



# DICKSON- SECTION 72

## COMMUNITY WORKSHOP 2 REPORT



PREPARED FOR | ENVIRONMENT, PLANNING AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT DIRECTORATE

SUBMITTED | 10 JANUARY 2019

# DICKSON - SECTION 72 COMMUNITY WORKSHOP 2 REPORT

## DISCLAIMER

The content of this report was prepared for the exclusive use of the Environment Planning and Sustainable Development Directorate to assist with consideration of the urban renewal of Section 72 Dickson and is not to be used for any other purpose or by any other person or corporation.

**SPACELAB** accepts no responsibility for any loss or damage suffered arising to any person or corporation who may use or rely upon this document for a purpose other than that described above. Plans and text accompanying and within this document may not be reproduced, stored or transmitted in any form without the prior permission of the author/s.

**SPACELAB** declares that it does not have, nor expect to have, a beneficial interest in the subject project.

**SPACELAB** Studio Pty Ltd holds Quality Management System AS/NZS ISO 9001:2015 certification. This report has been prepared and reviewed in accordance with that system. If the report is not approved for issue, it is a Preliminary only.

REVISION	ISSUE DATE	AUTHOR	APPROVED
A	23.11.2018	HS	
B	10.01.2019	HS	GB

## CONTACT INFORMATION

**SPACELAB STUDIO PTY LTD**

ABN 15 167 074 062

**Hamish Sinclair** | Statutory and Strategic Planner

5/97 Northbourne Avenue Turner ACT 2612

Telephone: 6262 6363

Email: hamish@spacelab.net.au

This page has been left intentionally blank.

# CONTENTS

<b>1 INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>5</b>
1.1 PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT	5
<b>2 THE SITE</b>	<b>7</b>
2.1 SITE LOCATION	7
2.2 CONTEXT	7
2.3 WORKSHOP PROGRAM	7
<b>3 DESIGN PRINCIPLES</b>	<b>9</b>
3.1 URBAN DESIGN	9
3.2 LANDSCAPE DESIGN	9
<b>4 THE FEEDBACK LOOP</b>	<b>10</b>
4.1 URBAN DESIGN FRAMEWORK	10
4.2 LANDSCAPE DESIGN FRAMEWORK	15
<b>5 NEXT STEPS</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>APPENDIX A</b> - Table Reports	
<b>APPENDIX B</b> - Design Concepts	





# 1 INTRODUCTION

## 1.1 PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT

This second report has been prepared by **SPACELAB** as the planning and design consultants engaged to deliver design services for Section 72 Dickson for the ACT Government, Environment Planning and Sustainable Development Directorate (EPSDD). It in no way represents the views of the ACT Government or EPSDD.

It is to summarise the result of community input during the Workshop 2 on 15th November 2018. This report showcases responses from community participants to the design concept proposed for the Estate Development Plan (EDP) for Section 72, Dickson, that was presented at the workshop.

**SPACELAB** facilitated two design workshops utilising the principles of co design for the preparation of an estate development plan and urban renewal project for the subject site. The first workshop was framed as a listening exercise in which participants were

actively encouraged to provide their ideas and views on the key principles of urban and landscape design and how these apply to key issues for the subject site. The second workshop explored an overall design concept that drew upon the community responses to Workshop 1, background consultation and technical expertise to inform the proponent. This report captures the participants ideas, comments and concerns in terms of key design elements and individual responses that arose from each table. It is noted that some participants provided multiple comments on the same topic. The participant responses have been grouped by urban and landscape design responses to the overall concept and those elements that were able to be presented.

The **SPACELAB** design concept presented at workshop 2 was built on the preliminary planning scenarios developed by EPSDD, using input from the community and site analysis that was presented at workshop 1. While many of the community responses

cannot be actioned within the limitations of the EDP process, they are none the less recorded here for transparency purposes. The reports from each table have been faithfully transcribed and can be viewed in full in **APPENDIX A**.

The plans that attendees at Workshop 2 were asked to comment on can be viewed at **APPENDIX B**.

The consultant team is now working to analyse the feedback provided at Workshop 2 that is documented in this report. This will inform the Draft EDP that is being prepared.



Aerial View of Section 72 Dickson

## 2 THE SITE

### 2.1 SITE LOCATION

Section 72 is located between Antill Street to the North, Sullivan’s Creek to the south, the Dickson Group Centre to the West and Dickson Playing Fields to the East.

The site is zoned Commercial Zone CZ6 Leisure and Accommodation and sits within the Dickson Precinct and adjacent to the master planning areas of Dickson Group Centre and the Northbourne Avenue transit corridor.

There is a total of 18 blocks in Section 72 of Dickson and contains a range of land uses along with several vacant blocks, Block 6, 22 and 25, that form the basis of this urban renewal project.

### 2.2 CONTEXT

Following extensive consultation including the EPSDD **YourSay** Survey and EPSDD Community Drop in Sessions, and the **SPACELAB** led Community Workshop 1, a draft concept plan was formed as an integral part of developing the concept design to be used for Community Workshop 2.

The **SPACELAB** and Cardno team has worked closely with all community members present at the workshops to discuss the ideas and vigorously test assumptions underpinning the concept.

**SPACELAB** established the workshops as a round table discussion format, where participants had the opportunity to have their input in a respectful and considered approach. The methodology for both workshops was grounded in principles of co-design and each workshop adopted a listening approach to capture community ideas.

### 2.3 WORKSHOP PROGRAM

After an initial introduction from **SPACELAB** to the project and the **SPACELAB** and Cardno team the Director of Urban Renewal EPSDD affirmed the Dickson Section 72 project objectives as:

- An integrated urban renewal project, and
- Siting of Common Ground Housing Initiative within the precinct.



Existing Sullivan’s Creek dual frontage example



Envisaged low speed/ pedestrian friendly road on the northern side of the Sullivan’s Creek



Envisaged articulation of street frontage to Sullivan’s Creek

The workshop was broadly arranged in two parts:

1. The presentation of urban and landscape plan design principles from **SPACELAB**, the **SPACELAB** Draft Concept Plan and figures (**APPENDIX B**) that respond to six key themes derived from Workshop 1 along with landscape concepts that could support the design (see **3.0 DESIGN PRINCIPLES**), and
2. Table based community evaluation of the draft concept design, review of opportunities and alignment with themes of Workshop 1 (see **4.0 THE FEEDBACK LOOP**).

There were 42 community members registered and 29 attended this workshop (4 attendees presented themselves for the workshop on the night). All members were organised into six workshop table groups for discussion with a recorder assigned to each group. Each member had a chance to raise questions directly to the designers at their tables and to provide and discuss their thoughts with the group with the recorders transcribing the discourses and noting where ideas were contested.

## 2.4 WORKSHOP DETAILS:

**Date and time:** Thursday 15th November 2018, 18:30 to 21:00.

**Location:** Ground Floor Function Room, Dame Pattie Menzies House, Challis Street, Dickson.

**Attendees:** 29 Community members, 9 facilitators, 4 government staff.

**Provided Materials:** each member had access to the Draft Concept and Plans (and associated imagery prepared by **SPACELAB (APPENDIX B)**).

Background information on the planning and community engagement outcomes to date, including the Dickson Section 72 Community Listening Report for Stage 2, was emailed to all registered participants of the workshop. In response to interest in how the Common Ground initiative works a link was provided by EPSDD to a short video about the Common Ground development in Gungahlin.

Copies of the **SPACELAB** Section 72 concept design principles (section **3.0**) were also provided and used at the workshop. A **SPACELAB** rendered 3D design video of the concept was also shown.

**Expectations:** to allow community to influence the design of the redevelopment; to hear the voice of community and recognise their needs and wishes toward the future Estate Development Plan(EDP).



# 3 DESIGN PRINCIPLES

## What we previously heard:

Based upon what we heard from the community and recorded in Workshop 1 report six key findings to inform the design process were identified:

1. A mix of housing typology, and social community is preferred over a single development type.
2. A precinct that connects the existing community as a cohesive site, re-activating existing spaces and features.
3. A safe environment: inviting and permeable with improved connections (footpaths, cycleways and roads); Active frontages, with passive surveillance and lighting.
4. An outdoor, connected park system with a focus on retention of existing facilities and opportunities for after-hours activities.
5. Integration of Common Ground into the precinct, and not be isolated from the surrounding community.
6. Consideration of the tree canopy in the precinct and working around them with a considered and long-term view, to preserve and manage the buffers against wind and sun.

These findings were tested against the completed Dickson Section 72: *YourSay* ACT survey data.

## How we responded:

The design principles below and following figures ( **APPENDIX B** ) were developed and presented by **SPACELAB** to frame and encourage conversations at each table:

### 3.1 URBAN DESIGN

#### Cohesion:

A precinct that connects the existing community as a cohesive site, reactivating existing spaces and features.

#### Safety:

A safe environment that is inviting and permeable with improved connections (footpaths, cycleways and roads) and appropriate lighting. Has active frontages that promote passive surveillance.

#### Housing Choice:

A mix of housing typology, and social community housing is preferred.

#### Diverse and Connected:

An outdoor, connected park system with a focus on retention of existing facilities and opportunities for afterhours activities.

#### Landscape Integration:

Consideration of the tree canopy in the precinct and working around them with a considered and long-term view, to preserve and manage buffers against wind and sun.

### 3.2 LANDSCAPE DESIGN

#### Safe site permeability:

A network of well-lit pedestrian paths for entering and crossing section 72. Important path connections overlooked thus far.

#### Sullivan's Creek linear park:

Incorporation of a low impact pedestrian gravel path along the southern length of the site. Natural and cultural site history.

#### Community green spaces and amenities:

Upgraded and supplementary ideal playground.

#### Public square upgrades and improved parking configuration:

Associated with the pool site and broader connectivity within Section 72. Pool forecourt upgrades.

# 4 THE FEEDBACK LOOP

This section is a record of the individual comments from each table in response to what we presented in **3.0 DESIGN PRINCIPLES** and **APPENDIX B**. The comments from each table are collected together to respond to the urban design and landscape frameworks used for the workshop. While some tables prioritised issues, others didn't. Accordingly, the following responses to the frameworks and design concept evaluation are simply transcribed with no implied hierarchy or ordering intended. They are simply the community input to the process of design and a critique of the concept.

Where an individual comment was unclear in intent or focus the relevant table recorder was consulted to provide context for what was said. The original table reports as compiled by each reporter on the night are appended for continuity and transparency purposes. Please refer to **APPENDIX A**.

The table discussions from Community Workshop 2 as transcribed are:

## 4.1 URBAN DESIGN FRAMEWORK

### 4.1.1 COHESION

- Can the boundary (of the site) change (expand)?
- Concern Dickson playing field will be rezoned apartments, including the oval.
- Development on Section 72 – Question about Coles development starting will Section 72 start after. (Construction trucks – where do they park?)
- Connection of Dickson Group Centre and playground with Section 72 and connectivity to library for example.
- Shadow – (Block 6) overshadowing on dance school.
- Diagonal access – “Blocky” (approach to design of the) pathway is bad. Cross block pathway (is desirable). Less rectangular building (design is sought). Easy for non-vehicle access.
- (More background) assessment (is) needed for cultural needs and residential purpose.
- Antill Street – Welcoming entry needed, more non-commercial usage.

- Commercially adaptable areas and Community use areas.
- Dead space on east of Hawdon Place
- Playground to the east – Not really in a great spot.
- Playground – In S72 near tennis courts to the south.
- Existing zoning - includes community establishment, recreation, temporary housing.
- Like (the idea of a) straightened up Rosevear Street as it creates a visibility corridor.
- Rosevear Place road realignment near ANCA – ANCA currently enjoys the bend in the road. Believes that by straightening the road, the character will be reduced.
- Joining the street is good (Rosevear to Hawdon).
- Concern about the six storeys built form Block 6 (based on Gungahlin Common Ground/ six storeys ) façade not at human scale, out of scale and overlooking child care centre.
- 4 to 6 storey height is really high.
- Six storey seen as a precedent (setting) concern to filter out over the residential sites (as it will create precedent for adjacent developer sites to seek redevelopment to go up to the whole precinct being six storeys).
- Buildings – 5 to 6 storeys are too high, community use for people outside.
- Building height – having six storeys at the Rosevear Place (B6) on the opposite side of the tennis courts seems will not be a good design and it's not connected to other side of the section.
- Height limit – Concerned that the Listening Report identified people wanted fewer than 4 storeys, however there are 5 + 6 storeys presented (in this concept).
- Concern about height, six stories really high e.g. the building at the corner of Challis and Antill Street imposes onto Antill street, needs to step back.
- (Concern about the ) number of stories – Number of stories and basement parking.
- 3-4 storey building natural light issue – In winter there will be a concern that spaces, and buildings will not be in enough natural light/sunshine.
- Want 2 or 3 storey heights.
- Must be people scaled (2 storey) not high rise (6 storey).
- Split community use ground floor with residential above could work.
- Too much building- built space dominates green space. Prefer a re-balance towards

green space.

- (sketch up) Shocking images (show) a field of apartments.
- Need something to draw people into the site around the south of the pool. Really need to focus on pedestrian access to the centre of the section through and past the “choke point” of the car park and dog walking track space (Cowper street connection).
- Parking study – Dickson carparking needs to be looked at before Section 72 starts.
- Car parking (located at pool rear car park) needs to serve the whole precinct.
- Car parking demand analysis is needed for this concept.
- Carparking spaces for residences – How many are needed to be provided per dwelling?
- Site (S72) should not attract or be a offsite car parking provider.
- Want pedestrian crossing and intersection light control on Antill Street and Rosevear as well as Antill/Hawdon intersections.
- Three key things: a significant park, pedestrian access., not more parking but less.
- Separate cycle from and pedestrian crossings on Antill Street.

- Hope street bridge crossing obvious (is supported), don’t need any more than that added one (over Sullivan’s creek).
- Building orientation (proposed) – North/South is preferred due to how it appears from the residences to the South of S72 Dickson.
- Building articulation – could this be written in the code or EDP?
- Density – concern about density of building. Concern about cars/traffic generation.

#### 4.1.2 SAFETY

- Dead zone on Dickson Playing Fields and west of the hill (the area fronting Hawdon Pl and the embankment of the playing field oval) could be a temporary car park for Hawdon place – or could be a park upgrade space or car parking area.
- School kids walkability – safety pedestrian access.
- Safety for women and not having dark areas is main request. The area should be safe for walk all the time.
- Bridge – Connection to be from south side to the other side (into S72) to allow people park and walk to work. Already it is not safe, people walk through the creek go get to the other side.

- Playground – A playground to be built near B6 (to) make (the area) more accessible and safer for kids and women to use.
- Gravel path – Roots and possible trip hazard.
- Lighting/open spaces – Laneways – gardens to open up.
- (Improved) Lighting (is sought). (There is) a lot of concerns about the tree roots being trip hazards. It’s dark and can’t see if someone is hiding. Solar (powered) lighting is desired. (Placement) in the corners (of the section) ensure trees and corners do not cause dark and dangerous areas (enabling passive observation areas).
- Skate park – A good skate park (safe) encourages safety. Diverse range of people will use a good skate park. Belconnen’s redeveloped skate park used a good example as to how it was upgraded and attracted a more diverse range of users from families, young kids up to teenagers and young adults all using facility in harmony. Kids need a good space too.
- Skatepark – Will assist with passive surveillance. Situate it near pool. Area needs tidying up – modernising, sculpture walk, parkland, tree houses like there used to be at Weston Creek Park. Camperdown Commons brought up again and recommended as a good format. (I specifically was advised to

look at).

- Insurance at skate park – question was raised about insurance which is not required as it would be like all other active parks where user uses at own risk.
- Open space – creative use of spaces without all the standards (bother). Only reason for adding housing is for the ACT Government to convince the public that will the addition of residential buildings the area will automatically be considered safe. Natural creative play spaces reduce risk for ACT Government.
- Outdoor gym (location should be) not too close to skatepark or similar things that make it unsafe to use (for women). To be (located) in a “private” location away from distractions.

#### 4.1.3 HOUSING CHOICE

- Residential –Water usage, sewer usage (capacity).
- Basement parking – Good quality parking, storage, to improve vision amenity.
- Population – On street parking, facility improvement.
- Lack of transit – far away from transit, only one bus.
- Public housing – provides facilities, more

open space to provide activity for common ground.

- Common Ground is supported. (assume B6) is a good location and area for families to be connected to the community and be looked after.

- Investment – If I have money to buy an apartment (in Dickson) it's not a good option and location and mix. I wouldn't buy an apartment in this area (S72).

- Residential and community use (is supported) – (However) Commercial (use) is in the Group Centre and that is enough.

- No residential as per 2014 community consultation – Many people attended the community consultation in 2014 and no mention on residential but rather a community space. Why has everything changed so dramatically in four years?

- 2014-2017 fallow period – 2017 re-run consultation with less exposure (some people did not receive survey) and now to find that there is residential included in section.

- 3 years ago the community said that no to residential built in this area. This is a CZ6. The zone is not for housing.

- No residential – (this site is the) only inner north Canberra space available that is community based. 5 years ago, residential buildings were not part of the concept.

- Layout only one option – no residential.

- Redeveloping for housing will be a problem – Lessens value. As government will be releasing cheaper housing along Northbourne Avenue, public housing people will be shunted to S72. Developers would not be happy about a proportion of land given to affordable housing. Land values change – community sections will change.

- Land release – Nowhere listed – Land release for S72 cannot be found anywhere.

- Non-residential – ACT Govt was asked about the possibility of the site becoming non-residential. Advised that 260 surveys had overwhelming response for residential build.

- Huge disappointment at the introduction of residential into the precinct.

- Trojan horse of “low cost” housing but Govt fails to provide it at even a minimal level and will move to full residential.

- Concern residential will look like any other residential development around Dickson

- This is a classic “boiling frog” scenario for residential into Dickson with scenario 1 and 2 moving heights from 3 and 4 storey to 4 and 6 storeys.

- Characteristics of this section as primarily community use with some residential. This concept has been presented as the reverse

of that.

- How much is there of the need for the divide between commercial floor space and residential air (use) space for people to be in there (debated).

- Change of use (meeting from 2014) – We were never asked in 2014 if we wanted to sell it for private development (we = the community).

- Change of use, open space – Object to residential use/commercial use – want it to be purely for commercial use space. There is not enough open space.

- Study area as outlined on presented plan (rezoning?) – Rezoning – if the government is doing densification then could they consider extending the rezone to include the rest of Dumaresq Street.

- Community affordability – general community and artists may not be able to afford the rent for the spaces.

- Community affordability for rent/spaces – Would the community space be available at a reduced cheap rate?

#### 4.1.4 DIVERSITY AND CONNECTION

- The (people in the Dickson) area need a reason to go into the space. The community use is that reason.





- Flexible zones to provide different ideas (types of activities) to be run by community.
- (Create an) attraction – (leveraging off) ANCA, improves activity and facility standard to accommodate events, ABC moves in.
- Library – Extra library in S72, Dickson Library is congested.
- Shops – Having a couple of community cafes (is supported). Having a coffee shop (as an attractor) will make the residential area busy.
- Oval – Can't be used for daily, homeless people sleep in.
- Northbourne connectivity – Connects with light rail, improves footpath, bus stop only uses for interchange.
- Community activity (needs to encourage) Night time usage (as this will) provides activity for S72, e.g. outdoor exercise (areas).
- Community facilities – Something that can supplement the existing Hall, 350 m<sup>2</sup> is not viable in terms of size.
- Build farm – Indicative only. Very interested in the end outcome.
- Camperdown Commons (community city farm) – Very good example how to incorporate a community and commercial

space amongst residential. Check out website.

- Alternative uses for outdoor spaces – Ideal for “urban farm” (i.e.. Camperdown Commons) which offers spaces to use for the community, yoga, café, linked with community businesses, interactive experience. Include Dickson Wetlands and Majura Nature Park as links to the urban farm. Involve school groups to visit, community groups (interactive experiences) to be engaged in urban farming. Learning centre – HUB – CBR, nature park and/or education centre.
- Community garden-wanted and needed.
- Common area/community garden – Squandering vital piece of land for money.
- Access – pedestrian access on the existing bridge on east-south corner (Cowper street) is missing. Having windows (facing) toward south (buildings) to avoid having passive areas. Having (lots of street) trees will be difficult to have passive solar (access to living spaces) in the building. (Suggest) staggered buildings to allow passive solar to the buildings.
- Not an obvious location within the section for additional new green spaces but in terms of community space this provides the reason for green space.

• Pedestrian – Continue the footpath from east to west.

- Paths at south of the estate – South of existing gravel path. Connectivity of pedestrian path. North-south connection to the west needs to have thought on Antill Street crossing. North-south connection is great but would be good to have connection over Sullivan's Creek.
- Bike path network needs to support and be sufficient to support this development concept e.g. BBQ's, events, etc also need to be walkable attractions.
- Connectivity of the pathways and bridges – Would the bridge be able to be aligned with the gap in the houses (top of Bates Street)?
- Shared pedestrian and cyclist (paths)– Currently a lot of clashes happen between cyclists and pedestrians, separate paths to be designed. Move cycle path to the other (south) side of creek and provide bridges to connect into the section. Different pavements for pedestrian and cycle paths would be desired so it would be good to have separate paths.
- Traffic – Consideration of internal roads.
- Hydrological considerations – hydrological creeks used to run through the site.
- Tennis courts – Usage on the up. Saturday mornings are packed.

- Bridge – Bridge over the creek to allow to and use the other side.
- Bridges/flooding/landscaping – Bridges that are currently in place need to be upgraded. Like the idea of extra bridges to increase the access points across Sullivan’s Creek. Good for families, older people, disabled, cyclists...
- Don’t crowd it out as a space- (leave it as) an oasis.
- Love Dickson group centre and swimming pool that 1960’s design feel, car park too.
- North West area of site – Pool site could expand to the North. Area already looks okay.
- Sound from pools and other recreation spaces may cause a reduction in activity due to new residences – Residents may stop/prevent activity occurring near and at pool area due to the noise they receive in the new residences. i.e. bands playing, school carnivals, concerts, general activities.
- Visitor parking generation is a concern with the increasing use increasing demand.
- Pressure on parking near ANCA – Concerned that ANCA Studio’s parking may be used by new residents. The high rises may change the character of the current space.

#### 4.1.5 SOCIAL INCLUSION

- Cultural Assessment (needs to be done).
- Ground space for open/community uses – Ensures the use for ground floor usage for adaptability.
- Mid-northern B22, western B6 – park, cultural elements, community usage rather than building.
- Ground floor commercial – Not possible, needs quality commercial than adaptable space.
- Question was: Where (are) these (design) elements coming from? - Common Ground should be built in Northbourne Avenue (public transport and facilities accessibility) not Dickson. The proposed elements are like dog’s breakfast; not connected together.
- Bus stop (Antill Street and Depot) – Only use for processing, no staying, no attraction.
- Common Ground and playground (could be integrated – if) a playground was to be provided for Common Ground to allow parents supervise their kids.
- Community uses – Walk in clinic is desired. They are open till late and people from other areas will come to use which results in afterhours life. Carparking in the basement of buildings can be used as parking for Walk in Clinic.
- Community uses safety concern was raised that walk-in clinic is not a good idea as drunk people and crazy people will cause problems around (the area outside the) clinic.
- Common Ground – Will go on B25. Concern about business hours assistance, or 24 hours usage.
- Community services – Very important for the growing population.
- Historic site “Aerodrome” – S72 was originally part of runway to aerodrome. No acknowledgement on the site anywhere regarding this piece of history. Historic air crash is not acknowledged by way of memorial. Actual original bore hole on site is also not acknowledged. History of Canberra should be noted as it is important.
- Senior centre.
- Senior citizen activity and disabled (access) – More community uses to be allowed around the hotel. Accessibility for senior and disabled people.
- Aged care concern – Concerned that wheel chair, disabled or people with prams may be unable to walk to the tram stop (1.3 kms) due to distance.
- Parents with kids, prams etc generate the need to drive to the site creating concern about congestion.

- This is a Hackett and Watson people space





also.

- Desired community uses – Cheap affordable space, community organic garden, inviting spaces, spaces other than just children’s playground, skate park, really like CERES, picnic spaces, gathering spaces.
- Community amenity provision – Important to provide amenity given the amount of urban infill occurring in Canberra’s inner North. Concerned about lack of open space. Really important to bring the community together. Want to create a real sense of community and to see this as a real opportunity to start at.

#### 4.1.6 LANDSCAPE INTEGRATION

- Open space – large open space should be in the middle blocks.
- South open space – too many trees can’t be used as an open space.
- Good open space. Open space and parkland within the blocks in middle.
- S72 is only potential place for open space.
- Trees – (can address) concern about houses on the southern (Dumaresq) Street from the future buildings in B25 and (limiting development height) maximum to be 2 storeys (to prevent overlooking adjoining uses).

- Landscape/trees – suggested to have an active mixed uses for this section. Something that makes the area safe for women. Those buildings with commercial (ceiling height adaptable) spaces to be a space to attract different mixed uses. Cultural activity café not for alcohol. Safe to walk past. Night life to be provided. An example was the Woden bus station area which is unsafe after 5pm. Community bus station area is mixed use and is active till late at night.
- Southern path – Improvement (required), pavement (permeable), walkability and no gravel.
- Path connection – At the end of Rosevear and at end of North South Path.
- (Establish) entry (statement) planting at the base of Hawdon Place (where it connects with Sullivan’s creek and Dickson wetlands as it’s a) big pedestrian thoroughfare over the weekend.
- Community gardens are supported. A community garden/café/library for the community is seen as good for (parents accessing the) childcare (centres).
- Naturalising creek – This is a desire, expand upstream wetland.
- Capturing SW – Feed SW into eastern park,

water tanks.

- Ponds – Desire for ponds (in S72).
- Landscape Elements – Benches, BBQ’s, static exercise equipment.
- Trees – more trees along Sullivan’s Creek to assist with erosion due to drought.
- Water course. Site contamination? Clay/soil content.
- Pool – Corner near Sullivan’s Creek – a water feature. Flow pathway from Dickson through to S72. Carpark being used by non-pool users.
- Like the nature play type playground. Need a really good space to bring people to the area.
- People (parents with small children toddlers) will need to drive there.
- Antill street park (B13) not supported
- A significant playground is required for the precinct, not pocket parks between buildings (i.e. on B6, 22, 25).
- The area near the tennis courts is better for a bigger park space and link it with adjacent green space.
- Park spaces between buildings (B6, 22, 35) are too small to be useful.

- Green space north of the pool (B13) provides green backdrop and borrowed view (for pool users) and could hold circuit /gym fitness equipment for people in that space.
- Pathway upgrades – Concerned about rubbish. People leaving rubbish along the current pathway.
- Amenity and quality of life – Promote physical activity. Want a place to enjoy the outdoors for residents, make this a desirable suburban amenity.
- Don't touch tennis courts.

## 4.2 LANDSCAPE DESIGN FRAMEWORK

### 4.2.1 SAFE SITE PERMEABILITY

- Call for a halt (to this project) till more information about population projections etc (is addressed) in the Tech summary of S72 prepared by EPSDD.
- Nothing (in the way of a significant green space) from Hawdon to Northbourne Avenue.
- (Should be) a showcase for ACT Government (urban) rejuvenation
- Universal design – Inclusive of diversity of everyone. Access by all.

- Yoursay (survey outcomes) – appear not to be considered. Start development conversations via EO1 for sites. Athletics? Community-cultural groups/top dance studio already there.
- Misleading process – Disappointment from Workshop 1.
- No destination (in Section 72) – only used for access.
- Trade off – provide information about actual development.
- Section 72 needs open to connection to other (adjoining) spaces as well (as internal space).
- The concept is “very blocky” large block, intensive, built environment will be a huge heat sink.
- Safety improvements i.e. lighting – upgrade pathways with lighting. It is too dark on cycle paths especially along the creek line. Needs more lighting. Clear away heavy vegetation bordering the cycle path. Relocate lights to the side of the pathway they are not currently on so that the pathway is evenly lit as it has dark spots at the moment.
- Ability of road users to change direction on Antill street could be prevented by traffic lights.
- Parking standards don't work for (infill

development) density and suggested mix of community and residential.

- Underground parking to get cars out of the verges and existing spaces.
- Underground parking needed to cope with already suburb overflow parking issues.
- Underground parking structures with park space above (at ground level).
- Trees for Winter – Mix of Eucalypt, deciduous. Select carefully. Placement of trees important.
- Lighting – Paths that glow or light from solar lighting. Panels above tree canopy but lights below the canopy. Recessed lighting in walls or furniture that cannot be vandalised. In concentrated residential areas it is important to improve dark areas and add subtle but effective lighting.
- Concerned (about the need for) allocated area to park ambulance service vehicles.
- (The project needs to) talk about the community open space.
- Canberra has lack of area for different uses and multi-purpose (uses).
- This development to be a multipurpose destination and facilities.
- To be an area for many groups and different categories to use.

- For outdoor active recreational that people can use freely and safely – this site has potential to turn into a good place for kids and seniors.
- Outdoor gym – Place this not near the skate park. Please consider where the gym is placed as this could be a safety concern. Concerned that when people (mainly women) are using the gym, they may be harassed by people using the skate park.
- The open space on north-west of the site to not be developed.
- Open areas between blocks (numbered as 1 in the presented plan) will be “private property” to those nearby apartments and they will take the ownership. It will turn to their “backyard” and won't let others use them.
- Pedestrian connectivity – Across Cowper Street in front of pool. Possibly behind pool. Crossing across Antill needed.
- Western side of Rosevear Place – Would be good to activate this space. Pool being either all on or all off is not great. Would be good if this area could be activated. E.g. gym.
- Exercise equipment – From path network into the site from Cowper Street as a preferred outcome.
- As the wrap up – Still there are height

raising buildings that the community doesn't want. The workshop that had been undertaken some 4-5 years ago should be used as inputs to the design not only recent workshop being undertaken. Skate park/facility for senior people and wheelchairs access. Should be sending the results of these surveys directly to community and not forcing us to search on internet to find what happened and what were the outcomes of the workshop.

#### 4.2.2 COMMUNITY GREEN SPACES AND AMENITIES

- Lots of good landscaping, flexible views reflecting the spacelab (Workshop 1) report and themes.
- Opportunity to bring people in (to the Section 72).
- Maintenance of landscaping (is a concern as it) needs to last 50 years.
- Wanting more space for people using the space (Section 72).
- Example (of a good space is) Forest Lake its one big open space and a gazebo would be good.
- Not another Henry Rollin (design)Park which is concrete, ugly, harsh and likely too

hot in summer.

- (Shade solution could be) Tuggeranong Laneway example uses sails and trees.
- More toilets/public toilets are rare. There aren't enough in the parks.
- Solar energy use and storage (should be used for buildings and park infrastructure).
- Remnant trees – save as many as possible. If a tree needs replacing, could this be replaced with a similar or the same species?
- Deciduous trees – Don't like oak trees. Like the use of trees between buildings and along each street.
- Planting to attract native bird life – Encourage native bird life by planting species to attract them.
- Community garden combined with a playground. Like the idea of having a community garden in Section 72, south of tennis courts or/in common ground. Would like a play space to co-locate with the garden.
- Nature play – Positive toward, nature play spaces.
- Accessible playground - a good idea.
- Sensory garden spaces – Would like to see it within the linear park.

- High quality open spaces – Thoughtful design is required. An opportunity to provide a healing environment. Make this a really inclusive space.
- Trees – More eucalypt, keep apple trees and pool area.
- Trees are going to be removed – Photos, data, info on every tree. Overall consensus is to keep as many trees as possible confirmed by consultant. Good to keep cool, relaxing and play areas.
- Open space in mid west every space – Balance between open space and structure.
- Open space to gather and do recreations.
- Skatepark is desired.
- Block 6 to have an indoor climbing Gym.
- Government to put in those uses that community wants otherwise its wasting time asking people what they think and what they want.
- Community green spaces – The ones labelled inside the development are residential not commercial.

#### 4.2.3 SULLIVAN'S CREEK LINEAR PARK

- Quality landscaping with visual appeal is a priority.

- Finn street park is not relevant to this proposal or on B6 or B22.
- Wetlands could be upgraded including toilets.
- (Dickson) Wetland and Lyneham shops are examples of people friendly open space. (Need to value the Social capital investment in Section 72). Original(?) Canberra plan (provides a good design idea).
- Dickson playing field is a sports place while Dickson wetland is not distinctive as it has no facilities, Wetlands could be a space for pop ups.
- Want a commitment about what people are going to be there and the uses intended on each block.
- Sustainable capture of water (should be used
- Water permeable walkways (should be used) not gravel
- Additional Footbridge – Very positive. Happy to have another footbridge. Wants good lighting near the proposed footbridge -necessary.
- Addition bridges – To allow more access across Sullivan's Creek. Reduce traffic on skinny and wide bridge.
- Bridge to the west of Rosevear Place over

Sullivan's Creek – Loose gravel, too narrow, widening would be good.

- Creek/bridge works – Build the bridge to consider future remediation i.e. naturalised creek. Design the bridge so the work is not abortive.

- Hawdon Place is a dead area(streetscape) needs to be replanted. New trees bring life to the area.

- Dead space east (Dickson playing fields frontage) of Hawdon Place could be either a play park or car parking be provided for this area.

- Elevation – Land form is very flat (and likely impacted by) Flood zone every 100 years. (The site is) constrained by overflow of water. Can do some elevation (filling) of grounds in common areas.

- Natural play (style of area)– Engagement for public use. Water play. No long stay for south space.

- Playground (equipment)– BBQ (needed, also a) playground (could be) located south of existing tennis courts.

- South east (Cowper street access to Section 72)– entry statement is desirable.

- Enough space for landscape architecture interventions – South laneway isn't enough.

Good but not enough space. Location. Space focus for community. Finn St (example of an award winning park) is bad.

- Trees – the (Section 72) usage (should be) for trees.

#### 4.2.4 PUBLIC SQUARE UPGRADES AND IMPROVED PARKING CONFIGURATION

- (Concept appears to be) developed in isolation.

- Need to understand the real-world costs (of redevelopment of the Section 72).

- (Needs to be an) oasis with a central area (B6).

- Bit more space to use for (events such as) festivals, lanterns, design festivals.

- Day and night use (needed for the) space.

- Stage 88 type spaces for performances are needed as Community centre already has dances.

- A central square on the new street (B6) or behind parklands hotel (B22).

- Library spaces, IT hubs, apprentice accommodation (social housing) but not student accommodation.

- The supporting infrastructure is missing

thought (about) the site and cumulative impact of the development and existing facilities.

- 5 storey on Antill Street frontage if not used for green space, is out of character for (that part of) Antill St (and adjoining suburban residential) character, not very appealing.

- Don't want high rent spaces want to keep costs low through sustainable energy uses etc, including street lighting.

- Artworks/murals on blank walls – Could these be produced by local artists? May keep the local artists connected to the community. Murals may prevent vandalism.

- If the childcare is full now it could be a good idea to allocate an area for more childcare.

- Family space and community facility to be provided.

- Senior people to be more involved in the future activities within this Section 72.

- Discussion was around the very good facility and condition of Common Ground in Gungahlin.

- Comment on having the Common Ground in the established area.

- Commercial spaces are supported but not





shops.

- Place for kids to play as they will inactive while living in apartments.
- Climate change to be consider in this development.

• Parking – Keep parking numbers the same, not more or less. Pool parking to be kept and used for purpose. High rise residential to allow sufficient parking on site to stop excessive parking on streets.

• Heights – Not wanting to go higher that 3 to 4 stories max. More than 4 stories is considered commercial and undesirable. Height to be lower or much lower. Concern of buildings having poor visual amenity. Planning controls to have set backs and potential tapered heights. Disparity in surrounding single dwelling residential houses vs very high developments.

• Accidental driving into pool – Misguided traffic visuals into existing forecourt.

• Parking at pool – Less parking may be a better idea at the forecourt area of the pool.

• Community use – Can't happen in built form. Should be with in mid east(Block 22). Historically used by community. Sense of community. Last place for community.

• Space for community. Residential will increase pressure.

• Antill Street – Traffic congestion. Not playful friendly. Pollution is heavy (not suitable for play).

## 5 NEXT STEPS

This report completes the co-design workshop phase of preparation of a draft Estate Development Plan (EDP) for Dickson Section 72

The EDP is required for the purpose of subdivision under Section 94 of the Planning and Development Act 2007. Along with setting a subdivision layout of blocks it may also address associated infrastructure for the subdivision that is to be handed back to the ACT Government.

Accordingly, the lodgement of an EDP is part of the development application process and public notification and agency referral requirements for public consultation and development assessment.

While a range of concepts and community generated ideas arising from both workshops are unable to be integrated into the EDP process, the recording in this and the preceding workshop report, provide a valued resource for EPSDD to draw upon as part of it's wider urban renewal agenda and development of an identity for section 72.

### 5.1 FROM COMMUNITY CO DESIGN TO THE ESTATE DEVELOPMENT PLAN

The contribution of the community to establishing design principles in the

first work shop has enabled SPACELAB to develop a framework and concept that set the basis for Workshop 2. The next step opportunity for community participation in the design process is when the draft EDP is released by EPSDD for public consultation. A further opportunity will occur when the EDP is lodged as a Development Application and public consultation processes are carried out in accordance with the Planning and Development Act 2007.

The consultant team is now working to analyse the feedback provided at Workshop 2 that is documented in this report. This will inform the Draft EDP that is being prepared.



