to the issue of landownership particularly foreign ownership. The second theme discussed the governance structure respondents commented that all development should be subject to an open and transparent approval and tender process. Feedback, particularly from the council workshops and written submissions received related to the role of local government in the transformation process. Other responses received regarding the planning process focussed on funding and the importance of a strategic planning framework.

Land ownership

Land ownership should be controlled by the Government. Australian ownership comprising of NSW Government boards, superfunds and investors should be given priority to invest in the projects over foreign investment. Foreign ownership should be limited and taxed so that money can be reinvested into public benefit. As much as possible, public ownership, particularly along the foreshore should be retained.

Clarification is required whether the Commonwealth Department of Finance, Services and Innovation or Government Property NSW, are to be included in the list of departments working on The Bays Precinct. The role of the Foreshore Committee also has to be clarified particularly regarding how it relates to UrbanGrowth NSW.

Ensuring that there is an appropriate level of governance across the transformation process

All development within The Bays Precinct will need to be subject to an open and transparent approval and tender process. This will require a governance structure that defines the development objectives and outlines controls that developers must adhere to. The governance process will ensure developers are held accountable, preventing unsolicited or commercial in-confidence proposals. Development opportunities should be provided to a number of different developers rather than risk the entire precinct being managed by a single developer. This model for governance should ensure a whole-of-government approach to planning and implementing The Bays Precinct transformation.
Local Government involvement

The partnership between State and local Government should be developed further, particularly as the City of Sydney Council and Leichhardt Municipal Council are likely to take on planning and governance and the ongoing maintenance of community facilities in The Bays Precinct. Both councils have Community Strategic Plans that research the community’s views in relation to active and public transport, housing mix, balancing residential with commercial and industrial development, public open space and recreational facilities, environment protection and enhancement, and community services.

Regular workshops and briefings with the Councils are required to maintain a partnership approach and ensure the knowledge the Councils have of their communities is incorporated into further development of the Plan. The Parramatta Road Urban Transformation Plan seconded Council staff into the UrbanGrowth NSW project team; a similar arrangement could be used for The Bays Precinct.

Funding

An investigation into appropriate funding mechanisms needs to be undertaken. There has to be greater recognition that a proportion of the funds required for the delivery of The Bays Precinct will be generated by development. In addition, sites within and adjacent to The Bays Precinct that benefit from the project, should make appropriate contributions (financial and otherwise) to the realisation of the plan. Awareness should be raised within the community that there will be trade-offs between actions within the plans and development to enable these plans to be funded.

Strategic planning framework

An overall strategic framework is required to bring The Bays Precinct together into one single entity rather than a series of individual projects. The framework should be consistent with the aims and objectives of the Sydney Regional Environmental Plan (Sydney Harbour Catchment) 2005 (SREP). The aims of the SREP have been developed to ensure that the Sydney Harbour is maintained as an outstanding national asset and one of national heritage significance. The Transformation Plan should also make reference to the City of Sydney’s Sustainable Sydney 2030 strategy.

World-class global Sydney

A small number of responses provided commentary regarding how development of The Bays Precinct will contribute to Sydney’s role as an internationally competitive city.

- The Bays Precinct will attract tourists to Sydney, and further our reputation as an internationally renowned city.
- In order for White Bay to be an important global hub it must be accessible from the city by walking/riding/public transport.
- The Transformation Plan is ambitious and modern and will provide a much needed lift to Sydney's international profile.
Figure 3 Feedback on the proposed mix of uses, Sydneysiders Summit May 2015
Immediate Priority Destinations

Destination 1: Bays Waterfront Promenade
Destination 2: Bays Market District
Destination 3: White Bay Power Station
Destination 4: White Bay including White Bay Cruise Terminal
3. **Destination 1: Bays Waterfront Promenade**

There were 388 responses received regarding Destination 1: Bays Waterfront Promenade. The Bays Waterfront Promenade has been identified in the Discussion Paper as an Immediate Priority Destination. The community were invited to provide feedback on the objectives, features and the mix of uses proposed for The Bays Waterfront Promenade.

At the Community Workshop attendees participated in an activity to describe the personality of The Bays Waterfront Promenade. The result of this activity is presented at the end of this section.

**Objective**

For the first time, to deliver a continuous, staged, waterfront Promenade from Balmain to Pyrmont, connecting right through to the CBD and beyond.

**Features**

- A 5.5 kilometre Promenade from Balmain to Pyrmont
- Options for walking and cycling by the water
- A new must-see destination peppered with activity.

**Possible mix of uses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Public realm</th>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>Employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Destination 1: Bays Waterfront Promenade</td>
<td>•••</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: *** Major focus, ** Moderate focus, * Minor focus, - None

Source: Discussion Paper p22

**Feedback regarding Destination 1: The Bays Waterfront Promenade**

The inclusion of Glebe Island Bridge as part of The Bays Waterfront Promenade was the most significant theme and was raised in almost one third of the responses received regarding The Bays Waterfront Promenade, as shown in Figure 4. The other significant themes include public benefit, the 5.5 kilometre promenade, and transit and connections to the promenade. Other minor themes include the planning process, jobs and housing, these themes relate directly to the overarching objectives for The Bays Precinct.
**Glebe Island Bridge**

The inclusion of Glebe Island Bridge as part of the Bays Waterfront Promenade was the most significant theme to emerge from the responses received regarding this Destination. There were a number of suggestions for how Glebe Island Bridge could be incorporated as listed below.

**Suggestions for Glebe Island Bridge**

- Glebe Island Bridge would provide an important connection to the other side of the harbour enabling the promenade to be continuous and loop around the harbour.
- The bridge should be reopened for pedestrians and cyclists.
- The bridge could be used for light rail.
- Reopening the bridge should be a priority as it can be upgraded at a low cost.
- Maintain Glebe Island Bridge with restaurants.
The promenade

Overall the feature of a 5.5 kilometre promenade from Balmain to Pyrmont was supported by the large majority of responses received. Feedback regarding this feature included suggestions that the promenade should be extended through to other areas of Sydney or alternatively converted into a continuous circuit. A large number of responses commented that the promenade should be wide enough to accommodate the number of pedestrians and cyclists that would use it.

The promenade should be extended

The proposed promenade should be extended to the surrounding suburbs like Balmain East and Glebe. From the current plan it is not clear how the promenade will connect to the ANZAC Bridge. A tourist trail could be created extending from The Bays through to Rushcutters Bay, and this could include a cycle route. Looking 20 years forward, a walkway from Rushcutters Bay to Balmain could be featured in any Sydney travel book.

The promenade should be a continuous uninterrupted circuit

The promenade should allow for continuous access along the foreshore that is uninterrupted by the marina or other facilities that currently intersect the pathway. The location of the promenade should be reviewed to ensure that continuous access can be provided. The promenade should either be created as a loop by including the Glebe Island Bridge or ANZAC Bridge, or by providing return transport options such as ferry so that it can be used as a circuit without requiring people to double back. The continuous loop could also be created by constructing boardwalks over the water in some areas such as the intersection of Wattle Street and Bridge Road. A continuous circuit is a good idea to motivate people to stay healthy as they enjoy walking with a view of the water. It will allow for new activities within the city area.

Accommodate separate walking and cycling paths

The waterfront promenade will need to be wide enough to accommodate the number of pedestrians and cyclists who will use it, and this number will increase over time. Shared user pathways will not be sufficient and pedestrian and cycle paths should be separated to avoid conflict between the different users.

There should be sufficient space between the promenade and surrounding land uses to create a greater sense of open space along the promenade. This includes a specified requirement for buildings to be set back a minimum distance from the Bays Waterfront Promenade.

Public benefit

The feature within the Discussion Paper about the creation of a must see destination peppered with activity received the largest amount of comments within the theme of public benefit. The majority of these comments related to the types of activities that should be provided. Other sub-themes relating to public benefit include the provision of public amenities and open space. A small number of responses were received that did not support the feature of activities along the Bays Waterfront Promenade.

Activities along the promenade

Include opportunities along the promenade for different types of activities along the way. These activities should allow people to reconnect with the water, and they could include: kayak hire facilities, small boat storage, public paddleboats for hire, boat hire (perhaps a boat share service), in-harbour pool, steps down into the water, and areas to launch small remote-controlled boats.
Along the promenade there should be opportunities to encourage people to exercise through fitness stations for all ages and abilities, children’s playgrounds and coin operated bike rental for hop on and hop off uses. Activities should extend from just being an area for fitness and could include market stalls and art features. The promenade will be a long-term legacy for Sydney, so there should be flexibility to cater for a range of uses over time.

**Open space and green features**

The promenade should be a green way connecting a series of parks that are located alongside the foreshore. One space could include a new foreshore park on Bank Street that has previously been proposed for future public open space. The promenade should be designed as a tree lined walkway with natural landscaping and trees. Native plants and habitats along the waterfront will attract birds, butterflies and frogs etc. This is an opportunity to improve biodiversity and connection to natural environment, revegetate mangroves along the walkway for climate adaptation.

**Public amenities**

The promenade should be attractive looking with a reasonable provision of public amenities that will service the pedestrians and cyclists. These amenities should include shelters, widened sections of the promenade for breakout and seating, toilet facilities and water bubblers. In addition, there should be art installations and sculptures along the promenade by well-known artists. Sign posts and way finding should be put in place to encourage exploration and invite access to promenade.

Survey respondents were asked to rank the most important facilities to be provided along the promenade. The most important facilities included walking facilities, drinking fountains and access to the market, while the least important included other exercise, access between home and work, and cycling facilities.

**Constant activity should not be provided along the Promenade**

Constant activity should not be provided the whole way around. This could provide the Bondi to Bronte experience which has minimal activities along the walk.

**Connectivity**

*In relation to the theme of connectivity, the majority of comments received discussed the importance of the area being accessible by public transport with key linkages to areas adjacent to the Bays Waterfront Promenade. A small number of responses were received with relation to the issue regarding the supply of parking and ensuring that sufficient parking is provided to accommodate new residents and visitors to the area.*

**The promenade should be accessible for all**

The promenade should have sufficient transport connections enabling pedestrians to easily access the route without relying on cars. Public transport could include ferry services that run across the river or light rail. The provision of public transport services could convert the promenade into a circuit, by providing a start/end of walk facility. However, there should be access to the promenade from many points with key linkages to the adjacent established neighbourhoods. It should also be designed to be accessible for all forms of mobility. This includes taking into consideration parking and access as well as non-slip surfaces, sufficient provision of seats and easy wayfinding.
**Adequate parking**

Parking is important and additional parking will be required to accommodate both new residents and potential visitors to the area. New parking options could include underground parking or expanding parking into the area currently used by light industry along The Crescent, Annandale.

**Planning process**

*The main theme in relation to the planning process related to timing and ensuring that The Bays Waterfront Promenade is completed as soon as possible.*

**The promenade will need to be completed as soon as possible**

The Bays Waterfront Promenade is an exciting prospect, it has been promised before by various Governments, yet has never eventuated. The promenade will need to be delivered as soon as possible to ensure that it is not just another idea that is being put forward and never implemented.

**Other themes**

*The remaining themes raised in the responses received regarding Destination 1 related to existing features within the area and the need to acknowledge the area’s maritime past.*

**Remove existing features**

Nothing should remain of the existing structures; this includes removal of the cement plant, boat hire and wreck next to the Sydney Fish Market.

**Acknowledge the maritime past**

The promenade should incorporate innovative ways to reflect the history of the area. The acknowledgement of history could include a time line built into the fabric of the walkway, themed sections that reflect history, naming walking paths after Aboriginal tribes from the area. It is important that parts of the history are not lost while the area is redeveloped.
Personality of Destination 1: The Bays Waterfront Promenade

At the Community Workshop participants were asked to describe the personality of The Bays Waterfront Promenade Destination as illustrated in Figure 6.
Figure 6 Personality of Destination 1: The Bays Waterfront Promenade
Destination as described at the Community Workshop
4. **Destination 2: Bays Market District**

There were 490 responses received regarding Destination 2: Bays Market District. The Bays Market District has been identified within the Discussion Paper as an Immediate Priority Destination. The community were invited to provide feedback on the Objectives, Features and the mix of uses proposed for the Destination as specified within the Discussion Paper and provided below.

At the Community Workshop attendees participated in an activity to describe the personality of The Bays Market District. The result of this activity is presented at the end of this section.

**Objective**

To rejuvenate the Sydney Fish Market (wholesale and retail) and connect it to the water, and expand the fresh food offering, creating a world-class Bays Market District.

**Features**

- A rejuvenated Sydney Fish Market
- A new fresh food and produce market
- Restaurants, cafes, and Sydney’s best dining destination.

**Possible mix of uses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Public realm</th>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>Employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Destination 2: Bays Market District</td>
<td>⋆⋆⋆</td>
<td>⋆</td>
<td>⋆⋆⋆</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: ⋆⋆⋆ Major focus, ⋆⋆ Moderate focus, ⋆ Minor focus, - None

**Feedback regarding Destination 2: The Bays Market Destination**

The feedback received regarding The Bays Market District related directly to the features of the Destination with the Sydney Fish Market receiving the greatest number of comments, as shown in Figure 7. Transit and connections and public benefit were also major themes from the responses received about the Destination. Despite there being a major focus on employment and a moderate focus on housing in the Discussion Paper relatively few responses were received regarding jobs or housing.
Sydney Fish Market

The two main themes to emerge regarding feedback received about the Sydney Fish Market relate directly to the features proposed in the Discussion Paper for The Bays Market District. Respondents supported the expansion of retail opportunities at the Sydney Fish Market to include a new fresh food and produce market. Strong support was also given to the rejuvenation of the Sydney Fish Market and this was considered to be overdue. While there was a high level of support for the Sydney Fish Market to be rejuvenated and expanded, concerns were raised by a number of responses that the authenticity of the Market would be lost and prices would increase. Other themes raised a smaller number of responses related to sustainability initiatives and the potential for the Sydney Fish Market to be relocated.
Expand retail options

The Sydney Fish Market could be expanded into a fresh food market including fruit and vegetable produce and a growers market similar to Melbourne’s Queen Victoria Market. The markets could be converted into a world class fish market in combination with a world class farmers market that showcases the finest produce, food and wine from all over Australia. In addition to catering for tourists, the market should still have a local focus. The new market should include a variety of restaurants and open space where people can enjoy the produce onsite. Good examples of similar markets worldwide include: Chelsea Markets in New York City, Tokyo fish market and Global Village in Dubai.

Consideration should be given for uses within the market that will keep the area active after hours. Ideas for upgrading the market include having different areas within the markets for different cuisines, floating markets on the harbour, an artisans finders keepers style market, multicultural events such as noodle markets, night markets, and festivals and having celebrity chefs brand the market.

A rejuvenated Sydney Fish Market

The refurbishment of the Sydney Fish Market is well overdue and should be considered a high priority. The buildings are old, run down and not considered clean. There is an issue with the seagulls that leave a mess and grab food. The market should be a prime Sydney location to meet friends and visitors from out of town. It should be renovated to bring them up to international standards including dining areas and restaurants. Environmental standard on the management of the facility should be enforced preventing rubbish from contaminating the waterways.

Maintain authenticity of Sydney Fish Market

The Sydney Fish Market is the largest seafood destination in Sydney and the redevelopment should not result in a loss of authenticity. The market should stay affordable and maintain the primary purpose of selling seafood. Restaurants should not just be fine dining but should include the cheap fish and chips that have been associated with the Sydney Fish Market.

Renewable energy and sustainable packaging

The market should be sustainable utilising renewable energy that is obtained from solar panels on the roof and electrical power cells in the walkways. Within the market, sustainable practices should be encouraged such as biodegradable packaging without the use of polystyrene and plastic bags.

There is also an opportunity within the site to educate the community about sustainable fishing practices including, where your fish comes from and how it is stored and informative pieces about Australian and imported fish.

Relocate Sydney Fish Market

The Sydney Fish Market is currently in a prime location on waterfront land. Relocating the market would create the opportunity for the site to be redeveloped. Glebe Island and Blackwattle Bay were suggested as alternate locations. In addition, the pier along Bridge Road could be developed for the markets to be relocated.
Connectivity

It was recognised by almost a quarter of the responses received for The Bays Market District Destination that access and connectivity would need to be improved. Suggestions were received regarding a number of different travel modes:

- Improved parking facilities should be provided; these could include an underground parking facility, that would enable the existing parking to be used for open space or restaurants.
- Additional berths and mooring facilities so that patrons are able to access the market by boat. There should be more accessibility for recreational water users, with facilities to be able to park vessels while they visit the market.
- Improve boating facilities for community use under ANZAC Bridge with rooms, toilets, showers, boat ramp, boat storage (non-powered).
- Wheelchair access should be improved particularly from Pyrmont as lift and stair access has just been improved.
- Bridge Road should be relocated to the other side of the Avenue of the Figs (Wentworth Park), allowing greater access to the foreshore.
- Improved public transport is required to manage the logistics of visitors moving to and from the markets. Public transport options could include ferries across the harbour to connecting to other points within The Bays Precinct or the City.
- Traffic management is required to resolve conflicts between cars and trucks accessing the Sydney Fish Market. A traffic plan of the study area surrounding the market should be undertaken to address how traffic/congestion around the area could be managed.
• A pedestrian and cycle path should connect the Sydney Fish Markets to the CBD via Pyrmont Bridge. The pathway should have separate bike and walking tracks. Bicycle hire should also be made available.

Public benefit

The majority of responses received within the theme of public benefit related to Wentworth Park and its connection to the Sydney Fish Market. It was acknowledged that additional areas would need to be made available for public open space. Other responses regarding public benefit discussed the importance of maintaining culture and heritage in the area, the natural environment and cleaning water in the harbour.

Connection to Wentworth Park

Wentworth Park should be connected to the waterfront and the Sydney Fish Market. One option could be to close Bridge Road and construct a bridge. Having Wentworth Park connected to the Sydney Fish Market would enable better use of the park, while also providing a place to eat food purchased in the Sydney Fish Market. An improved connection would also open the vista from Wentworth Park to the Bay increasing the amenity of the Park. Perhaps close Bridge Road and install a bridge.

In addition to Wentworth Park, other areas should be made available for public open space and sport and recreation activities. The current Sydney Fish Market car park could be converted into a small park, similar to the Tumbalong Park amphitheatre. Other recreation facilities that could be provided in the area include sports fields, dog park, sport centre, exercise circuit and a beach within Blackwattle Bay.

Maintain culture and history in the area

The area should include some cultural facilities such as places of worship, cultural centres and art areas to replace artist studios that were demolished in Glebe. There should also be acknowledgement of Indigenous history in the area and this could be through a sculpture installation.

Maritime related industries should be maintained within the area, ensuring that the area remains as a working harbour. This includes ensuring that the fishing fleet stays within the Sydney Fish Market precinct. The cement batching plant should be relocated so that industry in the area remains maritime related.

Natural environment

Consideration should be given to the natural environment and plants within the area. Flowering trees will attract bees and birds, this should include native plants such as magnolia trees and bluebell flowers. Community gardens are effective at building communities and these could be integrated with the Sydney Fish Market. Edible plants and nut orchards could also be a feature within the area.

Clean the harbour water

Water within the harbour needs to be cleaned and free of pollution so that everyone can enjoy it. Currently the water smells and this is affecting the area. Encouraging mangroves to grow within the harbour will assist with removing pollution and improving the health of Blackwattle Bay.

Housing

Housing comprised approximately 11 per cent of the responses received regarding The Bays Market District. Of these responses, there was an almost equal distribution between those
responses discussing the need for the provision of affordable housing and those that disagreed with the Discussion Paper and stated that housing should be provided within this Destination.

**Provide affordable housing**

There is a lack of clear targets and commitment to the provision of affordable and social housing. The area should encourage a diversity of residents and this will require a range of housing. Affordable housing should be provided for key workers such as police, bus drivers, nurses and teachers, who will not be able to afford to live in this location.

**Housing should not be provided**

The area surrounding the Sydney Fish Market is not suitable for housing. It would be an unpleasant place due to the smell of the fish markets and close proximity to the freeway. The area should be kept for commercial uses. Other examples of similar markets such as the Queen Victoria Markets and San Francisco Harbour do not include housing.

**Personality of Destination 2: The Bays Market District**

At the Community Workshop participants were asked to describe the personality of The Bays Market Destination as illustrated in Figure 9.

**Figure 9 Personality of the Destination 2: The Bays Market District described at the Community Workshop**

![Word Cloud Image](image-url)
5. Destination 3: White Bay Power Station

There were 635 responses received regarding Destination 3: White Bay Power Station. White Bay Power Station has been identified in the Discussion Paper as an Immediate Priority Destination. The community were invited to provide feedback on the objectives, features and the mix of uses proposed for the White Bay Power Station as specified in the Discussion Paper.

At the Community Workshop attendees were asked to describe the personality of White Bay Power Station. The result of this activity is presented at the end of this section.

Objective
To unlock the potential of the White Bay Power Station to recognise its history in an authentic way.

Features
- A hub for knowledge-intensive industries
- Restoration of State-listed heritage.

Possible mix of uses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Public realm</th>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>Employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Destination 3: White Bay Power Station</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: *** Major focus, ** Moderate focus, * Minor focus, - None

Source: Discussion Paper p26

Feedback regarding Destination 3: White Bay Power Station

Public benefit and rejuvenation of the White Bay Power Station were the two most significant themes to emerge from the responses received regarding Destination 3 as shown in the Figure below. There was a lot of commonality between these themes the responses received recognised that the Destination could be possible because of the rejuvenation of White Bay Power Station. Transit and connections, design excellence (particularly in relation to sustainability) and housing all received a large number of comments reflecting the overall objectives for The Bays Precinct. One of the features for this Destination related to its role as a hub for knowledge intensive industries, however only a small number of responses discussed the theme of employment.
Public benefit

The opportunity for the White Bay Power Station Destination to be converted into a cultural precinct was one of the strongest themes to emerge from the feedback received. It was suggested that the White Bay Power Station could become the focal point as they key attractor to the area that would encourage art and cultural activities within the Destination. In relation to the theme of public benefit, respondents also discussed the opportunity for preserving the land surrounding the White Bay Power Station as public open space.

Creation of a cultural precinct

This Destination has the potential to become the arts and cultural precinct for The Bays Precinct supporting the creative character of Balmain. The Power Station could become the focal point of the Destination as a ‘Tate Modern meeting Chicago’s Millennium Park’. Rejuvenation opportunities could include a MONA-Style arts centre/gallery, Indigenous art gallery, museum or theatre. Activities and facilities within the cultural precinct could include artist studios, artists in residence and workshops. The Brisbane Powerhouse is one example of a power station being converted into an art and cultural hub.

There is the opportunity for the area to become a destination for local markets and festivals. As a new cultural precinct it has the potential to be a venue for the Biennale of Sydney and even part of the Vivid Sydney Festival.
Parkland surrounding the Power Station

The area surrounding the Power Station should be kept as open space and connect to the foreshore. The open space is particularly important if housing is proposed within the Destination. As a parkland it should be family friendly with a playground and gardens, it could also include a maritime sculpture garden incorporating some of the old industrial artefacts. Other activities to be included within the area surrounding the Power Station could include: swimming pool, skate park, cinema, sports field or community centre. The parkland should connect directly to the Power Station enabling inside access to the facility. Examples of similar open space include: Tumbalong Park, Central Park and the New York City Highline.

White Bay Power Station

Restoration of a State-listed heritage item as referred to in the Discussion Paper was supported by the majority of the responses received. White Bay Power Station was considered to be the focal point of this Destination and responses either discussed the importance of its preservation or suggested rejuvenation opportunities. However, a small number of responses were received that did not support its preservation and requested other options be considered for the location.

Restoration of a State-listed heritage asset

The White Bay Power Station is iconic and its heritage should be preserved. The White Bay Power Station building is the focal point of this destination and the building should be repaired so that it can be used by the community. The site should remain publicly owned and not be sold off to private developers. Adaptive re-use of the White Bay Power Station is a great idea. The history should be retained, while allowing community access to the facility.

Rejuvenation opportunities for the White Bay Power Station

The following responses were received regarding rejuvenation opportunities for the White Bay Power Station:

- A science museum or education centre, this could include relocating the Powerhouse Museum into the Power Station. There could be a Questacon type museum within the Power Station
- Tertiary educational facility such as TAFE or a university. The area could become an educational precinct catering from kindergarten to tertiary facilities
- A civic centre including council, town hall, library and community centres
- The White Bay Power Station has the potential to host multiple uses including retail, housing, cafes, meeting areas. A mix of activities is required to ensure the area is active after hours and on the weekends
- Develop as the new Sydney Fish and Food Market
- A distillery or brewery similar to that of the Bombay Sapphire project in the UK. The brewery would integrate with the industrial building.

The White Bay Power Station should not be preserved

The Power Station should be removed; it is a large building in a significant state of decay. Refurbishment seems unnecessary when other options could be considered that would take advantage of its prime location.
Connectivity

Feedback from the community regarding accessibility and connectivity related predominantly to the improved provision of public transport and opportunities for active travel. Concern was expressed by a number of respondents about vehicular access within the area and the impact this would have on road congestion.

Improved public transport

Public transport will need to be considered as part of the planning, this includes an extension of the light rail so that it connects to a station at the Power Station. The light rail could function as a metro connecting The Bays Precinct to Barangaroo. A ferry stop should also be provided enabling direct connections to Circular Quay and Darling Harbour. The existing rail link under Victoria Road should be maintained as a future option.

Pedestrian access to the site should be considered as a priority over vehicle access. There should be separate walking and cycle paths that connect to the CBD and Pyrmont.

Impact of vehicular access and road congestion

There is currently limited car access to the precinct, and this could cause congestion in the area as it changes over time. Traffic solutions will be required to improve the bottleneck at the end of Victoria Road. WestConnex will exacerbate congestion in the area and has the potential to restrict the development of the site.

Housing

Feedback regarding the provision of housing within the White Bay Power Station Destination was divided between those that support housing within this Destination and those that opposed. Those that supported made suggestions regarding density, diversity and affordability.

Suggestions for housing

- More detail is required about the plans for affordable housing, the target should be set at 30 per cent.
- A diverse mix of housing should be provided allowing for a diversity of residents.
- More detail is required regarding the density of housing proposed. Medium density development is more compatible with the White Bay Power Station than high rise development.
- New apartment blocks should blend with the façade of the existing buildings.

Housing should not be included within the White Bay Power Station Destination

Housing should not be included within the planning of this Destination. The White Bay Power Station site should not include residential development; it should be a place for the community with its surrounds for open space.
Design excellence

The majority of comments relating to the theme of design excellence discussed sustainability and the potential for the White Bay Power Station to become a generator for renewable energy. A number of respondents expressed concern about the overall design for the Destination.

A power generator for renewable energy

White Bay Power Station could be reinstated as a power generator for renewable energy. The roof top could be used for solar panels generating electricity for uses within the building and surrounding area with a zero carbon footprint. The solar panels would be an effective adaptive reuse of the building acknowledging its former use.

The Power Station could also be converted into a tri-generation plant, similar to the 2012 London Olympic power plant. The plant could generate energy from waste enabling the site to become self-sustainable. There is the opportunity for the site to become a green energy complex for research and development into renewable energy.

Concern about design within the Destination

Don’t turn the area into another Pyrmont, Barangaroo or Harold Park, where the bland high rise buildings are only available for the rich.

Jobs

All of the responses received in relation to the themes of jobs commented on the feature suggested in the Discussion Paper for the area to become a hub for knowledge intensive industries.

A hub for knowledge intensive industries

The Destination could become an innovation and sustainability hub with high technology companies such as Google or Apple in residence. The technology sector has a big tenancy in the CBD; the area should be attractive to relocate to. The hub should not just rely on one or two companies, but should also provide smaller spaces for start-up companies these could include co-working spaces or incubating centres. The hub will generate employment and add diversity to the area.
Personality of Destination 3: White Bay Power Station

At the Community Workshop participants were asked to describe the personality of the White Bay Power Station as illustrated below.

Figure 12 Personality of Destination 3: White Bay Power Station as described in the Community Workshop
6. **Destination 4: White Bay including White Bay Cruise Terminal**

There were 154 responses received regarding Destination 4: White Bay including White Bay Cruise Terminal. White Bay has been identified in the Discussion Paper as an Immediate Priority Destination. The public were invited to provide feedback on the objectives, possibilities and the mix of uses proposed for the Destination as described in the Discussion Paper.

At the Community Workshop attendees participated in an activity to describe the personality of White Bay including White Bay Cruise Terminal. The result of this activity is presented at the end of this section.

**Objective**

In partnership with the Port Authority of NSW, to engage stakeholder on innovative solutions to the environmental and operational issues at White Bay Cruise Terminal and consider longer-term future uses of White Bay.

**Possibilities**

White Bay has the potential to be transformed with medium density living designed to complement all that is enjoyed in the existing neighbourhoods that sit next to White Bay. These many different uses could exist alongside smaller scale working harbour activities.

**Possible mix of uses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Public realm</th>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>Employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Destination 4: White Bay including White Bay Cruise Terminal</td>
<td>⬤⬤⬤</td>
<td>⬤⬤⬤</td>
<td>⬤⬤⬤</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: ⬤ Major focus, ⬤ Moderate focus, ⬤ Minor focus, - None

**Feedback regarding Destination 4: White Bay including White Bay Cruise Terminal**

The White Bay Cruise Terminal received the greatest number of comments for this Destination as shown below. These related either to its removal or mitigation measures to reduce some of the adverse impacts on the surrounding area. Other significant themes related to public benefit and the opportunities that the White Bay Cruise Terminal could generate. Improved transit and connections to the White Bay Cruise Terminal was also a common theme. Similar to other destinations, housing received a moderate number of comments and these related to the provision of affordable housing.
White Bay Cruise Terminal

The majority of comments received regarding the White Bay Cruise Terminal discussed the negative impacts that the facility has had on the surrounding area. Responses either commented that the White Bay Cruise Terminal should be relocated to a ‘more suitable location’ or made suggestions regarding mitigation techniques that would reduce some of the impacts of the White Bay Cruise Terminal. A number of responses acknowledged that the White Bay Cruise Terminal could provide economic opportunities and benefits to the surrounding area.

Removal of the White Bay Cruise Terminal

White Bay is not a suitable location for the White Bay Cruise Terminal. Placing the cruise terminal in this area has created a public health risk due to pollution and noise generated by the ships that dock. The Discussion Paper has included the White Bay Cruise Terminal as part of the White Bay Destination. There is the concern that this will affect the discussion about this Destination because the solutions to the cruise terminal problems are directly linked to the future development of White Bay.

Figure 13 Overview of responses received regarding Destination 4: White Bay including White Bay Cruise Terminal
Mitigation techniques to reduce the impact of the White Bay Cruise Terminal

The White Bay Cruise Terminal has impacted on the surrounding area as identified within the EPA Inquiry. Responses were received regarding changes in the infrastructure and operation of the White Bay Cruise Terminal that would mitigate some of these adverse impacts. These mitigation techniques include:

- Provide on-shore power facilities that ships can utilise when docked. These facilities will prevent the ships from having to generate their own power, such as through the burning of sulphur fuels that emits pollution from the ships.
- Improve public transport to the White Bay Cruise Terminal to reduce the traffic generated by cruise ship passengers that use the local streets for parking.
- Develop waste management strategies that remove waste from cruise ships, this waste includes air pollution and landfill waste.
- Implementing mitigation measures to restore amenity to nearby residential properties.

Opportunities for the White Bay Cruise Terminal

The White Bay Cruise Terminal provides economic opportunities for the surrounding area. These opportunities could include providing accommodation for tourists, restaurants and cafes and transport to the terminal. The area should be a destination that showcases the best of Sydney.

Public benefit

The majority of responses received regarding public benefit related to the provision of facilities and activities that would attract tourists and residents to the area. Other responses received related to the acknowledgement that the history of the area should be preserved.

Provide a range of facilities and activities

New development in the area should not just be housing but should include a mix of facilities and activities that will attract tourists and residents to the area. Facilities should include shops, cafes, theatres and entertainment, particularly for the overseas cruise passengers. Public open space should also be provided, and could include: local harbour inlets for swimming, extending White Bay into a sandy beach or an area like Tumbalong Park. Facilities within the public open space could include off leash dog areas, sport and recreation facilities or an area for small sailing boats.

Redevelopment of the area should include art spaces similar to Carriageworks and Australian Technology Park. There is the opportunity for housing to be provided at subsidised low rent so that local artists can afford to stay within the area. Innovative industries are drawn to artistic areas.

History of the area should be preserved

There should be acknowledgement of the history of the area as part of the rejuvenation of the destination. The White Bay Hotel is one example of a site that is iconic within the area. The Hotel should be rebuilt with a replica of the heritage façade. The maritime history of the area has significantly influenced how the area has been developed to date. A heritage trail should be developed through the area identifying heritage items or developments.

Connectivity

Responses in relation to connectivity focussed primarily on the importance of improved public transport particularly to service the White Bay Cruise Terminal. In relation to active transport,
suggestions were received that the White Bay Destination should be incorporated as part of The
Bays Waterfront Promenade Destination.

**Improved public transport**

Public transport should be improved to serve the White Bay Cruise Terminal and Balmain East. Improvements could include a light rail service that connects the Cruise Terminal directly to Central Station. A ferry terminal could also be included as part of the Cruise Terminal.

Improvements to public transport will reduce the amount of street traffic that has been generated by the White Bay Cruise Terminal. Local roads such as Robert Street and the White Bay intersection to the Glebe turn off are already highly congested. Any further changes to the Cruise Terminal and developments in the surrounding area such as the Harold Park development in Glebe will further exacerbate these existing traffic issues. WestConnex has the potential to have a significant impact on traffic within the area, particularly if a motorway off ramp is proposed near the entry to White Bay/Rozelle.

**Include the White Bay Cruise Terminal as part of The Bays Waterfront Promenade**

White Bay including White Bay Cruise Terminal should be incorporated as part of The Bays Waterfront Promenade Destination thereby encouraging people to walk and cycle to the facilities in the area.

**Housing**

*Similar to feedback received regarding the other destinations, the majority of responses within the theme of housing focussed on the importance of the provision of affordable housing. A number of responses disagreed with the Discussion Paper, stating that this Destination is not suitable for housing.*

**Affordable housing**

A percentage of all sites within the Destination should be dedicated to affordable and social housing for key workers such as police, bus drivers, nurses and teachers etc. The target for this level of provision could be 30 per cent of dwellings to be residential. A mix of private, affordable and social housing will assist in the creation of a socially mixed development.

**Housing not suitable near the White Bay Cruise Terminal**

Housing is not suitable in the White Bay area due to noise and pollution from the cruise ships. There are other areas in The Bays Precinct more suitable for housing.

**Jobs**

*Responses received in relation to the theme of employment focussed on the opportunities that could be generated from the White Bay Cruise Terminal.*

**Employment for the surrounding area**

There are opportunities for the Cruise Terminal to generate jobs and this should be encouraged as part of The Bays Precinct transformation. Jobs should remain local and include different types of jobs to encourage a diversity of people in the area.

**Personality of Destination 4: White Bay including White Bay Cruise Terminal**

Community Workshop participants were asked to describe the personality of Destination 4: White Bay including White Bay Cruise Terminal as shown in Figure 14.
Figure 14 Personality of Destination 4: White Bay including White Bay Cruise Terminal as described at the Community Workshop
7. Destination 5: Rozelle Bay and Bays Waterways

There were 173 responses received regarding Destination 5: Rozelle Bay and Bays Waterways. In the Discussion Paper this area has been identified as a Medium Term Priority Destination. The public were invited to provide feedback on the possibilities and the mix of uses proposed for the Destination as outlined in the Discussion Paper.

Possibilities

The transformation of the Rozelle Bay and Bays Waterways has the potential to integrate a viable mix of new land and maritime uses including a mix of commercial, open space and other living uses, with working harbour industries and on-water recreation facilities. It would also include better public access to the waterfront.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Public realm</th>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>Employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Destination 5: Rozelle Bay and Bays Waterways</td>
<td>•••</td>
<td>•</td>
<td>•</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: ••• Major focus, • Moderate focus, * Minor focus, - None

Feedback regarding Destination 5: Rozelle Bay and Bays Waterways

In addition to Rozelle Bay, this Destination includes all of the waterways within The Bays Precinct encompassing Glebe, Blackwattle and Johnstons Bays. The inclusion of the waterways contributed to a large number of responses within the theme of public benefit, as shown in Figure 15. The superyacht marina received the second largest number of responses with concerns raised about its expansion. Similar to other destinations housing and connectivity received a significant number of responses. Within the theme of other, a number of comments were received with concerns about pollution in the harbour and the importance of assessing environmental conditions.
Figure 15 Overview of responses received regarding Destination 5: Rozelle Bay and Bays Waterways

Public benefit

The possibilities proposed in the Discussion Paper for activities within the waterways attracted a large number of responses, particularly regarding on-water recreation facilities and the working harbour industries. A number of respondents stated that the foreshores should remain as public land and wanted to ensure that privatisation would not restrict access.

A public boat ramp and facilities for on-water recreation activities

On-water recreation activities should be encouraged through the provision of an easily accessible boat ramp that is available for public use. This is one of the few places left in Sydney for rowing, kayaking and dragon boating and these sports should be encouraged through facilities such as kayak hire, fewer swing moored boats in the Bays Precinct and a permanent home for dragon boats. Other water recreation activities suggested include a wave machine, harbour swimming pool and cable wakeboard park.

Maintain the heritage and history of the working harbour industries

Any future proposals should be faithful to the heritage and history of the area as a working harbour. Working bay sites and boating related uses should stay, the area should be 100 per cent dedicated to working harbour uses. These facilities are unique and add vitality to the area.

The foreshore should be made publicly accessible

The foreshore is public land and must be made publicly accessible. There should be no potential for privatisation of the waterfront. The foreshore should be opened up so that cyclists and pedestrians can be connected around The Bays Precinct. The harbour has many viewing areas however there are not many opportunities to touch the water.
Superyacht Marina

The Superyacht Marina is located in Rozelle Bay and a large number of respondents expressed concern regarding the potential expansion of this facility.

Do not expand the Superyacht Marina

The Superyacht Marina functions more as an entertainment precinct than a marina. There are too many restaurants and the boats play loud music disrupting the peaceful nature of the surrounding area. The larger boats should be discouraged as they disturb sediment on the contaminated bay floor and increase hazards in and around the water.

Housing

Within the theme of housing a number of different views were expressed. Consistent with feedback received for the other destinations, there was the comment that affordable housing be provided and also that there should be a mix of housing. A small number of comments were received that disagreed with the Discussion Paper stating that the area is not suitable for housing.

Affordable housing should be provided

The majority of people will not be able to afford housing here. A percentage of all the sites should be targeted for affordable rental for key workers such as police, bus drivers, nurses and teachers, etc. A mix of housing should be provided to attract a diversity of residents. The area should not just be converted into high rise buildings. Height restrictions are necessary to keep views of the harbour from Wentworth Park and respond to the surrounding context.

This Destination is not suitable for housing

The sites in this destination are not suitable for housing; the area is too narrow and too close to the motorway. The poor amenity for housing would be exacerbated should the WestConnex motorway be constructed.

Connectivity

Similar to other destinations, improved public transport was considered important for decreasing car usage.

Improve public transport to decrease car usage

Public transport such as improved ferry access and light rail would decrease car usage. Water speed limits in Rozelle Bay would enable a viable ferry service to operate from The Bays Precinct to Barrangaroo. Additional ferry services could operate between various points in and around The Bays Precinct including: Annandale, Glebe, Blackwattle Bay and Rozelle Bay.

Pollution

Avoid pollution into the harbour

A robust assessment of the existing environmental conditions within the sea bed and quality of the water within Bays Waterways should be undertaken to monitor the pollution in the harbour. Flotsam on the waterways should be picked up and the waterways maintained with mangroves. Attention needs to be given to the safe removal of heavy metals in the harbour.
8. **Destination 6: Rozelle Rail Yards**

There were 105 responses received regarding Destination 6: Rozelle Rail Yards. In the Discussion Paper this area has been identified as a Longer Term Priority Destination. The Public were invited to provide feedback on the possibilities and the mix of uses proposed for this Destination.

**Possibilities**

The transformation has the potential to reconnect areas to the north and south of the Rail Yards and to improve connections from Lilyfield to the water.

Future uses could include a mix of different housing, including affordable housing, as well as public spaces and employment uses.

**Possible mix of uses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Public realm</th>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>Employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Destination 6: Rozelle Rail Yards</td>
<td>●●</td>
<td>●●●</td>
<td>●</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: *** Major focus, ** Moderate focus, * Minor focus, - None

**Feedback regarding Destination 6: Rozelle Rail Yards**

The responses received regarding the Rozelle Rail Yards were fairly evenly divided between the three themes of connectivity, housing and public benefit. The responses relate directly to the possibilities proposed in the Discussion Paper: improving connections from Lilyfield to the water; providing a mix of housing and public spaces. While employment was identified as a minor focus within the Destination, there were very few responses that discussed jobs.
Connectivity

The majority of responses received within the theme of connectivity focussed on the potential of the Rozelle Rail Yards to reconnect the areas north and south of the rail yards and be used for future transport needs. Improved pedestrian and cycle connections were raised. A number of responses expressed concern that WestConnex would prevent some of the ambitions of The Bays Precinct from being achieved.

The potential to reconnect areas

There is an opportunity reconnect communities to the north and south of the Rail Yards, connecting Lilyfield to Annandale. This could be achieved through the expansion of the light rail network so that the Rozelle Rail Yards are connected to the White Bay Power Station, across the Glebe Island Bridge to the CBD. There should also be connections to the White Bay Cruise Terminal and towards Balmain. The existing transport corridors should be preserved for future transport needs.

Improved pedestrian and cycle connections

Planning should be integrated so that there are pedestrian and cycle connections to light rail stations with easy through connections to the surrounding communities and neighbourhoods. The condition of local cycleways should be improved so that they cater to the needs of cyclists and are not an afterthought of a line painted on a road.

Impact of WestConnex

UrbanGrowth NSW’s ambitions cannot be achieved if WestConnex is constructed. Rather than build WestConnex, public transport should be provided. If however, WestConnex is constructed
then more interesting infrastructure should be considered, such as a landscaped valley with lots of trees.

**Housing**

*For the majority of responses received about housing, the provision of housing was considered acceptable within this Destination.* A large number of these responses commented on the need for a commitment to the provision of affordable housing. Within those that supported housing there was some discussion regarding density with some responses stating that the Rozelle Rail Yards is an ideal location for high density apartments while others commented that medium density should be provided. Not all of the responses agreed with the provision of housing in this Destination and a number of responses commented that the area is unsuitable because of the shape of the land.

**Commitment to affordable housing**

There needs to be a firm commitment to affordable and social housing targets. Affordable housing will allow for greater diversity in the inner west allowing for university students, young families and those on a lower income.

**Higher density housing should be provided in the Rozelle Rail Yards**

The Rozelle Rail Yards is an ideal location for high density housing and there should be no height restrictions governing its development.

**Medium density housing should be provided**

Height restrictions are important; there should be no high rise towers like Barangaroo or Harold Park.

**Area is not suitable for housing**

The shape of this land and the traffic doesn’t make the area suitable for housing.

**Public benefit**

*In relation to the theme of public benefit, responses can be divided into the potential for the area to become a nature reserve or green links, and ensuring that the history of the area is acknowledged.*

**Nature reserve/green links**

There is the potential for the area to become an urban jungle with nature reserves, biodiversity corridors and green ways connecting to Iron Cove and the Cooks River. Bicentennial Park could be extended to Easton Oval with a green roof over The Crescent and City East West Link. As many green corridors as possible should be created, maintaining open space within the area. The green corridors would assist in preserving the existing bird/wild native life in the area.

**Reminiscent of the past**

The history of the area should be integrated into its future. This could be achieved through establishing a historical railway museum, keeping the older train lines and signs of the past. It could even include an underground graffiti art destination.
9. Destination 7: Glebe Island

There were 101 responses received regarding Destination 7: Glebe Island. In the Discussion Paper this area has been identified as a longer term priority Destination. The community was invited to provide feedback on the possibilities and the mix of uses proposed.

Possibilities

The transformation of The Bays Precinct offers the opportunity to support economic activities of maritime industries and celebrate the authenticity of the working harbour.

Possible mix of uses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Public realm</th>
<th>Housing</th>
<th>Employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Destination 7: Glebe Island</td>
<td>Strategic deep-water port</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend: *** Major focus, ** Moderate focus, * Minor focus, - None

Feedback regarding Destination 7: Glebe Island

The theme of public benefit received the largest number of responses. A number of suggestions for future uses on Glebe Island were made with the majority focussing on provision of public open space and recreational facilities. Similar to other destinations, the themes of connectivity and housing received a large number of comments.

Figure 17 Overview of responses received regarding Destination 7: Glebe Island
Public benefit

The theme of public benefit received a significant number of responses which was attributed to the number of suggestions that Glebe Island should be converted into public open space and recreational facilities.

Public open space and recreational facilities

Glebe Island could be converted into dedicated open space and parklands that are available to the broader community. The open space would be large enough for gatherings as well as providing an outdoor venue for performance. The space should allow for night time and day time uses. It could be an innovative global destination similar to Marina Sands, Singapore. Other recreation on Glebe Island could include: flying fox across The Bay, dog parks, kayak rental, rooftop playing fields and an open swimming pool on the point. An independent cost benefit analysis of the various future land uses and development options for the site should be undertaken. Restaurants, cafes and outdoor bars should be provided on Glebe Island.

Connectivity

The majority of responses received regarding connectivity recommended that Glebe Island be connected by water transport to Pyrmont.

Good connections to Glebe Island through ferries and other water transport

A ferry terminal should be provided connecting the area to Pyrmont and the CBD. Removal of the Glebe Island Bridge could facilitate improved ferry access.

Jobs

Respondents support the possibility suggested in the Discussion Paper of encouraging the economic activities of maritime industries. It was also suggested by some respondents that spaces be set aside for artisan industries such as boat building.

Long term job creation through maritime industries

The maritime industries and port opportunities are important to maintain in order to generate long term job creation. Knowledge based jobs should not be a focus within this Destination.

Provide affordable spaces for artisan industries

Affordable spaces should be provided for artisan industries including boat building, arts and culture. Other cultural facilities could include an Indigenous Art Gallery or a Sculpture Park.

Housing

The only comments relating to housing focused on concern about views being obstructed.

Prevent sightlines from Pyrmont to Rozelle being obstructed

Housing, particularly along the water’s edge should be low rise and restricted to 3-4 stories, this would protect sightlines from Pyrmont to Rozelle across the bay.
10. Feedback on the engagement process

General feedback received on the engagement process

A number of responses made comment on the current and future engagement processes for The Bays Precinct. Themes identified in relation to the engagement process include:

- There is a lack of detailed information available for people to provide comment on
- Consultation should be expanded to cover a more geographic spread of stakeholders
- Engagement activities should be held at venues within the project area
- The range of formats to provide feedback is comprehensive and positive
- There is a need to engage more with the Indigenous community to understand their needs and recognise their culture in any future developments
- Public consultation should be ongoing during every stage of the project right through to construction, this should include ongoing community representation and participation on UrbanGrowth NSW’s expert panel
- Transparency in decision making is very important to eliminate corruption that has previously been seen.

Feedback on The Bays Precinct Sydneysiders Summit and Leadership Forums

People were also given the opportunity to provide formal feedback on the engagement process at The Bays Precinct Sydneysiders Summit and Leadership Forums, held from 15 to 18 May 2015. An online evaluation form was made available at the events. This took the form of a short questionnaire using four iPad devices to capture feedback. The iPads were located at the main exit.

A total of 194 Sydneysiders participated in the onsite evaluation event. This represents approximately 16 per cent of all people that attended the event. The majority of feedback was received on the Saturday (36 per cent) and Sunday (49 per cent), with a smaller proportion providing feedback on the Friday (3 per cent) and the Monday (12 per cent). This result reflects the lower number of participants on the Friday and Monday.

Overall event rating

The Bays Precinct Sydneysiders Summit and Leadership Forums received very positive feedback, with 91 per cent of respondents rating the event as ‘good’ or ‘very good’ overall. Only 8 per cent indicated the event was ‘adequate’, and 1 per cent rated it as ‘poor’ or ‘very poor’.

Quality of information provided

Positive feedback was also received about the quality of the information provided at the event. A total of 92 per cent of respondents answered yes when asked: ‘has the event given you good information about the transformation?’

Of the 8 per cent that indicated no, the questionnaire asked respondents to provide comments as to why not.

The most common comment was that the presentation/talk was too short, vague and general, glossing over the important detail of the topics at hand. Of the 16 comments provided, 13 of these felt that the information presented was too general. They were looking for more detail, particularly about housing, public transport and green spaces.
The other three comments felt the engagement process was not genuine, and that the transformation will go ahead regardless.

**Opportunity to have a say**

A total of 93 per cent of respondents felt that they had the opportunity to have their say at the event.

Of the 7 per cent that didn’t feel they had the opportunity to have their say, the questionnaire asked respondents to provide further comments. A total of 15 people wrote further comments:

- Six comments reflected a feeling that the consultation process was dismissive and that the engagement did not feel genuine.
- Five respondents felt that the process was not good enough, in particular it was not interactive enough, that the method of gathering information (post it notes/butchers paper etc.) was not formal enough (should have been more credible like ‘forums that take minutes and have follow up activities like focus groups’), there needed more human interaction, and a longer time period for the forum (e.g. over two weeks) for people to take in the information.
- Three respondents felt that the information was too vague and didn’t feel clear on what they should be commenting on, or what the engagement process was supposed to achieve.

**Intention to provide further feedback**

A total of 55 per cent of respondents indicated that they intended to give more feedback online.

Respondents who indicated ‘yes’ to this question were asked where they would provide further feedback. The responses were varied, including: on the UrbanGrowth NSW website, on the internet, through the Call for Great Ideas initiative, through online submissions, via direct email, through workshops, via media or social media, using local community groups and attending any further forums, and the use of online discussion forums.

**Methods of providing feedback to respondents**

Respondents were asked to indicate how they would like to get feedback on the information they had provided, and were given the option to tick as many options as they wished.

The most common ways people wanted to be given feedback was via a detailed report online or a brief summary report online.

Respondents who ticked ‘other’ and wrote a response indicating they wanted to be informed via expert opinion submissions, publicly available changes to the Transformation Plan arising from feedback, email, media release and having the opportunity to work on the development of the Transformation Plan.
Appendix A – Additional single responses

Destination 1- The Bays Waterfront Promenade

The following individual responses were received and have been recorded in verbatim:

- Skinny tall powers on the escarpments
- Make it cultural! Australia is such a multi-cultural country and needs to maintain this!!!
- No more out of area boat storage
- Please consider acoustic impacts on existing neighbouring Darling Harbour events impinge on bay area (acoustic funnelling) and events in bay area may magnify this effect
- Floating bridge like the Brisbane River Walk
- Keep streets that run to the water open creating a vista and destination
- Change connections to make it easier to get to the water by a more direct path
- An area cannot be considered “public access” if there are dogs off leash
- Need to honour the Parramatta River - It is not mentioned in the information
- Stop WestConnex. It will waste enough waterfront land for a minimum of six lanes of traffic
- Difficult to discuss final use of Promenade without knowing the final use of the land adjoining the Promenade i.e. how does it interact and what may eventuate there
- The Promenade is below the Western Distributor Freeway which carries a lot of traffic every day – the Promenade should be quiet and free from pollutants
- Great places are a product of the context i.e. can’t necessarily recreate or replicate something else in this location – what is driving the design. Paddington Reservoir Gardens responds to its context
- The Bays Promenade has a south west orientation – difficult to get good access to sunshine. Future development nearby needs to protect sunlight and not overshadow Promenade
- Elevated views. Resident’s views respected
- Connection between the harbour and the park is very important
- A statue of Jesse
- I would give open space so instead of looking at the one place you can look everywhere
- Removing the old bridge to facilitate ferries and other water transport and help flush Rozelle and Blackwattle Bays which are not clean.
**Destination 2- Bays Market District**

The following individual responses were received and have been recorded in verbatim:

- Bins for compostable items
- Give clear funding & priorities to social infrastructure
- Shelters from sun + rain at intervals
- Composting organic waste
- More attention to the implications of climate change inc. sea level rise.
- What about asbestos, soil contamination etc.
- New building on piers should be a largely transparent building so not to block views to water or be intrusive
- More space so you don't constantly bump into people
- I’d put in the public/community needs facilities at commencement of planning. Developers will jump at the chance to put dense housing but will show no interest/concern for infrastructure for those who will live in it
- PLEASE not loss of green space
- Housing with green space and walkway along water? (2 Bank Street, Pyrmont - NAGA Spirit Dragon Boating Club)
- What are you going to do about noise pollution from the ANZAC Bridge in this area for any development
- I’m dubious of the world ‘retail’ - we don’t want clothing franchises
- Sydney loves a party. We love shine - so ask Baz Luhrmann!! seriously!!
- Whatever is done here it must be able to evolve with the changes consumers require/demand
- Fish and they will be called the "fish finger"
- Fish
- Soften impact of Glebe Pt Road on amenity of bay walk
- Balancing living (apartments) with markets + tourism
- Harbour side access! No disruption of workers income
- Learning to live - Living to learn
- Unlock super funds to enable SMSF invest in precinct
- Development to address homelessness in Wentworth Park
- Plan area energy / power requirements early
- Naturalise the Bay again & get rid of urban and industrial feel
- Disagree with removing Fish Market - why remove when it has been successful since the 60's
**Destination 3-White Bay Power Station**

The following individual responses were received; they have been recorded here verbatim:

- Ageing in place in all planning
- Mental Health Rehабilitее Hospital
- I hope you guys make this area flourish, there is such good foundations for an amazing space
- Massive parking space with connection to CBD
- Need for disability access to all public amenities
- Primary consideration of land uses should be health impacts
- How does this fit in with the rest of the Bays area?
- Lack of detail on plans
- Aged care facility for all the Baby Boomers
- Don’t want shopping malls
- Don’t let obsession with Power Station prevent doing something. It can be representative of its heritage but a new building. no new power station. They don’t belong in central Sydney
- Lack of consideration for Indigenous Australians. Inclusion!!
- No casino's and no Disneyland
- Yukie facilities
- The destruction of historical values and social values that is not responding to future impacts such as cultural transformation
- YES -> we can beat London!
- I like muffins
- Berg-hain II
- Women and children refugees
- Timeframe starting? Four projects on discussion today will be constructed first. Make a start before 2019. Promenade early next year. Power station process takes us into next year. Meantime activities/uses temporary solution
- Beware of the mine work working - methane
- Inclusionary zoning!
- Make it safer
- Live, work and play
- Ensure kids / family friendly development.
**Destination 4-White Bay including White Bay Cruise Terminal**

The following individual responses were received and have been recorded in verbatim:

- Please do not create another Moore Park or King Street Wharf
- White Bay school of engineering?
- Please consider the implications for day cares, schools, hospitals when considering medium and high density housing. These facilities are already maxed out
- Peak Phosphorus Peak oil, are great threat to Sydney's food security. More is needed in the urban food production issue
- Sydney needs a petrol storage space (failsafe in case tankers cannot get through). Port area / safe solution
- Re-instate natural coastline
- Water quality better here -> less stormwater run off (Lot 38PT Bowman Street, Port Jackson - White Bay)
- Innovative design
- Are the issues causing very significant disruption to residence, houses are still expensive
- Now White Bay SEPP listen to council/residents
- Do we need another Martine Museum?
- Locals may see some benefits but don’t want property prices to go up too much and become unaffordable
- Another prime housing spot
- Crucial to extent/mimic surrounding street patterns
- Crucial to maintain correct line of sight for existing residents in public location
- All ground floor apartments should have their own entrance to the street, and not hidden behind Fish Mkt!
Destination 5- Rozelle Bay and Bays Waterways

The following individual responses were received and have been recorded in verbatim:

- Link them to the suburb of Rozelle via a pedestrian/cycle (only) bridge over the City West Link and the Rozelle Rail Yards to the Rozelle Bay light rail stop
- It could be promoted as a mini Darling Harbour. Family attractions with workability as the main transport
- See "act now safe Rozelle Bay" paper proposal
- Chairlift
- Disabled access to foreshore and facilities
- Disneyland
- Offshore marinas – floating
- Organise Mullins / Roberts St intersection for residents exiting Balmain
- Immediately introduce low sulphur restrictions for all Australian ports for all vessels. Parity with US and Europe shipping
- No WestConnex
- Integrate with timing and construction of WestConnex and any future public transport; Light rail, metro
**Destination 6- Rozelle Rail Yards**

The following individual responses were received and have been recorded in verbatim:

- Suggest a series of carparks. This keeps cars out of the city and lets people take the light rail, bus or new ferry instead. Carparks would charge fees. Could break it up with commercial offices. Generates income

- Include schools and public parks to meet needs of new and adjoining residents. Express tram service from central. The infrastructure is there but it simply takes too long

- "Food" facility - gardens…. Second this, great location for city farming that could include vertical form buildings + farm living community subsidised/farm working/ disadvantage/ mental health / live work type housing

- Employment

- Consider making it a hub for FAMILY FUN. Eg wave park, lagoon area, Arlie beach, skate parks, kiddy parks with creative equipment, wheelchair basketball site for disabled and able to play together

- Design for this in whole of precinct from the outset. Includes building design for waste management

- Integrate rail with my proposal for energy from waste plant to process the waste of Sydney siders. Low impact / high environmental value

- Removal of billboard on silos

- Use the rail to take compost that can be produced from residential domestic waste - here on site - out to country areas where the compost is needed or use onsite here.
**Destination 7- Glebe Island**

The following individual responses were received and have been recorded in verbatim:

- Setbacks
- High levels of affordable housing
- Convert silos to apartments
- Move Fish Markets to Glebe Island
- Relocate maritime activities to Botany Bay
- Workshops for maritime historical societies
- Food producing trees
- Avoid contamination of waterways
- LEGO LAND
- A swag space ship
- Safety and liveability
- Value capture for public benefit
- Schools and parks
- Food security
Appendix B – Post-it notes

Post it-

At the Sydneysiders Summit in May 2015, participants were asked to provide feedback through a range of post-it note activities detailed below.

Feedback on the objectives and features

Participants were asked to indicate through a post-it note activity what they liked, didn’t like or would change about the objectives of The Bays Precinct.

A total of 444 post-it notes were placed on the feedback boards. The following provides an indication of the number of post-it notes that were received in each category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What you like</th>
<th>What you don’t like</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To deliver a hub of export-oriented knowledge-intensive jobs that can increase Sydney’s global competitiveness</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To deliver enduring, socially inclusive and great places to benefit Sydneysiders and national and international communities</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To deliver housing choices, including affordable housing options, through design, finance, and construction excellence</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To deliver a world class mass and active transit and infrastructure solution that unlocks the economic and human potential of The Bays Precinct and demonstrates a model of environmental excellence</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To achieve building design excellence and quality urban design in all destinations</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Destination 1- The Bays Waterfront Promenade

Feedback on the proposed mix of uses

Participants were asked to indicate through a post-it note activity whether they agreed or disagreed with the mix of uses proposed for the Bays Waterfront Destination. The Discussion Paper stated that the mix of uses for the Bays Waterfront would have a major focus on the public realm with a minor focus on employment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What you like</th>
<th>What you don’t like</th>
<th>What you would change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No of post-it notes</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Feedback on the objectives and features

Participants were asked to indicate what they liked, didn’t like or would change about the objectives and features of the Bays Waterfront Promenade.

A total of 258 post-it notes were placed on the feedback boards. The following provides an indication of the number of post-it notes that were received in each category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What you like</th>
<th>What you don’t like</th>
<th>What you would change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Destination 2- Bays Market District

Feedback on the proposed mix of uses

Participants were asked to indicate whether they agreed or disagreed with the mix of uses proposed for the Bays Market District. The Discussion Paper stated that the mix of uses for the Bays Market District would have a major focus on the public realm and employment with a moderate focus on housing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No of post-it notes</th>
<th>What you like</th>
<th>What you don’t like</th>
<th>What you would change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Feedback on the objectives and features

Participants were asked to indicate what they liked, didn’t like or would change about the objectives and features of the Bays Market District.

In broad terms, 258 post-it notes were placed on the feedback boards. The following provides an indication of the number of post-it notes that were received in each category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No of post-it notes</th>
<th>What you like</th>
<th>What you don’t like</th>
<th>What you would change/suggestion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Destination 3- White Bay Power Station

Feedback on the proposed mix of uses

Participants were asked to indicate whether they agreed or disagreed with the mix of uses proposed for the White Bay Power Station. The Discussion Paper stated that the mix of uses for the White Bay Power Station would have a major focus on the public realm, housing and employment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No of post-it notes</th>
<th>What you like</th>
<th>What you don’t like</th>
<th>What you would change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Feedback on the objectives and features

Participants were asked to indicate what they liked, didn’t like or would change about the objectives and features of the White Bay Power Station. A total of 365 post-it notes were placed on the feedback boards. The following provides an indication of the number of post-it notes that were received in each category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No of post-it notes</th>
<th>What you like</th>
<th>What you don’t like</th>
<th>What you would change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>125</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Destination 4- White Bay including White Bay Cruise Terminal**

**Feedback on the proposed mix of uses**

Participants were asked to indicate whether they agreed or disagreed with the mix of uses proposed for White Bay including White Bay Cruise Terminal. The Discussion Paper stated that the mix of uses for White Bay including White Bay Cruise Terminal would have a major focus on the public realm, housing and employment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No of post-it notes</th>
<th>What you like</th>
<th>What you don’t like</th>
<th>What you would change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Destination 5- Rozelle Bay and Bays Waterways**

**Feedback on the proposed mix of uses**

Participants were asked to indicate whether they agreed or disagreed with the mix of uses proposed for the Rozelle Bay and Bays Waterways Destination. The Discussion Paper stated that the mix of uses for the Rozelle Bay and Bays Waterways Destination, would have a major focus on the public realm and a moderate focus on housing and employment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No of post-it notes</th>
<th>What you like</th>
<th>What you don’t like</th>
<th>What you would change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Destination 6- Rozelle Rail Yards**

**Feedback on the proposed mix of uses**

Participants were asked to indicate whether they agreed or disagreed with the mix of uses proposed for the Rozelle Rail Yards. The Discussion Paper stated that the mix of uses for the Rozelle Rail Yards, would have a major focus on housing, moderate focus on the public realm and a minor focus on employment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No of post-it notes</th>
<th>What you like</th>
<th>What you don’t like</th>
<th>What you would change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Destination 7- Glebe Island**

**Feedback on the proposed mix of uses**

Participants were asked to indicate whether they agreed or disagreed with the mix of uses proposed for Glebe Island. The Discussion Paper stated that the mix of uses for Glebe Island was for it remain as a strategic deep-water port.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No of post-it notes</th>
<th>What you like</th>
<th>What you don’t like</th>
<th>What you would change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix C – Community workshop questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Destination 1: Bays Promenade | 1. What do you like?  
2. What don’t you like?  
3. Is there anything you would change? What is that and why?  
4. Do you have any other comments on this Destination?  
5. What type of fresh food or other retailers would you like to see at this destination  
6. What other activities or services that you would like to see at this destination?  
7. These are the sorts of facilities that could be located here. Where would you like to see these facilities located?  
   - Public toilets  
   - Seating  
   - Picnic facilities  
   - Shade cover  
   - Places to launch watercraft  
   - Places to get into the water  
   - Exercise equipment  
   - Play spaces  
   - Drinking fountains.  
8. If this destination were to have a personality how would you describe that person to a friend? |
| Destination 2: Bays Market District | 1. What do you like?  
2. What don’t you like?  
3. Is there anything you would change? What is that and why?  
4. Do you have any other comments on this Destination?  
5. What type of fresh food or other retailers would you like to see at this Destination  
6. What other activities or services that you would like to see at this Destination?  
7. What times would you like to see the market operating?  
   a. Early morning  
   b. Morning to afternoon  
   c. Evening  
   d. Night.  
8. If this Destination were to have a personality how would you describe that person to a friend? |
| Destination 3: White Bay Power Station | 1. What do you like?  
2. What don’t you like?  
3. Thinking over the next 20 years, what sorts of jobs do you
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Destination</th>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Destination</td>
<td>think might attract people from across Sydney, across Australia and internationally to work at the White Bay Power Station Destination?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. What other spaces and places for people should be included here</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. What kind of housing would be appropriate here to support these knowledge-intensive industries?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. If this Destination were to have a personality how would you describe that person to a friend?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destination 4: White Bay Cruise Terminal</td>
<td>1. How could we best engage with the members of the community in the immediate term, on innovative solutions to the environmental and operational issues at White Bay Cruise Terminal?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. In the longer term, White Bay has the potential to be transformed with medium density living designed to complement existing neighbourhoods. And to include uses that will complement existing small scale working harbour activities (e.g. wharf and boat repair, marina, maritime services and rescue, bulk dry goods). Given this, what sort of uses could work best at this Destination in the longer term?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Do you have any other comments on this Destination?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. If this Destination were to have a personality how would you describe that person to a friend?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D – Online survey questions

The Bays Precinct

1. Do you have any ideas for The Bays Precinct that you want to share?

The Bays Waterfront Promenade

Looking at what is proposed for The Bays Waterfront Promenade:

1. What do you like?
2. What don’t you like?
3. Is there anything you would change?
4. Would you use the promenade? (Tick box options)
5. If so, what for?
   - access to the market
   - access between home and work
   - access into the water
   - recreation
   - exercise
   - walking
   - cycling
   - other (open field)
   - other (open field)

6. What are the most important facilities to be provided with the promenade? (Tick box options)
   - public toilets
   - seating
   - picnic facilities
   - shade cover
   - places to launch watercraft
   - places to get into the water
   - exercise equipment
   - play spaces
   - drinking fountains
   - other (open field)

7. Do you have any other comments on this Destination? (open field)
The Bays Market District

Looking at what is proposed for The Bays Market District:
8. What do you like?
9. What don’t you like?
10. Is there anything you would change?
11. What type of fresh food or other retailers would you like to see at the market? (open field)
12. What other activities or services that you would like to see at this Destination? (open field)
13. What times would you like to see the market operating? (Tick box options)
   - early morning
   - morning to afternoon
   - evening
   - night
14. Do you have any other comments on this Destination?

White Bay Power Station

Looking at what is proposed for White Bay Power Station:
15. What do you like?
16. What don’t you like?
17. Is there anything you would change?
18. What activities could be considered for the Power Station surrounds in the short-term, until transformation of this area begins to happen? (Tick box options)
   - an open-air market
   - concerts, live music and other productions
   - public forums
   - open days
   - other (specify)
19. What complementary uses should be considered for this Destination in the longer term? (open field)
20. Do you have any other comments on this Destination? (open field)

White Bay and White Bay Cruise Terminal

21. Looking at the early thinking for this Destination, what are the main issues that should be considered in future planning?

Rozelle Bay and Bays Waterways

22. Looking at the early thinking for this Destination, what are the main issues that should be considered in future planning?
Rozelle Rail Yards

23. Looking at the early thinking for this Destination, what are the main issues that should be considered in future planning?

Glebe Island

24. Looking at the early thinking for this Destination, what are the main issues that should be considered in future planning?
Appendix E  -Respondent demographic data

Demographics of respondents

Demographic data was collected for those respondents that attended the Community Workshop or completed one of the online surveys. Demographic data was obtained for approximately 16 per cent of all people who provided feedback on The Discussion Paper. The sections below summarise the demographic characteristics of respondents for each of these activities.

Survey respondents

A total of 111 online surveys were completed, with 77 individual survey participants in total. Because survey participants could answer as many of the Destination surveys as they desired, some people double up. Respondents were asked to provide their age, gender and language spoken at home, with details for each characteristic summarised below.

Age

A total of 70 survey participants provided information about their age. The majority of survey participants (64 per cent) were 45 years or older, with the largest group of people falling between 55 and 64 years of age (29 per cent). The figure below displays the range of ages of participants.

![Age distribution](image)

Gender

A total of 71 survey participants provided information about their gender. The majority of survey participants (72 per cent) were male, with female participants making up 28 per cent of responses.

Language spoken at home

A total of 71 survey participants provided information about the language they speak at home. The majority of survey participants (96 per cent) spoke English at home, with 1 per cent indicating they spoke Chinese, and 3 per cent indicating ‘other’.
Community workshop

A statistically representative Community Workshop that involved 132 community members was held on 26 May 2015. Participants were randomly selected by an independent consultant using an existing research database and were a demographic and geographic representation of the Sydney community.

Respondents were asked to provide their age, gender, language spoken at home, place of residence, level of education and income. 132 participants responded, with details for each characteristic summarised below.

Age

The majority of participants were aged under 50 (73.5 per cent), with more people aged between 20 and 29 (27.3 per cent) than any other age group. The figure below shows the range of ages of participants.

Gender

Of the 142 respondents, a total of 53 per cent of participants were female, and 47 per cent were male.

Language spoken at home

Of the respondents, the most common languages spoken at home other than English were Arabic with seven participants (5.3 per cent), Chinese with seven participants (5.3 per cent) and Greek with six participants (4.5 per cent).
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