

Great picnics with family and friends 72 comments

This theme captures one of the key reasons many respondents visit the park, as it is conducive to an picnic. Respondents appreciated the picnic-related facilities offered by the park such as BBQ areas, tables and seating.

Comments included:

- *Picnics*
- *Tables for lunch*
- *BBQs with family and friends*

Great for everyone to meet and socialise 69 comments

Comments included:

- *It's the People's Park*
- *For everyone*
- *Great place to meet friends*
- *Caters for all*
- *Something for everyone*
- *Feels like a community space*
- *Space for all to enjoy*
- *All people can enjoy it*
- *Open to everyone*
- *Suits all walks of life*

Birdlife 61 comments

Comments included:

- *Birds*
- *Swans*
- *Feeding the ducks/birds*
- *Ducks*
- *Watching bird life*

Ponds 61 comments

Comments included:

- *Ponds*
- *Lakes*
- *Water*

A special feel about the park 58 comments

This theme refers to the notion that there is a special feeling within the park that people experience when they visit. Many respondents commented on the feeling they get upon entering the park, which gives them a sense of well being. This encourages many to visit the park regularly.

Comments included:

- *Love this place*
- *Everything is special*
- *It's so great*
- *It's magical*
- *Even in the rain - gumboots and kids*
- *Favourite place*
- *Foresight to set this land aside - wonderful*
- *Favourite place in Sydney and whole world*
- *Fantastic place*
- *Very poetic*
- *Casual discovery - always changing with the seasons - you just keep getting to know it*

Kiosk, cafe and dining facilities 57 comments

Comments included:

- *Coffee*
- *Good that everything is in one spot e.g. coffee, toilets, restaurant*
- *The restaurant is good*
- *Cafe to meet friends*
- *Dining facilities*
- *Toilets*
- *Food is great - three levels of dining*
- *Ice-cream - especially the soft serve*
- *Ice-cream truck*

Passive recreation 51 comments

Comments included:

- *Resting places*
- *Sitting under trees and dreaming/reading*
- *Passive recreation*
- *A place for passive recreation*
- *Sitting on a bench in the sun studying*

### Good parking

46 comments

This theme captures the idea that many find the parking good and there is a general consensus that free parking is a good thing.

Comments included:

- *Free parking*
- *Public parking*
- *Good parking*

### 'For everyone'

41 comments

A park for everyone and all ages.

### Freedom

36 comments

Comments included:

- *People can make their own activities*
- *People can make their own fun*
- *Freedom*
- *A great place for kids to roam free, ride their bikes etc.*
- *No rules – less rules not more*
- *That it is not all fenced in. I grew up in the country and think it is good that city kids get to play in something that isn't too tame. There are wild parts.*

### Free entry

35 comments

There is a strong feeling amongst many of the respondents that it is fundamentally a 'peoples park', designed for the people. Therefore, respondents tended to appreciate the importance of the park being free and accessible.

Comments included:

- *Free*
- *Free to use*
- *No admission charge*

### Horses

18 comments

Comments included:

- *I like watching the horses*
- *Horses*
- *Pony rides*
- *Horse riding*
- *Equestrian*

### Exhibitions/Events

17 comments

People tend to love the idea of exhibitions and events within the park, particularly artistic expressions such as music.

Comments included:

- *Exhibitions around the park*
- *Photographic exhibition was great*
- *The sculptures in the park -could also have an exhibition*
- *Events*

### History and heritage

16 comments

This theme captures the appreciation many respondents tended to have for the history and significance of the park in the context of the wider Sydney community.

Comments included:

- *The historical elements, like the big old gates*
- *History*
- *Heritage*
- *Old landscaping*

### Friendly people

15 comments

There is a strong sense of community amongst respondents, many of whom commenting positively on the social interaction that takes place within the park.

Comments included:

- *Nice people*
- *Attracts relaxed people*
- *Friendly - no judgement*
- *Friendly people*
- *People are sociable - good mix*

### Moonlight Cinema

8 comments

This represents a very popular event held by the Park and many respondents hope to see its return, and with greater regularity.

Comments included:

- *Moonlight Cinema*
- *Moonlight Cinema – maybe should be longer*
- *Like the ruggedness Moonlight Cinema*

### Car-free days

4 comments

Pop-up bar

3 comments

Miscellaneous single comments

10 comments

Comments included:

- General layout
- Always people around
- Ranger for a day
- As a regular user haven't had much issues with people disobeying rules
- Speed limits are necessary
- Play music
- Kid's scavenger hunt
- Sunny
- Civilised
- The city end has pretty much been destroyed with Sports Office park and car parks. Disgraceful use of parkland.

Do you think Centennial Park has any weaknesses and how would you address these?

Summary of themes that emerged from this question

| Theme                                                                    | No. of comments |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|
| Speeding and aggression, by cyclists and cars                            | 81              |
| General upgrades in park amenities, especially toilets and bins          | 62              |
| Call for improvement of food and beverage facilities – more coffee!!     | 59              |
| Dissatisfaction with car congestion and parking                          | 54              |
| Some negative feedback relating to landscaping, planning and maintenance | 27              |
| Too many large-scale disruptive events                                   | 25              |
| Caution about commercial activity in the Park                            | 25              |
| Dissatisfaction with park access, safety and gate times                  | 25              |
| More dog control and cleanliness is needed                               | 24              |
| More picnic facilities                                                   | 24              |
| Some improvements are needed with children’s facilities and safety       | 24              |
| Better signs & access to information around the Park                     | 20              |
| Lack of sporting & recreational diversity and facilities                 | 19              |
| A general concern over crowding in the Park                              | 10              |
| Miscellaneous single comments                                            | 4               |
| Total comments                                                           | 483             |

Each theme is presented in further detail below.

Speeding and aggression, by cyclists and cars | 81 comments

This theme was particularly strong with many respondents calling for the speed and ‘aggression’ of cyclists to be addressed through speed-limit enforcement. Similarly, several respondents expressed concern over the speed at which some cars travel through the park. There was a call for more policing is needed for cyclists and cars.

Some respondents proposed that cars and cyclists should be kept separate through the introduction of an exclusive cycleway.

Comments included:

- Cyclists are ‘too aggressive’, and often rude
- The speed limit for cyclists needs to be enforced
- Too many dangerous car drivers, including ‘over the top’ driving
- There should be separate roads for cyclists
- There should be better policing of cycle groups – cycle groups ‘cause havoc’
- Ban peloton riding at peak times
- Poor regulation for training cyclists
- Drivers and cyclists are not aware of the rules

General upgrades in park amenities, esp. toilets and bins | 62 comments

This theme includes a broad range of facilities that respondents would like to see in the park. However, two facilities are particularly in demand according to the respondents: toilets and bins. Many respondents felt quite strongly that there are not enough of these facilities and would therefore like to see more, as well as general improvements on those that exist already.

Comments included:

- Update/increase number of toilets
- More bins
- More/better indoor sporting and recreational facilities
- Lighting for park
- More baby changing areas
- More bubblers

Call for improvement of food and beverage facilities – more coffee! | 59 comments

There is a rather strong and consistent sentiment that more food and beverage facilities are needed across the park, particularly more coffee facilities. However, people generally don't want to see more permanent structures in allowing improvement, rather they would prefer to see 'mobile' coffee and food carts so as not to disrupt the natural environment of the park. Some further patterns identified amongst the responses include the desire for a greater variety of food and beverage options, as well as cheaper food and beverage options.

Comments included:

- Better food and coffee is needed park-wide
- More mobile coffee & food carts/vans
- More cafes and restaurants in general
- The restaurant & kiosk are too expensive
- Not enough 'choice' when it comes to food & beverage
- Cafes are too crowded
- Poor service in the restaurant
- Would like to see more 'pop-up' bars

Dissatisfaction with car congestion and parking | 54 comments

A general sentiment appeared about Centennial Park being less-than-ideal in terms of car congestion, improvements with road signage, and a greater range of transport options around the park. There was also a call for more parking to be made available.

A number of people seem to want cars to disappear altogether from the park, calling for a 'hidden car park' and more 'car free' days.

Comments included:

- Too much car congestion & traffic (29)
- More parking facilities needed, including an underground car park (10)
- Too many parked cars in sight (4)
- More 'car free' days (4)
- Ban cars to make the park safer (2)
- Clear pedestrian zone (2)
- Address parking
- Calls for a free shuttle-bus service
- More road signage around the park

Some negative feedback relating to landscaping, planning and maintenance | 27 comments

Comments about the overall physical state of the park, include the cleanliness and condition of the park's features. Several comments call for better drainage following rain as this seemed to impede some people's use of the park. Similarly, respondents seemed dissatisfied with the state of the road and path surfaces.

Comments included:

- Poor road and path surfaces
- Better drainage required following rain
- More cleaning of the park is required
- Better weed control
- Needs to be as natural as possible
- Toilets not cleaned to high-enough standard
- 'Overly conservative' tree management
- The pond is too 'murky'
- Horse track is in poor condition
- Bindies in the top part of the hills hurt dog's feet
- Roots are showing up on some walkways
- Tree sponsorship is too expensive

Too many large-scale disruptive events | 25 comments

The majority of respondents mentioned there are too many large-scale events that leave some areas damaged. This theme includes some general comments relating to noise and disruption for neighbours. Some said traffic management during events is poor.

Comments included:

- Too many large scale events
- Large scale events leave some areas damaged
- Events held in the park cause too much noise/disruption for neighbours (5)
- There is a need to improve the park's relationship with its neighbours – noise restrictions during big events
- Traffic management for big events is poor

Caution about commercial activity in the park | 25 comments

This theme captures a sentiment that some park-goers are opposed to commercial activities within the park. Respondents feel strongly about protecting and preserving the park’s natural beauty, thus anything that is perceived to disrupt this is met with their disapproval.

Comments included:

- *There is a perceived commercial overuse of the park*
- *Need to regulated ‘self-interest’ groups*
- *Trainers should pay for their use of the space*
- *Remove all commercial activity*
- *Too much perceived profit motive at the cost of the park’s tranquillity*
- *Too much concrete*

Dissatisfaction with park access, safety and gate times | 25 comments

The theme broadly refers to how, and at what times, people can enter and exit the park. Respondents seem dissatisfied with how early the gates close, as well as the apparent lack of public transportation in, out and around the park.

Comments included:

- *The gates close too early*
- *A better pedestrian crossing is needed on Grand Drive*
- *Better overall access is needed*
- *There should be security at night*
- *More exit signs are needed*
- *More bus stops around the park with direct access to major centres*

More dog control and cleanliness is needed | 24 comments

This theme relates to a number of comments about the potential hazard that some dogs present, particularly to children, as well as identifying a need to facilitate greater dog cleanliness. Barring certain breeds of aggressive dogs, keeping dogs in separate areas, and introducing more dog bins were some of the logical suggestions people made.

Comments included:

- *Better control over off-leash dogs is needed*
- *People need to clean up after their dogs*
- *More dog bins are required*
- *More separate dog areas are required*
- *Greater ranger presence is required*
- *Pit bulls should be barred*
- *Young dogs are not well supervised*

More picnic facilities | 24 comments

This theme is fairly straightforward in that people clearly love to picnic in the park, however there seems to be a lack of picnic facilities according to these respondents. Some respondents seem to think the booking cost for private picnic areas is too expensive.

Comments included:

- *More BBQ areas*
- *More tables*
- *More seating*
- *Booking cost too high for picnic areas*
- *Under cover picnic areas*

Some improvements are needed with children’s facilities and safety | 24 comments

This theme relates to respondents’ demands for an increase in both the quantity and safety of children’s playgrounds. There was a general feeling that there should be separate areas with regard to particularly young children. There was also a general concern for the threat posed by cars, hence an improvement in children’s pedestrian crossings is needed.

Comments included:

- *Not enough kid’s playgrounds*
- *Fences for playgrounds are needed*
- *Safer bike zones for kids*
- *Age zones for kids*
- *More security for kids*
- *More shaded areas for playgrounds*
- *Closed off section for toddlers*
- *Bigger/more sandpits*
- *Pedestrian crossing on Grand Drive needs to be addressed*
- *Areas around the water could be more child friendly*
- *Rubber turf for playgrounds*

Better signs & access to information around the park | 20 comments

This theme captures a general wish shared by many of the respondents to have greater/easier access to information around the park. The type of information requested by ranges from signs and maps providing clearer directions about the geography and layout of the park, as well as information about the park’s history, nature and wildlife.

Comments included:

- *More signs are needed for both directions and general park information*
- *‘Points of interest’ information*
- *Lack of ‘App’ accessibility and information*
- *Education centre is too small*
- *More ‘visible’ rangers are needed*

Lack of sporting & recreational diversity and facilities | 19 comments

Some respondents desire to see a greater range of sporting and recreational activities in the Park. A key criticism was that a lack of such facilities is perceived to be the inhibiting factor for allowing such activities to occur.

Comments included:

- *Greater diversity of sport and recreation is needed*
- *Real tennis court would be great*
- *More organised sporting activities across the park*
- *Mini-golf course*
- *Skate park*

A general concern over the crowding in the park | 10 comments

This theme relates to how respondents felt about other the social interaction that takes place within the park. A general was a dissatisfaction with crowds or ‘concentrations’ of people in certain areas. Some people felt this led to a need to engender a stronger ‘sense of community’. It seems that respondents enjoy the fact other people also use the park, and that there is a level of healthy social interaction up until a certain point (when it becomes too crowded).

Comments included:

- *The park is too busy with too many people – refers to a concern for a perceived ‘tipping point’ of too many people in CP (5)*
- *More/better volunteer programs and community participation in the park*
- *Lack of ‘sense of community’ in the park*
- *Better relationship with neighbouring people and institutions is required*
- *Needs to stay relevant and reflect community values*

Miscellaneous single comments | 4 comments

Some one-off comments about the park that don’t necessarily fit within any of the general themes.

Comments included:

- *Feeding the birds makes beggars of them*
- *Empty lodging could be used as rental accommodation*
- *There should be more volunteers to pick up litter around the park*
- *The kiosk gets over-saturated*

Is anything missing from Centennial Park that you would expect to be in a park of this type?

Summary of themes that emerged from this question

| Theme                                                                        | No. of comments |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|
| More amenities across the park                                               | 64              |
| A range of recreational activities and associated facilities across the park | 44              |
| A lack of some sporting facilities                                           | 43              |
| A lack of food and beverage facilities                                       | 40              |
| More diverse trees and gardens and more habitat areas in the park            | 22              |
| Greater expression of art and culture across the park                        | 21              |
| Access to information around the park                                        | 13              |
| Some improvements needed with layout, roads and paths                        | 10              |
| Better regulations, policing and speed limit enforcement                     | 9               |
| Miscellaneous single comments                                                | 6               |
| Total comments                                                               | 272             |

Each theme is presented in further detail below.

More amenities across the park | 64 comments

There was quite a clear sentiment expressed by respondents that they wish to see more amenities across the park.

Comments included:

- More benches and seating
- More undercover areas for shade & shelter in adverse weather
- More water bubblers
- More dog-poo bins
- More BBQ areas
- Better lighting, preferably solar
- More toilets
- More general waste bins
- Tables
- Underground car park
- Better transport across the park
- Air pump stations for bikes
- Open park earlier on weekends
- More accessible areas for elderly
- More dog watering stations

A range of recreational activities and associated facilities across the park | 44 comments

This theme captures a shared sentiment amongst most of the respondents relating to an expectation to see a more diverse range of activities across the park. People were quite enthusiastic about what the park should have in terms of activities. These comments mainly refer to physical/outdoor activities, including children's facilities.

The theme above included the following comments:

- Public swimming pool
- Climbing equipment for kids)
- More sandpits for kids
- More bike hire facilities for bike riding
- Closed off play section for toddlers
- Paddle boats on the lake
- More nature walks
- Flying fox
- Swings
- Petting zoo
- Climbing wall
- Kite shows

A lack of some sporting facilities | 43 comments

There is a strong desire for ‘real’ tennis courts to be introduced into Centennial Park. To a lesser extent, respondents also want to see indoor sporting facilities and a more diverse range of sporting facilities.

Comments included:

- Real tennis courts
- Indoor sporting facilities
- More sports in general
- Skate park
- Indoor tennis
- Squash
- Free access to sport
- Outdoor exercise equipment

A lack of food and beverage facilities | 40 comments

There was a clear sentiment from these respondents that they feel there are not enough food and beverage facilities, particularly access to coffee. ‘Coffee carts’ by far seem to be the most popular idea that respondents want to see in the park. None of the respondents suggested permanent structures are needed. Rather, the respondents would prefer greater access to mobile food and beverage, so as not to ‘detract’ from the park’s natural state.

Comments included:

- Coffee carts across the park
- More varied food options
- Pop-up restaurants and bars
- Ice-cream vans

More diverse trees and gardens and more habitat areas in the park | 22 comments

Respondents want to see a greater diversity of flora, and the adoption of more sustainable practices in terms of the management of such flora.

Comments included:

- A greater diversity of tree life across the park
- Vegetable and community gardens
- More composting practices
- The implementation of a scientific advisory body
- More bushland areas
- Wildlife sanctuaries
- Horticultural educational displays

Greater expression of art and culture across the park | 21 comments

Some respondents want to see more artistic expression, in a variety of forms, throughout the Park. A number of comments emphasised the importance of disseminating historical information about the park through education centres and a museum, to facilitate a greater culture of appreciation for the park’s significance over time.

Comments included:

- More art pieces/installations across the park
- Museum for park history
- Amphitheatre for more cultural events
- Education building
- Area to read about history of park
- Water sculptures/features

Access to information around the park | 13 comments

Signs are needed to provide information about where to go and what to do. Interactive maps and access to WIFI Internet were also suggestions.

Comments included:

- More signs are needed
- WIFI internet access
- Signs on the history of the park
- Interactive maps
- Education programs about the park
- Signs providing plant information
- Signs providing wildlife information

Some improvements needed with layout, roads and paths | 10 comments

This theme captures some general comments in relation to their dissatisfaction with some missing/inadequate aspects of the layout, roads and paths around CP. Many respondents emphasised a desire to see greater pedestrian safety and accessibility.

Comments included:

- Greater pedestrian access and pathways (5)
- Speed bumps on roads to slow motor vehicles down
- Safer parking facilities
- Lighting for after-dark safety/access
- Better maintenance of roads and paths
- A separate space for horses

Better regulations, policing and speed limit enforcement | 9 comments

This theme primarily captures a sentiment amongst to address the car and cyclist speeding issue. Respondents under this theme have identified a lack of policing/enforcement mechanisms. Some comments suggest ways to improve the situation.

Comments included:

- Need for rangers to better enforce the speed limits (3)
- More police presence (2)
- Better enforcement of park rules in general (2)
- More fines for speeding cars/cyclists
- More visible park staff presence

Miscellaneous single comments | 6 comments

These singular comments do not really fit under any of the other themes and include:

- Chinese garden
- Meditation space
- Face painting facilities for children
- Crossing for horses
- Sun dial
- Outdoor chess

What would you NOT wish to see in Centennial Park in the future?

Summary of themes that emerged from this question

| Theme                                                       | No. of comments |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|
| More large events                                           | 113             |
| Further development or buildings                            | 92              |
| Commercial activities in the Park                           | 66              |
| More cars or car parking                                    | 42              |
| Parking charges                                             | 31              |
| Exclusion zones                                             | 30              |
| Nothing, keep as is                                         | 29              |
| Any loss of open space                                      | 21              |
| Fast food vendors                                           | 17              |
| Hiring out parts of the park for weddings/private functions | 15              |
| More people – reached a tipping point                       | 12              |
| Cyclists' aggressive behaviour needs to stop                | 12              |
| No reduction in car parking                                 | 11              |
| Removal of trees                                            | 7               |
| Charging for park entry                                     | 7               |
| Family friendliness must stay                               | 6               |
| Speed bumps on cycle track                                  | 5               |
| Dogs in kids areas                                          | 5               |
| Public transport through the park                           | 3               |
| More rangers in the park                                    | 3               |

What would you NOT wish to see in Centennial Park in the future...cont'd?

Summary of themes that emerged from this question

| Theme                    | No. of comments |
|--------------------------|-----------------|
| Don't like car free days | 3               |
| Lights                   | 2               |
| Park character           | 2               |
| Commercial dog walker    | 2               |
| Personal trainers        | 2               |
| Likes car free days      | 2               |
| Single comments          | 11              |
| Total comments           | 551             |

Each theme is presented in further detail below.

More large events

113 Comments

This theme captures the strong sentiment shared by many of the respondents relating to their opposition to ‘large-scale’ big events, especially big music festivals. Whilst many respondents would generally like to see small-scale type festivals and events, there is a shared concern that anything overly large will have a negative impact on the park and its neighbours.

Comments included:

- *Music festivals*
- *Events*
- *Sporting events*
- *Food festivals*
- *Conventions*
- *Traffic congestion during events*
- *Pre and post event restrictions on access*
- *Anti-social behaviour by post event attendees*

Further development or buildings

92 comments

Respondents in this theme were quite emphatic with their shared anti-development sentiment. Further development is seen as a threat to this fundamental values of the park that people so treasure and any proposed form of ‘concrete’ or structure is generally not acceptable.

Comments included:

- *Amusement or theme parks*
- *Big permanent venues that detract from Nature*
- *High rise*
- *Concrete structures/constructions*
- *Roads*
- *Swimming pools*
- *Gyms*
- *Buildings*
- *Large structures/reduced parking/formalised sport*
- *Skate parks*

Commercial activities in the park

66 comments

Respondents were generally opposed to anything that may disrupt the setting and tranquillity of the park, including profit driven commercial activities. Respondents value the peace and naturalness of the park, therefore commercial activity is generally perceived to be a threat to such values.

Comments included:

- *Commercial activities in the park*
- *Anything commercial i.e. nothing that will detract from the greenery*
- *No more commercial - we don't need more bike hire or dog washers*
- *Shops*

More cars or carparking

42 comments

This theme was quite straightforward in that the majority of respondents don’t want to see an increase of cars throughout Centennial Park, and definitely don’t want to see a car park as it is perceived that this would directly facilitate an increase in traffic and people. Rather, many alternative solutions have been offered by respondents to facilities greater access to the park without increasing the number of cars, including greater levels of public transport.

Comments included:

- *Increase in the number of cars*
- *No more cars - introduce a horse and cart, or train service/light rail to stop more cars from entering*
- *Traffic*
- *No car park!*

Parking charges

31 comments

This theme relates to a shared view amongst these respondents that the park represents an escape from commercial activities for many, thus people should not have to pay to be there.

Comments included:

- *No parking fees*
- *No metres or metered parking*
- *Parking limits - want to relax all day*

Exclusion zones should not be introduced

30 comments

This theme similarly captures a key sentiment shared by these respondents: the park should be free and accessible to ‘all walks of life’. Thus, to exclude people from certain areas would run counter to this fundamental park value.

Comments included:

- *Exclusion zones or anything which denies public access*
- *Closed off natural areas*
- *Areas assigned for the sole use of particular groups*

Nothing - keep the park as is

29 comments

This theme captures quite a strong sentiment that relates to their desire to preserve their much-loved park the way it is. Many respondents tend to visit the park because it represents a ‘sanctuary’ type environment. Respondents were quite emphatic in terms of resisting any change that may threaten their sanctuary.

Comments included:

- *Nothing should be added, not necessary*
- *No activities*
- *Fine as is*
- *Keep as is!*
- *Doesn't need anything*
- *Change*
- *I like everything as it currently is*
- *I would like to see the park maintained as it is*
- *Would like to keep everything the same*

Any loss of open space 21 comments

A recurring value amongst a majority of respondents is their love of the park’s ‘openness’. Given this, it is clear that respondents are generally opposed to anything that may encroach on such openness, including buildings and developments.

Comments included:

- Don't take away the open space
- Any limiting of the open space
- Don't sacrifice green space for anything
- I wouldn't want any development to cut into free space

Fast food vendors 17 comments

This theme captures the notion that ‘fast food’ is generally regarded as incongruent with the kind of healthy, outdoor lifestyle the park promotes.

The theme above included the following comments:

- I don't want coffee carts on every corner
- No fast food - keep it healthy
- No vending machines
- McDonald's
- Ice-cream truck
- Mobile food carts. They are cheap and trashy. These should be replaced with small permanent booths for coffee and convenience retail which can be opened up for peak times

Hiring out parts of the park for private functions and weddings 12 comments

Respondents in this theme simply stated they do not believe the park is a place that should be available for private functions, including weddings.

More people – reached a tipping point 12 comments

Whilst there is a strong sense of community amongst park-goers, there is a sentiment that certain events may trigger what has been referred to as a ‘tipping point’ whereby the park becomes ‘too busy’ and full of people. Car parks and large-scale events are often met with opposition, as it is perceived these will bring ‘too many’ people into the park and disrupt its ‘tranquillity’.

Cyclists’ aggressive behaviour needs to stop 12 comments

This theme captures quite a strong sentiment relating to the dangerous speed at which many cyclists travel, in conjunction with their ‘aggressive’ behaviour. Many respondents have suggested speed limits and rule enforcement. Some respondents have suggested a separate area altogether is needed to address this issue.

Comments included:

- I do not think Centennial Park needs more sporting grounds or needs to encourage cyclists any more than it does. Children cyclists, yes, and casual cyclists, yes, but not those hard cyclists who race around in solid groups and are a menace and danger to pedestrians
- Increase in cyclists
- Large groups of cyclists
- Cyclists going faster than speed limits

No reduction in car parking 11 comments

People noted the importance of being able to park across different areas of the park. Some reminded about the importance of parking for elderly and people with a disability

Removal of trees 7 comments

Charging for park entry 7 comments

Family-friendliness must stay 6 comments

People who responded were concerned that the Park may become less family-friendly in the future.

Dogs in kids areas 5 comments

Speed bumps on cycle tracks 5 comments

Respondents said the park is a great place for cyclists, especially during the early morning and when the park is quiet.

Public transport through the park 3 comments

People mentioned both trams and buses in this theme.

More rangers in the park 3 comments

Car free days 3 comments

Lighting in the park 2 comments

Changes to park character 2 comments

The respondents mentioned futuristic or modern features, whether art or furniture that doesn’t relate to the existing character of the Park.

Commercial dog walking 7 comments

Personal trainers/boot camps 7 comments

Single Comments 11 comments

This relates to all the single comments that do not necessarily fit under any of the other themes.

Comments included:

- *Unhappy real tennis players with no place to go*
- *Horse riding or anything to do with dogs*
- *Church groups doing anything at all in the park*
- *The park is big enough I don't mind the concerts and am happy to see them continue*
- *I don't want to see a change in gate times. Otherwise the park would be dangerous*
- *Not limited in the future - suggest it and see what people think*
- *Restraint of any widening of public sport events*
- *Can't see the sense in the labyrinth*
- *The removal of the horse track or closing of the equestrian grounds. Major events should be done away from the track so riders can continue use of the track*
- *Safely fences etc. - too much OH&S!*

Is there an events/s that you WOULD LIKE to see take place in Centennial Park in the future that is not currently staged in the Park?

Is there an events/s that you WOULD LIKE to see take place in Centennial Park in the future that is not currently staged in the Park?

Summary of themes that emerged from this question

| Theme                                                                        | No. of comments |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|
| No additional events should be held in the park                              | 79              |
| Family friendly events, especially with an educational twist                 | 42              |
| Everything musical....but nothing too big!                                   | 40              |
| Sports and organised recreation across the park                              | 28              |
| Arts festivals and greater artistic expression across the park               | 26              |
| A variety of food and wine markets and festivals                             | 25              |
| A 'real tennis' facility                                                     | 18              |
| More film and cinema events                                                  | 16              |
| More fundraising events and community engagement                             | 10              |
| Educational programs and festivals relating to nature and the park's gardens | 9               |
| Car/cycle free days                                                          | 6               |
| Corporate events and fun runs                                                | 4               |
| Miscellaneous single comments                                                | 18              |
| Total comments                                                               | 321             |

Each theme is presented in further detail below.

No additional events should be held in the park | 79 comments

This theme captured comments from people who feel that overall, no additional events, and especially large music events, should be held in the park, as they are disruptive or damaging or both.

There is a feeling however, that smaller events, such as the ones below, are more acceptable to many more people.

Family friendly events, especially with an educational twist | 42 comments

Many respondents have young families and wish to see more family oriented events and festivals in Centennial Park. Respondents share a common desire to see anything that will 'entertain' the kids. A further common theme was that something with an educational element would also be ideal.

Comments included:

- Any 'fun' & 'entertaining' events for kids
- Family 'fun-run'
- Light Garden
- Pet oriented festivals
- Educational nature programs for kids
- Circus
- Christmas party for children
- Picnic days
- Federation education
- Balloon races
- Mass tree planting and nature workshops
- A concert similar to the 'Wiggles'
- Jumping castles
- Puppet shows

Is there an events/s that you WOULD LIKE to see take place in Centennial Park in the future that is not currently staged in the Park?

Music, music, music....but nothing too big! | 40 comments

Many people said they love to listen to music outdoors and want to see more music across the park. This was qualified by a majority of the respondents as preferring small-scale music festivals over larger ones.

Comments included:

- More live music across the park
- Jazz music festival
- Opera
- Local/free music
- Busking permits
- Small music concerts
- Outdoor music
- Classical music
- Symphony orchestra
- World music

Sports and organised recreation across the park | 28 comments

Respondents wanted to see more tennis events in the park. More sporting and recreational events in general, including a greater variety of sporting and recreational events, are similarly seen as a desirable outcome for respondents.

Comments included:

- Tennis events
- Bike racing
- More sporting events
- Equestrian
- Roller-blading
- Yoga
- Corporate games at lunchtime

Arts festivals and greater artistic expression across the park | 23 comments

Many of the respondents were artists themselves and wish to see more festivals, exhibitions and events held throughout the park with an artistic focus. Most respondents were quick to add that they prefer small-scale festivals over anything large scale. Similarly, respondents tended to like the idea of such festivals being outdoors rather than in an enclosed venue.

Comments included:

- Sculptures and exhibitions across the park
- Arts and crafts stalls
- Design markets)
- Photography
- Multipurpose venue for theatre
- 'Low key' theatre
- Shakespeare in the park
- Facilities for local artists

A variety of food and wine markets and festivals | 25 comments

A clear sentiment amongst respondents is their love of food and wine in an outdoor setting. It followed from many of the responses that people hope to see more food and wine festivals to cater for this love. Some more specific comments referred to more 'age related' food and wine events, as well as more 'pop-up' bars and 'farmers markets'.

The theme above included the following comments:

- Farmers or fresh food produce market
- A greater variety of food and wine festivals (but nothing big)
- Food festivals in general
- 'Pop-up' bars
- 'Pop-up' Food
- Ambient music
- Dancing in selected areas

A 'real' tennis facility | 18 comments

The Park could house a real tennis facility that would enable real tennis games to be played, as well as championships hosted.

Is there an events/s that you WOULD LIKE to see take place in Centennial Park in the future that is not currently staged in the Park?

More film and cinema | 16 comments

This theme captures the love of the ‘Moonlight Cinema’ and their wish to see more of such events, especially over a longer period. When respondents were asked the above question, more often than not this was the first answer mentioned, and with great enthusiasm.

Comments included:

- More Moonlight Cinema
- Film events
- Moonlight Cinema all year long
- Summer movies
- Kid movies

More fundraising events and community engagement | 10 comments

This theme captures the strong sense of community that respondents have in relation to the park and other people that use the park. Respondents want to utilise the park for charitable and celebratory purposes, ultimately bringing the park community together in a more meaningful way.

Comments included:

- Events for the community
- Community garden
- Greater volunteer participation
- Remembrance days
- Charity days
- Greater Australia day events/participation
- Multi-cultural celebratory events

Educational programs and festivals relating to nature and the park’s gardens | 9 comments

Appreciation for the natural beauty of the park and its gardens highlights a shared desire to learn more about the natural aspects of the park.

Comments included:

- Garden shows
- Educational nature events
- Horticultural shows
- Native plant and animal activities
- Floral festival and celebration of ‘natural world’

Car/cycle free days | 6 comments

Respondents felt these would be beneficial to the park and its visitors.

Corporate events and fun runs | 4 comments

Respondents felt these would be beneficial to the park and its visitors.

Miscellaneous other events | 18 comments

These include singular comments that don’t necessarily fit within any of the other themes:

- Ice-skating in the Park
- Remote control boat races
- County Fair
- Introduce ‘Vivid’ to Centennial Park
- Vintage car day
- Fair day for Mardi-Gras
- Boot car sales
- Fireworks on NYE
- Glynbourne-style opera concert
- Hunger Games
- Indoor functions space
- Dog swimming
- Petting zoo
- A celebration each year for the opening of the Park
- Balloon races
- Designer market
- Sculpture by the Sea (in the park)
- Serpentine Gallery Annual Pavilion Exhibition

Are there any other comments that you would like to make about Centennial Park overall?

Summary of themes that emerged from this question

| Theme                                                                           | No. of comments |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------|
| People love the park as a special place and peaceful retreat                    | 84              |
| Greater number/diversity of food and recreation facilities provided by the park | 34              |
| Don't let the park become too over developed or commercialised                  | 23              |
| A broader range of sporting facilities                                          | 18              |
| Cyclists and car controls                                                       | 14              |
| People love the gardens and greenery                                            | 9               |
| General opposition to the idea of a car park                                    | 9               |
| Keep up the good work                                                           | 5               |
| A wider range of recreation facilities                                          | 3               |
| Single miscellaneous comments, incl: 'no further comment'                       | 60              |
| Total comments                                                                  | 259             |

Each theme is presented in further detail below.

People love the park as a special place and a peaceful retreat | 84 comments

There was a clear and consistent sentiment amongst the respondents that they share a love for the park's atmosphere and that it is a truly special place for Sydney. Some said that it should remain as it is, other commented 'don't make it into an amusement park' by adding too many activities for different groups.

The theme above included the following comments:

- *The park is special as a peaceful retreat*
- *Love it all*
- *Love the park as it is*
- *Keep up the good work*
- *Well maintained*
- *Relaxing*
- *An important place for people to visit*
- *Please protect it*
- *Don't make it into an amusement park*
- *'Great treasure' of Sydney*
- *Quiet*
- *Peaceful*
- *'Favourite place'*
- *'People's park', therefore people should decide future*

Greater number/diversity of food and recreation facilities provided by the park | 34 comments

There was a collective sentiment amongst many of these respondents that more facilities in general are required across the park. These responses mostly relate to food and beverage facilities, sporting facilities and children's play

The theme above included the following comments:

- *A greater diversity of recreation facilities*
- *Children's play facilities*
- *More lunch facilities*
- *Tennis club*
- *Skate park*
- *A baby park*

Are there any other comments that you would like to make about Centennial Park overall?

### Don't let the park become too over developed or commercialised | 23 comments

This theme captures a key sentiment about CP: people don't want to see too much change in terms of 'development' and 'commercialisation'. The majority of comments under this theme relate to a common perception that there is already too much commercial activity in the park.

Within this theme, some sentiments were:

- *Already too much commercial activity*
- *Keep any necessary development to a minimum*
- *Don't let the park turn into a 'shopping centre'*
- *Don't allow any development that might encourage more people into the park*
- *Keep the park the same*
- *Don't expose the park to external influences*
- *Don't make the park into an 'amusement park'*
- *Henry Parkes dream is being destroyed by 'penny pinching bureaucracy'*

### A wider range of sporting facilities | 18 comments

This theme captures a call for more sporting facilities such as indoor sporting facility, a skate park and a real tennis court, which has received some other mentions elsewhere in the findings.

### Cyclist and car controls | 14 comments

Respondents expressed concern for the speed at which some cyclists and motorists travel on the roads. Thus they hope to see greater enforcement of speed limits and road rules.

The comment made for this theme is:

- *Cyclists don't follow the road rules*
- *Want to see more 'car free' days*
- *Need to address 'aggressive' cyclist behaviour*
- *Bikes don't stop at crossings*
- *Cyclists should be given priority over cars*

### People love the gardens and greenery | 9 comments

A consistent sentiment amongst respondents was their love for the 'natural' state of things, particularly the 'greenery' and the gardens in general.

The theme above included the following comments:

- *Love the gardens*
- *The greenery is important*
- *Love the diversity of the gardens*
- *More plants and wilderness*
- *Green space encourages social cohesion*

### General opposition to the idea of a car park | 9 comments

Respondents were generally opposed to the idea of a car park. The theme above included the following comments:

- *Better public transport in lieu of car park*
- *Strong opposition to a car park in the park*
- *If a car park is introduced, keep it in a 'concentrated area'*

### A wider range of recreational facilities | 3 comments

Comments included a call for an outdoor chess area.

### Single miscellaneous comments/no further comment | 60 comments

Singular comments that don't necessarily fit within other themes:

- *No further comment to make (50)*
- *More active marketing campaigns for donations are needed*
- *Don't use the park as a memorial site*
- *Don't overregulate the park*
- *Would like to see a Chinese garden section*
- *No more restaurants*
- *Indigenous interpretation of aboriginal history of the area*
- *It's overregulated and over signed. The Paddington gates are a maze of do's and don'ts.*
- *Get rid of sexual deviants – not in keeping with a family-friendly park*
- *Ponds need further regeneration*
- *A separate children's play area for kids over 5.*

# AREA SPECIFIC FINDINGS

Busbys Pond Area  
Federation Valley  
Learner's Cycleway  
Parade Grounds

---

Please note that data collected in the following sections was not undertaken as an activity mapping exercise, which would require a completely different approach. The activities therefore that people said they undertake in each of these areas or may not be representative of all activities undertaken in these areas at other times.

BUSBY'S POND AREA

What activities have you most recently undertaken in your nominated section of Centennial Park?

Picnics and get togethers | 22 comments

- Great for picnics
- Family day get together
- Children's birthday party
- BBQs
- Enjoying time with husband

Walking, running, bike riding, feeding ducks, photography | 17 comments

- Walking
- Bike riding
- Sports
- Feeding ducks
- Photography
- Running
- Walking the dog
- Throwing a ball around
- Bird watching

A place for relaxing | 9 comments

- Relaxation, resting, quiet time
- Meditation
- Sitting
- Reading

What do you like about your nominated section of CP?

Peacefulness, beauty and the natural environment | 25 comments

- Peacefulness
- Pretty, beautiful
- The natural environment
- Great family atmosphere
- Serenity
- 'Escape' from the city
- Relatively quiet
- Clean
- Watching the world go by

Openness, layout and accessibility | 23 comments

- Openness
- Birdlife and wildlife
- Trees and garden
- Free access
- Easy access and parking
- Well maintained
- Views of ponds
- Paved walking

A place to enjoy a variety of activities | 13 comments

- A great place to enjoy a picnic
- Café
- Well maintained
- Historic buildings
- Facilities
- Reading
- World Character
- Cycling
- Throwing a ball around
- Facilities for kids to play

Is there anything you don't like about your nominated section of CP and how would you improve this?

Rubbish, lack of seating and rotundas, noise, crowding and booking fees | 13 comments

- Lack of seating, rotunda, tables
- Upgrade of facilities
- Too much garbage – more bins, rubbish collection
- Too noisy
- Too crowded in the middle of the day
- Dirty walks and shores
- People bringing own food to feed ducks
- The pond high water mark covered in rubbish
- Visitors who don't take rubbish
- Social/corporate bookings and fees

Dangerous cars and cyclists and need for better pedestrian access | 4 comments

- Better pedestrian access needed
- Stop motor vehicle access
- Cars/cyclists are 'dangerous'

Positive Comments | 2 comments

- Don't touch
- Love it the way it is

FEDERATION VALLEY

What activities have you most recently undertaken in your nominated section of Centennial Park?

Off leash: playing and walking the dogs | 11 comments

- *Taking the dog for a walk*
- *'Playing' with their dogs off leash*

Picnicking, playing with kids and meeting friends | 12 comments

- *Playing with the kids*
- *Enjoying a picnic*
- *Meeting friends and socialising*
- *Enjoy a coffee*

Walking and cycling | 4 comments

- *Walking*
- *Cycling*

Relaxing, reading and bird watching | 3 comments

- *Reading*
- *Relaxing, peaceful, sitting on grass*
- *Bird watching*

What do you like about your nominated section of CP?

Views, woods and spaciousness | 29 comments

- *Great aspect/views*
- *Love the bush/trees/wooded area*
- *Open spaces and spacious*
- *Easy to find*
- *Black cockatoos*
- *Open spaces*
- *Sheltered*
- *Relaxed atmosphere*
- *Variation of slopes and heights*
- *Feels like miles away from city*
- *A space for everyone*
- *Great meeting spot*
- *Water springs*



Off-leash area for dogs to enjoy | 14 comments

- *Off leash is great for dogs)*
- *Dogs can 'have a good play'*
- *Good exercise for dogs*
- *Dogs 'love it'*
- *Good to see*

Is there anything you don't like about your nominated section of Centennial Park and how would you improve this?

Conflicts: uses and activities | 5 comments

- *Intimidating gangs of dogs*
- *Proposed amphitheatre*
- *Needs more crossings*
- *Cycling groups speeding past – dangerous and rude*
- *Off leash and food areas not a good mix*

Tree management and drainage | 4 comments

- *Chopping down pines*
- *Too few trees*
- *Plant something to feed black cockatoos*
- *Storm water drainage terrible*

Lack of amenities for dogs | 2 comments

- *Lack of bins and dog bags*
- *Need drinking facilities for dogs*

LEARNER'S CYCLEWAY

What activities have you most recently undertaken in your nominated section of Centennial Park?

Spending time with family and kids | 12 comments

- Spending time with family and kids
- Picnic
- Feeding ducks
- Birthday party

Using the cycle way, play equipment and other active recreation | 9 comments

Respondents in this area undertook a variety of activities, however it was obvious from the responses that 'using the bike track' or cycling was the predominant sporting activity.

Comments included:

- Utilising the bike track and riding with kids
- Watching kids play on play equipment
- Cycling
- Jogging
- Scooter on track
- Soccer
- Riding/Walking past
- Roller blading
- Climbing trees

What do you like about your nominated section of Centennial Park?

Safe place to play , rest ,picnic and to exercise| 18 comments

- Great for kids to learn and play
- It is a safe area with sightlines to view children
- Great family area
- Keeps kids of main road
- There are other kids to play with
- Good to rest/picnic
- Purpose built for kids exercise
- Playground and bike track
- Big enough for lots of people to exercise

Place to park with space and not too many cars | 10 comments

- Places to park
- Well maintained
- Open, no fence
- Magnificent park
- Lots of space most of the time
- No intersections
- Not many cars
- Low speed limit
- Room for overtaking bikes

Is there anything you don't like about your nominated section of Centennial Park and how would you improve this?

Missing facilities: shade , seating, toilets and equipment for children of all ages | 14 comments

- No shaded areas or shelter
- Not enough seating for adults
- No coffee
- Needs water drinking fountain
- Add a flying fox
- Needs a bigger play gym
- Clean up toilets
- Equipment needs updating, not challenging, more variety
- Equipment for all aged children
- Single child dominating play equipment
- Needs a second track

Dangerous crossing – needs to moved | 9 comments

Parent respondents expressed a general concern for the danger this area represents for children and dogs. Cars and cyclists do not necessarily adhere to speed limits and thus crossing the road presented a threat.

Comments included:

- Location needs to be moved
- Grand drive is dangerous on weekends
- They need to add traffic lights
- They need to move the cycleway to the inside of Grand Drive to avoid the need to cross
- Crossing is ignored by cyclists
- Cars speeding
- Crossing grand drive is dangerous for kids, bikes and dogs
- Doesn't address traffic issues after 9.30

Missing facilities: shade, seating, toilets and equipment for children of all ages | 14 comments

The respondents provided a list of comments which would add to the comfort of the area including:

- No shaded areas or shelter
- Not enough seating for adults
- No coffee
- Needs water drinking fountain
- Add a ‘flying fox’
- Needs a bigger play gym
- Clean up toilets
- Equipment needs updating, not challenging, more variety
- Equipment for all aged children
- Single child dominating play equipment
- Needs a second track

Other comments | 4 comments

- Like it to be like Olympic Park or Sydney Park
- Conflict between different groups
- Gets muddy/poor drainable



PARADE GROUNDS

What activities have you most recently undertaken in your nominated section of Centennial Park?

Walking, jogging and cycling | 11 comments

- Jogging/running
- Cycling
- Park walk
- Dog walking

Socialising with friends and family | 5 comments

- Meeting friends in the area
- Picnic with family
- Coffee with friends
- Meeting friends for a BBQ

Sports activities | 5 comments

- Soccer
- Football
- Kicking ball in open space

Using the playground and kid related activities | 3 comments

- Utilising the playground facilities with kids
- Feeding ducks

What do you like about your nominated section of Centennial Park?

Openness, spacious safe and clean | 11 comments

- Openness
- Nice meeting spot
- Nice and open
- Dog friendly
- Fun
- Clean
- Safe
- Family friendly
- Space to play football

Great access | 9 comments

- Proximity to restaurant/café
- Easy to access
- Close to home
- Close to playground
- Proximity to parking
- Car free
- Everything is nearby i.e. toilets/café/soccer

Child friendly and well maintained | 4 comments

- Equipment for kids
- Well maintained
- Easy to watch kids
- Plenty of entertainment

Is there anything you don't like about your nominated section of Centennial Park and how would you improve this?

Poor drainage, expensive food and need for more seating and rubbish bins | 8 comments

- *Drainage is sometimes a problem*
- *Bins for dogs are needed*
- *Food is too expensive*
- *More outdoor seating is needed*
- *Dislike the multi-purpose sports posts, would prefer to see just soccer posts*
- *Prospect of speed humps*
- *Events damage area*

Area is too busy | 3 comments


- *This area is too busy*
- *There is an 'over-saturation' in one area*
- *People are there at the same time*

DEMOGRAPHICS


Demographic information for those who took park in the survey is provided below. Please note that as this was a qualitative research study, the demographics information does not conform to any statistical profile. As discussed in the introduction, the sample was an ‘a priori’ sample of park users, who were present in the park at the time, or of people who self-selected to participate online.

The age groups, gender balance and postcodes will therefore not necessarily be representative of all people who use Centennial Park.


AGE GROUPS OF SURVEY PARTICIPANTS




GENDER



POSTCODES in 2000 to 2050



OTHER POSTCODES



# APPENDIX

# CENTENNIAL PARK MASTER PLAN 2023

## CENTENNIAL PARK MASTER PLAN - SURVEY

Thinking firstly, about Centennial Park as a whole...

3. Is anything missing from Centennial Park that you would expect to be in a park of this type? (This could be a physical feature or an activity.)

[illegible]

4. What would you NOT wish to see in Centennial Park in the future? (This may refer to any features or activities that are not currently a part of Centennial Park.)

This image shows a full page of a document template. It features a series of evenly spaced, light gray horizontal lines across the entire width of the page, creating a ruled effect similar to notebook paper. The background is white, and there are no margins, text, or other markings present.

## CENTENNIAL PARK MASTER PLAN - SURVEY

Thinking firstly, about Centennial Park as a whole...

5. Is there an event/s that you WOULD LIKE to see take place in Centennial Park in the future that is not currently staged in the Park?

This image is a completely blank white document with no visible content, text, or markings.

## CENTENNIAL PARK MASTER PLAN - SURVEY

Now please think about ONE section of Centennial Park only...

We ask you to think about ONE section of the Park THAT YOU USE REGULARLY. This might be ONE of the four sections that are listed below.

6. Please nominate ONE section of Centennial Park you would like to discuss in questions 7, 8 and 9 below.

- ☐ The learners Cycleway, or
  - ☐ Picnic area adjacent to Busbys Pond, or
  - ☐ Federation Valley, or
  - ☐ Parade Grounds

7. What activities have you undertaken today in this section of Centennial Park?

[illegible]

8. What do you like about this section of Centennial Park?



## CENTENNIAL PARK MASTER PLAN - SURVEY

Now please think about ONE section of Centennial Park only...

9. Is there anything you don't like about this section of Centennial Park and how would you improve this?

[illegible]

10. Are there any other comments you would like to make about Centennial Park in general?

[illegible]

CENTENNIAL PARK MASTER PLAN - SURVEY

A little about you...

11. What is your gender?

☐

Female

☐

Male

☐

Other designation. If you wish you may specify below

12. In which age group are you?

☐

Less than 10 years

☐

10-20

☐

21-35

☐

36-45

☐

46-60

☐

61-75

☐

76 or older

13. Please advise in which postcode you live in primarily

14. If you would like to be informed about when and how you can comment on the Draft Master Plan please fill in your email address

(Your email is held in strict confidentiality by Centennial Park and Moore Park Trust.)

Interviewer

Date



Copyright 2013  
The People for Places and Space  
Studio 66 / 61 Marlborough Street Surry Hills NSW 2010 Australia  
Ph: 02 9310 3233 | Fax: 02 9310 4705  
Email: p4ps@p4ps.com.au | www.p4ps.com.au



BLANK PAGE

CENTENNIAL PARK  
Exhibition of the Draft Master Plan 2040

Stage Two: Phase One Online Survey Report  
30 September to 15 October 2013  
First 13 days of the 30 day exhibition period

October 2013  
Prepared for The Centennial and Moore Park Trust & BVN Donovan Hill Architecture.

Prepared by:  
The People for Places and Spaces



BLANK PAGE

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION TO THE DRAFT ..... v

MASTER PLAN CONSULTATION..... v

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: INCOMPLETE ONLINE SURVEY REPORT ..... ix

THE SUMMARY TABLES: RESPONSES, THEMES AND ORDERING..... xi

THE SURVEY PARTICIPANTS.....xii

THE MASTER PLAN IN SUMMARY - ONLINE.....1

MAIN REPORT .....21

    THE MASTER PLAN - IN GENERAL .....22

    THE MASTER PLAN – OUTER / INNER PARK .....30

    THE MASTER PLAN - TRAFFIC, ACCESS & CIRCULATION .....34

    THE MASTER PLAN - ENHANCED PEDESTRIAN EXPERIENCE .....39

    THE MASTER PLAN - A NETWORK OF HUBS / IMPROVED AMENITIES.....43

    THE MASTER PLAN - DEFINED EVENT ZONES .....47

    THE MASTER PLAN - WELLNESS, SPORTS & RECREATION .....51

    THE MASTER PLAN - PLAY FOR ALL AGES .....55

    THE MASTER PLAN - ENHANCED INTERPRETATION .....59

THE MASTER PLAN IN SUMMARY .....61

APPENDIX.....63

# INTRODUCTION TO THE DRAFT MASTER PLAN CONSULTATION

This report has been prepared by The People for Places and Spaces, a member of the Centennial Park master plan team led by BVN Donovan Hill Architecture, appointed by the Centennial Park and Moore Park Trust (the Trust) to lead the process of creating a master plan for Centennial Park.

This is the first ever master plan for Centennial Park and looks forward to 2040. This project will deliver a long-term planning document to improve the management and maintenance of what is one of the world’s best public parks.

The Centennial Park Draft Master Plan is attached (Appendix A.)

Six Principles and Eight Key Moves that have shaped the Plan are as follows:

## THE SIX PRINCIPLES

- A Park that endures
- A Park for All
- A Park for Discovery and Education
- A Park for Partnerships
- A Park for Health and Wellbeing
- A Park like No Other

## THE EIGHT KEY MOVES

- Outer Park/Inner Park
- Traffic Access and Circulation
- Enhanced Pedestrian Experience
- A Net Work Of Hubs/ Improved Amenities
- Define Event Zones
- Wellness, Sport and Formal Recreation
- A Park for Play
- Enhanced Interpretation



## TWO PUBLIC CONSULTATION COMPONENTS

The Public were invited to comment on the Draft Master Plan in two ways.

1. The Tent in the Park exhibition included a facilitated display, supported by the Trust Staff and the Consultant Team, who introduced the plan, discussed proposals and answered questions between Saturday 5 October to Sunday 13 October 2013. Participants completed a survey in the tent, or later on line.
2. An online survey on Centennial Parklands website

Monday 30 September to Tuesday 29 October 2013.

The survey questions for the exhibition and the online survey were identical. Both groups of participants were asked:

What do you like about the Draft Master Plan?

What do you not like about the Draft Master Plan?

Do you think there is anything missing?

Age, gender and place of residence?

One hundred and ninety-four people completed the survey either by visiting the Tent in the Park Exhibition or Online, having never visited the Tent. Note that Tent in the Park includes the 73 people who completed the survey while visiting the tent and 21 who completed on-line after their visit to the tent.

Number of people who participated in either of the consultation methods is set out in Figure One

| Survey Method                       | Number of Participants | Percentages |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------|-------------|
| Tent in the Park<br>5 to 13 October | 94                     | 48.45%      |
| Online Survey<br>30 to 14 September | 100                    | 51.55%      |
| TOTAL                               | 194                    | 100%        |

Figure One: Tent in the Park and Online survey participants



BLANK PAGE

TWO PUBLIC CONSULTATION COMPONENTS (continued)

This Online Consultation Report is one of two reports being prepared by The People for Places and Spaces based on the findings from the public consultation on the Centennial Park Draft Master Plan 2040:

The Trust will undertake its own review of the additional data returned between 16 to 29 October 2013. This survey can be found at the following web address: <https://www.surveymonkey.com/s/8ZC6QHV>

A Tent in the Park Report shows findings from the consultation with people that visited Tent in the Park during 5 October to 13 October 2013.

The findings presented in both reports will be reviewed and considered by the Trust and Master Plan Team to finalise the New Centennial Park Master Plan 2040, prior to its release by the end of 2013.

OTHER CONSULTATIONS NOT INCLUDED

Consultations the CEO and Executives of the Trust and groups of key external stakeholder groups listed below are not included in either report and include:

Centennial Park Consultative Committee

Centennial Park Residents' Association

Centennial Park users

Commercial businesses, hirers, catering companies, event organisations

Neighbouring organisations

Local Government – surrounding municipalities

Members of Parliament

NSW Government agencies and peer organisations

ROUND ONE PUBLIC CONSULTATION

A first round of consultation took place between 2 July 2013 and 14 July 2013. A total of 580 people responded to the first round consultation through participating in intercepts in the Park or on online.

A Round One Report 'Centennial Park: A Survey of Park Users, July 2013' was prepared by The People for Places and Spaces and provided an in-depth analysis of all participants responses.

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: STAGE TWO

## PHASE ONE ONLINE SURVEY REPORT

30 September – 15 October 2013

The Main Report follows the Executive Summary and readers are encouraged to read both reports in order to fully understand the depth and range of the responses

One hundred people participated in the Online Survey, recording 214 comments and responses. Where more than one idea was contained in a participants responses, they have been broken into separate comments for clustering during the data analysis.

### ANALYSIS AND REPORTING

Not all respondents answered all three park-related questions in the online survey – some answered only those in which they were most interested. Therefore, the numbers of responses for each question vary.

People who attended the Tent in the Park facilitated display had the opportunity to ask questions and discuss the Draft Master Plan with members of the design team and park staff: they had the opportunity to clarify information, which participants online did not.

For this reason, data from the In-park and Online components of the public consultation **cannot** be combined and reported together.

It is important to note that the objective of community consultation is to invite people to *have their say* – without restriction in regard to who can participate or limits on what they can say. The objective of this type of consultation is to discover the full range of views that exists within a given group, about a particular issue with which they are familiar. The Trust was seeking the views of park users about the Draft Master Plan 2040.

Qualitative research is the only research method that fulfils these objectives for community consultation. This type of research seeks to understand in some depth, people's experiences and views of a particular subject with which they are familiar. No one should be excluded, if they wish to participate. By using different consultation processes (in-park and online), the consultation has been made widely accessible for all people to participate in ways that are convenient for them.

The Trust's objective was to encourage as many people as possible to participate. Prior advertising in newspapers and via online publicity channels, such as Twitter and Facebook, among others, publicised the survey. The sample generated 94 in-park responses from respondents who self-selected to participate in this in-park consultation.

### IS QUALITATIVE RESEARCH STATISTICALLY VALID?

The simple answer is No. The objectives of inviting broad participation and encouraging people to respond in any way they wish, using open-ended questions, cannot be met with quantitative, statistically valid sampling techniques. It is not possible to employ statistically valid quantitative research techniques to community consultation, as this would exclude people from participating, once sample quotas were filled. Statistical sampling does not allow respondents to express any views they wish, but rather requires them respond to questions that carry a pre-determined range of responses. Quantitative, statistically valid research is simply unsuitable to the requirement for inclusive and exploratory community consultation, where everyone is welcome to participate.

The findings in this report cannot be said to be statistically representative of any broader group – such as all park users, if they did not participate in the consultation. We do confirm however, that the findings accurately represent the views of those who participated.

# THE SUMMARY TABLES: RESPONSES, THEMES AND ORDERING

By nature, qualitative data can is dense. To ensure that the findings are both accessible and readable, the responses were coded and analysed using a theme analysis.

For each question, similar ideas and comments have been coalesced into particular themes that emerged from the data. Any responses that did not accord with a theme have been reported as single responses.

The themes have been reported in order of magnitude, according to the number of comments within each theme – from those with the most comments, to those with the fewest. This is a descriptive means of ordering qualitative data to make it more accessible to readers.

There is no statistical significance implied by these numbers. In presenting the data in this way, we do not imply that the stronger themes are more important than other themes, or any individual ideas. Readers should therefore evaluate each theme, or individual comment, on its merits.

The summary tables for the Master Plan in general and for each of the 8 Key Moves follows.

Participants' responses to the master plan are recorded in the summary table that follow. The 328 responses from the ninety-four respondents have been clustered by themes for each of the topic areas.

Readers are encouraged to read the Main Report, which provides details of all comments and brings alive the voices of the participants.




# THE SURVEY PARTICIPANTS

100 people participated in the 'Online' Survey


Demographic information for those who took park in the survey is provided below. Please note that as this was a qualitative research study, the demographics information does not conform to any statistical profile. It simply reflects the demographics of those who self-selected to participate.

The age groups, gender balance and postcodes will therefore not be representative of all people who use Centennial Park.


## AGE GROUPS OF SURVEY PARTICIPANTS 'ONLINE'



## GENDER OF SURVEY PARTICIPANTS 'ONLINE'



POSTCODES IN 2000 TO 2050 'ONLINE



THE MASTER PLAN IN SUMMARY – P1  
ONLINE

| Theme                                           | Total      | Like      | Dislike   | Missing   |
|-------------------------------------------------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| In General                                      | 80         | 31<br>39% | 29<br>36% | 20<br>25% |
| Outer/Inner                                     | 27         | 3<br>11%  | 23<br>85% | 1<br>3%   |
| Traffic, Access<br>and Circulation              | 33<br>100% | 14<br>42% | 10<br>30% | 9<br>27%  |
| Enhanced<br>Pedestrian<br>Experience            | 10<br>100% | 2<br>20%  | 7<br>70%  | 1<br>10%  |
| A Network of<br>Hubs /<br>Amenities             | 21<br>100% | 6<br>29%  | 6<br>29%  | 9<br>43%  |
| Defined Event<br>Zones                          | 15<br>100% | 2<br>13%  | 6<br>40%  | 7<br>47%  |
| Wellness,<br>Sports and<br>Formal<br>Recreation | 16<br>100% | 4<br>25%  | 5<br>31%  | 7<br>44%  |
| Play for all<br>Ages                            | 5<br>100%  | 2<br>40%  | 1<br>20%  | 2<br>40%  |
| Enhanced<br>Interpretation                      | 7<br>100%  | 1<br>14%  | 1<br>14%  | 5<br>72%  |
| TOTAL                                           | 214        | 65        | 88        | 61        |

30%41%29%

THE MASTER PLAN - IN GENERAL



One key areas of community interest that came through strongly in the consultation is an intense interest in what stays the same. There is an overwhelming love and respect of the place, and we want to ensure that the traditions and legacies that we have today are maintained into the future.

The following table represents the number of general comments left by participants who completed the survey

| Total      | Like      | Dislike   | Missing   |
|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| 80<br>100% | 31<br>39% | 29<br>36% | 20<br>25% |

Participant comments concerning the reasons for their choices appear in the following theme analysis

# THE MASTER PLAN - IN GENERAL

|                                                                   |    |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| What Participants Like                                            | 31 |
| Minimal changes and positive enhancements                         | 10 |
| A park for everyone to share                                      | 5  |
| Consulted and valued                                              | 5  |
| There is a long-term plan                                         | 3  |
| Peaceful oasis                                                    | 3  |
| Retaining open space                                              | 3  |
| Safety                                                            | 1  |
| Addresses many issues                                             | 1  |
| What Participants Do Not Like                                     | 29 |
| Against new built environment                                     | 10 |
| Against commercialism and partnerships                            | 9  |
| Too much change                                                   | 3  |
| Not preserving minimal change                                     | 2  |
| Lack of consideration for flora and fauna                         | 2  |
| Plan is too conservative                                          | 1  |
| Master Plan is not clear                                          | 1  |
| Not enough un-leashed areas for dogs                              | 1  |
| What Participants Think is Missing                                | 20 |
| Failure to consider dogs                                          | 7  |
| Insufficient information regarding commercialism and partnerships | 4  |
| More detailed information                                         | 4  |
| Missing maintenance                                               | 2  |
| No timeline information for implementation                        | 1  |
| No short-term outlook                                             | 1  |
| Safety concerns                                                   | 1  |

# THE MASTER PLAN - OUTER & INNER PARK



Strengthening the planting of trees and native grasses to the Outer Park in order to enhance its dual role as a buffer to the surrounding urban environment and as the 'green gateway' to the Inner Park

Enhancing existing landscape character precincts including open parklands, groves, gardens and avenues

Encouraging the growth of native grasslands to create biodiversity

The Master Plan proposes subtle changes to the landscaping in the Outer Park (more trees in selected areas, and the growth of native grasses) to enhance the experience of the Outer Park as a spatial and ecological filter to the Inner Park.

The following table represents the number of general comments left by participants who completed the survey

| Total | Like | Dislike | Missing |
|-------|------|---------|---------|
| 27    | 3    | 23      | 1       |
| 100%  | 11%  | 85%     | 3%      |

Participant comments concerning the reasons for their choices appear in the following theme analysis

# THE MASTER PLAN - OUTER & INNER PARK

|                                                                                         |    |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| What Participants Like                                                                  | 3  |
| There is a tree succession plan                                                         | 2  |
| Retaining the wilderness of the outer park                                              | 1  |
| What Participants Do Not Like                                                           | 23 |
| Opposed to making outer track available for off-road cyclists and keeping dogs on-leash | 18 |
| Against formalising outer trail                                                         | 3  |
| Over manicured                                                                          | 2  |
| What Participants Think is Missing                                                      | 1  |
| More natural environments                                                               | 1  |

# THE MASTER PLAN - TRAFFIC ACCESS & CIRCULATION



The Draft Centennial Park Master Plan 2040 considers four key areas of intervention with respect to vehicular access and movement through Centennial Park: 1.Improvements to Grand Drive / 2.Improved vehicular permeability - amending the existing one-way system within the Inner Park to allow access to the Inner Park from the east side of Grand Drive / 3.Conflict minimisation - safety improvements to a number of intersections along Grand Drive, separate to but endorsed by the Master Plan / 4.Improvements beyond the Park boundary - improvements to pedestrian, cyclist and public transport access to the park.

The following table represents the number of general comments left by participants who completed the survey

| Total | Like | Dislike | Missing |
|-------|------|---------|---------|
| 33    | 14   | 10      | 9       |
| 100%  | 42%  | 30%     | 27%     |

Participant comments concerning the reasons for their choices appear in the following theme analysis

# THE MASTER PLAN - TRAFFIC, ACCESS & CIRCULATION


|                                                    |    |
|----------------------------------------------------|----|
| What Participants Like                             | 14 |
| Better traffic management                          | 3  |
| Access to the park                                 | 2  |
| Grand Drive upgrade                                | 2  |
| Less cars through reduced parking                  | 2  |
| Minimal change for bike users                      | 1  |
| Better public transport                            | 1  |
| Oxford Street cycleway                             | 1  |
| Focus on improved pedestrian and cyclist safety    | 1  |
| Change direction of Parkes and Dickens Drive       | 1  |
| What Participants Do Not Like                      | 10 |
| Authoritative cyclist control                      | 4  |
| Safety issues crossing Grand Drive                 | 2  |
| Not enough car spaces                              | 1  |
| New direction of Parkes and Dickens Drive          | 1  |
| Cars are ruining the park                          | 1  |
| Planning for off-road cyclist                      | 1  |
| What Participants Think is Missing                 | 9  |
| A plan for cyclist behaviour                       | 4  |
| A plan for cyclist and pedestrian safety/conflicts | 3  |
| Additional horse crossing                          | 1  |
| Additional ways to access the park                 | 1  |

# THE MASTER PLAN - ENHANCED PEDESTRIAN EXPERIENCE



The Draft Centennial Park Master Plan 2040 seeks to make the ‘People’s Park’ more accessible to more people whilst preserving the sense of discovery and areas of unstructured access which make the current Park experience unique.

Defining key pedestrian circulation routes will enable the Park to accommodate increasing numbers of visitors without compromising the condition of its green spaces and landscaped areas, and will also ensure the aging population can continue to access to the Park’s diverse recreational offerings.



Participant comments concerning the reasons for their choices appear in the following theme analysis

# THE MASTER PLAN - ENHANCED PEDESTRIAN EXPERIENCE

|                                    |   |
|------------------------------------|---|
| What Participants Like             | 2 |
| New and improved walkways          | 2 |
| What Participants Do Not Like      | 7 |
| Formalising path surfaces          | 5 |
| No reduction of natural feel       | 2 |
| What Participants Think is Missing | 1 |
| Additional tracks                  | 1 |

# THE MASTER PLAN - A NETWORK OF HUBS / IMPROVED AMENITIES



As the population grows and park visitation increase, a greater number of 'family hubs' will be required to spread people throughout the park to avoid congestion. Families demand playgrounds and amenity, and new kiosks will be established together with bathroom facilities to ensure both comfort and proximity for family activities. The proposed new hubs have been carefully spaced to ensure they cater for different areas of the Park. Each hub builds on an existing node of activity, and either replaces an existing building or is clustered around existing development.

The following table represents the number of general comments left by participants who completed the survey

| Total | Like | Dislike | Missing |
|-------|------|---------|---------|
| 21    | 6    | 6       | 9       |
| 100%  | 29%  | 29%     | 43%     |

Participant comments concerning the reasons for their choices appear in the following theme analysis

# THE MASTER PLAN - A NETWORK OF HUBS / IMPROVED AMENITIES

|                                      |   |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| What Participants Like               | 6 |
| New cafes/eateries                   | 2 |
| The updating of amenities            | 2 |
| More facilities                      | 2 |
| What Participants Do Not Like        | 6 |
| Too many new facilities              | 2 |
| Relocation of maintenance depot      | 2 |
| It's a park not a café               | 1 |
| Against the Ranger's Residence plans | 1 |
| What Participants Think is Missing   | 9 |
| More amenities/facilities            | 6 |
| A volunteer's centre                 | 1 |
| Needs more lighting                  | 1 |
| Needs better food selection          | 1 |

# THE MASTER PLAN - DEFINED EVENT ZONES



The Draft Centennial Park Master Plan 2040 proposes three areas for temporary events, and provides specific amenities and services to support them. However, it does not prohibit temporary events from being held in areas other than the three identified primary event zones - provided they are appropriate for the proposed locations.

The following table represents the number of general comments left by participants who completed the survey

| Total | Like | Dislike | Missing |
|-------|------|---------|---------|
| 15    | 2    | 6       | 7       |
| 100%  | 13%  | 40%     | 47%     |

Participant comments concerning the reasons for their choices appear in the following theme analysis

# THE MASTER PLAN - DEFINED EVENT ZONES

|                                           |   |
|-------------------------------------------|---|
| What Participants Like                    | 2 |
| Mix of events                             | 1 |
| Reduced impact from events                | 1 |
| What Participants Do Not Like             | 6 |
| Brazilian Fields expansion                | 2 |
| Events creating noise                     | 2 |
| Against events                            | 1 |
| Events affect environment and wildlife    | 1 |
| What Participants Think is Missing        | 7 |
| The private use of Belvedere Amphitheatre | 2 |
| Planning strategy for events              | 2 |
| Car free days                             | 1 |
| Event free days                           | 1 |
| Permanent bar                             | 1 |

# THE MASTER PLAN - WELLNESS, SPORTS & FORMAL RECREATION



The Draft Centennial Park Master Plan 2040 seeks to maintain the existing formal and informal recreational opportunities of the Park, while identifying opportunities to actively pursue partnerships with University educators and/or health providers to provide opportunities for health and wellbeing programs in the Park.

The following table represents the number of general comments left by participants who completed the survey

| Total | Like | Dislike | Missing |
|-------|------|---------|---------|
| 16    | 4    | 5       | 7       |
| 100%  | 25%  | 31%     | 44%     |

Participant comments concerning the reasons for their choices appear in the following theme analysis

# THE MASTER PLAN - WELLNESS, SPORTS & RECREATION

|                                          |   |
|------------------------------------------|---|
| What Participants Like                   | 4 |
| Fitness stations                         | 3 |
| Maintenance of sports facilities         | 1 |
| What Participants Do Not Like            | 5 |
| Safety for horses, riders and the public | 3 |
| Against organised exercise activities    | 1 |
| Against fitness stations                 | 1 |
| What Participants Think is Missing       | 7 |
| Additional sports and recreation         | 3 |
| Outdoor swimming pool                    | 2 |
| Maintenance of horse track               | 2 |

# THE MASTER PLAN - PLAY FOR ALL AGES



All play spaces to offer an innovative, world's best play experience. Play spaces to be colocated with complementary visitor services. Each play space should have a unique character. Together, they should offer a diverse range of experiences and cater for a diverse group of people, from babies to adults. New place spaces should respond to and enhance the existing Park landscape character.

The following table represents the number of general comments left by participants who completed the survey

| Total | Like | Dislike | Missing |
|-------|------|---------|---------|
| 5     | 2    | 1       | 2       |
| 100%  | 40%  | 20%     | 40%     |

Participant comments concerning the reasons for their choices appear in the following theme analysis

# THE MASTER PLAN - PLAY FOR ALL AGES

|                                    |   |
|------------------------------------|---|
| What Participants Like             | 2 |
| Improved children's cycling area   | 1 |
| Improved education precinct        | 1 |
| What Participants Do Not Like      | 1 |
| Location of water playground       | 1 |
| What Participants Think is Missing | 2 |
| Suggested activities               | 2 |

# THE MASTER PLAN - ENHANCED INTERPRETATION



The draft Centennial Park Master Plan 2040 proposes four themes around which the interpretive experience might be generated through a new interpretation overlay to be permanently embedded within the Park landscape. In addition, a digital component will complement the interpretative experience and enable all visitors to connect in real time to an evolving online archive.

The following table represents the number of general comments left by participants who completed the survey

| Total | Like | Dislike | Missing |
|-------|------|---------|---------|
| 7     | 1    | 1       | 5       |
| 100%  | 14%  | 14%     | 72%     |

Participant comments concerning the reasons for their choices appear in the following theme analysis

# THE MASTER PLAN - ENHANCED INTERPRETATION

|                                    |   |
|------------------------------------|---|
| What Participants Like             | 1 |
| Improving signage and way finding  | 1 |
| What Participants Do Not Like      | 1 |
| Removal of sponsorship plaques     | 1 |
| What Participants Think is Missing | 5 |
| Interactive sculpture              | 2 |
| Educational tools                  | 2 |
| Increase signage in the park       | 1 |



BLANK PAGE

# MAIN REPORT

The main report expands on material presented in the Executive Summary. It contains all comments that participants submitted coded by themes.

# THE MASTER PLAN - IN GENERAL

### PROPOSED PLAN



One key areas of community interest that came through strongly in the consultation is an intense interest in what stays the same. There is an overwhelming love and respect of the place, and we want to ensure that the traditions and legacies that we have today are maintained into the future.

The following table represents the number of general comments left by participants who completed the survey

| Total | Like | Dislike | Missing |
|-------|------|---------|---------|
| 80    | 31   | 29      | 20      |
| 100%  | 39%  | 36%     | 25%     |

*Participant comments concerning the reasons for their choices appear in the following theme analysis*

# THE MASTER PLAN - IN GENERAL

|                                                                   |    |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| What Participants Like                                            | 31 |
| Minimal changes and positive enhancements                         | 10 |
| A park for everyone to share                                      | 5  |
| Consulted and valued                                              | 5  |
| There is a long-term plan                                         | 3  |
| Peaceful oasis                                                    | 3  |
| Retaining open space                                              | 3  |
| Safety                                                            | 1  |
| Addresses many issues                                             | 1  |
| What Participants Do Not Like                                     | 29 |
| Against new built environment                                     | 10 |
| Against commercialism and partnerships                            | 9  |
| Too much change                                                   | 3  |
| Not preserving minimal change                                     | 2  |
| Lack of consideration for flora and fauna                         | 2  |
| Plan is too conservative                                          | 1  |
| Master Plan is not clear                                          | 1  |
| Not enough un-leashed areas for dogs                              | 1  |
| What Participants Think is Missing                                | 20 |
| Failure to consider dogs                                          | 7  |
| Insufficient information regarding commercialism and partnerships | 4  |
| More detailed information                                         | 4  |
| Missing maintenance                                               | 2  |
| No timeline information for implementation                        | 1  |
| No short-term outlook                                             | 1  |
| Safety concerns                                                   | 1  |



## What participants like about the Master Plan in General

### Minimal changes and positive enhancements | 10 Comments

- Haven't changed the bike user space too much
- Conserving and enhancing the park's living legacy by preserving the existing vistas and unique landscape precincts within the park
- Preserve the key benefits and features of the park
- Enhances shared space, preserving dogs, creating even better wild and community spaces.
- Preserve the environment
- Much staying the same and no backpackers camping!
- It is going to enhance rather than change the nature of the place.
- A focus on retaining what makes the park work
- Keeping the green spaces through out the park.
- Maintaining the existing structure of the park.

### A park for everyone to share | 5 Comments

- No group of users or trees will be impacted or disadvantaged.
- Balance the park users needs
- The plan appears to preserve the key benefits and features of the park as we know it and enhances them in terms of shared space, preserving dogs, creating even better wild and community spaces.
- The park looks like it will become better connected and appeal to more users in more ways.
- As well as projection for needs of all in the future.

### Consulted and valued | 5 Comments

- In general very good
- It is consultative.
- Everything.
- Open to suggestion
- Majority of the plan is well worth the time and money

### There is a long term plan | 3 Comments

- A long-term plan
- That there is a plan to 2040.
- Sustainability for the park in the long term.

### Peaceful oasis | 3 Comments

- Enhancing the park as a peaceful oasis
- Peaceful oasis within the city endures.
- Like areas for wellness included, a sanctuary feeling for relaxation and meditation.

### Retaining open space | 3 Comments

- Focus on keeping green space and consideration of biodiversity.
- Retains and improves landscapes and plantings.
- Keeping the green spaces through out the park.

What participants like about the Master Plan in General (Continued)

Safety | 1 Comment

- Improving safety

Addresses many issues | 1 Comment

- Addresses many of the issues with the park.



What participants did not like about the Master Plan in General

Against new built environment | 10 Comments

- There is a determination to build just about everywhere in the park
- How about leaving us with a 'park' instead of an 'activity centre'. What's wrong with a bit of 'rustic' feel? If I want a fully 'built and controlled' environment, i can stay home.
- Too much man-made space.
- To establish new buildings and structures in the park
- The installation of so many new paths, toilets, showers, viewing and seating areas will fundamentally change the quiet, rural, natural character of the park and create numerous eyesores that break the natural flow of the park.
- Leave us with a 'park' instead of an 'activity centre'. What's wrong with a bit of 'rustic' feel?
- What about just leaving well enough alone?
- Too many man-made spaces. A park is not meant to be a social venue.
- To establish new buildings and structures in the park including a new amphitheatre
- The lack of respect for this parkland is truly appalling. Cutting down shady natives to make way for a sports field, cars parked on it each weekend, rubbish and broken bottles left behind, a pond that often has an oil slick streak across the top, and play equipment that children don't know how to use. Please stop defiling this much used and highly loved park.

Against commercialism and partnerships | 9 Comments

- A sane and wise approach that is not governed by making money.
- I do not at all like the notion of "a park for commercial and non-commercial partnerships". A park should have trees, grass, ponds, and nature. A park should not have commercial interests.
- There are fewer and fewer areas which are not impinged upon by some organised, commercially oriented activity.
- Any area which is used for commercial purposes and which alienates users of the park must be re-considered
- In an attempt to raise revenue, the park will no longer be a park of tradition and original meaning.
- There should be no more commercial premises allowed in the park.
- I am also opposed to such a building being in constant potential use by the university of nsw
- The draft master plan proposes to increase commercial activities in the park, which must not be permitted and would establish a long-term precedent for such activities remaining in the park.
- In an attempt to raise revenue, the park will no longer be a park of tradition and original meaning.

Too much change | 3 Comments

- Please stop defiling this much used and highly loved park.
- I think you are trying to change it too much
- It is a park, not an amusement park (we already have one of those in sydney). We only have one centennial park - please don't change what it is.

Not preserving minimal change | 2 Comments

- Some aspects of the draft plan run contrary to the aims of conserving the park
- Reduction of natural feel of park and green spaces

## What participants did not like about the Master Plan in General (Continued)

### Lack of consideration for fauna and flora | 2 Comments

- These events cause damage to the park's landscape and disturbance to the wild life in the park.
- The master plan suggests there is a consideration of flora and fauna. Although there will be no impingement on habitat by building infrastructure, there appears to be a lack of consideration for the impacts possible activities will have on threatened species within the park. There is a proposal to extend the Brazilian fields into Lachlan Reserve during events. This is directly adjacent to a grey-headed flying fox colony that has been known to be a maternity area. The grey headed flying fox is a considered to be a threatened species and is already under pressure from habitat fragmentation and loss, and more recently, extreme heat events. Grey headed flying foxes are highly sensitive animals, especially around birthing time. Events being that close to the flying fox camp could cause stress within the animals and will compound with the other threatening processes already mentioned. This will not only affect the fecundity of the grey-headed flying fox but also increase the likelihood of diseases within the flying foxes that have been known to transmit to humans (stressed flying foxes have been known to be more susceptible to carrying viruses, like all animals.) I suggest this area be reconsidered.

### Plan is too conservative | 1 Comment

- Very conservative. Basically no new initiatives

### Master plan is not clear | 1 Comment

- The wording of the master plan is ambiguous.

### Not enough un-leashed areas for dogs | 1 Comment

- Off-leash dog-walking areas will be reduced over time.

## What participants think is missing in the Master Plan in General

### Failure to consider dogs | 7 Comments

- A dog swimming area.
- No mention of dog owners and dogs in the document
- More areas for off-leash dog walking tracks.
- There are not enough off-leash areas for dogs in Sydney.
- I also object to the fact that every time you install a formal 'cafe', it excludes dogs and their owners. This alienates us from the park.
- There does not seem to be a fenced off-leash area for dogs
- I have seen dogs not on a leash and almost destroying a swan.

### Insufficient information regarding commercialism and partnership | 4 Comments

- There is insufficient information about the proposed commercial uses of the existing residences in the park. Will they serve alcohol, hours of operation, nature of businesses?
- Analysis of sanctuaries around the world, which are self-funding without resorting to events like concerts...
- Figures of various types usage, now and later?
- Information about the proposed commercial uses of the existing residences in the park.

### More detailed information | 4 Comments

- There are varying levels of details in this plan - from the specific width of a parking/pedestrian buffer to the proposed 'water play' area. It would benefit the plan to provide specifics about significant proposals. This would also be more consistent.
- Unsure as to the extent of new facilities and change? Would like to see more detail - the online information is more like a strategic direction vs. A master plan.
- More about the proposed grand drive footpath improvements
- Feel as though we are being kept in the dark. Why not provide capacity numbers for locker rooms, children's water facilities, food/beverage venues?

### Missing maintenance | 2 Comments

- Cleaner pond water increased irrigation of grass deep pond for water catchment for irrigation spraying of bindies - every year there are bindies!!!! Better maintenance of grounds.
- Ongoing restoration and contextualising original park statuary that was originally a feature of the park.

### No timeline implementation | 1 Comment

- There is no timeline for stages of implementation

### No short-term outlook | 1 Comment

- What about the short-term future i.e. the next 3 to 5 years.

### Safety concerns | 1 Comment

- 24hr in-park security

# THE MASTER PLAN - OUTER & INNER PARK



Strengthening the planting of trees and native grasses to the Outer Park in order to enhance its dual role as a buffer to the surrounding urban environment and as the ‘green gateway’ to the Inner Park

Enhancing existing landscape character precincts including open parklands, groves, gardens and avenues

Encouraging the growth of native grasslands to create biodiversity

The Master Plan proposes subtle changes to the landscaping in the Outer Park (more trees in selected areas, and the growth of native grasses) to enhance the experience of the Outer Park as a spatial and ecological filter to the Inner Park.

The following table represents the number of general comments left by participants who completed the survey

| Total | Like | Dislike | Missing |
|-------|------|---------|---------|
| 27    | 3    | 23      | 1       |
| 100%  | 11%  | 85%     | 3%      |

Participant comments concerning the reasons for their choices appear in the following theme analysis

# THE MASTER PLAN – OUTER / INNER PARK

| What Participants Like                                                                  | 3  |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| There is a tree succession plan                                                         | 2  |
| Retaining the wilderness of the outer park                                              | 1  |
| What Participants Do Not Like                                                           | 23 |
| Opposed to making outer track available for off-road cyclists and keeping dogs on-leash | 18 |
| Against formalising outer trail                                                         | 3  |
| Over manicured                                                                          | 2  |
| What Participants Think is Missing                                                      | 1  |
| More natural environments                                                               | 1  |

## What participants like about 'Outer/Inner Park'

### There is a tree succession plan | 2 Comments

- Some of the ideas re planting seems good
- Strengthen the planting of trees and native grasslands to enhance the definition of the existing 'green verge'.

### Retaining the wilderness for outer park | 1 Comment

- Love the 'open woodland' character of the Lang Road area; it often feels like you're in the middle of nowhere, thanks to the lack of formal structure.

## What participants did not like about 'Outer/Inner Park'

### Opposed to making outer track available for off-road cyclists and keeping dogs on-leash | 18 Comments

- We are very concerned that the outer trail (from which mountain bikes are currently barred, although they flagrantly use it) should be opened to bikers, with the potential of conflict and injury to adults, children, joggers and dogs. The prospect of owners being "encouraged" to keep their dogs on leash on the outer trail, and sharing with "slow cyclists" (surely an oxymoron) is daunting. Should the outer trail be refurbished to become "self-regulating" we can only foresee an influx of bikes, with or without permission, and consequent chaos
- The outer path to be used for bicycles. Most mornings there are large packs travelling in excess of 30kms/hour that refuse to stick to the cycleway but often use the whole width of the road. These people are inconsiderate and aggressive towards both pedestrians and motorised traffic and are not effectively monitored at present. Creating a shared foot/cycling track is a recipe for disaster. Traffic.
- Please reconsider allowing cycling access to this outer path as children will be at risk and parents won't be able to let go of them, which will end up with it not being used.
- It would be a huge loss to dog walkers, runners and walkers, if the goat track were made accessible to bikes. An impact on a large number of people who use the park.
- Yes! The outer path area being changed from an off lead dog area to a cycle path. Dogs have always been able to use this area. The park rules state that dogs can be off- lead on the outside of the ring rd. Restricting the off lead area to just federation valley is unfair to dog owners.
- I am a dog owner and feel you are reducing the leash free area, which is not fair.
- The concept of having "slow cyclist" on this path with dogs on a leash is surely a recipe for disaster. Cyclists will, however well intentioned, be enticed to ride this new track fast. At least currently there is no clear "path" for large sections that the pedestrians and dog walkers, thus when a cyclist does pass, they don't need to try and stay on the same 2-3m strip and pace them with considerably more pace.
- Wild outer park - don't make dog owners leash their dogs on the outer perimeter! Ample space for non-dog lovers, let dog owners exercise without the need for a leash.
- "a self regulated path for trail running, walking, dogs on leash and slow cyclists. Provide kilometer markers" - an absolutely ridiculous and ill-informed concept. Runners and bicycles is a recipe for disaster. Off road bush hacking cyclists illegally use the trail.
- Do not like the idea that the outer park will cease to be an off leash walking area for dog owners, and will allow cyclists to ride along this path. There are very few off leash areas where dog owners can walk their dogs and this amenity in Centennial Park is very highly valued by many dog owners from around Sydney.
- The master plan specifies this to change to on-leash only and allow access to bike riders. Bike riders already have access to a huge amount of the park, where dogs are forced on leash. It's advertised as being "more inclusive".

## What participants did not like about 'Outer/Inner Park' (Continued)

- Yes. Opening up the outer trail to cyclists and making it dog on leash. Cyclists will only serve to disrupt the peaceful and secluded nature of the outer trail- the majorities who use it currently go far too fast and disregard walkers and joggers. To think a speed limit will be enforceable is ludicrous. Bike riders have plenty of access already. It is incredibly important for people to have space for off leash dog walking. It is simply insufficient to confine off leash areas. To open the outer trail for cyclists is supposed to make it more inclusive, but will be at the expense of the high number of existing dog walkers and joggers.
- Yes - proposal to restrict dog walking in the outer perimeter to on leash only - to make way for cyclists - who already have their own dedicated region for the park. The park hosts and needs extensive off-leash walking areas that are accessible from all around the park - dog walkers do not drive to the park and start from a specific location but enter the park at their nearest access point and need to be able to exercise their dogs off leash from that point.
- The outer trail is one of the most fragile areas of the park in regards to tree roots and erosion. Historically cross-country runners, walkers and dog-walkers have used the outer trail and all three of these groups have co-existed for decades. The single group that is highly antisocial and causes the most damage to the area are off-road mountain bike cyclists. A slow cyclist; pedestrians and bikes do not mix.
- The plan as outlined in the draft master plan is an ill-considered concept that discriminates against dog-walkers in favour of the increasingly powerful and well-funded cyclists lobby group
- Please reconsider allowing cycling access to this outer path as children will be at risk and parents won't be able to let go of them, which will end up with it not being used.
- Cyclists already tend to run the centre part of the park, we do not need them to own the outer trail.
- Object to the new additional bike path running from the ponds out to Randwick gates.

### Against formalising outer trail | 3 Comments

- Formalising the outer trail - i kind of like it how it is?
- The planned "formalisation" of the outer trail is not a good idea. The fact that centennial park is one of the few places that you can run and play on surfaces other than bitumen or concrete.
- There are plenty of formalised paths in the park already.

### Over manicured | 2 Comments

- I would like the natural treks through the trees away from the "developed" areas to be preserved - the bush in the city. So many young people don't get the opportunity to walk in the bush and learn about insects and small animals in their natural environment. It is invaluable for overseas visitors who don't have time to go out of Sydney. Please keep a lot of this
- The 'wilder' parts of Centennial Park should be retained.

## What participants think is missing in 'Outer/Inner Park'

### More natural environments | 1 Comment

- Less formal areas and more natural field/environments.

# THE MASTER PLAN - TRAFFIC ACCESS & CIRCULATION



The Draft Centennial Park Master Plan 2040 considers four key areas of intervention with respect to vehicular access and movement through Centennial Park: 1.Improvements to Grand Drive / 2.Improved vehicular permeability - amending the existing one-way system within the Inner Park to allow access to the Inner Park from the east side of Grand Drive / 3.Conflict minimisation - safety improvements to a number of intersections along Grand Drive, separate to but endorsed by the Master Plan / 4.Improvements beyond the Park boundary - improvements to pedestrian, cyclist and public transport access to the park.

The following table represents the number of general comments left by participants who completed the survey

| Total | Like | Dislike | Missing |
|-------|------|---------|---------|
| 33    | 14   | 10      | 9       |
| 100%  | 42%  | 30%     | 27%     |

Participant comments concerning the reasons for their choices appear in the following theme analysis

# THE MASTER PLAN - TRAFFIC, ACCESS & CIRCULATION

| What Participants Like                             | 14 |
|----------------------------------------------------|----|
| Better traffic management                          | 3  |
| Access to the park                                 | 2  |
| Grand Drive upgrade                                | 2  |
| Less cars through reduced parking                  | 2  |
| Minimal change for bike users                      | 1  |
| Better public transport                            | 1  |
| Oxford Street cycleway                             | 1  |
| Focus on improved pedestrian and cyclist safety    | 1  |
| Change direction of Parkes and Dickens Drive       | 1  |
| What Participants Do Not Like                      | 10 |
| Authoritative cyclist control                      | 4  |
| Safety issues crossing Grand Drive                 | 2  |
| Not enough car spaces                              | 1  |
| New direction of Parkes and Dickens Drive          | 1  |
| Cars are ruining the park                          | 1  |
| Planning for off-road cyclist                      | 1  |
| What Participants Think is Missing                 | 9  |
| A plan for cyclist behaviour                       | 4  |
| A plan for cyclist and pedestrian safety/conflicts | 3  |
| Additional horse crossing                          | 1  |
| Additional ways to access the park                 | 1  |

## What participants like about 'Traffic, Access & Circulation'

### Better traffic management | 3 Comments

- Improving vehicle circulation in the park.
- I feel the proposed traffic changes to the park are excellent.
- Conflict minimisation on roads.

### Access to the park | 2 Comments

- Retains cycling/cyclists' access.
- Gateway improvements.

### Grand drive upgrade | 2 Comments

- I love the illustration of the planting along grand drive.
- Re-instating grand drive parallel parking.

### Less cars through reduced parking | 2 Comments

- I like the fact that there is going to be less cars.
- I like that you've reduced parking in the park.

### Minimal change for bike users | 1 Comment

- Like that you haven't changed the bike user space too much.

### Better public transport | 1 Comment

- Better public transport to the park is a great idea.

### Oxford street cycleway | 1 Comment

- Oxford street cycleway.

### Focus on improved pedestrian and cyclist safety | 1 Comment

- Focus on improved pedestrian and cyclist safety

### Change direction of Parkes & Dickens Drive | 1 Comment

- Changing the one way set up to access internal areas of the park.

## What participants do not like about 'Traffic, Access & Circulation'

### Authoritative cyclist control | 4 Comments

- Bikes should not have right of way as they speed around the corner in packs and fan across the road going 30km an hour, which is dangerous for people and animals.
- Not addressed safety issues of immediate concern, such as cyclists riding at high speeds in excess of 30km/ph.
- Major issue of cyclists. Absolutely take advantage of the park and the cycleway. They must be given their own lane with speed monitoring and possibly registration to enter the park and participate
- Mountain bikes and pack cyclists. By far the most anti-social, abusive and non-inclusive group are the mountain bike riders and pack peloton/lycra mob.

### Safety issues crossing Grand Drive | 2 Comments

- I have felt unsafe crossing grand drive when entering from Parkes Drive on the weekends. A high congestion area on the weekends with a variety of park users entering from the Paddington gates.
- Apprehensive when crossing roads due to the volume, high speed and inconsideration of cyclists.

### Not enough car spaces | 1 Comment

- Parallel car parking will likely halve parking spaces. No explanation of how/where the shortfall will be recovered?

### New direction of Dickens and Parkes Drive | 1 Comment

- No explanation of how the reversal of traffic in Parkes Drive will affect circulation at (more frequent) unusual times.

### Cars are ruining the park | 1 Comment

- There's no education about sharing the park. I don't think you've actually stated the biggest problem is that cars are ruining the park. Cars are not a recreational use of the park but they impact on everyone else's use of the park. I think people need to be told to get to the park a better way.

### Planning for off-road cyclists | 1 Comment

- Why not accommodate off-road bicycles them in the Master Plan. I would like to see some planning for the cyclist who regularly cycle there for exercise. Perhaps there should be designated times for cycling early in the morning to allow cyclists to train with other users of the park aware that this is going on- just like they do with the soccer fields.

What participants think is missing in 'Traffic, Access & Circulation'

A plan for cyclist behaviour | 4 Comments

- Minimise the adverse impact the cyclists currently have. Putting regular speed bumps on the motorised traffic portion of the road thus encouraging them to stick to the cycling lane. Giving rangers the powers to confiscate bikes from persistent speeding offenders.
- Keep it low key and fine cyclists who ride off road.
- Thanks for the recent "smoothing" of sections of cycleway (much appreciated). However, there are some other small sections that could improve cyclists' experience e.g. Where the road meets the grand drive at the randwick gates.
- A dedicated bus route from bondi junction terminus to centennial park.

A plan for cyclist and pedestrian safety/conflicts | 3 Comments

- Doesn't seem to be any thought towards cyclists using grand drive in the plan. There are so many cycling accidents on grand drive.
- Not enough attention on how to deal with cyclists and pedestrians. Better signage, clearer pathways and education of all may improve this.
- Cycle path needs to be better maintained should be swept daily and after winds. Two people in my group have crashed this year running over sticks about 2cm diameter.

Additional horse crossing | 1 Comment

- I think there needs to be people and horse crossing at the Lang Road entrance so it is safer for horses to get across to the horse track.

Additional Ways to Access the Park | 1 Comment

- A dedicated bus route from Bondi Junction terminus to Centennial Park.

THE MASTER PLAN - ENHANCED  
PEDESTRIAN EXPERIENCE



The Draft Centennial Park Master Plan 2040 seeks to make the ‘People’s Park’ more accessible to more people whilst preserving the sense of discovery and areas of unstructured access which make the current Park experience unique.

Defining key pedestrian circulation routes will enable the Park to accommodate increasing numbers of visitors without compromising the condition of its green spaces and landscaped areas, and will also ensure the aging population can continue to access to the Park’s diverse recreational offerings.

The following table represents the number of general comments left by participants who completed the survey

| Total | Like | Dislike | Missing |
|-------|------|---------|---------|
| 10    | 2    | 7       | 1       |
| 100%  | 20%  | 70%     | 10%     |

Participant comments concerning the reasons for their choices appear in the following theme analysis

# THE MASTER PLAN - ENHANCED PEDESTRIAN EXPERIENCE

|                                    |   |
|------------------------------------|---|
| What Participants Like             | 2 |
| New and improved walkways          | 2 |
| What Participants Do Not Like      | 7 |
| Formalising path surfaces          | 5 |
| No reduction of natural feel       | 2 |
| What Participants Think is Missing | 1 |
| Additional tracks                  | 1 |



## What participants like about 'Enhanced Pedestrian Experience'

### New and improved walkways | 2 Comments

- Extra walking tracks in the park.
- No alterations to the informal track inside the white equestrian fence.

## What participants do not like about 'Enhanced Pedestrian Experience'

### Formalising path surfaces | 5 Comments

- Putting in a proper walk-way around this area would also destroy the 'natural' feel of it. Not necessary.
- Trail running has become really popular over the past few years; the outer trail should be the location for city resident to have a feel about trail running. We do not need more paved runs...
- Unclear how the upgrade to tracks/paths will occur. While there is a need to improve surface of a number of paths around the perimeter (e.g. Because they have a soft sand), their replacement needs to be a soft surface not a paved surface.
- No more formed paths - especially not concrete or bitumen.
- Sealing the surface of various pedestrian paths will also just encourage off road biking...

### No reduction of natural feel | 2 Comments

- Expansion of tracks and paths and reduction of natural feel of park and green spaces. There are no new paths needed.
- I would be concerned if Centennial Park became overly trailed. Secondary route #6 feels completely unnecessary to me.

## What participants think is missing in 'Enhanced Pedestrian Experience'

### Additional Tracks | 1 Comment

- I would like to see a footpath/running track installed all the way around the park on the outside of the park railings.

BLANK PAGE



# THE MASTER PLAN - A NETWORK OF HUBS / IMPROVED AMENITIES



As the population grows and park visitation increase, a greater number of 'family hubs' will be required to spread people throughout the park to avoid congestion. Families demand playgrounds and amenity, and new kiosks will be established together with bathroom facilities to ensure both comfort and proximity for family activities. The proposed new hubs have been carefully spaced to ensure they cater for different areas of the Park. Each hub builds on an existing node of activity, and either replaces an existing building or is clustered around existing development.

The following table represents the number of general comments left by participants who completed the survey

| Total | Like | Dislike | Missing |
|-------|------|---------|---------|
| 21    | 6    | 6       | 9       |
| 100%  | 29%  | 29%     | 43%     |

Participant comments concerning the reasons for their choices appear in the following theme analysis

# THE MASTER PLAN - A NETWORK OF HUBS / IMPROVED AMENITIES

|                                      |   |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| What Participants Like               | 6 |
| New cafes/eateries                   | 2 |
| The updating of amenities            | 2 |
| More facilities                      | 2 |
| What Participants Do Not Like        | 6 |
| Too many new facilities              | 2 |
| Relocation of maintenance depot      | 2 |
| It's a park not a café               | 1 |
| Against the Ranger's Residence plans | 1 |
| What Participants Think is Missing   | 9 |
| More amenities/facilities            | 6 |
| A volunteer's centre                 | 1 |
| Needs more lighting                  | 1 |
| Needs better food selection          | 1 |



## What participants like about 'A Network of Hub / Improved Amenities'

### New cafes/eateries | 2 Comments

- Greater number of places for food and drink. The Master Plan goes far enough in this regard.
- A new permanent cafe and toilets at Vernon Pavilion.

### The updating of amenities | 2 Comments

- Park definitely needs more and better amenities.
- Improved amenities to get changed, toilets.

### More facilities | 2 Comments

- More new toilets.
- Additional bbq areas would also be great.

## What participants do not like about 'A Network of Hub / Improved Amenities'

### Too many new facilities | 2 Comments

- Can't see how it's large enough to include all of the proposed facilities
- Food outlets at sports hub, southwest hub, Vernon Hub

### Relocation of the Maintenance Depot | 2 Comments

- Relocate the maintenance depot to Moore Park. Really!
- Master plan is for Centennial Park only. Yet it also involves Moore Park. Key move 4 is to relocate the maintenance depot from centennial park to Moore Park to free up high-value space for uses more sympathetic to the parklands environment

### It's a park, not a café | 1 Comment

- Centennial Park is a park not a place for coffee drinkers and commercial cafe patrons. There should be no more commercial premises allowed in the park.

### Against the Rangers Residence Plans | 1 Comment

- Opposed to plans for the ranger's cottage.

What participants think is missing in 'A Network of Hubs / Improved Amenities'

More amenities/facilities | 6 Comments

- More barbecue facilities (these could be pay operated to raise parkland revenue).
- Clean water stations throughout the park.
- More garbage/recycling stations.
- More toilet amenities
- Some of the facilities in the parkland do need some updating.
- Mobile food trucks with sophisticated food, not just hamburgers and toasted sandwiches.

A volunteer's centre | 1 Comment

- Volunteer's centre/office.

Needs more lighting | 1 Comment

- Permanent lighting in the park. Lighting above entrances and exits to enhance park at night.

Needs better food selection | 1 Comment

- Better cafe operators; refrigerated sandwiches don't cut it.

THE MASTER PLAN - DEFINED EVENT ZONES



The Draft Centennial Park Master Plan 2040 proposes three areas for temporary events, and provides specific amenities and services to support them. However, it does not prohibit temporary events from being held in areas other than the three identified primary event zones - provided they are appropriate for the proposed locations.

The following table represents the number of general comments left by participants who completed the survey

| Total | Like | Dislike | Missing |
|-------|------|---------|---------|
| 15    | 2    | 6       | 7       |
| 100%  | 13%  | 40%     | 47%     |

Participant comments concerning the reasons for their choices appear in the following theme analysis

# THE MASTER PLAN - DEFINED EVENT ZONES

|                                           |   |
|-------------------------------------------|---|
| What Participants Like                    | 2 |
| Mix of events                             | 1 |
| Reduced impact from events                | 1 |
| What Participants Do Not Like             | 6 |
| Brazilian Fields expansion                | 2 |
| Events creating noise                     | 2 |
| Against events                            | 1 |
| Events affect environment and wildlife    | 1 |
| What Participants Think is Missing        | 7 |
| The private use of Belvedere Amphitheatre | 2 |
| Planning strategy for events              | 2 |
| Car free days                             | 1 |
| Event free days                           | 1 |
| Permanent bar                             | 1 |



## What participants like about 'Defined Event Zones'

### Mix of events | 1 Comment

- Plan still allows for a mix of events, and encourage this. The open-air cinema is a fantastic event and really enhances the liveability for Sydney.

### Reduced impact from events | 1 Comment

- Reduced impact from events on the rest of the park.

## What participants do not like about 'Defined Event Zones'

### Brazilian Fields expansion | 2 Comments

- Moulding of topography in Brazilian Fields for viewing.
- The new structure proposed for viewing sporting events.

### Events creating noise | 2 Comments

- Citizens in a cosmopolitan city like Sydney need a sanctuary, quiet places of beauty and contemplation, not another location for events
- Entertainment with that level of noise and impact should not be held within Centennial Park. There is a responsibility to preserve the natural environment of the parklands. It is a park not a stadium!

### Against events | 1 Comment

- Opposed to the park being rented out for events.

### Events affect environment and wildlife | 1 Comment

- Draft plan should disallow the park being used for 'events', commercial or otherwise. Centennial park is a park and it is inappropriate to risk the integrity of flora and fauna in the park by allowing this to continue

What participants think is missing in 'Defined Event Zones'

The private use of Belvedere Amphitheatre | 2 Comments

- Belvedere amphitheatre used to be a 'public space'. Currently for at least 4 months, it is alienated from public use by the cinema. This sort of over development that is already going on in the park which the proposed master plan appears to extend.
- I am also opposed to such a building (new amphitheatre) being in constant potential use by the university of NSW.

Planning strategy for events | 2 Comments

- No explanation of whether any of the changes are specifically to enable more concerts and other major commercial uses.
- Not clear what the limitation to external events will be. They remove significant areas from public use and the fencing installed is ugly.

Car free days | 1 Comment

- More car free days.

Event free days | 1 Comment

- How about one weekend day a month not only being 'car free' but also being 'event free'!

Permanent bar | 1 Comment

- The temporary bar that was in the Superintendent's Residence earlier this year was lovely, especially with the live music. Surely a permanent bar is an excellent way to tap into a mature, cashed up audience?

THE MASTER PLAN - WELLNESS, SPORTS  
AND FORMAL RECREATION



The Draft Centennial Park Master Plan 2040 seeks to maintain the existing formal and informal recreational opportunities of the Park, while identifying opportunities to actively pursue partnerships with University educators and/or health providers to provide opportunities for health and wellbeing programs in the Park.

The following table represents the number of general comments left by participants who completed the survey

| Total | Like | Dislike | Missing |
|-------|------|---------|---------|
| 16    | 4    | 5       | 7       |
| 100%  | 25%  | 31%     | 44%     |

Participant comments concerning the reasons for their choices appear in the following theme analysis

# THE MASTER PLAN - WELLNESS, SPORTS & RECREATION

|                                          |   |
|------------------------------------------|---|
| What Participants Like                   | 4 |
| Fitness stations                         | 3 |
| Maintenance of sports facilities         | 1 |
| What Participants Do Not Like            | 5 |
| Safety for horses, riders and the public | 3 |
| Against organised exercise activities    | 1 |
| Against fitness stations                 | 1 |
| What Participants Think is Missing       | 7 |
| Additional sports and recreation         | 3 |
| Outdoor swimming pool                    | 2 |
| Maintenance of horse track               | 2 |



## What participants like about 'Wellness, Sports & Recreation'

### Fitness stations | 3 Comments

- Planned fitness equipment would be a great addition to the park.
- Exercise stations more interaction with horses for casual visitors.
- The fitness and jogging areas seem to incorporate all areas of the park.

### Maintenance of sport facilities | 1 Comment

- Maintenance of the green spaces, existing and additional sporting facilities.

## What participants do not like about 'Wellness, Sports & Recreation'

### Safety for horses, riders and the public | 3 Comments

- Concerns about public safety, the safety of riders (children and adults, novice and experienced).
- Riding stables staff and horse owners having to take on much more responsibility in directing the public, traffic, road users, pedestrians and bike riders in order to keep their customers, horses and themselves safe.
- The master plan seems to want to increase the public access to everything within the park, including horses, however it is increasingly difficult to conduct this business in the park daily at the moment

### Against organised exercise activities | 1 Comment

- Strongly opposed to organised exercise or 'boot camp' groups using the park for group exercise

### Against fitness stations | 1 Comment

- A network of fitness stations - grand drive is already so busy and there are so many fitness groups already training in the park. I think 'fitness stations' will just create more congestion of people exercising around grand drive.

What participants think is missing in 'Wellness, Sports & Recreation'

Additional sports and recreation | 3 Comments

- Great if 3 or 4 cricket nets could be added.
- More non-traditional sports and activities.
- Mountain bike trail!

Outdoor swimming pool | 2 Comments

- Eastern suburbs could benefit from an outdoor 50m swimming pool which is heated all year round.
- An outdoor swimming pool. There is currently a serious lack of public swimming pools in the eastern suburbs..

Maintenance of horse track | 2 Comments

- Horse track around the outside should be better maintained with sand on track and it should be graded 1 or 2 a week.
- Better outlook on the facilities and the horse track would be ideal.

THE MASTER PLAN - PLAY FOR ALL AGES



All play spaces to offer an innovative, world's best play experience. Play spaces to be collocated with complementary visitor services. Each play space should have a unique character. Together, they should offer a diverse range of experiences and cater for a diverse group of people, from babies to adults. New place spaces should respond to and enhance the existing Park landscape character.

The following table represents the number of general comments left by participants who completed the survey

| Total | Like | Dislike | Missing |
|-------|------|---------|---------|
| 5     | 2    | 1       | 2       |
| 100%  | 40%  | 20%     | 40%     |

Participant comments concerning the reasons for their choices appear in the following theme analysis

# THE MASTER PLAN - PLAY FOR ALL AGES

|                                    |   |
|------------------------------------|---|
| What Participants Like             | 2 |
| Improved children’s cycling area   | 1 |
| Improved education precinct        | 1 |
| What Participants Do Not Like      | 1 |
| Location of water playground       | 1 |
| What Participants Think is Missing | 2 |
| Suggested activities               | 2 |



## What participants like about 'Play for all Ages'

### Improved children's cycling area | 1 Comment

- Improving the children's cycling area.

### Improved education precinct

- Improvement of education precinct.

## What participants do not like about 'Play for all Ages'

### Location of water playground | 1 Comment

- Whilst the concept of a water playground is worthy, the proposed location is not suitable.. The preferred location would be the south eastern end abounding ash paddock. The ground here is stable and will allow for a minimum impact on the environment, additionally the ponds have already had safety fences installed.

## What participants think is missing in 'Play for all Ages'

### Suggested activities | 2 Comments

- Urban agriculture. This is a huge social trend and some part of centennial park should be used for this, as most nearby residents have no opportunity to participate in it. Require dogs to be on leashes.
- Orienteering course

BLANK PAGE

# THE MASTER PLAN - ENHANCED INTERPRETATION



The draft Centennial Park Master Plan 2040 proposes four themes around which the interpretive experience might be generated through a new interpretation overlay to be permanently embedded within the Park landscape. In addition, a digital component will complement the interpretative experience and enable all visitors to connect in real time to an evolving online archive.

The following table represents the number of general comments left by participants who completed the survey

| Total | Like | Dislike | Missing |
|-------|------|---------|---------|
| 7     | 1    | 1       | 5       |
| 100%  | 14%  | 14%     | 72%     |

Participant comments concerning the reasons for their choices appear in the following theme analysis

# THE MASTER PLAN - ENHANCED INTERPRETATION

|                                    |   |
|------------------------------------|---|
| What Participants Like             | 1 |
| Improving signage and way finding  | 1 |
| What Participants Do Not Like      | 1 |
| Removal of sponsorship plaques     | 1 |
| What Participants Think is Missing | 5 |
| Interactive sculpture              | 2 |
| Educational tools                  | 2 |
| Increase signage in the park       | 1 |



## What participants like about 'Enhanced Interpretation'

### Improving signage and way finding | 1 Comment

- Improving access, signage and way finding

## What participants do not like about 'Enhanced Interpretation'

### Removal of sponsorship plaques | 1 Comment

- Plan should stop small sponsorship acknowledgement plaques from being place under trees. These plaques are spoiling the 'parkland' nature and are intrusive to the enjoyment of a natural environment.

## What participants think is missing in 'Enhanced Interpretation'

### Interactive sculpture | 2 Comments

- Interactive sculpture sounds interesting, as long as it does not become an eyesore in 20 years time. Park users should have input regarding any large, permanent art installations.
- Permanent contemporary sculpture pieces and events in the park.

### Educational tools | 2 Comment

- Something about restoring the information about birds and protecting their environment - the crossing between willow pond and fly casting pond was destroyed a few years ago. The birds are still there but the information board has been empty for years.
- 'History wall' highlighting origins, past events, people involvement of the park and the city of Randwick and Sydney.

### Increase signage in the park | 1 Comment

- Signs about bike and pedestrian etiquette at the entrances to the park.

THE MASTER PLAN IN SUMMARY

| Theme                                  | Total                        | Like                        | Dislike                     | Missing                     |
|----------------------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| In General                             | 80                           | <div>31<div>39%</div></div> | <div>29<div>36%</div></div> | <div>20<div>25%</div></div> |
| Outer/Inner                            | 27                           | <div>3<div>11%</div></div>  | <div>23<div>85%</div></div> | <div>1<div>3%</div></div>   |
| Traffic, Access and Circulation        | <div>33<div>100%</div></div> | <div>14<div>42%</div></div> | <div>10<div>30%</div></div> | <div>9<div>27%</div></div>  |
| Enhanced Pedestrian Experience         | <div>10<div>100%</div></div> | <div>2<div>20%</div></div>  | <div>7<div>70%</div></div>  | <div>1<div>10%</div></div>  |
| A Network of Hubs / Amenities          | <div>21<div>100%</div></div> | <div>6<div>29%</div></div>  | <div>6<div>29%</div></div>  | <div>9<div>43%</div></div>  |
| Defined Event Zones                    | <div>15<div>100%</div></div> | <div>2<div>13%</div></div>  | <div>6<div>40%</div></div>  | <div>7<div>47%</div></div>  |
| Wellness, Sports and Formal Recreation | <div>16<div>100%</div></div> | <div>4<div>25%</div></div>  | <div>5<div>31%</div></div>  | <div>7<div>44%</div></div>  |
| Play for all Ages                      | <div>5<div>100%</div></div>  | <div>2<div>40%</div></div>  | <div>1<div>20%</div></div>  | <div>2<div>40%</div></div>  |
| Enhanced Interpretation                | <div>7<div>100%</div></div>  | <div>1<div>14%</div></div>  | <div>1<div>14%</div></div>  | <div>5<div>72%</div></div>  |
| TOTAL                                  | 214                          | <div>65<div>30%</div></div> | <div>88<div>41%</div></div> | <div>61<div>29%</div></div> |



1. What do you like about the draft Master Plan 2040?

Handwritten feedback for question 1:

1. I like the fact that there is a lot of green space and that there is a lot of walking and cycling paths. I also like the fact that there is a lot of water and that there is a lot of wildlife.

2. Are there any aspects of the draft Master Plan 2040 that you do not like?

Handwritten feedback for question 2:

2. I don't like the fact that there is a lot of parking spaces and that there is a lot of traffic. I also don't like the fact that there is a lot of concrete and that there is a lot of noise.

[illegible]

---

☐ Less than 10 years      ☐ 10-20      ☐ 21-35

☐ 36-45      ☐ 46-60      ☐ 61-75

☐ 76-85      ☐ 86 or older

---



2



BLANK PAGE

CENTENNIAL PARK  
Exhibition of the Draft Master Plan 2040

Stage Two Consultation Findings  
Tent in the Park: 5 to 13 October 2013

October 2013

Prepared for The Centennial and Moore Park Trust & BVN Donovan Hill Architecture.

Prepared by:  
The People for Places and Spaces



CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION TO THE DRAFT ..... v

THE TENT IN THE PARK CONSULTATION ..... viii

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: THE TENT IN THE PARK CONSULTATION ..... ix

THE SURVEY PARTICIPANTS.....xii

SUMMARY OF SURVEY RESPONSES ..... 1

MAIN REPORT .....21

    THE MASTER PLAN - IN GENERAL .....22

    THE MASTER PLAN - OUTER & INNER PARK.....30

    THE MASTER PLAN - TRAFFIC ACCESS & CIRCULATION .....34

    THE MASTER PLAN - A NETWORK OF HUBS / IMPROVED AMENITIES.....47

    THE MASTER PLAN - DEFINED EVENT ZONES .....52

    THE MASTER PLAN - WELLNESS, SPORTS & FORMAL RECREATION .....58

    THE MASTER PLAN - PLAY FOR ALL AGES .....62

    THE MASTER PLAN - ENHANCED INTERPRETATION .....66

SUMMARY OF SURVEY RESPONSES .....69

BLANK PAGE

# INTRODUCTION TO THE DRAFT

## MASTER PLAN CONSULTATION

This report has been prepared by The People for Places and Spaces, a member of the Centennial Park master plan team led by BVN Donovan Hill Architecture, appointed by the Centennial Park and Moore Park Trust (the Trust) to lead the process of creating a master plan for Centennial Park.

This is the first ever master plan for Centennial Park and looks forward to 2040. This project will deliver a long-term planning document to improve the management and maintenance of what is one of the world’s best public parks.

The Centennial Park Draft Master Plan is attached (Appendix A.)

Six Principles and Eight Key Moves that have shaped the Plan are as follows:

### THE SIX PRINCIPLES

- A Park that endures
- A Park for All
- A Park for Discovery and Education
- A Park for Partnerships
- A Park for Health and Wellbeing
- A Park like No Other

### THE EIGHT KEY MOVES

- Outer Park/Inner Park
- Traffic Access and Circulation
- Enhanced Pedestrian Experience
- A Network Of Hubs/ Improved Amenities
- Define Event Zones
- Wellness, Sport and Formal Recreation
- A Park for Play
- Enhanced Interpretation



## TWO PUBLIC CONSULTATION COMPONENTS

The Public were invited to comment on the Draft Master Plan in two ways.

1. The Tent in the Park exhibition included a facilitated display, supported by the Trust Staff and the Consultant Team, who introduced the plan, discussed proposals and answered questions between Saturday 5 October to Sunday 13 October 2013. Participants completed a survey in the tent, or later on line.
2. An online survey on Centennial Parklands website

Monday 30 September to Tuesday 29 October 2013.

The survey questions for the exhibition and the online survey were identical. Both groups of participants were asked:

What do you like about the Draft Master Plan?

What do you not like about the Draft Master Plan?

Do you think there is anything missing?

Age, gender and place of residence?

One hundred and ninety-four people completed the survey either by visiting the Tent in the Park Exhibition or Online, having never visited the Tent. Note that Tent in the Park includes the 73 people who completed the survey while visiting the tent and 21 who completed on-line after their visit to the tent.

Number of people who participated in either of the consultation methods is set out in Figure One

| Survey Method                       | Number of Participants | Percentages |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------|-------------|
| Tent in the Park<br>5 to 13 October | 94                     | 48.45%      |
| Online Survey<br>30 to 14 September | 100                    | 51.55%      |
| TOTAL                               | 194                    | 100%        |

Figure One: Tent in the Park and Online survey participants

TWO PUBLIC CONSULTATION COMPONENTS (Continued)

This document The Tent in the Park Consultation Report is one of two reports being prepared by The People for Places and Spaces based on the findings from the public consultation on the Centennial Park Draft Master Plan 2040:

A separate Online Survey Report shows findings from the online responses received the first 13 days of exhibition from 30 September to 14 October 2013. This report is necessarily incomplete because the online survey remains open for responses until 29 October 2013.

The Trust will undertake its own review of the additional data returned between 16 to 29 October 2013.

The findings presented in both reports will be reviewed and considered by the Trust and Master Plan Team to finalise the New Centennial Park Master Plan 2040, prior to its release by the end of 2013.

OTHER CONSULTATIONS NOT INCLUDED

Consultations the CEO and Executives of the Trust and groups of key external stakeholder groups listed below are not included in either report and include:


- Centennial Park Consultative Committee
- Centennial Park Residents' Association
- Centennial Park users
- Commercial businesses, hirers, catering companies, event organisations
- Neighbouring organisations
- Local Government – surrounding municipalities
- Members of Parliament
- NSW Government agencies and peer organisations

ROUND ONE PUBLIC CONSULTATION

A first round of consultation took place between 2 July 2013 and 14 July 2013. A total of 580 people responded to the first round consultation through participating in intercepts in the Park or on online.

A Round One Report 'Centennial Park: A Survey of Park Users, July 2013' was prepared by The People for Places and Spaces and provided an in-depth analysis of all participants responses.

THE TENT IN THE PARK CONSULTATION



“WELCOME!  
HAVE YOUR SAY”





# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: STAGE TWO CONSULTATION THE TENT IN THE PARK

5 October – 13 October 2013

The Main Report follows the Executive Summary and readers are encouraged to read both reports in order to fully understand the depth and range of the responses

Ninety-four people participated in the Tent in the Park Consultation, recording 328 comments and responses. Where more than one idea was contained in a participants responses, they have been broken into separate comments for clustering during the data analysis.

## ANALYSIS AND REPORTING

Not all respondents answered all three park-related questions in the ‘in-park’ survey – some answered only those in which they were most interested. Therefore, the numbers of responses for each question vary.

People who attended the Tent in the Park facilitated display had the opportunity to ask questions and discuss the draft master plan with members of the design team and park staff: they had the opportunity to clarify information, which participants online did not.

For this reason, data from the in-park and online components of the public consultation cannot be combined and reported together.

It is important to note that the objective of community consultation is to invite people to have their say – without restriction in regard to who can participate or limits on what they can say. The objective of this type of consultation is to discover the full range of views that exists within a given group, about a particular issue with which they are familiar. The Trust was seeking the views of park users about the Draft Master Plan 2040.

Qualitative research is the only research method that fulfils these objectives for community consultation. This type of research seeks to understand in some depth, people’s experiences and views of a particular subject with which they are familiar. No one should be excluded, if they wish to participate. By using different consultation processes (in-park and online), the consultation has been made widely accessible for all people to participate in ways that are convenient for them.

The Trust’s objective was to encourage as many people as possible to participate. Prior advertising in newspapers and via online publicity channels, such as Twitter and Facebook, among others, publicised the survey. The sample generated 94 in-park responses from respondents who self-selected to participate in this in-park consultation.

## IS QUALITATIVE RESEARCH STATISTICALLY VALID?

The simple answer is No. The objectives of inviting broad participation and encouraging people to respond in any way they wish, using open-ended questions, cannot be met with quantitative, statistically valid sampling techniques. It is not possible to employ statistically valid quantitative research techniques to community consultation, as this would exclude people from participating, once sample quotas were filled. Statistical sampling does not allow respondents to express any views they wish, but rather requires them respond to questions that carry a pre-determined range of responses. Quantitative, statistically valid research is simply unsuitable to the requirement for inclusive and exploratory community consultation, where everyone is welcome to participate.

The findings in this report cannot be said to be statistically representative of any broader group – such as all park users, if they did not participate in the consultation. We do confirm however, that the findings accurately represent the views of those who participated.

## THE SUMMARY TABLES: RESPONSES, THEMES AND ORDERING

By nature, qualitative data can is dense. To ensure that the findings are both accessible and readable, the responses were coded and analysed using a theme analysis.

For each question, similar ideas and comments have been coalesced into particular themes that emerged from the data. Any responses that did not accord with a theme have been reported as single responses.

The themes have been reported in order of magnitude, according to the number of comments within each theme – from those with the most comments, to those with the fewest. This is a descriptive means of ordering qualitative data to make it more accessible to readers.

There is no statistical significance implied by these numbers. In presenting the data in this way, we do not imply that the stronger themes are more important than other themes, or any individual ideas. Readers should therefore evaluate each theme, or individual comment, on its merits.

The summary tables for the Master Plan in general and for each of the 8 Key Moves follows.

Participants’ responses to the master plan are recorded in the summary table that follow. The 328 responses from the ninety-four respondents have been clustered by themes for each of the topic areas.

Readers are encouraged to read the Main Report, which provides details of all comments and brings alive the voices of the participants.

BLANK PAGE




## THE SURVEY PARTICIPANTS

94 people participated in the 'Tent in the Park' Consultation


Demographic information for those who took part in the survey is provided below. Please note that as this was a qualitative research study, the demographics information does not conform to any statistical profile. It simply reflects the demographics of those who self-selected to participate.

The age groups, gender balance and postcodes will therefore not be representative of all people who use Centennial Park.

### AGE GROUPS OF SURVEY PARTICIPANTS 'IN PARK'




### GENDER OF SURVEY PARTICIPANTS 'IN PARK'





POSTCODES IN 2000 TO 2050 ‘IN PARK’



BLANK PAGE

# SUMMARY OF SURVEY RESPONSES

| Theme                                           | Total       | Like       | Dislike   | Missing   |
|-------------------------------------------------|-------------|------------|-----------|-----------|
| In General                                      | 100<br>100% | 62<br>62%  | 16<br>16% | 22<br>22% |
| Outer/Inner                                     | 39<br>100%  | 19<br>48%  | 20<br>52% | 0<br>0%   |
| Traffic, Access<br>and Circulation              | 70<br>100%  | 23<br>33%  | 28<br>40% | 19<br>27% |
| Enhanced<br>Pedestrian<br>Experience            | 12<br>100%  | 7<br>58%   | 1<br>8%   | 4<br>33%  |
| A Network of<br>Hubs /<br>Amenities             | 47<br>100%  | 25<br>53%  | 3<br>6%   | 19<br>40% |
| Defined Event<br>Zones                          | 24<br>100%  | 5<br>20%   | 15<br>63% | 4<br>17%  |
| Wellness,<br>Sports and<br>Formal<br>Recreation | 17<br>100%  | 8<br>47%   | 2<br>12%  | 7<br>41%  |
| Play for all<br>Ages                            | 10<br>100%  | 4<br>40%   | 3<br>30%  | 3<br>30%  |
| Enhanced<br>Interpretation                      | 9<br>100%   | 3<br>33%   | 1<br>11%  | 5<br>56%  |
| TOTAL                                           | 328         | 165<br>48% | 80<br>27% | 83<br>25% |

# THE MASTER PLAN - IN GENERAL



One key areas of community interest that came through strongly in the consultation is an intense interest in what stays the same. There is an overwhelming love and respect of the place, and we want to ensure that the traditions and legacies that we have today are maintained into the future.

The following table represents the number of general comments left by participants who completed the survey

| Total | Like | Dislike | Missing |
|-------|------|---------|---------|
| 100   | 62   | 16      | 22      |
| 100%  | 62%  | 16%     | 22%     |

*Participant comments concerning the reasons for their choices appear in the following theme analysis*

THE MASTER PLAN - IN GENERAL

|                                                               |    |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| What Participants Like About the Draft Master Plan            | 62 |
| Well thought through and great ideas                          | 17 |
| A park for everyone to share                                  | 9  |
| That there is a plan                                          | 6  |
| Maintain character of the park                                | 5  |
| Minimal changes and positive enhancements                     | 4  |
| The plan is well presented                                    | 4  |
| Consulted and valued                                          | 3  |
| No additional built environment                               | 3  |
| Peaceful oasis                                                | 3  |
| There is a long-term plan                                     | 3  |
| Commercial partnerships valued                                | 3  |
| Retaining open space                                          | 1  |
| Dog friendly                                                  | 1  |
| What Participants Do Not Like About the Draft Master Plan     | 16 |
| Lack of consideration for flora and fauna                     | 4  |
| Against commercialism and partnerships                        | 3  |
| Not consulted and valued                                      | 2  |
| Against new built environment                                 | 2  |
| More of a sanctuary                                           | 2  |
| Many dislikes                                                 | 1  |
| Inadequate planning                                           | 1  |
| Not enough un-leashed areas for dogs                          | 1  |
| What Participants Think is Missing from the Draft Master Plan | 22 |
| No plan for maintenance                                       | 8  |
| Failure to consider dogs                                      | 5  |
| Missing flora and fauna                                       | 3  |
| More detailed information                                     | 3  |
| No timeline or funding information for implementation         | 2  |
| Revenue generation                                            | 1  |

THE MASTER PLAN - OUTER & INNER PARK



Strengthening the planting of trees and native grasses to the Outer Park in order to enhance its dual role as a buffer to the surrounding urban environment and as the ‘green gateway’ to the Inner Park

Enhancing existing landscape character precincts including open parklands, groves, gardens and avenues

Encouraging the growth of native grasslands to create biodiversity

The Master Plan proposes subtle changes to the landscaping in the Outer Park (more trees in selected areas, and the growth of native grasses) to enhance the experience of the Outer Park as a spatial and ecological filter to the Inner Park.

The following table represents the number of general comments left by participants who completed the survey

| Total | Like | Dislike | Missing |
|-------|------|---------|---------|
| 39    | 19   | 20      | 0       |
| 100%  | 48%  | 52%     | 0%      |

Participant comments concerning the reasons for their choices appear in the following theme analysis.

# THE MASTER PLAN - OUTER & INNER PARK

|                                                                                               |    |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| What Participants Like                                                                        | 19 |
| Retaining the wilderness of the outer park                                                    | 9  |
| Formalising the outer trail                                                                   | 5  |
| That there is a tree succession plan                                                          | 4  |
| Cultivated inner park                                                                         | 1  |
| What Participants Do Not Like                                                                 | 20 |
| Opposed to making outer track available for off road cyclist & keeping dogs on leash          | 18 |
| Over manicured                                                                                | 2  |
| What Participants Think is Missing                                                            | 0  |
| Participants do not think there is anything missing from the Master Plan – Outer & Inner Park |    |



# THE MASTER PLAN - TRAFFIC ACCESS & CIRCULATION



The draft Centennial Park Master Plan 2040 considers four key areas of intervention with respect to vehicular access and movement through Centennial Park:

The following table represents the number of general comments left by participants who completed the survey

| Total | Like | Dislike | Missing |
|-------|------|---------|---------|
| 70    | 23   | 28      | 19      |
| 100%  | 33%  | 40%     | 27%     |

Participant comments concerning the reasons for their choices appear in the following theme analysis.


# THE MASTER PLAN - TRAFFIC ACCESS & CIRCULATION

| What Participants Like                          | 23 |
|-------------------------------------------------|----|
| Better access to the park                       | 4  |
| Grand Drive upgrade                             | 4  |
| Change direction of Parkes & Dickens Drive      | 4  |
| Better traffic management                       | 4  |
| Parallel parking along Grand Drive              | 3  |
| Oxford Street cycleway                          | 1  |
| Reducing cyclist aggression                     | 1  |
| Crossing Grand Drive                            | 1  |
| What Participants Do Not Like                   | 28 |
| Focus on improved pedestrian and cyclist safety | 9  |
| Authoritative cyclist control                   | 7  |
| Traffic control;                                | 3  |
| Not enough car spaces                           | 3  |
| Over manicured Grand Drive                      | 2  |
| Poor access for events                          | 1  |
| Change direction of Parkes & Dickens Drive      | 1  |
| Limit car parking                               | 1  |
| Parallel parking worries                        | 1  |
| What Participants Think is Missing              | 19 |
| A plan to control cyclist behaviour             | 10 |
| Traffic control                                 | 4  |
| Safe Grand Drive crossing                       | 3  |
| Cyclist access                                  | 1  |
| Relocate parking                                | 1  |

# THE MASTER PLAN - ENHANCED PEDESTRIAN EXPERIENCE



The draft Centennial Park Master Plan 2040 considers four key areas of intervention with respect to vehicular access and movement through Centennial Park:



Participant comments concerning the reasons for their choices appear in the following theme analysis.

# THE MASTER PLAN - ENHANCED PEDESTRIAN EXPERIENCE

|                                                 |   |
|-------------------------------------------------|---|
| What Participants Like                          | 7 |
| Focus on improved pedestrian and cyclist safety | 7 |
| What Participants Do Not Like                   | 1 |
| Dangerous erosion                               | 1 |
| What Participants Think is Missing              | 4 |
| Stop erosion                                    | 2 |
| Addition Tracks                                 | 2 |

# THE MASTER PLAN - A NETWORK OF HUBS / IMPROVED AMENITIES



The draft Centennial Park Master Plan 2040 considers four key areas of intervention with respect to vehicular access and movement through Centennial Park:

The following table represents the number of general comments left by participants who completed the survey

| Total | Like | Dislike | Missing |
|-------|------|---------|---------|
| 47    | 25   | 3       | 19      |
| 100%  | 53%  | 6%      | 40%     |

Participant comments concerning the reasons for their choices appear in the following theme analysis.

# THE MASTER PLAN - A NETWORK OF HUBS / IMPROVED AMENITIES

|                                    |    |
|------------------------------------|----|
| What Participants Like             | 25 |
| New café's / eateries              | 9  |
| Improved amenities / toilets       | 5  |
| Re-use of existing buildings       | 4  |
| Additional toilets                 | 4  |
| New hubs                           | 3  |
| What Participants Do Not Like      | 3  |
| No more cafes                      | 3  |
| What Participants Think is Missing | 19 |
| Need more seating and benches      | 4  |
| More bubblers and water stations   | 4  |
| More lighting                      | 4  |
| More amenities and Wi-Fi hubs      | 3  |
| Better food selection              | 2  |
| Maintenance for hubs and amenities | 1  |
| Opening times extended             | 1  |

# THE MASTER PLAN - DEFINED EVENT ZONES



The draft Centennial Park Master Plan 2040 considers four key areas of intervention with respect to vehicular access and movement through Centennial Park:

The following table represents the number of general comments left by participants who completed the survey

| Total | Like | Dislike | Missing |
|-------|------|---------|---------|
| 24    | 5    | 15      | 4       |
| 100%  | 20%  | 63%     | 17%     |

Participant comments concerning the reasons for their choices appear in the following theme analysis.

# THE MASTER PLAN - DEFINED EVENT ZONES

|                                                       |    |
|-------------------------------------------------------|----|
| What Participants Like                                | 5  |
| More events                                           | 3  |
| Defined event zones                                   | 1  |
| Belvedere amphitheatre upgrade                        | 1  |
| What Participants Do Not Like                         | 15 |
| Events creating noise                                 | 6  |
| Brazilian fields expansion                            | 2  |
| Against large events                                  | 2  |
| Events affect environment and wildlife                | 2  |
| Increased traffic and reduced access caused by events | 1  |
| Permanent power supply                                | 1  |
| Trust is governing itself                             | 1  |
| What Participants Think is Missing                    | 4  |
| Event planning strategy                               | 2  |
| Specific events missing                               | 2  |

# THE MASTER PLAN - WELLNESS, SPORTS AND FORMAL RECREATION



The draft Centennial Park Master Plan 2040 considers four key areas of intervention with respect to vehicular access and movement through Centennial Park:

The following table represents the number of general comments left by participants who completed the survey

| Total | Like | Dislike | Missing |
|-------|------|---------|---------|
| 17    | 8    | 2       | 7       |
| 100%  | 47%  | 12%     | 41%     |

Participant comments concerning the reasons for their choices appear in the following theme analysis.

# THE MASTER PLAN - WELLNESS, SPORTS AND FORMAL RECREATION

|                                                    |   |
|----------------------------------------------------|---|
| What Participants Like                             | 8 |
| Fitness stations                                   | 4 |
| Adding/improving sporting fields                   | 3 |
| Values and integrity                               | 1 |
| What Participants Do Not Like                      | 2 |
| Reduced passive recreation due to organised sports | 2 |
| What Participants Think is Missing                 | 7 |
| Additional sports and recreational                 | 5 |
| Olympic swimming pool                              | 2 |

# THE MASTER PLAN - PLAY FOR ALL AGES



The draft Centennial Park Master Plan 2040 considers four key areas of intervention with respect to vehicular access and movement through Centennial Park:

The following table represents the number of general comments left by participants who completed the survey

| Total | Like | Dislike | Missing |
|-------|------|---------|---------|
| 10    | 4    | 3       | 3       |
| 100%  | 40%  | 30%     | 30%     |

Participant comments concerning the reasons for their choices appear in the following theme analysis.

# THE MASTER PLAN - PLAY FOR ALL AGES

|                                              |   |
|----------------------------------------------|---|
| What Participants Like                       | 4 |
| Improved children’s waterpark/cycling area   | 3 |
| Improved education precinct                  | 1 |
| What Participants Do Not Like                | 3 |
| Location of waterpark                        | 3 |
| Education for young people with disabilities | 1 |
| Relocate cycleway away from Grand Drive      | 1 |
| What Participants Think is Missing           | 3 |
| Partnerships with local schools              | 3 |



# THE MASTER PLAN - ENHANCED INTERPRETATION



The draft Centennial Park Master Plan 2040 considers four key areas of intervention with respect to vehicular access and movement through Centennial Park:

The following table represents the number of general comments left by participants who completed the survey

| Total | Like | Dislike | Missing |
|-------|------|---------|---------|
| 9     | 3    | 1       | 5       |
| 100%  | 33%  | 11%     | 56%     |

Participant comments concerning the reasons for their choices appear in the following theme analysis.



# THE MASTER PLAN - ENHANCED INTERPRETATION

|                                       |   |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| What Participants Like                | 3 |
| Improved signage and way finding      | 2 |
| Indigenous Australian consideration   | 1 |
| What Participants Do Not Like         | 1 |
| Inadequate signage                    | 1 |
| What Participants Think is Missing    | 5 |
| Plants and wildlife educational tools | 4 |
| Interpretation by artists             | 1 |

BLANK PAGE

# MAIN REPORT

The main report expands on material presented in the Executive Summary. It contains all comments that participants submitted coded by themes.



# THE MASTER PLAN - IN GENERAL



One key areas of community interest that came through strongly in the consultation is an intense interest in what stays the same. There is an overwhelming love and respect of the place, and we want to ensure that the traditions and legacies that we have today are maintained into the future.

The following table represents the number of general comments left by participants who completed the survey

| Total | Like | Dislike | Missing |
|-------|------|---------|---------|
| 100   | 62   | 16      | 22      |
| 100%  | 62%  | 16%     | 22%     |

Participant comments concerning the reasons for their choices appear in the following theme analysis



THE MASTER PLAN - IN GENERAL

|                                                               |    |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| What Participants Like About the Draft Master Plan            | 62 |
| Well thought through and great ideas                          | 17 |
| A park for everyone to share                                  | 9  |
| That there is a plan                                          | 6  |
| Maintain character of the park                                | 5  |
| Minimal changes and positive enhancements                     | 4  |
| The plan is well presented                                    | 4  |
| Consulted and valued                                          | 3  |
| No additional built environment                               | 3  |
| Peaceful oasis                                                | 3  |
| There is a long-term plan                                     | 3  |
| Commercial partnerships valued                                | 3  |
| Retaining open space                                          | 1  |
| Dog friendly                                                  | 1  |
| What Participants Do Not Like About the Draft Master Plan     | 16 |
| Lack of consideration for flora and fauna                     | 4  |
| Against commercialism and partnerships                        | 3  |
| Not consulted and valued                                      | 2  |
| Against new built environment                                 | 2  |
| More of a sanctuary                                           | 2  |
| Many dislikes                                                 | 1  |
| Inadequate planning                                           | 1  |
| Not enough un-leashed areas for dogs                          | 1  |
| What Participants Think is Missing from the Draft Master Plan | 22 |
| No plan for maintenance                                       | 8  |
| Failure to consider dogs                                      | 5  |
| Missing flora and fauna                                       | 3  |
| More detailed information                                     | 3  |
| No timeline or funding information for implementation         | 2  |
| Revenue generation                                            | 1  |

What participants like about the Master Plan in General

Well thought through and great ideas | 17 Comments

- I view the plan favourably.
- Some wonderful ideas.
- Lots of great ideas
- Good in parts.
- Many things
- All of the principles are wonderful.
- Great plans, particularly to incorporate a games space
- It overall looks very good.
- Like it.
- Just about everything!
- Everything is amazing! Well done.
- Keeping our parks, especially Centennial being close to the city and Heritage up to date.
- An excellent job.
- Love Centennial Park.
- It is well thought through, and the proposed improvements are excellent.
- Keep up the great work.
- Looks good.

A park for everyone to share | 9 Comments

- It will remain the people's park for everyone to share.
- Encompasses most activities that people visit the park for sport, relaxation, natural beauty, socializing. Improving on existing facilities and structures.
- A good balance for all users.
- Will remain the people's park for everyone to share.
- Like the increasing diversity for different age groups.
- Plan keeps abreast of demographics
- A number of people have been considered in their different activities.
- Very good, considered and balanced
- I like that it is inclusive of all age groups.

That there is a plan | 7 Comments

- Excellent idea to put forward a plan that will continue to nurture this wonderful inheritance into the future.
- I love that there is a plan - looks great!
- The planning.
- The general plan looks quite good. Any attempt to upgrade and extend the park facilities should be applauded and supported.
- Vision - Areas due for improvement.
- Like that there is one! (Plan).
- Confirmed Vision

## What participants like about the Master Plan in General (continued)

### Maintain character | 5 Comments

- Maintain the character and enjoyment of park.
- Like lots of improvements without changing the spirit of the park.
- Continuation of existing services enhancing facilities and green areas.
- I like that it builds on existing strengths.
- Like the way they are trying to preserve the essential character of the park.

### Minimal changes and positive enhancements | 4 Comments

- Minimal and effective changes.
- Keeps most things the same.
- The minimal changes all appear positive enhancements.
- Like that it largely stays the same.

### The plan is well presented | 4 Comments

- Vision. An imaginative plan. User friendly and welcoming.
- Very clear and easy to understand
- Very thoughtfully planned and well illustrated.
- It is well thought and explained.

### Consulted and valued | 3 Comments

- That a master plan is being considered and the public is given the chance to have a say.
- Like the continued consultation with interest groups.
- Takes on board the increasing local population.

### No Additional built environment | 3 Comments

- 100% support of not adding any new structures to the park.
- Like the commitment to not increase the built environment.
- Appreciate the hands off approach with less built structures.

### Peaceful oasis | 3 Comments

- Like that it keeps open space and areas for solitude.
- Focus on the park as a serene oasis.
- Oasis within the city

### There is a long term plan | 3 Comments

- Like the long term outlook
- Planning for the future.
- Plan for future is an excellent initiative and well overdue.

## What participants like about the Master Plan in General (continued)

### Commercial partnerships valued | 3 Comments

- Existing buildings availability to public and commercial.
- I like that there have been a change to commercial 'partnerships' rather than 'host'.
- The Master Plan is generally very good. I particularly like the focus on making spaces available to all potential hirers with less focus on particular users having almost exclusive use of some facilities.

### Retaining open space | 1 Comment

- I like that you are keeping the open spaces.

### Dog friendly | 1 Comment

- Keep it dog friendly.

## What participants do not like about the Master Plan in General

### Lack of consideration for flora and fauna | 4 Comments

- Insufficient attention to wildlife and endangered species. Inadequate consultation to create wildlife corridor for endangered species including rare raptors, birds, reptiles and invertebrates and rare species of Microbat present.
- Many people feed the ducks bread. Duck numbers appear excessive and damage is being done to the areas where they are fed.
- I would like to have more areas for birds, flowers and wilderness.
- There is not enough emphasis on biodiversity

### Against commercialism and partnerships | 3 Comments

- Bit concerned about all the eateries and money-making ventures
- The un-commercial nature is the aspect I love about the park.
- Bringing in more commerce will change the character of the park.

### Not consulted and valued | 2 Comments

- The entire process of the development of the Draft Centennial Park Master Plan 2040 would seem to be wrong. The Trust should have spent more time and money on a comprehensive consultation process and then drafted a plan based on the result of this consultation instead of wasting money on a misguided plan with a glossy marketing campaign followed by the absolute bare minimum of consultation.
- lack of plans to work with community consistency.

### Against new built environment | 2 Comments

- Over development should be avoided.
- Dislikes the clash between the South West areas being deemed 'wild' yet having a cafe installed.

### More of a sanctuary | 2 Comments

- I would like the park to be more of a sanctuary, with no traffic except for free shuttle services.
- I am in favour of a quiet place for reflection as well as a sanctuary for wildlife. Anything in the plan that runs counter to these is not in the interest of a tranquil place: Rock concerts, more sporting events, cyclists etc. should not be encouraged.

### Many dislikes | 1 Comment

- So many aspects of the Draft Centennial Park Master Plan 2040 that myself, and many others, do not like.

### Inadequate planning | 1 Comment

- Masterplan inadequate for 2040.

### Not enough un-leashed areas for dogs | 1 Comment

- Don't like the dog-leash areas near BBQs as get abused if my dog is off the leash and people are eating.

## What participants think is missing about the Master Plan in General

### No plan for maintenance | 8 Comments

- No recycling mentioned. All that recycling goes to land fill.
- Lot of glass around the perimeter, especially Lang Road York road 24, and area 2. Need workers to screed the sand. Keep the track sandy as this shows up the glass.
- Feral animal control? Carp in the ponds.
- Needs Draft Centennial Park Maintenance Plan 2040. This would include removal of currently unused or unnecessary buildings or infrastructure. Preservation and ongoing maintenance of the remaining buildings or infrastructure.
- A comprehensive plan and sufficient staff to improve the actual 'parkland'
- Vigorous stand of feral gorse (east and west of the stairs)
- Less pollution.
- I was appalled several years ago to see that the recycling bins were emptied in with other rubbish. In short there is no recycling going on.

### Failure to consider dogs | 5 Comments

- Dog swimming areas.
- Place to tie up dogs in shade with water near food outlets
- Place for my dog to be unleashed.
- Demountable cover for dogs tied outside the cafe. Some get shelter but other posts are in full sun. These are only needed in summers.
- It would be good to have poo bins next to poo bags dispensers

### Missing flora and fauna | 3 Comments

- Have you considered trialing the native frangipani in the park?
- Kangaroos and koalas.
- More flower garden areas. More natives, e.g. waratah, kangaroo paw etc.

### No timeline or funding information for implementation | 3 Comment

- Timing of when things might happen!
- The needs more explanation of funding strategy.
- Acknowledgement of the increased financial burden of maintenance costs on the proposed new infrastructure

### More detailed information | 2 Comment

- This is the master plan — we'd like this process to happen again when all DETAIL is available because 'the devil's in the detail'!
- Little or no detail on total failure to maintain the existing infrastructure and green space

### Revenue generation | 1 Comments

- Possibility of charged entry and parking?

BLANK PAGE



THE MASTER PLAN - OUTER & INNER PARK



Strengthening the planting of trees and native grasses to the Outer Park in order to enhance its dual role as a buffer to the surrounding urban environment and as the ‘green gateway’ to the Inner Park

Enhancing existing landscape character precincts including open parklands, groves, gardens and avenues

Encouraging the growth of native grasslands to create biodiversity

The Master Plan proposes subtle changes to the landscaping in the Outer Park (more trees in selected areas, and the growth of native grasses) to enhance the experience of the Outer Park as a spatial and ecological filter to the Inner Park.

The following table represents the number of general comments left by participants who completed the survey

| Total | Like | Dislike | Missing |
|-------|------|---------|---------|
| 39    | 19   | 20      | 0       |
| 100%  | 48%  | 52%     | 0%      |

Participant comments concerning the reasons for their choices appear in the following theme analysis.

# THE MASTER PLAN - OUTER & INNER PARK

|                                                                                               |    |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| What Participants Like                                                                        | 19 |
| Retaining the wilderness of the outer park                                                    | 9  |
| Formalising the outer trail                                                                   | 5  |
| That there is a tree succession plan                                                          | 4  |
| Cultivated inner park                                                                         | 1  |
| What Participants Do Not Like                                                                 | 20 |
| Opposed to making outer track available for off road cyclist & keeping dogs on leash          | 18 |
| Over manicured                                                                                | 2  |
| What Participants Think is Missing                                                            | 0  |
| Participants do not think there is anything missing from the Master Plan – Outer & Inner Park |    |



## What participants like about 'Outer & Inner Park'

### Retaining the wilderness for outer park | 9 Comments

- Areas will be retained for passive recreation;
- Like the outer path being even more wild and the ecology preserved
- Woodland Wilderness areas around the edges of the park
- Wilder outer park is a great idea.
- Leave wild life areas of the park untouched.
- Enjoy the more natural sides of the park.
- Like the Southwest area will be retained as a wild natural area, used by a lot of people. Home to many small creatures; quail, turtles, field mice. Unique area in the city.
- Leaving it as it is also decreases the cost of maintenance of the park.
- Also that the rugged spaces are remaining so. It means that I can feel like I am on an adventure, without handrails

### Formalising the outer trail | 5 Comments

- Formalising the outer trail to preserve areas subject to erosion etc., but should leave as much as possible.
- Like formalising the outer ring to give access to wider aspects of the park.
- Likes the idea of sealing/furnishing perimeter track.
- The outer ring.
- The outer trail looks good. Well done.

### There is a tree succession plan | 4 Comments

- No net loss of open spaces and trees.
- Tree succession plan; future tree replacement plan
- Future tree replacement plan.
- Likes the new ideas of tree planting as need for further habitat installation

### Cultivated inner-park | 1 Comment

- Maintain inner-park as cultivated.

What participants do not like about 'Outer & Inner Park'

Opposed to making outer track available for off road cyclist & keeping dogs on leash | 18 Comments

- I am horrified at outer trail to be opened up for slow cyclists - there are no such things - at the moment cyclists are required to ride in groups of a maximum of 15 at a maximum speed of 30kph.
- Park regulations require all cyclists to ride on the bike track. This is being abused and is a significant danger on the outer trail. Humans, dogs and bikes do not mix.
- Imagine the influx of cross-country bikes, usually ridden by younger people coming from everywhere to use the track.
- The beauty of Outer Trail is that dogs can walk off lead. Concerned that we could lose it to cross country bike riders.
- Consider an increase in the number of bike riders result in the park being liable for any injuries because most bike riders are uninsured.
- No cycling on outer trail - safety aspect for mountain off-road cyclists, pedestrians, runners and dogs
- Concerned about the "goat track" plans, an all weather surface is going to be put on it and that "slow cyclists"(?!) will be allowed on, that dogs will have to be on a leash.
- Absolutely no place for cyclists to share such a path. Outside the Grand Drive is a dog off-leash designated area. It will become a track for BMX and mountain bikes, a very dangerous prospect.
- The track is widely used by walkers, people with strollers, runners and people with dogs. Cyclists are not allowed on the track but do so anyway. The cyclists are generally men who ride at speed, particularly down slopes with total disregard for anyone else.
- Cyclists and pedestrians do not mix and there is already a problem with accidents on the park's roads.
- Contrary to the statements in the Draft Master Plan, by requiring dogs to be on leash on the upgraded path, you are reducing the off leash area and just encouraging people to walk their dogs in more populated areas of the park.
- I ride my bike in the park as well as walk my dog and see the two activities as completely separate.
- The outer park is currently one of the very few serene zones of joggers and walkers simply enjoying the parklands and the absence of high speed wheeled machines
- Not happy about outer trail having cyclists on it.
- I object very strongly to the proposal that the 'Outer Trail', is going to be opened up to cyclists, and dog owners will no longer be allowed to use the path unless they leash their dogs.
- Should not allow cyclists on Outer Trail and allow dogs off leash, as in the rest of the outer park area.
- People use the outer track for a variety of activities but all enjoy the peace and tranquility of an area away from the roads, cyclists and cars. People who walk their dog on the track do so while keeping a close eye on their dogs. The dogs are well behaved, do not trouble people without dogs and are far less of an inconvenience than cyclists.
- The introduction of cyclists to the outer park is simply a very bad idea. There is more than enough space already allocated for cyclists. Cyclists have access to all roads outside and within the park.

Over manicured | 2 Comments

- Careful to not over-manicure the areas; keep it natural and beautiful.
- Prefer the essentially unstructured nature of the park

Participants do not think there is anything missing from the Master Plan – 'Outer and Inner Park' Section

THE MASTER PLAN - TRAFFIC ACCESS & CIRCULATION



The Draft Centennial Park Master Plan 2040 considers four key areas of intervention with respect to vehicular access and movement through Centennial Park: 1.Improvements to Grand Drive / 2.Improved vehicular permeability - amending the existing one-way system within the Inner Park to allow access to the Inner Park from the east side of Grand Drive / 3.Conflict minimisation - safety improvements to a number of intersections along Grand Drive, separate to but endorsed by the Master Plan / 4.Improvements beyond the Park boundary - improvements to pedestrian, cyclist and public transport access to the park.

The following table represents the number of general comments left by participants who completed the survey

| Total | Like | Dislike | Missing |
|-------|------|---------|---------|
| 70    | 23   | 28      | 19      |
| 100%  | 33%  | 40%     | 27%     |

Participant comments concerning the reasons for their choices appear in the following theme analysis.

# THE MASTER PLAN - TRAFFIC ACCESS & CIRCULATION

|                                                               |    |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| What Participants Like About the Draft Master Plan            | 23 |
| Better access to the park                                     | 4  |
| Grand Drive upgrade                                           | 4  |
| Change direction of Parkes & Dickens Drives                   | 4  |
| Better traffic management                                     | 4  |
| Parallel parking along Grand Drive                            | 3  |
| Oxford Street cycleway                                        | 1  |
| Reducing cyclist aggression                                   | 1  |
| Crossing Grand Drive                                          | 1  |
| What Participants Do Not Like About the Draft Master Plan     | 28 |
| Focus on improved pedestrian and cyclist safety               | 9  |
| Authoritative cyclist control                                 | 7  |
| Traffic control;                                              | 3  |
| Not enough car spaces                                         | 3  |
| Over manicured Grand Drive                                    | 2  |
| Poor access for events                                        | 1  |
| Change direction of Parkes & Dickens Drives                   | 1  |
| Limit car parking                                             | 1  |
| Parallel parking worries                                      | 1  |
| What Participants Think is Missing from the Draft Master Plan | 19 |
| A plan to control cyclist behaviour                           | 10 |
| Traffic control                                               | 4  |
| Safe Grand Drive crossing                                     | 3  |
| Cyclist access                                                | 1  |
| Relocate parking                                              | 1  |



## What participants like about 'Traffic Access & Circulation'

### Better access to the park | 4 Comments

- Allows for staging better access into the park plans for the future in a constructive way.
- Plan considers access to the park and maneuverability
- Alison Road entry is great.
- Gateway improvements

### Grand Drive upgrade | 4 Comments

- The proposed upgrade of facilities, toilets, children's cycleway and ceasing to allow cars to angle park around grand drive on tree roots are good.
- Proposed planning of trees around grand drive.
- Landscaping for car parking around grand drive are great ideas.
- Likes the ides of proper pedestrian crossings over Grand Drive.

### Change direction of Parkes & Dickens Drive | 4 Comments

- Like the idea of opening up the centre more by changing traffic flow.
- Reversing direction of Parkes & Dickens Drives makes sense.
- Like the ideas of reducing “rat-running” through the park.
- The improved through traffic fare to the centre of the park.

### Better traffic management | 4 Comments

- Addresses some of the traffic problems in the park.
- Better traffic management.
- Great the plan is considering access to the park and maneuverability and signage in the park.
- Keep using speed display monitors as it shows vehicle speeds.

•

## What participants like about 'Traffic Access & Circulation' (Continued)

### Parallel parking along Grand Drive | 3 Comments

- Support move to parallel parking even though it reduces parking spaces
- Proposed parallel parking
- The new parking arrangements and buffer zones look great.

### Oxford Street cycleway | 1 Comment

- Like the external cycle track on Oxford Street.

### Reducing cyclist aggression | 1 Comment

- Focus on reducing cyclist aggression.

### Crossing Grand Drive | 1 Comment

- Entering through the Robertson Road Gates would be facilitated if a crosswalk could be provided to cross Grand Drive.

## What participants do not like about 'Traffic Access & Circulation'

### Focus on improved pedestrian and cyclist safety | 9 Comments

- Have to elicit the cooperation of dog owners.
- Cyclists seem to be a protected species. There seems to be little consideration of the interaction of cyclists and pedestrians. I think people find cyclists rather than cars as more of a threat when crossing grand drive. (They're a bit more unpredictable, harder to see and have varying speed). They tend to dominate their space more so than cars, particularly those who treat it like a velodrome.
- As things stand, cyclists are a danger to human life.
- Cars and cyclists conflicting; cheeky monkey pro forum people bragging about going around 70kms.
- Cyclist attitude to other park users is deplorable be they children or the elderly or dog owners.
- Cyclists and pedestrians do not mix and there is already a problem with accidents on the park's roads.
- The outer park is currently one of the very few serene zones of joggers and walkers simply enjoying the parklands and the absence of high speed wheeled machines.
- There is the cycleway for children, appropriately named the learners cycleway. There is even a dedicated, and recently enlarged, cycleway on the grand drive. In fact, it is very difficult to get away from the angry yelling and total disregard for road rules that is so frequently the trademark of the lycra clad centennial park cyclist packs.
- I was hoping for more of a solution for the conflicting interests of peloton cyclists, car drivers recreational cyclists and pedestrians. Disappointing that what is for the only unpleasant aspect of the park is only briefly mentioned but no apparent solution outlined. I understand it is a difficult issue.

### Authoritative cyclist control | 7 Comments

- Cycle track cyclist speed - monitoring by CCTV
- Something has to be done about the cyclists and the way they use the park - grand drive. If cars are restricted to 30kph why are cyclists allowed to 'zoom' past at speeds of 45/50kph. Quite apart from anything else, pelotons of 16 are far too big.
- Pathways speed humps should be installed.
- All bikes should be 'registered'.
- Cyclists using the park, as an outdoor velodrome must be addressed. They do not obey the traffic signs (keep within the cycle lane, speed limits, stop signs are ignored, their groups often exceed the stipulated 16 riding two abreast and they totally ignore one-way street signs).
- There is no provision to contain and address the 'overbearing vulgarity' of the cyclists! They come in packs of 20-25 early on Tuesday and Thursday mornings. They abuse pedestrians and anyone that gets in their way as they speed around at 40-45kmph.
- The cyclists generally ride at speed, particularly down slopes with total disregard for anyone else.

### Not enough car spaces | 3 Comments

- I am concerned for those outside the area if there is reduction/limitation of car parking.
- Needs to ensure adequate parking.
- The reduction in parking facilities is a pity.

### Traffic control | 2 Comments

- Speeding cars, particularly in the early morning, are a problem when it is not uncommon to see speeds around 60kph in operation.
- Prior to 9am motorists feel free to exit the Robertson Road Gates via the entrance gate.
- I am worried about the change of traffic direction in Dickens Drive and Parkes Drive, including night turns.

### Over-manicured Grand Drive | 2 Comments

- It all looks a little bit neat. I like the messiness of the parking edges around Grand Drive. Ban parking there if you must, but please, no pavers and planter boxes!
- Too many fancy paths planned.

### Limit car parking | 1 Comment

- Parking should be restricted or abolished entirely.

### Parallel parking | 1 Comment

- Combining parallel parking near the kid's bike track will be a disaster on weekends as this is the bottleneck of the park and where many people park. There is no alternate side road for these people to park on.

### Poor access for big events | 1 Comment

- Big events have access issues.

## What participants think is missing from 'Traffic Access & Circulation'

### A plan to control cyclist behaviour | 10 Comments

- A plan to control those abusive cyclists on Tuesday and Thursday mornings.
- If timing of different speed cyclists is not effective in accommodating different interests, perhaps different lanes for speeding cyclists, leisure cyclists and children cyclists.
- A serious plan to tackle aggressive cyclist behaviour including speeding and abuse to fellow park users.
- Action to address the misconduct of cyclists.
- I think cyclists should have to pay to cycle here.
- As a regular daytime cyclist in the park, I would like to see a small kerb-like delineation line erected throughout the park to segregate the cycle and car lanes. I have witnessed far too many vehicles parking, driving and reversing in the cycle lane as well as weaving in and out of it due to mobile phone and other distractions. I have also seen the aftermath of a few accidents caused by negligent motorists in the park and feel that a segregated path is crucial to providing not only a healthy but safe activity for cyclists. I also feel that there should be increased signposting of the speed limit within the park, better located so that they are much more visible to everyone.
- An occasional police presence would also aid in reducing vehicular speeding as the park is used by many motorists as a short-cut between suburbs.
- No mention of how to reduce the speed of cyclists and yet this is a key concern from park users.
- There needs to be a better solution for the conflicting interests between cyclists, drivers, and pedestrians. Clear definitions of courtesy.
- The plan seems rather silent relating to issues on cycling.

### Traffic control | 5 Comments

- Signs should be in the park indicating 'No Entry' into Darley Rd. before Grand Drive.
- Use barriers to physically stop people from turning into Gate 7.
- Traffic islands increases in size to stop right hand turn.
- Controls to stop cars parking off roads,
- Bike lanes being confused for car lane.

### Safe Grand Drive crossing | 3 Comments

- Safe crossing, e.g. elevated road with pedestrian under path.
- The ongoing issue of the kids bike track and foot traffic across Grand Drive to get to it.
- A raised area where the pedestrian section of Grand Drive intersects with various roads such as Dickens Drive to prevent drivers hitting small children, the disabled and older people

### Cyclist access | 1 Comment

- The greatest need is for bike paths leading into the park.

### Relocate parking | 1 Comment

- Remove car parking completely from the park area; instead, have dedicated parking next to the SCG/Fox Anzac Parade. Shuttle services can then ferry users through the park and crisscross to everywhere in the park. Removing parking will open up Grand Drive to cyclists very safely.

THE MASTER PLAN - ENHANCED PEDESTRIAN EXPERIENCE



The Draft Centennial Park Master Plan 2040 seeks to make the ‘People’s Park’ more accessible to more people whilst preserving the sense of discovery and areas of unstructured access which make the current Park experience unique.

Defining key pedestrian circulation routes will enable the Park to accommodate increasing numbers of visitors without compromising the condition of its green spaces and landscaped areas, and will also ensure the aging population can continue to access to the Park’s diverse recreational offerings.

The following table represents the number of general comments left by participants who completed the survey

| Total | Like | Dislike | Missing |
|-------|------|---------|---------|
| 12    | 7    | 1       | 4       |
| 100%  | 58%  | 8%      | 33%     |

Participant comments concerning the reasons for their choices appear in the following theme analysis.

# THE MASTER PLAN - ENHANCED PEDESTRIAN EXPERIENCE

|                                                 |   |
|-------------------------------------------------|---|
| What Participants Like                          | 7 |
| Focus on improved pedestrian and cyclist safety | 7 |
| What Participants Do Not Like                   | 1 |
| Dangerous erosion                               | 1 |
| What Participants Think is Missing              | 4 |
| Stop erosion                                    | 2 |
| Additional Tracks                               | 2 |



## What participants like about 'Enhanced Pedestrian Experience'

### New and improved walkways | 7 Comments

- New walkways around the lakes.
- I agree to opening up the walk that is currently a gay beat so safer for others.
- New trails, walks and wayfinding and upgraded paths all sound great.
- Walks without cyclists or runners would be beneficial to 'old plodders'.
- I like the improvements to pedestrian access and walkways past ponds.
- Likes the idea of sealing/furnishing perimeter track.
- Great that work will prevent erosion and construction of walkways in fragile areas.

## What participants do not like about 'Enhanced Pedestrian Experience'

### Dangerous erosion | 1 Comment

- Near Federation Valley erosion has seriously exposed tree roots making them a danger for runners and dogs (can't be too good for the trees either).

## What participants think is missing from 'Enhanced Pedestrian Experience'

### Stop erosion | 2 Comments

- Yes, fixing erosion by stopping bikes on riding/ walkways and thus destroying them
- Add guttering to control erosion.

### Additional tracks | 2 Comments

- Separate track for runners, perhaps on the inside of the walking track. Walkers and runners on same track constantly dodging each other.
- Loch Avenue needs one-way traffic, a separate footpath for pedestrians

BLANK PAGE



THE MASTER PLAN - A NETWORK OF HUBS / IMPROVED AMENITIES



As the population grows and park visitation increase, a greater number of 'family hubs' will be required to spread people throughout the park to avoid congestion. Families demand playgrounds and amenity, and new kiosks will be established together with bathroom facilities to ensure both comfort and proximity for family activities. The proposed new hubs have been carefully spaced to ensure they cater for different areas of the Park. Each hub builds on an existing node of activity, and either replaces an existing building or is clustered around existing development.

The following table represents the number of general comments left by participants who completed the survey

| Total | Like | Dislike | Missing |
|-------|------|---------|---------|
| 47    | 25   | 3       | 19      |
| 100%  | 53%  | 6%      | 40%     |

Participant comments concerning the reasons for their choices appear in the following theme analysis.

# THE MASTER PLAN - A NETWORK OF HUBS / IMPROVED AMENITIES

|                                                               |    |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| What Participants Like About the Draft Master Plan            | 25 |
| New cafés/eateries                                            | 9  |
| Improved amenities/toilets                                    | 5  |
| Re-use of existing buildings                                  | 4  |
| Additional toilets                                            | 4  |
| New hubs                                                      | 3  |
| What Participants Do Not Like About the Draft Master Plan     | 3  |
| No more cafes                                                 | 3  |
| What Participants Think is Missing from the Draft Master Plan | 19 |
| Need more seating and benches                                 | 4  |
| More bubblers and water stations                              | 4  |
| More lighting                                                 | 4  |
| More amenities and Wi-Fi hub                                  | 3  |
| Better food selection                                         | 2  |
| Maintenance for hubs and amenities                            | 1  |
| Opening times extended                                        | 1  |



## What participants like about 'A Network of Hubs / Improved Amenities'

### New cafes/ eateries | 9 Comments

- New coffee areas.
- Increase cafe facilities sound good.
- Like the more light refreshments.
- Like the additional low key kiosk facilities (as opposed to the fine dining)
- Like the variety of hubs, cafes and shelters.
- I like the cottage area to have an eating area.
- In particular the picnic areas, food facilities, playgrounds.
- Having a cafe near the children’s cycleway would be of great benefit to mums and dads spending time in this area with their children.
- Also like the new permanent cafe to add variety.

### Improved amenities / toilets | 5 Comments

- Improved amenities (toilets, food/drink outlets)
- Improved access to amenities.
- Some useful additions e.g. improved amenities.
- The proposed upgrade of facilities, toilets.
- Likes that new amenities will run from stable power source, not solar power and inappropriate use.

### Re-use of existing buildings | 4 Comments

- Like the proposal to use the cottages for short stays for revenue generation.
- Greater use of two cottages.
- Like the ranger’s cottage for commercial use.
- Utilisation of existing heritage buildings for various uses

### Additional toilets | 4 Comments

- Like the increase in facilities.
- Toilet facilities to serve the Belvedere Amphitheatre make sense to complement the enhancements being undertaken.
- I am very much in favour of MORE well equipped toilets and more refreshment areas
- Likes that the new toilet designs will not perpetuate the existing problems with these facilities

### New hubs | 3 Comments

- I like the idea of a main hub at Vernon Pavilion
- New hubs good especially at bike track.
- South West hub - improved space to encourage and facilitate kids play and development, but importantly in a way that's SAFE from cars, horses and cyclists.

## What participants do not like about 'A Network of Hubs / Improved Amenities'

### No more cafes | 4 Comments

- Sure the park needs to cater to a range of tastes but is it necessary for the park to perform the role of cafe?
- The new high-use areas like the food areas will only increase traffic.
- I do not think that we need more coffee shops in Sydney! I come here to get away from the usual aspects of Sydney.
- Too many facilities will detract from the park.

## What participants think are missing in 'A Network of Hubs / Improved Amenities'

### Need more seating / benches | 4 Comments

- More seating provided especially in out of the way spots where one could rest and enjoy the ambience of the park.
- We need a lot more tables and benches, most families have an elder over 55 years and these people usually cannot sit on the ground.
- New amenities would be great for the northeast corner of the park.
- You need more family semi-secluded areas with picnic facilities rather than vast sites.

### Missing bubblers/water station | 4 Comments

- I would like more bubblers/drinking stations.
- Cold-water bubblers would be good.
- Water filling stations.
- Upgrade drink stations for water bottle filling for the public.

### Need more lighting | 4 Comments

- Lighting for running/exercise in the evening, especially in winter.
- Lighting especially in winter time so the park can be used after 5:30
- Additional lighting to facilitate longer training hours within a safer environment as there are some very dark areas at the stands and surrounds.
- I think there could be more lights to improve safety and encourage more evening use

### More amenities / Wi-Fi Hub | 3 Comments

- Could we have a Wi-Fi hub?
- Change rooms near to exercise areas.
- More toilets.

### Needs better food selection | 2 Comments

- Need to provide good, healthy, simple food at normal prices.
- I would like an affordable eatery that provides healthy options not just ice cream.

### Maintenance | 1 Comment

- Bubblers are left unattended; Paddington gate bubbler has been broken for 2 weeks (plus).

### Opening times extended | 1 Comment

- Any possibility of keeping the cafe (street-side) open later. 3pm is closure time whereas the long summer evenings could be a moment to simply chill out.

BLANK PAGE



THE MASTER PLAN - DEFINED EVENT ZONES



The Draft Centennial Park Master Plan 2040 proposes three areas for temporary events, and provides specific amenities and services to support them. However, it does not prohibit temporary events from being held in areas other than the three identified primary event zones - provided they are appropriate for the proposed locations.

The following table represents the number of general comments left by participants who completed the survey

| Total | Like | Dislike | Missing |
|-------|------|---------|---------|
| 24    | 5    | 15      | 4       |
| 100%  | 20%  | 63%     | 17%     |

Participant comments concerning the reasons for their choices appear in the following theme analysis.

# THE MASTER PLAN - DEFINED EVENT ZONES

|                                                       |    |
|-------------------------------------------------------|----|
| What Participants Like                                | 5  |
| More events                                           | 3  |
| Defined event zones                                   | 1  |
| Belvedere Amphitheatre upgrade                        | 1  |
| What Participants Do Not Like                         | 15 |
| Events creating noise                                 | 6  |
| Brazilian Fields expansion                            | 2  |
| Against large events                                  | 2  |
| Events affect environment and wildlife                | 2  |
| Increased traffic and reduced access caused by events | 1  |
| Permanent power supply                                | 1  |
| Trust is governing itself                             | 1  |
| What Participants Think is Missing                    | 4  |
| Event planning strategy                               | 2  |
| Specific events missing                               | 2  |



## What participants like about 'Defined Event Zones'

### More events | 3 Comments

- More music and art/cultural events.
- More small quiet events.
- Like that they will introduce a more intimate classical concerts.

### Defined event zones | 1 Comment

- Defined and upgraded event zones will help everyone understand different usages within the park.

### Belvedere Amphitheatre upgrade | 1 Comment

- Toilet facilities to serve the Belvedere Amphitheatre make sense to complement the enhancements being undertaken at the moment.
- I like the improvements to Belvedere Amphitheatre. It will make Moonlight Cinema more enjoyable.

## What participants do not like about 'Defined Event Zones'

### Events creating noise | 6 Comments

- I am concerned that music concerts are planned. I live nearby & the noise level & frequency concern me. Is there a way to cap the number of music concerts held there?
- I strongly object to any plans by the Trust to continue loud live music events at the park. However, the large concerts that are being held in the park are on a completely different scale of intrusiveness.
- Please make sure you don't have big events like Rock festivals or concerts. It creates a lot of noise and vandalism in the streets near the park.
- We strongly object to the current 'events' management. The noise level is intolerable. We hear the bass speaker reverberation and feel it too indoors with all doors shut and we have double-glazing. The length is also unacceptable.
- We were horrified by the noise (music) of the pop-up bar, by the Rangers House. Concerned that the peace in the park is one of its most important treasures. No ongoing live or at any of the bars, cafes, popups should be planned. The park is a place for the music of nature. We do understand the very occasional one-day live musical event
- To me, the absence of loud music, or any music is just as important as being among the ponds and plants. If non-audible events are held they should, if at all possible, be held without the addition of musical entertainment.

### Brazilian Fields expansion | 2 Comments

- I do not like the plan to allow the Brazilian Fields defined event zones to expand east or south as this will severely impact on access within the park to all park users. A recent one-off concert in the park used this expansion over Loch Avenue and effectively cut off access along Loch Avenue for over a week whilst the event promoters set up and later dismantled staging, fencing, etc. I do not understand why such large-scale musical events are allowed access to the park given there are other concert venues/stadiums better equipped to host these events.
- This particular expansion plan for the Brazilian Fields defined events does not sit well with the park's philosophy of being the 'People's Park' and supposedly remaining accessible to pedestrians of all ages, cyclists, cars and horses.

### Against large events | 2 Comments

- I am very much against rock music festivals being held here
- Larger commercial activities. The nature of certain commercial activities such as large music concerts has a number of detrimental impacts on the parklands and local residents. For example, unacceptable noise levels for local residents, drunken behavior of attendees, large amounts of rubbish left behind (beer bottles in the park are common)

### Events affect environment and wildlife | 2 Comments

- These events also have an adverse impact on the environment from lands being covered with tents, staging, etc., and holes being dug to erect fence poles.
- This is a park for everyone not just those that attend concerts like these. This excessive noise level must also affect the wonderful wildlife in the park.

### Increased traffic and reduced access cause by events | 1 Comment

- Apart from the reduced access to this area for commercial activity, Also, said events encourage increased heavy vehicle traffic throughout the park which pose safety problems for the park's users, especially when trucks park and drive in the cycle lane.

## What participants do not like about 'Defined Event Zones' (continued)

### Permanent power supply | 1 Comment

- I am disturbed to read that the Draft Masterplan proposes a permanent power supply to the three event sites.

### Trust is governing itself | 1 Comment

- I am also disturbed to discover that Randwick Council's LEP defers responsibility for issuing any licenses to the Trust, so that the Trust is governing itself.

## What participants think is missing in 'Defined Event Zones'

### Event planning strategy | 2 Comments

- Events planning design so when there is an event it doesn't look awful around it - like nice fencing and plant boxes.
- Specific control mechanisms for events/concerts.

### Specific events missing | 2 Comments

- I would like more car-free days, at least once a month.
- I would also like to see more public events and festivals in the park to encourage wider participation.

BLANK PAGE



THE MASTER PLAN - WELLNESS, SPORTS & FORMAL RECREATION



The Draft Centennial Park Master Plan 2040 seeks to maintain the existing formal and informal recreational opportunities of the Park, while identifying opportunities to actively pursue partnerships with University educators and/or health providers to provide opportunities for health and wellbeing programs in the Park.

The following table represents the number of general comments left by participants who completed the survey

| Total | Like | Dislike | Missing |
|-------|------|---------|---------|
| 17    | 8    | 2       | 7       |
| 100%  | 47%  | 12%     | 41%     |

Participant comments concerning the reasons for their choices appear in the following theme analysis.

# THE MASTER PLAN - WELLNESS, SPORTS & FORMAL RECREATION

|                                                    |   |
|----------------------------------------------------|---|
| What Participants Like                             | 8 |
| Fitness stations                                   | 4 |
| Adding/improving sporting fields                   | 3 |
| Values and integrity                               | 1 |
| What Participants Do Not Like                      | 2 |
| Reduced passive recreation due to organised sports | 2 |
| What Participants Think is Missing                 | 7 |
| Additional sports and recreational                 | 5 |
| Olympic swimming pool                              | 2 |



## What participants like about ‘Wellness, Sports and Formal Recreation’

### Fitness stations | 4 Comments

- New exercise areas.
- I like the proposal of providing a series of fitness stations. It looks like a number of people have been considered in their different activities.
- Fitness stations are great ideas.
- Outdoors gym for over-55-year olds

### Adding/improving sporting fields | 3 Comments

- Great plans, particularly to incorporate a games space.
- I like the sporting areas and maintaining public access.
- Like that the hockey field has been brought back so as not to impede views.

### Values and integrity | 1 Comment

- A core value, which protects the integrity of activities.

## What participants do not like about ‘Wellness, Sports and Formal Recreation’

### Reduced passive recreation due to organised sports | 2 Comments

- Consider areas left open for sporting activities, mainly used on weekends in summer, reduces in favour of increased passive recreation.
- Proposed spectator facilities on Reservoir Fields aren’t required and would only reduce space available for sports. It’s only for the girl’s touch football during 2 out of 4 terms of the year when there are any spectators there anyway at the moment, so is not likely to be used much. In addition, the facilities would face ways from the view anyway. The current view looking up from below the Reservoir Fields is fine as it is, looking at the trees all along the bank. Removing the trees and seeing the rear of a spectator facility would be far less pleasant,

What participants think is missing in 'Wellness, Sports and Formal Recreation'

Additional sports and recreational | 5 Comments

- Rowboats and aqua bikes for at least one lake.
- Like to see an athletics track at the sports hub or next to it, to accommodate athletics training on grass in Centennial Park.
- Maybe include a few more different types of areas, like frisbee or golf.
- Model yacht pond made functional like the one in Luxemburg Gardens. Concrete edges, pond yachts for hire, seasonal.
- Skateboard and Scooter Park.

Olympic swimming pool | 2 Comments

- I believe what the eastern suburbs is lacking is sports facilities. I think an Olympic swimming pool to facilitate learners to swim and recreational swimmers as well as lap swimmers would be go
- Idea of a swimming pool has been raised with me, but probably better in Moore Park area.

THE MASTER PLAN - PLAY FOR ALL AGES



All play spaces to offer an innovative, world's best play experience. Play spaces to be collocated with complementary visitor services. Each play space should have a unique character. Together, they should offer a diverse range of experiences and cater for a diverse group of people, from babies to adults. New place spaces should respond to and enhance the existing Park landscape character.

The following table represents the number of general comments left by participants who completed the survey

| Total | Like | Dislike | Missing |
|-------|------|---------|---------|
| 10    | 4    | 3       | 3       |
| 100%  | 40%  | 30%     | 30%     |

Participant comments concerning the reasons for their choices appear in the following theme analysis.

# THE MASTER PLAN - PLAY FOR ALL AGES

|                                              |   |
|----------------------------------------------|---|
| What Participants Like                       | 4 |
| Improved children’s waterpark/cycling area   | 3 |
| Improved education precinct                  | 1 |
| What Participants Do Not Like                | 3 |
| Location of waterpark                        | 3 |
| Education for young people with disabilities | 1 |
| Relocate cycleway away from Grand Drive      | 1 |
| What Participants Think is Missing           | 3 |
| Partnerships with local schools              | 3 |



## What participants like about 'Play for All Ages'

### Improved children's waterpark / cycling area | 3 Comments

- Improved children's facilities including water play.
- Water parks for kids are great ideas.
- Improving children’s cycling area

### Improved Education Precinct | 1 Comment

- Improvement of Education precinct.

## What participants do not like about 'Play for All Ages'

### Location of water playground | 1 Comment

- Children's water play @ SW hub - put it in Darley Paddock area. SW hub is most environmentally sensitive part of the park and should be maintained.

### Education for young people with disabilities | 1 Comment

- Education and activity area should consider the needs of young people with disabilities.

### Relocate cycleway away from Grand Drive | 1 Comment

- I think the children's learning cycleway should be relocated away from Grand Drive and into the middle of the park.

## What participants think is missing in 'Play for All Ages'

### Partnerships with local schools | 3 Comments

- Forge stronger relationships with local schools, like cycle lessons and road safety classes.
- Local primary schools involved with the children’s garden- maybe a kitchen garden component with basic cooking facility - this could possibly attract some funding through Kitchen Garden Scheme.
- More educational visits by schools to enhance additional gardens.

BLANK PAGE



THE MASTER PLAN - ENHANCED INTERPRETATION



The draft Centennial Park Master Plan 2040 proposes four themes around which the interpretive experience might be generated through a new interpretation overlay to be permanently embedded within the Park landscape. In addition, a digital component will complement the interpretative experience and enable all visitors to connect in real time to an evolving online archive.

The following table represents the number of general comments left by participants who completed the survey

| Total | Like | Dislike | Missing |
|-------|------|---------|---------|
| 9     | 3    | 1       | 5       |
| 100%  | 33%  | 11%     | 56%     |

Participant comments concerning the reasons for their choices appear in the following theme analysis.

# THE MASTER PLAN - ENHANCED INTERPRETATION

|                                       |   |
|---------------------------------------|---|
| What Participants Like                | 3 |
| Improved signage and wayfinding       | 2 |
| Indigenous Australian consideration   | 1 |
| What Participants Do Not Like         | 1 |
| Inadequate signage                    | 1 |
| What Participants Think is Missing    | 5 |
| Plants and wildlife educational tools | 4 |
| Interpretation by artists             | 1 |



## What participants like about 'Enhanced Interpretation

### Improved signage and way finding | 2 Comments

- Improving access, signage and way finding to better identify food/beverage options, toilets etc.
- The plan considers signage in the park.

### Indigenous Australian consideration | 1 Comment

- Clan and Country - attention to pre-parklands enjoyment of water sources by Indigenous Australians.

## What participants do not like about 'Enhanced Interpretation

### Inadequate signage | 1 Comment

- The signage needs improvement.

## What participants think is missing in 'Enhanced Interpretation

### Plants and wildlife educational tools | 4 Comments

- Brochures to identify plants and trees in parks as an educational tool.
- Signs around ponds to educate public not to feed the ducks and birds in the ponds and explain the reason why, that they should not eat bread etc.
- Would like to see better promotion, education and respect of the wildlife in the park.
- Adding plaques and information for structures.

### Interpretation by artists | 1 Comment

- I would like to be sure that the interpretive strategies are done with care ideally involving more respected and original artists in designing and conceptualising the strategies and appoint artists to the team.



SUMMARY OF SURVEY RESPONSES

| Theme                                  | Total | Like              | Dislike          | Missing          |
|----------------------------------------|-------|-------------------|------------------|------------------|
| In General                             | 100   | <div>6262%</div>  | <div>1616%</div> | <div>2222%</div> |
| Outer/Inner                            | 39    | <div>1948%</div>  | <div>2052%</div> | <div>00%</div>   |
| Traffic, Access and Circulation        | 70    | <div>2333%</div>  | <div>2840%</div> | <div>1927%</div> |
| Enhanced Pedestrian Experience         | 12    | <div>758%</div>   | <div>18%</div>   | <div>433%</div>  |
| A Network of Hubs / Amenities          | 47    | <div>2553%</div>  | <div>36%</div>   | <div>1940%</div> |
| Defined Event Zones                    | 24    | <div>520%</div>   | <div>1563%</div> | <div>417%</div>  |
| Wellness, Sports and Formal Recreation | 17    | <div>847%</div>   | <div>212%</div>  | <div>741%</div>  |
| Play for all Ages                      | 10    | <div>440%</div>   | <div>330%</div>  | <div>330%</div>  |
| Enhanced Interpretation                | 9     | <div>333%</div>   | <div>111%</div>  | <div>556%</div>  |
| TOTAL                                  | 328   | <div>15648%</div> | <div>8927%</div> | <div>8325%</div> |

BLANK PAGE

This image shows a blank white page. A solid black vertical line runs along the left edge, creating a margin. The rest of the page is completely white and contains no other markings or text.

[illegible]

[illegible]

---

☐ Less than 10 years      ☐ 10-20      ☐ 21-35

☐ 36-45      ☐ 46-60      ☐ 61-75

☐ 76-85      ☐ 86 or older

---



2



Centennial  
Parklands

Stage Three: Consultation findings

# Draft Centennial Park Master Plan 2040

*Online exhibition, individual and institutional submissions*

14 – 29 October 2013



BLANK

CONTENTS

Executive Summary

Online survey

    The survey participants – demographics

Individual submissions

Institutional submissions

Petition

Main Report

    Online submissions

        In General

        Key move: Outer / Inner Park

        Key move: Traffic, access and circulation

        Key move: Enhanced pedestrian experience

        Key move: A network of hubs / Improved Amenities

        Key move: Defined event zones

        Key move: Wellness, Sports and Recreation

        Key move: Play for all ages

        Key move: Enhanced interpretation

    Individual electronic submissions

        In General

        Key move: Outer / Inner Park

        Key move: Traffic, access and circulation

        Key move: Enhanced pedestrian experience

        Key move: A network of hubs / Improved Amenities

        Key move: Defined event zones

        Key move: Wellness, Sports and Recreation

        Key move: Play for all ages

        Key move: Enhanced interpretation

    Institutional submissions

        In General

        Key move: Outer / Inner Park

        Key move: Traffic, access and circulation

        Key move: Enhanced pedestrian experience

        Key move: A network of hubs / Improved Amenities

        Key move: Defined event zones

        Key move: Wellness, Sports and Recreation

        Key move: Play for all ages

        Key move: Enhanced interpretation

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

ONLINE SURVEY

The online survey – Stage Three – opened on Monday 14 October and closed Tuesday 29 October 2013. 140 participants made submissions during this stage.

This timeframe resulted in a 30-day online survey period (Stage Two and Stage Three online), and complemented the in-tent consultation period. The survey was hosted on the Centennial Parklands website, using the Survey Monkey research tool.


The survey participants - demographics

Demographic information for those who took part in the survey is provided below. Please note that as this was a qualitative research study, the demographics information does not conform to any statistical profile. It simply reflects the demographics of those who self-selected to participate.

The age groups, gender balance and postcodes will therefore not be representative of all people who use Centennial Park.


A further note on online participants during this stage is that 80.7% of participants had not visited the Consultation Tent during the in-park consultation period, therefore had not engaged or interacted with anyof the planning team prior to giving their feedback to the survey.

Age groups of participants




The profile between Stage Two – online participants (30 September – 13 October) is markedly different to this profile above. The above reflects an older demographic, and is, as such, even less representative of the regular visitor profile that visits Centennial Park throughout the year.

Gender of participants



The gender ratio of participants is broadly consistent with Stage One (F: 53%, M: 47%), Stage Two – in tent (F: 54%, M: 46%), and Stage Two – online (F: 64%, M: 36%).

Postcodes of participants



Consistent across the Stage One and Stage Two surveys has been a greater engagement level in immediately surrounding suburbs to Centennial Park. The comparative data in Stage Three shows a slightly elevated level of responses from the Inner West of Sydney, stretching to Camperdown, Five Dock, Petersham and Newtown.

INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS

During Stage Three we received 31 individual submissions by post, hand or email (primarily through the [info@centennialparklands.com.au](mailto:info@centennialparklands.com.au) email address). As they were broader ranging, and not necessarily formatted consistently with the online survey, these submissions have been analysed separately.

INSTITUTIONAL SUBMISSIONS

During Stage Three, we received eight institutional submissions electronically. Institutional submissions are those which are wide ranging in nature, and are submitted on behalf of an organisation or political office, rather than a private individual.

Institutional submissions were received from:

- Centennial Parklands Community Consultative Committee
- Waverley Council
- Randwick City Council
- Sydney Water Corporation
- BIKEast
- Alex Greenwich MP, Member for Sydney
- Sydney High School Foundation Inc.
- UNSW - Australian Wetlands, Rivers and Landscapes Centre

These submissions have been analysed separately to the online responses, with key issues broken down and organised within the general format of this report.

PETITION

On 30 October 2013 an anonymous petition was handed in at the Parklands Office reception with 59 signatures attached.

The petition statement read:

We the undersigned do NOT want any new buildings in the childrens' cycleway area. This area is wonderfully peaceful and green and should be left alone for the unfettered enjoyment of the children and their families! We are happy to have picnics, cycle and play where NO built structures exist (other than the toilet block).

We do NOT want a hugely widened artificial path through this area, as it will destroy the peaceful nature. Any protective surfacing should only be in essential area (e.g. where sand is eroding) and should have a natural look.

Thank you,  
Yours sincerely

This petition will be considered as a submission against the *Key Move – Enhanced Pedestrian Experience* and *Key Move – A network of hubs / Improved amenities*.

## MAIN REPORT – ONLINE SURVEY SUBMISSIONS

This section of the Stage Three report relates to responses received via the online survey from 14 October to 29 October 2013.

### THE MASTER PLAN – IN GENERAL (Online)

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS LIKE                                                                                       | 79 |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| That there is a plan and vision for the future                                                               | 15 |
| General                                                                                                      | 14 |
| - “Proposals are generally modest and well focused”                                                          |    |
| - “Fantastic”                                                                                                |    |
| - “Great vision”                                                                                             |    |
| - “Everything”                                                                                               |    |
| - “Plan is terrific”                                                                                         |    |
| - “Like the philosophy behind it”                                                                            |    |
| - “Lots to like”                                                                                             |    |
| - “Well thought out improvements and environmentally responsible”                                            |    |
| Preservation values - retaining what is already good such as existing features, open space, trees and vistas | 14 |
| Consultation and the opportunity to have input                                                               | 8  |
| Considers the diverse mix of park users and attempts to cater for everyone’s needs                           | 7  |
| The thought that has gone into it – Well researched, thorough, comprehensive, carefully considered           | 6  |
| No reduction in green space or increase in built area - (unless compensated for by a reduction elsewhere)    | 6  |
| Plan presented in a clear and easy to understand form                                                        | 2  |
| Preserves and enhances the existing flora and fauna it sustains                                              | 2  |
| Respectful, ‘light touch’ approach                                                                           | 1  |
| Attempts to address future population growth and demand                                                      | 1  |
| Aims for Centennial Park to be the pre-eminent park in NSW in the future                                     | 1  |
| Emphasis on financial sustainability for the long term maintenance of the Park                               | 1  |
| Proposal to seek National Heritage Listing                                                                   | 1  |

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS DO NOT LIKE                                                                                                                           | 40 |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| General                                                                                                                                                 | 12 |
| - “Park will lose its natural look”                                                                                                                     |    |
| - “Overdevelopment at the expense of the natural environment”                                                                                           |    |
| - “Emphasis on commercialisation rather than the green / open space”                                                                                    |    |
| - “Departs from previous plans”                                                                                                                         |    |
| - “Leave the park alone”                                                                                                                                |    |
| - “Is it a theme park or a park”                                                                                                                        |    |
| - “Park has lost its way with”                                                                                                                          |    |
| - “Confusion about what the park should be”                                                                                                             |    |
| - “Completely unacceptable”                                                                                                                             |    |
| - “Fails to respond to the Park’s unique character and values”                                                                                          |    |
| Too much commercialisation and “creeping privatisation”                                                                                                 | 8  |
| Too much new development – buildings and infrastructure                                                                                                 | 7  |
| Intensification of use                                                                                                                                  | 5  |
| Ignores management and protection of the environment                                                                                                    | 2  |
| Funding proposals – alternatives should be found – Aren’t Moore Park activities and leasing of the old Showground supposed to provide for the Parklands | 2  |
| Emphasis on financial sustainability will lead to more development                                                                                      | 1  |
| Survey of park users limited                                                                                                                            | 1  |
| Consultation from October 5-13 too short – Exhibition material should have been available elsewhere other than online                                   | 1  |
| reduction in green space and increase in built area                                                                                                     | 1  |

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS THINK IS MISSING                                                                                                                                                                                | 70 |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| An environmental management plan or plan to protect the Parks flora and fauna and environmentally sensitive areas – Biodiversity should be an overriding theme / core value                                       | 13 |
| Ponds management and protection is not addressed– their sustainable management is critical                                                                                                                        | 8  |
| Greater funding support from Government - so it doesn’t have to be run like a private business                                                                                                                    | 4  |
| Any mention of birds – their protection and management                                                                                                                                                            | 4  |
| More bubblers / drinking fountains                                                                                                                                                                                | 3  |
| All new development should be wheelchair accessible                                                                                                                                                               | 2  |
| Provision for a community garden                                                                                                                                                                                  | 2  |
| Maintenance of the Park’s curtilage – Outside the fence is a Council responsibility but should be coordinated with park maintenance and formal pathways provided / enhanced. This should be addressed in the plan | 2  |
| More off leash areas for dogs                                                                                                                                                                                     | 2  |
| Better signage and enforcement to control dogs                                                                                                                                                                    | 2  |
| More animal habitat areas                                                                                                                                                                                         | 1  |
| Limits on commercial activity                                                                                                                                                                                     | 1  |
| Graded levy on Local Government rates to provide funding                                                                                                                                                          | 1  |
| The cost of undertaking this master planning exercise                                                                                                                                                             | 1  |
| The cost of implementation and maintenance of the proposed improvements – how much and where from?                                                                                                                | 1  |
| Insufficient planning for more visitors                                                                                                                                                                           | 1  |
| An accurate perspective on the relationship between pedestrians and cyclists – conflict is exaggerated                                                                                                            | 1  |
| A commitment to retain off-leash areas for dogs                                                                                                                                                                   | 1  |
| A clear statement about the dog areas in the Park                                                                                                                                                                 | 1  |
| Relocating all support services (buildings) outside the Park                                                                                                                                                      | 1  |
| A commitment to gradually increase green space and reduce built space with each project                                                                                                                           | 1  |
| Museum in the Park (in one of the cottages?)                                                                                                                                                                      | 1  |
| Partnering with the Botanic Gardens or an ecological organisation for the provision of education                                                                                                                  | 1  |
| A centre for ongoing scientific research                                                                                                                                                                          | 1  |
| Alternative funding proposals such as a lottery (like the Opera House)                                                                                                                                            | 1  |
| More / better marketing to win support for the need to generate revenue through events                                                                                                                            | 1  |
| A maintenance regime to eradicate bindiis                                                                                                                                                                         | 1  |
| A plan to control feral animals and weeds                                                                                                                                                                         | 1  |
| Effective controls on littering in the Park – especially by sporting groups                                                                                                                                       | 1  |
| Inclusion of Federation Way – it is part of Centennial Park not Moore Park                                                                                                                                        | 1  |
| An enforcement regime to better control anti-social behaviour (beats)                                                                                                                                             | 1  |
| A plan for managing stormwater runoff into the Park eg through liaison with other Government agencies in the catchment                                                                                            | 1  |
| A commitment to reduce further potable water use in the Park                                                                                                                                                      | 1  |
| Strategies to involve the community and schools in habitat enhancement                                                                                                                                            | 1  |
| Little consideration of what goes outside the boundaries – it is critical that the Park is properly integrated with this                                                                                          | 1  |
| Consideration of evening use                                                                                                                                                                                      | 1  |
| Preservation of the ESBS remnant on Greenfinch Hill                                                                                                                                                               | 1  |
| Sculptures in the Park – temporary installations                                                                                                                                                                  | 1  |

THE MASTER PLAN – KEY MOVE 1: Outer / Inner Park (Online)

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS LIKE                                              | 19 |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| 'Wild' outer park of woodlands and wilderness                       | 8  |
| Tree planting and replacement plan                                  | 6  |
| Differentiation between cultivated inner park and 'wild' outer park | 3  |
| Native trees and grasses in the Outer Park                          | 1  |
| No change to current off-leash dog areas                            | 1  |

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS DO NOT LIKE                                                            | 40 |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Dogs “on leash” on perimeter trail                                                       | 18 |
| Cyclists on perimeter trail                                                              | 18 |
| 'Wild' Outer Park - limits use in these areas                                            | 2  |
| More planting of native species – it is the mix of vegetation that makes the Park unique | 1  |
| Enhancement of cultivated Inner Park – leave as is                                       | 1  |

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS THINK IS MISSING                                                                                                        | 21 |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Provision for mountain bikes and off road cycling                                                                                         | 4  |
| Controls on anti-social behaviour of mountain bike riders                                                                                 | 4  |
| Vegetation corridors connecting areas of native bush and providing additional habitat                                                     | 3  |
| Greater planting diversity in the 'Wild' Outer Park - should have more than just native grasses to provide a viable habitat for fauna     | 3  |
| A grove of flowering eucalypts, some Banksia species, Illawarra flame trees, waratahs and Gynea lilies, flowering shrubs and themed zones | 2  |
| Making the drainage line from the inner ponds to Kensington Pond a 'wild' corridor                                                        | 1  |
| More bushes and undergrowth in Outer Park for small bird protection                                                                       | 1  |
| More information on tree replacement and additional plantings – what species and where                                                    | 1  |
| A commitment to maintain natural areas such as Lachlan Swamp                                                                              | 1  |
| Measures to reduce visitor use of sensitive areas to prevent their degradation                                                            | 1  |

THE MASTER PLAN – KEY MOVE 2: Traffic, Access and Circulation (Online)

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS LIKE                                       | 15 |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Reversing direction of one way roads inside Grand Drive      | 5  |
| Oxford St cycleway – good its outside the Park               | 3  |
| Removal of angle parking around Grand Drive to protect trees | 3  |
| Parallel parking around Grand Drive – safer and look better  | 3  |
| Drop off zone at Learner's Cycleway                          | 1  |

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS DO NOT LIKE                                                        | 20 |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Grand Dr improvements – are unnecessary – tree roots can be protected with more fill | 5  |
| Grand Dr improvements – unsafe (especially parallel parking – will narrow the road)  | 4  |
| Increased danger on Grand Dr near Southwest Hub because of greater activity          | 3  |
| Too much focus on catering for motorists – Pedestrians should be prioritised         | 3  |
| Grand Dr improvements – will increase congestion                                     | 2  |
| Proposed improvements at intersection of Grand Dr and Hamilton Dr                    | 2  |
| Pedestrian path too narrow - a park for people or cars?                              | 1  |

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS THINK IS MISSING                                                                                                                            | 25 |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Controls on anti-social behaviour of pack cyclists                                                                                                            | 8  |
| Reintroduction of car free day                                                                                                                                | 4  |
| Charge vehicles for entry to reduce vehicle numbers                                                                                                           | 2  |
| Allocate more road space for cyclists                                                                                                                         | 2  |
| Solution to tension between cars and cyclists                                                                                                                 | 1  |
| Controls on cars entering Grand Dr for safety of cyclists                                                                                                     | 1  |
| Better provision for cycle groups on Grand Dr in the morning eg through limiting vehicular access to 7.30am, greater restrictions on off-leash dog areas, etc | 1  |
| Provide parking outside the Park and small scale shuttle transport within                                                                                     | 1  |
| Enforce existing car and bike regulations to address problems                                                                                                 | 1  |
| Provide a public transport node within the Park                                                                                                               | 1  |
| More car parking                                                                                                                                              | 1  |
| Parking on outside of Grand Dr at the Learner's Cycleway                                                                                                      | 1  |
| Increased speed limit for cyclists to 40 km/hr                                                                                                                | 1  |

THE MASTER PLAN – KEY MOVE 3: Enhanced Pedestrian Experience (Online)

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS LIKE                                                                    | 22 |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Improved pedestrian path network providing better access to different parts of the Park   | 6  |
| New access way from Alison Rd across Kensington Pond                                      | 5  |
| Formalised (and permeable) outer walking / running trail instead of existing eroded track | 4  |
| Decks on the edge of ponds                                                                | 2  |
| Mountain bike trail ?                                                                     | 1  |
| Improved way finding signage                                                              | 1  |
| Southwest Trail                                                                           | 1  |
| Alignment of improvements with key public transport access points                         | 1  |
| Extending a formal path on Parkes Dr south of the Vernon Pavilion                         | 1  |

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS DO NOT LIKE                                                                                     | 22 |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Upgrading of perimeter trail - will attract too much use and conflict, better as is                               | 11 |
| Alison Rd entry – an overdeveloped grand entrance that is unnecessary                                             | 3  |
| More formal pathways – public liability paranoia                                                                  | 3  |
| Southwest Trail and its continuation into the Inner Park will impact on local ecology                             | 3  |
| New formed path in Pine Grove – Unnecessary, impacts landscape and will diminish existing unstructured experience | 1  |
| Grand Dr crossing at Southwest unnecessary                                                                        | 1  |

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS THINK IS MISSING                                                                                                                                           | 12 |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| Limiting cyclists to roads only – shared paths are a safety issue                                                                                                            | 3  |
| More pedestrian crossings across Grand Dr                                                                                                                                    | 3  |
| Reconfiguring Grand Dr so cars and parking is on the left side and cyclists on the right – safer, more natural, cars off trees and better for drop offs at Learners Cycleway | 1  |
| Widening Grand Dr path by removing the inner kerb                                                                                                                            | 1  |
| All paths should be wheelchair friendly (not gravel, grass or stone)                                                                                                         | 1  |
| A limit on the increase of concrete and hard surfaces                                                                                                                        | 1  |
| A maintenance regime to reduce erosion of paths                                                                                                                              | 1  |
| A limit on the width of the perimeter trail to 2.0-2.5 metres                                                                                                                | 1  |

THE MASTER PLAN – KEY MOVE 4: A network of hubs / improved amenities (Online)

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS LIKE                                               | 21 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| More / improved amenities – especially at the Vernon Hub and showers | 8  |
| More food and beverage outlets                                       | 2  |
| New Sports Hub                                                       | 2  |
| Southwest corner and Hub                                             | 1  |
| Relocation of depot                                                  | 1  |
| Improved park furniture                                              | 1  |
| Adaptive reuse of cottages                                           | 1  |
| Upgrading equestrian area                                            | 1  |
| Additional facilities at childrens learners cycleway                 | 1  |
| Developing the Education Precinct                                    | 1  |
| Some new commercial activities that provide useful services          | 1  |
| New toilet at Belvedere Amphitheatre                                 | 1  |

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS DO NOT LIKE                                                                                 | 25 |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|
| More food and beverage outlets – Unnecessary and will only generate more rubbish                              | 5  |
| 'Improvements' and increased use in southwest corner – leave as is                                            | 4  |
| New café at Vernon Hub – Unnecessary, no space, impact on heritage building, existing mobile café is fine     | 3  |
| Amenities in the northeast corner – Unnecessary, impact on landscape, Oxford St related use                   | 3  |
| Relocation of depot – may result in more buildings                                                            | 2  |
| New Sports Hub – Unnecessary and may result in more buildings                                                 | 2  |
| Too many 'hubs'                                                                                               | 1  |
| Consolidation of hubs and upgrading of equestrian grounds will impact on fauna and flora                      | 1  |
| Refurbishment of cottages could compromise their architectural value                                          | 1  |
| Adaptive reuse of cottages for commercial activity                                                            | 1  |
| Enhanced equestrian area unnecessary                                                                          | 1  |
| Southwest corner improvements and Hub unnecessary and will destroy the quiet, peaceful character of this area | 1  |

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS THINK IS MISSING                                                                                             | 4 |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| Incorporate the Education Hub and proposed new amphitheatre into Southwest Hub to free up the Education Precinct for the depot | 1 |
| Move proposed toilets / showers at the Vernon Hub further west to Mission Field                                                | 1 |
| Sports Hub should be multi use and accessible for all not just a club for some                                                 | 1 |
| Provision of bike storage                                                                                                      | 1 |

THE MASTER PLAN – KEY MOVE 5: Defined event zones (Online)

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS LIKE                    |  | 6 |
|-------------------------------------------|--|---|
| New performance venue                     |  | 3 |
| Emphasis on smaller, more intimate events |  | 2 |
| Provision for more events                 |  | 1 |

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS DO NOT LIKE                                              |  | 6 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|---|
| Major events - especially music concerts and those with a commercial focus |  | 6 |

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS THINK IS MISSING        |  | 4 |
|-------------------------------------------|--|---|
| A ban on noisy concerts                   |  | 2 |
| Limits on the number of additional events |  | 1 |
| Mountain bike event(s)                    |  | 1 |

THE MASTER PLAN – KEY MOVE 6: Wellness, Sports and Formal Recreation (Online)

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS LIKE                                                       |  | 5 |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|---|
| Focus on sporting activities                                                 |  | 2 |
| Emphasis on the site as a place of wellness and recreation for the community |  | 1 |
| Provision for recreation of all kinds                                        |  | 1 |
| Fitness stations around Grand Dr                                             |  | 1 |

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS DO NOT LIKE                                                                                              |  | 3 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|---|
| Fitness stations around Grand Dr                                                                                           |  | 1 |
| Increase in areas formalised for specific recreation activities – over-regulating – all of park should be available to all |  | 1 |
| Reduction of sports fields from 3 to 2 and proposed spectator stand will limit use for fitness trainers                    |  | 1 |

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS THINK IS MISSING                                                                            |  | 19 |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|----|
| A world class indoor / outdoor pool / aquatic centre (like that in Prince Alfred Park)                        |  | 3  |
| Cross country running track – eg using Grand Dr, Loch Av, Broome Av, Carrington Dr, Parkes Av and Hamilton Dr |  | 2  |
| Controls on anti-social behaviour of runners                                                                  |  | 1  |
| Controls on personal fitness trainers who are impacting the flora                                             |  | 1  |
| Locating fitness stations near amenities                                                                      |  | 1  |
| Fitness stations should be small and unobtrusive                                                              |  | 1  |
| Upgrading (eg gravel) the jogging trail inside the horse track                                                |  | 1  |
| Provision of more playing fields to accommodate increased demand.                                             |  | 1  |
| Provision of facilities for baseball in the Park                                                              |  | 1  |
| McKay Oval should be designated as SBHS's primary sports field                                                |  | 1  |
| Provision of cricket nets – preferably near McKay Oval (or alternatively in Robertson Rd Field                |  | 1  |
| Upgrading the fitness station near the Woollahra Gates                                                        |  | 1  |
| Some provision for undercover sports training in the proposed Reservoir Field spectator stand                 |  | 1  |
| Floodlighting of sports fields in the Park to cater for increased demand                                      |  | 1  |
| Provision of a skate facility for youth                                                                       |  | 1  |
| A commitment to reduce use of the Park by large sporting groups (eg cyclists and runners0                     |  | 1  |

THE MASTER PLAN – KEY MOVE 7: Play for all ages (Online)

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS LIKE                                 |  | 3 |
|--------------------------------------------------------|--|---|
| Emphasis on low impact outdoor recreational activities |  | 1 |
| Improved childrens play areas                          |  | 1 |
| Emphasis on nature based play and discovery            |  | 1 |

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS DO NOT LIKE                                                                        |  | 5 |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|---|
| Adventure playground – Unsafe, costly, out of character with surrounds and impacts local environment |  | 5 |

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS THINK IS MISSING                                         |  | 4 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|---|
| Emphasis on low impact outdoor recreational activities                     |  | 1 |
| Improved childrens play areas                                              |  | 1 |
| Emphasis on nature based play and discovery                                |  | 1 |
| Relocation of the Learner’s Cycleway inside Grand Dr for childrens’ safety |  | 1 |

THE MASTER PLAN – KEY MOVE 8: Enhanced interpretation (Online)

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS LIKE                                                                          |  | 3 |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|---|
| Increased emphasis on interpretation and education – especially ecology and indigenous heritage |  | 2 |
| Increased emphasis on heritage                                                                  |  | 1 |

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS DO NOT LIKE |  | 0 |
|-------------------------------|--|---|
|-------------------------------|--|---|

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS THINK IS MISSING                             |  | 3 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------|--|---|
| Retention of the Park’s heritage                               |  | 1 |
| A commitment to retain the heritage listed brick toilet blocks |  | 1 |
| More interpretive signage beyond the Ponds Trail               |  | 1 |

MAIN REPORT – INDIVIDUAL SUBMISSIONS

This section of the Stage Three report relates to the 31 submissions received by hand, by post or via email, separate to the online survey, from individuals between 14 October to 29 October 2013.

THE MASTER PLAN – IN GENERAL (individual electronic submissions)

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS LIKE                                               |  | 5 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|--|---|
| Improvements proposed to service increasing demands appreciated      |  | 4 |
| Recommendation to seek National Heritage Listing for Centennial Park |  | 1 |

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS DO NOT LIKE                                                                             |  | 13 |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|----|
| Sense of “turning a quiet, wild natural environment into a fun fair”                                      |  | 4  |
| “Putting a very heavy footprint onto poor Centennial Park”                                                |  | 1  |
| Residential use of cottages – will result in degradation of the asset                                     |  | 2  |
| Commercial use of cottages                                                                                |  | 1  |
| Relocation of depot to Moore Park                                                                         |  | 1  |
| Uncertainty of what will happen in the Depot area                                                         |  | 1  |
| Emphasis on financial sustainability – park should be properly funded by Moore Park commercial activities |  | 1  |
| Increased built area despite assurances to the contrary                                                   |  | 1  |
| Plan too driven by light rail                                                                             |  | 1  |

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS THINK IS MISSING                                                      |  | 14 |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|----|
| Controls on anti-social behaviour and environmental destruction of mountain bike riders |  | 3  |
| Controls on anti-social behaviour of pack cyclists                                      |  | 2  |
| Greater funding support from Government                                                 |  | 1  |
| Critical that sustainable management of ponds is addressed                              |  | 1  |
| Controls on feeding of fauna                                                            |  | 1  |
| Bus service around Grand Drive                                                          |  | 1  |
| Measures for protection of the ponds and wildlife                                       |  | 1  |
| Include York Road ESBS in Centennial Park                                               |  | 1  |
| Limits on the number of major events                                                    |  | 1  |
| Upgrading of ponds (eg boardwalks around edges)                                         |  | 1  |
| Measures to protect and support the environmental values of the park                    |  | 1  |

THE MASTER PLAN – KEY MOVE 1: Outer / Inner Park (individual electronic submissions)

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS LIKE                                       |  | 1 |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|--|---|
| Concept of the ‘wild’ outer park of woodlands and wilderness |  | 1 |

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS DO NOT LIKE                |  | 28 |
|----------------------------------------------|--|----|
| Dogs “on-leash” on outer perimeter trail     |  | 12 |
| Cyclists may be permitted on perimeter trail |  | 12 |
| Upgrading of perimeter trail                 |  | 3  |
| Overdevelopment of the southwest             |  | 1  |

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS THINK IS MISSING                                                         |  | 1 |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|---|
| Rehabilitation / restoration of important wetland / bushland areas in inner and outer Park |  | 1 |

THE MASTER PLAN – KEY MOVE 2: Traffic, Access and Circulation (individual electronic submissions)

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS LIKE                                       | 5 |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| Parallel parking – it’s safer                                | 2 |
| Reversal of traffic flow on Parkes Drive and Dickens Drive   | 2 |
| Removal of angle parking around Grand Drive to protect trees | 1 |

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS DO NOT LIKE                                                                                  | 3 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| Parallel parking in Grand Drive – reduction in parking, will slow traffic, increasing congestion and pollution | 2 |
| Oxford St cycleway entering the park at western end                                                            | 1 |

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS THINK IS MISSING                                                        | 6 |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| If angle parking retained – reverse in only                                               | 1 |
| Recover and reuse old sandstone edging around Grand Drive                                 | 1 |
| Threshold treatment at Randwick Gates to improve cyclist safety                           | 1 |
| RMS should provide road space for Oxford St cycleway at western end                       | 1 |
| Traffic light phase at Oxford St / Lang Rd intersection for cars exiting Paddington Gates | 1 |
| Swap parking and cycle lanes on Grand Drive                                               | 1 |

THE MASTER PLAN – KEY MOVE 3: Enhanced Pedestrian Experience (individual electronic submissions)

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS LIKE                                      | 2 |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| New access way from Doncaster Avenue across Kensington Pond | 1 |
| Upgrading Randwick Pond path                                | 1 |

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS DO NOT LIKE                                                          | 6 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---|
| Formalising pathways                                                                   | 3 |
| Ponds Walk, Southwest Trail and Garden Walk are insensitive to the natural environment | 1 |
| Decks on Busby’s Pond                                                                  | 1 |
| Overdevelopment of the Alison Rd entry                                                 | 1 |

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS THINK IS MISSING | 1 |
|------------------------------------|---|
| A pathway along Carrington Drive   | 1 |

THE MASTER PLAN – KEY MOVE 4: A network of hubs / improved amenities (individual electronic submissions)

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS LIKE |  | 0 |
|------------------------|--|---|
|                        |  |   |

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS DO NOT LIKE                                                                                                                  |  | 9 |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|---|
| More food and beverage outlets                                                                                                                 |  | 2 |
| More toilets                                                                                                                                   |  | 2 |
| Cyclists sharing pathways                                                                                                                      |  | 2 |
| Overdevelopment of the Vernon Hub – considered an unnecessary upgrade (toilets nearby, existing mobile café fine), impact on heritage Pavilion |  | 2 |
| More 'hubs', event spaces and commercialisation                                                                                                |  | 1 |

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS THINK IS MISSING                                                                       |  | 6 |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|---|
| Minimise space for commercial activity at proposed Southwest Hub                                         |  | 1 |
| Landscaping around activity nodes and event areas to reduce visual intrusiveness and temporary screening |  | 1 |
| No music events or music at hubs                                                                         |  | 1 |
| Shower / change facilities at Brazilian Fields and Federation Valley toilets                             |  | 1 |
| Acknowledge the heritage significance of SBHS to the Park and especially McKay Oval                      |  | 1 |
| Toilets at Belvedere Amphitheatre                                                                        |  | 1 |

THE MASTER PLAN – KEY MOVE 5: Defined event zones (individual electronic submissions)

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS LIKE |  | 0 |
|------------------------|--|---|
|                        |  |   |

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS DO NOT LIKE                                                                             |  | 8 |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|---|
| Intensification of use with major events (resulting in degradation of park and loss of passive enjoyment) |  | 6 |
| Overdevelopment of Belvedere Amphitheatre                                                                 |  | 1 |
| Expansion of Brazilian Fields (and landscape reconfiguration) for major events                            |  | 1 |

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS THINK IS MISSING |  | 0 |
|------------------------------------|--|---|
|                                    |  |   |

THE MASTER PLAN – KEY MOVE 6: Wellness, Sports and Formal Recreation (individual electronic submissions)

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS LIKE |  | 0 |
|------------------------|--|---|
|                        |  |   |

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS DO NOT LIKE                        |  | 2 |
|------------------------------------------------------|--|---|
| Horse hire at Equestrian Grounds                     |  | 1 |
| Restricting sports field use to short term hire only |  | 1 |

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS THINK IS MISSING                                           |  | 1 |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|---|
| Regulated arrangements (including commercial licensing) for fitness trainers |  | 1 |

THE MASTER PLAN – KEY MOVE 7: Play for all ages (individual electronic submissions)

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS LIKE                  |  | 1 |
|-----------------------------------------|--|---|
| A formal children's adventure play area |  | 1 |

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS DO NOT LIKE           |  | 1 |
|-----------------------------------------|--|---|
| Location of children's water playground |  | 1 |

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS THINK IS MISSING                  |  | 1 |
|-----------------------------------------------------|--|---|
| Relocate childrens' water playground to Ash Paddock |  | 1 |

THE MASTER PLAN – KEY MOVE 8: Enhanced interpretation (individual electronic submissions)

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS LIKE | 0 |
|------------------------|---|
|                        |   |

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS DO NOT LIKE | 0 |
|-------------------------------|---|
|                               |   |

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS THINK IS MISSING | 0 |
|------------------------------------|---|
|                                    |   |

MAIN REPORT – INSTITUTIONAL SUBMISSIONS

This section of the Stage Three report relates to the eight institutional submissions received from 14 October to 29 October 2013. Each participant organisation will have an acronym for reference appended to indicate which comment they made.

| Institution                                              | Reference |
|----------------------------------------------------------|-----------|
| Centennial Parklands Community Consultative Committee    | CCC       |
| Waverley Council                                         | WC        |
| Randwick City Council                                    | RCC       |
| Sydney Water Corporation                                 | SWC       |
| BIKEast                                                  | BE        |
| Alex Greenwich MP, Member for Sydney                     | AG        |
| Sydney High School Foundation Inc.                       | SHS       |
| UNSW - Australian Wetlands, Rivers and Landscapes Centre | UNSW      |

THE MASTER PLAN – IN GENERAL (institutional submissions)

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS LIKE                                                                         | Ref                            |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Overall support for the Master Plan                                                            | CCC<br>WC<br>BE<br>SHS<br>UNSW |
| Broadly supportive of CP Master Plan, but believes CP and MP should come under one master plan | AG                             |
| Supportive of pursuit of National Heritage Listing                                             | WC                             |
| Supportive on no loss of green space, tree numbers or animal habitat areas                     | RCC                            |
| Historically significant built fabric to be conserved                                          | RCC                            |
| Master Plan does not appear to create any adverse impacts on Sydney Water assets               | SWC                            |

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS DO NOT LIKE                                                                                                                                                                 | Ref  |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| Although no net loss of green space is the stated aim, large losses will be soon suffered in Moore Park due to light rail, so additional green open space must take priority over development | AG   |
| Master plan is weak on environmental management, education and research – need to adopt a vision for the environment as a subset of the overarching vision for the Park                       | UNSW |

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS THINK IS MISSING                                                                                                                                                                                                        | Ref         |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------|
| An overall environmental management plan – particularly for ponds and waterways, flora and fauna management                                                                                                                               | CCC<br>UNSW |
| Needs an environmental best practice declaration                                                                                                                                                                                          | CCC         |
| Management of visitor impacts on Park through litter, new informal paths created                                                                                                                                                          | CCC         |
| Re-alignment of York Road to abut Moriah College and integrate York Rd ESBS site into Centennial Park                                                                                                                                     | WC          |
| Consult Sydney Water on upgrade or decommissioning of reservoirs – opportunities for better integration with park and improvements to pedestrian access could be achieved, as well as recreational needs of the Bondi Junction community. | WC          |
| Park to remain a peaceful, serene oasis within the City                                                                                                                                                                                   | RCC         |
| Future management changes to stormwater or waterway function to be discussed with Sydney Water                                                                                                                                            | SWC         |
| Need to seek opportunities to expand available public green open space                                                                                                                                                                    | AG          |
| Need to consider the freshwater ecosystem, as it is part of the broader Botany catchment                                                                                                                                                  | UNSW        |
| Plan needs to position Centennial Park as a learning institution – particularly at tertiary level                                                                                                                                         | UNSW        |
| Partnerships should consider partnering with universities to solve environmental problems                                                                                                                                                 | UNSW        |

THE MASTER PLAN – KEY MOVE 1: Outer / Inner Park (institutional submissions)

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS LIKE                             | Ref        |
|----------------------------------------------------|------------|
| Supportive of the formalisation of the outer trail | CCC        |
| Supportive of the distance markers on outer trail  | CCC        |
| Supportive of the outer/inner park concept         | AG<br>UNSW |

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS DO NOT LIKE                                                                                                            | Ref |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Don't like dogs on-leash in what is now an off-leash area – suggest removal of reference: “...dependent on traffic flow and volume...”   | CCC |
| Do not want cyclists permitted on the outer trail                                                                                        | CCC |
| Do not want cyclists using any part of the outer park – there should be designing out of opportunities for cyclist to use off-road areas | CCC |

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS THINK IS MISSING                                                                                                          | Ref  |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|
| Needs to be clear and appropriate signage to educate/communicate changes to the outer park, increased communication to cyclists             | CCC  |
| Strengthen the wild outer concept with a section of terrestrial environment management and the connectivity between place and flora / fauna | UNSW |

THE MASTER PLAN – KEY MOVE 2: Traffic, Access and Circulation (institutional submissions)

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS LIKE                                                                                                                 | Ref      |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|
| Supportive of the Oxford St pedestrian path – recommend a generous width for safety                                                    | WC       |
| Supportive of Musgrave Avenue upgrade for cycling safety                                                                               | WC       |
| Supportive of closure of Darley Road slip lane to improve safety between CP and QP                                                     | WC       |
| Supportive of improved pedestrian and cycling access and connectivity to surrounds, particularly at Randwick and Musgrave Avenue Gates | RCC      |
| Retaining left-turn only at Govett St Gates (left-in, left-out access)                                                                 | RCC      |
| Highly supportive of the integration of light rail into the master plan                                                                | RCC      |
| Removal of angled parking around Grand Drive                                                                                           | BE       |
| Supportive of Parkes and Dickens reversal of traffic flow                                                                              | BE       |
| Supportive of gate and intersection improvements                                                                                       | BE       |
| Supportive of proposed drop-off zone at SW Hub                                                                                         | BE       |
| Highly supportive of closure of Darley Road slip lane                                                                                  | BE       |
| Highly supportive Oxford St pathway                                                                                                    | BE<br>AG |
| Supportive of road direction changes                                                                                                   | AG       |

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS DO NOT LIKE                                                                                                             | Ref |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Not supportive of a shared pathway along Oxford St – believe a separated bicycle path that connects with Waverley cycling route           | WC  |
| Any pedestrian element of the Oxford St pathway needs to take into account the potential conflict if adjoining the Waverley cycling route | WC  |
| Cyclists should be permitted to go contra-flow within roads inside Grand Drive                                                            | BE  |
| Parkes Drive speed bump should have greater gap on western side for cyclists turning uphill into Parkes Drive and starting a climb        | BE  |
| Parking should be removed from around the SW Hub                                                                                          | BE  |

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS THINK IS MISSING                                                                                                                                                 | Ref |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Needs to be clearer segregation between cyclists and other park users                                                                                                              | CCC |
| Improved lighting and wayfinding signage along Oxford St pathway                                                                                                                   | WC  |
| Ensure linkages between new pedestrian trails and the Waverley Council’s Green Links walking trails                                                                                | WC  |
| Any improvements at Darley Road intersection require raised zebra crossing and appropriate landscaping                                                                             | WC  |
| Inclusion of fun and creative infrastructure on Oxford St cycleway, such as bike pumps, bike lock up and pavement markings.                                                        | WC  |
| A way finding strategy needs to follow master plan to improve navigation within the Park and with reference to surrounding streets                                                 | WC  |
| Paved footpaths provided along boundaries of the Park (e.g. York Road)                                                                                                             | WC  |
| Improved integration with surrounding street network through new pedestrian entries (e.g cnr Oxford and York; end of Birrell St; Queens Park Road)                                 | WC  |
| Need to change the language of the inner roads to accommodate first and foremost a more comfortable pedestrian and cyclist experience                                              | WC  |
| Need to improve pedestrian safety concerns at Govett St gates entrance/intersection                                                                                                | RCC |
| Clarification sought on whether road between Grand Drive and Darley St remain two-way or become one-way, as per changes proposed for Parkes Drive                                  | RCC |
| Paved space of 0.5m wide is needed on drivers side of parallel parked cars to avoid planting between trees from damage – may mean reducing cycling lane to 3.2m, which is adequate | BE  |
| Randwick Gates intersection between vehicles and cyclists needs improvement – consider City of Sydney (Bourke St Cycleway) style side-street crossing design                       | BE  |

THE MASTER PLAN – KEY MOVE 3: Enhanced Pedestrian Experience (institutional submissions)

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS LIKE                                                                | Ref |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| New, low impact pedestrian paths to improve connections with outer residential zones  | WC  |
| Highly supportive of new Alison Road entrance integrating with light rail station     | RCC |
| Support for new Alison Road entrance, bridge over Kensington Pond and Southwest trail | BE  |
| Supportive of improvements to access path from gate on York Road                      | BE  |
| Supportive of improved pedestrian access and enhanced pedestrian network              | AG  |

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS DO NOT LIKE | Ref |
|-------------------------------|-----|
|                               |     |

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS THINK IS MISSING                                                                                                                           | Ref |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Planting and landscaping along new pedestrian paths to encourage education, ecology and birdwatching                                                         | WC  |
| Clustered plantings and dense Bosque-like forests should be preserved                                                                                        | WC  |
| A program of self-guided timed tours                                                                                                                         | WC  |
| Possibility for more paths offering different experiences (stepping stones, disabled access, bush walks, tree top walk) – ref: Canberra Arboretum Play space | WC  |
| Improvements needed to reduce conflicts with vehicles/cyclists by improved raised pedestrian crossings, pavement treatments or markings                      | WC  |

THE MASTER PLAN – KEY MOVE 4: A network of hubs / improved amenities (institutional submissions)

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS LIKE                                                                        | Ref |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Supportive of the new hubs approach – as long as designed to blend with landscape             | WC  |
| Broadly supportive of sports hub upgrade – however more detail is sought re Fairland Pavilion | SHS |
| Supportive of a new food and beverage amenities at Fairland Pavilion                          | SHS |

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS DO NOT LIKE | Ref |
|-------------------------------|-----|
|                               |     |

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS THINK IS MISSING                                                                  | Ref |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| SHS can help restore the McKay Fields to five (rather than the current four) playing fields         | SHS |
| Any redevelopment of Fairland Pavilion should ensure all current uses are catered for going forward | SHS |

THE MASTER PLAN – KEY MOVE 5: Defined event zones (institutional submissions)

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS LIKE | Ref |
|------------------------|-----|
|                        |     |

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS DO NOT LIKE                                                                                                                  | Ref |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Opposed to increased use of Park for music events and concerts                                                                                 | RCC |
| Further development and access to SW Hub will increase cyclist safety issues                                                                   | BE  |
| Remove parking on Grand Drive between Equestrian Grounds and McKay Fields, provide new parking area accessed from Martin Road, Robertson Road  | BE  |
| Remove the importance of events in the Master Plan – impact does not justify the operation and alienates public space                          | AG  |
| Remove reference to Trust being a curator for programs of events and activities – primarily role for Trust is maintain and protect open space` | AG  |

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS THINK IS MISSING                                                                                                                      | Ref |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----|
| Consider multifunctional light poles in event zones to create an identity for each event zone – capitalise on ambience and investigate solar technology | WC  |

THE MASTER PLAN – KEY MOVE 6: Wellness, Sports and Formal Recreation (institutional submissions)

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS LIKE                                                                             |  | Ref |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|-----|
| Support the cross country routes                                                                   |  | BE  |
| Upgrade to facilities for unstructured recreation such as walking, jogging and cycling are welcome |  | AG  |

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS DO NOT LIKE                                                                                                                                                                           |  | Ref |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|-----|
| Do not like ‘short term hire only’ reference in sports field bookings – should include reference to ‘in some circumstances’...believe the Deed of Licence with SBHS demonstrates this approach can work |  | SHS |

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS THINK IS MISSING                                                                                                               |  | Ref |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|-----|
| We believe cross country routes are also suitable for casual bike use and bicycle access – well-regulated                                        |  | BE  |
| New cross-country route between Parklands Hub with Dickens Drive via Pine Grove would be good                                                    |  | BE  |
| The master plan should recognise the historical connections between Centennial Park and other public and community institutions (including SBHS) |  | SHS |

THE MASTER PLAN – KEY MOVE 7: Play for all ages (institutional submissions)

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS LIKE                                                                    |  | Ref |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|-----|
| Like play spaces but keep understated so that landscape itself informs how one would play |  | WC  |

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS DO NOT LIKE |  | Ref |
|-------------------------------|--|-----|
|                               |  |     |

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS THINK IS MISSING                                                        |  | Ref |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|-----|
| Sensory planting opportunities should be sought for contemplation                         |  | WC  |
| Design should allow for challenging navigation opportunities                              |  | WC  |
| Viewing platforms designed in interesting shapes and form                                 |  | WC  |
| Seating positioned to celebrate views and vistas                                          |  | WC  |
| Consider accessibility for the elderly and disabled                                       |  | WC  |
| A BMX track and skate park should be considered                                           |  | WC  |
| A tree top walk with tree houses would be a great addition                                |  | WC  |
| Inclusion of flood lights for certain sports fields in Centennial Park would be supported |  | RCC |

THE MASTER PLAN – KEY MOVE 8: Enhanced interpretation (institutional submissions)

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS LIKE                      |  | Ref      |
|---------------------------------------------|--|----------|
| Very supportive of the interpretive overlay |  | WC<br>AG |

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS DO NOT LIKE |  | Ref |
|-------------------------------|--|-----|
|                               |  |     |

| WHAT PARTICIPANTS THINK IS MISSING                                                                                                              |  | Ref |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|-----|
| A cultural heritage interpretation strategy should be considered                                                                                |  | WC  |
| Supportive of interpretation strategy, particularly Lachlan Swamp – historic connection with Sydney Water should be part of this interpretation |  | SWC |
| Want to see interpretation of the overall water heritage and connection – pre-European through to swamp, Busbys Bore and reservoirs             |  | SWC |
| Consideration of mobile technology for interpretation                                                                                           |  | SWC |
| Seeking further information and input on any new connections to Reservoir Fields                                                                |  | SWC |





# APPENDIX E: WORKSHOP 1, BENCHMARKING PRESENTATION BY CIVITAS

The following slides were presented as part of a Workshop discussion with CPMPT Staff by Civitas.

## Contemporary Trends in Urban Park Use and Design

The term “Park” is loaded with meaning - but different meanings to different people. The original idea of a park, or pleasure garden for public use, grew out of public discontent with the expansive gardens and hunting grounds controlled by royalty in England, France and Germany. Under popular pressure in the 18th century some royals began allowing public access to their private grounds on a limited basis. As the industrial age dawned, the disparities of wealth and public health led to a belief that access to nature was a necessary requirement of urban life for everyone.

Much investigation, reporting and theory was written in the mid 19th century that led to a growing belief that public places for nature were essential to urban life. The seminal example of these ideas was Central Park in New York, the first park designed entirely with public use in mind. With its completion the world began to recognize that nature was no longer just a place to hunt, gather or grow crops - nature was important to the personal health and social structure of new urban populations.

With this example many parks began developing in cities around the world in response to the same urban problems of London and New York. Theories and design practices began developing to deliver and manage these new spaces. From their original inception these were pleasure gardens that ranged from the highly pastoral and passive to formal patterned gardens for the display of plants. Arboreta, Botanical Gardens, Zoological Gardens and Parks were all an outgrowth of these trends.

In general these parks were seen as places of passive reflection, respite and social gathering - parks were thought of as an antidote to the stresses of the city. But between World War I and World War II a new idea of public health emerged that was based in modern ideas of personal activity, sport and health. In the period following World War II there was a marked shift away from the idea that parks were for passive use toward a more progressive idea that parks were venues of healthful physical and social activity. By the 1960's the worldwide norm had become parks for active recreation, including international standards for ratios of park space and recreation services per capita of population. The idea of public parks had shifted from reflection to action. For the next 30 years the majority of new park development and park management was about managing the competing needs of various park recreation users. Maintenance and scheduling of multiple sports became the role of the parks managers.

By the 1990's however, new ideas began to emerge. There was a growing awareness that nature had a role to play within cities, and that people enjoyed access and participation with nature. There was also a growing awareness of the need to make cities more livable and sustainable - and that meant more complex systems for mobility, more mixing of uses, more compact forms of urban design, and multiple purpose spaces and buildings. Social life began returning to the streets and public spaces of most cities during this period, a trend that continues to grow.

During this same period world cities saw increases in populations with declining resources for the development and management of new parks and other elements of the public realm. One common response was to begin using planned, programmed events and festivals as a way of both generating revenue for park operations and to attract people back into core cities. Suburban flight and commercial development had a material impact on the economic and social life of core cities, and urban advocates seized on the creation of new public venues and events to draw people back. The myriad of public museums, aquariums, zoos, and other cultural and entertainment venues that have been developed globally since the mid 1980's is astounding. Cities began competing for their new cultural attractions as well as their historic ones. This trend continues as it is ever more clear that cities are in global competition for tourists, talent and ambitions that lead to economic development and stability.

Urban Parks are rapidly becoming another tool used to improve the quality of life for citizens while also attracting new attention from visitors. Parc de La Villette in Paris, Bryant Park and the Highline in New York, and Millenium Park in Chicago are examples of parks being designed specifically for cultural and entertainment uses. This is the current trend among the great parks of the world such as Sydney's Centennial Park.

Today's Victorian parks (i.e. Centennial) have to meet the full range of needs and desires of increasingly diverse and active populations. People need active recreation, organized league sports, and quiet areas for reflection as always; but new and more intensive uses are finding great success in most parks as well. These include a rapid increase in various forms of personal exercise such as cycling, running, roller blades, skate skis and many other forms of movement, places for dogs both on and off-leash, and many other activities. At the same time the desire for the use of parks for special events, festivals, themed activities (outdoor movies, concerts etc.) and for general recreation (bird watching, picnicking, glamping etc.) is also on the rise.





The successful contemporary urban park, no matter what the size, is now supporting many more activities, many more patrons, and many more management and maintenance demands than ever before. In the most active examples such as Bryant Park, the park almost exists purely as a social and commercial gathering place that changes so frequently that the social scene is the primary attraction. This has led to highly increased costs and an upward cycle of increasing fees, sponsorships, corporate uses and branding. In high density locations like Bryant Park and Millenium Park the most pressing issues of debate are the protocols and pricing for multiple access. Both of these examples have gone to levels of branding that have created significant concern and push-back from special interest groups and the public at large. In general, these parks have been built on public lands, paid for with at least a measure of public money, and are at times seen as being hijacked by corporate interests instead of available as free and open parkland for all.



This trend has changed both the trajectory of public parks and the roles of those who are responsible for them. It is no longer sufficient to be the director of park activities like it was 100 years ago, nor is it adequate to be the manager of public recreation like it was 50 years ago. Today, for a park of the size, significance and complexity of Centennial Park, we must become Curators of the Park and all its uses. A curator does more than direct and manage, he or she continually balances and designs the use of the park to both satisfy loyal users and to attract new ones. Much like a museum that includes old masters, a permanent collection plus travelling exhibits, the curator chooses to have both recurring visitors and new offerings that raise issues, ideas and trends that patrons find compelling.

Much like a well-run museum, there can never truly be a stable state in a successful urban park. Curating the timing, overlap, and content of each activity changes with the seasons, by the year, and by the trends of use as tastes change. This means that the curators have to understand that a great park has a very durable, resilient and handsome framework of spaces, places, attractions and connections, while also having places and activities that change over time. Parks are places of personal and collective veneration, but are also places where people come to find themselves anew.


This curatorial balance requires that the curators and the users have an ongoing relationship and dialogue about the current state and future offerings within the park. One realization that emerges is that there are very few activities within a complex park that can afford to be single purpose only. To the extent possible uses overlay or are inter-visible with one another; are multiple use depending on the day or time; or are converted between various uses by management techniques.


For example, football fields that are under heavy weekend and evening pressure may be used for kites, model airplanes, or other pickup sports. Roads that are critical to access for active sports may be closed portions of the day or week to cyclists and other wheeled activities. Parking may be managed in many ways to increase or decrease visitation in various areas. Private cars may be displaced by public trams , at times; or parking may become consolidated and supplanted by trams when use patterns demonstrate safety and access benefits. Lastly, special events can be parsed into many types ranging from private events to major spectacles, each with a different responsibility and fee that is appropriate to their impact and contribution to the financial health of the park.







C I V I T A S







St. Patrick's Island looking to East Village



HUMAN EXPERIENCE IN PUBLIC SPACE



BEING ALONE



TOUCHING NATURE



BEING ALONE TOGETHER



STROLLING



DISCOVER NATURE



THINKING



WAITING



SPECIAL EVENTS



INCIDENTAL ENCOUNTER



FANTASY



SPECTACLE



CURIOSITY



PLAY



BELONGING



PERFORMANCE



TRADITION



SOCIAL EXCHANGE

