

## Doncaster Hill Precinct 1 Masterplan: Summary of Feedback

### Distribution of Doncaster Hill Precinct 1 Brochure and Masterplan

Placed on Manningham City Council and Doncaster Hill websites		
eNewsletter	-	117 subscribers
Doncaster Primary School	-	375 brochures
Library displays	-	250 brochures
Display in Council Foyer	-	190 brochures
Masterplan at Counter	-	70 copies of Masterplan (approx)
Residents Adjoining Precinct 1	-	140 brochures
Adjoining Owner Non-Occupier	-	36 brochures
Interested Individuals	-	135 brochures
Community Groups	-	44 brochures
Senior Citizens Reference Group	-	44 brochures
Local Developers	-	22 brochures
Issues Forum Members	-	47 brochures
State Government Stakeholders	-	10 copies of Masterplan and brochures
Councillors Packs	-	9 brochures
Managers	-	17 brochures

### 70 Submissions Received

58 feedback forms (57 hardcopy, 1 online)  
12 written

### Demographic information:

Where responses came from

50 from Doncaster  
7 from Doncaster East  
4 from Lower Templestowe  
3 from Templestowe  
1 from Box Hill North  
5 unknown

Age of respondents

1 was aged 25-34  
18 were aged 35-49  
11 were aged 50-59  
17 were aged 60-69  
15 were aged over 70  
7 unknown

# Summary of quantitative feedback

## Importance of Guiding Principles

### Community Wellbeing

1	2	3	4	5
Very important 35.5 (61%)	Somewhat important 9.5 (16%)	Neutral 8 (14%)	Not very important 2 (3%)	Not at all important 3 (5%)

**Ave ranking: 1.75**

### Being Active

1	2	3	4	5
Very important 40 (71%)	Somewhat important 6 (11%)	Neutral 6 (11%)	Not very important 3 (5%)	Not at all important 1 (2%)

**Ave ranking: 1.55**

### Getting Around

1	2	3	4	5
Very important 39 (70%)	Somewhat important 12 (21%)	Neutral 3 (5%)	Not very important 1 (2%)	Not at all important 1 (2%)

**Ave ranking: 1.45**

### Going Green

1	2	3	4	5
Very important 30 (53%)	Somewhat important 14.5 (25%)	Neutral 7.5 (13%)	Not very important 3 (5%)	Not at all important 2 (3%)

**Ave ranking: 1.80**

### Creating Identity

1	2	3	4	5
Very important 18.5 (33%)	Somewhat important 17.5 (31%)	Neutral 9 (16%)	Not very important 4 (7%)	Not at all important 7 (13%)

**Ave ranking: 2.35**

The results from the feedback forms suggest strong interest in improvements to the transport network within and surrounding Doncaster Hill, with 'Getting Around' being allocated the highest importance overall.

However 'Community Wellbeing', 'Being Active' and 'Going Green' were all ranked very highly in their importance for the Masterplan, and despite being placed lower than the other areas, 'Creating Identity' was also seen by most respondents to be an important element.

Some comments received seem to suggest that part of the reason for the lower ranking of 'Creating Identity' may have been due to a weaker communication of the values and actions within this part of the Masterplan, which will be worked on for the final version.

These are all positive results and indicate that the current structure of the Masterplan, around these five guiding principles, is appropriate for ensuring that it meets the needs and wishes of the community.

## Overall Response to Masterplan

<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
Very satisfied <b>14.5</b> (27%)	Somewhat satisfied <b>15.5</b> (29%)	Neutral <b>10.5</b> (19%)	Dissatisfied <b>7.5</b> (14%)	Very dissatisfied <b>6</b> (11%)

Ave ranking: 2.52

The response to the Masterplan as a whole was largely positive, with 56 per cent of respondents saying that they are 'Very Satisfied' or 'Somewhat Satisfied' with the overall direction of the Masterplan. With 19 per cent expressing a neutral response, 25 per cent of respondents said that they were 'Dissatisfied' or 'Very Dissatisfied' with the direction of the Masterplan.

### Major concerns were:

- Issues related to residential element including heights; increased traffic, noise and crime; impact on tranquillity, safety and identity from attracting new residents; and the affect its placement will have on the open space;
- Waste of ratepayers money, will push rates up;
- Transport inadequate and needs to be addressed;
- Impacts on parking in site and surrounding streets;
- Impact of increased traffic and noise pollution on surrounding residents;
- Safety of shared paths;
- Outdoor amphitheatre or performance space not desirable;
- After hours activity attracting noise, vandalism, crime;
- Loss of open space;
- Changing the feel of Doncaster

Comments and concerns of those who were 'Very dissatisfied' included that they:

- Don't want to something equivalent to Flinders Street Station over their back fence, and are concerned about the impact of increased traffic and noise pollution on surrounding residents;
- Consider it a waste of ratepayers money, or believe it will push rates up;
- Believe it will disturb the existing tranquillity and safety by attracting a range of new residents and visitors, while pushing locals out;
- Believe there was not enough consultation with residents as to whether they would want these Council services or plans once they are informed of the cost.
- Are not happy with open space being used for outdoor amphitheatre and performance space, or turned into housing.

Some of the supportive feedback from responses included:

- 'Magnificent - congratulations to all involved'
- 'If everything is incorporated as you say it will be, I am very much looking forward to this development'
- 'The plan has great merit, a focus and goals to the future. It is needed to plan this way forward'
- 'I think that the Doncaster Hill precinct is the best thing that could happen in the City of Manningham. It could help people in different ways.'
- 'Great to see the range of opportunities we have here.'
- 'Having a community centre is a fantastic way to invite a sense of belonging.'
- 'I truly hope the guiding principles envisaged do become a reality.'

## Feedback from consultation sessions

### Community Information Session - 21 May 2009 (24 attendees)

#### *Community Wellbeing / Being Active*

- Keep views through the back of the site
- Concern about residential development within Precinct 1 taking up reducing opportunities
- Concern about conflict between pedestrians and cyclists on shared paths - need for separate paths
- Find out what youth want - productive visible and 'productive' spaces where they won't loiter and litter
- Concern raised about possible issues with primary school located in middle of activity
- Walking to Westfield via Goodson Street not inviting as it is difficult to enter Westfield
- Bowls facility offers community friendly activity.
  - Inconvenient position?
  - Parking requirements
- Explore additional uses for Schramms pavilion
- Importance of privacy for school, as well as surveillance
- Possible shift in bowling membership?
- Use of sporting ovals for casual use and alternative uses - both currently high-use. Lower oval in poorer condition with drought.
- Stage 1 community building - rooms available for community use
- Setback of building too close - shame to lose wide open vista, although it is a quick glimpse when passing by car.

#### *Getting around*

- 3.2 - Excellent
- 3.7 - Improved access for pedestrians through site very good
- 3.9 - Path OK through school after hours
- 3.14 - Impressed with improved Doncaster Hill signage and support
- 2-hour parking on northern side of Berkely Street
- Timber on bridges at Ruffey Lake Park require maintenance

#### *Creating Identity*

- 5.1 - Fairly supportive
- 5.2 - Maintenance might be an issue. Underpass is 'sleazy' and untidy. Lighting makes it better. Concern about hotel.
- 5.4 - Some would love it some would hate it. Water is nice - recycled? Junior play, not teens. Nice seats - ie. Brunswick street. Not too big, pedestrian scale. User friendly and nice to look at. Art fence is good.
- 5.5 - Like that idea. School kids could do something for opening. Flags? Bricks, tiles, paving. 'Nice on the eye'.
- 5.6 - Will already have two red lanes. What room? Should make wider. Extend the tram - waiting since 1961.
- 5.7 - Not like Federations Square. Good idea though. Wind an issue?
- 5.8 - Good
- 5.9 - Used to be a house. Demolished over Christmas?!? Relocate municipal functions? Use building for culture, arts and music? U3A? Reception room. No pokies!

- 5.10 - Karralyka. Definitely. High school have a facility? They could hire it out.
- General:
  - Do not want medium density on the site
  - 'Ovals are our backyard'
  - Keep it open, not like NY. Leave it like it is.
  - Importance of link to Ruffey Lake Park.
  - Should be the open space precinct. Want to keep freedom. 'Balance of City and Country' - want to keep that.

### **Doncaster Primary School Council Session - 26 May 2009**

#### Concerns/Issues:

- Keen to get better use of stadium and maximise any opportunities for uses within the new Community building
- Support maintaining and increasing amount of green open space and areas usable for outdoor activities and identifying school oval use as part of overall open space/recreation plan.
- Would like opportunities to have areas to display children's artwork, promote school events etc
- Support ESD and especially any opportunities for WSUD
- Support pedestrian and cycling works but link through school will need to take security issues into account
- Are keen to use opportunities to promote walking and cycling (link to health) and use of public transport; would be keen for timetabling of community bus to get students to school at an appropriate time (currently too early)
- Concerned about parking, traffic circulation, drop off points – still problems with Westfield parking and impact traffic circulation, delays etc, also during construction
- Security will need to be kept in mind at all stages
- Would like better pedestrian access into Westfield also better pedestrian and cycle access down to Ruffey lake Park
- Given school will be constructing its new building late 2010, concerned about impact of Community building construction timetable: will need very clear plan for parking, traffic circulation etc
- Suggestion to maximise use of Schramm reserve ovals: eg velodrome around bottom oval to double up as practice skating.

### **Access and Equity Session - 20 May 2009**

#### Concerns/Issues:

- Are keen to use opportunities to promote walking and cycling (link to health) and use of public transport
- Concern about conflict between pedestrians and cyclists on shared paths - need for separate paths
- Concern about future speed reduction on Doncaster Road causing increased traffic congestion
- Enthusiastic about cultural activities and community art.