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# Overview

In February 2020 Corryong Primary School closed and a prep to grade four building on the senior campus of Corryong College was established. The site and its attached historical building are a central feature of Upper Murray’s history and identity, as recognised through the Upper Murray and Corryong Community Recovery Committees’ 2019-2020 Eastern Bushfires recovery priorities



In October 2021 the Upper Murray and Corryong Community Recovery Committees with support of Bushfire Recovery Victoria, launched an online survey to understand community sentiment for the future of the disused Corryong Primary School site. This survey was hosted on [ourrecovery.com.au](https://vicgov.sharepoint.com/sites/VG000985/REO%20division/Community%20Engagement%20and%20Advancement/Digital%20Engagement%20Platform/Reporting/CRC%20Reports/Corryong%20Primary%20School%20Site/ourrecovery.com.au) and was just one part of extensive community consultation that occurred concurrently.

The survey was structured to represent two key elements of this consultation:

1. The first component aimed to understand the **importance of the site in general**, and ideas for its future development
2. The second component aimed to **understand how strongly the community were attached to the old primary school building** and how it could be included in the overall future development of the site.

Other community consultation included five focus groups and one community workshop to explore the findings further. The following report provides analysis and insights for the online survey only.

# Overall insights

## The old primary school building is of high significance to the community both historically and sentimentally.

There was a very strong response to ensuring this building is kept and repurposed for the community. This sentiment is strongly reinforced by:

* **63.82%** of people responding that the historically significant building should be retained in response to [question six](#_Question_six_-)
* **80.63%** of people responding ‘yes’ to [question ten](#_Question_10_-) that the primary school building should be included in the future development of the site. In [following on from question ten](#_Question_10a_–) to explain their response and understand respondents’ sentimental and historical attachement to the building:
  + **65.02%** of people indicated a strong attachement
  + **17.94%** of people indicated a moderate attachment
* **91.07%** of people responded that the building should be retained, respectfully restored and used for the community.

## The community strongly supports the site being retained as a multi-disciplinary community space, most strongly suggesting the inclusion of community recreation, early education and services and tourism attractions/services.

* [Question five](#_Question_5_-) asked community to score out of five how strongly they supported three proposed statements for the future use of the site. The community most strongly supported that the **site be retained for community use with a score of 4.45/5**.
* [Question seven](#_Question_7_-) asked community to score out of five what elements should be included in the future development of the site. The community most strongly supported including **educational services (4.18/5)**; **recreation activities (4.13/5)**; and **community services operating from the site (4.12/5)**.
* To understand from community the number one element to include into the future development of the site, the community responded highly in [question eight](#_Question_eight_-) for **educational services (29.24%)**; **community services operating from the site (22.22%)**; and **tourism attraction business or services (17.54%)**.
* The sentiments from question seven and question eight were further validated via written responses to [question nine](#_Question_9_-). When asked for any other comments about the site in general, respondents took the opportunity to provide suggestions for the site. These suggestions were analysed and categorised into ten core themes:
  + Community recreation space (41.03%)
  + Early education & services (39.49%)
  + Tourism (23.59%)
  + Art & culture (12.31%)
  + Higher education (11.79%)
  + Allied health (10.77%)
  + Independent & assisted living (10.77%)
  + Housing & accommodation (8.72%)
  + Retail & hospitality (6.15%)
  + Public amenities (5.13%)

## Youth recreation was a priority to many community members and was categorised under **community recreation space** in question nine.

Youth was a central focus with many responses highlighting that there needed to be a space for the youth like sporting facilities, pump bike track, parks, skate park.

## The Man from Snowy River was central to the identity and pride of the Upper Murray region and this came through strongly across multiple survey responses.

Multiple survey responses echoed the pride the community felt for the iconic Man from Snowy River festival and other Man from Snowy River attractions in the area. Many shared that they’d like to see this space used to enhance these existing tourism attractions.

# Introduction to the online survey

The online survey comprised 11 questions with two additional questions embedded using survey logic. The survey aimed to understand the cross section of past and present residents responding to the survey, how they felt about the site in general and how strongly attached they were to the old primary school building.

All survey questions were optional and paper-based versions were made available at various high traffic points across the Upper Murray region. Paper based surveys completed were input via OurRecovery Platform to ensure all responses were represented in the data.

The 11 questions and two additional questions varied in type and included:

* Four ‘select box’ questions that enabled only one response to be selected
* Four ‘multi choice’ questions that enabled unlimited multiple responses to be selected
* Two ‘matrix’ questions that enabled respondents to select how strongly they supported an idea or statement.
* Three ‘long text’ questions that enabled respondents to provide individual written feedback.

## Analysis of qualitative data produced by long text question types

The qualitative data produced by the three long text question types was analysed and sorted into categories. High level details of these categories are listed below:

**Question 9 – Do you have any other comments about the development of the old primary school site?**

* Responses were sorted into ten categories that encompassed the ideas and suggestions community had for the future of the site.

**Question 10a – Please explain your response**

* Respondents were asked to explain why they selected yes, no or unsure to question 10 that asked if they thought the old primary school building should be included into the future development of the site.
* Responses were categorised on a scale of how strongly the community was attached to the old primary school building.

**Question 11 – Do you have any other comments about the old primary school building?**

* To capture final sentiments about the old primary school building, responses were categorised into three categories indicating preferences to retain or demolish the building.

More information to contextualise the categories selected can be found in the survey data breakdown in the following pages of this report.

# Survey data breakdown

|  |
| --- |
| **Question 1 - What area of the Upper Murray region are you from?** Select Box | Skipped: 4 | Answered: 345 (98.9%) |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Answer choices** | **%** | **Count** |
| Berringama | 1.16% | 4 |
| Biggara | 4.35% | 15 |
| Colac Colac | 2.90% | 10 |
| Corryong | 48.12% | 166 |
| Cudgewa | 9.57% | 33 |
| Greg Greg | 1.16% | 4 |
| Jingellic | 0.29% | 1 |
| Khancoban | 4.64% | 16 |
| Lucyvale | 1.45% | 5 |
| Nariel Valley | 3.77% | 13 |
| Thowgla | 6.09% | 21 |
| Tintaldra | 0.87% | 3 |
| Tooma | 2.32% | 8 |
| Towong | 8.99% | 31 |
| Walwa | 2.32% | 8 |
| Welumba | 0% | 0 |
| Other | 2.03% | 7 |
| **Total** | **100%** | **345** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Question 2 - What age group are you in?**  Select Box | Skipped: 4 | Answered: 345 (98.9%) |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Answer choices** | **%** | **Count** |
| Under 18 | 1.74% | 6 |
| 18-25 | 7.83% | 27 |
| 26-35 | 22.32% | 77 |
| 36-45 | 20.29% | 70 |
| 46-55 | 15.07% | 52 |
| 56-65 | 16.23% | 56 |
| 65 | 15.94% | 55 |
| Prefer not to say | 0.58% | 2 |
| **Total** | **100%** | **345** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Question 3 - What is your association to the old primary school site?**  Multi Choice | Skipped: 4 | Answered: 345 (98.9%) |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Answer choices** | **%** | **Count** |
| Corryong resident | 53.33% | 184 |
| Upper Murray region resident | 40.29% | 139 |
| Current student | 1.45% | 5 |
| Past student | 46.09% | 159 |
| Family member of current or past student | 35.94% | 124 |
| Past/present staff member | 9.86% | 34 |
| Person with interest in history | 23.77% | 82 |
| Local business owner | 18.84% | 65 |
| Retail worker | 4.06% | 14 |
| Industrial worker | 2.03% | 7 |
| Farm worker | 15.94% | 55 |
| Developer | 0.29% | 1 |
| Tourism operator | 1.74% | 6 |
| Other | 3.77% | 13 |
| **Total** | **100%** | **345** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Question 3a - What type of business do you own?** Multi Choice | Skipped: 285 | Answered: 64 (18.3%) |

This question had embedded survey logic and was triggered to **only** appear after question three when respondents had selected ‘local business owner’ as a response.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Answer choices** | **%** | **Count** |
| Farm or agriculture related | 53.13% | 34 |
| Food and/or accommodation | 18.75% | 12 |
| Retail store | 20.31% | 13 |
| Grocery | 1.56% | 1 |
| Construction or building related | 3.13% | 2 |
| Trades (plumbing, electrical etc) | 1.56% | 1 |
| Tourism business | 12.50% | 8 |
| Other | 20.31% | 13 |
| **Total** | **100%** | **64** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Question 4 - Why is the old primary school site important to you?** Multi Choice | Skipped: 5 | Answered: 344 (98.6%) |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Answer choices** | **%** | **Count** |
| It is a historical feature of the Upper Murray region | 64.83% | 223 |
| It is a highly visible site within Corryong that has opportunity to attract business or residential development | 59.88% | 206 |
| It represents the Upper Murray region's growth and development | 38.66% | 133 |
| Friends and/or family were students | 36.63% | 126 |
| I was a student | 38.66% | 133 |
| I was a teacher | 5.23% | 18 |
| It's not important to me | 5.52% | 19 |
| Other | 4.94% | 17 |
| **Total** | **100%** | **344** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Question 5 - On a scale of 1-5, how strongly do you support the following?** Matrix | Skipped: 5 | Answered: 329 (98.5%) |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **1**  **Do not support** | **2**  **Somewhat support** | **3**  **Neutral** | **4**  **Support** | **5**  **Strongly support** | **Count** | **Score** |
| The site should be retained for community use | 2.08% 7 | 3.87% 13 | 8.33% 28 | 18.15% 61 | 67.56% 227 | 336 | 4.45 |
| The site should be privately developed | 42.46% 138 | 20.92% 68 | 24.62% 80 | 8.62% 28 | 3.38% 11 | 325 | 2.10 |
| Some of the site should be privately developed and some retained for community use | 23.49% 78 | 15.96% 53 | 24.10% 80 | 20.18% 67 | 16.27% 54 | 332 | 2.90 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Question 6 - What part of the site do you think should be retained?** Multi Choice | Skipped: 9 | Answered: 340 (97.4%) |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Answer choices** | **%** | **Count** |
| All buildings | 28.24% | 96 |
| The historically significant building | 63.82% | 217 |
| The buildings along Hanson Street frontage | 31.47% | 107 |
| The oval area | 43.82% | 149 |
| Some of the oval area | 8.53% | 29 |
| None of the site should be retained | 3.24% | 11 |
| Other | 4.12% | 14 |
| **Total** | **100%** | **340** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Question 7 - On a scale of 1-5, how strongly do you support including the following elements in the future planning of the site?** Matrix | Skipped: 3 | Answered: 346 (99.1%) |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **1**  **Do not support** | **2**  **Somewhat support** | **3**  **Neutral** | **4**  **Support** | **5**  **Strongly support** | **Count** | **Score** |
| Retail and business development | 20.25% 66 | 20.25% 66 | 19.94% 65 | 27.30% 89 | 12.27% 40 | 326 | 2.91 |
| Residential development | 62.01% 204 | 10.03% 33 | 9.73% 32 | 11.55% 38 | 6.69% 22 | 329 | 1.91 |
| Commercial development | 36.56% 117 | 20.63% 66 | 18.44% 59 | 18.75% 60 | 5.63% 18 | 320 | 2.36 |
| Industrial development | 76.80% 245 | 6.90% 22 | 10.66% 34 | 3.76% 12 | 1.88% 6 | 319 | 1.47 |
| Tourism attraction businesses or activities | 10.03% 34 | 13.27% 45 | 11.50% 39 | 29.20% 99 | 35.99% 122 | 339 | 3.68 |
| Educational services | 3.92% 13 | 7.53% 25 | 9.64% 32 | 24.40% 81 | 54.52% 181 | 332 | 4.18 |
| Recreation activities | 3.29% 11 | 8.38% 28 | 8.38% 28 | 32.34% 108 | 47.60% 159 | 334 | 4.13 |
| Community services operating from the site | 4.15% 14 | 6.82% 23 | 10.68% 36 | 29.08% 98 | 49.26% 166 | 337 | 4.12 |
| Open green space | 8.95% 28 | 9.27% 29 | 17.89% 56 | 28.75% 90 | 35.14% 110 | 313 | 3.72 |

|  |
| --- |
| **Question 8 - What is the MOST important element you would like to see in any future development of the site?** Select Box | Skipped: 7 | Answered: 342 (98%) |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Answer choices** | **%** | **Count** |
| Retail and business development | 5.56% | 19 |
| Residential development | 3.22% | 11 |
| Commercial development | 0.29% | 1 |
| Industrial development | 0.58% | 2 |
| Tourism attraction businesses or activities | 17.54% | 60 |
| Educational services | 29.24% | 100 |
| Recreation activities | 15.20% | 52 |
| Community services operating from the site | 22.22% | 76 |
| Other | 6.14% | 21 |
| **Total** | **100%** | **342** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Question 9 - Do you have any other comments about the development of the old primary school site?** Long Text | Skipped: 154 | Answered: 195 (56%) |

Based on the responses that emerged, 10 common catergories were identified. The categories are listed below. Examples of the types of suggestions assigned to each category are provided to get a sense how responses have been categorised. Many responses had multiple categories assigned to them during the analysis of the data.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Category** | **Examples referenced** |
| **Early education & services** | multi-disciplinary early years learning centre; before/after school care; kinder/playgroup; holiday programs; maternal child health services |
| **Housing & Accommodation** | Rentable space; short term accommodation; residential housing |
| **Retail & Hospitality** | Retail; food & hospitality; local café; brewery |
| **Higher Education** | Adult education; outdoor education & training camp; agriculture school |
| **Community recreation space** | Youth recreation\*; exercise equipment; gardens; community gathering space; sport; green space; maze; sculptures; summer BBQs; library; park; nursery  *\*Youth recreation was a strong theme. Examples for youth recreation included: kids BMX track, bike pump track, skatepark, basketball, cricket nets* |
| **Tourism** | Tourism services; tourism attraction; caravan/RV park; camp site; Man from Snowy River attraction; hall of fame |
| **Allied Health** | Disability services; mental health services; youth services; osteopaths/occupational therapy services etc |
| **Public Amenities** | Parking; restrooms |
| **Art & Culture** | Markets; festival/event space; art classes; workshops; arts centre; theatre; studios |
| **Independent & Assisted Living** | Independent living facility; aged care housing; aged care services; respite services |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **%** | **Count** |
| Early education & services | 39.49% | 77 |
| Housing & Accommodation | 8.72% | 17 |
| Retail & Hospitality | 6.15% | 12 |
| Higher Education | 11.79% | 23 |
| Community recreation space | 41.03% | 80 |
| Tourism | 23.59% | 46 |
| Allied Health | 10.77% | 21 |
| Public Amenities | 5.13% | 10 |
| Art & Culture | 12.31% | 24 |
| Independent & Assisted Living | 10.77% | 21 |

## Featured comments

“Great space for a childcare centre. Lack of childcare means we are less likely to attract people to the area.”

***(early education & services)***

“An overall childcare centre including maternal and child health, play groups, day care, before and after school care, holiday care and programs. Recreation and sporting activities on the oval including development of a proper track and field running track, playground, bike pump track, outdoor gym…all able to be utilised by anyone within the community at any time.”

***(early education & services; community recreation space)***

Corryong lacks the support for families and children needing services like after school care, long day care, speech therapist and OTs. This creates the perfect space for our community to build a support system for future generations to be able to stay in Corryong.

As a working mum of 2 who grew up in foster care and has no support team around me, this is something that is important.

***(early education & services; allied health)***

“Early childhood Education & Training is in crisis and this is a chance to help address the issue, including maternal child health, childcare, kindergarten and teacher training.”

***(early education & services; community recreation space; higher education)***

|  |
| --- |
| **Question 10 - Do you think the old primary school building should be included in the future development of the site?** Select Box | Skipped: 34 | Answered: 315 (90.3%) |

Respondents **strongly indicated** that they considered the old primary school building should be included into the future development of the site.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Answer choices** | **%** | **Count** |
| Yes | 80.63% | 254 |
| No | 5.71% | 18 |
| Unsure | 13.65% | 43 |
| **Total** | **100%** | **315** |

|  |
| --- |
| **Question 10a – Please explain your response**  Short Text | Skipped: 126 | Answered: 223 (64%) |

This question had embedded survey logic to prompt a follow up question linked to question 10. This aimed to discover how strongly attached respondents were to the old primary school building.

Responses were categorised into five categories to quantify the **sentimental attachment to the building**. These categories and the rationale for assigning responses to them is listed below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Strong attachment** | respondents who strongly referenced the historical significance of the building and generally used emotive language. |
| **Moderate attachment** | respondents who opted to restore and repurpose the building, with no strong reference to its history or use of emotive language. |
| **Neutral attachment** | respondents who recognised the historical significance but accepted that restoration and maintenance of the building may be cost prohibitive. |
| **Some attachment** | respondents who had a preference to keep the building, but their language was passive and no reference to its historical significance was made. |
| **No attachment** | respondents who either did not care what happened to the building or opted for it to be demolished. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **%** | **Count** |
| Strong attachment | 65.02% | 145 |
| Moderate attachment | 17.94% | 40 |
| Neutral attachment | 8.07% | 18 |
| Some attachment | 4.93% | 11 |
| No attachment | 4.04% | 9 |
| **Total** | **100%** | **223** |

## Featured comments

“This is part of our history, a beautiful building which can be repurposed. I think it would have a detrimental impact on existing community to see it torn down.”

***(strong attachment)***

“It is a local building rich in history, that could lend itself to some very clever architecture to at least maintain the façade”

***(strong attachment)***

“This is a part of our community history and retaining the building will strengthen feelings of connection.”

***(strong attachment)***

“This area is the heart and blood of the site and should be repaired to original state. It represents the heart of the Upper Murray, the fight for schooling in the area, the determination and commitment of residents to support their community betterment.”

***(strong attachment)***

“Very little historical buildings have been retained. This building is significant for the majority of residents in and surrounding Corryong. Support following the bushfires was located here. Comfort and hope in this familiar old place.”

***(strong attachment)***

“It is history, so it is hard to say knock it down but it’s such a good area to build the town and really upgrade the community.”

***(neutral attachment)***

“I am aware of the historical significance of the 'old building' and the attachment that many people have to it, but I am also aware that the cost of restoration and refurbishment of the building would be astronomical”

***(neutral attachment)***

|  |
| --- |
| **Question 11 – Do you have any other comments about the old primary school building?**  Long Text | Skipped: 237 | Answered: 112 (32%) |

When asked if respondents had any other comments, many took the opportunity to reiterate that the old primary school building should be included into the future development of the site.

Responses were categorised into **retain**, **demolish** or **neutral**. These categories and the rationale for assigning responses to them is listed below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Retain** | respondents who referenced ideas for future uses and next steps for the building. Commentary reinforced the ten themes that emerged from question nine. Additional commentary included the need to restore the building internally whilst respectfully maintaining its original façade. |
| **Demolish** | respondents who were concerned the building was unsafe and would be too costly to the community to restore. |
| **Neutral** | respondents who acknowledged that the building was significant value to the community but also that keeping it could be costly due to asbestos concerns, white ants and general upkeep associated with an old building. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **%** | **Count** |
| Retain | 91.07% | 102 |
| Demolish | 3.57% | 4 |
| Neutral | 5.36% | 6 |
| **Total** | **100%** | **112** |

## Featured comments

I think the historical/heritage features of the building (particularly the facade) should be kept, whilst the interior could be renovated/improved to cater for a variety of uses

***(Retain)***

It’s an incredible space and could be the heart of the area if done right. It really seems to suit artist / craft / maker space. It should be accessible by everyone.

***(Retain)***

Would be excellent opportunity to make into a childcare centre incorporating before and after school care. Much needed in this community.

***(Retain)***

Asbestos concerns I have heard. May be best to get rid of but can be pricey to do so

***(Demolish)***

Needs a lot of work but things like this don't get built anymore. It could become a tourist destination with the right plan.

***(Neutral)***

# Summary

The data displayed in this report shows clear community sentiment for the future of the disused Corryong Primary School site and its attached historical building. The survey data amongst additional data obtained through the consultation process will inform the next steps of this project.

## What the **survey data** said

* + - * + The old primary school building is of historical significance and importance to the Upper Murray community. It should be included into the future development of the site.
        + The future use of the site should be multi use in its function to meet the diverse needs of the community.
        + The site should be retained mostly for community use. The most prominent responses embodied using the site for:

Community recreation

Early education and services

Community services operating from the site

Enhancing local tourism

## Next steps

* + - * + This report will be shared with Towong Shire Council along with the deidentified raw qualitative data. The Council will also be provided with outcomes from the focus group conversations and community workshop.
        + Towong Shire Council will lead the next phases of this project. This will include reviewing the community consultation outcomes and commencing conversations with the state government to input into future plans for the site on behalf of the community.