



Stakeholder Consultation Report

Summary of community stakeholder briefings

Conducted 31 March 2011

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|----------|
| Executive Summary | 3 |
| Background | 4 |
| Objectives..... | 4 |
| Execution & Participation | 5 |
| Consultation feedback | |
| Table of Areas of Interest & Questions | 6 |
| Consultation outcomes | 7 |
| Appendix A | |
| Royal Far West – Feedback Form | 8-9 |

COMMUNITY STAKEHOLDER BRIEFINGS

Executive summary

The majority of representatives at the community stakeholder briefings were positive and accepting of the Royal Far West (RFW) concept plan and the potential for urban renewal, with some concerns expressed.

There was a high level of interest, constructive questioning and debate at all briefings.

The following are the headline observations arising from the briefings:

- There was universal consensus that the current RFW clinical services building on South Steyne was dilapidated, rapidly approaching its functional use-by-date and in need of replacement.
- There was broad support for the renewal of RFW properties on South Steyne and Wentworth Street, provided the following conditions are met:
 - the height and design of any new buildings does not adversely impact on local amenity;
 - potential local traffic impacts are anticipated and addressed;
 - there is minimal or no interruption to clinical services for country children during construction.
- There was general acknowledgement that at present there was a shortage of adequate visitor accommodation (hotel) facilities in the Manly area.

Background

The community stakeholder briefings were required because:

- Proposed re-developments of RFW properties in Wentworth Street and South Steyne, Manly were declared major projects (Part 3A) for the purpose of planning assessment in November 2010.
- RFW is in the process of preparing an Environmental Assessment (EA) for submission to the Department of Planning (DoP).
- Consultation with key stakeholders must to be undertaken in accordance with the DoP 'Guidelines for Major Project Community Consultation 2007.'

Objectives

The community stakeholder group briefings were held to:

- Provide community stakeholders with an opportunity to gain a greater understanding of the RFW concept plan;
- Provide community stakeholders with an opportunity to raise issues of concern in a face-to-face setting;
- Allow RFW to respond directly to any issues of concern;
- Strengthen important long-term relationships in the local community;
- Assist in shaping the final EA document;
- Ensure compliance with the Director General's Requirements (No. 18) that 'an appropriate and justified level of consultation' take place in accordance with DoP guidelines.

Execution & Participation

- In accordance with DoP guidelines for consultation, key stakeholders were identified as individuals and groups directly impacted by the proposal or likely to have an interest in the local or regional impacts of the proposal.
- As a result, representatives of the following stakeholder groups were invited to attend group briefing sessions on Thursday 31 March 2011:
 - Royal Far West staff and volunteers
 - Manly Council – Mayor, councillors and planning staff
 - Department of Education and Training
 - Manly Village School
 - Royal Far West School / RFW School Council
 - Manly Community Centre, Wentworth Street
 - IPN Medical Centre (tenant - South Steyne)
 - Australian Doctors International (tenant – Elsie Hill building)
 - Two adjacent landholders from Victoria Parade.
- All groups accepted the invitation offer with the exception of the adjacent landholders who were unavailable (separate briefing date offered).
- Approximately 50 attendees across five sessions were addressed by Jann Kingston, CEO of RFW, and Ian Cady, Associate Director at Urbis.
- The briefing incorporated the following elements:
 - Evolution of RFW and its connection to the Manly community
 - Overview of RFW services, governance principles and funding streams
 - Key drivers of the redevelopment proposal
 - Step-by-step description of the Major Project planning process
 - Status update of the RFW concept plan in the Major Project planning process
 - Elements of Environmental Assessment and Project Team members
 - Description of existing DCP height controls for Manly
 - Presentation of the RFW Concept Plan including proposed heights (up to G+11) and floor space ratios for new buildings; built form diagrams including 3D massing, shadow diagrams, architectural impressions of indicative street views and contextual height diagram of the Manly beachfront.
- Prior consultation had occurred with State MP for Manly, Mike Baird and the RFW Board.
- Further consultation is planned with existing tenants of the Elsie Hill building on Wentworth Street.

Consultation feedback

The following questions by area of interest were raised during the stakeholder briefing sessions:

| Area of interest | Questions |
|-------------------------------------|--|
| Purpose of project | What is the main driver of the redevelopment project? What are the 'public benefit' merits of the project? |
| Proposed height of buildings | How does the proposed height of the hotel building compare to Manly DCP height controls? How does the proposed height of the hotel building compare to other existing buildings in Manly? Why is the proposed height of the corner feature (South Steyne & Wentworth St.) taller than that proposed for the rest of the street frontage? Will the proposed hotel building cause shadowing on the beach? Are there any potential privacy impacts on Manly Village School? |
| Proposed scale of buildings | What is the total floor space of the proposed new buildings? How does the proposed clinical floor space compare with existing clinical floor space? |
| Project cost | What is the estimated total cost of redevelopment project? Will there be a commitment to 'financial openness' with the community? |
| Project timing | What is the earliest time that construction could commence? What is the proposed timeframe to complete the project? |
| RFW School | Who owns the land that currently houses the RFW school? Have tenure details with the Department of Education been resolved? Will the RFW school be maintained as part of the redevelopment? If yes, where is it likely to be located? |
| Green Space | Will there be any green space maintained for use by the children at the RFW school? |
| Clinical services | How many children does RFW provide treatment for each year? Are you proposing to expand the range of clinical services for country kids under the redevelopment? |
| Project funding structure | How is it proposed to fund the new clinical service building? Will the RFW properties on South Steyne be retained or sold? Has RFW investigated all of the potential financing models (e.g. link with surrounding landowners; St. Patrick's lease model)? |
| Clinical services funding | Why does NSW Health not cover 100% of RFW's clinical service costs? |
| Drummond House | Will Drummond House be maintained under the proposed redevelopment? What function will Drummond House serve? |
| Hotel operation | How many rooms would the proposed hotel have? Have discussions commenced with hotel operators? Is there enough visitor demand for a hotel at Manly? |
| Car parking | Will there be provision for parking for RFW staff? Will there be additional public parking? Have you considered approaching Council about building a car-par under Wentworth St. that adjoins Council's existing car-park? |
| Manly 2015 | Has consideration been given to integration with Council's Manly 2015 plan? |
| Elsie Hill residents | Will there be provision to accommodate existing residents of Elsie Hill within the new development? |

c a t o
c o u n s e l

Consultation outcomes

The majority of participants seemed to have a high level of satisfaction with the level of information and the responses to questions provided about the concept plan on the day.

There was universal acknowledgement of the need to upgrade Royal Far West's existing clinical building, and a high degree of in-principle support for the proposed concept plan.

The main issue of contention that was consistently raised throughout the group sessions related to the proposed height (G+11) of the hotel / visitor accommodation building on South Steyne. The chief concern centred on consistency with surrounding developments, and potential shadowing of Manly beach was a secondary concern.

This was the same chief concern raised by the Member for Manly, Mike Baird, in an earlier consultation, despite his general endorsement of greater visitor accommodation in Manly.

It was observed by some attendees that although there are a few examples of buildings of this height and above on the Manly beachfront, it would be preferable if the height of the proposed buildings were more consistent with those on surrounding streets. The height of the residential building above the Council car park in Wentworth St. was raised as a more appropriate benchmark. This was also consistent with the view expressed by Mr Baird.

The majority of other questions and issues raised during the group briefing sessions tended to be of lesser concern and were generally answered to the satisfaction of attendees on the day. Some issues that were raised, for example the model of project funding and the status of negotiations with the Department of Education over land, are the subject of further deliberation and discussion respectively.

Royal Far West committed to follow-up on a suggestion from the Manly Council briefing session that the Council's 'Manly 2015' plan (yet to be released) be referenced prior to the lodgement of the EA with a view to considering the longer-term transport vision for the beachfront precinct.

All attendees were advised of the opportunity to provide further comments or feedback or seek more information about the Concept Plan via the attached feedback form (see Appendix A) which was available.

-ends-

c a t o
c o u n s e l



Have your say about the Royal Far West Concept Plan

Please complete this form and return to registration desk or:

Post **Todd Hayward, Cato Counsel:**
 8-12 Ann Street, Surry Hills NSW 2010
Fax **9212 0211**
Email: **todd@catocounsel.com.au**

Please be as specific as possible.

If you wish to provide additional feedback please feel free to append it to this form.

What do you like most about the Concept Plan that you have viewed today?

What do you like least about the Concept Plan?



Do you have any further comments on the Royal Far West Concept Plan at this stage?

To help us continue to make our consultation an effective process, is there any additional information that you would have liked at the Information Session that wasn't provided?

To help us understand the context of your feedback, please provide the following information:

Name *(optional)* _____

Your Street Name _____

Your Suburb _____

Are you a resident in the area? *(please tick)* ☐ Yes ☐ No

Are you a business operator in the area? *(please tick)* ☐ Yes ☐ No

Organisation *(if applicable)* _____

Do you own a property in the area, but live elsewhere? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Thank you for your feedback