

Mather & Associates Landscape Architects

DOMAIN SITE MASTER PLAN

Community Involvement Report

Report to:
Mather & Associates
131 Catherine Street
LEICHHARDT NSW 2040
Telephone: 02 9564 1186
Fax: 02 9564 5303

Prepared by:
Kerry Morrison & Associates
P. O. Box 135
Camperdown NSW 1450
Telephone: 02 9550 6390
Fax: 02 9519 6638

DOMAIN SITE MASTER PLAN
COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT REPORT

Table of Contents

<u>1</u>	<u>INTRODUCTION</u>	1
1.1	<u>PROJECT BACKGROUND</u>	1
1.2	<u>COMMUNICATIONS AND CONSULTATION STRATEGY</u>	1
<u>2</u>	<u>SUMMARY OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES</u>	2
<u>3</u>	<u>COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES</u>	3
3.1	<u>DEFINITION OF THE COMMUNITY</u>	3
3.2	<u>INTERNAL STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS</u>	3
3.2.1	<u>Workshop No. 1</u>	3
3.2.2	<u>Workshop No. 2</u>	4
3.2.3	<u>Workshop No. 3</u>	4
3.3	<u>EXTERNAL STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS</u>	4
3.3.1	<u>Workshop Meeting No. 1</u>	4
3.3.2	<u>Workshop Meeting No. 2</u>	4
3.4	<u>OUTCOMES OF WORKSHOPS</u>	5
3.4.1	<u>Internal Stakeholders Issues and Ideas</u>	5
3.4.2	<u>External Stakeholders Issues and Ideas</u>	5
<u>4</u>	<u>KEY ISSUES</u>	7
<u>5</u>	<u>FUTURE COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT</u>	9

APPENDICES

Appendix A	List of External Stakeholders
Appendix B	Internal Stakeholder Comments and Ideas
Appendix C	External Stakeholder Comments and Ideas

DOMAIN SITE MASTER PLAN

COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT REPORT

1 INTRODUCTION

This report has been prepared to collate and record the community involvement activities undertaken for preparation of the Domain Site Master Plan during the investigation period from November 1999 through to February 2000. Details of activities undertaken are provided and a summary of the issues that were raised during the course of the consultation process.

1.1 Project Background

The Royal Botanic Gardens (RBG) commissioned Mather & Associates Landscape Architects (MALA) to prepare a Site Master Plan for The Domain. Kerry Morrison & Associates was commissioned by MALA to manage and implemented the community involvement process.

The community involvement program was structured to provide both internal and external stakeholders and members of the community with the opportunity to provide input into the development of the Master Plan.

1.2 Communications and Consultation Strategy

To guide the communications and community involvement activities, a Communications and Consultation Strategy (CCS) was prepared outlining the tasks and activities that would be undertaken including a program, methodology and techniques that would be used during the process to communicate with stakeholder groups and the wider community.

The process was designed to obtain input from stakeholder groups to input into the studies and investigations being undertaken by the study team for the development of the Site Master Plan. This was to enable integration of the feedback and input from relevant stakeholders.

The process comprises two key stages. Stage one was designed to identify stakeholder groups and individuals and to obtain views and comments from internal and external stakeholders regarding target and desired outcomes, issues, concerns, constraints and opportunities for input into the draft Site Master Plan. Stage two was designed to inform stakeholders, the wider public and community of the opportunity to comment on the draft Site Master Plan and provide input and comments. Feedback would then be input into the final Site Master Plan.

This report is a summary of the Stage one communications and consultation. A summary of the activities is provided in Section 2 of this report.

2 SUMMARY OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES

The following is a summary of the community involvement activities undertaken.

Activity	Summary	Date
Communications and Consultation Strategy	Prepared and reviewed by RBG.	October 1999
Definition of community	RBG provided lists stakeholders, which were continually reviewed and updated to maintain accuracy.	November 1999
Stakeholder Workshops	Three internal stakeholder workshops. Two external stakeholder workshops.	Details below.
Meetings with stakeholders	Throughout the study period, meetings were held with individual stakeholders to obtain information and ideas.	Study period.
Staff Newsletter	RBG prepared and distributed information outlining the progress of the project.	March – April 2000
Responses to inquiries	Members of the project team were available to respond to community questions and concerns throughout the project.	Ongoing
Internal Stakeholder Workshops		
Workshop No. 1	Managers and staff - discussion of the studies and investigations being undertaken for the Site Master Plan. Identification of issues and concerns for The Domain and within each Precinct.	16 th November 1999 9 am – 12 noon
Workshop No. 2	Managers and staff - presentation and discussion of opportunities and constraints, and ideas proposed for each Precinct.	18 th January 2000 9.30 am – 12.30 pm
Workshop No. 3	Outdoor staff - presentation and discussion of concepts and ideas prior to public display.	24 th October 2000 2.00 pm - 4.00 pm
External Stakeholder Workshops		
Workshop No. 1	Businesses, commercial operators, tourism and sporting groups, Heritage Council and National Trust – discussion of opportunities and constraints, issues, concern and ideas.	9 th February 2000 9 am – 12 noon
Workshop No. 2	Neighbours and adjoining users – discussion of opportunities and constraints, issues, concern and ideas.	9 th February 2000 1.30 pm – 4.30 pm
Future Community Consultation		
Future community consultation is outlined in Section 5.0 of this report.		

3 COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT ACTIVITIES

3.1 Definition of the Community

The level of interest in the development of a Master Plan for the Domain was anticipated to be extensive, considering the history, location and high usage. To establish and define the community to be involved in the project, discussions were held with management and staff of the Royal Botanic Gardens (RBG) to identify the stakeholders, interested groups and individuals, who would be interested in being involved in the project.

Key stakeholder groups were identified as internal and external stakeholders. Internal stakeholders were the managers and staff involved in the day-to-day operation of The Domain and the Royal Botanic Gardens. External stakeholders were defined as those located adjacent to The Domain and regular users (commercial and non-commercial), and the wider community.

With the location and the extensive use of the area, stakeholder groups were further subdivided into related groups to provide a structure to the consultation activities. Internal stakeholders were considered one group, however external stakeholders were divided into a number of sub-groups. The three main categories of external stakeholders were:

- (1) Neighbours and adjoining users;
- (2) Businesses, commercial operators, tourism and sporting groups, the Heritage Council and National Trust; and
- (3) Infrequent users and wider community.

Consultation with all stakeholders was considered essential for the development of the Site Master Plan.

3.2 Internal Stakeholder Workshops

Three workshops were held with internal stakeholders, namely members of the RBG management and staff, throughout the development of the draft Plan. The purpose of the Workshops was to gain insight into the matters that were considered to be issues and concerns from the people who are responsible for the day-to-day management, operation and maintenance of The Domain.

The RBG management and staff are ultimately responsible for the successful maintenance of The Domain, hence the attitudes, opinions, concerns and issues raised by the group are considered important in the development of the Site Master Plan.

Three workshops were held and are described below and issues raised are presented in Appendix A.

3.2.1 Workshop No. 1

The first workshop with internal stakeholders was held on 16th November 1999 for 3 hours, and was attended by 12 RBG managers and staff members. The purpose of the Workshop was to outline the studies and investigations being undertaken for the development of the Site Master Plan and seek input and comments from the group. Key members of the consulting team gave presentation on the studies being undertaken and their approach to the investigations. These were:

- Chronology of The Domain by Dr. R. Annable
- Cultural Context of The Domain by G. Britton
- Team presentation of Site Issues – I. Mather, S. Hoy and G. Britton

Discussions were then focussed on each of the six precincts that make up The Domain, with issues and concerns identified and recorded.

3.2.2 Workshop No. 2

The second workshop with the internal stakeholders was held on 18th January 2000 and was attended by 8 RBG managers and staff members. The purpose of the workshop was to present the ideas developed since the first workshop, to discuss the ideas and seek direction and clarification from the group, prior to presentation to the external stakeholders.

Two plans were presented to the group. The first plan was entitled 'Opportunities and Constraints', which summarised each of the problems and opportunities for each precinct. The second plan showed the 'Options' that were being considered for each of the precinct areas.

3.2.3 Workshop No. 3

The third workshop with internal stakeholders was held on 24th October 2000 and was attended by eight (8) RBG managers and staff members. The purpose of the Workshop was to present the draft Plan, and seek input and comments from a practical "hands on" management and implementation point of view.

Discussions included the ideas for each Precinct and feedback included comments on the problems encountered with the management and maintenance of the various activities that occur in The Domain.

3.3 External Stakeholder Workshops

Two external stakeholder workshops were held in February 2000, a morning session and an afternoon session. Invitations were sent to relevant groups and organisations to attend. The purpose of the Workshop was to outline the process of the development of the Site Master Plan and seek input and comments on the issues and concerns that should be considered, from the perspective of the external stakeholders.

The external stakeholders were divided into two main groups; Group 1 was the businesses, commercial operators, tourism and sporting groups, Heritage Council and National Trust, and Group 2 the neighbours and adjacent landholders and operators. The list of invitees is included in Appendix B. Issues raised at the workshop meetings are provided in Appendix C.

3.3.1 Workshop Meeting No. 1

The first external stakeholders Workshop meeting was held as a morning workshop on 9th February 2000 at the RBG offices. Representatives of business groups, commercial operators, tourism operators, sports operators, the Heritage Council and National Trust were invited, although not all were able to attend the meeting.

3.3.2 Workshop Meeting No. 2

The second external stakeholders Workshop meeting was held during the afternoon of 9th February 2000 at the RBG offices. The invitees were the neighbours, adjacent landholders and operators, including the City of Sydney, Pavilion on the Park, Sydney Hospital, and Friends of RBG.

3.4 Outcomes of Workshops

The following is a summary of the outcomes of the internal and external stakeholder workshops, the issues, ideas and suggestions that were raised and discussed. All issues and ideas have been taken into consideration and/or incorporated in the development of the draft Plan of Management.

3.4.1 Internal Stakeholders Issues and Ideas

The three workshops provided a process of development of issues and ideas for the Plan of Management. During the first workshop issues and concerns were identified that the group thought should be addressed in the development of the Plan of Management and Master Plan. The issues covered the management, operation and maintenance of The Domain and specific matters associated with each of the Precinct areas.

Discussions during the second workshop provided comment on the identified opportunities and constraints associated with each Precinct, and comments and ideas on what would be considered a preferred outcome.

Each workshop included discussion of the usage of the Domain, the patterns and the need to include continued opportunities for public usage, as well as possible improvements to the maintenance regimes and management.

The matters raised can be broadly divided into the following groupings:

- Functions and events management
- Recreation management
- Transport and circulation – traffic and pedestrians
- Edges and connections/paths
- Landscape character
- Landmark trees, vegetation and tree management
- Visitor information
- Administration (management and maintenance)

The common elements within each category were:

- Conflict of uses
- Frequency of activities and over use
- Visitor information and user attitudes
- Internal and external linkages
- Vistas and aesthetics
- Preservation of cultural significance
- Preservation and replacement of plants

A summary of the comments and ideas raised at the workshops is included in Appendix A. The following is a list of the categories of issues raised.

- General comments
- Tarpeian Precinct
- Macquarie Precinct
- Phillip Precinct
- Crescent Precinct
- Art Gallery, Landbridge, Top of Naval Fuel Store
- Yurong and Woolloomooloo Precincts
- Outdoor Staff comments and Risk Management

3.4.2 External Stakeholders Issues and Ideas

Issues raised by external stakeholders are summarised and can be found in Appendix C. Issues have been grouped into key strategic area and the following key headings.

- General comments
- Boundaries
- Heritage
- Landscape
- Interpretation
- Linkages and Gateways
- Traffic and pedestrian conflicts
- Hospital Road
- Bus and Coaches
- Ferry Wharves
- Bicycle use
- Tourism and visitors
- Cathedral College
- Sport – Corporate Cup (runners)
- Sport – Runners and Games
- Other Comments

4 KEY ISSUES

The issues raised have been condensed to a number of key issues to be addressed in the Site Master Plan. These issues have been incorporated and addressed in the Draft Site Master Plan, which will be publicly exhibited for wider community and stakeholder comment. Following the end of the public exhibition period, comments will be collated and evaluated prior to the completion of the final Site Master Plan.

The key matters for consideration include the following:

- Need to find a “balance” between all activities to enable management of all demands and existing activities.
- Need to maintain the values of The Domain and the inter-relationship with the Royal Botanic Gardens.
- Need to evaluate and reduce level of use/conflict, in some areas.
- Need to address bus and coach use of road to Mrs Macquarie’s Chair.
- Need to provide additional funds for improvements and cost effective management.
- Need to provide for the integration of all requirements (eg maintaining historic values etc), activities and uses (sporting and recreation) of The Domain.
- Need to consider the inter-relationship with the Botanic Gardens and the linkages for ‘through traffic’ – pedestrians and others (eg joggers and runners).
- Need to provide for user personal safety and security.
- Need to provide for new activities/uses and change existing activities/uses in some areas.
- Where changes are proposed, a transition period should be allow to enable stakeholders time to modify and adjust to the new requirements.
- Need to provide for efficient management of The Domain.

Key issues identified were grouped into the following categories:

- Recreation / Functions / Events
- Transport and Circulation
- Edges and Connections
- Landscape Character
- Landmark Trees and Vegetation
- Visitor Information
- Administration

Within each of these categories were subcategories. These are as follows:

Recreation / Functions / Events

- Conflicting demand for use of the Domain for recreation- passive and active, events, functions and tourism.
- Overuse and degradation of The Domain.
- Income required for the ongoing management, maintenance and improvements to The Domain.

Transport and Circulation

- Conflict between pedestrians, cars and buses.
- Bus and Coach use.

Edges and Connections

- Defining the extent of The Domain.
- Connectivity.

Landscape Character

- Character.
- Statuary, Monuments & Memorials.
- Landscape Unity.

Landmark Trees and Vegetation

- Aging tree stock.
- Garden areas and ornamental plantings.
- Loss of indigenous plant material.
- Difficult to manage grassed steep slopes.

Visitor Information

- Maximising public understanding of The Domains high cultural significance.
- Wayfinding.

Administration

- Clear statement of RBG values and policies need to be made.

The ideas and suggestions have been considered with the development of the Master Plan and incorporated where possible. RBG actions have been developed to provide direction and initiatives for the future of The Domain.

5 FUTURE COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

It is recognised that there are many stakeholder groups and individuals who have an interest in The Domain and the completion of a Plan of Management and Site Master Plan. Stage two of the communication and consultation strategy would be implemented. It will enable transparent public scrutiny of the draft documents, a communications strategy is being finalised. It will ensure that the wider community is advised of the draft Plan of Management and seek community and stakeholder input into the draft Plan. The key elements of the Strategy are:

- Public dissemination of brochure that outlines the draft Plan and opportunity form comment;
- Public display of Draft Site Master Plan in easily accessible areas for a period of 2-3 months, including the opportunity to comment and clear instructions on how to comment;
- Evaluation of comments, suggestions and ideas from public display period;
- Incorporation of comments and suggestions for input into the final Site Master Plan.

It is anticipated that there may be a considerable level of interest and level of participation in the draft Plan. However, with clear information provided and access to a contact person to answer questions and inquiries, it is anticipated that an excellent outcome will result and provide RBG with a clear focus for the future of The Domain.

APPENDIX A

INTERNAL STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS AND IDEAS

INTERNAL STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS

The following are the comments raised at the three Internal Stakeholder Workshops. The comments are reported in terms of the Strategic Areas, as defined by the key operational areas and values pertaining to the day-to-day management of The Domain.

The strategic areas are:

- Visitors and Stakeholders
- Functions and Events
- Recreation
- Thematic & living collections
- Plant sciences and research
- Biodiversity conservation
- Interpretation
- Heritage
- Infrastructure and Assets

They have also been sub-divided into general comments and each of the precincts, in the following order:

1. General Comments
2. Tarpeian Precinct
3. Macquarie Precinct
4. Phillip Precinct
5. Crescent Precinct
6. Art Gallery, Landbridge, Top pf Naval Fuel Store
7. Yurong and Woolloomooloo Precincts
8. Outdoor Staff Comments & Risk Management

1. General Comments

Strategic Area	Internal Stakeholders
Visitors and Stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need policy of no campers. • Wayfinding and better directional signage. • Lighting, safety, security.
Functions and Events	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policies need to be developed for tree management during events. • Road closures – frequency, timing, impact on neighbours, particularly AGNSW. • Attitude to site by special events companies, promoters, contractors, and caterers. Need protocol for users, and education of the significance. Some companies have been banned from the Domain. • Lawn 64 was not to be included in Master Plan, yet its connection to the Tarpeian Precinct should still be recognised.
Recreation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joggers – need active management, organisation of joggers, and allocation/definition of jogger routes, code of conduct required. • Jogger routes could be rubber surface. • Joggers should be discouraged from the Botanic Gardens, as occurs in other Botanic Gardens. • Need cyclist control. • Need inline skater’s control. • Policy for active sports – frequency, type, carrying capacity, equity.
Thematic & living collections	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policies need to be developed for living collections • Need to specify plant palettes for each area. Indigenous/exotic and signature plantings/repeated element. • Plant palette needs to recognise local environment – example of <i>Aurucaris</i> on Yurong ridge top.
Plant sciences and research	
Biodiversity conservation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policies need to be developed tree replacement, flower beds, etc.
Interpretation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wayfinding and better directional signage
Heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need connection between RBG and historical connections.
Infrastructure and Assets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paths need to be redefined – primary and secondary circulation. • Redefine roads for pedestrian priority. • Service access needs to be redefined including emergency access. • Existing boundaries between BG and Domain – should they be reconsidered? • Existing entrances – are they logical? • Where is the main entrance to the Botanic Gardens? • Possible new entrance at the corner of Macquarie Street or extend Central Avenue across Cahill Expressway and create a new ceremonial entrance. • Lighting, safety security. • “Flower billboards’ on cliff face below AGNSW with community message/advertising for Gardens.
Other Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What is happening about the waterfront route from Kings Cross to Circular Quay? • ABC Pool is in the way.

2. Tarpeian Precinct

Strategic Area	Internal Stakeholders
Visitors and Stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has been used as location for film shoots.
Functions and Events	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The space is generally under utilised but is used intensively on News Years Eve. • Lawn 64 was not to be included in Master Plan, yet its connection to the Tarpeian Precinct should still be recognised.
Recreation	
Thematic & living collections	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing <i>Ficus</i> species are in decline - maintain on life support or allow to die? • Appropriateness of term 'Living Collection'. Vegetation and trees are crucial to the Domain but are not part of a botanic collection. • Tarpeian currently has policy of no tree replacement, which needs to be addressed. To be developed as part of the project. • A high level of use in this area would be difficult to maintain due to compaction on trees.
Plant sciences and research	
Biodiversity conservation	
Interpretation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cut off from the rest of the Gardens. • Interpretation of area as part of the Inner Governor's Domain. Tarpeian has been parkland since 1914. Not relevant anymore. PoM and Master Plan need to determine the appropriate evolution of the Domain and whilst recognising historical context should not only reconstruct a certain time in history.
Heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic connection to Government House. • Ownership of cliff face? – Would be handed over to RBG. Need to state archaeological and cultural significance and have a policy regarding the cliff face i.e. no memorials, advertising etc.
Infrastructure and Assets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area mainly functions as buffer between Government House and Macquarie Street. • Path leading from entrance opposite Moore Steps. Often confused as entrance to RBG but goes nowhere. If the Northern Depot were removed this would be a logical entrance to the Gardens from Circular Quay. • Option to get services to Tarpeian not to be ruled out in the long term.

3. Macquarie Precinct

Strategic Area	Internal Stakeholders
Visitors and Stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Palace Gates entrance used as a lunch venue for city workers. • Need to address circulation/pedestrian issues at entry/exit to Cahill at corner of Bridge and Macquarie Street. • Kiosk - management would like to extend the kiosk. Need to develop guidelines for upgrading of precinct. All elements in precinct have finite life therefore need to develop policy regarding future. For example, sandstone retaining wall already needs maintenance after 10 years.
Functions and Events	
Recreation	
Thematic & living collections	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Macquarie Street palms all have replacement palms yet Tarpeian don't. Why?
Plant sciences and research	
Biodiversity conservation	
Interpretation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Moorshead Fountain Gate needs to be reconsidered, gate should be more visible - on corner?
Heritage	
Infrastructure and Assets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • "Salad bowl" – lease or sell, location for memorials? Landbridge over Cahill? wasted space. • Presentation to street frontage to be maintained. • Identity of the edge as part of the Domain. • Macquarie Street is most 'urban' part of the gardens. Different furnishings design etc. Often not perceived as part of Domain. Is this OK or does it need RBG stamp? • Courtyard in front of Palace Garden Gates - is this really appropriately designed, are the finishes appropriate? Preference for a coffee cart and more seating rather than expanding kiosk. Courtyard will be used as stage on Australia Day. • Vehicular access to garbage is bad. Waste servicing is inadequate. • Moorshead Fountain Gate - benefactors interested in funding relocation of gates. Option that Shakespeare Place will be closed to vehicles in 5-10 years. Important to establish visual connection to Phillip Precinct.

4. Phillip Precinct

Strategic Area	Internal Stakeholders
Visitors and Stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cultural role of Phillip Precinct - event type/style, community mix, frequency, cost of fencing vs free, screening, noise issues.
Functions and Events	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Option for alternative stage location to be prepared for edge against the Cahill in case cover isn't feasible or doesn't happen. Sound barriers? • Second option for stage location not to be termed 'preferred' option.
Recreation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Active sport. No bat sports - conflict with pedestrians, Oztag has the most impact on the fields, children's playground, and exercise equipment. • Frequency and size of events to minimise maintenance on lawns. • Facilities - use of, location, access to, and standard of.
Thematic & living collections	
Plant sciences and research	
Biodiversity conservation	
Interpretation	
Heritage	
Infrastructure and Assets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reinstate connection with the Botanic Gardens - Central Avenue, lower or cover the Cahill. • Connection with RBG closer to Shakespeare Place. • Train tunnel air vents-remove or ameliorate. • Ventilation towers conflicting with visual amenity of area. Need to make it clear to State Rail that they are unacceptable. • Pedestrian connection between AGNSW and Library. • Soundproofing along the Cahill behind Central Depot - RTA responsibility? • Erosion of landscape edge along Hospital Road, change of character with the use of Hospital Road for vehicular access. • Hospital Road-beautiful pedestrian priority boulevard. • Hospital Road-RBG events rely heavily on it-safety, access, parking issues, media parking, buses use. • No Permanent Stage. • Orchestral Shell? • Fencing for events? - permanent locations for temporary fencing of events. • Plan for opposite side of Hospital Road - currently mix of garden areas and lawn. RBG doesn't own the front of Parliament House. Connections through Library and Hospital aren't legible i.e. it is difficult to find your way through. Master Plan to set principles behind design of Hospital Road/Avenue, including signature treatment at pedestrian connections.

5. Crescent Precinct

Strategic Area	Internal Stakeholders
Visitors and Stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unstructured recreation, memorials, rough lawns. • Backyard - no real function, left over green space. • Set of rules with regard to availability of playing fields so that long-term commitments can be made to key stakeholders.
Functions and Events	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to specify requirements to able to properly maintain turf. 6 weeks required after the Christmas/New Year events and 6 weeks mid year.
Recreation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unstructured recreation, memorials, rough lawns. • Discussion regarding level of sport to be provided for in Crescent and Phillip Precinct. Even increasing the area and quality of playing fields in the Crescent Precinct the playing fields in the Phillip Precinct would still be required. • Lunchtime sport is a very important use of the Domain - both Crescent and Phillip Precincts. Master Plan and PoM to outline appropriate use and appropriate level of use of playing fields. • Fields currently required - 1 Austag, 2 - Volleyball, 3 - Netball, 3 - Touch Football, 1 – Soccer. • Need to consider options for Crescent Precinct plus an option that looks at the short term with the Domain car park staying. • Level of sporting use to be raised at the external stakeholders meeting.
Thematic & living collections	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Views from Darlinghurst and back edge of park are visually unappealing – can they be improved.
Plant sciences and research	
Biodiversity conservation	
Interpretation	
Heritage	
Infrastructure and Assets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Domain car park - 'enhance landscape'. • AGNSW access to car park-move entrance to car park? formalise existing desire line? - Lighting for security is needed. • Train station - 4 cars only at the end of car park. Open train station as trade-off for road closures in Domain. • Redevelopment of Domain car park to include bus layover area. • Helicopters - acceptable for emergencies, special structure, and assistance to neighbours, noise, and impact on Woolloomooloo. • No Helipad! • Edmund Capon has a proposal for covered walkway from Domain car park to AGNSW – to be discussed with RBG. • Existing Domain car park entry/exit structure needs to be demolished. • Pedestrian link from Cook and Phillip Park discussed - will need to redirect pedestrians around playing fields. • Need to find out loading for roof of car park – option for sports field.

6. Art Gallery, Landbridge, Top of Naval Fuel Store

Strategic Area	Internal Stakeholders
Visitors and Stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area in front of art gallery and on other side of road is used as a milling area for gallery patrons and for school groups, conflict between traffic and pedestrians. • Increasing number of residents in Woolloomooloo and Darlinghurst therefore RBG becomes 'backyard'.
Functions and Events	
Recreation	
Thematic & living collections	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integrate landscaping above wine bunkers. • Rationalise and beautify entire area. • Back of AGNSW - visual unit? • Staircase between Landbridge and back of AGNSW. • Request that any planting solution should require minimal horticultural attention.
Plant sciences and research	
Biodiversity conservation	
Interpretation	
Heritage	
Infrastructure and Assets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Area in front of art gallery and on other side of road is used as a milling area for gallery patrons and for school groups, conflict between traffic and pedestrians. • AGNSW spreading out into RBG. Presentation of AGNSW to road. • Need to address major entry point to gardens from Woolloomooloo. • Need to lobby for demolition of electricity substation and return to RBG. • RTA is committed to pedestrian link from Landbridge to back of AGNSW. Edmund Capon is against this for security reasons. • Function of area in front of AGNSW? • Need to review options for this area with regard to 40-year lease of Naval Fuel Store and 50 year lease of Landbridge. Naval Fuel Store can take no weight at all therefore need to look at options with hard surfacing. Need to develop a solution, which can be achieved with limited funds. • Need to find out all loadings • Integral Energy refuses to consolidate and demolish the Electrical Substation but may respond to community pressure. Therefore need to look at options for it staying and going. • Opposition to toilets at this point as it is too close to the edge.

7. Yurong and Woolloomooloo Precincts

Strategic Area	Internal Stakeholders
Visitors and Stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce tourist clutter at the point - high demand from tour operators, brides, commercial film and media. • Nocturnal activities - sex workers.
Functions and Events	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Possible event site on Woolloomooloo Bay? • Events space at end of point should be specifically for tourists. Second events site not necessary.
Recreation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not much picnicking in the central islands, visibility from road. • Jogger conflicts with pedestrians.
Thematic & living collections	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revegetation has been in for approx. 4 years. • Declining trees.
Plant sciences and research	
Biodiversity conservation	
Interpretation	
Heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Draw out significance of Mrs Macquarie's Chair.
Infrastructure and Assets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should the boardwalk be extended further along Woolloomooloo Bay? • Henry Lawson Gate is the only exit after gate lockup need revolving gate on Macquarie Street and closer to Woolloomooloo. • Dogs - disposal bins. • ABC Pool - landscape unit, RBG to appropriate if possible. • Maintaining road surface, dollar contribution from bus operators. • Vic Lodge Development-road, pedestrian, buses. • Reduce tourist clutter at the point - high demand from tour operators, brides, commercial film and media. • Option to block off road at the beginning of Yurong Precinct. Provides opportunities to have a series of lookout points along the road, which would reduce the concentrated impact at the point. Trackless train to take tourists to the point. See Yurong Issues Management Plan. • Power, sewerage outlet at Mrs Macquarie's Chair. • No path, worn dirt track beside road. • Events space at end of point should be specifically for tourists. Second events site not necessary. • Ferry locations are acceptable for presentation purposes. There was a ferry wharf in Farm Cove until 1972 although it is not ideal because of the wash. Also there may be conflict with cinema screen and events at fleet steps.

8. Outdoor Staff Comments and Risk Management

Strategic Area	Internal Stakeholders
General Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No sense of The Domain as a whole, perceived as separate areas by public, staff arrangements (therefore staff) and management. • Management and care divided into different areas by organisation, even historical hierarchy of spaces.
Visitors and Stakeholders	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Educate people about The Domain primarily as garden, about trees as heritage and about plant care. Also the open space use is secondary. Public have perception of ownership and unrestricted rights. • Path opposite service entry to AGNSW needs to be removed to reduce pedestrian and traffic conflicts.
Functions and Events	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is a series of community events that are guaranteed access to The Domain - Festival of Sydney; Trotfest; Carols in the park; etc • Develop policy regarding the frequency of events and location and size of marquees i.e. rotate large and small on two lawn spaces. • Concentration of events results in a larger and long repair time. Longer breaks would improve results of repair. • Possible staggering of events locations i.e. Harbour party at Tarpeian or Mrs Macquarie's Chair, preferably not at Fleet Steps, turf is damaged from open-air theatre and guests climb the slopes damaging plants. • Staggering events would help with repair and lower complaints from other users. • Event and function sizes should be limited to manageable sizes. • Concentrate events into a tighter time frame with larger repair time in between, rather than staggered. i.e. site does not have time to recover New Year to Trotfest, Outdoor theatre to Harbour party. • Fees for event/function use need to reflect the cost of damage and repair. Repair costs should be included in the event costs. • Events, especially large ones, should have NO GLASS as a condition – signage, education required. No glass should be allowed at any events. • Events contracts should include input from outdoor staff to minimise damage. • No events during winter. • Extra contract staff required mid November to end February to cope with damage/management while events are on – this should be funded by events. • Organisation agrees to events contracts that The Domain cannot sustain and ground staff cannot manage. • Limit the size of structures for events. i.e. Open-air theatre a disaster- a large crane installs the screen from the grass area, entire area needs to be re-levelled and returfed. • Cleaning is a problem – events organisers are responsible at the moment. Sometimes use volunteers, sometimes contractors with mixed success. Don't ever pick up small stuff that is dangerous especially glass. • Cleaning after events is a problem and the quality of the cleaning varies with the organisers.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guidelines for cleaning could be provided to event organisers. • RBG provide guidelines to organisers but need to add more to cleanup requirement. Should it be sub-contracted by RBG? Not keen to supervise cleanup by RBG subcontractors.
Recreation	<p>Sport Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More control required for sports. • Users need to be educated about use of areas. • Discussion of location of sports to assist with long-term management. • Netball and volleyball can rotate locations –manageable. • Change Touch football to Austag on precinct plan. • The idea of a jogger path is OK for corporate cup but casual joggers will not run on paths preferring the grass, harming turf and trees. Maybe education. • Sports facilities: Phillip Precinct should be limited to soccer, netball and volleyball. One soccer field only. Netball and volleyball are moveable which allow impacts on one area to be reduced. Crescent Precinct should be provided for Oztag, touch football and 6-a-side soccer. • Areas need to be able to take the wear and tear of the sports activities. • Sports need to be controlled by RBG not the Contractors demands. • Sports with heavy impact on turf need to be managed to include charging the costs for maintenance required.
Thematic & living collections	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rock overhangs - remove? • Environmental weeds. • Very difficult to maintain turf on cliffs. • Re-expose rock and plant, locally native species - opportunity for interpretation of natural heritage and for 'plant' conservation. <p>Tree Management</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tree management needs greater consideration. • Tree replacement should include consideration of management and use of the areas. • At current temporary stage and compound location (Philip precinct) vehicles move around front and back. All surrounding trees are too close and are damaged during use. • Trees in Philip precinct are being nursed along due to damage; are declining but nothing is being done. • Central Avenue trees and how to treat under them is a large problem - maybe mulch. • Tree replacement policy should have third aspect- replacement should be appropriate to the surrounding use and management, should not be constrained to exact place or species to reduce possible harm. • A couple of Eucalypts are doing well in the new events area, possible to identify. • General agreement for of planting for 1:5 slopes in Yurong and Woolloomooloo, however a big job. Suggestion to get the framework, say tree or quick/rehabilitation shrub species in first, then working on detail.
Plant sciences and research	
Biodiversity conservation	

Interpretation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public education required – perception of public ownership and unrestricted rights. • Need signage and public education. • Education of the public required to (1) increase people’s appreciation and understanding of the resource and the value of the area (2) the impacts of sports and the limitations on the area.
Heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was a caretaker’s cottage on Yurong hill, middle-island. • Suggestion for historic photo displays in landscape i.e. cricket match in Philip and at Mrs Macquarie’s Chair.
Infrastructure and Assets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paths and stairs. • Post and rail fences. • Handrail for Fleet Steps? Policy regarding appropriateness of handrails for heritage steps. • Fleets Steps - event space not competitive needs sewer, power and water. Set-up for footings, maintain lawn-improve drainage and provide irrigation. • Paths and edges are in bad repair. • Informal paths need to be made into formal paths. • Paths – hierarchy good idea. Need to seal goat tracks; remove path between 2a and 3a: widen some paths and particularly intersections to provide adequate space for vehicle maintenance movements. • Steps in Yurong middle-island need to be removed due to safety hazard. • Also other steps damaged and dangerous. All steps need to be evaluated for damage and danger. • Paths and path edges are in bad repair. • Rounding-out path intersections for vehicle turning should be incorporated. • Goat track across Phillip and in front of Art Gallery south to east Sydney. Close in stairs. • Suggest the provision of a large bus bay at proposed Yurong toilets. • Steps in Yurong middle island onto road a safety hazard and should be removed. • Suggest path opposite service entry to AGNSW be removed. • Suggestion that the temporary stage be moved to the top of the Domain car park.

APPENDIX B

List of External Stakeholders

Need to get electronic copy from Ian Innes

APPENDIX C

EXTERNAL STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS AND IDEAS

EXTERNAL STAKEHOLDER COMMENTS and IDEAS

The following are the comments raised at the two External Stakeholder Workshops. The comments are reported in terms of the Strategic Areas as defined by the key operational areas and values pertaining to the day-to-day management of The Domain.

The strategic areas are:

- Visitors and Stakeholders
- Functions and Events
- Recreation
- Thematic & living collections
- Plant sciences and research
- Biodiversity conservation
- Interpretation
- Heritage
- Infrastructure and Assets

Strategic Area	External Stakeholders
General Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Domain and the Botanic Gardens should be studied together. • Comments need to be integrated. • Plan needs to show care and clarity – what and why. • Need a management and planning process for the area. • Need a coherent plan for the whole area, not just the precincts. • There is a complexity of uses to be addressed. • A Master Plan will make it easier to process applications from RBG. • It is important that passive and private uses do not take a second seat to active and commercial uses. • Define philosophy in the design. • Cannot alienate public space. • Definition of rules and guidelines: ‘Homebake’ over ruled Trust legislation of no pop concerts. <p>Other Comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Train station for visitors? • No wharf in Farm Cove. • Electricity substation is bigger than it needs to be, location needs to be reconsidered, and operation – power surges experienced at the Pavilion on the Park. • Electricity substation needs to be relocated away from the Domain. • If Yurong Point is closed to buses, coaches and cars, a trackless train could be provided for visitors.
Visitors and Stakeholders	<p>Tourism and visitors</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tourism pressure and bus/coach use is a conflict for the Domain. • Pedestrian and vehicle conflict is a big issue. <p>Cathedral College</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • College has few of its own facilities and needs to be able to use the Domain facilities for recreational activities. • School has limited storage facilities. • St Mary’s Road traffic is increasing and classroom windows cannot be opened due to traffic noise. • Any changes in the Domain will have an implication for the School.
Functions and Events	

Recreation	<p>Sport – Corporate Cup (runners)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regular weekly event, 6 km route (2 loops), 32 teams participate with 300-320 runners (and there is a waiting list of competitors). • Code of Conduct issued to competitors and identification numbers. • Competitors do not run on the road. • Facilities (toilet, change room, showers) could be improved. Facilities are shared. Most competitors shower at their offices. • If facilities were to be relocated, the start and finish location of the race would be considered. Current location is fine. <p>Sport – Runners and Games</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Corporate Team Challenge, Sunday morning 3,000 runners, 10 km race. • Lunchtime runners would use a jogging track and warm up areas. • Need to develop a code of conduct for lunchtime runners, and a route so all run in one direction. • Directional signage could be incorporated in the Domain for joggers and runners. • Additional training facilities could be incorporated in the landscaping for joggers such a hills. • Lunchtime sports are very popular and there is a huge demand. Sports include volleyball, soccer, netball, and Austag. All sports use temporary facilities and the provision of a storage area would be advantageous for goal posts, balls, nets, etc. • Lunchtime sports are so popular that teams are turned away. • Turf needs to be improved for all users, both passive and active. • Sports in the Crescent Precinct constantly loose balls over the edge. • Need more space for more teams. • Need to improve Crescent precinct for summer period (1 – 2 fields), as the Phillip Precinct cannot be used during that period. • The soccer field should not be dissected by the footpath. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to manage what is happening in the Phillip Precinct. No cricket in Phillip Precinct.
Thematic & living collections	<p>Landscape</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Crucial to define landscape type, character, and the nature of the space. • Support for treed boulevard however consultation will be required as it goes through the parliamentary precinct.
Plant sciences and research	
Biodiversity conservation	
Interpretation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interpretation required for the historical foreshore.
Heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A heritage investigation should precede the Master Plan. • Request for a presentation to the Heritage Council and National Trust. • Need to identify conflicts and traditional uses and standards of management with regard to historical significance. • Past concern with heritage issues eg Sydney Sculpture Walk. • Any improvements need to relate to the cultural heritage of the site.

<p>Infrastructure and Assets</p>	<p>Boundaries</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current boundaries are unclear. • Need definition and defence of boundaries. • Need to reclaim edges with a statement of presence. • Boundaries fixed by legislation and the Botanic Gardens can encroach on the Domain. • Incision of Conservatorium. <p>Linkages and Gateways</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relationship with neighbours is important and linkages need to be established and integrated with the surrounds. Need to allow for population fluctuations. • Gateways and access is important to the harbour. • Location of the Cahill Expressway is a disaster and needs to be considered. • Domain gates and fencing promotes connection with the Gardens. • Access points could be provided through the Attorney Generals site. • Need to reinforce nodes and linkages. • Direct tourists to Art Gallery from library. • Open up historic walkways. • Alternative pedestrian desire lines to the Domain from Macquarie Street could be investigated eg St James statue, open up the Barracks, lane behind Art Gallery. <p>Traffic and pedestrian conflicts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Domain is being ‘shredded’ by cars. Biggest challenge is to control and conceal cars. • Opening Central Avenue for pedestrians will reduce pedestrians on Art Gallery Road. • Conflict with pedestrians and cars on the Landbridge area. • Metered parking encourages use and should be removed. • Pavilion on the Park use Hospital Road for deliveries when Art Gallery Road is closed. Need a loading zone area designated. • Removal of traffic from around Yurong Point is supported. <p>Hospital Road</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Too much traffic on Hospital Road. Metered parking encourages cars and increases conflict and congestion. Degrades the Gardens. • Should only be an access road. • Need to maintain pedestrian access through the hospital grounds. • The hospital does not like the pedestrian desire line through the hospital grounds. • Should be a back lane only. • Is it possible to remove buses from Hospital Road? • RBG needs control of Hospital Road for event management.
----------------------------------	---

Bus and Coaches

- Yurong Point is a tourist icon and the number of buses is meeting tourist demand and need.
- Tourism NSW and Tourism Council of Australia dictate bus and coach routes. Any change would need to negotiate with Tourism Council of Australia, particularly if buses/coaches are to be banned from the Point. The visiting and photo opportunity for tourists must be maintained.
- If buses are banned, cars should be banned too.
- Tourists do not like to change vehicles.
- Bus/coach layover was proposed for the Domain car park, which would be advantageous for operators using the area. It was not intended as a drop-off for Mrs Macquarie's Chair.
- If a levy or fee is proposed for access to Yurong Point, the industry needs to be warned in advance to enable the cost to be included in the operating costs. A reasonable fee would be acceptable to the industry.
- Spreading the bus/coach visiting times to avoid the peak stopping periods and congestion would be difficult as it is a deregulated market and difficult to control.
- Tour bus operation is extremely competitive.

Ferry Wharves

- Extremely expensive resource to construct and operate for Sydney Ferries. New funds are not expected to be available until after 2002.
- Sydney Ferries have no additional ferries. Any new stop would need to be close to the existing ferry route.
- The commercial viability of the new stop would need to be established. 32 passengers per trip would be required to make it commercially viable.
- Smaller wharf operators; water taxis, etc may be interested.
- Construction of a wharf for small ferries is supported to relieve pressure with cars and buses.

Bicycle use

- Cyclists need to be part of the transport equation.
- Exclusion from the Botanic Gardens is understood, however, a circuit through the Domain would be ideal.
- Incidental bicycle storage and lockers are being made available at train stations and ferry wharves, perhaps some could be considered.
- Signage to indicate the legal rights of cyclists needed around the Domain.