

Elsternwick Park Northern Sector

Stage 3 Deliberative Panel Summary

November 2016

Deliberative Panel Day One – Participant Notes

| | | |
|-----|---|---|
| 1.0 | Introduction..... | 3 |
| 2.0 | What I learnt, Session 1..... | 3 |
| 3.0 | What I learnt, Session 2 | 4 |
| 4.0 | Questions for Next Week | 4 |
| 5.0 | Additional Material for Next Week..... | 5 |
| 6.0 | Current Votes | 5 |
| 7.0 | Comments..... | 5 |
| 7.1 | Option 1..... | 5 |
| 7.2 | Option 2..... | 6 |
| 7.3 | Option 3..... | 6 |
| 7.4 | Option 4..... | 6 |
| 8.0 | Which option do you most prefer currently?..... | 6 |
| 8.1 | Comments | 6 |

Deliberative Panel Day Two – Participant Notes

| | | |
|-----|---|---|
| 1.0 | Introduction..... | 6 |
| 2.0 | Summary of Session Two – Option Discussion..... | 7 |
| 2.1 | How can this option be tweaked so that we can live with it? | 7 |
| 2.2 | Who misses out with this option? How can their needs be accommodated? | 7 |
| 2.3 | Viability – Economic, Social and Environmental?..... | 8 |
| 3.0 | Summary of Session Three – Voting on Modified Options | 8 |
| 3.1 | To What Extent do you support each option? | 8 |
| 3.2 | 3.2 Which Option Do You MOST Prefer? | 9 |

Overall s

| | | |
|-----|----------------------------------|----|
| 1.0 | Process | 10 |
| 1.1 | Day One Comments | 10 |
| 1.2 | Day Two – One Word Comments..... | 10 |

Elsterwick Park North

Deliberative Panel Day One

When: Saturday, 5 November 2016

Where: Council Chambers, 15 Boxshall Street Brighton

Participation: 25 out of 26 Community Panel Members in attendance

1.0 Introduction

Day One of the Deliberative Panel, focused on providing participants with an overview of the task and process followed by a series of presentations from interested parties and Council members.

For the purpose of the following summary, Day One has been divided up into three distinct sessions:

- > Session 1
 - Introduction and presentations by Councils Director Environment Recreation and Infrastructure and Manager Open Space, Recreation and Wellbeing, Cricket and Football Club Representatives, Elsterwick Park Women's Golf Club and Council's Director Commercial Services regarding the financial Context.
- > Session 2
 - Presentations by Community members interested in Biodiversity Protection and Water Management, Community presenters around Water Sensitive Urban Design and Sustainability, Agency Presenter from Melbourne Water, presenter from the Cooperative Research Centre for Water Sensitive Cities.
- > Session 3
 - Presentations by Community members interested in Passive Recreation and residential amenity, presentation from ECREC representative, Panel Deliberation and indication of preference/leaning.

Panel members were requested to identify something from the sessions that they did not previously know. Below is a compilation of responses.

2.0 What I learnt, Session 1

- Sports
 - Don't mess with sports
 - Local sporting clubs will have some access to Oval 1 and facilities (though not sure how much)
 - Intensity of use by organised sport on open space
 - Golf course is considered as parkland
 - Golf course has 32 members
 - How badly rundown facilities are at the oval
 - Golf course usage and membership is so low
 - Footy and cricket get facilities very cheaply while golf expected to make a profit
 - Cricket club or Football club has 180 members
 - Demographics and the number of junior football teams
 - Football still do not have the minimum oval size
- > Finances
 - Council is planning major investment in capital in Bayside
 - If the golf course closes, Council will have to pay over \$400,000 to cover management of that area – Golf could pay its way given a chance
 - Council surplus!
 - Financial impact of the loss of golf
 - Financial planning policy of BCC
 - Council lets footy and cricket use its facilities cheaply
- > Complexity
 - Complexity of investment
 - Range of perspectives makes decision-making complex
 - A lot of sides to consider to maximise community participation
 - Every use is equally important to the uses
- > Environmental
 - Environmental considerations are not on the radar of sporting clubs
- > Other
 - That I can walk my dog 'safely' alongside the golf course
 - Some interesting stats
 - There is still an emphasis on young man's activities. More needs of older men and women need to be addressed

3.0 What I learnt, Session 2

- > Sports
 - Don't mess with sports
- > Complexity
 - To every action there is a reaction. Difficult to make all happy
 - Council has obligations beyond the vested interests of lobbying groups
 - Smart design will have lasting positive outcome and consequences
 - There are considerations outside the square
 - Is the flood problem a Bayside issue or Port Phillip?
- > Flooding and Wetlands
 - The importance of flood mitigation
 - The future maintenance of our wetlands, environment and the feasibility of having more sporting grounds/ovals given the increasing likelihood of flooding
 - Floods - rate of flow
 - The park is just one small part of an important waterway
 - Importance of water retention and conservation of the wetlands
 - By increasing the wetland area there is an opportunity to improve the quality of water flowing into the bay
 - Don't mess with water
 - That flooding occurs upstream as well and that the solution has to be across a number of Councils
 - Keeping an area for wetland creation
 - High importance of water catchment and management
- > Biodiversity and environment
 - Number of species of wildlife in the park
 - Diversity of birdlife
 - Even sports people like ducklings
 - How important our environment is
 - >1,000 species of wildlife in our park (x 4)
 - The golf course enables nature to survive in a not intrusive way

4.0 Questions for Next Week

At the conclusion of Day One, panel members generated a series of questions (see below) to assist in gaining a greater appreciation and understanding of the issues to be considered and deliberated during Day Two. Council's response to the questions can be found under Key Documents on the Elsterwick Park Have Your Say page.

- > Biodiversity and environment
 - How could an eco-centre be incorporated into Option 1? Any benefits or disadvantages?
 - In what ways could an environmental centre provide income to Bayside?
 - More transparent and not branded information
 - What is the 'urban forest' about?
 - What about the vegetated embankment?
 - Gio, April and Marcus
 - Can you cope with dogs given that there is such a large ownership of dogs in the area and the southern park is often full
 - Impact of access roads and lights on natural environment
 - Effect of Eco centre and the users on the wetland?
- > Sports
 - What is the level of noise for oval 2 and is it a stadium or will it be similar to the current oval 2 (flat)
 - Damien Von Trier
 - What is the percentage of open space in public land in Bayside that is used for sport? What percentage of the population use these facilities vs the percentage of the population that will use open space?
 - Do Council have statistics to back up what the sporting clubs are saying that they don't have enough sporting properties to meet community needs?
 - Does Oval 1 have its own change rooms/storage or does it share with Oval 2?
 - How are the southern ovals being used? Can they meet the football and cricket club's needs?
 - I would like to understand the lease and use of oval 1?
 - Why is Elsterwick Park South not being incorporated into the plan? What are the southern ovals currently used for.
- > Golf
 - I would like to understand if Brighton Golf club/course is at capacity and how it is similar and different to the current Elsterwick golf course
 - Where else can local novice golfers play locally?
- > Water
 - Nigel
 - How does the water management plan by Nigel fit in with each option? What is the context of this plan?
 - Costing of water holding and purification?
 - Cost of creating wetland and conservation area?

- I would like to understand more about how increasing the size of the wetland will reduce pollution in the bay?
- (Helen and Lorna)
 - Would 50% of the proposed wetland/stormwater solution be of benefit in meeting the pollution needs?
 - If the closed outlets from the Elwood Canal were opened by the City of Port Phillip, would this assist in meeting your objectives?
- In times of heavy rain/flooding what impact has this had on Bayside beaches? Cost to Council (lost tourism, negative publicity etc?).

5.0 Additional Material for Next Week

The following additional material was requested, some of which was unable to be supplied within the timeframe available.

- > List of all ovals in Bayside that includes the associated football club and with the oval size (length x width)
- > Projections of sport and recreational usage over the next few years
- > A better map of the current situation at the park
- > A summary of the south part of the park
- > A table with every groups preferred options
- > Running cost analysis for option 1 – 4
- > Current golf course operator lease highlights

6.0 Current Preference

At the conclusion of Day One panel members were asked to provide an indication of how they were feeling regarding the three options (plus a maintain status quo option) that were the outcome of the community workshop held at Sandringham Football Club. In addition panel members were asked the reason for this preference. The results of this are presented in sections 6 – 8.

| | Strong Support | Can Live with | Not Sure | No Support |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| Option 1 | 17 | 3 | 1 | 4 |
| Option 2 | 3 | 7 | 6 | 9 |
| Option 3 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 16 |
| Option 4 (as is) | 4 | 5 | 1 | 14 |

7.0 Comments

7.1 Option 1

- > At this point most support for 1 and 2 because I believe it is very important for the wetlands area to be preserved, especially as part of a broader irrigation network. That said I like the eco centre and eco golf course.
- > Could increase the wetland/sustainability needs for the south of the oval
- > Not enough available space for recreational use and the growing needs/demographics of bayside
- > The idea of flood mitigation is also good
- > Can the ovals in Elsternwick Park south be better utilised
- > I will support option 1 as long as I can walk my dog
- > Importance of natural environment and involving people in conservation and preservation of biodiversity far outweighs sporting needs
- > Retain golf course and encourage community to participate. Help with funding
- > Very much in favour of wetlands and biodiversity protection
- > Proper assessment of whether oval 2 can be resized in current location
- > Relocate eco centre to SW corner
- > Redesign internal parking
- > No car park or access. Bigger wetlands. Water and flood management for whole site. Shared facilities for oval 1 and 2.
- > Would like road to be removed and parking from centre (would need lighting that is not conducive to wildlife)
- > Can an eco-centre be added? (not in the middle)
- > Can steps like Stawell be added?
- > Very much in favour of wetlands development
- > I like the idea of a 3 level eco centre
- > We need an area to enjoy the sounds of nature and return back to basics from our busy lives

- > Preferred provided it meets the environmental and wetland needs of the area
- > No additional car parking or roadways within the park
- > No new change room in the park. No new driveway. No new parking in the park.
- > Expansion of wetlands and filtration of water is important
- > It allows us to create an absolutely unique environment in an urban setting
- > I support option 1 given that oval 2 is improved and good facilities are built to cater for women and park users. Also no dog users.

7.2 Option 2

- > Golf course is beyond hope and doesn't warrant investment
- > Must have an oval 2 or 2 important sporting clubs will be displaced
- > Good variety of wetlands, open space in option 2
- > Active sports on ovals takes up too much room already. Many others need to be accommodated for passive recreation.
- > The active sports take too much room already on the southern part of Elsternwick Park. There is often nowhere for dogs to play as both ovals are taken by support. We need more diversity rather than active sport.

7.3 Option 3

- > We do not need extra buildings on site – it is a precious open space. No more pavilions
- > Too much Golf space. Change golf to Par 3/ Pitch n Putt and increase wetland/eco use
- > If the golf course is lost then it should not be a land grab for footy and cricket. It should be for wetlands/forest.
- > Don't like that the wetland hasn't been expanded.

7.4 Option 4

- > Retain golf course with improvements
- > Golf course with eco centre
- > Keep golf course but not oval 2
- > Develop eco centre for education, community and tourism
- > Shared space golf/ wetlands
- > Meet needs of sports clubs and population predictions through alternative grounds (for oval 2 use)

8.0 Which option do you most prefer currently?

| Option 1 | Option 2 | Option 3 | Option 4 |
|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| 18 | 3 | 2 | 2 |

8.1 Comments

- > Eco centre business model w/ revenue for Council
- > Retain golf course with eco group as partners
- > Flood prevention benefits Port Philip and Glen Eira. Part payment from them?

Deliberative Panel Day Two

When: Sunday, 13 November 2016

Where: Council Chambers, 15 Boxshall Street Brighton

Participation: 25 out of 26 Community Panel Members in attendance

1.0 Introduction

Day Two of the Deliberative Panel, focused on providing participants with an overview of the task and process followed by a series of presentations from interested parties and Council members. Note, following a recommendation from the panel facilitator (Max Hardy) the panel heard from two additional speakers representing cricket and local residents.

For the purpose of the summary, Day Two has been divided up into three distinct sessions:

- > Session 1
 - Introduction, review of insights since last week, Council Response to questions, discussion regarding the addition of two presenters and the alteration to the process and presentations by Cricket Club and community representatives.
- > Session 2
 - Small group discussion of the three options and potential modifications, present discussion back to the Panel.
- > Session 3
 - Identification of new, modified options and break into small groups to build on these. Voting on preferred options and day close.

2.0 Summary of Session Two – Option Discussion

Participants were randomly divided into four small groups (mix of interests) and asked to review the three existing options in response to the following questions:

- > How can this option be tweaked so that we can live with it?
- > Who misses out with this option? How can their needs be accommodated?
- > Viability – Economic, Social and Environmental?

A summary of the findings and comments of all four groups is provided below.

2.1 How can this option be tweaked so that we can live with it?

| Option 1 | Option 2 | Option 3 |
|---|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Move oval 2 closer to 1. Shared facilities if number 1 was in scope - Extended wetlands and potential meandering water flow - No access road through the middle of the site or new hard scaping (e.g. car parks) - Potential to - Would like oval 1 to be included in flood mitigation - If oval number 2 has an upgraded surface/pavilion - Separated cyclist and pedestrian paths - Dogs not excluded but allowed on leash only. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Additional works for flood mitigation (extend wetlands) - Extended paths in the south for walking/running - Fitness equipment where oval 2 currently is - Shared oval pavilions - Keep and improve oval 2 in current location - Move oval 2 further to the north - Remove multi-purpose area for use by an eco-centre/conservation use - Ensuring trees are kept - No access road or car parks through the middle of the site - Separated cyclist and pedestrian paths - No building in the middle of the park | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Golf is retained in a smaller size/different configuration (usable by golfers) - Move Oval 2 back - Remove fence from oval one - Mitigate oh & s impacts of golf around sports - No new café in middle of site - Improve facilities for public space and passive recreation - Create increased ability to walk through the golf course - No lighting late at night that would impact on wildlife and community - Dogs not excluded but allowed on leash only |

2.2 Who misses out with this option? How can their needs be accommodated?

| Option 1 | Option 2 | Option 3 |
|--|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Golfers - Reduced fee at alternate club - Designated tee times at alternate club - Sporting Clubs Disappointed - Access to other ovals and facilities supported - Potential to give priority of use for ovals to local sports teams | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Golfers - Reduced fee at alternate club - Designated tee times at alternate club - Environmental - Loss of trees on golf course - Potential loss of species - Council - Loss of lease fees from golf course. - Sports - No female popular sports included - Community - Loss of shaded areas, ensure replanting - Potential issues with traffic management | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Golf is retained in a smaller size/different configuration (usable by golfers) - Move Oval 2 back - Remove fence from oval one - Mitigate oh & s impacts of golf around sports - No new café in middle of site - Improve facilities for public space and passive recreation - Create increased ability to walk through the golf course - No lighting late at night that would impact on wildlife and community - Dogs not excluded but allowed on leash only |

2.3 Viability – Economic, Social and Environmental?

| Option 1 | Option 2 | Option 3 |
|---|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Environmental - Benefits of improved flood mitigation, water filtration and increased native habitat - Social - Increased passive recreation opportunities - Economic - Loss of funds for lease of golf course - Some gain in funds from café/eco-centre - Potential tourism benefits by creating a unique asset | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Environmental - Poor environmental aspects (loss of park/trees for hard spaces and oval) - Social - Good for those interested in organized sports - Economic - Loss of income from golf lease - Cost of developing | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Environmental - No increased wetland for flood mitigation/water filtration - Social - No free access to the space - Economic - Continued income from golf use. May be impacted by current configuration. Not desirable by golfers - Cost of redevelopment of two ovals and changing oval 2 space |

3.0 Summary of Session Three – Voting on Modified Options

Participants were then asked if there were other/hybrid options that could be considered. Three variations were pitched (presented as per below) and panel members were requested to divided themselves according to which option best suited their view to work on modified options to represent to the group. The options are briefly summarised as follows:

Option 1A

This option would see the golf course replaced with an expanded wetlands and urban forest including display gardens of indigenous plants and bush foods. Passive recreation including perimeter bike path, fitness stations, BBQ's and additional mounding for increased storm water detention during high rainfall events. Include additional car parking on the north side of Bent Avenue and retain fencing for security. Provide pedestrian priority across Bent Avenue and a strong link to the north and south of Elsterwick Park. Retain Oval No. 2 and upgrade playing surface. Upgrade St Kilda Street car park and ensure safe passageway from Club Rooms (upgraded) to oval. Create a welcoming link/entrance with a possible café at Glen Huntly Road / New Street intersection.

Option 2A

This option would see Oval 2 relocated to the north east corner of the Park and construction of a pavilion that could be used for both the oval and other recreational users. Include additional tree planting along New Street. Vehicle access to the sportsground/netball courts and pavilion to be from Glen Huntly Road. The southern part of the park to consist of expanded wetlands and urban forest incorporating increased storm water detention. This option replaces the golf course.

Option 5

This option includes retention of golf course but in a reconfigured layout that will provide more open space that could be used for increased wetlands, possibly a meandering wetland. Retain Oval No. 2 and upgrade the playing surface. Include a walking path between the sportsgrounds and the golf course. Include a shelter near the wetland for wildlife observations. Upgrade the existing golf pro shop to include a meeting room and café.

3.1 To What Extent do you support each option?

Following presentation of each revised option back to the panel, members were asked to identify their level of affiliation with each option as presented below and in 3.2 which option they preferred the most.

| | Strongly | | Can Live With | | Not Sure | | Do Not Support | | Total | |
|-----------------|----------|----|---------------|----|----------|---|----------------|----|-------|-----|
| | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | % | # | % |
| Option 1 | 10 | 42 | 10 | 42 | | | 4 | 16 | 24 | 100 |

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------------|----|------|---|------|---|------|----|-------|----|-----|
| Option 1a | 14 | 58 | 7 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 13 | 24 | 100 |
| Option 2 | 2 | 8.33 | 2 | 8.33 | 2 | 8.33 | 18 | 75 | 24 | 100 |
| Option 2a | 6 | 25 | 5 | 21 | 3 | 13 | 10 | 41 | 24 | 100 |
| Option 3 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 83 | 24 | 100 |
| Option 4 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8.33 | 3 | 13 | 19 | 78.67 | 24 | 100 |
| Option 5 | 4 | 17 | 3 | 13 | 1 | 4 | 16 | 66 | 24 | 100 |

3.2 3.2 Which Option Do You MOST Prefer?

Panel members were asked which option they preferred the most, below is a tally of this feedback.

| | Count | Percentage |
|------------------|-------|------------|
| Option 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Option 1a | 14 | 58 |
| Option 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Option 2a | 6 | 25 |
| Option 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Option 4 | 0 | 0 |
| Option 5 | 4 | 17 |

Overall Process Comments

1.0 Process

1.1 Day One Comments

- > Options 1, 2 and 3 haven't been explained to us yet?
- > Facilitator – Max Hardy was great
- > People's questions can be very long
 - Some butting in. Facilitator needs to be tougher on them
 - Too many statements instead of questions
- > There should have been representatives from Glen Eira and Port Philip Council or residences because they use the park too, sometimes more than Bayside residents.
- > Very proud and excited to be part of this process
- > Presentations were helpful
- > People talking and moving around in the public gallery at the start of the day was very distracting
- > Great idea to ask presenters to give us their three key messages
- > Carried out with respect and inclusion
- > Don't feel that comfortable voting with my stickers in front of the public gallery
- > Great process, would have voted quite differently if I hadn't heard presentations and only received plans
- > Better quality of information supplied. Seems to be biased information from those who presented
- > Enjoyed the way the presenters were small focus (e.g. footy club) to broader implications – Elster Creek Basis
- > Very well organised. Thanks Cindy! Loved the food too!
- > Fair overview of considerations. Development would need to be in stages. Organisation was excellent.
- > Process was excellent, refreshing, open and yet task orientated
- > Some (enforced) guidelines to the presenters, might have made all presentations much more succinct and too the point

1.2 Day Two – One Word Comments

- > Complex
- > Inclusive
- > Insightful (x6)
- > Interesting (x4)
- > Informative
- > Surprising
- > Stressful
- > Considerate
- > Involved
- > Rewarding
- > Hopeful (x2)
- > Inclusive
- > Respectful
- > Educational
- > Enjoyable
- > Challenging (x2)
- > Shambles
- > Council Bias
- > Good
- > Grateful
- > Misleading Information
- > Self Interest wins
- > Doolally