

Q3: CRITICAL ELEMENTS  
TRANSPORT & MOVEMENT

TRANSPORT & MOVEMENT	COMMUNITY FACILITIES & CENTRES	RESIDENTIAL & COMMUNITY SAFETY	COMMUNITY VALUES & CHARACTER	ENVT & OPEN SPACE
Retain footpath network not enclosed by fences	No future roundabouts with exits/entries for houses or schools	Make best use of limited funds - avoid re-doing things by doing them right in the first place	Include control of development eg. public comment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Ensure funding for Yerrabi Pond landscaping is not diverted to other areas</li> </ul>
Must be designed for public transport links, loops	Maintain quality of outlook	Maximise delivery on the ground of facilities	Ensure overall plan for the area	High hill for lookout with car access and other recreational facilities - focal point for Gungahlin community - Horse Park, Moncrieff, Taylor, North Amaroo, One Tree Hill
Pleasant pathways encourage maintenance/ownership by adjacent residents	Provide shops, banks/ATMs, petrol stations - people need them	Core facilities needed early on	Ensure community facilities considered up front with retail areas eg. public toilets, halls, cycle paths	Combine lookout with walking tracks through bushland, plant natives if necessary
Don't build houses along streets where first impression is of garages	Schools are more than just schools, important for community activities	Focus on single centre until critical mass achieved	Combine open space, recreational facilities and community facilities eg. scouts, churches with ovals	Need for underpass at Gundaroo Drive to give access near Yerrabi Pond - principle applies generally to pedestrian/cycle access throughout Gungahlin
Community should front the streets	Few exits out of Palmerston - avoid repeating this	Provide more parks and open space	Designate green space	Underpasses/safe crossings need to be in areas where they will be used, especially by children
Create inviting streets	Provide good access, bus routes	Emphasise positive features of existing development	Provide free parking for town and other shopping centres	Small ovals and informal recreational space within suburbs preferable to large complexes
Cul-de-sacs are good for building community, close to public transport, pathways	Manage traffic and reduce traffic speeds	Avoid negatives ie. transport and access	Include petrol station	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need to be mindful of bushfires on urban edge and interface with woodland open space</li> </ul>
Short paths - safer			Prepare management plan for recreation and open space areas defining roles and responsibilities of management	Need for firebreaks between urban area and woodland
Encourage gates to paths			Ensure weed control	Preference is for northern upland woodland areas with walking trails to lookout
Decent links early are really important (ie. paths, roads, cycle paths)			Consider cattle grazing as a way to control weeds	Hobby farms/"bush blocks" a possibility but not to detriment of community uses or conservation
Entrances to estates need to be attractive and welcoming (no fences to main entrance roads)			Control pilfering of natural areas by people and animals	Hobby farms/"bush blocks" would require covenant on land use
Do not build divisions into suburbs (ie. estates such as Harcourt Hill) - them vs. us			Fire control	Concern about water resources and poor soil conditions
More roads			Provide for youth refuge - young people found sleeping on streets	Need to protect rocky creek in North Amaroo (former Horse Park Pond site) - buffer along creek line is required

**TRANSPORT & MOVEMENT****COMMUNITY FACILITIES &  
CENTRES****RESIDENTIAL & COMMUNITY  
SAFETY****COMMUNITY VALUES &  
CHARACTER****ENVT & OPEN SPACE**

More road space

Early provision of major roads pathways

No missing bits

Roads first, housing second

Examine structure of education provision -  
provide continuity within Gungahlin

Provide leisure facilities for family outdoor  
recreation: barbecue areas with seats and  
shade, fitness track

Ensure proper consultation with residents -  
don't leave us out of information loop  
Avoid repeating mistakes of Palmerston -  
too small, houses all the same, structure of  
blocks the same

Need variety in design and infrastructure  
development

Road design needs rethinking

Detracts from longer term attractiveness to  
industries and employers

• **Enforcement of environment protection  
laws, especially in relation to runoff  
control from new development**

• **Maintenance of parklands, grasslands etc  
ie. weed control**

## SESSION 2

In the second session the workshop was divided into two groups. These groups comprised an amalgamation of the membership from the groups created in session 1. Group A comprised members from the environment and open space, and transport and movement groups and Group B from the community values and character, residential environment and community safety, and community facilities and centres groups.

A transcript of the groups' discussions is given below.

### **GROUP A - Environment & Open Space and Transport & Movement**

#### **HEADLINES**

- Enforce planning rules and monitoring, implementation eg deeds, penalties
- Facilitate linkages to integrate Gungahlin community both within and externally to the rest of Canberra
- Ensure sites for community facilities eg spiritual, open space, libraries, centres, focuses - catering for different pursuits
- Invest in creating communities for the long term, not just short term developer gains

#### **ISSUES RAISED**

- talking about theoretical, motherhood (eg "community") rather than detailed, practical solutions
- not creating communities
- PALM's role when land developers are actually responsible eg Nicholls Lakeside - recreational facilities?
- community needs to negotiate directly with developers for facilities
- where is the planning ahead for facilities?
- PALM is not ensuring that level of facilities is comparable with the rest of Canberra
- problem that rules are not being enforced eg dwelling numbers in Palmerston
- designing for social/community long term needs eg Amaroo - landscape, solar orientation
- falling down between planning and what happens on the ground - what is PALM's intention to enforce delivery by the development industry?
- what are the penalty systems?
- improvements to penalties in deeds, especially new and future deeds
- use financial penalties
- need to avoid residents having to take developer to Court for over-development in Palmerston (multi-unit site)
- avoid this occurring elsewhere in Gungahlin
- PALM needs more teeth
- creating community: linkages, centre location
- Palmerston design works well: bus route through road, quiet streets and houses, centre in middle with preschool, school and hall, open space system with footpaths, good links by foot and not necessarily by road; yet look like other parts of Canberra
- Ngunnawal works but without through road
- create sense of community by strong linkages, gateways into Gungahlin
- need good access to other parts of Canberra and better integration - problems with Ellenborough etc
- differing styles of suburbs - avoid rich vs. poor eg Nicholls and Harcourt Hill
- naming of estates divides community
- softer entry ways with trees preferable
- ugly signs and brick walls into 'The Promenade'
- lack of signs identifying suburbs

- lack of land for churches, scout halls etc. in the future - building a sense of community through recreational and spiritual facilities
- first mortgagees less able to support facilities initially but will be able to in medium term, however no opportunities if sites are not available
- housing for older people - nursing homes not necessary - smaller houses close to centres and facilities
- marginalised by North Canberra - residents therefore use "rat-runs"
- need to use Dickson and Belconnen facilities is unreasonable - overloading these
- need to look at broad impacts throughout Canberra
- Gungahlin already has enough people for government to provide community facilities eg churches, offices for facilities, library
- strong sense of community, just give us places to do it eg town centre with a heart
- need to be able to link with wider Canberra community eg for jobs, families etc.
- need local focus within suburbs
- co-location: different facilities for different groups so don't put public library in school
- ACTION - tap into meetings
- transport coordination - Gungahlin Drive built but traffic lights at Kosciuszko Drive delayed - why?
- staging of roads creates problems and is unsafe
- building/transport infrastructure (arterial roads, buses etc) early enough and stage development, lane by lane
- get buses in early, encourages users and set behaviour patterns early
- development timing and effects on rural leases and farming
- congestion on arterial road connections
- lobby Woolworths for improvements
- light rail question must be answered once and for all.

## **GROUP B - Community Values & Character and Residential Environment & Community Safety and Community Facilities & Centres**

### **HEADLINES**

- Transport/road access a critical issue - keep Monash Drive on the agenda
- Community facilities are needed: shops, schools (with continuity of education), service stations, parks, open space and recreational facilities, provision of sites for future needs
- Lack of grand plan for Gungahlin is a problem - where is the Telopea Park?

### **ISSUES**

- Opportunity for new start
- Newness attractive
- Small block sizes enable entry
- Increase water management, dams and lakes
- Avoid housing on shores
- Too much emphasis on profit by government
- Opportunity to create more "civic" area is being lost
- Suburbs lack diversity
- Residents seeking individuality not repetitiveness
- Destruction of natural areas
- Developers are not meeting obligations - nature strips, footpaths etc.
- Concern that government won't step in
- Many areas of open space in limbo: unmanaged, policy gaps
- Feedback from government is poor, community needs more information

- Concern that hidden agenda exists
- Processes need greater integrity
- Problems stem from government handing over infrastructure to developers
- Positives include: proximity/convenience (to Civic, Belconnen, Mitchell, future jobs); community spirit and chance to be involved as area develops; natural setting (which could be lost); opportunity to build one's own home; and views.
- Transport corridors a major issue: blockages, choke points, serious accidents. Need to upgrade, insert traffic lights.
- Failure to direct resources to solving obvious problems
- Congestion
- Dangerous "rat runs" through Lyneham, Ainslie
- Roundabouts need review
- Frustration with delays in providing facilities:
  - location of temporary youth drop-in centre causing problems
  - lack of recreational open space and facilities for older children/young adults
  - need for youth refuge site allocated for community groups
- Sites must be useable (eg grass needs to be kept short)
- Open space needs to be well located, maintained, weeds controlled
- Monitoring and management needed
- External appearance of some medium-density housing a problem- poor aesthetics
- Courtyard designs preferred
- Sensitive interface with street important
- Greater diversity, design controls and design and siting guidelines needed
- Housing should be attractive
- More landscaping needed - too much hard paved area, too much overlooking
- Good entries needed
- Avoid streets being dominated by sight of garages with no evidence of occupation at night
- Question of whether eucalypts make suitable street trees
- Large trees incompatible with small blocks so should go into communal open space
- Limited funds for urban infrastructure therefore sensible sequencing needed, ongoing review of priorities needed
- Signs could be put up to explain if something is unfinished eg cycle path
- Important to spend more wisely
- Main thing is to encourage sense of community as Gungahlin grows
- Not enough for teenagers to do
- Could use lake, put in scout hall
- Facilities for older people also needed
- Positives include:
  - outlook with rural views
  - cul-de-sacs
  - footpaths to shops
  - safety for children
  - friendly character
- Negatives include:
  - access to bus routes poor in Amaroo
  - intra-Gungahlin travel a problem
  - older people who can't drive are forced to rely on public transport
  - Gundaroo Road divides area in terms of bus services
  - must leave Gungahlin to get petrol, do banking, buy affordable groceries, have a picnic
- Schools are a positive community facility within walking distance (but lack of continuity of education is a problem)
- Shops are adequate

- Other problems:
  - grasslands management - rubbish, motorcycles
  - builders dumping rubbish
  - lack of playing fields for ball sports
  - lack of skateboard area, scout hall, swimming pool
  - Ngunnawal drop-in centre associated with antisocial behaviour - should not be in middle of residential area
  - lack of facilities for nursing mothers
  - lack of facilities for older people
  - William Slim Drive very dangerous - roundabouts too small
  - golf course access from roundabout
  - school in Palmerston and medium-density development accessed from roundabout
  - lack of police presence - in the past, police were seen on bikes which was a good thing
  - burglaries rising
  - noise pollution from Gungahlin Drive - acoustic fence inadequate - sound of trucks braking at future lights
  - Flemington Road junction with road north-east of town centre
- Community doesn't want false promises, wants realistic delivery dates
- Shopping areas may need to be delayed if town centre is to be viable
- Community shopping centre serves different role
- Danger of over-dependence on cars
- Need for small centres ie corner shop plus town centre - don't need group centres
- Kippax scale of development at Amaroo will over-service the area
- In longer term areas need small shops
- Buildings on ridges destroy rural character
- In terms of the road system, residents value the ability to get in and out of suburbs quickly
- Bus services cater for a small minority - area must be accessible to drivers
- Coercion to use public transport will fail
- Present system is inadequate for future traffic loads

## **PLENARY SESSION**

### **Main themes of the workshop are:**

#### **BIGGER VISION NEEDED FOR GUNGAHLIN**

- big pieces
- integration
- leadership, broad directions
- long term view.

#### **COMMUNITY**

- sense of community
- places to interact - schools, retail network, importance of town centre, range of community facilities
- interaction with rest of Canberra - ability to move between, access to retailing and other services externally.

#### **COMMUNITY FACILITIES**

- access
- provision for future facilities (sites)
- hierarchy - some for whole, some for suburb

03/10/02

- co-location - convenient location for number of facilities
- recognise different needs - age, ethnicity, religion, sporting interests.

#### RETAIL

- town centre must be strong
- local shops needed for basic convenience shopping and immediate contact.

#### TRANSPORT NETWORK

- external provision of links
- within Gungahlin between suburbs and to town centre in efficient way
- suburb - pedestrian system that works well to reach schools, shops; width and design, safety, wasted funds
- implement sooner rather than later.

#### MANAGEMENT

- poor implementation - plans didn't live up to expectations
- need for enforcement - verges, enforcing regulations to prevent developers encroaching onto open space
- government not spending well and perhaps not spending enough
- importance of feedback - consultation exercises and other issues over time.

#### OTHER ISSUES

- how to respond to questions raised needs to be considered by PALM
- strategic financial management and philosophy
- can't get good things cheaply - is community prepared to pay premium to have much better development in 50 years time? (more of the same or something which breaks the mould)
- setting aside sites - encouraging shops in local areas - should government apply financial incentive by not charging rates? community would ultimately pay - these sorts of things need to be looked at
- residents paid more for land and have therefore paid premium - equity issue - shouldn't be expected to bear the burden
- inter-government communication - individual agencies not talking to each other - lack of integrated planning and coordination.

#### URBAN DESIGN

- better quality of external appearance of medium-density housing - residents want to live and work in an area that is enjoyable to be in and drive through - overall amenity

## **APPENDIX B**

### **SUMMARY REPORT OF WORKSHOP B SUMMARY NOTES OF SECOND COMMUNITY WORKSHOP HELD ON 9 MAY 1998 AT GOLD CREEK HIGH SCHOOL LIBRARY, KELLEWAY AVENUE, NICHOLLS**

#### **WELCOME**

Introduction given by Rob Purdon (Chair) that the main purposes of the second community workshop, being to present planning material from the project to date, then for smaller groups to take this material and examine it in further detail and for a feedback session to close the workshop.

Mr Brendan Smyth, MLA, Minister for Urban Services made the following points:

- this project is about building communities
- aware of constant fear of community that government never listens and will do what it wants
- don't agree with that - what we have to do is to make genuine effort to get the most out of the process, hear you first-hand
- unless Ministers get out they can become very isolated
- workshops are a sincere attempt to listen - the goal from here is to prepare a variation to the Territory Plan which encompasses as much as possible of what the community wants.

#### **Questions**

Q1 - Is it true that the Government hasn't any real commitment to expanding Gungahlin?

Minister - would reject suggestion

Q2 - When Tuggeranong was developed there was a commitment to employment, this hasn't been the case in Gungahlin

Minister - there are no more Federal departments, population projections are weak. Need to maximise potential for jobs growth

Q3 - Should PALM's offices have been built in Dickson?

Minister - when Tuggeranong was developed there was a completely different situation - no more new government departments are coming, could possibly shuffle existing ACT departments but can't compare now to then

Q4 - Fed up with line that it's all too hard and we haven't got the money

Minister - economy has changed, run by local government, must strike a reasonable balance to ensure that all Canberrans get the best result

Q5 - How can we take concept of community consultation seriously when we hear of direct arrangements between Chief Minister and a developer, as in the Kinlyside example?

Minister - there is only a MOU to a concept, the Chief Minister has a responsibility to look at land to be released under new arrangements where PALM's functions have been split, a development application has not been lodged with PALM. All the MOU said was here is an idea, this is what needs to be considered.

Q6 - Why didn't Manuka development or \$15m pool come to Gungahlin?

Minister - developer has the right to approach the Government with proposal for any area.

Minister - What you'll hear today are the consultants' ideas and we need your feedback.

Rob: Issues raised are important. Today we're talking about bigger picture structure planning. The main work has been done by a large team headed by Mr Jan Martin. Jan will present an overview of where we're at, run through some of the options and hold a discussion. After the workshop session we'll get back together and summarise the outcomes of the workshops. This is not the last time you'll have a chance to comment. The team will finalise its report to PALM and PALM will prepare a draft variation to the Territory Plan which will also be released for comment. We will try to pick up issues raised - where these are outside the scope of the project, PALM will respond.

## MAIN PRESENTATION

Mr Jan Martin (consultant team leader from Sinclair Knight Merz) - This is a major review of the future planning for the northern part of the Gungahlin area. We (the study team) are also looking at provision of community facilities for whole of Gungahlin and detailed planning/urban design for Amaroo and several suburbs near the Town Centre.

We are tending to use people already living in Gungahlin as "guinea pigs". We appreciate your willingness to tell us about how things can be done better. We've been drawing on what we've heard and what's gone on in the past. We have a series of principles and objectives which fall under 4 headings.

- First is ecological sustainability – whole host of things.
- Second is social/cultural/livability – whether we're providing the right facilities, choice, right location etc.
- Third heading is economic sustainability – issue of cost constraint has to be taken into account, opportunities for employment, setting up conditions which generate local employment.
- Finally, the team is not strictly speaking looking at management issues but what matters is that we provide a set of planning tools that will work well within the management framework - what we put up needs to be adaptable – we are not relying on population projections for particular years.

Some of the things we've heard and thought of, although at this stage we have no final recommendations, in overview are:

### *Big picture issues*

- Setting and the landscape
- Burley Griffin
- Cyclists and pedestrians
- Places
- Options

In Canberra there is tradition that new urban form responds to the landscape, hilltops and steep slopes are protected and part of the environment so you can get to them and use them, similarly with open space and creek lines.

- Diagram 1 shows some of the starting points: Mulligans Flat removed from urban development, town centre in a fixed location, creation of grasslands.
- Diagram 2 of slopes shows where it is hard to build on.
- Diagram 3 looks especially at woodland and forest and grades land in upper area.

In broad terms the line proposed for urban development corresponds to the line currently on the Territory Plan, this is one of the things we're looking at closely.

We will be talking about roads, bus routes, trails and cycle paths. When we get into more detail looking at the landscape a whole lot of things result, such as the idea of suburbs as character areas defined by natural assets rather than roads as boundaries, with facilities in middle of character areas being served by roads.

Chris Purdon on community facilities (from Purdon & Associates) - my role is to develop a Community Facility Strategy for the whole of Gungahlin, so I have to identify requirements. Critical uses are schools (preschool to college) and open space, which structure urban areas. Others are community halls, churches etc ranging up to larger facilities. Four key issues have been identified which influence our input. First is changing location requirements. What is happening is

facilities are getting bigger, some are also becoming centralised at group and town centre level. Question of what is the role of the town centre, what facilities should be there and what should be at suburban level, which affects phasing. Next is co-location. There is considerable interest in co-location. We want to think about whether this is a good thing. Lastly we need to ask the question of what sort of things we need to leave sites for, and where do they need to be located?

Tom Brimson on transport issues (from Maunsells) - not only looking at private but also at public transport, walking and cycling. Couple of key broad issues which need to be understood. Jan mentioned employment in the town centre. The more concentrated the employment, the higher the proportion using public transport but not an efficient usage because buses travelling one way are full while buses the other way are empty. Also, the longer the trip length, the higher the volumes of traffic on certain links. Better environment on residential streets therefore results from shorter trips. Need to think about scale of roads and where they should be provided, ie. more 2 lane and fewer 4 lane. Another issue is how close people can be located to bus route. 500m is quite a long way to walk - longer means less likely to use public transport. Historically what has happened has been that town centre is developed at 50-60% development of an area such as Belconnen or Tuggeranong. Have looked at water supply - can be provided for all of the options. Stormwater - hard surfaces mean more runoff. Undesirable to increase flow on natural creeks. Ponds would hold and release. Sewerage - couple of key mains would be enlarged.

Jan Martin on landscape - Diagram of places. Have identified whole series of places which lend themselves to use for centres, schools, etc. Four main issues: phasing, (we're not going to recommend but we know it's important to reinforce town centre which suggests developing housing around there first to be cost-effective and useful). The second is roads. Horse Park Drive has been designed already and we can either retain or change this. Third is how much land we actually develop. One option shows more land being developed than the Territory Plan, and we are conscious of the argument that we should maximise population capacity to defer developing more sensitive areas such as Jerrabomberra. Possible case for housing development in the hills areas which is subject to strict set of environmental controls. Final issue is the way we organise various facilities and centres. There are 3 planned centres at Amaroo, Casey and somewhere between Moncrieff and Taylor. Mixed use centres area also proposed. Critical thing is primary schools distribution which are traditionally a community focus, have numerical catchment which changes as suburban population ages. Plans vary quite a bit depending on location of facilities.

Peter-John Cantrill on neighbourhood planning (from Alexander Tzannes & Associates) - We have been looking at outline planning (or suburb design), which deals with the individual block or section and how those blocks form neighbourhoods and then suburbs. Outline planning takes abstract ideas about planning and converts them into real shapes on the ground. The workshop hopes to give you real locations which present an idea of how suburbs might look, but this is only one possible outcome. The process starts with a look at good areas in Canberra and considers how to reproduce good qualities of streets, parks and blocks. (Examples of street in Deakin and parks and different types of houses shown). The challenge is how to put things in place which achieve better outcomes. We look at the characteristics of the area we're working with - existing landscape, valleys which may be good for parks, higher areas to see from. Look at all major and all minor elements that make up a suburb. Hope to suggest how areas will actually look, planting, parks, etc.

Chair (Rob Purdon) called for general questions.

Q1 - To Tom, query about floodplains heading towards Mitchell. Roads raised a little but don't seem high. If deluge happened what then?

Tom Brimson - whole series of ponds are planned to be put in, all of roads built to 1 in 100 year flood level. This is the standard of arterial roads in Canberra and most arterials in Australia.

Q2 - Future development in Amaroo, how will it impact on open spaces?

Tom – detail still being resolved. May encroach into area once considered suitable for pond.

Q3 – How large will pond be?

Tom – if there, several hectares.

Q4 – In general, if we take Moncrieff for example, what is sensitivity of planning process to preserving landscape features such as rocky outcrop on steep slopes?

Jan Martin – likely to recommend conservation as landscape asset but line would be reviewed in a few years time.

Q5 – Why is it projected that population will grow, and what is argument for trying to increase employment in town centre (would personally not want to work in Gungahlin)?

Jan – currently expected that Canberra will grow at about 1% and quite a few will continue to come to Gungahlin. Policy may change but we're working with a prediction, though we don't know how quickly. All best predictions are that population will continue to grow. There are number who would like to work here and at town centre and would like to see town centre as interesting place in which case you might like to work here. We're trying to set up conditions so that town centre is interesting. Other reason is to handle commuters who have to leave and can't get out onto highways.

Q6 – I live in [estate of Amaroo] – will we get anything?

Jan – this area looks like a good location for a planned centre.

Q7 – What is the location of future population growth beyond Amaroo?

Jan – would like to see around town centre. Our plans will provide for different phasing strategies.

Q8 – Member of Scout Association – in looking to the future we need to know where development will be over next 2-4 years.

Jan - agreed.

Q9 – How can you justify development right on waterways when runoff affects waterways, eg. promenade.

Tom – making sure to reserve width of land along edge. In terms of preserving water quality, being handled by smaller ponds. Land use policy was determined in original planning for Gungahlin.

### **SMALLER WORKSHOP SESSION**

The Chair directed that the workshop be divided into three groups to discuss:

- 'the big picture' - movement and environment
- centres - schools, facilities and recreation
- quality residential environments - neighbourhood outline planning Amaroo case study.

A summary of the major issues raised is provided below. A full transcript of the issues raised by each group is at Attachment A.

## PLENARY SESSION

A reporting back of the discussions from the three smaller groups was given by each group's leader. The key points raised are set out below.

### ***'The big picture' - movement and environment***

Report back by Jane Goffman

Major topics discussed were:

- need for a strategic plan for the whole of the ACT to inform planning of Gungahlin which provides employment distribution, is developed in consultation with NSW, sets aside land for recreation, special uses etc, provides real certainty, sets out economic goals and addresses financial issues
- Gungahlin's population capacity and how many people can be accommodated – the total number should be derived from the form of development, which should be sensitive to the environment and provide a diverse mix of block sizes, including more larger blocks than in existing Gungahlin in order to produce a rich and diverse community which attracts particular strategic uses
- urban edge – where it should be and how it should be used and managed – preserve hilltops within urban area and allow urban development up to the current line on the Territory Plan but permit clusters of special development within highly natural setting up to the border which conserves habitat and open space corridors
- road network and hierarchy – depends on links with the rest of Canberra but must ensure excellent access to other areas and safe road widths: important to make public transport viable but the group could not agree on whether to design roads for comfortable peak or off-peak use. Movement systems must support employment within Gungahlin.

### ***Centres - schools, facilities and recreation***

Report back by Tony Carmichael

Major topics discussed were:

- changing trends in provision of facilities and location issues were discussed
- Gungahlin town centre should reinforce its role by providing public facilities and by locating residential development there immediately
- co-location is not of serious concern provided that it is used sensibly and sensitively: keep entrances separate, joint use of parking, schools may need lockers for equipment for other users
- Raiders facility not a good example of a facility providing for the wider Gungahlin community
- Palmerston doesn't have a lot of land set aside for other uses – needs more
- buildings should be designed to be adaptable
- staging of facilities is important, shouldn't disadvantage residents – location in terms of initial as well as mid to long term. Concern expressed that Gungahlin not going to develop at rate sufficient to attract services (may have been allayed).

### ***Quality residential environments - neighbourhood outline planning Amaroo case study***

Report back by Rob Purdon

Major topics discussed were:

- focus on residential planning and design at the suburb level. The group worked through urban design process. What level of prescription should PALM apply to planning for new area?
- issues about degree of certainty that community could expect in relation to provision of facilities and open space
- discussion about value of hilltops and valleys as part of open space system, the extent to which you take existing trees and place them within open space

- discussion and strong support for principle of energy-efficient design at street layout and house design stage
- support for a number of small local parks, mechanism to retain existing vegetation and contribute to identity of suburb. Should road go all the way around parks? Opportunity for some to back directly onto private housing
- design for Amaroo makes sense and represents a useful compromise between economic viability and community ideals
- desire for facilities that can be regarded as community facilities – physical and financial access (in terms of affordability). Developers need to be encouraged to provide facilities for youth and others.

Suggestion from the floor that an important output of these workshops needs to be sending a message to the Legislative Assembly that bi-partisan political support and leadership is sought to establish a strategic plan for the ACT in the year 2000 (Mr Corbell MLA supported this proposal).

## **CLOSING**

Closing remarks were given by Ian Wood-Bradley, Manager, Gungahlin Section, PALM

It has been a valuable set of workshops and thanks to the people who have come along to participate in them. A record of this workshop will be sent out to all participants. A session for reporting back on the results of the project will occur in July/August when the consultants have finalised their report.

It is intended that the outputs from this review will be implemented, in part, through changes to the ACT's statutory planning policies. To this end, a draft variation to the Territory Plan will be on exhibition for community comment. The draft variation will contain recommendations for the planning of the northern undeveloped part of Gungahlin and will be accompanied by a background paper, which will be a summary of main report from this review. The draft variation will comprise a plan and series of principles and policies.

Community consultation on the draft variation will probably be for about six weeks, during this time there will be further public meetings in Gungahlin. This is the time when formal submissions will be sought by PALM on the proposed changes to Gungahlin's planning.

Once comments on the draft variation have been considered, the draft variation will be referred by the Minister to the Legislative Assembly's Standing Committee on Urban Services for its consideration and subsequently, to the Assembly for its adoption.

## **NOTES FROM SMALLER DISCUSSION GROUPS**

### **ENVIRONMENT AND MOVEMENT GROUP**

The group discussing the big picture planning, environment and movement issues was facilitated by Jane Goffman, Planning Solutions.

Main questions posed by consultants:

1. Population - how many people?
2. Where is the urban edge? How should it be used and managed?
3. Road hierarchy?

## 1. *Population*

- Relationship between Gungahlin and rest of ACT - where is Gungahlin in the strategic plan for the ACT? Important to talk to NSW also
- Roads - traffic management, routes in/out/through Gungahlin
- Population - will people choose to move here or be forced to
- How will growth be affected by urban infill (total numbers and rate of growth)
- Population demographics
- Occupancy rates and building startups
- Residential land area no longer available due to other constraints eg. legless lizards. How else could this land be used?
- Cumulative impact of development
- Style of housing/nature of development ie. bigger blocks - density issues and mix of housing - spread of population
- How far should diversity go?
- Dress circle locations/covenants on building size relative to block size
- Areas should be set aside but not developed until area settles down ie. mortgages under control
- Reserve sites for community uses ie. scout halls
- Can area with its ecological values support high or low population levels?
- Maximise undeveloped areas - no easy answers. If broadacre blocks go in, issues such as public transport need to be reconsidered. No public transport could be considered a feature. Needs change, landlords don't advise tenants
- What should the mix be?
- Does the pattern of development need to be changed now or considered later in outer areas?
- Don't cover it all in concrete!
- If land is scarce, reserve some areas for particular uses now
- Broadacre as precursor to more standard residential
- Land tenure issues.

## 2. *Urban edge*

- Being pillaged - As soon as land is earmarked, needs to be protected
- Long term management beyond grazing ie. people use, weed management
- Infrastructure needs to be in place
- How should it be done strategically?
- Staging: depends on people and economics
- Current Territory Plan policies: set out what sort of development is acceptable
- Style and character - block size/mix/incremental effects
- Specific characteristics eg. a prison
- Is Gungahlin cheap housing or quality development?
- Limit on height of development on hills - visual effect (other areas in Canberra are height restricted - this area should be the same)
- Lower rather than higher
- Preserve the hilltops
- Blocks not what developers originally promised - need alternative areas for bigger blocks etc.
- Is edge the border? What is going to happen in NSW? Will they have development up to their side and of what type?
- Form of development for Harrison and Mulanggarri?
- Higher densities closer to town centre, justifies public transport etc.
- Could be some clusters also, within outer areas
- Create artificial areas - non-native parks (Kambah and Telopea Parks are good examples).

### 3. *Roads*

- What dictates type of road we have - traffic volumes dictate
- Signals and roundabouts
- Unlikely to have grade separation
- Road system to avoid high volumes on particular streets
- Need wider roads with larger setbacks for residential. Gungahlin feels like "goat tracks" - not the concept of Canberra, with big wide roads. Driver mindsets!
- Access roads better elsewhere in Canberra
- Flemington Rd needs to be extended!
- Population dictates timing on road construction/upgrade
- Public transport corridor - yet to be decided - in road reserve or separate.
- Lights at Kosciusko - positioning - might have detrimental effect, to have too many.
- Don't replicate what happens at the end of the Parkway in Tuggeranong (series of traffic lights)
- More accidents with lights than roundabouts, traffic delays also worse with lights
- Less interruption better for traffic but not for pedestrians
- Traffic will avoid town centre and go to Civic if too easy to bypass and keep moving
- Main roads and residential streets should be wider!
- Makes traffic speed up and pedestrian movement more difficult
- Managing growing traffic volumes and increasing car dependence
- System should allow for efficient public transport
- Spine which is extendable and cost effective
- Avoid costly maintenance
- Should not have roads so dominant in movement system
- For some, owning and running a car is cheaper and more efficient because public transport in Gungahlin is inefficient - need to use several buses to reach destination
- Employment issue, and weekend traffic generated by social activities, shopping etc.
- Design for off-peak traffic
- Design for traffic loads
- Traffic lights inefficient - timing when no other cars around - wait times and pollution
- Lights are computerised - signal patterns set for different times during the day
- Not seen as efficient!

### 4. *Strategic planning*

- Need a strategic plan for the ACT which includes Gungahlin
- List values for defined characters: boarding schools, organisations, foundations, recreation areas, housing mix, possible prison - set land aside for these uses
- This determines long term facilities planning
- Vision of strategy
- Y plan and employment distribution
- Equestrian access is type of thing which needs to be considered
- Tell Government it is time to have an apolitical plan
- In absence of strategic planning, issues such as Kinlyside occur
- Need certain amount of certainty
- Financial realism needed, not dreams.

## COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND CENTRES GROUP

The group discussing community facilities and centres was facilitated by Tony Carmichael, Manager, Integrated Planning and Assessments, PALM.

### Main issues for discussion:

1. Changing locational requirements
2. Role of Gungahlin town centre
3. Use of co-location
4. Provision for future demand

- good local and central areas
- cost of access to facilities
- timing of facilities
- population 15,000 now, 33,000 estimated in 7 yrs including infill
- concern about infill direction and population assumptions
- aim is balance and issue of land availability
- important that facilities are suitable for population and in right place at right time

### *Co-location*

#### Schools:

- size
- sequencing
- building in stages, some parts started then expanded
- need to rethink demographics assumptions and fixed policies ie. primary every year go to high school for 6 yrs
- co-location good idea (good transport) but didn't match type to household needs/socio-economic status
- demographers didn't recognise changing patterns eg Nicholls school
- lack of flexibility to adapt to changing development patterns
- can reduce transport time if facilities are co-located
- separate entrances for high school and primary school if co-located
- as demographics change, co-location allows greater flexibility to change use
- plan around circles: cluster facilities
- safety, transport, distance especially for primary school children: issue if 2 primary schools co-located
- walk of 5 minutes is good distance from home to primary school (400m)
- cycleways (Palmerston) improve safety to school, with underpasses to cross busy roads
- good public transport may allow enlarged circles
- issues of driving to school vs public school bus so co-location wouldn't suit some
- model of 2 schools co-located
- makes sense if there is demand
- overkill if always co-located
- can build and then leave space available
- broaden definition of co-location ie. possibly to include church
- size of schools: are smaller better?
- costs, opportunities
- viable size 450 but larger than this doesn't necessarily improve
- safety issue if halls (eg Girl Guides) not near houses and in open areas (but noise an issue if directly adjoining)

- need some open space but also security (eg. Scout Hall): near water, open fields - can't camp on ovals: private secured area of 4-5 blocks
- need to know that community is not too far - issues of isolation at night
- link between hall and opportunities for activities ie. camping, water-based etc.
- could co-locate community halls ie. Scout/Girl Guide which use at night and child care centre during day
- schools need more lock-up space with adult-size stages, audio, access after hours
- Palmerston 4 - open space/greenfields
- don't build on foreshore
- high turn away rate at Nicholls child care centre

### ***Retail and town centre***

- when group centres in, local shops affected - doesn't necessarily mean better services for residents
- build town centre as centre of community, have it as a community space and build it up from there in stages
- complaint about Raiders club - social problems, rubbish, anti-social, gambling, poker machines
- town centre needs people living there
- link park to town centre - needs a major rethink
- link residential to town centre and Amaroo and Palmerston: architecture
- need a swimming pool: 25m pool in short term an option
- meant to be a range of community facilities in town centre, not just pokies
- everyone agreed that it should be more like original proposal
- received impression that it was a broader concept ie sporting, restaurants etc.
- local shops should be reinforced over group centres
- want local shops to include chemist, bakery, take away fish n chips - not so much supermarket
- two centre: occasional care facility important for child care without booking
- need to manage staff: children ratio
- community facilities need substantial land in feasible areas: not just a block between 2 houses or that is "spare"
- scouts, churches, age care, community halls etc.
- timing of Amaroo local centre - need to quarantine group centres role - supermarkets expensive
- use car to shop so distance doesn't matter - need local centres also
- for people without cars - need to take care not to forget this, single households need more than take away type of shop
- playgrounds, not big ovals, needed in suburbs
- town centre - accessible, entrance for cars ie. not back end type of facade as at Lyneham
- hardware shop in town centre
- good thing about group centres - they have shops like hardware
- however can have these in town centre
- have land/facility which can be changed to a house at a later stage ie. suitable for playgroups, meetings etc. when demand falls in future years
- consider possible demand reduced now for schools
- try to forecast changing demand and consider after hours use of facilities
- need to consider different levels of same facility ie tennis courts
- difference between sport/recreation and serious facility
- local school might have fun facility
- playgrounds - great for 2 year olds but not sure for older children.

## NEIGHBOURHOOD DESIGN GROUP

The group discussing neighbourhood design was facilitated by Rob Purdon, Purdon & Associates.

Three topics were posed for discussion:

1. what are the different parts of a suburb?
2. illustrations/types
3. Amaroo neighbourhood outline plan (details)

### 1. *What are the different parts of a suburb?*

- what is the relationship with the landscape?
- scope for the developer to change elements
- concern with differences between Territory Plan and what is built
- suburbs are not always driven by good design (ie Ngunnawal)
- prescribe, or controls and enforcement on developers
- no room for small parks after development
- parks/open space built prescribed by Government
- waterways & pathways considered to be parks ie. leftover bits of land that can't be re-sold
- park area needs to be useable
- plans developed in consultation with PALM
- developers aware of market demand (block size, mix) and costs, ie. through joint ventures, reasonable return to Government
- market helps drive open space/park provision, tree retention

### 2. *Illustrations/types*

Parks (small) with houses facing and overlooking: excellent example

- there are also other ways ie edge streets, courtyards to parks
- minimise rear fences while maintaining privacy (ie courtyards)

Rear fence to park - poor relationship

- close to stormwater drain
- nice straight path
- park is not developed is useable

Street (Grant St)- great street

- width 18-20m/6.0/18-20
- substantial trees
- nice and shady
- allows very large trees
- is there a case for a range of street sizes?
- size of blocks/streets should not drive the standard of streetscape provided (ie you can tell the more expensive streets by the sizes of public and street spaces)
- needs to be balanced against higher premiums
- should build equity into land development issues

Location of garage to street

- turn garage address into an alley/service area
- Radburn style of subdivision turns back on the street
- much learned since this time (lease and development conditions)
- builders do not buy as many house blocks in a row any more

- orientation of buildings very important to energy costs
- size of block and house determined by street orientation
- design to maximise solar efficiency
- difficult to find this type of block/house orientation to buy
- side of house facing north (living areas) is better
- complex issue for street design

3. *Amaroo Neighbourhood Outline Plan (details)*

- concern about developing on higher ground
- who makes these decisions?
- retain groups of trees for parks
- large tree stands: poor quality
- high value trees spread randomly
- high quality tree retention is important, can only be retained on large blocks
- trees identified for retention should be retained by developers
- different types of places require different treatments (ie no trees for kick about areas)
- parks for visual value (passive)
- variety of park sizes and types
- what is a park?!
- recreation park provision (BMX track)
- activity by the ponds may not only be local
- what is rationale for removal of horseshoe? pond
- more small ponds upstream
- use that area for playing fields/planned centre
- what is a planned centre?
- fitness areas around lakes not provided in Gungahlin
- defend promenade: residents want to be close to attractive land, access to those resources
- buyers need to be told that these things won't change
- shown on implementation plans
- need for teenage facilities (promenade/lakeside, basketball/handball courts)
- facilities not provided until residents request
- developers provide facilities without being told
- roads always appear to be north-south (sun in your eyes)
- can't see where residents can say is ours (ie. theatre community owned/run)
- park is good when not raining
- amphitheatre at Lake Ginninderra
- school facilities too expensive.

*APPENDIX C*

**NORTH GUNGAHLIN STRUCTURE PLAN REVIEW  
KEY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOPS REPORT  
HELD NOVEMBER 2001**

**PLANNING AND LAND MANAGEMENT**

## INTRODUCTION

This report provides a summary of the issues raised and discussed in a series of workshops undertaken on the brochure *North Gungahlin - Planning for New Suburbs*. It outlines the workshop structure, summarises the key issues and planning principles identified, and provides a detailed account of the participants and discussions that took place in each workshop.

Planning and Land Management (PALM) commenced a review of the Gungahlin Structure Plan in 1998 to examine the planning for North Gungahlin. The original planning for this area commenced in the 1970's, and the first detailed plans were produced in the late 1980's. Since that time Gungahlin has seen significant change, including the identification of environmentally significant sites, a change in the population structure and economy of Canberra, and issues of sustainability have become increasingly important in urban planning. Additionally, when the original planning for Gungahlin was undertaken, there were no residents. The presence of a community now means their input can be incorporated into the review.

As part of the consultation program on the draft North Gungahlin Structure Plan review, PALM released a brochure for community comment which outlined how the results of previous consultations have been incorporated into the draft Structure Plan, and to test the guiding principles on which the draft Structure Plan is based. The brochure was released for community comment on 3 September 2001 for a three-month period until 7 December 2001. This series of four workshops formed one component of the activities undertaken as part of the community consultation program by PALM during this period.

The workshops were held during November 2001, each focussing on a theme, to which relevant government agencies and key community groups with interests pertaining to that theme were invited. The four themes were:

- Environmental Values
- Creating Communities
- Effective Use of Resources
- Sense of Place

Each workshop began with an introduction and outline of the structure planning process. This was followed by an opportunity for each participant to express the values and issues that they believed were of importance for the North Gungahlin Structure Plan. Subsequent discussions were directed at and focused around aspirations for the structure plan. The final session of the workshop then looked at the guiding principles outlined in the brochure for the structure plan to test them against the issues and aspirations raised. Those guiding principles are Open Space, Road Network, Schools, Shops and Housing.

The issues and values expressed by each participant have been recorded verbatim from white board notes taken by the facilitator, and minutes that were also taken. For ease of reporting and interpretation, the aspirations expressed have been grouped under the following headings: Planning Policy, Urban Design, Infrastructure, Environmental Management, Landscape, Heritage, Community, and Regional Planning. The discussion around the testing of the Structure Plan principles was recorded in dot point form as issues were mentioned and discussed.

## **1. SUMMARY OF ISSUES RAISED**

### **1.1. SESSION 1 - ENVIRONMENTAL VALUES**

**Thursday 8 November 2001, 2.00 – 4.30**

#### *Values and Issues*

The values and issues raised by participants included the implementation of sustainable urban design and innovative urban management strategies; the management of the interface with the surrounding development, particularly in relation to bushfire; the sub-regional context in which the area sits; the management of stormwater and water features; the type and function of open space; the management and retention of flora and fauna; the protection of landscape features; existing constraints and opportunities to the development; creating communities for future residents; and the historical context of the area including the Ngunnawal people.

#### *Aspirations*

Aspirations for the Structure Plan expressed by the group were spread across seven of the broad headings. Urban design elements featured strongly, such as the importance of variety in housing, built form and densities. High quality streetscapes and community spaces were raised frequently. In keeping with an underlying theme of the sustainability which directed much of the discussion, provision for 'soft' infrastructure and a variety of transport options including adequate pedestrian and cycle paths were mentioned.

Discussions also focussed heavily on environmental management including designing with nature to account for the ecological values contained within the North Gungahlin area, specifically the Horse Park wetlands and numerous waterways and features. Other aspirations for the Structure Plan included maintaining the landscape amenity, providing for social diversity in a range of places for community activities and the need to develop a regional vision for North Gungahlin.

#### *Testing the Structure Plan Principles*

Testing of the Principles generated a detailed discussion which culminated in a new set of principles, taking priority over the existing principles that were seen as secondary. The proposed guiding principles include Water, Recreation, Conservation, Landscape and Aesthetic Values, Soil/land/air capability, and Cultural Resources.

Numerous other key principles were also identified for directing the development of the Structure Plan to encompass the range of issues and aspirations that had been raised. These included renaming the existing Road Networks principle to Movement Systems to broaden the scope of transport options. The clustering of community facilities to improve surveillance and staging, and use of locational criteria for those facilities to improve trip times, and respond to areas of natural interest were clearly identified as necessary principles to achieve the 'village' concept. Recognition of the surrounding environments and communities, and the identification of the values shaping the design of the future suburbs were also suggested as principles to guide the Structure Plan.

### **1.2. SESSION 2 – CREATING COMMUNITIES**

**Tuesday 13 November 2001, 2.00 – 4.30**

#### *Values and Issues*

The values and issues raised by participants included accessible and equitable distribution of social infrastructure including schools, colleges and community facility sites; affordable housing and

mixture of contemporary housing types, integration of new community with existing community; schools and non-school based community partnerships; recreation facilities for marginalised groups to ensure a livable and rewarding community; opportunities for youth accommodation and employment; retention of hilltops for recreation; need for an employment base; greater incentives and facilities required to encourage cycling and public transport use; and housing densities and associated social problems.

### *Aspirations*

In keeping with the theme of this workshop, the aspirations for North Gungahlin expressed by this group focussed principally on the 'community' heading. The flexible and multi-purpose use of schools for activities aside from education for all sectors of the community was strongly supported. The need for a variety of open space areas to cater for formal and informal recreational activities, that can be maximised by community groups and include facilities for all age groups was frequently raised. Access to all community facilities including open space was also seen as a necessary planning consideration. Other aspirations included the establishment of an employment base, the need for interpretive material to allow new residents to understand and get a sense of belonging to the new area, and that the Structure Plan act on comments raised by the community for the new area.

Discussions also centred around urban design, particularly in regard to housing and its affordability, the provision of public housing, clustering higher densities around shopping centres, and housing styles which build on the features and environmental values of the new suburbs. The relationship to, and compatibility between housing and open space to ensure safe and effective recreation areas was also seen as an important element for the structure plan. Provision for all modes of transport, both motorised and non-motorised in a sustainable manner was also raised.

### *Testing the Structure Plan Principles*

As with the previous workshop, this component of the workshop also considered the current principles before expanding on the existing set and generating additional key principles. The group suggested that the 'Road Network' guiding principle be broadened to cater for other forms of transport and access to them, and be renamed 'Transport Network'. The 'Schools' principle was considered to be too narrow, suggested amendments including the various forms of child care available within the community, and locational criteria to ensure integration with shops and public transport. It was suggested that the 'Housing' principle be broadened to include affordable housing, and a mix of housing to cater to lifestyle, not solely income.

The group also suggested numerous other guiding principles for consideration in forming the Structure Plan that included the issues raised in earlier discussions. A 'Landscape' theme emerged with several suggestions for principles such as the use of water to guide urban form, maintain open areas and influence design for water reuse, and maintenance of the landscape for the values it contains and linkages with community facilities. The use of streetscape elements such as wider streets and verges to improve landscape character in new areas was also suggested.

In a similar way, an 'Employment' theme emerged with suggested principles including creating opportunities for the dispersal of public and private employment, relocation of public offices and national institutions into the area, creating opportunities for a mix of employment entry and skill level amongst the community, a concentration of services to generate a flow on in employment growth, and creating opportunities for peripheral businesses that respond to the environmental characteristics of the area. Other principles included locating recreation facilities and areas on appropriate gradients and integrating them with, shops, schools and public transport, and crime prevention through the design of the built form and landscaped areas.

### **1.3. SESSION 3 – EFFECTIVE USE OF RESOURCES**

**Wednesday, 14 November 2001, 2.00 – 4.30pm**

#### *Values and Issues*

The participants at this workshop raised values and issues for the effective use of resources that included the sustainable management of water resources and open space; population sequence; consistency with the National Capital Plan; strategic approach to housing location and densities; integration of the new area with the Gungahlin Town Centre, particularly in relation to the implementation of the retail structure; protection of environmental and cultural values for ecological, recreation and landscape needs; sustainable transport options including cycling; affordability; the form, staging and long term maintenance costs of infrastructure, and the impacts of the development on existing infrastructure; linkages to adjoining areas and edge management; provision for timely emergency service access; certainty of planning process; and formal and informal recreation areas.

#### *Aspirations*

Aspirations expressed by this group centred strongly around urban design issues. As with previous groups, there was a strong focus on the need for different types of residential accommodation across a range of age groups, family structure and household income, on a variety of block sizes. Clustering housing to enhance resource use, economise on services, improve landscape and shift cost was identified as important elements to the achievement of water sensitive urban design. The use of rapid transit public transport to link high density residential areas with the city centre was identified as important. Taking the development front to the north of the Gungahlin Town Centre, rather than to the south-east was expressed as desirable to improve public transport in Gungahlin and improve the interactions between the new and existing area. The function of small shopping areas to service local needs, and flexible district centres that allowed upper story residential use were seen as an important structure to support but not compete with the town centre. The consideration of likely future changes in house land values when planning these areas was also raised.

Aspirations also centred around environmental management including integration of the Structure Plan with the rest of Gungahlin to develop opportunities for the most effective use of corridors. Utilising existing areas of significant features such as the Horse Park wetlands and building on volunteer groups was seen as a model for managing the values contained within the local environment. Opportunities for demonstrating best management practice for the local environment were also expressed as examples for generating employment, in addition to other strategies to encourage employment growth.

#### *Testing the Structure Plan Principles*

Along similar results from other workshops, the group testing the principles were keen to broaden the existing principles and suggest additional guiding principles. 'Movement Corridors' was supported as an alternative to 'Road Networks' incorporating functions additional to people and traffic movement such as open space, landscape and drainage.

As 'Open Space' relates to significantly different land uses, it was suggested it be divided according to its functions of conservation, recreation and drainage. These include principles for dealing with conservation areas to encourage protection of significant features, incorporate buffer areas, provide for habitat and protection of environmental values within the urban area. The 'Schools', 'Shops' and 'Housing' principles were all seen as too specific and ignoring other uses such as community facilities. It was suggested that the schools principle be broadened to define a strategic approach to their location, function and flexibility to define their role in the creation of communities. Ensuring

that opportunities for local shopping are equal for all residents, that the scale and hierarchy of centres is defined, and that their sequencing does not impede the development of the town centre were identified as key principles for shops. Principles that challenge the association of high value landscapes with low density, high value housing, strategically locate high density housing and create attractive urban environments were suggested for residential development.

Other principles generated by the discussion to direct the Structure Plan included the opportunities to incorporate landscape features into the urban area, and the need to build on the relationship between the environment and community to develop a 'sense of place' within each area that is not reliant on the built form. Maximising opportunities to balance open space with economic and social considerations, and creation of local industry-type opportunities were suggested as examples of the type of economic principles necessary to guide the Structure Plan.

## **1.4. SESSION 4 – SENSE OF PLACE**

**Tuesday, 20 November 2001,**

### *Values and Issues*

Despite the smaller attendance at this workshop, issues and values raised were many and varied including functional urban design in road networks, residential streetscapes and open space systems; the integration of schools into the community; integration of urban villages; sense of place for each suburb through design; development of the town centre in co-ordination with this area along similar principles, bus routes; long term viability and flexibility within retail centres; asset quality and long term maintenance; employment; greater level of certainty and clarity in planning and achievement of planning outcomes; interactions between public and private spaces; and inclusion of Gungahlin in the overall context of Canberra as the 'Garden City'.

### *Aspirations*

Aspirations expressed by members of this group touched on several of the broad headings but focussed primarily on planning policy and urban design. The importance of detailed guiding principles in the Territory Plan and Structure Plan, reducing the use of defined land provisions, and ensuring that principles are developed and implemented were all raised by participants as key policy initiatives to ensure the effective implementation of the structure plan and greater clarity in planning.

Discussion here also focussed heavily on urban design issues, including the need for more detailed work to convey place making intentions and develop themes for each suburb to ensure character. Frontage to streets by high density developments, quality of streetscape, and quality controls to ensure character of place were seen as important elements. Other aspirations included resolution of the open space network to delineate the type of space and its relationship with urban development, learning from good and bad examples of higher density residential development to ensure mistakes are not repeated, and that design is directed by liveability issues rather than profit driven.

### *Testing the Structure Plan Principles*

Discussions around the existing guiding principles focussed on the need for all principles to be related to create a community with the full range of services from each guiding principle available. Expanding on the principles, suggestions included the Housing principle be improved by offering choice in style to cater to varying family and economic situations. The Road Network principle was seen as limited in scope, its focus to emphasise open space, path networks and the human scale of the street. Suggested improvements to the principles for Open Space included provision of high quality open space for effective usage by all sectors of the community, setting a hierarchy of parks, consideration of social outcomes in high density areas, and altering the perception of space as a burden to that of an asset on which to build community partnerships.

The group proposed a diverse range of additional principles across several issues. Their aims to encourage the use of existing features and landscape in design, pick up on the cultural values of the existing residents to achieve a cohesive community, and design to minimise vandalism and maximise the use of public spaces. Principles to recognise the high level of car ownership in design, both in residential areas and in mixed use areas for employees were raised. Public transport featured strongly in discussion for principles of planning a network which is efficient in the context of the open space system, is flexible and locates bus stops within specified distances of all residences. Economic principles were also proposed by this group to ensure that the design considers the long term maintenance of assets and high use areas.

## **1.5. NEXT STEPS**

Following the close of consultation on the *North Gungahlin – Planning for New Suburbs* brochure, all comments received and the detailed discussions and issues raised in this series of workshops will be consolidated for consideration and incorporation into the draft Structure Plan.

This revised document will then form the basis for the preparation of a Draft Variation to the Territory Plan (DVP), Preliminary Assessment (PA) and Background Report. Both the DVP and PA require formal statutory consultation processes. Community consultation will be undertaken through these processes in accordance with the requirements of the *Land (Planning and Environment) Act 1991*.