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1 INTRODUCTION

In June 2009 the Minister for Planning announced the commencement of an interactive consultation process to help visualise the future of Bays Precinct, in particular White Bay, Glebe Island and White Bay Power Station.

The Stage 1 consultation process involved:
- an interactive website
- a public submissions process
- a community reference group
- specific consultation with industry groups
- submissions from NSW Government agencies, City of Sydney and Leichhardt Council

The aim of Stage 1 was to:
- gather information and ideas to be used to develop a set of draft principles to guide future planning of Bays Precinct.
- identify short, medium and long term land use opportunities for Bays Precinct.

A second stage of consultation is to seek feedback on the draft planning principles and the opportunities identified in the Stage 1 consultation process with respect to Bays Precinct.

Significant outcomes from the Stage 1 consultation process are:
- There is strong support for the approach adopted which recognised the need for early consultation / involvement in the development of ideas and formulation of planning principles.
- The importance of retaining a maritime character / working harbour is recognised with a variety of opinions on how this can be achieved.
- There is strong support for the creation of additional open space.
- Transport / traffic issues need to be resolved.
- Bays Precinct needs to respond to the aspirations of the local and regional communities while also acknowledging the potential the precinct may play in the growth of global Sydney.
- The Stage 1 consultation process has raised the profile of Bays Precinct, encouraging and stimulating debate on the precinct’s future.
- It is acknowledged that redevelopment is inevitable but the scale and extent of redevelopment is still an unknown.
- Fragmentation of Bays Precinct should be avoided. In the short to medium term retention of working harbour uses will protect Bays Precinct against fragmentation and allow full consideration of future development options.
- Bays Precinct needs flexibility to change as needs evolve and more is known with respect to Sydney’s future global, regional and local growth.
One of Bays Precinct’s outstanding attributes is that it is owned and controlled by the NSW Government facilitating ultimate land use decisions that can serve more than purely financial outcomes.

In future planning for Bays Precinct the following considerations need to be addressed:
- Bays Precinct is the last deepwater berthing area in Sydney Harbour under NSW Government ownership and control
- priority should be given to land uses that are dependent on a land / water interface i.e. recognise Bays Precinct’s ongoing role in Sydney’s maritime economy
- future land uses need to have regard to how Bays Precinct can strengthen and enhance Sydney’s role as a global city
- future land uses need to integrate with and knit back to surrounding communities and businesses with enhanced accessibility
- all future development should incorporate enhanced traffic and transport infrastructure
- foreshore land should be retained in public ownership
- public access to the waterfront and increased open space opportunities should be maximised.

STAGE 2 CONSULTATION
Planning Principles:
The following planning principles have been distilled from the Stage 1 consultation process and are put forward for Stage 2 engagement with community, business and industry:

- The Foreshore
  - Promote foreshore access throughout Bays Precinct
  - Prioritise land uses based on their need for waterfront proximity
  - Prioritise land uses based on their need for deep water berthing
  - Preserve passive maritime recreational opportunities

- Heritage
  - Utilise existing heritage features as project drivers
  - Conserve, interpret and adaptively reuse the precinct’s heritage

- Traffic and Transport and Access
  - Create an integrated traffic and transport and access plan to:
    - promote sustainable transport options
    - connect, enhance and promote public transport options throughout the precinct
    - reduce car dependency
    - enhance pedestrian and cycle connections
investigate the provision of ferry services to White Bay, and in the future, to Glebe Island
investigate light rail extension options to White Bay

• Public Domain
  - Emphasise the public domain through foreshore access and pedestrian streetscapes
  - Recognise the waters of Sydney Harbour as a component of the public domain
  - Foster open space throughout the precinct for both passive and active uses

• Community and Culture
  - Provide for new and existing communities
  - Foster social inclusion
  - Foster creative, incubator industries
  - Contribute to Sydney’s rich culture

• Design Excellence
  - Urban design and built form should be sympathetic to the scale and character of surrounding areas while responding to the precinct’s natural features (e.g. topography, views, headlands)
  - Design review principles should be entrenched in precinct redevelopment for both built form and public domain

• Environmental Showcase
  - Lead in environmental sustainability
  - Allow flexibility to adopt future gains in environmental technologies

• Infrastructure
  - Recognise infrastructure needs and implement them before or during new development taking place

• Economic Sustainability
  - Complement and contribute to Sydney as a global city

• Public Interest
  - Retain public ownership of Bays Precinct

Land Use Opportunities:
Major outcomes of the Stage 1 consultation process with respect to land use opportunities are the need to:

• advance the resolution of issues related to White Bay Power Station
• determine the ongoing role of the import industries currently located at Glebe Island and in conjunction with this review the concrete batching operations at Blackwattle Bay
• recognise Rozelle Rail Yards future role in the provision of transport infrastructure for the Sydney Region while exploring any opportunities for infill residential / small scale commercial use / open space, recreation

• emphasise the need to address traffic and transport issues in the short term exploring opportunities for a light rail spur line to White Bay and the provision of ferry services to White Bay

• acknowledge Sydney as a global city

These issues will be addressed by the NSW Government through reference to the NSW Government Bays Precinct Taskforce.
2 BACKGROUND

With a harbourside location just two kilometres from the CBD, Bays Precinct is a key part of Sydney’s harbour foreshore.

Bays Precinct has a land area of 80 hectares, the majority of which is owned by NSW Government authorities, including Sydney Ports Corporation, NSW Maritime and Sydney Harbour Foreshore Authority.

Bays Precinct is a diverse area including maritime and working harbour uses in the Glebe Island and White Bay areas; commercial maritime uses in Rozelle Bay; a large amount of disused land in the Rozelle Rail Yards and White Bay Power Station; and a mix of uses in Blackwattle Bay.

Of particular significance is that White Bay and Glebe Island precincts have operated as port facilities for more than 100 years and represent the last remaining deep water commercial berths within Sydney Harbour under NSW Government ownership and control.

However the Bays Precinct has undergone a number of land use changes in recent times providing the catalyst for an evaluation of future planning principles, land use options, opportunities and directions for the Precinct.

Principal changes have been:

- White Bay Power Station – decommissioned in 1983
- Rozelle Rail Yards – cessation of rail operations in 1997
- White Bay – cessation of P&O stevedoring operations in 2003
- Glebe Island – cessation of ATT car import operations in November 2008

The future of Bays Precinct is important to both the local community and the wider population of Sydney. Future planning for the precinct needs to consider the local needs, Sydney’s maritime economy and the strengthening of Sydney’s role as a global city.
3 STAGE 1 CONSULTATION PROCESS

Sydney Harbour Foreshore Authority was charged with undertaking the Stage 1 consultation process.

The consultation process centred on a number of strands:

Broad consultation and public submissions

A dedicated website was established under the URL www.shapesydenyforeshore.com, containing information about the precinct, its history and existing land uses.

Links were provided from this page to:

- online forums where ideas and information could be shared in a blog-style format
- a Facebook page to allow users to become ‘friends’ of Bays Precinct, and receive project updates
- a You Tube channel featuring a 3D animated flyover and video introductions to the online forums
- a project brochure and background paper which were distributed to key stakeholders and to service centres at Leichhardt Council and City of Sydney
- a dedicated email address baysprecinct@shfa.nsw.gov.au for submissions

Advertisements were placed in metropolitan and local media. Postcards and balloons were also distributed in the CBD and local centres to raise awareness with respect to the project and encourage participation in it.

Outcomes of the online forums are summarised at Attachment A.

Community Reference Group

In March 2007 the Premier announced the NSW Government would establish a community reference panel to provide community input to proposed land use reviews of Bays Precinct.

A Community Reference Group (CRG) was established in June 2009 with membership from local community action groups, residents, business, maritime industries and unions, property owners, local government, the MP for Balmain and representatives of State Government agencies. CRG membership is listed at Attachment B.

The CRG’s terms of reference were:

- provide advice about community aspirations and needs in relation to Bays Precinct that will inform future planning processes
- advise on current and emerging issues of interest and concern to the community and various stakeholders
encourage and inform community discussion by conveying information on Bays Precinct to community and stakeholder networks; and

provide input to matters considered by the NSW Government’s Bays Precinct Taskforce in preparing for the first phase of strategic planning for the future of the Precinct.

The CRG met as a group on nine occasions between 27 July 2009 and 30 March 2010 and also formed a number of working parties to report back on specific issues.

A public meeting was convened by members of the CRG at Wentworth Park on 7 July 2010 to report back to constituent community groups on the Stage 1 consultation process.

Stage 1 Consultation Process – Planning Principles

COMMUNITY REFERENCE GROUP OUTCOMES

The CRG in its Executive Summary Report of March 2010 describes a way forward for Bays Precinct and its future transition as follows:

“The full potential of this site can only be achieved if:

• planning decisions are made on the basis of a clear, long term vision and respect for agreed planning objectives and principles;

• planning decisions are coordinated;

• we bring into play the best and most creative uses for the future use and character of this part of Sydney Harbour.”

The 11 core objectives for the future of Bays Precinct (supported by more specific planning principles) are listed in the Executive Summary Report as:

OBJECTIVE 1: INTEGRATED FUTURE PLANNING

• No more one off, ad hoc planning decisions by State Government or other planning authorities

• All future planning and development decisions relating to the Bays Precinct to be on the basis of the agreed Principles and an integrated strategic plan for the whole Precinct incorporating a long-term (c.20 years) vision

OBJECTIVE 2: PRIORITY AND PRECEDENCE FOR THE PUBLIC GOOD

• Establish public good, not private benefit as the overriding driver for future planning decisions for the Bays Precinct
• Protect the remaining public ownership of foreshores and harbour from further alienation by sale or long-term lease for private use and restore headlands and heads of bays to the public

OBJECTIVE 3: ACCESS, OPEN SPACE AND RECREATION
• Open much more of the foreshores to the community and provide, wherever possible, continuous foreshore corridors for pedestrians and cyclists
• Restore the headlands and heads of bays to the public as opportunity arises
• Maintain safe access to the Bays for passive water based activities (rowing, dragon boating, kayaking, sailing)

OBJECTIVE 4: RECOGNITION OF HERITAGE
• Recognise the Bays’ significant maritime and industrial history in planning decisions
• Conserve all heritage items and, where feasible, provide for adaptive reuse of significant structures

OBJECTIVE 5: LAND USES
• Provide for local distinctiveness and character
• Given the high residential density of surrounding areas, ensure planning decisions have the minimum possible adverse impact on existing residents and businesses

OBJECTIVE 6: PROVISION FOR TRANSPORT
• Ensure no new activities or developments are approved without simultaneous provision for the necessary transport infrastructure- including public transport
• Prohibit approval of long term activities that will result in increased traffic congestion within the surrounding suburbs

OBJECTIVE 7: HOUSING
• Exclude private housing from direct foreshore frontage and, except for the Rozelle Train yards corridor, restrict housing to a lower order priority within the precinct

OBJECTIVE 8: BUILT FORM AND DESIGN
• All built form is to be of excellent design, on a compatible scale with the adjacent neighbourhoods and to contribute to a high quality public domain
• Views, including views to landmarks, to be conserved and where possible, expanded

OBJECTIVE 9: COMMUNITY AND CULTURE
• Create a high profile for cultural and artistic activities as an integral and significant aspect of the precinct’s character

OBJECTIVE 10: ECONOMIC LIFE
• Maintain a contemporary ‘working harbour’ character for the precinct and support other employment opportunities including green R&D and creative industries (e.g. incubators, artist studio space)
OBJECTIVE 11: SUSTAINABILITY AND ENVIRONMENT

- Incorporate best practice sustainability principles in all development and ensure that all uses enhance the sustainability of human and physical ecology in waterways and foreshores.

A second report ‘The Future of the Bays Precinct – Sydney’ was produced independently by a number of individuals who were also active members of the Community Reference Group.

This report concluded:

“The scale of the opportunity that the Bays Precinct offers Sydney by a brave, imaginative and holistic approach is not quickly grasped. The time frame alone could be 20 or 25 years.

It is important then that the planning process begins soon and that the Bays Precinct be:

- Looked at strategically.
- Assessed in its totality.
- Quarantined from medium and long term uses until the points above are addressed.
- Given into the responsibility of a body that has the area as its sole focus.
- Allowed to have the ongoing input of stakeholders in future planning.”

The planning and design strategies identified in the report are on the whole consistent with those identified by the Community Reference Group.

1. **Integrated Future Planning**

   - All future planning and development decisions relating to Bays Precinct are to be on the basis of an integrated strategic plan and principles for the whole Precinct.

2. **Priority and Precedence for the Public Good**

   - Bays Precinct, as part of Sydney Harbour, is a public resource owned by the public, to be protected for the public good. Bays Precinct foreshore lands are to remain in public ownership for the benefit of the local and wider community.

3. **Access, Open Space and Recreation**

   - Public access to the foreshore, including open space corridors for pedestrians and cyclists, is to be maintained and significantly extended as a vital part of the planning process.
• Foreshore land available for recreational use is to be maintained and significantly expanded.
• Traditional maritime recreational uses (rowing, dragon boating, kayaking, sailing) are to be preserved and safe navigation and speed parameters retained.

4. Heritage
• Ensure future planning recognises the significance of the area in Sydney’s maritime and industrial history. This will include conservation of all heritage items and, where feasible, adaptive reuse of the significant structures of the Precinct.

5. Land Uses
• Allow for a range of land uses within the Precinct to provide for local distinctiveness and character. Ensure all uses have the minimum possible adverse impact on existing residents and businesses.

6. Transport
• All activities and development to be integrated with the timely provision of integrated transport infrastructure including an integrated public transport strategy. Long-term uses must not result in increased traffic congestion within the surrounding areas.

7. Housing
• Housing is considered a lower order priority within the Precinct. Any new housing is to be diverse and responsive to the range of community needs. Private housing is excluded from direct foreshore frontage.

8. Built Form and Design
• All built form is to be of an excellent design, on a compatible scale with the adjacent neighbourhoods and to contribute to a high quality public domain.
• Views, including views to landmarks, are to be conserved and where possible, expanded.

9. Community and Culture
• Ensure cultural uses, including the celebration of indigenous and contemporary culture and publicly accessible art, are an integral part of the Precinct.

10. Economic Life
• Maintain the ‘working harbour’ character of the Precinct in conjunction with support for other employment opportunities including green R&D and creative industries (e.g. incubators, artist studio space)

11. Sustainability and Environment
• Incorporate best practice sustainability principles in all development and ensure that all uses enhance the suitability of human and physical ecology in waterways and foreshores. This will include a whole of catchment approach to water management.
Targeted Consultation

Targeted consultation was undertaken by Sydney Harbour Foreshore Authority with a number of industry and professional organisations including Sydney Business Chamber, Property Council of Australia, Tourism and Taskforce Forum, Australian Institute of Architects (NSW), Australian Institute of Landscape Architects (NSW), Planning Institute of Australia (NSW). A number of these bodies provided formal submissions in response to the consultation process.

Principle outcomes were:

- All submissions supported the approach of opening up involvement at an early stage of the planning process through the development of ideas.
- All submissions recognised the importance of the site as part of the ‘Global City’ role that Sydney has.
- All submissions recognised the importance of the waterfront and the working port with varying approaches as to how much was to be retained.
- All submissions stressed the importance of transport.
- A joint submission from AIA, AILA and PIA stressed the importance of the planning and decision making process.

TTF in November 2010 released a report “Harbour View – A Vision for Sydney Harbour” recognising the need for a master plan for Bays Precinct following final consultation with the tourism industry and general community.

The report states “While residential development will be part of the Bays Precinct, this area must also have a public domain for Sydneysiders and visitors. This is our last chance to consider major sporting facilities, theme parks, a cruise shipping terminal, recreational facilities or retail and dining areas on the harbour. Whatever Sydney chooses, hotel development and effective ferry services will be essential for the precinct.”

Submissions from NSW Government Agencies, Leichhardt Council and City of Sydney

NSW Government Agencies

The following NSW Government agencies made submissions:

- Heritage Council
- Sydney South West Area Health Services
- Department of Transport and Infrastructure
- Department of Planning
Leichhardt Council

Leichhardt Council was represented on the Community Reference Group through a number of Councillors and Precinct Committee members.

Council made a submission in July 2009 providing suggestions and draft principles it considered critical to the development of a Master Plan for the area with an emphasis on transport / access, open space and sustainability.

Council advised it would work with the local community to determine land uses and activities appropriate to locate within the area.

In a November 2010 submission to the NSW Department of Planning in relation to the proposal for a Cruise Passenger Terminal at White Bay 5 Council states it “considers that Sydney’s future economic and environmental well-being is dependant upon the development of both a long term maritime strategy for Sydney Harbour and a Bays Precinct Master Plan.”

City of Sydney

While the majority of Bays Precinct falls outside the City of Sydney Local Government Area, the City was represented on the Community Reference Group.

The City made a submission on Bays Precinct in December 2009 offering preliminary ideas for discussion. The submission was not an adopted Council policy.

The submission proposes a strategic plan be developed for Bays Precinct to ensure a coordinated approach for:

- the distribution and organisation of land uses;
- managing the needs of the working harbour and recreational uses;
- transport management, including connecting to the CBD and greater Sydney;
- environmental management and long term sustainability; and
- heritage preservation and representation.

The submission also states that the Bays Precinct Strategic Plan must refer to and fit with any overarching plans for the future of the whole of Sydney Harbour.

In July 2010 the Council resolved to establish a Bays Renewal Committee to advise on an integrated and strategic planning approach to these (Bays Precinct) and nearby Harbour areas.
New Development Authority

A number of submissions recommended a new government agency be established to undertake preparation of a precinct master plan for Bays Precinct and management of the redevelopment process.

Since the commencement of Bays Precinct community consultative process the Sydney Harbour Foreshore Authority has been incorporated into the Land and Property Management Authority (LPMA). Further, the NSW government has endorsed the LPMA as the key land and precinct management agency for the core Sydney Harbour foreshore areas, including those from Balmain to Circular Quay.

This decision has provided a strong structural and operational base for the completion of the Darling Harbour South and Circular Quay Master Plans and provides a strong platform from which to complete a precinct master plan for the Bays area and the subsequent redevelopment process, including the consideration of issues and outcomes detailed in Section 4 below.

Submissions

A summary of all submissions received is at Attachment C.

Copies of all submissions are available at www.shfa.nsw.gov.au/baysprecinct. Hard copies of any of the submissions can be accessed by contacting Kirsty Martin at Sydney Harbour Foreshore Authority on telephone (02) 9240 8712.
4 STAGE 1 CONSULTATION PROCESS – LAND USE ISSUES

4.1 WHITE BAY POWER STATION

(Area: 3.4 hectares. Ownership: Sydney Harbour Foreshore Authority)

White Bay Power Station was purchased from Pacific Power by the Sydney Harbour Foreshore Authority in 2000 for $4 million. It is the longest surviving Sydney power station and significantly retains a representative set of machinery and items associated with the generation of electricity in the early and mid-20th century.

Aesthetically White Bay Power Station contains internal and external spaces of exceptional significance. Externally it is a widely recognised and visible landmark, marking the head of White Bay and the southern entry to the Balmain peninsula.

The power station is of high social significance, being recognised as an important surviving example of the power stations that once were prominent in the inner Sydney landscape. It is listed on the Register of the National Estate, the NSW State Heritage Register, the Sydney Harbour Foreshore Authority S.170 Register and the Register of the National Trust of Australia (NSW).

The site is currently zoned for port and employment uses.

A Conservation Management Plan (CMP) for White Bay Power Station was endorsed by the Heritage Council in 2004. The CMP identifies and describes the cultural significance of the site and proposed conservation policies to manage the asset into the future. It can be used as a management tool and as part of a design brief for future works and development.

Sydney Harbour Foreshore Authority has recently commissioned an update to the CMP to reflect any changes to White Bay Power Station and its immediate environment since 2004.

An important outcome of the Stage 1 Bays Precinct consultation process was support for the retention and adaptive reuse of the power station with a preference for community/cultural uses, incubator industries and some suggestions on renewable energy opportunities.

The Property Council of Australia in its submission of November 2009 stated:

“There is no single or simple solution for the future of the White Bay Power Station.

In some respects the Power Station imposes a significant constraint on the urban renewal of the Bays Precinct. Its location prevents the realignment of Victoria Road, its heritage listing limits substantial structural change and its deteriorating condition would require substantial investment (both public and private) to facilitate its reuse.

Despite these constraints the White Bay Power Station is a unique site that should be interrogated to determine whether it would be appropriate for commercial use and, more importantly, a viable redevelopment prospect.”

City of Sydney in its submission of December 2009 provided a vision for the White Bay Power Station Precinct as the main cultural hub of the inner west; a performance space, gallery space including temporary spaces for creative workshops and artist studios. In the longer term the Power Station could become a Museum or Art Gallery, reflecting its unique heritage and iconic building form and capitalising on the expansive spaces available internally.
A public square on the foreshore could set a strong forecourt for the revitalised White Bay Power Station and host local festivals, market days and outdoor art events and performances associated with the cultural uses of the Power Station.

Sydney Harbour Foreshore Authority advises there is also an urgent need to treat or replace the existing galvanised steel roofs and stormwater systems to prevent further water penetration and to protect the power station’s heritage infrastructure.

**Way Forward:**

Sydney Harbour Foreshore Authority will give detailed consideration to the findings of the Conservation Management Plan and explore what steps can be taken to advance proposals in the short to medium term for adaptive reuse of White Bay Power Station.

**4.2 GLEBE ISLAND**

(Area: 36.72 hectares. Ownership: Sydney Ports Corporation)

Following the departure of ATT car import operations in 2008, Glebe Island is now, apart from occasional dockside mooring of special vessels, underutilised with the only ongoing active use being the silo operations on its north western edge.

Highly visible from surrounding areas the silos were first constructed in the 1930s and were used for grain storage. These earlier silos were demolished in 2000 when grain storage ceased. The current silos were constructed in 1975.

The silos are listed on Sydney Ports Corporation Section 170 Heritage Register and are noted as being of Local Significance under Leichhardt Local Environmental Plan 2000.

Current users of the silos have leases through to 2020. Any approval for new or renewed leases at Glebe Island with terms extending beyond 2020 require Cabinet approval.

Some submissions in response to the Stage 1 consultation process advocated removal of the silo operations prior to their lease expiry as they were perceived as a significant barrier to the coordinated planning and redevelopment of Glebe Island. Others suggested retention of the silos for adaptive reuse when the current leases expire.

Others advocated the continuation of the silo industries and the expansion of industrial uses at Glebe Island through the amalgamation and relocation of the Hanson and Hymix concrete batching plants from Blackwattle Bay.

If these import activities are not to be accommodated in the long term at Glebe Island, consideration must be given to where such goods could be imported and the potential transport and economic costs of relocating them elsewhere.
Sydney Ports Corporation view is that the economic value of the dry bulk trade at Glebe Island is vital to Sydney and NSW. While there has been a decline in throughput Glebe Island (and to an extent White Bay) is the only dry bulk facility in Sydney. Glebe Island performs a crucial role in supplying the local construction market with cement and gypsum.

Sydney Ports Corporation advise they have recently had enquiries about operating new dry bulk facilities at Glebe Island. They are keen to explore such possibilities at what has become Sydney Ports Corporation’s last remaining operational port area in Sydney Harbour able to cater for such products.

Sydney Ports Corporation are continuing to invest in infrastructure at Glebe Island.

Sydney Ports Corporation are proposing use of Glebe Island on up to ten occasions per year as an overflow terminal when the two current dedicated passenger terminals (Overseas Passenger Terminal at Circular Quay and Barangaroo No. 5) are occupied. This would be an interim measure until the commissioning of White Bay 5 as a cruise terminal with an overflow facility at White Bay 4.

Cement Australia made a submission on the strategic value of the Glebe Island Cement Terminal.

Cement Australia submit:

- their shipping terminal at Glebe Island is one of the most strategically located cement facilities in the country giving easy access to Sydney city centre, ensuring minimum trucking movements on the road network.
- the removal of the terminal would see a significant increase in road traffic in and out of Sydney as cement would have to be delivered from Port Kembla and Port of Newcastle causing an increase of over 1 million kilometres in trucking movements per annum in and out of Sydney, and driving up the cost of supplying cement into metropolitan Sydney by $10/tonne.
- the NSW Government should consider the environmental, economic and road congestion benefits of the Glebe Island Cement Terminal and look to extending the facility lease beyond the current 2020 expiry date.

The Joint Ministerial Taskforce Report on Tourism, Planning and Investment discussed Glebe Island as follows:

- “Alongside Barangaroo, Glebe Island provides one of the last remaining opportunities to enhance tourism product and service offerings opportunity in Sydney on an accessible and relatively unconstrained government harbour front site. The Taskforce has discussed options that include:
  
  o the development of a specialist attraction precinct incorporating a mix of visitor commercial and residential uses; or
• employment-generating opportunities linked to the creative industries (identified by the NSW Government as one of the State’s key innovation sectors).”

• Given the need for proximity to the Sydney CBD and to reinforce the international business headquarter functions proposed for Barangaroo, the development of the site for major convention and exhibition facilities in itself is not supported by the Taskforce, although the site may provide functions that support expanded business event facilities proposed for the SCEC site in nearby Darling Harbour.

Way Forward:

• The ongoing maritime commercial use of the Glebe Island silos serviced from Glebe Island Wharf 7 and 8 needs to be investigated to determine whether these industries remain post 2020 and if they are to do so, that their operations are protected from inappropriate adjacent development.

• A determination on the ongoing role of the silo industries at Glebe Island will flow onto decisions with respect to the ability to explore opportunities on relocating the Hanson / Hymix operations from Blackwattle Bay to Glebe Island.

4.3 ROZELLE RAIL YARDS

(Area: 19 hectares. Ownership: Sydney Harbour Foreshore Authority)

Sydney Harbour Foreshore Authority acquired much of the site from State Rail in 1999 and has entered into short term lease arrangements with a variety of users. As the site is income generating there are no immediate redevelopment pressures.

The CBD Metro project proposed a purpose built depot at the Rozelle Rail Yard adjacent to the City West Link Road. The Metro project also proposed a pedestrian and cyclist bridge over the depot from Lilyfield Road to Blackwattle Bay. Train stabling and maintenance facilities as well as an operations control centre would be an essential component of any future metro project.

This is a large site with the potential to deliver significant development and positive public domain and amenity outcomes.

While there is the opportunity to identify the Rail Yards as an urban renewal site, given the traffic and transport constraints applying to Bays Precinct transport infrastructure requirements should be given the highest priority.

Any proposals for this area should encourage integration with bus services, the road network and bicycle networks.

Future development options also need to take into account land that may be required for a future M4 Extension.

Given the cancellation of the CBD Metro project there is now the time / opportunity to explore development options.

Infill residential / recreation / open space are possible future uses but reservation of the Rail Yards as a transport base / corridor must take precedence.
Way Forward:

- Confirm Rozelle Rail Yards primary use as a reservation for transport infrastructure.
- Investigate future land use options while acknowledging transport infrastructure must take precedence at all times.
4.4 TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORT

The area surrounding Rozelle Bay, Glebe Island and White Bay is severely constrained with respect to traffic and transport. The Anzac Bridge, Victoria Road and City West Link experience congestion in the morning and afternoon peaks.

Due to the transport constraints of the precinct, careful consideration needs to be given to land use development scenarios and subsequent transport requirements.

Relevant considerations are:

- The mix, distribution, intensity of land use within the precinct and its likely staging such that maximum utilisation can be made of metropolitan-wide public transport and local transport modes.
- The realistic extent of metropolitan travel demand likely to be taken up by bus services, light rail, ferries, and any metro service, and the consequent role that travel by private car and heavy vehicles / freight will play in meeting the transport needs of the precinct.
- Impacts of vehicular access and traffic flow on Victoria Road, The Crescent and City West Link.
- Issues of pedestrian and bicycle connections
- Transport Management and Access Plans (TMAPs) will be required to identify the required infrastructure, services and demand management measures to manage the transport impacts of the development from an early stage.
- New ferry routes should be considered to facilitate connectivity of Bays Precinct to Balmain, North Sydney, King Street hub / future Barangaroo hub. Services to White Bay / Glebe Island could form part of new routes to Glebe Point Road / Jacksons Landing.
- The proposed light rail extension from Lilyfield to Dulwich Hill will utilise an existing former goods rail corridor. The opportunity exists to provide a spur line to White Bay utilising existing disused infrastructure.

Way Forward:

Traffic and transport issues are:

- the need to reserve land for any future transport infrastructure
- exploration of a light rail spur from Lilyfield to White Bay to provide a public transport connection for White Bay, the new cruise passenger terminal and the Balmain Peninsula
- provision of ferry services
- overall safeguarding the potential for multi-model transport initiatives being bus, light rail, ferry, metro, bicycle and vehicle access improvements.
ANZAC BRIDGE – Western Distributor major road linkage to Bays Precinct
4.5 SYDNEY AS A GLOBAL CITY

Sydney is Australia’s only global city. Barangaroo is currently the only broad scale CBD site able to accommodate Sydney’s continued commercial and corporate growth. With its close proximity to the CBD, Bays Precinct offers opportunities with respect to accommodating Sydney’s next phase of global city development.

Options are:

- an employment hub
- a setting for a mixed commercial / residential development
- leisure and tourist destination; and/or
- a community hub on the fringe of the CBD.

Access and public transport will be integral to all future development options.

Fragmentation of Bays Precinct should be avoided. In the short to medium term retention of working harbour uses will protect against fragmentation and allow full consideration of the Precinct’s future development options.

One of Bays Precinct’s outstanding attributes is that it is owned and controlled by the NSW Government thereby facilitating ultimate land use decisions that can serve more than purely financial outcomes.
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Community Reference Group Key Objectives and Recommendations

1. Objective: Integrated Future Planning
No more one off, ad hoc planning decisions by State Government or other planning authorities. All future planning and development decisions relating to the Bays Precinct to be on the basis of the agreed Principles and an integrated strategic plan for the whole Precinct incorporating a long term (c20 years) vision.

Supporting Principles
1.1 Develop an integrated strategic plan for the whole of the Bays Precinct incorporating strategic planning principles.
1.2 Develop a series of linked specific Master Plans for each definable site. They are to be consistent with the integrated strategic plan and principles. Existing Master Plans are to be amended where they are inconsistent with the strategic plan or its principles.
1.3 Ensure the longer term (up to 20 years) vision for the Bays Precinct guides more immediate planning decisions so that implementation of the long-term vision is not precluded by incompatible or unsympathetic activities/development.

2. Objective: Priority and Precedence for the Public Good
Establish public good, not private benefit as the overriding driver for future planning decisions for the Bays Precinct. Protect remaining public ownership of foreshores and harbour from further alienation by sale or long-term lease for private use and restore headlands and heads of bays to the public.

Supporting Principles
2.1 The Bays Precinct (as a part of Sydney Harbour) is to be recognised as a public resource, owned by the public, to be protected for the public good.
2.2 The Bays Precinct foreshore lands are to remain in public ownership for the benefit of the local and wider community.
2.3 The restoration of headlands to public green space and heads of bays for public use as opportunities arise.
2.4 Leases on publicly owned lands and buildings are to be limited to medium term (c30 years) except where the lease provides for public use.
2.5 The public good has precedence over the private good whenever and whatever change is proposed for the Bays Precinct or its foreshore (as a part of Sydney Harbour).
2.6 Protection of the natural assets of the Bays Precinct (as a part of Sydney Harbour) has a high priority.
3. Objective: Access, Open space and recreation
Open much more of the foreshores to the community and provide, wherever possible, continuous foreshore corridors for pedestrians and cyclists. Restore the headlands and heads of bays to the public as opportunity arises. Maintain safe access to the bays for passive water based activities (rowing, dragon boating, kayaking, sailing).

Supporting Principles
3.1 Create continuous public access to the foreshore (except where precluded by health, safety or security issues) including open space corridors for pedestrians and cyclists along the waterfront, wharves, the White Bay powerhouse and the Rozelle railway yards, as a vital part of the planning process. This will include:
- Publicly accessible open space strategically located at specific locations around the Bay, extending and connecting existing adjoining open spaces.
- Provision of public open space for both passive use and active/sporting recreational uses.
- The restoration of headlands to public green space and heads of bays for public use as opportunities arise.
- The setback of any development fronting the Bays with a building line of not less than 20 metres from the foreshore.
- Ensure access for people with disabilities is integrated into all aspects of planning in line with relevant standards and guidelines.

3.2 Ensure 24 hour access to the foreshore except where ‘working harbour’ functions require occasional or permanent restricted access. Co-locate these functions wherever possible to minimise the areas of restricted ‘working harbour’ foreshore access.

3.3 Maximise opportunities for waterfront and water-based recreational activities by limiting structures on the water that impede water surface activities.

3.4 Preserve traditional and compatible maritime recreational uses (rowing, dragon boating, kayaking, sailing) and retain safe navigation and speed parameters. This should include ensuring that maritime activity is characterised by low wash, low frequency, low use of the space with limited early morning activity.

3.5 Coordinate open space locations with the public transport network and key public access points and reflect environmental sustainability principles.

3.6 Reconnect green corridors using endemic native plants where possible.

4. Objective: Heritage
Recognise the Bays’ significant maritime and industrial history in planning decisions. Conserve all heritage items and, where feasible, provide for adaptive reuse of significant structures.

Supporting Principles
4.1 Recognise the significance of the area as part of Sydney’s maritime and industrial history including by:
- Incorporating reference to and the creative interpretation of the Precinct’s maritime and industrial history into any redevelopment.
- Conserving and adapting, where feasible, the significant fabric of the Precinct, including all heritage and other structures.
5. **Objective: Land Uses**

*Provide for local distinctiveness and character. Given the high residential density of surrounding areas, ensure planning decisions have the minimum possible adverse impact on existing residents and businesses.*

**Supporting Principles**

5.1 Allow for a range of land uses within each definable site and within the whole Precinct focusing on activities that will provide their own distinctiveness and character and which take into account a balanced response to regional, state and national needs and the high density residential character of the surrounding suburbs.

5.2 Ensure all uses have a minimum possible adverse impact on existing residents and businesses. Create ‘buffer zones’ where uses may have adverse impacts.

5.3 Prioritise land for activities that are dependent upon a foreshore location in preference to those which are simply enhanced by that location.

5.4 Ensure planning responds to the existing geography and built forms, points, headlands, valleys, cuttings, bridge structures etc.

5.5 Encourage maritime related land uses throughout the Precinct.

5.6 Concentrate existing heavy industry land uses in appropriate locations to allow opportunities for other sites to be redeveloped for more sensitive land uses.

5.7 Maximise public access and activation of the foreshore through a range of land uses that will enhance public safety through both the day and at night.

5.8 Ensure that land uses and their population intensity are appropriately integrated with public transport accessibility and overall transport infrastructure.

6. **Objective: Transport**

*Ensure no new activities or developments are approved without simultaneous provision for the necessary transport infrastructure- including public transport. Prohibit approval of long term activities that will result in increased traffic congestion within the surrounding suburbs.*

**Supporting Principles**

6.1 Develop an integrated public transport strategy for the Precinct that guides future development and includes the following:

- Prioritise sustainable transport opportunities, including walking and cycling, by maximizing access to public transport and nearby centres and activity hubs.
- Extend the light rail system to the peninsula
- Maximise opportunities offered by the existing heavy rail access to the Harbour to achieve efficient cargo transportation and support the ‘working harbour’
- Provide a heavy transport road corridor from the port areas to the adjacent arterial road system to avoid impact on the suburban road system.
- Maximise opportunities created by any future plans for a rail metro
- Create a high quality pedestrian environment taking precedence over vehicles.
- Minimise the provision of car parking after consideration of the accessibility of public transport and services.
- Exclude car parking structures from the area between any waterfront building and the foreshore Introduce additional ferry services to the area

6.2 Integrate continuous pedestrian and cycle ways with foreshore activities and the surrounding area.

6.3 Ensure that the long term uses do not result in increased traffic congestion within the surrounding suburbs

6.4 Coordinate any ferry services with the location and timing of local water based recreational activities

6.5 Support car share as a transport mode throughout the precinct
7. Objective: Housing

Exclude private housing from direct foreshore frontage and restrict housing to a lower order priority within the Precinct.

Supporting principles
7.1 Housing is considered to be a lower order priority within the Precinct (except for the within the Rozelle train yards site).
   - Ensure location of housing considers compatibility with ongoing and proposed maritime uses and adequate provision of open space.
   - Ensure housing locations do not impair provision of working harbour uses or public open space and amenity nor enable private ownership of land with direct foreshore frontage.
7.2 Ensure any housing is diverse in type, size, form, and design, providing for both market and affordable housing and a range of housing needs, including aging in place, affordable housing, social housing, families, students and adaptable accessible housing.

8. Objective: Built Form and Design

All built form is to be of excellent design, on a compatible scale with the adjacent neighborhoods and is to contribute to a high quality public domain Views, including views to landmarks, to be conserved and where possible, expanded.

Supporting principles
8.1 Ensure development manifests design excellence by:
   - Developing/redeveloping at a compatible scale at interfaces with the adjacent neighborhoods
   - Ensuring the bulk, scale and location of buildings consider local views into, over, through and from within the Precinct, and conserve and, where possible extend, significant views
   - Implementing principles of ‘view sharing’ where relevant
   - Contributing to a high quality public domain
   - Developing diverse architectural responses, with buildings having a diverse design, fine grain and pattern, with active frontages and articulated elevations.
   - Using design competitions for key site locations
8.2 Allow for the ongoing sustainable use and reuse of buildings.

9. Objective: Community and Culture

Create a high profile for cultural and artistic activities as an integral and significant aspect of the Precinct’s character

Supporting Principles
9.1 Ensure cultural uses and the celebration of indigenous and contemporary culture are an integral part of the Precinct.
9.2 Provide for publicly accessible art to be incorporated in the Precinct making reference to the water base environment and the area’s maritime history.
9.3 Integrate appropriate and adequate community and education facilities within the Precinct.
9.4 Provide for maritime education and training activities to occur within the Precinct.
10. Objective: Economic Life

Maintain a contemporary ‘working harbour’ character for the Precinct and support other employment opportunities including green R&D and creative industries (eg incubators, artist studio space)

Supporting Principles

10.1 Maintain a contemporary ‘working harbour’ character of the Bays Precinct considering current and future needs within the Precinct.

10.2 Ensure continuing commercial port use within the Precinct is supported together with the consideration of future port related uses.

10.3 Ensure other non-trading maritime commercial activity (eg vessel repair, lay-up berthage, bunkering, space for harbour related construction works and other support services) are supported as currently vital to the effective functioning of the Harbour.

10.4 Encourage ‘Green’ R&D industries in the Precinct.

10.5 Identify opportunities for the beautification and development of open foreshore space for public use and amenity as an economic benefit to the City.

10.6 Identify opportunities for supporting creative industries (eg provision of incubators and artist studio spaces).

10.7 Provide for economic growth and job opportunities for the future of the local and regional area.

11. Objective: Sustainability and Environment

Incorporate best practice sustainability principles in all development and ensure that all uses enhance the sustainability of human and physical ecology in waterways and foreshores.

Supporting principles

11.1 Ensure all uses enhance the sustainability of the human and physical ecology in the immediate and neighbouring waterways and foreshores.

11.2 Ensure all uses comply with relevant environmental guidelines and controls.

11.3 Ensure development takes a ‘whole-of-catchment’ approach to water cycle management through:

- integrating the provision of open space with opportunities for water sensitive urban design that manages water onsite, reduces pollutants flowing to the harbour and improves waterway health and reduces potable water use
- creating a water conservation and harvest scheme for the whole Precinct that deals with collection, treatment and reuse.

11.4 Design roads to provide for a high quality pedestrian and cycling environment.
Summary of Recommendations

1. No new development proposals for the precinct be considered or approved unless they comply with Planning Principles for the Bays Precinct that have been publicly exhibited in Stage 2 and approved, and with an approved Master Plan based on those approved Planning Principles.

2. The Government approves the broad Objectives and Principles developed by the Bays Precinct Community Reference Group as the basis for the draft planning principles to be exhibited in stage 2 of the Bays Precinct planning process.

3. To overcome the current fragmentation of responsibilities, the Government establish a dedicated authority to co-ordinate and manage the Bays Precinct within Sydney Harbour. This authority should have relevant expertise and community representation. It should be publically accountable and its powers should be subject to relevant planning, heritage and environmental legislation and its decisions subject to appropriate appeal mechanisms.

4. The NSW Government maintains its current commitment to community participation in the Bays Precinct Planning Process into Stage 2 and establishes a range of mechanisms to include a broad range of interested people. This should include the establishment of a formal and adequately supported community advisory committee with balanced representation from the Precinct as a key part of this consultation process. It is recommended that there be an effective direct linkage between this committee and the Bays Precinct Task Force.
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Bays Precinct Taskforce Members

The Bays Precinct Taskforce is chaired by Department of Premier and Cabinet, with representatives from Sydney Harbour Foreshore Authority, NSW Treasury, Department of Planning and Infrastructure, Transport for NSW, Sydney Ports Corporation and Roads and Maritime Services.

*Members*

Dianne Leeson (Chair)/Kathryn Pearson – Department of Premier and Cabinet

Diana Talty/Paul Robinson – Sydney Harbour Foreshore Authority

Louise Courtney – NSW Treasury

Juliet Grant – Department of Planning and Infrastructure

Mark Ozinga/Tim Dewey – Transport for NSW

Grant Gilfillan/Marika Calfas – Sydney Ports Corporation

Michael Wright – Roads and Maritime Services

Graham Jahn – City of Sydney

Peter Conroy/Rochelle Porteous – Leichhardt Municipal Council

Jane Marceau/Lesley Lynch – Community representatives
APPENDIX 4
BAYS PRECINCT LAND OWNERSHIP AND LAND TENURE
ANALYSIS

Land ownership and land tenure

Refer page 2 for land ownership and lease termination dates.
## Land ownership and land tenure

### Bays Precinct land ownership & lease termination dates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner / Lessee</th>
<th>Agreement for Lease</th>
<th>Lease Term</th>
<th>Lease Commencement Date</th>
<th>Lease End Date</th>
<th>Lease Options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Baileys Marine</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Sydney Ports Corporation; White Bay Cruise Passenger Terminal</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>permanent use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Working harbour uses including layup area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Gypsum Resources Australia</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Cement Australia</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>40 years</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>2057</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Sugar Australia</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Sydney Harbour Foreshore Authority</td>
<td>N/A Vacant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Sydney Heritage Fleet (part site)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Freehold private land</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Freehold private land</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Freehold private land</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Freehold private land</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Sydney Fish Market</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>50 years</td>
<td>29 October 1994</td>
<td>28 October 2044</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Blackwattle Bay Marina B1</td>
<td>Executed</td>
<td>35 years</td>
<td>1 September 2016</td>
<td>1 September 2051</td>
<td>10 years subject to capital expenditure invested in site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Blackwattle Bay Marina B2</td>
<td>Executed</td>
<td>35 years</td>
<td>1 September 2016</td>
<td>1 September 2051</td>
<td>10 years subject to capital expenditure invested in site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Hanson</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Seawind</td>
<td>Executed</td>
<td>40 years</td>
<td>1 June 2014</td>
<td>1 June 2054</td>
<td>10 years to 2064 subject to capital expenditure invested in site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Roads and Maritime Services Part Slip Lane, remainder vacant</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Devine Marine</td>
<td>Executed</td>
<td>10 years</td>
<td>1 April 2014</td>
<td>1 April 2024</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Waterway Constructions</td>
<td>Executed</td>
<td>10 years</td>
<td>1 January 2014</td>
<td>1 January 2024</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Polaris Marine</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>17 years</td>
<td>28 February 2011 (lease executed)</td>
<td>27 February 2028</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Australian Wharf and Bridge</td>
<td>Executed</td>
<td>10 years</td>
<td>3 December 2013</td>
<td>3 December 2023</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Temporarily occupied by Sydney Heritage Fleet</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Sydney Boatshoise</td>
<td>Executed</td>
<td>30 years</td>
<td>29 May 2016</td>
<td>29 May 2046</td>
<td>25 years to 2071 subject to capital expenditure invested in site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Sydney Superyacht Marina (Lots 1 &amp; 2)</td>
<td>Executed</td>
<td>44 years</td>
<td>31 August 2016</td>
<td>31 August 2060</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Sydney City Marina</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>52 years and three months</td>
<td>2 September 2011 (lease executed)</td>
<td>1 December 2063</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Longitude Rozelle Bay</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>52 years</td>
<td>7 October 2011 (lease executed)</td>
<td>30 November 2063</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To be read in conjunction with land ownership and land tenure map, page 1
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Executive Summary

The Glebe Island Bridge is a swing bridge which previously connected Pyrmont with Glebe Island.

Urbis has been engaged by New South Wales (NSW) Roads and Maritime Services to undertake consultation with key maritime businesses located in the Blackwattle Bay and Rozelle Bay foreshore areas.

Outcomes of these discussions may be used to inform ongoing planning and development considerations for the Glebe Island Bridge. Consultations included desktop research and telephone discussions with stakeholders.

Key findings of this report include:

- Glebe Island Bridge (the Bridge) is located on Sydney Harbour and spans a narrow channel of water to connect Jackson’s Landing in Pyrmont with Glebe Island in Rozelle. The Bridge structure is 108m long and is connected to the land by two artificially-formed abutments.

- The Bridge is not listed as an item of state heritage significance on the State Heritage Register under the Heritage Act 1977.

- The City of Sydney and Leichhardt Municipal Council have identified a long term opportunity to provide a cycleway over the Bridge. This is noted in the Draft City of Sydney Development Control Plan 2010 and the Leichhardt Council Bicycle Strategy 2007.

- Blackwattle Bay and Rozelle Bay form part of the Inner Sydney Foreshore area. As two of the few remaining working parts of Sydney Harbour, use of the bays by commercial and recreational operators has formed part of continued economic development.

- The Blackwattle and Rozelle Bay area is used by a number of different services, operators and the general public throughout the week (day and night).

- Blackwattle Bay and Rozelle Bay are unique within the Sydney Harbour landscape due to the mix of uses and accessibility. The area provides access for the general public, provides significant employment and is one of the only working harbour areas left in Sydney Harbour.

- The area is important to Sydney economically and socially. In addition, a number of businesses within the bay area provide important maintenance and services for the operation and use of Sydney Harbour as a working port.

- A number of stakeholders stated that the preference for any changes or redevelopment within the area should reflect the vision of the original Bays Precinct Masterplan (1998 and 2001).

- The proximity of the Blackwattle Bay and Rozelle Bay area to the Sydney CBD is an important factor for operators and workers. It offers access to the general public and is serviced by extensive private and public transport options.

- The enclosed nature of the Blackwattle Bay and Rozelle Bay area offers natural protection to vessels from currents and wind and the provision of deep water to enable larger vessels to move freely and easily onto moorings.

- The Glebe Island Bridge channel is narrow and is difficult to navigate due to the existing level of vessel traffic. There was a concern that reinstating the operational swing bridge may increase travel times and jeopardise safe navigation.

- It is suggested that significant development plans for the Blackwattle Bay and Rozelle Bay area may increase vessel movements and waterway traffic in the future. A number of business operators intend to redevelop the land and sea side of current services, particularly in Blackwattle Bay.
- It was reported that continued development and economic activity is contingent on access to the wider Sydney Harbour area.

- It was suggested by large maritime business operators that any additional impediments to exiting and entering the Glebe Island Bridge channel may disadvantage operations and negatively impact on the value the location currently provides.

- Overall, there was a view that the Glebe Island Bridge should remain open.
Introduction

The Glebe Island Bridge is a swing bridge which previously connected Pyrmont with Glebe Island. The bridge has been left in the ‘open’ position since 1995.

As part of the Bays Precinct Strategy, the New South Wales (NSW) Government and other key stakeholders are considering options for the future use of Glebe Island Bridge. The Bays Precinct Strategy is a broad policy initiative which aims to redevelop the inner Sydney foreshore areas including Blackwattle Bay and Rozelle Bay.

One option that has been suggested is to reactivate Glebe Island Bridge as an operational swing bridge. This would provide an additional access point connecting the communities of Pyrmont and Rozelle.

Urbis has been engaged by New South Wales (NSW) Roads and Maritime Services to undertake consultation with key maritime businesses located in the Blackwattle Bay and Rozelle Bay foreshore areas.

REPORT STRUCTURE

This report reviews the business operations of key maritime businesses and identifies the concerns of these stakeholders in relation to the redevelopment of the Glebe Island Bridge.

Section 1 reviews the site and interface of the Glebe Island Bridge with local area land and waterway uses. This includes an historical appreciation of the site and its present condition and functionality. This section also provides analysis of the Bays Precinct Taskforce and the key elements of this policy objective.

Section 2 profiles the large maritime business operators in Blackwattle Bay and Rozelle Bay. This includes an assessment of business operations and regular vessel movement in and out of the Glebe Island Bridge channel, in addition to agreed leasehold agreements and redevelopment plans.

Section 3 outlines the large maritime business operators consulted as part of this process and identifies key concerns in relation to potential changes to the current operation of the Glebe Island Bridge and the impact this may have.

The final section provides a summary of consultation outcomes and concerns.

METHODOLOGY

This report provides a summary of outcomes based on:

- Desktop review of existing data and documentation provided by NSW Roads and Maritime Services.
- Telephone consultations with nine large maritime business operators undertaken on 14 and 15 May 2012.

This report represents a snapshot of key perspectives and concerns. It does not represent a detailed assessment of needs or potential impacts associated with particular options for the Glebe Island Bridge.
1 Glebe Island Bridge

1.1 LOCATION AND CONTEXT

Glebe Island Bridge (the Bridge) is located on Sydney Harbour and spans a narrow channel of water to connect Jackson’s Landing in Pyrmont with Glebe Island in Rozelle. The Bridge structure is 108m long and is connected to the land by two artificially-formed abutments (See Picture 1)

PICTURE 1 – GLEBE ISLAND BRIDGE IN THE ‘OPEN’ POSITION

Source: Urbis 2012

The Bridge was formerly the only traffic link between Pyrmont and Glebe Island. The previous arterial link connected to Bank Street in Pyrmont and James Craig Road on Glebe Island. The usefulness of the Bridge as an arterial traffic route has been superseded by the construction and operation of the Anzac Bridge in December 1995.

In recent years Jackson’s Landing has experienced large scale redevelopment including high density residential land use and landscaping of the foreshore area for recreational uses. The foreshore area of Glebe Island continues to operate primarily as a working harbour with a diverse range of maritime land uses encouraged to begin operations in recent times. Key operators include recreational marine, charter vessels and construction and maintenance services. These are concentrated on James Craig Road, Rozelle NSW and Bridge Road, Pyrmont NSW.

It is understood that approximately 200 vessels a day rely on access through this passage, including commercial vessels, super yachts and other recreational vessels.
1.2 HISTORY AND CURRENT STATE

The Bridge is an electrically operated low-level steel swing bridge. Construction of the Bridge was completed in 1903.

The Bridge was designed to link traffic from Sydney’s western suburbs to the Central Business District. The Bridge also provided movement for vessels between Blackwattle Bay and Rozelle Bay to Sydney Harbour.

The Bridge stopped operating in 1995 when the ANZAC Bridge opened. The Bridge no longer forms part of the road network and cannot be accessed by the general public. The Bridge is permanently in an ‘open’ position at present.

Structural assessments of the Bridge indicate that it is in very poor condition. For instance:

- between 30% and 45% of the structural steel requires replacement or repair;
- the majority of timber safety fenders (located underneath the swing component of the Bridge when closed) have rotted through and snapped;
- a large proportion of the sandstone piers supporting the Bridge require repair or replacement.

Minimal maintenance work has been carried out on the Bridge in recent times and inspection noted that considerable rust and flaking paintwork is evident. The NSW Heritage Database notes the condition of the Bridge assessment as ‘poor’.

The Bridge is not listed as an item of state heritage significance on the State Heritage Register under the Heritage Act 1977.

The City of Sydney and Leichhardt Municipal Council have identified a long term opportunity to provide a cycleway over the Bridge. This is noted in the Draft City of Sydney Development Control Plan 2010 and the Leichhardt Council Bicycle Strategy 2007.

1.3 BLACKWATTLE BAY AND ROZELLE BAY

Blackwattle Bay and Rozelle Bay are located approximately two kilometres west of the Sydney CBD. The combined area of both bays is bounded by the suburbs of Rozelle, Annandale, Glebe and Pyrmont.

Blackwattle Bay is located between the Pyrmont Peninsula and the foreshores of Glebe. The foreshore area is irregularly shaped and is bounded by Pyrmont Bridge Road and Blackwattle Bay. It is approximately 1.3 hectares in area, part of which is reclaimed land with wharf structures built on piles over submerged land.

Rozelle Bay extends along the northern foreshore of Rozelle Bay from the old Glebe Island Bridge in the east, swinging around south of Whites Creek and terminating at the western edge of Bicentennial Park, east of the Light Rail viaduct. Victoria Road and The Crescent extend along the northern boundary of the foreshore area. James Craig Road traverses the site from The Crescent to the Glebe Island Dockyard area. Much of the Rozelle Bay foreshore is reclaimed and a piled wharf extends along a major portion of the waterfrontage.

Blackwattle Bay and Rozelle Bay continue as two of the few remaining working parts of Sydney Harbour and use of the bays by commercial and recreational operators has formed part of economic development.

Key landmarks in the area include:

- Anzac Bridge
- Glebe Island Bridge
- Sydney Fish Markets.
• Bicentennial Park
• Glebe Island.

Blackwattle Bay and Rozelle Bay form part of the Bays Precinct, located on the inner-city foreshores of Sydney Harbour.

The final version of the *Master Plan for Rozelle and Blackwattle Bays Maritime Precincts* (NSW Waterways Authority, 2002) proposed to redevelop the foreshore areas and was accepted by the now defunct NSW Waterways Authority in 2002. One of the key objectives of the master plan was to ‘reinforce and complement the role of the precinct as a major inner harbour port and maritime location’ (NSW Waterways Authority, 2002).

1.4 BAYS PRECINCT TASKFORCE

The Minister for Planning and Infrastructure has established the Bays Precinct Taskforce (the Taskforce) to recommend a strategic framework for the Bays Precinct for the next 25 years and beyond1.

The key terms of reference for the Taskforce include:

• devise and implement an effective consultative process to enable local and regional stakeholders to have informed input into the strategic framework for the Bays Precinct
• identify current and emerging issues affecting the Bays Precinct
• identify short, medium and long-term issues and constraints, and requirements to address these
• advise on appropriate land uses having regard to strategic transport, port, maritime and waterfront precinct priorities for adjacent local areas and communities, metropolitan Sydney and NSW.

The scope of work undertaken by the Taskforce is guided by:

• the economic, employment, cultural, environmental and recreational needs of adjacent local areas and communities, metropolitan Sydney and NSW
• regional and local transport infrastructure requirements and the need to address current precinct traffic and transport constraints
• the unique attribute of the Bays Precinct as the last remaining undeveloped foreshore area of the natural deepwater port of Sydney Harbour, and the ongoing port and maritime needs of metropolitan Sydney and NSW
• recognition that Glebe Island and White Bay will be used for ongoing and future port-related uses
• existing studies, reports and strategies developed for the precinct, including any relevant reports documented by Leichhardt Council and City of Sydney.

Members of the Taskforce include representatives from Sydney Harbour Foreshore Authority, NSW Treasury, Department of Planning and Infrastructure, Transport for NSW, Sydney Ports Corporation, Roads and Maritime Services, City of Sydney Council and Leichhardt Municipal Council. The Taskforce is chaired by Department of Premier and Cabinet.

---

2 Review of key maritime businesses

This section outlines the variety and mix of business operators currently using Blackwattle Bay and Rozelle Bay as a working harbour area. The operators range from recreational users such as charter boats and marina operators, to industrial barges and boat refitting and maintenance contractors.

Table 1 below provides a review of the key maritime businesses which operate large vessels and with long term, or a right to, long term tenure. It outlines the type of operations and services they offer. This consultation focuses on businesses which have established, or have a right to, long term tenure in Blackwattle Bay or Rozelle Bay.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUSINESS OPERATOR</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>BUSINESS DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Superyacht Marina</td>
<td>1 James Craig Road, Rozelle NSW</td>
<td>Marina accommodates a wide range of yachts visiting the area, the majority of which are large ocean going ocean vessels. Sydney Superyacht Marina provides clients with complete flexibility and offers access to the marina at times convenient to client needs. There are from 10 to 15 movements per day through the Glebe Island Bridge access point depending on the season, although movements can be twice this during the weekends and peak summer months. The lease term agreement is in place until 2060 and considerable further investment is planned. There are three businesses operating on this site, the marina, yachting agents and a sales function. Yachting agents supply maintenance and logistical assistance to clients when boats are in dock.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Boathouse</td>
<td>James Craig Road, Rozelle NSW</td>
<td>The primary business includes a dry dock facility with a marina and commercial boat mooring. Further uses include a boat brokerage and back offices for recreational operators. Main users of the facility are Sydney Fast Ferries. A number of vessels are brokered from the site. There are around 10 larger vessels currently utilising the facility, but there is capacity to accommodate twice that number. It is estimated that current berth users activate up to 20 movements through the Glebe Island Bridge every month. The business has a 30 year lease agreement, activated when the site is fully developed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seawind Catamarans</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Business specialising in the manufacture, maintenance and berthing of large ocean going catamarans and trimarans. There are 17 berths available for holding large vessels and there is also a single marine charter boat used for client functions, etc. Of the 10 boats currently utilising the facility only one is a small vessel. Others are large and in peak season the business would expect to have full use of all berths. Movements can be unpredictable but in peak season there would be 24 movements per day on average, with around 4 movements per day during the low season. The nature of the business requires flexibility of vessel movement. Different business operations mean some movements are unpredictable specifically impromptu repairs, charter services and short notice test sailings. Agreement for lease is a minimum of 40 years once the site becomes fully operational.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney City Marine</td>
<td>James Craig Road, Rozelle NSW</td>
<td>Boat maintenance, repair and refit business specialising in all types of vessel including sailing yachts, superyachts and commercial vessels. Business is based on constant stream of work with tight scheduling of lifting and entering of vessels from and to water at precise times. When the business is working at optimum capacity, the operators expect to make up to 10 vessel movements in and out of the Glebe Island Bridge channel per day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUSINESS OPERATOR</td>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
<td>BUSINESS DESCRIPTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Occasion Cruises at</td>
<td>Bridge Road, Pyrmont NSW</td>
<td>Charter vessel services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackwattle Bay Marina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackwattle Bay Marine</td>
<td>37 Bank St, Pyrmont NSW</td>
<td>Marine salvage company which uses large construction crane barges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blackwattle Bay Marine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Devine Marine</td>
<td>James Craig Road, Rozelle NSW</td>
<td>Marine salvage company which uses large construction crane barges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterway Constructions</td>
<td>James Craig Road, Rozelle NSW</td>
<td>Marine salvage company which uses large construction crane barges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polaris Marine</td>
<td>James Craig Road, Rozelle NSW</td>
<td>Marine salvage company which uses large construction crane barges</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The business operates a dual function. The Blackwattle Bay Marina is an 18 berth wharf that acts as a mooring for a mix of charter vessels. Three of these vessels are owned by All Occasions cruises and 12 are managed at the marina for other charter operators. The charter vessels are large with mast heights in excess of 5m. These vessels operate on the Sydney Harbour area and are primarily used for recreational and tourist operations. The business is dependent on good access to Sydney Harbour. These vessels serve patrons at different times of the day. Significant investment is planned for the site and the lease agreement with the business is scheduled for 35 years once redevelopment is complete. Vessel movements vary throughout the year, averaging up to 58 per week in March/April but increasing to more than 100 per week in November/December. The business intends to install a maintenance lift dock to increase the capacity of the maintenance and services arm, and to increase the wharf area to accommodate larger vessels. Redevelopment is anticipated to be complete and operational around February/March 2013. The business has a key role in continuing to assist in the redevelopment of the foreshores area in Blackwattle Bay and Rozelle Bay, and the leasehold is expected to run for a further 20 years. The business operates a range of salvage, towage, mooring and marine construction services. Vessel fleet includes tug boats and larger vessels that are greater than 5m in height.

Lease of the wharf area and low level maintenance are key services operated by this business. The wharf area is leased by charter operators with a total of 24 vessels in operation. Up to 11 vessels have a mast height in excess of 5m. Vessel movements vary throughout the year, averaging up to 30 movements per day if all boats are in use. At other times movements average around 10 per day. Movements can be unpredictable as charters can serve patrons at different times of the day. Leasehold is scheduled to run until 2018 in the first instance with an option to review.
### BUSINESS OPERATOR | ADDRESS | BUSINESS DESCRIPTION
--- | --- | ---
Australian Wharf and Bridge | James Craig Road Rozelle NSW | Maritime contractor undertaking construction, maintenance and refurbishment of maritime structures including wharves, marinas and piers. Business operates a wide range of large construction and maintenance vessels including three large construction crane barges up to 27m in height. Movements are unpredictable, barges can be in and out regularly or as little as once a month. This is dependent on where the contract is based and the term agreed. The leasehold will secure operations at the present site for up to 10 years after site development is complete.

**Industry**

Hanson Construction Materials | Bridge Road Glebe NSW | Business operates as a receiving and processing point for primary material aggregates for concrete manufacture. The site includes a berth area for a large cargo ship. Site lease expires in 2013.

Hymix Australia | Bank Street Pyrmont NSW | Concrete batching plant site. Primary business does not employ vessels but does lease a portion of the site to charter vessel operators.

**Other business operations**

Sydney Fish Market | Bank Street Pyrmont NSW | This business operates a lease of wharf service to a number of charter vessel operators including Manly Fast Ferry, Fusion Cruises and a number of privately owned yachts. These charter operations are serviced on two of the existing wharves. The primary business is fishing to service the fish market. The commercial fishing fleet contains 15 vessels at base level, all of which are large ocean going craft, with mast heights in excess of 5m. On average the wharf regularly contains 10 to 15 large vessels with movements of all these vessels on most days. The business intends to upgrade the land side of the site significantly, although full redevelopment plans have been abandoned for the time being.

Australian Heritage Fleet | James Craig Road Rozelle NSW | The Rozelle Bay workshop is a refitting and maintenance area for a number of historical vessels. Redevelopment plans include a sea heritage dock, heavy wharf and floating pontoon. Relocation to Blackwattle Bay would include the maintenance of current operations and continued servicing and housing of all vessels. Plans also include provision for common user boat ramp for use by smaller vessels for launching operations.

Source: NSW Roads and Maritime Service
3 Consultation with key maritime businesses

The following provides a summary of key findings from consultation undertaken with large maritime business operators within Blackwattle Bay and Rozelle Bay.

3.1 LIST OF STAKEHOLDERS CONTACTED
Large maritime business operators consulted include:

- Sydney Superyacht Marina
- Sydney Boathouse
- Seawind Catamarans
- Sydney City Marine
- All Occasion Cruises/Blackwattle Bay Marina
- Blackwattle Bay Marine Operatives (Giddens)
- Sydney Fish Market
- Waterways Constructions
- Australian Wharf and Bridge.

3.2 KEY MESSAGES
Stakeholders included large maritime business operators in four main categories of operation with similar interests. These include:

- Recreational and commercial boating
- Charter vessel services
- Waterfront contractors
- Other business operations.

An overview of the businesses in each category is provided in Section 2.

Key messages are presented within the above categories to provide a concise understanding of the different concerns and issues identified during the consultation.

3.2.1 RECREATIONAL VESSEL SERVICES

WORKING HARBOUR
A common theme discussed by a number of marinas was the location of the bay area in close proximity to Sydney CBD, and the positive communications and relationships between public and private operations that occur within the area. It was recognised that the bay area is one of the very few places for commercial use and activity within close proximity to the Sydney Central Business District (CBD).

It was reported that the bay area is ideally located in relation to access with the Sydney CBD. The bay area is busy throughout the week, but it was noted that on special event days, including Australia Day and New Year’s Eve the bay area and Bridge Channel is extremely busy.
“Seasonal activity is intense and the free flow of vessels is key to achieving this optimum outcome on high activity days.”

The marinas consulted were asked to speak about what they would like to see occur within the Blackwattle and Rozelle Bay area moving forward. There was overall consensus that they would like to see the bay area continue to be a working harbour. One marina also stated that they would like to see more commercial operators within the area, operating in a clean and efficient manner.

“This is important for Sydney and commercially for the area, there is a good mix of recreational and commercial uses and convenience should remain as is.”

It was reported that the creation of Rozelle Bay as a recreational boating hub is an important part of the Sydney Harbour landscape and that it “makes sense” given the location to the wider harbour, NSW Maritime Services and other dedicated services for recreational boating in the area.

It was also stated by one marina that if the Glebe Island Bridge were to close, many customers would choose to store boats elsewhere if they could not access the harbour in a timely fashion. This would ultimately impact on the social and economic benefits currently experienced within the Blackwattle Bay and Rozelle Bay area.

INVESTMENT

A number of the marinas consulted indicated their intention to continue to invest in the Blackwattle and Rozelle Bay area, further expanding on upgrades and redevelopment of services and operations on their sites.

It was reported that a number of businesses have long term plans and investment within the Blackwattle and Rozelle Bay area. One marina noted plans to include a 300 boat dry boat store commencing in 2012 and completion in 2014, a commercial maritime building due to be completed in 2016 and in 2018, a multi-storey car park and further dry boat facility (DA approval up to 600 boats). Another business stated they have invested more than $15 million on their site in anticipation of the masterplan to develop the bays area.

One business stated that current and future upgrades on their site include building a small office complex with café and a slipway to assist with the maintenance of facilities. There will also be continuous business development regarding the marina, chartering and maintenance beyond 2015. A third marina reported they have a long term development plan for mixed use offices and retail as well as restaurants within the yacht club (2012 construction and operation from 2013 to 2015). Only one business stated that they had no current or future plans to develop or expand.

WELL PROTECTED BAY

The marina operators were asked about what they believed currently worked well within the Blackwattle and Rozelle Bay area. There was agreement that the bay area is well protected from weather and harbour elements, including; wind, currents and deep sea levels. One marina stated that the bay is:

“… well protected and good for boats, it is easy to house them, and accessibility to Sydney Harbour is excellent.”

The deep water of the bay area was also seen as a positive attribute for those vessels that access and use the bay area and that this is “…one of the very few in Sydney.”

Additionally, it was noted that the bay area does not have a lot of “wash” and this makes it a safer place to lift and launch boats. It was also noted that sailing within the area, with the speed restrictions in place, makes the journey into the harbour already onerous.

“Commercial boats find it difficult to get out of the bay area… any further delays would make business operations more difficult.”
ORIGINAL MASTERPLAN

One marina noted the significant investment already committed to development and upgrade of the site and that continued investment could only be assured if the original Bays Precinct masterplan was implemented going forward. Similar sentiment was reported from other marina operators.

ACCESS

It was noted by one marina that during peak movement times vessels have to queue to travel through the Bridge channel and currently this is dangerous. It is anticipated that there will be an increase in vessels within the area and this activity will exacerbate current issues in parking and movement through the Bridge channel. Currently, it was recognised that the Bridge channel is working well, however any increase in traffic, even with the Bridge open, will make it more difficult to navigate and decrease safety. One marina stated that removing the Glebe Island Bridge would mitigate against these issues.

It was stated by two marinas that the ANZAC Bridge now accommodates all access from and to Rozelle Bay area. "It makes no sense to have it there (Glebe Island Bridge) given the ANZAC Bridge and the large commercial shipping activity moving through the access point."

Furthermore, it was noted that the Bridge channel is narrow and there are a number of safety issues currently experienced within this area that will escalate if the Bridge becomes fully operational and reverts to a swing opening and closing system. There is particular concern associated with boats doing 'doughnuts' while waiting for the Bridge to open as well as backing up traffic.

"Doing doughnuts in this environment is very dangerous, contemplating large numbers of vessels all trying to work around each other in this confined space."

One marina noted that the "Glebe Island Bridge is in a serious state of disrepair and to fix it up would cost a lot", however it does need to be done. It was also reported that if the Bridge was removed it would make the area safer.

"The channel is very narrow and traffic light system currently requires a lot of attention to the system… super yachts find it difficult to access as is."

It was reported there were dangers for vessels launching onto the water, especially when there are high traffic movements through the Glebe Island Bridge channel. Unrestricted height access was an additional benefit of having the Glebe Island Bridge in the open position permanently, and was noted by a number of marinas.

It was reported that vessels choose the location of Blackwattle and Rozelle Bays due to access through the Glebe Island Bridge channel to Sydney Harbour and beyond, convenience to the Sydney CBD, and geographic location and protection of the bay area.

3.2.2 CHARTER VESSEL SERVICES

WORKING HARBOUR

Overall, the charter services suggested the current operations in the Blackwattle and Rozelle Bay area supports a working harbour.

INVESTMENT

Similarly to other lease holders within the Blackwattle and Rozelle Bay area, charter vessel services have large monetary investments associated with upgrades and developments of their services. One charter vessel service stated an investment of $20 million into the Blackwattle Bay area; this includes a 20 berth marina for charter boats only. Additionally, there are plans to redevelop their land with mixed use development including offices, function centres and back of house operation areas for charters (due to begin in 2014 – 2015).

Another charter service also stated that they have future plans to develop their site. This included a maintenance lift dock to be installed to increase maintenance operations for other vessels including yachts (December 2012). It was noted that there was intention to increase the wharf to accommodate larger vessels (February/March 2013).
One charter vessel operator also noted the importance of the working harbour and the employment opportunities created through continued investment.

“We employ up to 200 people and those jobs are in jeopardy if charter boats move out of the Blackwattle Bay area.”

WELL PROTECTED BAY

It was noted by one charter vessel service that a positive aspect of the Blackwattle and Rozelle Bay area was the protection of the bay and that it is a “nice, calm, protected area.” Another charter service stated that wave movements within the bay areas are minimal and this makes maintenance of vessels easier.

ORIGINAL MASTERPLAN

Charter vessel services were asked what they would like to see occur in the Blackwattle and Rozelle Bay area moving forward. Two charter services felt that it was important the implementation of the original Bays Precinct masterplan in 1998 and 2001 come to fruition. One charter vessel operator stated:

“The two bay areas were to be redeveloped contingent on the Glebe Island Bridge remaining open.”

Another charter vessel service stated that it would be important to meet the original masterplan requirements and vision. These included the redevelopment of the fish markets and the completion of the walkway around the bay area.

ACCESS

It was noted that one charter service believed closing the Glebe Island Bridge would place significant pressure on charter operators. There is an understanding by some operators that the Bridge would be left open except for one or two days a year.

“Access is the key concern.”

Overall, it was noted that charter services generally believed that to close the bridge for cyclists and pedestrians was not supported by operators.

3.2.3 WATERFRONT CONTRACTORS

WORKING HARBOUR

There is a concern that the harbour is losing maritime activity and working operations and that “maintenance still needs to be undertaken”. It was noted that access to the harbour in a short amount of time is of particular importance for maintenance and service operators in the bay area.

“When salvaging a vessel we need to move through the Bridge channel quickly.”

It was also noted that there is a large amount of development occurring within Blackwattle Bay and this may increase the number of vessels within the Bay and Sydney Harbour. It was believed by one operator that closing the Bridge will make Sydney Harbour less accessible and that this has implications in itself, including limiting accessibility and opportunities for activity on the waterways and concern associated with maintaining key waterway structures (bridges and ferry wharves).

“Sydney Harbour is only beautiful because of the activity that is allowed. We need access in and out and this will only work if the Bridge channel is opened.”

INVESTMENT

One construction business stated that they have been in the area for 20 years and hoped to continue in the area for another 20 years and beyond, working with NSW Roads and Maritime Services. They have been involved in all major foreshore redevelopments within Sydney Harbour.

Maintenance and service operators described Blackwattle and Rozelle Bay as well protected. It was noted by one operator that there is currently limited space within the Bays to expand, with some having to lease area within White Bay to supplement the space in Blackwattle and Rozelle Bays.
“From our requirements we need more space for current and future operations.”

It was reported that operations and businesses within the Blackwattle Bay and Rozelle Bay area relied on the key features of the location.

“Some activities cannot function without being on the waterfront… some businesses are also enhanced by being on the waterfront and depend on it.”

WELL PROTECTED BAY

It was reported that the current Bridge channel is narrow, while the bay is well protected from weather conditions. There was a concern that if the Glebe Island Bridge were to close, the channel may become dangerous. This was in reference to the large number of vessels queuing on either side of the Bridge, and movement through the channel when the Bridge opened.

“If there were to be three or four barges, commercial operators and fishing boats all trying to get through… you could have up to 100 vessels in the area at one time… this could take up to two hours to get through the narrow channel.”

ACCESS

A number of maintenance and construction services within the Bay spoke about the importance of ensuring that the Bridge is kept open for their operational purposes. This is of particular importance for these businesses because they access Sydney Harbour on a regular basis and sometimes with limited notice.

“The beauty of the bay area is always having the Bridge opened so that we can carry on work unimpeded.”

A number of services stated that if the Bridge was closed and access through the channel was only at certain times of the day that this would impact on the operation, maintenance and services readily available. For example, some businesses stated that wind and current movement can significantly effect work being undertaken. It was noted that in construction “things can always go awry” and for the large vessels that undertake repair and maintenance work, including barges, manoeuvring or waiting for Bridges to open and close can be dangerous and time consuming. Access through the Bridge channel is particularly important for services that salvage sinking boats. It was stated that the only control for big barges is if they are under tow (pushed). If this process stops it could become extremely dangerous for those on board and surrounding vessels or structures.

“At the moment the Bridge is open all the time and works very well – there is no lining up.”

Freedom of movement through the Bridge channel was believed by maintenance and service providers to currently work well in the Bay area. A number of stakeholders interviewed stated that they had experienced, over time, the Glebe Island Bridge as a continuously opened structure as well as operating as both opened and closed. There was overall consensus that maintenance and service operators would require more freedom moving forward.

“If the Bridge were to close it would cause major implications in movement of vessels.”

3.2.4 OTHER BUSINESS OPERATIONS

WORKING HARBOUR

Commercial operators within Blackwattle Bay stated that vessels use the Bridge channel most days of the weeks. For example, fishermen usually access the channel Saturday through to Thursday. There was a concern that Sydney has lost most of its working ports, and what has evolved within Blackwattle and Rozelle Bay is important for the activity and functioning of the Sydney waterways.

Further, Blackwattle Bay and Rozelle Bay are unique in that they provide access to the general public employment opportunities. One key operator noted there is an important ambience about the bays, where people are able to buy fresh produce from retail stores and sit by the bay and watch fishermen coming in
and leaving, undertaking their day-to-day activities. The more than two million tourists that visit the Sydney Fish Markets every year was provided as an example of why it is important to continue to employ a mix of uses at this site.

"It is important to preserve the working harbour and also ensure that it is accessible for the community."

INVESTMENT

A key business operator noted that they have made significant investment in the area.

"In essence, we are here to stay; our lease is to run for another 34 years."

They stated that they have no plans to move from the area and they are undertaking significant upgrades to improve their site.

"This shows we are about to invest in the precinct."

ORIGINAL MASTERPLAN

Business operators believe that it is important for future redevelopment within the bay area to implement a whole of precinct approach. It was noted that too often a “piece by piece planning approach” has been undertaken. The different interests and concerns of the combination of business operators and community groups in the area should be considered.

ACCESS

There is a preference for the Glebe Island Bridge to remain in the open position. This allows free navigation of vessels and also preserves the visual aspect of the structure.

"It does need to be preserved but in terms of functionality, it needs to be open."

One business operator believed the walkway around the foreshore is a good concept as long as it takes into account the different uses, including business operators within the precinct. It was also noted that it is important to consider public access and safety.

"If we lose this as a wharfing and berthing area for commercial fleet it won’t leave anything left in Sydney, it is important to keep this."

3.3 KEY FINDINGS

- The Blackwattle and Rozelle Bay area is used by a number of different services, operators and the general public throughout the week (day and night).

- Blackwattle Bay and Rozelle Bay are unique within the Sydney Harbour landscape due to the mix of uses and accessibility. The area provides access for the general public, provides significant employment and is one of the only working harbour areas left in Sydney Harbour.

- The area is important to Sydney economically and socially. In addition, a number of businesses within the bay area provide important maintenance and service requirements to the operation and use of Sydney Harbour.

- The majority of those consulted stated they plan future investment in the area, including the upgrade of current facilities, expansion and development plans.

- A number of stakeholders stated that the preference for any changes or redevelopment within the area should reflect the vision of the original Bays Precinct Masterplan (1998 and 2001).

- The proximity of the Blackwattle Bay and Rozelle Bay area to the Sydney CBD is an important factor for operators and workers. It offers access to the general public and is serviced by extensive private and public transport options.
- A further positive is the readily available access connecting the Blackwattle Bay and Rozelle Bay areas to other parts of Sydney Harbour.

- The enclosed nature of the Blackwattle Bay and Rozelle Bay area offers natural protection to vessels from currents and wind and the provision of deep water to enable larger vessels to move freely and easily onto moorings.

- The Glebe Island Bridge channel is narrow and is difficult to navigate due to the existing level of vessel traffic. There was a concern that reinstating the operational swing bridge may increase travel times and jeopardise safe navigation.

- It is suggested that significant development plans intended for the Blackwattle Bay and Rozelle Bay area may increase vessel movements and waterway traffic in the future. A number of business operators intend to redevelop the land and sea side of current services, particularly in Blackwattle Bay.

- Overall, there was a view that the Glebe Island Bridge should remain open.
4 Conclusion

This report provides a summary of outcomes from consultations with a number of key maritime businesses in the Blackwattle Bay and Rozelle Bay areas. Consultations were undertaken to profile current operations, future plans, and key values and concerns.

The Glebe Island Bridge has been in the ‘open’ position since 1995. Since that time a number of large maritime business operations have commenced within the enclosed area of Blackwattle Bay and Rozelle Bay. These businesses operate large vessels which demand frequent, and in some cases unpredictable, movements in and out of the Glebe Island channel to access the wider Sydney Harbour area. Continued operation and further economic development is a key objective of foreshore redevelopment and is recognised by the Bays Precinct Taskforce and NSW Roads and Maritime Services.

The consultation identified a number of key messages from large marine business operators. Concern was most evident around the value of the working harbour and the significant advantages of operating in a protected and enclosed bay. The natural attributes of Blackwattle Bay and Rozelle Bay offer large maritime business operators significant advantage and have encouraged the continued redevelopment of the foreshore area and the emergence of further port-related economic activity.

It was reported that continued development and economic activity is contingent on continued access to the wider Sydney Harbour area.

It was suggested by large maritime business operators that any additional impediments to exiting and entering the Glebe Island Bridge channel may disadvantage operations and negatively impact on the value the location currently provides.
Appendix A

Large maritime business operator consultation discussion guide
Discussion Guide
Glebe Island Bridge – Stakeholder Consultation
NSW Roads and Maritime Services

Hi XXX,

My name is XXX, I am from a Social Planning and Research company called Urbis. I understand NSW Roads and Maritime Services recently contacted you to say we would be calling you regarding the Bays Precinct Development Strategy. NSW Roads and Maritime Services have engaged Urbis to consult with key lease holders in the Rozelle and Blackwattle Bay areas. This is to help inform an understanding of key issues and concerns around the Bays Precinct Development Strategy, how the area currently functions, current benefits, and future aspirations for the area, as well as the role of your business and operations.

We are talking with a number of other key lease holders in the area. We will be providing a summary of outcomes from these discussions to NSW Roads and Maritime Services. This will inform future planning as part of the Bays Precinct Development Strategy.

I have a few questions to ask you about this, is now still a good time to talk?

Please note that in order to preserve your privacy, responses will not be attributed to individuals in our reporting or discussions with NSW Roads and Maritime Services. However, we may report key issues for different operations.

If you would like a copy of these notes, please ask me at the end of our interview.

Do you have any questions before we begin?

Questions:

1. What is your main role within the Blackwattle and Rozelle Bay area? E.g. services and operations

2. How many vessels do you have which would not fit under the bridge when closed (ie. 4.7m)?

3. How often do these vessels move in/out the Bridge channel?

4. What are your short and long term plans for your business?

5. What you think currently works well in the Bays Precinct?
6. What do you think are the key issues or concerns within the Bay area? How do you think these may be overcome in the future?

7. What would you like to see occur within Blackwattle and Rozelle Bay moving forward?

8. Do you have anything else you would like to add?

Thank you for your time.
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APPENDIX 6
REPORT ON THE OUTCOMES
OF STAGE 2 CONSULTATION (KJA)
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.
## 6 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 Excellent</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.
BAYS PRECINCT
BLACKWATTLE BAY
GLEBE ISLAND
GLEBE ISLAND BRIDGE
ROZELLE BAY
ROZELLE RAIL YARDS
WHITE BAY
WHITE BAY POWER STATION