

PRESIDENT'S REPORT FOR MAY 14 MEETING

GLEBE ISLAND BRIDGE CELEBRATION

Early this year The Glebe Society contacted the Leichhardt Municipal Council, the City of Sydney Council and the National Trust requesting in principle support for a **community celebration of Glebe Island Bridge** during Heritage Festival or at another appropriate time. Each endorsed the idea and the two Councils adopted resolutions to this effect. It was agreed in discussions that a meeting of representatives from these four organisations should be held to agree on plans and establish a working project. May 8, was the earliest date that this could be arranged.

The broad idea now is for Sydneysiders to have access to the bridge for several hours during a Saturday or Sunday this Spring. Their presence would celebrate the Heritage listing of the bridge and recognise its past and future role as a link to and from the City and the Balmain Peninsula (and of course beyond to the North West). This will require historical interpretation, crowd facilities, marketing and most significantly safe approved access to the Bridge, which is 'owned' by Roads and Maritime Services. The RMS is required to open and close the bridge four times per year so one of those closures could be for several hours to incorporate the celebration. **The celebration would gain Sydney's attention to what could become a forgotten heritage bridge and highlight its essential potential for pedestrian and cycle connection to the city's traffic network. Its purpose is to promote the bridge.**

At the meeting it was agreed that TGS would approach community organisations that may be interested, City would help plan the event and consider grant application. National Trust would use its influence and promotional capability. Mayor Byrne could not attend but I will discuss his Council's commitment and I imagine it will at least match the City of Sydney. The event will be simple and aimed at families, which cross the bridge and may brunch nearby. The City estimates that attracting a large crowd will not be an issue. A joint letter to Roads and Maritime Services will arrange a meeting at which access negotiations will commence. TGS will 'lead' the project. We are the least influential and resourced but best placed to link others and use grants to, among other things, contract a professional events organiser. I will have a very rough grant budget prepared soon and will circulate it to you. I have asked Communications to set matters up so that anyone browsing for Glebe Island Bridge would be directed to the TGS website. National Trust and the Council(s) will assist with notes for the site and linkages will be established between our site and the other project members. If Communications cannot arrange this matter, which is now urgent, we shall need to purchase an URL.

LOGO

The reason we are considering our Logo is so that our image reflects our accepted strategy, *Engaging Glebe*. This emphasises the integration of Heritage, Environment and Community. None stands alone. This is consistent with our intention to engage the community broadly including young professionals. Our current Logo seems to signify heritage as built environment, though we know that TGS does not operate that way. Thus any Logo we eventually choose must meet this criterion.

The process of direct communication has been intrinsically successful for the enthusiastic involvement of members has been impressive. In the following table I have set out total responses, unqualified responses, qualified responses, criticisms and commendations. Remember I asked members to vote their preferences so I cannot know whether unqualified responses liked the Logos but I know that qualified responses do not. This group made comments such as, "I don't like any of them but nevertheless these are my choices." Criticisms were those who did not believe any of the Logos were suitable and some of these made constructive critiques. Commendations were

those who specifically praised the logos and process. I have replied to members who made comments explaining that I would complete this analysis, continue the process and keep the membership involved¹.

Total responses	Unqualified votes	Qualified votes	Commendation votes	Criticisms without votes
67	41	4	6	16

I took first choice as the most preferred and the last as least preferred and discarded other third choices. As some voters made only one choice the least preferred column totals less than 50.. There were 40 respondents who did not qualify their responses in any manner. There were 4 who did not like the options supplied but voted. These added to the 6 commendation votes bring the tally to 51.

Design	Most preferred	Least preferred
1	17	8
2	7	13
3	13	9
4	14	8
Total	51	Not applicable

It is more important to get this right than get it done quickly. The level of involvement demands no less.

Technically the Logos were critiqued for their corporate nature, currently fashionable design, use of transparency and colour. It was noted that the colours “did not speak of old Glebe” like the ‘dirty red’ used by Glebe sporting teams. Concerns about using the designs in grey scale were made. One respondent most helpfully ‘mocked up’ the designs in black and white against a Bulletin background. A recurring comment was that the designs did not produce identity without words.

The current Logo was chiefly designed by Christine Stewart² about 1990. Most critics said that TGS should consider an updated version of this. Some options included removing the words, opening the door, changing the colour, incorporating steps by our name.

It seems to me that options 1 and 4 are the most preferred of the designs and there is an equally strong response for the current logo (updated). Options 2 and 3 are less preferred. The membership showed a distinct interest in the discursive process and we must ensure that is appropriately continued. Their comments were direct and insightful (see comments below).

I believe we should:

1. prepare an article for the Bulletin and the President’s Page in terms of the above;
2. take into consideration the overall comments and adjust the most preferred options 1 and 4, to overcome perceived deficiencies;
3. bearing in mind advice from members and *Engaging Glebe* re-design the current Logo;
4. write to all members with email addresses and ask them to choose one of these three;

¹ I retain copies of all emails for continuing analysis as required.

² I have corresponded with Christine Stewart.

5. re-consider the matter at a subsequent meeting.

SUPER YACHT MARINA

We did not have time to consider the letter from the Chairman of the Super yacht Marina at our May meeting. I received an email shortly after from Mr Graham and a few days later from the Department of Planning. The first asked if we had decided our response to his letter. The second suggested that I should act executively. I told both parties that we would consider it at our May meeting. Dr Lynch has prepared a discussion paper for you.

CROWN LAND LEGISLATION

The NSW government is proposing changes to Crown Land Legislation that may have serious impacts upon heritage, environment and community. Liz Simpson Booker is analysing the matter.

OFFICERS AND COMMITTEE MEMBERS

In between now and the AGM I shall talk to each of the committee members for advice on: the AGM President's Report, how we are doing and their planned future involvement. I would like to be able to let any potential new President know where we stand.

John Gray

SOME COMMENTS FROM MEMBERS ABOUT LOGOS

But that said - I think all are more than acceptable. They are fresh and contemporary and capture the essence of (TGS) rationale. Good work!

Thank you for the opportunity to have an opinion. I think it's great that the society is modernising in this way.

Congratulations , well done. This is a very difficult thing to undertake!

I'm voting in favour of none of them as I feel each is 'corporate' in vibe and unrepresentative of The Glebe Society as a whole.

In my opinion the designs retain little of the heritage values of the Society, nor do they protect the respectability of the Society's reputation.... the colouring is not representative of Glebe, the design is corporate...

(do) not necessarily .. keep (existing) but .. have one that reflects the old Glebe.

A logo that has to be explained with a footnote doesn't work. The current logo is immediately recognisable; if a change is needed I'd prefer a variant of that -- maybe an open door, or heritage window for a squarer image.

The new Logos don't reflect or build on the existing logo (24 years old) which is recognised across & beyond Glebe and quite beloved by GS members & others.

Number 1 looks like Harold Park³

³ And it was also pointed out that 4 seemed to have numbers within it.