The Bays Precinct Taskforce Consultation Forums

Feedback form report: July 2012
1 Introduction

The NSW Government has established the Bays Precinct Taskforce to advise on a strategic framework for the Bays Precinct for the next 25 years and beyond.

Community members were invited to attend a series of workshops to be briefed on the Taskforce’s work to date and to contribute to the Taskforce’s report back to the NSW Government. The report is to be submitted by 30 July 2012.

Over nine workshops conducted in three rounds, a total of 188 individuals participated in the consultation. Around half attended one workshop and half attended two or three rounds of workshops.

At each workshop, participants were invited to complete and submit a feedback form rating different aspects of the consultation workshop, such as quality of information, opportunity to contribute, value of group discussion and the running of the workshop.

This information was used to shape each subsequent round of workshops to deliver consultation which best suited the Bays Precinct community.

Over the three rounds of workshops, 128 feedback forms were completed and returned to the project team.

This report sets out the key features of the feedback over three rounds. Raw data from each of the three rounds is provided as an appendix to this report.

2 Who submitted feedback forms?

The majority of feedback forms were submitted by local residents.

A much smaller group of port, maritime and industry representatives submitted forms. A handful of active recreation and visitors also responded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Round 1</th>
<th>Round 2</th>
<th>Round 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local resident</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port/ Maritime/ Industry</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work/ Business owner</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active recreation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequent visitor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 Round 1 Outcomes

Too many presentations, at the expense of valuable table discussion in the first round.

“Some of the government authorities (and others) could have been much briefer in their presentations leaving more time for discussion at tables”

“More time for community to say what we want, not just ask questions. More time for us to come up with positive suggestions”

“The provision of information for stage 1 was appropriate. I expect more input/debate at working stage 2”

In Round 1, more than half the respondents rated the overall quality of information provided as good or excellent (54%). Less than a third (28%) rated it as “average”.

While there were opportunities to ask questions during Round 1 workshops, respondents did not believe that they had received satisfactory answers to their specific questions, with many rating this as average, below average or poor (68%). Many of the questions were parked or taken as on notice that evening and responded to in subsequent Rounds.

There was a range of views regarding whether there had been sufficient opportunity for input by the community.

- 40% of respondents thought that there were good or excellent opportunities to give their input.
- The 37% who rated their input opportunities as poor or below average generally commented that there needed to be more time given to feedback activities, rather than presentations.
- The table discussions were deemed valuable by a strong majority of respondent (87%).

A majority of respondents rated the forum as being well or excellently run (70%), however there was some concern expressed about outdoor lighting, room heating and disabled access.
4 Round 2 outcomes

Strong approval of the table discussions and opportunities to provide feedback.

“Interesting range of views from various agendas.”

“More opportunity for open exchange/discussion areas between community and agencies”

“[The table discussions] were because important issues got raised. It concerned me that some people who came to "sit in" as council members often verged on pushing their own perspectives and even dominating when this is meant to be a "community consultation" and they already have a platform.”

“Improved on round 1”

Respondents gave highly positive feedback on most aspects of the second round forums.

The overall quality of information was rated as good or excellent by 61% of respondents. Three-quarters of respondents (75%) rated the running of the forum as “good” or “excellent”.

The one exception to the generally positive feedback was in regards to the answers provided to specific questions by the Taskforce. While just over one third (35%) rated the responses given at the forum as good or excellent, 30% rated answers as average and 33% rated it as below average or poor.

Despite this, respondents were particularly positive about their opportunities to provide feedback – generally, as well as specifically about the draft principles and sub precincts:

- Opportunities to provide feedback (57% good or excellent).
- Process to provide feedback on draft principles (61% good or excellent)
- Process to provide feedback on sub precinct and issues (51% good or excellent, with 29% average)

Respondents provided a range of positive commentary about the opportunity to share their views and listen to others’ ideas during table discussions. A strong majority (86%) described the table discussions as useful, with some respondents explaining:

- “It’s always interesting to find out what other people think and what they’re concerned about.”
- “An opportunity to voice suggestions.”
- “A chance to hear what others value and time to clarify my own thoughts.”
5 Round 3 outcomes

Strong approval of the open question time and opportunities to give feedback; some participants noted a lack of group work.

“I like the mix of Q&A and Group discussions. Pleased that Roads Authority were present at last.”

“I agree that going with the Q&A was the best was to proceed today.”

“Much improved format - less restricted & allowed exchange of ideas between community and interactive with the agencies.”

“I think a group work session is always better than a Q&A session.”

The Round 3 workshops were designed to be flexible to the needs and interests of participants – and offered the opportunity for participants to choose whether they took part in table discussions, individual work and/or a significant period for questions and answers.

Respondents positively rated the running of the forum and its format: almost 70% rating it as good or excellent and no-one rating it as ‘poor’.

Half of the respondents (50%) reported that table discussions had been useful. Many of those who had rated it as “not useful” noted that they had enjoyed it during previous rounds, or that their fellow participants had not opted to conduct a table discussion.

While most respondents offered positive feedback about the format, some participants felt that more structured table discussions would have created a better forum for sharing thoughts and information.

- “Would have been good to have table discussions. Didn't occur but would have been useful to discuss topics (but still allow individual to write their own answers).”

One respondent noted the challenges of Q&A – to encourage and support less extroverted members of the community:

- “With polarised views, nature pushed most personalities into their shell - probably best to do individually so true views can be expressed.”

That being said, there was a high degree of satisfaction regarding the opportunities for community members to provide input. Almost half rated the opportunity as “excellent” (45%), with three-quarters (75%) rating the opportunity positively overall.

Most participants rated the information provided at the forums as high quality:

- Over 50% thought the quality of information about the process was good or excellent, with around 40% rating process information as average.
- 60% rated the quality of information about the responses and gaps as good or excellent (60%). About one-third rated the responses information as average.
### Appendix: raw data

#### 6.1 Rankings raw data results

**Round 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>1 Poor</th>
<th>2 Below Average</th>
<th>3 Average</th>
<th>4 Good</th>
<th>5 Excellently</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1. Overall quality of info provided</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2. Explanation of the range of needs in the Bays Precinct</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3. Explanation of the range of opportunities in the Precinct</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4. Opportunities for community members to provide input</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5. Providing answers to your specific questions</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6. The running of the forum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7. Were the table discussions valuable to you?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Round 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>1 Poor</th>
<th>2 Below Average</th>
<th>3 Average</th>
<th>4 Good</th>
<th>5 Excellently</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1. Overall quality of info provided</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2. Process to provide feedback on draft principles</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3. Process to provide feedback on Sub precincts and issues</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4. Opportunities for community members to provide input</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5. Providing answers to your specific questions</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6. The running of the forum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7. Were the table discussions valuable to you?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Round 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>1 Poor</th>
<th>2 Below Average</th>
<th>3 Average</th>
<th>4 Good</th>
<th>5 Excellently</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1. Overall quality of info provided</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2. Quality of information provided about the process</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3. Quality of information provided about responses and gaps</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4. Opportunities for community members to provide input</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5. Providing answers to your specific questions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6. The running of the forum</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7. Were the table discussions valuable to you?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.2 Comments from feedback forms

Round 1

Additional comments on the forums and how they might be improved in the future:

- A greater focus on how the proposals from each agency affect the community in concrete forms
- Some of the govt authorities (and others) could have been much briefer in their presentations leaving more time for discussion at tables
- More time for community to say what we want, not just ask questions. More time for us to come up with positive suggestions
- Discussions not structured, ad hoc, and dominated by single issue advocates
- Provide individual participants with an 'essential' response return form - more collation - yes - but may elicit concerns overridden by the 'lowest common denominator' approach
- Better lighting, too much presentation
- More time for discussion groups and question time
- Listen and act
- Tell more people they are taking place, what it will mean to them
- Ensure agency presentations use evidence base
- Consideration of community input by the authorities. So far community is ignored
- To have a concrete outcome
- Circulation of working papers prior to the forum date
- Keep to time on the presentations so discussion and questions have reasonable time
- Open them to the community in an open way. Only those ‘in the know’ are being informed via our own networks with great effort
- Allow participants to comment on the 'proposed' developments when presentations are being given
- The provision of information for stage 1 was appropriate. I expect more input/debate at working stage 2
- Ask questions after each speaker. Don't repeat information already on handouts
- Venue and access created difficulties (darkness Weds night sugg 'nothing happening'). No lift. Locked gates.
- There were two missing elephants from the forum: INSW and the motorway proponents from TFNSW. Their decisions render much of the evening's discussion and the presentations touching on non-port related matters most. The community members highlighted the importance of public transport being prioritised but none of the agency representatives were able/willing to address this concern.
- The point was made that TFNSW weren't present. I agree with this? Public transport is THE vital issue.
- Some very good presentations of info by councils. However, not enough time for community response
- 1. All a bit amateurish - poor AV and management. 2. The governance of the process is not clear. Is the outcome of the task force 'advice' on a positive and serious recommendation.
- Turn on heating, make sure disabled bathroom is clear of furniture
- Not sure what the outcome was. Is anybody listening?
- No, reasonable given
- Well done to KJA
- Serious considerations of residents input
- Presenters should not be allowed to choose the order in which they prepare. A random order should be generated. Jane Marceau gave herself a biased advantage which appealed to the mass.
- I would like to see more 'linking' approach between all Taskforce members. More 'holistic' approach re workshops
- Thankyou
- Consultation means asking what people think not what experts think we should agree to
- I have worked on and around the harbour both for government (1977-1993) and private waterfront contractor (Waterway Construction - 1993 to present) amounting to 35 years experience and
observation. I am happy to continue to the process as and may be required to ensure sensible planning outcomes

- Answers were evasive - experts ignored crux of questions eg why isn't infrastructure in place before development? Eg Cruise Passenger Terminal and public transport

**Round 2**

Additional comments on the forums and how they might be improved in the future:

- Strata managers attempt to force their views
- Some plans on the wall have helped
- Interesting range of views from various agendas
- They were because important issues got raised. It concerned me that some people who came to "sit in" as council members often verged on pushing their own perspectives and even dominating when this is meant to be a "community consultation" and they already have a platform.
- Provide 'diabetic' food and no stuff that would kill you - high sugars
- Same IT method to type in the info and print it out large format and email to contributors
- More open feedback on status of community developments that restrict opportunities. Perhaps a A&A session to reps.
- Time limits on certain topics and individual perspectives followed by attempts to reach consensus. Absolutes and a lack of compromise re perspectives should be heard but not allowed to dominate - everyone must be heard.
- Sydney University Womens RC is concerned about the proposal for increased ferry routes within Blackwattle Bay. We understand that more ferry services are important to local residents however it does compromise the safety of rowers within the Bay. If it does go ahead, we would like to put forward the possibility of services starting from 7am onwards (given peak rowing hours 5-8am)
- Improved on round 1
- Competing agendas from different government departments lead to misinformation
- I'd love a night where big concepts from the community could be presented or pitched to an evening like this, say 15 minutes max per concept - then rated by our collective by private vote - Q&A's could be allowed for concepts which resonate widely.
- Opportunity to voice suggestions
- A chance to hear what others value and time to clarify my own thoughts
- People's views always interesting and important
- It's always interesting to find out what other people think and what they're concerned about
- I arrived late
- Very comprehensive
- Positive contributions were made
- Max 8 people in each group
- Quieter Venue
- Very well done
- Invitation to go to schools in the area and targeting voices of young people
- More opportunity for open exchange/ discussion areas community agencies
- Circulating staff were very helpful
- Interesting interchange
- Govt architect should be here?
- More realistic frameworks of commercial relatives might help the community realise what's possible
- Better format for community input developed.
- I am concerned that this whole process (which is very valuable) will result in 'Advice' for the current Minister and may end up being forgotten. I would like to see the principles (and a future vision) in a
legally enforceable overriding planning document that will be consistently upheld in future decision making.

- Table discussions need some guidance.
- Plenty!!
- Pyrmont was consistently excluded from community and a key suburb affected by the Bays Precinct strategy.
- I think the community concern is about partial redevelopment of Bridge Rd foreshore (i.e. only B1 & B2) was captured. The most desirable idea would be integrate redevelopment of B1, B2 & B3 with SFM redevelopment.
- Public transport, especially light rail was mentioned. Recreation in R2 and not record in the notes.
- There was little or no consideration of Pyrmont, Blackwattle Bay, Bank St & the fish market.
- There was a brief passing comment which clarified a point that was concerning me, namely the extent to which (a) the Rozelle Rail Yards are largely irrelevant to most of the agencies associated with Bays Precinct and (b) that the railyards are the purview of Transport for NSW & infrastructure NSW; the sole/realistic purpose of the area being considered is for the portals and the tunnel head of the M4 East. Light rail & cycling will not receive anything but uninterested consideration.
- Still not convinced of Govt.
- I am particularly interested in pedestrian access from Annandale up to Victoria Road - greatly enhances the public transport options for residents in North Annandale.

Round 3

Additional comments on the forums and how they might be improved in the future:

- Once again we did not have open and transparent process i.e. each able to speak on & explain ourselves of what has been taken place over time to the folk in Toto!
- I like the mix of Q&A and Group discussions. Pleased that roads authority were present at last.
- Problem with weighting community views/ responses. The change of format at last session helped community to access info.
- Didn't do this.
- Needs chair, scriber, a defined subject area to discuss and relevant authorities on that table.
- Good degree of agreement reached.
- Round 2 = too unstructured.
- There wasn't much table discussion.
- Good follow up.
- My overall position is in favour of an integrated masterplan conveying development on land, water and with the transport infrastructure is restraint. The groups seemed simply to provide opportunities for special pleading by special cultural groups.
- Included work more fruitful in the circumstances.
- Would have been good to have table discussions. Didn't occur but would have been useful to discuss topics (but still allow individual to write their own answers).
- With polarised views, nature pushed most personalities into their shell - probably best to do individually so true views can be expressed.
- Table discussions were not held, would have been valuable.
- Yes, my complaint that last meeting was stacked and manipulated by White Bay strata folks.
- The most important thing to do out of this is to identify, timetable and communicate next steps.
- Yes, however there wasn't an opportunity due to the time consumed by others.
- Several of the 'Draft community positions…' comments were not what my table discussion concluded e.g. 'bulk trade elsewhere' - we though Glebe Island appropriate. 'Do not renew maritime leases in Rozelle Bay' - length of leases is the issue.
- It is important for Govt. to make a decision on at least planning principles quickly - business needs certainty; suspension of leasing activities.
- Discuss process, produces a better reasoned output than Q&A.
- One must let our communities VENT. To take 75% of time by only oneside is wrong wrong wrong - we are the community and need to be heard. "Sorry we ran out of time" not any good.
- Perhaps you could have advertised these with posters in popular businesses, through schools and childcare centres to get more input e.g. Cobden and Haysen Real Estate are seeking views from community on future of the high street.
- Emotions are high, a difficult task to manage the process, and will await the next phase.
- Not impressed it was move to W/End with no notice at previous meeting. Also reason given to move was disabled access. I don't see any disabled access.
- No, I agree that going with the Q&A was the best was to proceed today.
- Too much preliminary talk which couldn't be heard.
- Well conducted.
- Question discussion too short – should have been more workshop.
- As with the other workshops, today's workshop was well run.
- Much improved format - less restricted & allowed exchange of ideas between community and interactive with the agencies.
- Details complex, comments made largely on procedures not details.
- Kathryn Pearson is an invaluable asset to the Govt., smart & believable.
- I think the sessions improved as they went on. Most maritime uses on Rozelle Bay = OK. Tendency to be too commercial around super yachts. Dry boat stance = really most viable here.
- More opportunity to participate, use Ipads to capture feedback, do trade-off analysis.
- I think a group work session is always better than a Q&A session.