



STAGE 06 | STATUTORY NOTIFICATION

**INTRODUCTION**

The Draft Master Plan was prepared for the Callan Park site pursuant to the provisions of the Callan Park Act and State Environmental Planning Policy No.56. The Callan Park Master Plan, Draft Plan of Management and Conservation Management Plan were publically exhibited from Tuesday 15th February until Thursday 19th May 2011 along with the accompanying four Financial Models. In addition our community information sessions were also held during the exhibition period;

- Saturday 13th March 2011
- Sunday 20th March 2011
- Wednesday 30th March 2011
- Thursday 31st March 2011

During the exhibition period the community and key stakeholders were invited to participate in an online survey and/or send in written submissions commenting on the Draft Callan Park Master Plan.

**SURVEY COMMENTARY**

100 people commenced the Stage 6 survey and 96 people completed it.

1. Overall, what do you think about the exhibited Master Plan in its current form?

|           |       |
|-----------|-------|
| Excellent | 9%    |
| Very Good | 35.4% |
| Good      | 11.5% |
| Poor      | 11.5% |
| Very Poor | 19.8% |

2. Do you recommend that Leichhardt Council adopt the exhibited Master Plan?

|     |       |
|-----|-------|
| Yes | 56.4% |
| No  | 43.6% |

3. What do you like most about the exhibited Master Plan? The proposals for.....

|                                       |       |
|---------------------------------------|-------|
| Active & Passive Recreation           | 27.1% |
| Callan Point & Bush Regeneration      | 13.5% |
| Public Access                         | 12.5% |
| Responds to community input/ feedback | 7.3%  |
| Mental Health & Community Wellness    | 7.3%  |
| Callan Park Farm/Glovers Garden       | 6.3%  |
| Mental Health framework               | 5.2%  |
| Sustainability                        | 5.2%  |
| Nothing                               | 5.2%  |
| Foreshore                             | 3.1%  |
| Heritage landscape & Buildings        | 3.1%  |
| Building demolitions                  | 2.1%  |
| Everything                            | 2%    |

4. What do you like least about the exhibited Master Plan? The proposals for.....

|                                    |       |
|------------------------------------|-------|
| Mental Health framework            | 31.3% |
| Nothing                            | 27.1% |
| Building demolitions               | 10.4% |
| Active & Passive Recreation        | 7.3%  |
| Callan Park Farm/Glovers Garden    | 4.2%  |
| Public Access                      | 3.1%  |
| Callan Point & Bush Regeneration   | 1.0%  |
| Nothing                            | 5.2%  |
| The Plan of Management             | 5.2%  |
| Everything                         | 3.1%  |
| Mental Health & Community Wellness | 1.0%  |
| Sustainability                     | 0.0%  |
| Foreshore                          | 1.0%  |
| Heritage landscape & Buildings     | 0.0%  |

5. Which governance model do you recommend for Callan Park?

|                                                                                  |       |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| A statutory trust                                                                | 87.1% |
| Separate parcels within Callan Park managed by NSW Health and Leichhardt Council | 8.6%  |
| Existing arrangements (NSW Health & SHFA)                                        | 4.3%  |

6. Order the 12 Overlays from 1 to 12, with 1 being the system you would like to see implemented first, and 12 being the system you think should have the lowest priority:

|                      |                                    |
|----------------------|------------------------------------|
| Priority 1 (highest) | Public Access                      |
| Priority 2           | Active & Passive Recreation        |
| Priority 3           | Callan Point & Bush Regeneration   |
| Priority 4           | Callan Park Farm & Glovers Garden  |
| Priority 5           | Sustainability                     |
| Priority 6           | Heritage Landscape & Buildings     |
| Priority 7           | Mental Health & Community Wellness |
| Priority 8           | Existing health providers          |
| Priority 9           | Cultural Cluster                   |
| Priority 10          | Building Demolition                |
| Priority 11 (lowest) | Veterans Field                     |

7. Who do you think should fund the \$300 million to fully implement the Master Plan and \$5 million per annum maintenance?

|                    |       |
|--------------------|-------|
| Federal Government | 20.3% |
| State Government   | 78.0% |
| Leichhardt Council | 1.7%  |

Age of respondents

|               |       |
|---------------|-------|
| 15 – 24 years | 1.0%  |
| 25 – 34 years | 10.4% |
| 35 – 44 years | 28.1% |
| 45 – 54 years | 24.0% |
| 55 – 64 years | 20.8% |
| Over 65 years | 15.6% |

TOP LEFT. Table no. 64 Master Plan ratings  
 HIGHER MIDDLE LEFT. Table no. 65 Ratings on whether Leichhardt Council should adopt the Master Plan  
 LOWER MIDDLE LEFT. Table no. 66 Master Plan positives  
 BOTTOM LEFT. Table no. 67 Master Plan negatives  
 TOP RIGHT. Table no. 68 Preferred Governance model  
 MIDDLE RIGHT. Table no. 69 Overlay rankings  
 BOTTOM RIGHT. Table no. 70 Implement Master Plan

## SUBMISSION COMMENTARY ON OVERLAYS

In total there were 92 written submissions to the Draft Master Plan. These submissions were entered into a spreadsheet for analysis. In total there were 920 individual comments contained within the 92 submissions.

The comments were categorised according to the 12 Overlays in the Draft Master Plan. As far as possible, they were then sub-categorised and grouped according to whether they were supportive of an aspect of the Draft Master Plan, or critical of an aspect of the Draft Master Plan.

In total, there were:

- 87 'positive' or supportive comments (made by 63 individuals or groups)
- 479 'critical' comments or comments opposed to a particular aspect of the Draft Master Plan (made by 75 individuals or groups), and
- 254 'neutral' statements which could not be categorised as neither positive or negative, made by 78 individuals or groups.

A number of individuals made both supportive, and critical comments on the Draft Master Plan.

|    |                                | Critical | Supportive | Neutral |
|----|--------------------------------|----------|------------|---------|
| 1  | Biodiversity                   | 34       | 17         | 27      |
| 2  | Built Form & Infrastructure    | 53       | 11         | 23      |
| 3  | Culture                        | 30       | 5          | 10      |
| 4  | Economy                        | 28       | 2          | 4       |
| 5  | Energy                         | 4        | 2          | 15      |
| 6  | Food                           | 13       | 3          | 5       |
| 7  | Governance                     | 34       | 26         | 13      |
| 8  | Health                         | 107      | 62         | 82      |
| 9  | Pollution                      | 0        | 1          | 1       |
| 10 | Transport                      | 117      | 34         | 39      |
| 11 | Waste                          | 3        | 1          | 1       |
| 12 | Water                          | 8        | 1          | 1       |
|    | General (outside the Overlays) | 48       | 22         | 33      |
|    |                                | 479      | 187        | 254     |

### 1. Biodiversity

#### Tree Removal

21 of the 33 critical comments about the Biodiversity Overlay related to the removal of trees (primarily, but not limited to, those in front of the Convalescent Cottages [B401-B404]). 2 submissions supported removing self-seeded trees.

#### Comment

The Draft Master Plan proposed to remove stands of trees or individual types of species based on heritage and conservation principles and a best practice approach to maintaining natural biodiversity. The proposals accord with the project principles established through the extensive community consultation in 2010.

#### Supported elements of the Overlay

There were 6 comments in favour of the bush corridor and/or bush regeneration. Heritage plantings were supported and the new boardwalk for pedestrian access to the Callan Point Beach was seen as enhancing the marine environment.

#### Recommendation

That Leichhardt Council accept the Biodiversity Overlay proposals as they are described in the Draft Master Plan.

#### Possible alternative

The National Trust of Australia recommended pruning trees in front of the Convalescent Cottages 'until they die off'. Council may wish to consider this strategy.

### 2. Built Form & Infrastructure

#### Building Removal

47 of the 53 critical comments about the Built Form & Infrastructure Overlay related to building demolition, either opposing the proposed demolition of particular buildings, or opposing the proposed demolition of any buildings. Some misunderstood the provisions of the Cal-

lan Park [Special Provisions] Act 2002, suggesting that any demolition was 'illegal' according to this legislation, and others suggested delaying any demolition until further studies could be undertaken.

#### Comment

The Draft Master Plan proposes to demolish 39 buildings based on heritage and conservation principles and the community's clear desire (expressed throughout consultation in 2010) to increase open space, demolish dilapidated buildings, and respect the heritage values of the site.

The Act does not prohibit building demolition. Section 7, Clause 5 of The Act reads: 'Buildings must not be erected at Callan Park outside the footprints or building envelopes of the buildings that existed immediately before the commencement of this Act. However, this subsection does not prevent the erection of temporary structures.'

The Act makes the point of buildings being erected only within existing footprints and envelopes. For a building to be erected within an existing footprint or envelope, the original or previous building must first be removed or demolished.

#### Supported elements of this Overlay

There were 6 comments in favour of building demolition, including support for the demolition of the Veterans Wards at the foreshore. Fibre-optic cables and the restoration and preservation of built structures and gardens were also mentioned.

#### Recommendation

That Leichhardt Council accept the Built Form and Infrastructure Overlay proposals as they are described in the Draft Master Plan.

### 3. Culture

The 30 critical comments about the Culture Overlay were more diverse, with 2 comments critical of the Callan Park Museum, 7 comments questioning the Cultural Cluster, 6 protesting the removal of the Spanish War Memorial and 4 opposing the Veteran's Field. Queries raised were that the proposed amount of gallery space exceeds the recommendations of the Guppy Associates report and that the proposed educational and cultural uses would be at the expense of facilities and services for those with a mental illness.

#### Comment

Community support for the cultural initiatives in the Draft Master Plan, in particular for the potential synergies between the mental health functions of Callan Park and the capacity of the arts to assist recovery from mental illness, was unwaveringly strong throughout the 2010 consultation.

The Draft Master Plan proposes that 8% of the floor area of Callan Park be devoted to Community use, 42% to Education uses, and 50% to Health uses. These are the 3 uses permitted under The Act, which does not prescribe that Health should be the dominant use.

The Spanish War Memorial will now remain as part of the Master Plan.

#### Supported elements of this Overlay

Veteran's Field, the educational/vocational/arts synergies with mental health services, the Callan Park Museum and the Harbour Bridge memorial were all mentioned positively.

#### Recommendation

That Leichhardt Council accept the Culture Overlay proposals as they are described in the Draft Master Plan.

### 4. Economy

Of the 28 critical comments relating to the Economy Overlay, 16 were by way of 'form letters' with identical phrasing about a range of issues relating to mental health. These 16 letters all proposed that '30% of employment opportunities on the site should be for people who have mental health issues'.

#### Comment

To our knowledge, this would involve some form of affirmative action or positive discrimination. In Australia, The Racial Discrimination Act 1975 promotes equality for the law for all persons, regardless of their race, colour or national or ethnic origin, but does not provide for positive discrimination.

The Sex Discrimination Act 1984 promotes equality between men and women by protecting people from discrimination on the grounds of sex, pregnancy and marital status, but does not provide for affirmative action or positive discrimination.

The Affirmative Action (Equal Opportunity for Women) Act 1986

TOP LEFT. Table no. 71 Written submissions

requires certain employers to promote equal opportunity for women in employment. This Act defines 'Affirmative action' as 'appropriate action to eliminate discrimination by the relevant employer against women in relation to employment matters'.

The Disability Discrimination Act 1992 aims to eliminate discrimination against people on the ground of disability to ensure, as far as practicable, that persons with disabilities have the same rights to equality before the law as the rest of the community. The Age Discrimination Act 2004 provides for positive discrimination (actions to assist people of a particular age who experience a disadvantage because of their age).

It seems unlikely that a Master Plan could incorporate a provision requiring future tenants at Callan Park to abide by an affirmative action or positive discrimination program that is not possible under Commonwealth Law.

There were 4 negative comments about the fact that the Draft Master Plan does not refer to the Expressions of Interest (EOI's) Council received during consultation in 2010. The online EOI was always described as a 'non-binding' process that would 'assist Leichhardt Council determine how quickly it may be able to realise the Master Plan vision for Callan Park'. Council has recently contacted all those who submitted EOIs to thank them for their submissions and advise them that the details of their submission would be passed on to the proposed Trust.

6 comments opposed the number of cafes proposed in the Draft Master Plan (4). However each proposed café has the potential to provide training and employment opportunities for people recovering from mental illness. Therefore they are regarded as integral to the future operation of the Wellness Sanctuary.

#### Recommendation

That Leichhardt Council accept the Economy Overlay proposals as they are described in the Draft Master Plan.

#### 5. Energy

3 of the 4 critical comments relating to the Energy Overlay, questioned the analysis that led to recommending green energy. The 4th described this Overlay as 'irrelevant' until the Master Plan is adopted and the land use is known.

#### Comment

Since the draft Project Principles were first put to public consultation in July 2010, there has been consistent support for 'ensuring that Callan Park is a world-leading model for social, environmental and economic sustainability' and for 'ensuring that uses at Callan Park demonstrate a commitment to social, environmental and economic sustainability'.

It will not be possible to fulfil these Project Principles without the energy strategies detailed in the Draft Master Plan.

#### Supported elements of this Overlay

There was support for the whole Overlay and for site wide metering.

#### Recommendation

That Leichhardt Council accept the Energy Overlay proposals as they are described in the Draft Master Plan.

#### 6. Food

1 critical comment questioned the expansion of Glovers Garden, 4 were opposed to the Callan Park Farm and 8 were opposed to the Orchard. Of these, 1 individual questioned both the Farm and the Orchard on the basis that they would reduce open space and therefore contravene The Callan Park (Special Provisions) Act 2002 (The Act), and 3 people were concerned that open space was being granted to private individuals through the creation of the Callan Park Farm.

#### Comment

'Open space' is not defined in Callan Park (Special Provisions) Act 2002. To our knowledge, the meaning of the term 'open space' must therefore be gleaned by interpreting its ordinary meaning within the purpose of Callan Park (Special Provisions) Act 2002. The 3rd object of The Act is 'to allow public access to that open space, including that foreshore, for public recreational purposes of both an active and a passive nature'. Community gardening is a public recreational use that already exists at Callan Park – and both the Farm and the Orchard will extend this type of public recreation within Callan Park. Neither will be 'granted' or dedicated to a particular organisation for their exclusive use, and both will be tended collectively by any members of the community wishing to access them.

Both aspects of the Draft Master Plan have been strongly sup-

ported by the local community since consultation began in 2010.

#### Supported elements of this Overlay

The 3 favourable submissions supported the expanded community garden and the Callan Park Farm.

#### Recommendation

That Leichhardt Council accept the Food Overlay proposals as they are described in the Draft Master Plan.

#### 7. Governance

26 comments supported the Trust as proposed. Under the Callan Park (Special Provisions) Act 2002, options for a governance structure are either a Trust or management by Leichhardt Council. In the Stage 6 online survey during the Master Plan exhibition, 87% of 70 respondents agreed that the governance model should be a 'statutory trust managing the entire Callan Park site, funded by State Government but with Leichhardt Council and community members as trustees appointed by the state government'.

Critical submissions to the Draft Master Plan primarily referred to the form of the proposed Trust rather than the Trust model itself (only 3 suggested that Council should manage Callan Park, and another 2 suggested that a social enterprise should be the governing body. The latter is not possible under Callan Park (Special Provisions) Act 2002.

34 comments disagreed with the Trust which proposed a 7 member board comprising a CEO, the General Manager of Leichhardt Council, 3 members appointed by the State Government, 1 member from a Mental Health Advisory Board and 1 member from a Community Advisory Board.

14 suggested that the 'majority should be those with the lived experience of mental illness and organisations using the land'. Variations to this included suggesting 'mental health consumers, carers and NGOs' and 'aboriginal people with the lived experience of mental illness'.

3 recommended that the Board should include members from Council, health and 'those who have fought for Callan Park', 1 felt the 7 member board was too small and another recommended equal representation by Council and the state government. 1 supporter also cautioned that the 7 member board was too small.

1 suggested that Council adopt the model it endorsed 5 years ago: 3 nominated by the state government, 3 by Leichhardt Council, 1 elected by tenants, 1 from the National Trust, and 1 mental health representative.

A version of this last suggestion would seem to satisfy a desire for equal representation from Council and the state government. Given that the Trust will be required to deliver the Master Plan and implement the Plan of Management within the parameters of Callan Park (Special Provisions) Act 2002, it seems prudent that the Trust should have education, health and community expertise in its makeup.

#### Recommendation

Should Leichhardt Council wish to vary from the proposed Trust structure suggested in the Draft Master Plan, a satisfactory alternative could be:

- 3 members nominated by the State Government
- 3 members nominated by Leichhardt Council
- 1 member elected by tenants
- 1 member elected by the Community Advisory Board
- 1 member elected by the Mental Health Advisory Board

#### 8. Health

85 of the 105 critical comments to the Health Overlay referred to Mental Health. 8 suggested that more consultation is required with consumers, carers and relevant groups. 17 noted that the Mental Health components of the Draft Master Plan are 'inadequate'. 18 felt that there should be no 're-creation of the former institution and no creation of new institutions'. 1 felt the 'whole site should be devoted to Mental Health.'

23 appeared opposed to the range of voluntary accommodation options for mental health consumers, their families and carers on a short term basis, although some of these submissions seemed to be based on misinformation, with 1 comment stating that 'building 400 more beds for people with mental health challenges is a significant step backwards', 2 other comments opposed 'permanent accommodation for consumers' and another suggested that 'large concentrations of beds on site could lead to the bad old days'.

The Draft Master Plan proposes adaptive re-use of a number of buildings for low, medium and high support voluntary short stay accommodation for mental health service users; and family visitor accommodation for mental health service users. The maximum number

of beds which could be provided within the suggested buildings is 83.

The mental health framework upon which this proposal is based envisages a spectrum of levels of time-limited, short to medium stay non-acute accommodation for people accessing on-site services, include no/low support, hostel or serviced apartment style accommodation, medium support HASI-style temporary accommodation for those requiring some supervision and high support in a more traditional sub-acute hospital style facility. This model would allow for step-up accommodation in situations where a mental health consumer requires support but is assessed as not requiring accommodation, and step-down accommodation which could offer options for mental health consumers to transition between hospital and returning home.

The Master Plan does not mention permanent accommodation or involuntary hospitalisation or institutionalisation.

During the Stage 4 consultation, there was strong support for the range of voluntary accommodation options proposed by the Master Plan. Only 43 people opposed the Health Overlay, including any accommodation for people with mental illness, whereas 177 specifically supported the proposal because 'it provides short and medium term non-acute beds for people with mental illness'.

3 comments were critical of 'bringing people to the site to become objects of Mental Health research' or 'clinical beds for research purposes'. The Master Plan does not propose this; instead it proposes developing an independent research and training organisation within the Mental Health and Community Wellness Centre to monitor and evaluate the various treatment programmes and facilities provided to mental health consumers. To attract any government funding, future research initiatives may need to meet relevant State and Federal research frameworks, which all include principles of consumer care and participation in research, which is recognised by the NSW State Government as essential in fostering future best practice.

One comment suggested that the Project Principles 'bear no relationship to the Mental Health Framework proposed by Professor Vaughan Carr'. The Mental Health Project Principle was proposed by participants at a Mental Health workshop where Professor Carr presented his 'Framework' for discussion amongst community members, consumers, carers and other professionals. The Mental Health Project Principle was subsequently confirmed by the community in an online survey devoted solely to this item.

None of those who had proposed that a social enterprise manage Callan Park commented on the Mental Health Overlay recommendation to 'provide opportunities for Mental Health Consumer led social enterprises on Callan Park under the remit of a not-for-profit health use'. While the Callan Park (Special Provisions) Act 2002 precludes a social enterprise as the governing body, those who wish to see social enterprises involved in Callan Park should be comforted by this recommendation.

7 comments found difficulty with the word 'Wellness' in the description of Callan Park as a 'Wellness Sanctuary'. They were concerned that the term provokes visions of a day spa-like environment with 'body massages, mud treatments and hot rocks'. In fact the word is regularly used in relation to mental health issues: in 2008, the NSW Government produced 'The Wellness Guide: A Resource to Support the Recovery Journey' as part of its \$1.05 billion mental health budget. In late 2010, NSW Health published the Consumer Wellness Plan, which was designed by mental health consumers.

There were 38 comments supporting the Mental Health proposals in the Draft Master Plan, one specifically referring to the 83 proposed beds on site and 3 urging more beds. One of the supportive comments noted 'this section of the Plan has gone through an extensive public consultation. We are convinced that public opinion continues to see Callan Park as a haven for people recovering from mental illness'.

The balance of critical comments to the Health Overlay focused on Active Recreation, with 7 opposing the Skatepark, 4 concerned that there were too many sports fields proposed, 1 rejecting the idea of a performance centre and indoor exercise area, 1 rejecting the rowing boat and kayaking launching jetty and another suggesting that the Multipurpose court should be retained as a tennis court.

There were 23 supportive statements about Active Recreation, commending the number of sports fields, the skatepark and the synergies with mental health services.

The 3rd object of the Callan Park (Special Provisions) Act 2002 is to 'allow public access to open space, including foreshore, for public recreational purposes of both an active and passive nature'. The Draft Master Plan proposes specific opportunities for both active and passive recreation, restoring synergies between mental health and active recreation, and addressing critical local needs identified by Leichhardt Council's Recreation and Open Space Needs Study 2005 (p30). The proposed location for the skatepark suits the needs of young people, who are also entitled to public access to Callan Park.

The proposed sports fields and skatepark were strongly supported during the Stage 4 consultation.

#### Recommendation

That Leichhardt Council accept the Health proposals as they are described in the Draft Master Plan.

#### 9. Pollution

There were no comments critical of the Pollution Overlay, and 1 comment supporting the proposals in this Overlay.

#### 10. Transport

29 individuals or groups made 117 comments critical of the Transport Overlay. 11 were concerned by proposals to remove part of the wall at Balmain Road (to allow footpath widening and public access to the orchard). 5 opposed the introduction of a bus service into Callan Park. 12 did not agree with creating a new vehicular entry at Alberto Street.

The main concerns of those who were critical of the Transport Overlay were potential traffic increases, parking increases and rearrangements to parking. There is concern from Manning Street residents about potential increases in local traffic. 11 individuals requested a traffic and/or parking study.

#### Comment

Currently there are 687 formal car parking spaces on site. Informally there is capacity for a significant amount of additional onstreet spaces spread across Callan Park. The Master Plan proposes consolidating and rearranging parking, mainly by moving it to the perimeter of Callan Park. Excluding on street parking in Glover Street, the Master Plan proposes 868 parking spaces, an increase of 181 spaces over the current arrangement.

The proposed 868 spaces will allow access by mental health consumers, carers and members of the public to the full range of new facilities which will emerge on site. The Transport Overlay recognises that the shift from institutional based care to voluntarily accessed mental health programmes will require an overall increase in designated parking areas to cater for the increased movements into and out of the site. The Draft Master Plan's strategy of dividing the site to allow limited private vehicle movement through the whole site will provide a balance between allowing equitable access to services and facilities and encouraging sustainable transport.

#### Supported elements of the Transport Overlay

There was some support for road closures, sustainable transport, electric vehicle charging, cycling paths, parking on the perimeter, bike and buggy hire, the shuttle bus, the new main entrance at Alberto Street, the rowing boat and kayaking launching jetty, and revised front fence and gatehouse.

"In response to some concerns voiced during the exhibition period. A Traffic/ Transport Study was commissioned to address traffic and parking concerns, the impact study supported the transport overlay recommendations.

#### Recommendation

That Leichhardt Council accept the Transport proposals as they are described in the Draft Master Plan.

#### 11. Waste

1 individual was critical of the Waste Overlay, describing it as 'irrelevant'. 1 was opposed to the Water Mirror in Veteran's Field. 1 offered no objections.

#### Recommendation

That Leichhardt Council accept the Waste proposals as they are described in the Draft Master Plan.

#### 12. Water

The 11 criticisms of the Water Overlay related to removing the pool. 1 commented 'the commendable water retention scheme can still be implemented and does not necessarily entail the elimination of the pool which can be used by recovering mental health patients and consumers and staff'.

There was 1 comment supportive of water harvesting.

#### Recommendation

That Leichhardt Council accept the Water proposals as they are described in the Draft Master Plan.

#### GENERAL SUBMISSION COMMENTARY

## Consultation Process

There were 6 criticisms of the consultation process and methodology, suggesting that community comments were not as positive as stated in the Draft Master Plan, that questionable methods were used, and that the use of 'social media' style icons such as 'Like'/'Dislike' trivialised the process. 1 criticism suggested that the consultation processes ensured that 'the loudest voices were given the greatest weight'.

All community input into the Draft Master Plan was recorded and documented on the CallanParkYourPlan website. Summaries which have been published in reports (including the Draft Master Plan itself) can be verified against online community comments and the records of the numerous workshops held during 2010. Positive contributions have not been overstated and it is up to Leichhardt Council to determine whether it should respond to demonstrated support from many individuals or outspoken criticism from a few.

## Legibility

There were 19 comments critical of the Draft Master Plan as a document: spelling errors, typographical errors, readability (due to its preparation in A3 format, making legibility at A4 difficult), overuse of technical jargon and the fact that the list of Action Items on page 168 contains no verbs.

## Financial Modelling

The few comments received about financial modelling suggested that some figures may require checking, that assumptions about sports field income were overstated, and that the Draft Master Plan should establish priorities for the site so that governments and the public have a clear idea of what is required to deliver the plan.

## General Criticism

The Draft Master Plan was criticised for 'trying to please everyone', for giving no consideration to the fact that 'community groups could carry out preservation', for leaving Council open to legal challenges because it proposes demolition, and for being an 'opportunity' to establish a myriad of government and community activities such as dance, music and theatre'. The Master Plan consultants were also criticised as being 'inexperienced in mental health'.

The Draft Master Plan which is before Leichhardt Council works within the framework of the Callan Park [Special Provisions] Act 2002, a piece of legislation that not only protects Callan Park but also clearly describes its future potential for community, health and education uses within one of Sydney's most precious open spaces. The Callan Park [Special Provisions] Act 2002 envisages a multi-dimensional future for Callan Park, incorporating synergies between and amongst a variety of uses and encouraging active and passive recreation in Callan Park's open spaces. Preparing a multi-dimensional Master Plan required a multi-disciplinary team of experienced professionals, including Professor Vaughan Carr, a highly regarded expert in mental health.

## Support for the Draft Master Plan

The 22 general comments supporting the Draft Master Plan included statements such as 'I agree with most of the Master Plan', 'I enthusiastically support the draft Master Plan', 'realistic attempt to accommodate all interests', 'overall very supportive of the Master Plan' and 'congratulate Council and Consultants on a wide ranging and inclusive consultation process'.

## 'Neutral' Commentary

Commentary which was difficult to classify as either broadly 'critical' or broadly 'supportive' included statements like:

- Callan Park must be left for its natural beauty
- A licence is required for bush regeneration works
- A fauna survey is required
- Removal of feral animals needs to be addressed
- Provide an aviary site for WIRES
- Heritage is of the utmost importance
- Where did the stones go when Sydney University reduced the height of the walls
- The proposed boat storage building at the end of Glover Street does not appear to comply with the Callan Park (Special Provisions) Act 2002, unless the facility is not part of Callan Park
- Does the plan propose calling for existing tenants to remedy accretions outside the envelope?
- Page 184 Carbon Fund – references to NSW Feed in tariff and Carbon Trust
- Composition of the governing body is critical

- Legislation to protect heritage at Callan Park should be comprehensive
- A number of submissions proposed alternatives to items in the Master Plan, without being critical of it, e.g.:
  - Provide stairs to the beach and jetty
  - Include rowing club facilities
  - Add a rotunda for sports shelter
- Provide a summary table of proposed demolitions with brief comments
- Include a botanical walkway
- Change the name of Callan Park to an Aboriginal name
- Recognised all patients and community workers through interpretive signage
- Dedicate an area to indigenous life and culture
- Keep one of the Convalescent Cottages for community (not NGO) use
- A number of buildings should be used for the activities of a Mental Health Social enterprise
- Identify a passive aquatic recreational precinct
- Undertake a demographic audit of park users to confirm age and gender
- Peer operated accommodation may be an option
- Introduce an Australian National Wellness University
- Form a consumer run housing co-operative
- Provide skills parks for junior bike riders e.g dirt jumps, pump tracks
- Future tenants should be required to address how they intend to ensure people with lived experience of mental illness will benefit from their presence
- Introduce water based synthetic pitches for sport
- Include a labyrinth on the current bowling green
- Consider a boat ramp and parking
- Add a new gate at the top of Wharf Road for added protection from excessive traffic and parking
- Hold cycle events at Callan Park, add it to a tourism cycling trail, incorporate a cycle plan into Leichhardt bicycle strategy, add a bike hub resource
- Mention the current neglect of NSW Health
- Prioritise the 73 Actions on page 168 of the Master Plan.



