

Edited Transcript

Universal Design Conference

Sydney Town Hall (Lower)

Thursday, 21 August 2014 at 9am

Day 2

About This Document

This edited transcript has been taken directly from the text of live captioning provided by The Captioning Studio and, as such, it may contain errors.

The Captioning Studio accepts no liability for any event or action resulting from the draft transcript provided for this edited version.

COTA NSW accepts no liability for any event or action resulting from this edited transcript provided for the benefit of conference delegates. Only those presentations made in the Lower Town Hall are provided. There was no captioning available for the concurrent sessions held in an upstairs room.

The original draft transcript must not be published without The Captioning Studio's written permission.

Panel Session: Universal Design: Everyone, Everywhere

MC, ANDREW BUCHANAN: We have three speakers for our panel discussion – Kathryn Greiner, Nikke Gladwin, and Mark Relf. Kathryn Greiner currently chairs the Ministerial Advisory Committee on Ageing for the NSW Government.

Synopsis: The focus of Kathryn Greiner's presentation is on older people, but recognising that what is good for older people is also good for people of all ages. Attitudes to older people need to change so that there are more inclusive behaviours by others in the community. Unfriendly or thoughtless behaviours can be a barrier to being more active and involved as we age, and this is where engagement with the private sector is critical. Also needed are toolkits and information to help people understand why behaviours need to change, and this applies particularly to the private sector so that they can benefit from the upcoming baby boomer cohort, as well as the baby boomers themselves.

Population Ageing: More of the same?

KATHRYN GREINER AO: I just want to make a few comments today about creating more liveable communities and the engagement of not just ourselves but ourselves in the private sector.

Population ageing is identified as a policy priority in both *New South Wales 2021*, which is the Government state strategy, as well as more specifically in the New South Wales Ageing Strategy, the National Disability Strategy New South Wales Implementation Plan, and the New South Wales Carers Strategy. Public policy is only good policy when it assists all members of the community and doesn't play to a sector or cohort. Design is only "good" design if it universally assists all members of the community.

The Ministerial Advisory Committee advises our Minister on issues to do with ageing, so how do we define ageing? Well, usually it's five years older than the person asking it. But in the MACA we tend to look at ageing in terms of cohorts because the needs of the 55-year-olds are clearly different to the needs of the 90-year-olds, so we span it across in various cohorts and you can draw the lines wherever you want - 45 to 60, 60 to 75, 75 to 90, but it indicates that the "aged" cannot be identified as a single cohort, but, rather, the needs ebb and flow as life's journey continues.

The presentation by Richard Hawkins and Abigail Gray yesterday highlighted a significant overlap in issues and priorities for the carers, for the disabled and for the aged in terms of achieving the opportunities for all members to live their life as they wish, utilising an accessible built environment, reliable, regular and accessible transport, access to social participation, and attitudes of respect and inclusion. Not all carers, the aged or disabled will have the same needs at the same time, but at some point there will be an overlap, and I see it as a continuum of needs and people going in and out of that continuum.

I think it's really critical that we understand changing behaviour in the broader community is one of our greatest challenges, and that's where the engagement with the private sector is critical. If I would just put in a plea there, it's just that we must engage with the private sector. There is no point in us talking to ourselves. We know about it. The architects and the planners and the local government people who are here today, you're already on the bus. We have to get everybody else on the bus.

There needs to be a significant behaviour change and I think that the toolkits that Ger Craddock referred to

yesterday are going to be very informative capacity-building. They will provide people who are unaware of the needs of carers, the aged or the disabled, the knowledge and the skills needed to understand what is required. I use the example of a retail assistant. If I'm a retail assistant in a shop and a customer comes in with a teenaged child with Down syndrome or a carer with somebody who has dementia, the retail assistant needs to know that if I want to buy the frock, I need to have her or him watch that particular individual for me for five minutes, and do it with a degree of style and grace and it's that kind of behaviour change - if you walk into a shop in that scenario at the moment, you'll get a completely different response and it's not a criticism of those who are shop assistants, it's a criticism that we as a community have not changed behaviours.

No longer are any of us to be excluded from the life we want to lead. With the force of the growing cohort of baby boomers now in their 50s and 60s, I like to think that there are more of us than there are of them. I don't think it's realised yet, but baby boomers are a disruptive technology. Are you familiar with the term "disruptive technology"? It's best exemplified by using the example of Australia Post. Australia Post built its business on the back of people writing letters to each other, correspondence of bills, etc. Look what the email and the Internet has done to that. The entire business structure of Australia Post crumbled overnight and they rapidly had to find a new way of developing a business model to remain viable. So disruptive technology is something that starts very small but grows within a market and changes the way business is performed. Baby boomers are going to be the disruptive technology of our society, and that starts with good public policy, which in turn, is translated in the private sector to good design and to good policy.

The New South Wales Government has a whole-of-government attitude to ageing. It's easier said than done, but I think it is on the right track. Departmental heads have responsibility to ensure that their own agency is focused very much on ageing needs. For someone like me - I've been in health education and welfare all my life - it's intriguing to see the buy-in in the different government departments. Health clearly understands the tsunami coming to them. Health expenditure sky rockets for people in their later years and if health is not aware of that, budgeting for it and focusing on healthy ageing for all of us, they will literally be unable to cope, no matter who - my remarks are completely apolitical. It's just not going to be able to work.

They know that we're going to be living longer and we have to be living in a healthy, both in a physical way and a cultural way, so Sport and Recreation are on board, Arts New South Wales are on board, Transport is on board. They're very keen to be in this space, but we have to recognise they've had years of neglect which makes accessibility exceptionally challenged in Sydney. But I know that they're working on it.

Housing - it's a real challenge in Sydney. Real estate is expensive. Wait lists for affordable housing grow exponentially every year. Evidence is clear that seniors wish to age in place in their own community, not necessarily in their own home, but co-located in their community with their important structures of friends, medical services, knowing the butcher, the baker, the candlestick maker. Engagement with the private sector in this space in housing is absolutely critical and we will not be able to address the needs of affordable housing without engaging the private sector.

Interestingly, the community has very strong reservations about medium-density development and high-rise development. It's a real issue, great idea, folks, but don't build one near me. So my plea to the people from local council - you have to marshal your argument that you are not changing your communities in grave ways, but actually you're responding to the ageing community needs. I do make that plea to all of

us - architects, local council representatives, good urban design in medium density will save you money. Not every developer sees it that way, but you as architects and planners and local government employees are charged with the responsibility of ensuring that the developers in your community understand that.

Deputy Lord Mayor, Councillor Kemmis, yesterday in her welcome to the City noted that the City of Sydney is trying hard to establish affordable housing and to cater for the workers of our community who are not on high incomes, the policemen, the teachers and even the barristers. That's what creates the liveable community and, as COTA New South Wales consumer consultations revealed, living in a diverse community with residents of different ages is very important to seniors and indeed to us all.

The COTA report noted that safe and equitable access to the public domain and to public facilities, such as transport, recreation activities, requires attention to design details: level footpaths, adequate and appropriate street seating, lighting, wayfinding and easy access to toilets. "Create liveable communities" should be the catchcry for all of us. The ageing of the population is a worldwide phenomenon and it is the tsunami affecting all our communities. More and more people will remain in the workforce, the Federal Treasurer wants to lift the pension age to 70. Can I ask that we take the word "retirement" out of the lexicon? It's called chapter change. It's all we do in life. You change the chapter, finish here, start there. It doesn't matter what it is that you're doing, you just change chapters. Nobody ever retired.

Creativity and innovation will be critical in dealing with the issues that we have to face in our communities, whether it be increases in technology that allow us to live at home longer and more safely, the opportunity to have a health worker call in on you on your television at 9 o'clock in the morning, the mat that indicates whether somebody has actually moved across that mat this morning, the computer technology on the water pipe that tells the family 600 miles away whether or not any water has been used in the house. If you haven't used water, you haven't either got out of bed to flush the toilet or make the cup of tea - very simple things, they're available today, but we have to be creative in the way we allow people to remain at home longer.

In transport the taxi community is up in arms over something called Uber. It basically utilises empty cabs, hire cars and in some cases private vehicles. You can track it as an app on your phone and most people these days, even the Luddites amongst us, have mobile phones. So Uber is a way of knowing where the cab is, when it's arriving and where it's going. The taxi industry doesn't like it, but from my point of view when you get to the country, into rural and regional New South Wales, where taxis are few and far between, Uber is a way of moving people from point A to point B. It means that people can now access the services in their local community because there will be a safe car that can take them.

Lots of different creative, innovative ways of making sure that as our community ages, we have access to all of the activities that we want to participate in. Population ageing - yes, more of the same? Not at all. Thank you. (Applause).

ANDREW BUCHANAN: Nikke Gladwin is the coordinator of Child Friendly by Design project with Healthy Cities Illawarra.

Synopsis: Children are often forgotten in planning and neighbourhood design, yet they have a wealth of information and ideas ready to be tapped, if only they are asked. Child Friendly by Design is a project where collaborative projects where children and young people are involved in community engagement processes

for the benefit of everyone.

Child Friendly by Design: Capturing the voices of children

NIKKE GLADWIN: Thank you. So a place that's good for children is good for everyone. I'd like to give you a brief insight into the Child Friendly by Design project and how it includes children and families in decision making processes to shape communities, and the positive difference that that can make to everybody.

Child Friendly by Design projects involve children and young people and their families in the design and redesign of public open spaces. Many conventional planning processes do very little to give children, young people or families a voice on what is important to them within their own communities. We have sought to change that and, in doing so, developed a resource tool kit to help guide and direct practice for how you can make a place or space more child and family friendly.

In 2007 Healthy Cities was awarded funding from Communities for Children building stronger communities. The funding supported two projects in the Illawarra. One was to redesign a civic area and one a brown belt play space or open space. The engagement process included children, families, community organisations, authorities and local government and is documented in the resource toolkit that was developed as a result of the project.

Essentially, Child Friendly by Design is a collaborative process that collects ideas and aspirations using creative, child-friendly strategies. It translates those ideas in a meaningful way to influence not only design but policy and community planning. Too often as adults we build things for children and we neglect to talk to them about the things that they want, need or would work for them.

The UN Convention on the Rights of the Child recognises that children have the right to be healthy, safe and play, but also the rights of children to be respected, listened to and to participate in decisions that impact on them. So if we want our communities to be truly inclusive or universal and meet the needs of all citizens, including our very youngest, we need to work *with* children not just *for* them.

Children and young people are the experts in their own lives as are other people, and they have a really unique perspective which we sometimes ignore and I believe that's to our detriment. After all, we get it right for children, we get it right for us.

I'm in the third phase of Child Friendly by Design. I work in a vulnerable community in the Illawarra and the area that I work in was selected through a community round-table event, which brought together many different stakeholders, and again that was children, families, community organisations, the local authorities, other agencies and authorities. A unanimous decision was made at that event to select this particular area because of the level of negative impact that it had on the community around it.

So I started off this journey by talking to people within the community - shopkeepers, community organisations, community elders - and what I found out was that this space, which is a recreational, small open space with a small tatty playground, was a no-go area. People didn't visit it because they felt concerned about their safety, there were high levels of misuse, vandalism, graffiti, high levels of litter, some of the infrastructure had been subject to arson attacks. It was just a place people didn't want to be.

So, armed with that information, I visited the local child-care centre, which was just across the road from this space. I worked in the preschool room with children from ages 3 to 5. I chose art as a medium to engage with children and posed them two questions, and I have to add that was after a huge risk assessment and a visit to this space with the children. The questions that I asked them were really quite simple. I asked them what they liked about the space and what they disliked.

At the end of the session, Mahalia brought me her work - a large piece of blue paper. She'd used charcoal for her art. On that paper was that typical mark making of children. Some may refer to it as scribble. So I asked her about her picture and what she told me was that she didn't like the park because she didn't like the graffiti. She had something to say.

After going to the child-care centre, I moved on to the primary school and visited every class - in particular I met Abby, who was 10. Abby drew a fantastic picture, spectacular in fact, map-like, design like, and again I asked Abby to tell me about her work. Her first comment was "Well, if we planted trees, flowers and gardens, the space would be so much nicer for everybody". She went on to say that she'd like a swing in the park, but if there was a swing for her, there really needed to be something for her younger siblings.

She told me about her picture and this space over here, she said, is where my older brother Jonah can play footy with his mates. She described to me the pathways that she'd included and it turned out that her grandparents had responsibility for her care.

The park needed to be accessible because grandad was in a mobility scooter. It needed to include spaces to sit so nan could sit down, and she'd identified that those structures needed to be in place so that she could actually go out and play and her visit wouldn't be cut short.

She finally added that "if we got a bin, there wouldn't be so much litter". Kids are really insightful and they do have something positive to say. And yes, you always get the "I'd like a slide off the roof of that building into a vat of chocolate" type of response, but they do have really important messages for us as well, and it's not only consideration to themselves, it's consideration to their immediate family, extended family, which all has an impact on the community.

So what are the outcomes? Well, for Abby and Mahalia, a two-year project around this space has seen the introduction of a play club, which is based in the open space. It's seen the introduction of many community events which have planted trees and made gardens, and celebrated National Tree Day. It has seen the recruitment and training of volunteer members to build the capacity of the community in and around that space.

If we consider the triple P bottom line, the project has created a family-friendly space where people feel valued, they feel connected not only to their community but to each other, and that's had a ripple effect in terms of that sense of belonging, that ownership and even the guardianship of spaces and places.

We know that creating spaces where people want to be impacts on health and wellbeing. Active outdoor lifestyles contribute to decreasing levels of obesity, especially childhood obesity, and accessibility to great play spaces, well-designed play spaces builds and develops skills in children.

I think it's really important in terms of those social developments to have access to environments that

support children to problem solve. It builds their resilience. It creates children that are able to deal with the things that life throws at them. And that enables them to overcome issues in their life and it improves mental health within children. It builds stronger communities.

We can look at the profit, I suppose, in monetary terms or terms of wellbeing: connected family friendly places and spaces build the reputation of communities. It builds the success of towns and cities and increases local economy.

So I think all in all if we consider that universal design aims to create spaces that are good for everybody, to create spaces that are good for everybody we really need voices of children. (Applause).

ANDREW BUCHANAN: Mark Relf is experienced in a wide range of access-related projects and is an accredited access consultant.

Synopsis: The evolution of accessibility and universal design covers some fifty years and several legal instruments, standards, state planning policies, and local government ordinances. This presentation provides a potted history of the evolution of accessibility and universal design.

Universal Access is not Universal Design

MARK RELF: I've been asked to talk today on what is the perspective of an access consultant. So from an access consultant perspective I guess we're going to get into a little bit of the nuts and bolts of universal design and what that might mean in an everyday practice of being an access consultant.

So universal design is a term that was first coined by Ron Mace in 1985 in the US, although there have been other aspects of UD that have been around for quite some years before that in Europe and Scandinavia. We all know the 7 principles of universal design, which are spelt out quite clearly. Principles they are, but like many countries around the world enabling built environment to be accessible to everyone everywhere has been a slow and tedious process of evolution from those mid-80s to where we are now and evolution of UD is no different.

Universal design has many supporters, but of course there are no technical standards, regulations or laws that enshrine UD when it comes to the accessibility of buildings, products or services. It's just how we translate those 7 principles into what we do in terms of designing and developing guidelines and other policies.

So how should an access consultant apply universal design within their daily practice? I put three questions to myself in developing this conversation today: Are we on the right track with UD or is the 50-year history of enabling accessible environments outdated? Is the universal design concept a pure single practice or are there multiple methodologies in translating that into the built environment? Is there a place for two systems: accessible public spaces and universally designed private residential development, which seems to be the direction UD is taking in this country.

Long before universal design was coined by Ron Mace in 1985, Australian advocates under the auspice of ACROD (an advocacy organisation for people with disability) and Standards Australia developed the first access standard in 1968, almost 50 years ago. It wasn't called Australian Standard 1428.1, it was CA 52. A

passionate group of advocates got together under the auspices of ACROD to develop it. Just 24 pages in length, it had information covering basic requirements of wheelchair circulation spaces, stairway design, audio-visual signals and a few other items. And it had a preface that articulated that the basis of design for buildings for public use must take into account all members of the community. So that has been a bit of an enduring statement for almost 50 years.

In 1977, CA evolved into AS 1428 with an expanded scope that has subsequently had a number of revisions (in 1988, 1993, 2001 and 2009), each time the document getting much longer and the conversation and scope getting broader as it went along.

In the 1980s, when there were many incremental baby steps in progressing the debate forwards towards accessible public buildings. Notable milestones were the IYDP in 1981, and the introduction of Section 53 in Ordinance 70 in 1983 when the New South Wales Government, which specified accessibility requirements in public buildings. If you look at that old document, you can see the shape of part D3 of the BCA emerging, which evolved, and continued to evolve - to where we are today. One of the odd things with section 53 of Ordinance 70 (there may have been other examples in other States and Territories), was the provision for the step at the front door to be permissible. So it was quite an odd scenario with a building regulation that said these are the accessibility requirements, but you can have this step at the front door.

Also in the 1980s, AS1428.1 was updated and also access consultancies started to emerge and embrace the Standard to translate that into design into public buildings. ACROD maintained its key stakeholder role on the Australian scene and we sort of plodded along for a long time with voluntary input, but not seeing a great deal of change.

During the 90s the pace of change continued and picked up speed when we started to see the first national Building Code of Australia referencing AS1428.1, but still with the step at the front door. Then the Disability Discrimination Act of 1992 (DDA) was enacted, a red letter day in my view. AS1428 continued to expand and there was quite a hectic period as Standards Australia released parts 2, 3 and 4 all in the one year. We are struggling to get one developed over a five-year period these days, but it's testament to the work of the volunteers in those days to get three parts of the standards released in the same year.

I also looked at the Sydney Olympic Games as being a bit of a milestone for New South Wales as it prompted the professional of access consultants who were integral to every aspect of the design and construction of Sydney Olympic Park and all the Games facilities.

The Adaptable Housing Standard was published 1995, and since then local governments have incorporated proportional requirements for adaptable housing within multi-unit residential development. New South Wales started off with a nominal 10% of dwellings.

In 1997, after several years of negotiation between the Australian Human Rights Commission and the Australian Building Codes Board, we finally saw BCA 96 released and on this occasion it removed the step at the front door to buildings.

In 1998, the New South Wales Government sought to revise the state environment planning policy - it was then called Housing for Older People and People with Disabilities SEPP 5. It went through quite a significant

revamp to facilitate housing for older people, and has been revised in 2000, 2004 and 2007.

The 2007 version is almost fully accessible to AS1428 through its referencing and the way that the structure of the document is presented and used. So it's quite a formidable tool, I think, in terms of achieving accessible housing or at least what I would describe as a high-end universal housing.

During the 1990s I would tend to think that universal design started to enter the vocabulary of access consultants in Australia, but still the DDA was still the main game. So the concept of universal design hadn't gathered a lot of traction with policy makers at that time.

So we moved into the 2000s and started to see the development of the DDA Access to Premises Standard. It took eight long years for that to take effect. It didn't take the drafters that long to get it into place, but it took that long for the politicians to accept it and bring it forward and make it law. We also saw for the first time that the BCA embraced Class 2 residential flat buildings within its scope in D3, requiring accessibility in common areas of buildings.

Also after many years of conversation we saw the formation of the Australian Network for Universal Housing Design (ANUHD), which sought to move the conversation forward in the area of residential development which the BCA has never really dealt with at any point other than in localised policies.

Throughout the 2000s it's my view that universal design was a bit of a side issue for access consultants as the main game has always been about public buildings and making sure that they are accessible. So access consultants and local government have worked together in a loose partnership to see AS 4299 Adaptable Housing Standard roll-out in New South Wales and to make sure that Seniors Housing was being designed and constructed to comply with the relevant standards.

AS 4299 adaptability principles have often been misunderstood, misused and abused by designers and builders and to some extent some other players in the game. So AS 4299 has been through a chequered history since 1995.

Simultaneously, we started to see two streams of conversation emerge with universal design: universal design in a housing context and universal design in public buildings, which really gives way to access for all and consistency with the DDA. Once we got the Access to Premises Standard in place, access consultants saw this as being universal design, something that complied with the premises standard would reasonably be argued as being universally accessible to all.

Access consultants would tend to feel that the 2007 version of the Seniors Housing policy, which now adopts AS1428, will deliver accessible and adaptable design features, which by and large exceed anything that Livable Housing Australia has in place at the moment.

On the flip side, the ANUHD prosecuted the argument that while 10% of dwellings being adaptable may be useful, its real goal was to get 100% of dwellings designed with a universal design focus. That conversation continued throughout 2000 up until 2009, when the National Dialogue on Universal Housing Design took place. For those of us who have been around for that length of time, you will have noticed that it was primarily to bring a bit more drive to the conversation and bring together industry and government and the ageing and disability rights sector to establish universal design within mass market housing of single

detached dwellings across the country, an area which had been neglected up until that point.

Unfortunately, access consultants were excluded from that dialogue process and the revision of AS4299 of Standards Australia was put on hold whilst Livable Housing started to gather momentum.

From 2010 onwards AS4299 has had minimal take-up outside New South Wales, I think it's fair to say, and the Standard is often misunderstood by planners, architects and builders. For that reason, universal design advocates argue quite often against the notion of accessible and adaptable housing in favour of Livable Housing Design. There is nothing wrong with pushing forward with other ways of dealing with the subject.

Accessible design features have occasionally been maligned as being ugly, inappropriate and unsuitable for residential living. I often hear architects saying, one young fellow particularly said I just went on a holiday to Germany where they have no accessibility standards, it's wonderful, we can design stairs with no handrails, no tactile indicators cluttering things up, clear glazing to give that clean look in their built environment, but clearly how could that be safe and accessible and inclusive of everyone I do not know, but that's the mindset of some designers, some architects, unfortunately.

In 2011 Liveable Housing Australia established its Guidelines, which are an abbreviated version of AS4299 with a reduced scope aimed at the mass housing market. I guess during the same period access consultants looked at Livable Housing Guidelines as a bit of a branding and marketing campaign which is seeking to sell very modest provisions to the mass market. You've got to start somewhere, I guess. Local government access consultants continue using AS4299 Adaptable Housing throughout New South Wales quite successfully.

In New South Wales - I just looked at 40 or 50 councils from Newcastle and Wollongong, and with the exception of two they all specified adaptable housing in multi-unit residential sector and several now are specifying 1428.1 provisions as well, such as apartments in Hornsby and Gosford Councils. It's been recommended that local government continues to push the argument forward. I couldn't see any that really embraced the universal housing design guidelines at this point in time, but that will come.

I guess in my view the parallels between the 1970s and 2011 are pretty obvious as the cycle is starting with a very minimalist level of access commencing with the development of Livable Housing Guidelines with silver, gold and platinum levels. Let's look at silver, all it's really doing is getting rid of the step at the front door, but, hey, that's where we were in the mid-90s with the BCA. We have to start somewhere, move forward. So we really need to get the Livable Housing Guidelines implemented.

While the concept of universal design is widely supported by access consultants, it is clear that UD is now firmly embedded in the residential housing market commencing with social housing and hopefully rolling out into the mass market of detached and semi-detached dwellings as Livable Housing Australia develops partnerships with the mass production builders, such as Mirvac, Stockland, Lend Lease, and Meriton.

Let's come back to those three questions again: are we on the right track with universal design or is the 50-year history of enabling accessible environments outdated? In my view, the answer is enabling accessible environments is still on the right course and UD can play a part in that aim as it is established now and will hopefully develop. Is the universal design concept a pure single practice or are there multiple methodologies? Clearly, policy makers are embracing the principles of universal design and developing

guidelines, mostly on a voluntary basis to suit particular objectives. So we see a number of agencies, whether it's Livable Housing Australia or New South Wales Land and Housing Corporation and I'm sure there are others out there that I haven't come across just yet, whereby the universal design principles are taken forward and trying to be melded into a policy or a set of building guidelines that will hopefully meet those seven principles that we first enunciated.

Is there a place for two systems? I think there is. The two systems can co-exist, albeit the confusion over the coming years will prevail with Livable Housing Guidelines until they merge with Adaptable Housing and maybe start to include platinum plus and diamond levels and even go beyond that to deliver real accessibility.

So what does the future look like? What does the future hold? Over time, access consultants hope to see Livable Housing Guidelines and clever innovations in design and construction delivers real benefits to people with disabilities, their families and friends. The AS4299 needs to be revised to provide a more comprehensive standard or handbook to provide accessible residential development with multiple parts for people with various impairments. We might see a handbook with a number of chapters in it depending on what type of impairment it is that explains in detail how those impairments should be dealt with - not impairments so much, but how the design can accommodate those people in an independent fashion in their homes. Thank you. (Applause).

ANDREW BUCHANAN:

Some questions to the panel. Kathryn, the issue of ageing is obviously a huge issue to be faced by a whole range of countries. Do you ever wonder whether government will actually get it and do something constructively?

KATHRYN GREINER AO: I think the Government has to lead the way on this issue, but it's not just a government problem. It must engage with the private sector and I think what you've seen through all three presentations is that the private sector is seeking the information from both seniors in our community, young people in the design of their playgrounds and people with disabilities in terms of housing needs and housing requirements - it's something that involves all of the community, but if government doesn't lead it won't happen.

Every time I go overseas, I'm conscious of the fact that in Australia don't do disability well and that worries me and it has worried me all of my life when I worked in early childhood for 15 years, early childhood services and designing child-care centres. So we have always had this kind of a "them and us". It changes now when there is a greater push for children with disabilities to be included in mainstream schooling and not to be sidelined - we're learning as we go on this, but after 25 years, it is starting to change, where the needs of the individual child are met, and I could spend 45 minutes talking about that because that was effectively the philosophy behind the Gonski Review, that the funding should follow the child, not follow the school. Without that behavioural change in the community, then we won't get the respect and the inclusion that we're all seeking.

ANDREW BUCHANAN: Nikke, do you think we should listen to our children and grandchildren more?

NIKKE GLADWIN: Listening to children - yes, it is really important not only in our personal lives but also for me it's integral to the job and the role that I have within the community. When children are given the

opportunity or engaged and provided with the opportunities to have an opinion, they really do.

ANDREW BUCHANAN: Thank our three panellists, please, Kathryn Greiner, Nikke Gladwin and Mark Relf.
(Applause)