

# COMMUNITY CONSULTATION OVERVIEW RELATING TO ISLAND PARK MASTER PLAN SITES:

Community comments and recommendations were recorded during meetings held on Macleay Island at the Community Centre at 10.00 am, 06 December 2008 and on Russell Island at 2.00 pm at the Community Hall.

Preliminary park concepts of relevant parks to each island were presented and discussed.

The following is an overview of comments and suggestions put forward by attendees of each meeting, and does not represent "meeting minutes". While there was a formal discussion period at each meeting, there was also time for informal discussion between designers and small groups or individual attendees following the more formal proceedings. Responses (below) by consultants to comments, suggestions or questions are those given at each meeting. In some cases, it has been possible to elaborate on these further (as noted).

## 1.1 MACLEAY ISLAND

There was only a small number of local attendees at the meeting – seven, in total – however those attending were enthusiastic, articulate and appeared to have a good understanding of the project and the preliminary concepts proposed for each park.

Generally, 'timing' and 'priorities' were issues raised by some attendees, and more specifically, in relation to finishing off other parks on the island, that is, Dalpura Park. Unfortunately, the consultants were not in a position to comment on this park as it is not included in their scope of work, however this issue will be directed back to council for their consideration and feedback. Determination of timing and priorities associated with the parks being looked at in the current project will take place once master plans have been developed with community input (current phase of the project), finalized, costed and endorsed by the island communities and council.

### Pats Park, Macleay Island

Located at 143-157 Beelong Street, Macleay Island

#### Comments and Suggestions

- Responses from the group were very positive about improvements to access, opening up the park by relocating the toilet block, pruning the dense lower canopy of Cotton Trees located at the edge of the beach, managing erosion control and the number and layout of picnic and play facilities.
- Tree retention was seen as very important, with attention required to those recently damaged in storms.
  - *Response – All existing trees are proposed for retention with little additional tree planting required due to the existing excellent tree cover. Damaged trees, such as an example cited by one of the attendees, will require assessment of public risk by an arborist. All trees will require ongoing assessment and management to maintain their health and minimize risk to public use of the park.*
- Potential access from parking proposed in the side street to the north of the park is desirable.
  - *Response – The northern area of the park is currently subject to overland flow from the road and subsequent erosion. This area is proposed to be restricted in terms of formal access and*

*rehabilitated using low-level, but dense planting and unobtrusive materials to retain soil and mulch. There is scope to provide access ways from the side street through the rehabilitation zone using tracks or paths that run parallel with contours and connect to the major, accessible circulation (pathway) network of the park.*

- The swimming enclosure requires attention as the base is rocky and has oyster shells which are a hazard to safety. A tidal pool similar to Wynnum in Brisbane or ocean-side pools in Sydney would be ideal for the safety and amenity of users.
  - *Response – A tidal pool would be highly desirable here and elsewhere on the islands of southern Moreton Bay, but the cost would be very high and prohibitive. Local geology would also be a factor in the feasibility of such an endeavour. The safety issue raised in relation to the ground surface of the swimming enclosure is important and requires investigation of mechanisms to reduce hazardous objects, such as sharp rocks and oyster shells, or alternative siting of the enclosure within the park where such hazards do not exist.*
- More angle parking at the edge of Beelong Street may be required due to the popularity of this park.
  - *Response – Additional roadside parking will be added where it won't impact on erosion management, safe access and use of the park. A number of additional car parks should be possible along the road frontage.*

### **Sentosa Park, Macleay Island**

- Located at the corner of High Central Road, Sentosa Terrace and Udara Drive, Macleay Island.

#### **Comments and Suggestions**

- Generally, the scheme was 'OK', but not a lot of discussion ensued regarding this park. This may be due to its small size and low-key nature as a local park.

### **Southsea Terrace (Macleay Island Community) Park**

Located at High Central Road and Southsea Terrace, Macleay Island, including the Community Centre and its site

#### **Comments and Suggestions**

- Generally, there was positive feedback about proposals for the site of the Community Centre and the large park opposite where facilities are proposed to be located on level platforms formed by earthworks, with accessible pathways and ramps for all users formed between.
- Moving the pedestrian crossing point across High Central Road further away from the village 'centre' and corner from Southsea Terrace was considered a good idea regarding visibility and safety, however further traffic moderation was suggested in view of the high level of use that the park may attract, particularly during events. These suggestions included constructing a roundabout at the corner of Southsea Terrace and High Central Road, diverting traffic around the section of High Central Road between the new park and the site of the Community Centre, and installing traffic calming devices along this stretch of road with particular attention adjacent to the pedestrian crossing point.
  - *Response – All ideas put forward have merit and show a genuine concern relating to the speed of vehicles using this section of High Central Road. The consultants recommended that traffic issues are looked at more closely in the context of the broader road network and the*

*neighbouring shopping precinct, ferry and barge entrance and residential areas nearby. Also suggested were special traffic control measures to be undertaken when there are community events held at the park. These would only be temporary and associated with specific activities or events. A traffic study falls outside of the current master plan phase of the park, however a study of broad scope could be considered once the types of activities and facilities have been endorsed by the community, and potential visitor numbers determined.*

- The location of the toilets was thought to be at some distance from main facilities.
  - *Response – Further discussion outside of the main presentation and feedback session helped clarify where the main ‘day-to-day’ facilities were proposed, that is picnic, barbecue and play areas. This assisted attendees in realizing that the toilets were in fact close to where they would be most needed. During community events, portable toilets and bins etc would need to be brought onto the site to cater for the larger numbers of visitors to the park. These would be located on level surfaces near areas of activity.*
- Relocation of facilities for young people, such as the BMX track from adjacent to the Community Centre to the new park opposite, was generally considered to be a good idea, particularly because it opened up an area near the Community Centre that would be ideal for a Community Garden. There was some reservation about the relocated youth facilities, which could include both a BMX track and skating facilities, impacting upon residences in Scarborough Terrace.
  - *Response - It was acknowledged that there is the potential for some noise impacts arising from skating activities and gatherings of young people in this area of the park. It is important that further design of this area of the park endeavour to mask or deflect sound away from Scarborough Terrace, where possible, using earth mounding or changes in level. Management of these facilities will also be important, with night-time use discouraged or prohibited and casual surveillance opportunities maintained from neighbouring streets, the Community Centre and other areas within the park.*

## **Corroboree Place Park, Macleay Island**

Located at 1-9 Corroboree Place, Macleay Island

Preliminary design work has not as yet been undertaken on Corroboree Park pending a meeting with local indigenous stakeholders to gain an understanding of the cultural imperatives that need to be considered for this park.

## 1.2 RUSSELL ISLAND

The meeting was attended by 23 people including the local councilor, Barbara Townsend. A large proportion of attendees appeared to be local to the Jock Kennedy Park area.

A broad range of issues relating to Jock Kennedy Park was raised and discussed. While most of the discussion revolved around park planning issues where the need for an upgrade to facilities at the park was questioned, there were some useful comments on the preliminary concept design for the park regarding the type of facilities and their location within the park.

All issues are outlined below.

### Jock Kennedy Park, Russell Island

Located at Douglas Street, Russell Island.

#### Comments and Suggestions

These have been divided into two groups to reflect the two main areas of discussion and concern expressed by attendees – Park Planning Context and Jock Kennedy Park Concept.

#### Park Planning Context

- Throughout the meeting consultants emphasized that the proposal for upgrading Jock Kennedy Park was the result of recommendations of the SMBI Sport and Recreation Strategy and that this was based on the outcomes of extensive community consultation. One of the attendees confirmed this to the assembled group. Many attendees were critical of the park receiving an upgrade to include facilities and improved amenity. Some also indicated that initiatives to improve the park were the result of a long history which has revolved around moving the swimming enclosure from High Street Park near the barge/ferry jetty to Jock Kennedy Park. This history has involved two petitions from opposing camps being submitted to council.
  - *Response – The history surrounding the swimming enclosure has not been included in the brief or background supplied to the consultants working on the master plan for the park as the issue has not been raised in the last 4 to 5 years. While a swimming enclosure at the park is a proposal arising from prior community consultation and is included as a recommendation in the Draft SMBI Sport and Recreation Strategy, it is not the main driver for upgrading the park. The main aim of upgrading the park is to provide a recreation space and experience for the residents of the island in a comfortable foreshore location.*
- The need for a swimming enclosure was questioned since the pool had been opened on the island. There were also some suggestions that the swimming enclosure, if needed, would be better located at Sandy Beach, where it would have a sandy base and be more amenable to use by the community.
  - *Response – The consultants were unable to comment on the desirability of alternative locations for a swimming enclosure, although the Sandy Beach location seemed to be a great location for one from what was said at the meeting. The proposal for one at Jock Kennedy Park is being considered as part of the master plan as it arose as a desirable element in the park during community consultation associated with the Sport and Recreation Strategy project.*

*The swimming enclosure is discussed further in the Jock Kennedy Park Concept section of this document.*

- A number of attendees were concerned that the facilities at the park were a replication of those proposed for the large park at Union Street, some 300 to 400m away, and that this was unnecessary and a needless expense.
  - *Response - The proposal for the park at Union Street as described in the Draft SMBI Sport and Recreation Strategy has a number of facilities that are similar to those proposed for Jock Kennedy Park. However, the proposals for each of these parks are based on different aims and will have different roles in the open space and recreation scheme of the island. Further to the response given at the meeting, the Union Street park will be a large sport-oriented park with the potential for camping and other youth activities, including those associated with clubs. Community facilities such as picnic shelters, barbecues and play areas are proposed to compliment these activities. The proposal for Jock Kennedy Park is to provide facilities to support recreation for all members of the community in a foreshore setting. The two parks are therefore seen as very different in terms of their physical and social context. In terms of park planning, both parks are valid and desirable.*
- A small number of attendees were concerned with the costs associated with delivering the Jock Kennedy upgrade and how it is going to be funded.
  - *Response – Costing will be conducted once the content of the park, in terms of included facilities, is developed and this will depend upon community and council input. Regarding funding, the consultants have not been briefed on how council will pay for the upgrade, but it is understood that funding for all of the parks being studied in this project will come from some of the funds already collected from residents as part of existing general rates/levies etc. Where possible and applicable, this will be supplemented by state and federal government grants.*

During an informal discussion with meeting participants following the presentation and comment session, consultants advised those with issues associated with the proposed upgrade to the park that they needed to address these issues to council as a response to the Draft SMBI Sport and Recreation Strategy as this is where the direction for the upgrade and associated facilities had arisen. This would require them to challenge the findings of the Strategy and provide an alternative view to that of the community consultation undertaken during development of the Strategy.

### **Jock Kennedy Park Concept**

- The swimming enclosure may not be feasible at Jock Kennedy Park due to a number of reasons. These include the likely depth of mud at the base of any new enclosure making its use undesirable, the potential wash created by boats using the nearby channel, potential water quality issues arising from the dumping of human waste from boats using the nearby channel and the possibility that mangroves may need to be removed to install an enclosure.
  - *Response - Most of these concerns are valid and will need to be considered in locating any facility which enables people to access the water. Regarding mangroves, the size and location of the swimming enclosure, as proposed, is unlikely to have significant impacts on mangroves.*
  - *Further to comments made at the meeting, the master plan could indicate the location and size of the swimming enclosure and that construction would be **subject to** ongoing*

*consultation with the community, advice and permits from State Government agencies (EPA, Marine Parks, DPI), and further investigation in relation to primary contact with water in the bay and other safety issues. There is a recent report of people being harmed by coming into contact with fireweed when swimming in the bay at Jock Kennedy Park. This would also need to be investigated further.*

- The proposed boat ramp is considered undesirable as it will mean existing moorings will need to be relocated elsewhere, and there is potential for more traffic, noise and perhaps undesirable behavior, possibly at night. It is also not recommended by consultants in the October version of the Draft SMBI Sport and Recreation Strategy.
  - *Response – The recommendation for the boat ramp came from the September version of the Draft SMBI Sport and Recreation Strategy with council providing a preliminary design to be included in the park concept in recent weeks. There were concerns, however, about co-locating a boat ramp and a swimming enclosure in close proximity, hence the change in recommendation in the Final Draft Sport and Recreation Strategy (October, 2008). The preliminary master planning of the park has indicated that these activities can and should be separated as much as possible. The current concept, as presented at the meeting last Saturday, suggests that there will be minimal conflicts. Council has advised that the recommendation in the Final Draft of the Sport and Recreation Strategy (October 2008) will be amended to reflect this and acknowledge the community desire for the ramp as determined during consultation for the Strategy.*
  - *The issue regarding existing moorings near the proposed boat ramp will require further analysis with the assistance of council.*
  - *Management of the park will need to be well considered in terms of its use, with a preference that it does not attract use at night. Lighting considerations, a potential curfew and other management issues will be considered with council. Policing issues were also raised during the meeting and should also be considered as part of the park’s ongoing management, including connections between the park and police station.*
- The proposed toilet block presents a significant impact to the amenity and views of properties directly across the road. This location was questioned by a number of participants.
  - *Response – The toilet block was located towards the centre of the park to address the functionality of the park, providing optimal convenience for park users and high visibility to its entrance from activity areas around the park. Its location close to the road frontage was to permit visual access to comply with CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) guidelines and also to be located **above** the RCC storm surge level of 2.4m. The area in the park where a toilet can be located might be extremely limited.*
  - *It was acknowledged that this location will have impacts on nearby properties. A full range of options will be explored to locate the toilets elsewhere in the park to minimize such impacts and address limitations mentioned above.*
- There was some consternation that the park will appear overdeveloped with too many facilities and shrubs, and that the park’s use as a large open grassed area for active pursuits will be lost.
  - *The existing park comprises a large grassed area with very little shade. The proposed upgrade to the park will result in the loss of a substantial area of this open grass. This is to provide more of a balance in recreation activities, including passive recreation, and provide for a*

*broader spectrum of park users, such as families and older residents. At present, the park lacks the amenity to support a wide range of user groups and activities, mainly due to the lack of shade. While tree planting using species suitable for the coastal location and with clean trunks to retain visibility throughout the park and views across the park to the water will be used for shade, no shrub planting greater than 1m high (maximum) is proposed or desirable for use in the park.*

- *A number of structures are proposed to provide shelter for picnics and barbecues in one section of the park near a small sandy “beach”, with a playground in another, co-located with an open grassed area. The combination in facilities will provide a balance for passive and active use, although may constrain use of the park for golfers wishing to practice their swing or football-like games, which currently occurs. Opportunities exist for smaller scale active pursuits such as volleyball, however.*

*While proportions of spaces within the park and numbers and scale of facilities have been a major consideration during development of the preliminary park concept, **opportunities to expand the grassy active area will be explored further.***

- The proposed connection between Douglas Street and Bayview Road is on land that is privately owned and this access should not be permitted.
  - *The potential connection provides for pedestrian and cyclist access between Jock Kennedy Park and shops, car parking and ferry terminal access via Bayview Road. The vacant allotments that separate Douglas Street and Bayview Road are designated by council as ‘SMBI flood prone and storm tide’ areas and may therefore may be limited in terms of development.*
  - *During discussion with one of the attendees following the meeting, they suggested that a boardwalk along the waterfront would make an attractive connection between Bayview Road and the park. The presence of a private residence with a small jetty would limit this possibility, however. The vacant land nearby which is constrained for development would offer a more direct and legible connection between the park and Bayview Road, and permit the creek/drainage corridor that traverses the land to be managed for weeds, stability and water quality issues. As suggested during discussion following the meeting, a boardwalk character may be a favourable approach to management of the rehabilitation of the site and its appeal as a connector with the park.*