

INTRODUCTION

This report summarises the key outcomes of the Belconnen Options Workshop convened as part of the consultation process being managed by the Department of Territory and Municipal Services (TAMS) for the ACT Government on the future use of school sites in the District.

The main purpose of the workshop was to discuss the four generic options identified by the Government for re-use of the school sites, to identify other potential options and to consider community needs in Belconnen, Hall and North Canberra.

The Workshop was undertaken by Elton Consulting in conjunction with Purdon Associates as independent facilitators to inform the decision making process for TAMS.

The Workshop was held at the Australian Institute of Sport in Bruce from 6pm to 9pm on Tuesday 25 September, 2007. Information about the workshops was made available through personal invitations which were sent to all stakeholder groups and individuals on the TAMS contact list, media advertisements and the project website. About 110 participants attended, including representatives from a wide range of community interests as well as residents living in the vicinity of the sites identified for closure in Belconnen, Hall and North Canberra.

The workshop comprised two sessions exploring:

- The background and purpose of the project and a discussion of existing and emerging community needs within the local area.
- Discussion of the strengths and weakness of four different generic options for the use of the sites and identification of additional options the community considered should be included in any assessment of the re-use of the sites.

Each session included a briefing from the consultant team, as well as table discussion/reporting in greater detail, in smaller groups.

Two discussion sessions were held where table groups were able to discuss the topics in greater detail, in smaller groups. The first session focused on three broad questions:

1. *What is community?*
2. *What are the unmet needs in the community?*
3. *What are the emerging needs of the community?*

The second session discussed four generic options for possible uses for the school sites, which ranged from retaining the current buildings and adding the oval to existing public open space to complete redevelopment of the school site.

The following notes summarise the main themes and messages arising from each session. Appendix A provides a full listing of comments and issues recorded on the night.



SESSION 1: COMMUNITY NEEDS

What is community?

There was a wide variety of responses to this question. Recurrent themes included:

- a sense of ownership and belonging
- the capacity to come together, interact and share mutual interests
- whilst community may often have a strong geographical focus it may also at times transcend place
- a mix of ages and diversity of interests is important to their local communities
- community consists of people who care enough to pull together
- Connectedness and self determination were also important characteristics of functioning communities.

What are the unmet needs in the community?

The most frequent response to this question was that a major unmet need in the community is a local school. Most groups discussed the importance of schools in bringing together communities together, in more ways than just teaching children. Important functions of schools were:

- the frontline of care for children and families that may otherwise fall through the cracks
- the development of social networks not just between children attending the schools and parents of schoolchildren but also intergenerational links through volunteers and families with previous involvement with their local schools
- at the local level schools formed one of the points of interaction as halls etc were often the venue for community building activities beyond school hours.

Many people commented that with the loss of schools as the core of community there was a need to establish facilities that would help rebuild this sense of community and that this should be supported by a community development worker. Other common responses included:

- the need to provide aged care services and facilities that did not isolate or ghettoize older people
- the need for multi-purpose flexible community hubs, which are affordable and cater for the wide-ranging needs of a diverse community.
- affordable community centers for all groups (Landcare, neighborhood/community watch and educational facilities for both young people and adults)
- space for the arts – music, dance, artwork and theatre
- sporting and recreational facilities
- office space for community organizations
- enough space to accommodate the 120 groups on waiting list to use facilities (numbers increasing, not decreasing)
- facilities that are surrounded by quality public open space.

What are the emerging needs of the community?

In discussing the emerging needs of the community, many groups and individuals expressed the need to plan for the long-term, with reference made to the cyclical nature of demographic trends over the long term. There was criticism of the short term focus of the projections outlined in the workshop presentation. Common suggestions around emerging needs included:

- a coordinated approach to managing community groups and facilities
- community sense of 'ownership' over local facilities
- child care services
- aged care
- needs of minority groups (e.g. migrant families)
- men's sheds
- sustainability education centres



- community centres close to shops and transport networks
- community gardens.

SESSION 2: OPTIONS

General comments on generic options:

Most groups recognised a number of potential strengths and weaknesses for each option. Many participants however stressed that they did not support any of the options put forward, instead proposing the schools be reopened. It was stated that any discussion of the options should not be construed as endorsement of them. It was frequently commented that the strengths or weaknesses of the generic options could only be assessed in the context of individual sites and identification of the community benefits deriving from any change of use.

There was concern among participants about where revenue raised from the sale or development of the schools would be directed. A number of participants suggested that some or all of the revenue raised be used to support affected communities through strategies including:

- upgrading community facilities on the school sites
- long-term maintenance of community facilities on the school sites
- employing community development officers to support affected communities
- developing and maintaining community based management structures for the sites.

The most critical issue for the majority of participants was not to alienate the sites from long term public ownership either as school sites or for a range of community uses that may not be consistent with ACT Territory Plan's definition of community uses. It was also noted that at the local level the community should play an active role in determining the suitability of any future community use on the sites or the appropriateness of any community benefit deriving from a site's disposal.

Generic Option 1:

[Note: This option proposed that the existing buildings be re-used for community purposes and the grounds be incorporated into the Urban Open Space system.]

Of the options put forward, many people found this option preferable to other options.

- Strengths of this option as perceived by participants included:
 - ability for site to be reopened as a school in the future
 - community use of the site retained
 - green space and playgrounds retained
 - existing amenity of the suburb would be retained.
- Weaknesses of this option as perceived by participants included:
 - government commitment to adequate maintenance of premises is unknown
 - risk that premises will not be adequately maintained into the future leading to deterioration and eventual sale
 - risk of vandalism if buildings are not utilized in the evenings
 - loss of dedicated use of the oval for community activities and purposes
 - existing building designs may limit use by community for different purposes.

Generic Option 2:

[Note: This option proposed that the existing buildings be re-used for community purposes and that the grounds be developed either within the existing land use policy for the site (Community Facility) or with a variation to the Territory Plan to permit an alternative use.]

- Strengths of this option as perceived by participants included:
 - community use of existing buildings retained
 - water use reduced by removal of oval
 - development could support local business (e.g. shops) in the community



- development could be used for aged care/ageing in place facilities.
- Weaknesses of this option as perceived by participants included:
 - site no longer suitable to be reopened as a school in future
 - uncertainty about type of development on the site and whether development will be compatible with community uses such as band practice and youth activities
 - risk of increased traffic on site with development
 - loss of green space
 - limited land available for development restricts potential use.

Generic Option 3:

[Note: This option proposed that some of the existing buildings be demolished and the remaining buildings be re-used for community purposes and that undeveloped areas be developed either within the existing land use policy for the site (Community Facility) or with a variation to the Territory Plan to permit an alternative use.]

Many participants regarded this option with skepticism, perceiving it to be an interim step to option 4 and loss of all community buildings on the site.

- Strengths of this option as perceived by participants included:
 - some community buildings retained
 - revenue raised by development could be used to upgrade or maintain existing buildings.
- Weaknesses of this option as perceived by participants included:
 - loss of community buildings
 - uncertainty about type of development on the site and whether development will be compatible with community uses such as band practice and youth activities
 - loss of green space
 - risk of increased traffic on site with development.

Generic Option 4:

[Note: This option proposed the demolition of all buildings on the site and development of the whole site within the existing land use policy for the site (Community Facility) or with a variation to the Territory Plan to permit an alternative use.]

This option was the least supported by participants. Some people thought this option could be suitable for some sites, with caveats around zoning of development and use of revenue raised from sales, but others found this option completely unacceptable.

- Strengths of this option as perceived by participants included:
 - site could be zoned for community use and used as non-government school or retirement village
 - revenue from sale could be used to support other community uses.
- Weaknesses of this option as perceived by participants included:
 - loss of community facilities and space
 - loss of community ownership of site
 - risk that development of site will be unsuitable to surrounding community.

Alternative options suggested:

- Retain entire site, including the school oval, for use as a community facility or school. Adequate outdoor space in proximity of buildings was seen as critical to allowing a full range of community based activities.
- Sell site to non-government school, but ensure buildings available for use by community outside school hours, although this option was not supported by all community members.
- Partial land swap with the public urban space oval to maintain the relationship between community facilities. This would entail redeveloping some of the public urban space oval and joining the rest with the school oval to maintain a functional sports field whilst keeping the integrity of site for future use as a school or community facility.



- Partial demolition and rebuilding of community buildings. Retain parts of the site suitable for community use in existing buildings, release some land for sale and development, and use revenue raised to build new purpose built community buildings on the site.



Appendix 1 –Table Notes

Session 1: Community Needs

What is community?

A wide-variety of responses were received from the different groups, with common themes such as shared values, common interests, activities, needs and location which emerged, emphasising “focus” and “social capital”. Many groups identified the need for a sense of value and ownership, as well as some level of involvement, in their definition of a community. It was noted that a mix of ages and interest groups is important to people’s sense of local community.

One of the comments that resonated with many of the participants was that community consists of “people who care enough to pull together”. There is an interactivity and connectedness as well as commonality and integration which builds “social capital”, “fabric” and provides a sense of belonging that fulfils the needs of the individuals who comprise the community. The focus of the community is not commercial in nature and in actual fact, is “low cost” and long term. It provides support for those without family, active ageing members, young families and an easily accessible local venue for volunteers to work in.

Common descriptions of community included:

- A group of people with shared values and/or interests, who interact within a defined area such as local shops or schools, neighbourhood or suburbs with the emphasis on “local” as they live, visit or work in the area.
- The confined area or facilities providing structure and organisation to facilitate the activity which is shared by the members of the community.
- A “layered matrix of groups” which is renewable and dynamic and is neighbourhood based.
- The geographic area in which the community exists is local, or wider, and can overlap with other community areas, and is usually within a safe walking distance.
- A community has an identity (geographic, landscape, built environment etc); it is “where you are” and “have access to what you need”.
- A critical element of community is the “social network”.
- Community is focused around activities such as dog walking and neighbourhood watch.
- Community is intergenerational (segmentation by age is being practiced and is not appropriate for creating liveable communities).
- Community consists of lots of different people doing different things that form a “cohesive society” and feel “close knit”.
- Schools are a central focus for community in the long term. The school hall is historically the hub for the farming community. In some areas it is the only community building or facility for the community. Closing schools has reduced direct contact between people. These facilities lend themselves to a range of uses and the local community should have input into who uses the local school sites. The community wants “local self – determination”. Bulldozing the schools is not economical.
- Communities are evolving and constantly change.

What are the unmet needs in the community?

A frequent response was that an unmet need in the community is a local school. Most groups discussed the importance of schools in bringing communities together, in more ways than just teaching children. Many people expressed the need to establish facilities that help rebuild this sense of community and identity.

Another common theme was the need to increase aged care services and low cost accommodation. Many groups also expressed the need for multi-purpose community hubs, which are affordable and cater for the wide-ranging needs of the community. Many participants voiced that support for health services and schools needed to be locally available to the community.

It was noted that intergenerational mixing and networks that embrace community values, facilities that embrace multiple and dedicated use with flexibility for future needs of the community are important. Facilities need to evolve and change as communities and demographics change.



Government retention of sites can allow for this evolution. Once sold, it is out of community hands.

There are over 120 groups on the community space waiting list and a four to five year wait. Demand for space is increasing not decreasing. Some members expressed that there is demand for groups to expand but no where to expand to. Not for profit groups need affordable accommodation - Catering for the birth to 100 year age group. Other suggestions included:

- Small community focused schools - educational facilities – adult education needs (e.g. “University of Third Age”)
- More facilities for senior citizens – ageing population
- Health care for the 60+
- Facilities for high-needs care for the aged. “Aged ghettos” are not to be developed in preference to staying in the community or remaining locally at home
- Desperate need of respite for carers and aged care. Support for carers and education space. Day respite centres and child care – co-located
- Children’s organisations, birth to four year age groups, playgroups and playschools, mother networks, scouts and other youth groups
- After school programs – child care, playground for children and youth centre – within walking distance – young parents and families
- Youth support network – facilities – based on building and maintaining local involvement of young people – “youth ownership”
- Entertainment
- Community watch facilities
- Safety house, bushfire prevention and evacuation
- Community halls for community centre meetings, fetes, landcare
- Flexible, multi-purpose facilities well coordinated for community centres, which are affordable for all groups (landcare, neighbourhood/community watch and educational facilities for both young people and adults)
- Space and room for community not-for-profit groups
- Theatres for performance and rehearsal, low-cost studios for the arts –music, dance, artwork including studios for community/multicultural groups (bush dancing, storage and building space)
- Sporting and recreational facilities
- Space for planned and incidental meetings such as civic events for voting
- Quality public open space and office space
- Space for a community development officer and office space
- Quality public open space
- Men’s sheds/ community gardens
- Non- denominational Christian education
- Mental health care and rehabilitation
- Minority groups need to be integrated
- Advertising to increase awareness of TAMS
- Affordable housing for the 55+ year age group – in the local area and adaptable to aged care. Transition to supported accommodation is important
- Energy and water efficiency
- Opportunity for older people to pass on skills to younger people especially unemployed individuals
- Community not-for-profit groups
- Creative “development options” to enable greater access to housing market by low income families (affordable housing)
- Cultural needs – multicultural and access for and inclusion of culturally diverse groups and disabled people
- New communities and suburbs to be included.

The suggestions noted above were taken as a sample of the wide-range of responses to the theme of unmet needs in the community. Not all participants agreed with all of the comments made, although there was a high-level of support for the need to provide facilities for uses including: educational purposes, aged-care services, children services and flexible community spaces that are accessible to not-for-profit community groups.



What are the emerging needs of the community?

In discussing the emerging needs of the community, many groups and individuals expressed the need to plan for the long-term, with reference made to the cyclical nature of evolving demographic trends. Some of the key emerging trends that people noted were in relation to aged care and child care facilities, sustainable facilities and schools.

Other people suggested some more comments in relation to facilities such as: community gardens, Men's sheds and for the use of more minority groups.

Suggestions of emerging needs included:

- Co-operative management and a coordinated approach to managing community groups and facilities and a generic approach is relevant
- Aged care – lack of block size prevents intergenerational care and room for extended family; need to be close to family if possible
- Ageing needs require more community spaces
- Retain core facilities – not more housing – non reversible
- Flexible multi-purpose facilities able to change character as community needs change
- Reinforce established development – ballet school, playgrounds
- Community sense of 'ownership' over local facilities
- Clarification of buildings and sites uses
- Child care and aged care services close to shops and major centres
- Health facilities
- Less car use
- Needs of minority groups (e.g. migrant families)
- Men's sheds
- Sustainability – increase energy and water efficiency, sustainable transport networks and sustainability environment centres
- Changed cycles of demography as rejuvenation of areas occurs (e.g. Downer being rejuvenated)
- Community gardens
- Better use of brownfield development – take focus off school sites
- Schools sites are the perfect opportunity for better distribution of community facilities not real estate opportunities
- As transport costs increase, decentralized facilities will be needed
- Government to provide free accommodation and funding to assist community groups in maintenance and upkeep of not for profit groups
- Social benefits to Government in health rates
- Recognition of urban renewal and likelihood of increase in children and future need for schools
- Gungahlin needs a small school
- Choice in local area of neighbourhood schools
- Social programs for children – young people and families
- Retention of sites to maintain flexibility for the future (e.g. primary schools)
- Hub for local social network if no local school exists any more.

Session 2: Generic Options

General comments on generic options:

- The most critical issue for the majority of participants was not to alienate the sites from long term public ownership either as school sites or for a range of community uses that may not be consistent with ACT Plan's definition of 'Community Uses'. It was also noted that at the local level the community should play an active role in determining the suitability of any future community use on the sites or the appropriateness of any community benefit deriving from a site's disposal.
- Most groups recognised a number of potential strengths and weaknesses for each option. However, many participants stressed that they did not support any of the options put forward, instead proposing the schools be reopened. It was stated that any discussion of the options should not be construed as endorsement.



- Many participants felt that the strengths or weaknesses of the generic options could only be assessed in the context of individual sites and identification of the community benefits deriving from any change of use. They requested the opportunity to develop site specific options that take into account benefits and trade offs for individual communities.
- There was strong concern among participants about ongoing maintenance of community facilities on the sites. Participants feared that without government commitment to maintain the community facilities into the future they would become run down and eventually be sold off to private investors.
- A number of participants questioned where revenue raised from the sale or development of the schools would be directed. A number of participants suggested that some or all of the revenue raised be returned to affected communities through strategies including:
 - upgrading community facilities on the school sites
 - long-term maintenance of community facilities on the school sites
 - employing community development officers to support affected communities
 - developing and maintaining community based management structures for the sites.
- Some participants were concerned about the use any retained buildings would be put to. They believed that government would be given first priority to inhabit the buildings, and felt community groups should instead be given priority. Many participants felt retained community facilities should be used by local community groups specifically, but others felt non-location specific groups such as the University of the Third Age or different interest groups also needed access to community facilities.
- Many participants viewed development of retirement villages or aged care as a suitable option for partially or wholly developed sites. However, participants stressed this option was only suitable for those sites with adequate facilities, services and infrastructure to support this kind of development and therefore, would not be suitable to all sites.
- Different participants stressed the need for development or redevelopment of sites to be innovative, to take into account surrounding housing and land use, to be aesthetically pleasing and environmentally sensitive.
- It was suggested by a number of groups that a moratorium or cooling off period of between three and ten years occur between decisions being made and development on the sites progressing. It was suggested that during the moratorium, maintenance of the sites should continue and the sites should be used for community purposes.

Generic Option 1: Retain site and add oval to public open space

[Note: This option proposed that the existing buildings be re-used for community purposes and the grounds be incorporated into the Urban Open Space system.]

Of the options put forward, many people found this option preferable to other options.

Strengths of this option as perceived by participants included:

- Ability for site to be reopened as a school in the future should the demographic cycle require it.
- Community access and use of the site retained. Community able to maintain some control over site and site able to remain a hub for the local community.
- Site able to be used flexibly for a variety of community purposes.
- Green space and playgrounds retained for community use.
- Possibility for Department of Education to use site for program or training use.
- Existing amenity of the suburb retained.
- Preschool/childcare/play school settings remain within guidelines for ACT licensing.



Weaknesses of this option as perceived by participants included:

- Addition of oval to urban public space has long term environmental implications in terms of water use.
- Future rezoning and subdivision could make the asset vulnerable.
- Government commitment to adequate maintenance of premises is unknown.
- The cost of maintaining the site could mean site is not adequately cared for into the future.
- There is a risk that premises will not be adequately maintained into the future leading to deterioration and eventual sale of the site.
- The option means maintenance of the school oval and playground becomes the responsibility of a different government department, meaning that it may not be maintained in the same way as the rest of the site, and it may not remain within community control or for use for dedicated community activities.
- Variable condition or design of existing buildings may mean they may not be feasible for re-use as community facilities, or limit the types of activities and purposes buildings can be put to.
- There may not be enough tenants to utilize the buildings during both days and evenings. This leads to a risk of vandalism and security may be needed for the site.

Generic Option 2: School building/s retained with partial site development

[Note: This option proposed that the existing buildings be re-used for community purposes and that the grounds be developed either within the existing land use policy for the site (Community Facility) or with a variation to the Territory Plan to permit an alternative use.]

Strengths of this option as perceived by participants included:

- Community use of some existing buildings is retained
- Water use is reduced by removal of the oval.
- Development could support local business (e.g. shops) in the community.
- Development could encourage new business (e.g. doctors, dentists) to the area.
- Same planning and layout of site is to be kept, maintaining connection to past use of site.
- Development could be used for aged care/ageing in place facilities. Co-locating these facilities with pre-schools or community facilities will benefit all.

Weaknesses of this option as perceived by participants included:

- Site will no longer be suitable to be reopened as a school in the future should demographic change demand it.
- Changes/reduces local access to community facility.
- There is no certainty about the type of development allowed on the site. Potential land use planning changes mean the site may be vulnerable to future subdivision.
- Development will not necessarily be compatible with community uses such as band practice and youth activities. Housing development on the sites could turn into ghettos.
- There is a risk of increased traffic with development on the site.
- Possible loss of spatial continuity. The continuity of the site (including the oval and playground) should be considered and not broken up by development.
- Loss of green space.
- Limited land available for development restricts the potential uses of the developed area.
- Developing on the site will have environmental repercussions, increasing the carbon footprint of the site.

Generic Option 3: School building/s partially retained with some development

[Note: This option proposed that some of the existing buildings be demolished and the remaining buildings be re-used for community purposes and that the undeveloped areas be developed either within the existing land use policy for the site (Community Facility) or with a variation to the Territory Plan to permit an alternative use.]

Many participants regarded this option with scepticism, and a number of participants felt this option had no strengths. Many participants perceived this option to be an interim step to option 4 and ultimate loss of all community buildings on the site.

Strengths of this option as perceived by participants included:



- Some community buildings will be retained.
- Revenue raised by development of part of the site could be used to upgrade or maintain existing buildings for community use.
- The pre-school could be retrofitted to allow it to operate for specific community uses.
- The area to be developed could support retirement village.
- Development of the site could act to 'boost' the local population.

Weaknesses of this option as perceived by participants included:

- The site will no longer be suitable to be reopened as a school in the future should demographic change demand it.
- Development of the site will change the demography of the area, and if development includes housing then a school may be needed in the area in the future.
- Development of the site could reduce local access to community facilities.
- Loss of community buildings means there will be limited space and facilities to support the newly developed space and local community. There will be more people but less community space and facilities in the area around the site.
- There is no certainty about the type of development allowed on the site. Development will not necessarily be compatible with community uses such as band practice and youth activities.
- Potential land use planning changes mean the site may be vulnerable to future subdivision.
- Loss of green space for the area.
- The development could alienate the community from using the public urban space oval as well.
- There is a risk of increased traffic in the area with development on the site.



Generic Option 4: Site fully redeveloped

[Note: This option proposed the demolition of all buildings on the site and development of the whole site within the existing land use policy for the site (Community Facility) or with a variation to the Territory Plan to permit an alternative use.]

This option was the least supported by participants. Some people thought this option could be suitable for some sites, with caveats around zoning of development and use of revenue raised from sales, but others found this option completely unacceptable and stated that there were no strengths of this option.

Sites proposed for option 4 should be specifically listed on ALP policy platform for ACT election.

Strengths of this option as perceived by participants included:

- The site could be zoned for community use and used as non-government school or retirement village.
- Some participants felt that under appropriate controls, revenue from sale could be used to support other community uses. Comment was made by certain individuals that the government could use some of the money from the sale of certain sites, in order to fund the establishment of a new, multi-purpose facility. Others were more sceptical as to how this initiative would actually be carried out.

Weaknesses of this option as perceived by participants included:

- A loss of community facilities and space to residential use.
- A loss of community ownership of site leading to no future use of the land for community benefit.
- There is a risk that development of site will be unsuitable for surrounding community uses, which could potentially lead to ghettos being created.
- Some sites cannot have this option. Some of the buildings cannot be demolished for redevelopment, so would be unfit to have this option applied to these sites.
- There will be an increased carbon footprint, through the need to demolish and rebuild, as opposed to just maintaining the current buildings.
- No flexibility for future use as school / precludes re-emergence of school.
- Complete re-development of the site changes future demographics, by encouraging certain groups to establish themselves in the area and exclude others. The outcome of this will be long term and will depend on what facilities are established on the re-developed site.
- There was concern that by re-developing the site, the oval would also become unusable and if the private oval was built upon. Also, some participants were concerned that the public open space would become more difficult to access by the public.
- Many individuals and groups noted that option 4 was an unacceptable option.

Alternative options suggested:

- Retain entire site, including the school oval for use as a community facility or school. Adequate outdoor space in proximity to buildings was seen as critical to allowing a full range of community based activities. Many participants suggested an option to retain the whole school and oval for its intended use i.e. school and in interim, use it for community use. Open space could be used to build further community buildings in the future. Open space can be used for community gardens, dog training, basketball etc courts, fetes, and community events. Safe space adjacent to buildings for children's programs.
- Sell site to non-government school, but ensure buildings are available for use by community outside school hours. This option was not supported by all community members, but some stated strongly that it should be considered by the Government as an option. This would help to maximize facility use – i.e. school use during the day and community use in the evening and weekends. Leasing of school to private school would retain and maintain site at no cost to government. A condition of lease could be to make certain facilities available for community use after hours.
- Partial land-swap with public urban space oval to maintain the relationship between community facilities. Redevelop some of the public urban space oval and some of the school oval, maintaining integrity of site for future use as a school. In this approach it was suggested that the whole site be considered in planning for community space.



- Partial demolition and rebuilding of community buildings (e.g. Scandinavian model of collocated childcare and aged care facilities). Retain parts of the site suitable for community use in existing buildings, release some land for sale and development, and use revenue raised to build new purpose built community buildings on the site.
- Build purpose built community buildings by smart design means, as they could be turned back into a school when the population cycle changes.
- Open space could be used as a community garden and returned to school use when needed.

School specific comments:

- Some participants suggested the government should re-open Tharwa and Hall schools as they are historic sites.
- Options 2- 4 not appropriate for aged care in Flynn because there are no facilities nearby.
- Cook – a better option is to apportion part of green space for housing (on corner) and amalgamate oval with playground – retain local character and green space around buildings – not just a useless buffer zone.

