



GREATER  
SYDNEY  
PARKLANDS

## Meeting summary

### Callan Park community trustee board - Meeting 3, 2025

Date: Wednesday, 15 October 2025

Time: 6:00-8:00pm

Venue: Patrick Wright Room, Writing NSW (Garry Owen House, Callan Park)

#### Attendees

**CTB members:** Keith Irving (Chair), Louisa Larkin, Deborah Lennis, Stephen Conaty, Roslyn Burge, Nicholas Lewis and Cr Kerrie Fergusson

**GSP staff:** Callantha Bringham, Director Strategy, Design and Delivery; and Paula Tomkins, Senior Manager Parkland Planning

**Workshop facilitators:** Jen Guice and Phoebe Schumacher, Cred Consulting

**Secretariat:** Jenny Gleeson, A/Senior Manager Community Engagement

Topic	Summary
<p><b>Welcome and opening</b></p> <p>Keith Irving, Chair, Callan Park CTB</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The meeting was opened by the Chair. The Chair welcomed new community member, Nicholas Lewis.</li> <li>An Acknowledgment of Country was given.</li> <li>No conflicts of interest were declared.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Draft Plan of Management (Workshop - Part A)</b></p> <p>Cred Consulting + Callantha Bringham, Director Strategy, Design and Delivery; and Paula Tomkins, Senior Manager Parkland Planning, GSP</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GSP provided an overview of the statutory purpose and role of the plan of management (PoM), noting the legislative requirements.</li> <li>Cred Consulting provided an overview of the high-level themes arising from early feedback received during the exhibition period to date.</li> <li>The CTB shared community feedback heard so far during the exhibition period:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>many different reasons people love/use the park and the challenge to strike a balance.</li> <li>Diverse views about some uses e.g. sport and dogs/dog walkers.</li> <li>Lack of reference to the importance of community sports, its long-standing connection to the park, and health and wellbeing benefits.</li> <li>Opportunity to explore reuse of the disused buildings.</li> <li>Mixed feedback regarding the vision statement.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>



Topic	Summary
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CTB member feedback on the PoM vision: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Need to amplify some words/be more inspiring. Encourage greater recognition of Callan Park's uniqueness.</li> <li>- Heritage significance is missing; noting Callan Park is listed on the State Heritage Register. Acknowledge that Callan Park is a complex site due its history and uses.</li> <li>- The inclusion of the term "wellbeing" captures the relaxation and therapeutic uses of the park.</li> <li>- Need clearer wording to ensure long-term applicability. The PoM exists for up to 10 years, so need to get this right.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• CTB member feedback on document overall: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- This high-level document retains flexibility for what can happen in the park in the future.</li> <li>- Community sport/recreation (organised and unstructured) not sufficiently represented.</li> <li>- Alternate views regarding sport.</li> <li>- Opportunities to use empty buildings to address future community needs could be included.</li> <li>- Some concern about park visitor statistics.</li> <li>- Language used is important to guide the NSW Government in what the community wants. Concern that vague language may open-up opportunities for park use that the community does not support.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The CTB discussed whether the draft plan meets its functional requirements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Interim land use framework areas do not add up to 100% which provides flexibility in transitioning interim uses to other uses over the life of the plan.</li> <li>- Cafes appear in both structured and unstructured recreation. GSP advised that the PoM doesn't mean that GSP won't consult on these uses as opportunities arise.</li> <li>- Transparency regarding leasing/licencing is important. Tenant attraction/management also important.</li> <li>- Buildings and landscapes are lumped together in the plan; should be separate as their future is not being decided together; not the same as the natural environment.</li> <li>- The cultural landscape broadly is what makes the park "fly" and "sing"; would like to see inclusion of the words "cultural landscape".</li> </ul> </li> <li>• What works well in the draft plan? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Diverse park uses are covered well.</li> <li>- High-level document retains flexibility in what can happen in the park in the future.</li> <li>- Photo use/selection.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• What could be improved? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- To what extent are things happening beyond the park considered, including Cecily Street building and Leichhardt Oval upgrade?</li> <li>- Single ownership: Unclear which agency would own the park. Ambiguity makes some stakeholders nervous.</li> <li>- The plan needs people to make it happen. One member noted preference for the return of an onsite manager, accessible to the public.</li> <li>- Tree references welcomed, noting however most reference maintaining trees.</li> <li>- Need more cultural activity in Callan Park, currently only filming.</li> <li>- No bibliography; want to see inclusion of data to support recommendations.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• The CTB made the following comments and queries regarding next steps:</li> </ul>



Topic	Summary
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- GSP's response to the related actions from Meeting 2, 2025 were noted regarding the 'approval' requirements for the CTB.</li> <li>- The CTB requests sufficient time to consider the final plan (post-exhibition) before meeting to 'endorse' or 'approve' the final plan.</li> <li>- When is the CTB likely to receive the next iteration of the plan, incorporating the community and stakeholder feedback received during the exhibition period? GSP advised the anticipated timing is early 2026.</li> <li>- Will a What we Heard (WWH) report be published? Yes.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Draft Access, Movement and Parking Strategy (Workshop - Part B)</b></p> <p>Cred Consulting + Callantha Bringham, Director Strategy, Design and Delivery; and Paula Tomkins, Senior Manager Parkland Planning, GSP</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The CTB appreciates that their feedback, provided in the first term, has informed preparation of some elements of this draft plan. Gratifying to see the suggested system for improved access and movement coming to fruition.</li> <li>• The CTB shared key community feedback on the draft plan heard so far during the exhibition period: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Generally positive feedback; appreciate seeing the proposals through maps, routes etc.</li> <li>- General acceptance of rationale for closing Waterfront Drive.</li> <li>- Spread parking rather than concentrate.</li> <li>- Some concern the road changes are to accommodate increased sporting uses.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• CTB feedback by individual members on the draft plan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The PoM elements are important to focus on e.g. one-way vehicular loop. Concentrating traffic in one place has merit. Potential to retain Wharf Road as two way and include turning circles near the playing fields to help with drop off/pick up. This would remove the need to funnel sporting related traffic through the rest of the park, around the Kirkbride.</li> <li>- The swim site will require broad public access to Waterfront Drive. People need an easy, accessible way to get there to utilise the swim site. Can a shorter way in/out of Waterfront Drive be found?</li> <li>- Suggest a circular bus needed to improve movement throughout the park.</li> <li>- Prefer pedestrian paths separated from cyclists, given high-speed cyclists frequenting Callan Park.</li> <li>- Why not same emphasis to get people in off Balmain Road as there is for getting people in off the Bay Run into Callan Park.</li> <li>- Where is reference to Supply Road becoming pedestrianised, apart from emergency vehicles? The draft strategy is specific in relation to some roads, less specific about others.</li> <li>- Concern regarding Leichhardt Oval game days, especially once redeveloped.</li> <li>- Concern regarding proposed location of some of the shared paths through the central part of the park.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• GSP advised the strategy is a high-level document for the park as a whole. The POM identifies the need to prepare master plans for each management area. The CTB suggested an additional FAQ explaining this and add a note in the final plan that this pathway lines etc are indicative.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Correspondence and other business / Next steps, thanks and close</b></p> <p>Keith Irving, Chair, Callan Park CTB</p>	<p><b>Action: When will public engagement on the draft Conservation Management Plan occur?</b></p> <p><b>Action: GSP to distribute the draft 2026 CTB meeting schedule by end of November 2025.</b></p> <p><b>Action: GSP to provide an update on GSP/IWC MOU.</b></p>

