Ordinary Meeting
24 February 2020 at 7.30 PM
ORDER OF BUSINESS

Acknowledgement of Country
Prayer
Attendance, Apologies,
Declarations of Interests
1 Confirmation of Minutes
2 Mayoral Minutes & Reports
Tabling of Petitions
Addresses from the Public
3 Notice of Motions
(including Rescission Motions)
4 Council Reports
5 Correspondence
6 General Business
7 Questions With or Without Notice
8 Council in Committee of the Whole
# Index

## 1 – Confirmation of Minutes

1. Confirmation of Minutes of Ordinary Meeting 4473 held 9 December 2019
2. Confirmation of Minutes of Extraordinary Meeting 4474 held 16 December 2019

## 2 - Mayoral Minutes & Reports

2.1 NSW Bushfire Crisis and Drought Appeal
2.2 Hunter's Hill Residents recognised in the Australia Day Honours Roll 2020
2.3 Postponement of the Ordinary Meeting 10 February 2020

## 3 - Notices of Motion including Rescission Motions

3.1 Motion to Ensure Transparency in Press Communications
3.2 Motion to Improve Schedule of Works Communication
3.3 Motion to Review Hunters Hill Public School Drop Off Zones
3.4 Motion to Maintain a Roll of Business Voters
3.5 Motion to Assist in the Koala Habitat Recovery
3.6 Motion in relation to a State of Climate Emergency
3.7 Motion to report on update of delivery of pedestrian crossing at the corner of Mark and Mary Street
3.8 Notice to develop a mitigation strategy for extreme weather events
3.9 Motion to Audit Tree Canopy Safety in Hunters Hill

## 4 - Council Reports

4.1 Parramatta River Ferry Service Review
4.2 Gladesville Bridge Marina 'Designated Development Application' No. 380 Victoria Road, Drummoyne
4.3 Draft Local Strategic Planning Statement - Post Exhibition Report
4.4 Circular Economy
4.5 Tarban Creek Flying-Fox Camp Management Plan
4.6 Leasing of Road Reserve Adjacent to 13 Euthella Ave, Hunters Hill
4.7 Sale of portion of unmade road adjacent to 45 the Point Road Woolwich
4.8 Delegation to Mayor & General Manager during Christmas/New Year period - 2019/20.
4.9 Summary of Council Investments as at 30 November 2019 and 31 December 2019
4.10 Summary of Council Investments as at 31 January 2020
4.11 Report of Legal Matters January 2020
4.12 Minutes of Conservation Advisory Panel Meeting held 20 November 2019
4.13 Minutes of Conservation Advisory Panel Meeting held 11 December 2019
4.14 Minutes of the Audit Risk and Improvement Committee held on 27 November 2019
4.15 Minutes of the Gladesville Main Street Committee Meeting held 21 November 2019
4.16 Development Applications determined under Delegated Authority in December 2019 and January 2020
4.17 Development Applications determined by the Development Control Unit in December 2019
4.18 Development Applications determined by the Local Planning Panel in December 2019 362
4.19 Minutes of the Bushland Management Advisory Committee held on 21 October 2019 368
4.20 Councillor Briefing: 4 November 2019 373
4.21 Councillor Briefing: 9 December 2019 388

5 - CORRESPONDENCE

Nil

6 - GENERAL BUSINESS

Nil

7 - QUESTIONS WITH OR WITHOUT NOTICE

Nil
CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

COMMENCEMENT

The meeting opened with Acknowledgement of Country and Prayer at 7.30 pm.

IN ATTENDANCE

The Mayor Councillor Mark Bennett, Deputy Mayor Councillor Jim Sanderson, Councillors Ben Collins, Elizabeth Krassoi, Justine McLaughlin, Zac Miles, and Ross Williams.

ALSO PRESENT

The General Manager Lisa Miscamble, the Director Development and Regulatory Services Steve Kourepis, the A/Director Corporate Governance, Barry Husking, the Director Service Delivery and Special Projects George El Kazzi, Christina Pass (Minutes) and Josh Zufferey (Audi-Video Recording).

APOLOGIES

No apologies were received.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Mayor called for Declarations of Interest without response.

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

264/19 RESOLVED on the motion of Clr Miles, seconded Clr Williams

That the Minutes of Ordinary Meeting No. 4472, 25 November 2019 be confirmed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECORD OF VOTING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Mark Bennett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Ben Collins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Elizabeth Krassoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Justine McLaughlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Zac Miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Ross Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Jim Sanderson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Motion to Move 4.1

MOVE ITEM

265/19 RESOLVED on the motion of Clr Sanderson, seconded Clr Krassoi

That at 07:33 pm Item 4.1 be brought forward to be discussed prior to Item 3.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECORD OF VOTING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Mark Bennett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Ben Collins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Elizabeth Krassoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Justine McLaughlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Zac Miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Ross Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Jim Sanderson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.1 LEGAL ADVICE ON NOTICE OF MOTION: ITEM 3.1

PROCEEDINGS IN BRIEF

Mr Joerg Schmidt-Lermann addressed Council on this matter.

266/19 RESOLVED on the motion of Clr Collins, seconded Clr Sanderson
That the report be received and noted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECORD OF VOTING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Mark Bennett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Ben Collins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Elizabeth Krassoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Justine McLaughlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Zac Miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Ross Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Jim Sanderson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTICES OF MOTION INCLUDING REVISION MOTIONS

3.1 MOTION TO RELEASE CONFIDENTIAL BUSINESS PAPERS

PROCEEDINGS IN BRIEF

Mr Russell Young (Supporter) addressed Council on this matter.

267/19 RESOLVED on the motion of Clr Miles, seconded Clr Collins
Move to extend time for Mr Young

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECORD OF VOTING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Mark Bennett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Ben Collins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Elizabeth Krassoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Justine McLaughlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Zac Miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Ross Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Jim Sanderson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MOVED on the motion of Clr Williams, seconded Clr Miles

That Hunter's Hill Council adopts a policy of:

1. Making future confidential business papers publicly available once the substantive matter has been decided, subject to legal advice; and

2. Releasing historic confidential business papers automatically after 5 years if requested by a member of the public, subject to legal advice, unless extended by motion of council.
MOVED on the motion of Clr Sanderson, seconded Clr Krassoi

To AMEND the above Motion, by replacing it as follows:

That Council:

1. Restates its commitment to upholding the guiding principle noted in s.8A(2)(e) of the Local Government Act 1993 which provides that “Council decision making should be transparent and decision-makers are to be accountable for decisions and omissions” (Transparency Principle); and

2. Continue to proactively release government information in a manner that is consistent with the Transparency Principle and in accordance with the applicable legislative framework regulating the disclosure of government information including, inter alia, the provisions of the Privacy and Personal Information Protection Act 1998 and the Government Information (Public Access) Act 2009.

MOVED on the motion of Clr Williams, seconded Clr Miles to move into open Council for discussion

Come iyr of Open Discussion

An AMENDMENT was MOVED on the motion of Clr McLaughlin

that the following words be included as point 1 to Clr Sanderson’s Amendment.

“1. That Hunter’s Hill Council proactively release confidential business papers in accordance with the applicable legal framework relating to the release of confidential information.”

The AMENDMENT was ACCEPTED by Clr Collins and Clr Miles

268/19 RESOLVED on the motion of Clr Collins, seconded Clr Miles

1. That Hunter’s Hill Council proactively release confidential business papers in accordance with the applicable legal framework relating to the release of confidential information.

2. Restates its commitment to upholding the guiding principle noted in s.8A(2)(e) of the Local Government Act 1993 which provides that “Council decision making should be transparent and decision-makers are to be accountable for decisions and omissions” (Transparency Principle); and

3. Continue to proactively release government information in a manner that is consistent with the Transparency Principle and in accordance with the applicable legislative framework regulating the disclosure of government information including, inter alia, the provisions of the Privacy and Personal Information Protection Act 1998 and the Government Information (Public Access) Act 2009.
CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

Minutes of the Ordinary Meeting held on 9 December 2019.

RECORD OF VOTING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Against</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clr Mark Bennett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Ben Collins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Elizabeth Krassoi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Justine McLaughlin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Zac Miles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Ross Williams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Jim Sanderson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COUNCIL REPORTS

4.2 IMPLEMENTATION OF LEGISLATION TO MANAGE BOAT TRAILER PARKING

269/19 RESOLVED on the motion of Clr Williams, seconded Clr Sanderson

1. That Council consults with its community and all neighbouring Councils regarding its intention to implement the policy.


RECORD OF VOTING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Against</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clr Mark Bennett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Ben Collins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Elizabeth Krassoi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Justine McLaughlin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Zac Miles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Ross Williams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Jim Sanderson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 QUARTERLY BUDGET REVIEW AS AT 30 SEPTEMBER 2019

270/19 RESOLVED on the motion of Clr Collins, seconded Clr Krassoi

1. That the report to be received and noted.

2. That variations to 2019/20 budget estimates as outlined in this report be adopted.

RECORD OF VOTING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Against</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clr Mark Bennett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Ben Collins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Elizabeth Krassoi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Justine McLaughlin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Zac Miles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Ross Williams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Jim Sanderson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is page 8
4.4 HUNTERS HILL, LANE COVE, PARRAMATTA, RYDE, BUSHFIRE RISK MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE - BUSHFIRE RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN - 5 YEAR PLAN

271/19 RESOLVED on the motion of Clr Krassoi, seconded Clr Williams

1. That Council endorse the draft BFRMP 2019/24 for the purpose of public exhibition and consultation be undertaken for a period of 42 days as outlined in the report and;

2. That a further report is submitted to Council following the exhibition period, to consider the final plan for adoption.

Clr Collins left the meeting at 08:46 pm.

RECORD OF VOTING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Against</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clr Mark Bennett</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Elizabeth Krassoi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Justine McLaughlin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Zac Miles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Ross Williams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Jim Sanderson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.5 DRAFT PURCHASING AND TENDERING POLICY

272/19 RESOLVED on the motion of Clr Krassoi, seconded Clr Miles

1. That Council adopt the draft Purchasing and Tendering Policy

Clr Collins returned to the meeting at 08:47 pm.

RECORD OF VOTING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Against</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clr Mark Bennett</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Ben Collins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Elizabeth Krassoi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Justine McLaughlin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Zac Miles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Ross Williams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Jim Sanderson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.6 ENTERPRISE RISK AND BUSINESS CONTINUITY MANAGEMENT

273/19 RESOLVED on the motion of Clr McLaughlin, seconded Clr Sanderson


RECORD OF VOTING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Against</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clr Mark Bennett</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Ben Collins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Elizabeth Krassoi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Justine McLaughlin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Zac Miles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Ross Williams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Jim Sanderson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.7 REPORT OF LEGAL MATTERS NOVEMBER 2019

MOVED on the motion of Clr McLaughlin, seconded Clr Krassoi
That the report be received and noted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECORD OF VOTING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Mark Bennett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Ben Collins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Elizabeth Krassoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Justine McLaughlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Zac Miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Ross Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Jim Sanderson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.8 DELEGATION TO MAYOR & GENERAL MANAGER DURING CHRISTMAS/NEW YEAR PERIOD.

274/19 RESOLVED on the motion of Clr Krassoi, seconded Clr Williams
1. That the Mayor and General Manager exercise Delegated Authority in accordance with the above criteria during the period 10 December 2019 to 9 February 2020.
2. That a report be brought forward to the first Ordinary Meeting in 2020, detailing matters dealt with under Delegated Authority during the recess period.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECORD OF VOTING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Mark Bennett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Ben Collins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Elizabeth Krassoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Justine McLaughlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Zac Miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Ross Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Jim Sanderson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.9 MINUTES OF THE HUNTERS HILL LOCAL TRAFFIC COMMITTEE MEETING HELD 26 NOVEMBER 2019

275/19 RESOLVED on the motion of Clr Krassoi, seconded Clr Williams
That the Minutes and the Recommendations of the Local Traffic Committee held on 26 November 2019 be adopted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECORD OF VOTING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Mark Bennett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Ben Collins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Elizabeth Krassoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Justine McLaughlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Zac Miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Ross Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Jim Sanderson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.10 COUNCILLOR BRIEFING: 23 SEPTEMBER 2019

276/19 RESOLVED on the motion of Cllr Krassoi, seconded Cllr Williams
That the report be received and noted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECORD OF VOTING</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Mark Bennett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Ben Collins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Elizabeth Krassoi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Justine McLaughlin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Zac Miles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Ross Williams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Jim Sanderson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Against</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Mark Bennett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Ben Collins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Elizabeth Krassoi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Justine McLaughlin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Zac Miles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Ross Williams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Jim Sanderson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.11 COUNCILLOR BRIEFING: 28 OCTOBER 2019

277/19 RESOLVED on the motion of Cllr Williams, seconded Cllr Krassoi
That the report be received and noted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECORD OF VOTING</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Mark Bennett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Ben Collins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Elizabeth Krassoi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Justine McLaughlin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Zac Miles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Ross Williams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Jim Sanderson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Against</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Mark Bennett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Ben Collins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Elizabeth Krassoi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Justine McLaughlin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Zac Miles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Ross Williams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Jim Sanderson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.12 COUNCILLOR BRIEFING: 18 NOVEMBER

278/19 RESOLVED on the motion of Cllr Krassoi, seconded Cllr Williams
That the report be received and noted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECORD OF VOTING</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Mark Bennett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Ben Collins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Elizabeth Krassoi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Justine McLaughlin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Zac Miles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Ross Williams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Jim Sanderson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Against</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Mark Bennett</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Ben Collins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Elizabeth Krassoi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Justine McLaughlin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Zac Miles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Ross Williams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Jim Sanderson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.13 COUNCILLOR BRIEFING: 25 NOVEMBER 2019

RESOLVED on the motion of Clr Krassoi, seconded Clr Williams
That the report be received and noted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECORD OF VOTING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Mark Bennett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Ben Collins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Elizabeth Krassoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Justine McLaughlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Zac Miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Ross Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Jim Sanderson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.14 MINUTES OF THE ACCESS, INCLUSION & SENIORS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING HELD 1 JULY 2019

RESOLVED on the motion of Clr Krassoi, seconded Clr Williams
That the report be received and noted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECORD OF VOTING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Mark Bennett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Ben Collins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Elizabeth Krassoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Justine McLaughlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Zac Miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Ross Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Jim Sanderson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.15 MINUTES OF THE ACCESS INCLUSION AND SENIORS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING HELD 18 NOVEMBER 2019

RESOLVED on the motion of Clr Krassoi, seconded Clr Sanderson
That the report be received and noted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECORD OF VOTING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Mark Bennett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Ben Collins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Elizabeth Krassoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Justine McLaughlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Zac Miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Ross Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Jim Sanderson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.16 MINUTES OF THE HUNTERS HILL PUBLIC ART COMMITTEE MEETING HELD 7 NOVEMBER 2019

282/19 RESOLVED on the motion of Clr Williams, seconded Clr Miles
That the report be received and noted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECORD OF VOTING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Mark Bennett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Ben Collins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Elizabeth Krassoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Justine McLaughlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Zac Miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Ross Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Jim Sanderson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.17 MINUTES OF THE HUNTERS HILL ART EXHIBITION ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING HELD 26 NOVEMBER 2018

283/19 RESOLVED on the motion of Clr Collins, seconded Clr McLaughlin
That the report be received and noted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECORD OF VOTING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Mark Bennett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Ben Collins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Elizabeth Krassoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Justine McLaughlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Zac Miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Ross Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Jim Sanderson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

QUESTIONS WITH OR WITHOUT NOTICE

CONCLUSION

The meeting concluded at 9.05pm.

I confirm that these Minutes are a true and accurate record of Ordinary Meeting No. 4473 held on 9 December 2019.

.......................................................... .................................
Councillor Mark Bennett               Lisa Miscamble
MAYOR                            GENERAL MANAGER
CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

COMMENCEMENT

The meeting opened with Acknowledgement of Country and Prayer at 7.00pm.

IN ATTENDANCE

The Mayor Councillor Mark Bennett, Deputy Mayor Councillor Jim Sanderson, Councillors Ben Collins, Elizabeth Krassoi, Justine McLaughlin, Zac Miles, and Ross Williams.

ALSO PRESENT

The General Manager Lisa Miscamble, the Director Development and Regulatory Services Steve Kourepis, the A/Director Corporate Services, Barry Husking, the Director Service Delivery and Special Projects George El Kazzi, Christina Pass (Minutes) and Josh Zufferey (Audi-Video Recording & web upload).

APOLOGIES

No apologies were received.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Sanderson declared a non-pecuniary, non-significant interest in Item 1.6 the interest being in relation to the Development Applications determined by the Development Control Unit in November 2019.

Councillor Miles declared a non-pecuniary, non-significant interest in Item 1.4 the interest being in relation to the Development Applications determined under delegated authority November 2019.

1. COUNCIL REPORTS

1.1 DRAFT HUNTERS HILL LOCAL INFRASTRUCTURE CONTRIBUTION PAN 2020 - POST EXHIBITION AND ADOPT

284/19

RESOLVED on the motion of Clr Williams, seconded Clr Krassoi

A MOTION was moved by Clr Ross Williams seconded by Clr Elizabeth Krassoi that:

RECOMMENDATION

That Council adopts the Hunters Hill Local Infrastructure Contribution Plan 2020, in accordance with the requirements of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2000 and that the following actions are undertaken:

(a) Amendment No 1 being the update of forms in Schedule 3 and Schedule 4 and Amendment No 2 being the update of the operational Year 1 in the Work Schedule of the draft Hunters Hill Local Infrastructure Contribution Plan 2020 outlined in the body of the report and

(b) Publicly notify its decision on the Hunters Hill Local Infrastructure Contribution Plan 2020 in a local paper within 28 days of the decision on the plan, and
CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

24 February 2020

(c) Note that the Hunters Hill Local Infrastructure Contribution Plan 2020 does not come into effect until the date of the public notice, and

(d) Post Hunters Hill Local Infrastructure Contribution Plan to the NSW Planning Portal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECORD OF VOTING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Mark Bennett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Ben Collins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Elizabeth Krassoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Justine McLaughlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Zac Miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Ross Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Jim Sanderson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2 USE OF GLYPHOSATE AT HUNTER’S HILL COUNCIL

285/19 RESOLVED on the motion of Clr Krassoi, seconded Clr Williams

A MOTION was moved by Clr Elizabeth Krassoi seconded by Clr Ross Williams that:

RECOMMENDATION

1. That the report be received and noted.
2. That the Fact Sheet heading be changed to read: “Hunters Hill Council’s use of herbicides”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECORD OF VOTING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Mark Bennett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Ben Collins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Elizabeth Krassoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Justine McLaughlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Zac Miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Ross Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Jim Sanderson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3 DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS DETERMINED BY THE LOCAL PLANNING PANEL IN NOVEMBER 2019

286/19 RESOLVED on the motion of Clr Williams, seconded Clr Krassoi

A MOTION was moved by Clr Ross Williams seconded by Clr Elizabeth Krassoi that:

RECOMMENDATION

That the report be received and noted.
CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES  
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECORD OF VOTING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Mark Bennett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Ben Collins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Elizabeth Krassoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Justine McLaughlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Zac Miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Ross Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Jim Sanderson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clr ZM Miles left the meeting at 19:12 pm.

1.4 DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS DETERMINED UNDER DELEGATED AUTHORITY NOVEMBER 2019

287/19 RESOLVED on the motion of Clr Krassoi, seconded Clr Sanderson

A MOTION was moved by Clr Elizabeth Krassoi seconded by Clr Jim Sanderson that:

RECOMMENDATION
That the report be received and noted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECORD OF VOTING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Mark Bennett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Ben Collins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Elizabeth Krassoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Justine McLaughlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Zac Miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Ross Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Jim Sanderson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clr ZM Miles returned to the meeting at 19:14 pm.

1.5 MINUTES OF THE HUNTERS HILL VILLAGE MAIN STREET COMMITTEE MEETING HELD 27 NOVEMBER 2019

288/19 RESOLVED on the motion of Clr Krassoi, seconded Clr Williams

A MOTION was moved by Clr Elizabeth Krassoi seconded by Clr Ross Williams that:

RECOMMENDATION
1. That the Minutes of the Hunters Hill Village Main Street Committee Meeting held on 27 November 2019 be received and noted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECORD OF VOTING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Yes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Mark Bennett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Ben Collins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Elizabeth Krassoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Justine McLaughlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Zac Miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Ross Williams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Jim Sanderson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cir JS Sanderson left the meeting at 19:16 pm.

1.6 DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS DETERMINED BY THE DEVELOPMENT CONTROL UNIT IN NOVEMBER 2019

289/19 RESOLVED on the motion of Cir Krassoi, seconded Cir Williams

A MOTION was moved by Cir Elizabeth Krassoi seconded by Cir Ross Williams that:

RECOMMENDATION
That the report be received and noted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECORD OF VOTING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cir Mark Bennett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cir Ben Collins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cir Elizabeth Krassoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cir Justine McLaughlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cir Zac Miles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cir Ross Williams</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cir JS Sanderson returned to the meeting at 19:18 pm.

2. QUESTIONS WITH OR WITHOUT NOTICE

2.1 NEW YEAR’S EVE FIREWORKS

Cir Elizabeth Krassoi asked the following question without notice:

Would Council please bring a report on New Year’s Eve expenditure including safety practice by neighbouring Councils and strategies to recoup clean up and management costs.

2.2 HERITAGE REPORT – 10 COWELL STREET

Cir Zac Miles asked the following question without notice:

In Ordinary meeting held on 9 December 2019, a speaker to Item 3.1 – Release of Confidential Business Papers, Mr Russell Young, sought the release of the Heritage Report related to the recommended Heritage Listing of No. 10 Cowell Street prior to its sale to MOCH Pty Ltd in 2012. Can Council ensure that this report is provided to Mr Young as per the passed motion as soon as possible.

2.3 WOOLWICH BATHS OPENING HOURS

Cir Justine McLaughlin asked the following question without notice:

On behalf of a resident, that Council please advise whether the Woolwich Baths are being locked at the stated time of 5pm each day. If not, could Council please ensure that over the summer months, commencing ASAP that the baths are locked each evening to discourage anti-social behaviour. There has been a rise in such behaviour over the last few summers and it is impacting on the amenity of the surrounding residents.
COUNCIL IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

RECOMMENDATION

1. THAT pursuant to Section 10A subsections 2 & 3 and Section 10B of the Local Government Act, 1993 (as amended) the following items on the agenda for the Ordinary Council meeting be dealt with in Committee of the Whole for the reasons specified below:

2. The press and public be excluded from the proceedings of the Council in Closed Session on the basis that these items are considered to be of a confidential nature.

2.1 Tenders for the provision of Legal Services
Item 2.1 is confidential in accordance with s10A(2)(d)i of the Local Government Act because it contains commercial information of a confidential nature that would, if disclosed prejudice the commercial position of the person who supplied it.

2.2 Mayoral Minute: Review of General Manager’s Performance
Item 2.2 is confidential in accordance with s10A(2)(a) of the Local Government Act because it contains personnel matters concerning particular individuals (other than councillors).

3. That the Minutes and Business Papers including any reports, correspondence, documentation or information relating to such matter be treated as confidential and be withheld from access by the press and public, until such time as the Council resolves that the reason for confidentiality has passes or become irrelevant.

REPORT OF COUNCIL IN COMMITTEE

The Mayor advised that during closed session, 2 RESOLUTIONS were passed.

PRESENT

The Mayor Councillor Mark Bennett, Deputy Mayor Councillor Jim Sanderson, Councillors Ben Collins, Elizabeth Krassoi, Justine McLaughlin, Zac Miles, and Ross Williams.

OPEN COUNCIL RESUMED

291/19 RESOLVED on the motion of Clr Miles, seconded Clr McLaughlin

A MOTION was moved by Clr Zac Miles seconded by Clr Justine McLaughlin that:

RECOMMENDATION
That at 20:01 the meeting resume in Open Council and the gallery be invited back into the Chamber.
RECORD OF VOTING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Against</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clr Mark Bennett</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Ben Collins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Elizabeth Krassoi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Justine McLaughlin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Zac Miles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Ross Williams</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clr Jim Sanderson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL

292/19  RESOLVED on the motion of Clr Miles, seconded Clr Collins
1. That Item 2.1 Tenders for the Provision of Legal Services report be received and noted;
2. That the following firms be appointed to Council’s Legal Services Panel for three (3) years from the date of contract commencement and in accordance with the tender submissions:
   • Hall & Wilcox;
   • HWL Ebsworth
   • Lindsay Taylor Lawyers
   • Marsden’s Law Group
   • Schmidt-Liermann Lawyers;
3. That Schmidt-Liermann Lawyers be appointed as Council’s in-house legal services provider for three (3) years from the date of contract commencement; and
4. That all tenderers be advised of the outcome and be thanked for their interest in participating in Council’s tender for provision of legal services.

293/19  RESOLVED on the motion of Clr Miles, seconded Clr Collins
1. That the report be received and noted;
2. That Council endorse the excellent level of performance achieved by the General Manager, Lisa Miscamble, in her performance review for 2018-19;
3. That the General Manager’s remuneration for 2019-20 be as determined in Closed Session; and

CONCLUSION

The meeting concluded at 8:03.

I confirm that these Minutes are a true and accurate record of Extraordinary Meeting No. 4474 held on 16 December 2019.

.................................................................
Councillor Mark Bennett
MAYOR

.................................................................
Lisa Miscamble
GENERAL MANAGER
ITEM NO : 2.1

SUBJECT : NSW BUSHFIRE CRISIS AND DROUGHT APPEAL

STRATEGIC OUTCOME : COUNCIL COLLABORATES WITH OTHER AGENCIES AND ALL LEVELS OF GOVERNMENT

ACTION : COUNCIL ADVOCATES FOR THE COMMUNITY IN RESPONDING TO LOCAL AND REGIONAL ISSUES

REPORTING OFFICER : MARK BENNETT

RECOMMENDATION
That the report be received and noted.

REPORT

Our year starts on a solemn note with the devastation caused by fire and drought front of mind for all Australians. It has been a tragedy of a scale that we have not witnessed before and it has resulted in the loss of lives and a long lasting impact, on people's sense of safety and well-being.

Our thoughts are with those whose lives have been changed forever.

In the months preceding December the focus was on the north coast of NSW as well as other areas impacted. In response to this Hunter’s Hill Council organised for funds to be donated through the Buy a Bale initiative, raising to date $4,884.10. Hunters Hill Council has a friendship pact with Richmond Valley and we offered to support them with a drive for non-perishable food items and toys to be delivered to families in the Richmond Valley area who had been impacted on by the fires.

As we know, bushfires not only have a physical impact but also a social and emotional impact.

To offer support to the children of Richmond Valley, local school children at Hunter’s Hill Primary School with the support of the new Principal Kim Dudgeon, wrote letters to children in Rappville and Leeville. These letters express support and were delivered by the Mayor of Richmond Valley, Robert Mustow to children in the area. Late December letters were received from the children of the Rappville and Leeville Schools to the children of Hunters Hill Public School, thanking them for their support.

NSW Bushfire Crisis

Over the Christmas / New Year period NSW continued to be ravaged by bushfires with devastating impacts along the south coast and inland at an unprecedented scale.

In response to this the NSW Government has requested that the Office of Local Government (OLG) be the State coordinating agency between affected local councils seeking assistance and councils who have the capacity to assist. OLG has teamed up with the City of Sydney, Sydney Resilience Office and Local Government NSW to provide a disaster recovery council resource co-ordination service to assist councils impacted by the bushfire crisis.
NSW Government websites are also offering recovery information, information fact sheets and updates please visit the following useful sites via:


A Recovery Office has been established, coordinated by the City of Sydney, in conjunction with the NSW OLG and NSW Office of Emergency Management.

The City of Sydney has seconded two full time staff and a number of subject experts including legal and work health and safety to assist. The first phase of this work is focussed on collating a database of who can do what, and preparing information for councils regarding how to prepare secondments who may need to travel to affected communities. The Office of Emergency Management will liaise with affected Councils to understand their needs.

At the two Metropolitan Mayors meetings the scale and extent of the recovery effort has become apparent. There are impacts on local communities, vital infrastructure, local economies and native flora and fauna.

A number of bushfire affected local government areas including Wollondilly, Wingecarribee, Shoalhaven, Eurobodalla and Bega Valley have advised they are no longer able to take any more donations of physical goods and would encourage people instead to contribute financially or to volunteer their time.

A new website has been established to co-ordinate and manage donations to bushfire-hit communities via GIVIT. The NSW local government Minister Shelley Hancock said the state’s 128 councils would have access to the national not-for-profit organisation, which will act as ‘virtual warehouse’ and coordinate the distribution of goods and services to those in need. The NSW Government has provided funding for all NSW councils and their local charities to access GIVIT.

GIVIT records public and corporate pledges of support and works with councils to match donations to recipients. The service also includes an online hub linking residents seeking assistance to local support services and money donated is used to buy from local businesses.

There is a need for financial support in the short term to assist individuals impacted to re-establish and rebuild in their communities; there is a need to provide food and care for native animals as well as support local economic development in affected communities.

Hunters Hill’s greatest asset is its community and as such we will be co-ordinating a number of community initiatives to support those communities and areas who have been impacted on by these bushfires.

We have:

- Created a link via our website where our communities can donate directly through [http://www.givit.org.au/](http://www.givit.org.au/)
- Organised a community working bee in Town Hall to support WIRES’ need for pouches and nests for animals whose homes have been destroyed in the bushfires.

ATTACHMENTS

1. District Northern Times Article - Letter exchange with bushfire hit communities
PRIMARY school students have returned to school eager to read handwritten letters from bushfire-affected communities in a beautiful letter exchange aimed to support each other.

The initiative was done in partnership between Hunters Hill Public School and Hunters Hill Council and schools in the municipality’s sister city, Richmond Valley Council. Just before the Christmas break, Hunters Hill students from kindergarten to Year 6 wrote letters to Rupanyup and Leeville public schools – an area that lost about 50 homes.

And last week, Hunters Hill Public School students received replies to their letters. Year 5 student Savannah was excited to receive a letter pack.

“I feel really happy that they actually wrote back. They appreciated what we wrote,” Savannah said.

She said the letter talked about the student’s family and how they were going during the bushfires and drought.

Hunters Hill Mayor Mark Bennett thanked the students for their contribution.

“(The Richmond Valley students) know someone outside their area thinks about them and cares about them,” Cr Bennett said.
**ITEM NO**: 2.2  

**SUBJECT**: HUNTER’S HILL RESIDENTS RECOGNISED IN THE AUSTRALIA DAY HONOURS ROLL 2020  

**STRATEGIC OUTCOME**: COUNCIL BUILDS SOCIAL NETWORKS AND COHESION  

**ACTION**: SUPPORT AWARDS AND INITIATIVES THAT PROMOTE THE CONTRIBUTION MADE BY VOLUNTEERS TO COMMUNITY LIFE  

**REPORTING OFFICER**: CLR MARK BENNETT

---

**RECOMMENDATION**

1. That the report be received and noted.

**REPORT**

On 26 January 2020, the Governor-General and Chancellor of the Order of Australia, His Excellency General the Honourable David Hurley AC DSC (Retd), announced 1,099 awards in the 2020 Australia Day Honours List.

Honoured under the medal (OAM) of the Order of Australia in the general division were two of our local residents and our previous General Manager:

**Mr Peter Maniscalco OAM**

Has been honoured for service to the Italian community of Hunters Hill. He is the current president of the Saint. Antonio da Padova Protettore di Poggioreale Trapani Association since 2003 and when president from 1986 - 1995 helped co-found the Saint. Antonio da Padova Nursing Home. His contributions have also been recognised by Honourable Gladys Berejiklian MP in 2017 with a Certificate of Appreciation from the Premier of New South Wales and a North Sydney Community Award from The Honourable Joe Hockey MP in 2013.

**Dr Samiul Joseph Sorrenti OAM**

For service to orthopaedic and sports medicine especially the contribution to the Parramatta Eels Rugby Club, Marconi Soccer Club, North Sydney Rugby League Football Club and the Italian Rugby League. Internationally Dr Sorrenti is associated with the European Society of Sports Traumatology, Knee Surgery and Arthroscopy; the American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons and St John's Orphanage Tanzania.

**Mr Barry Smith OAM**

For service to local government, and to the community of Hunters Hill especially in his role as General Manager of Hunter’s Hill Council which he held for 22 years.
A local resident was also recognised as a Member (AM) in the General Division of the Order of Australia:

Ms Catherine Inglis

Catherine has been recognised for significant service to the building and construction industry especially through her role as General Manager in leading the Technical and Innovation and Specialised Building Systems for Brickworks Ltd and the National Director of the Housing Industry Association.

We congratulate all these recipients and thank them for their contributions to our community.

Letters of congratulations were sent on the 31 January 2020 to the OAM recipients on behalf of Council and the Municipality of Hunters Hill.

ATTACHMENTS
1. Local Recipients on the Australia Day 2020 Honour Roll
The following Biographical notes were published on the Governor General’s website (https://www.gg.gov.au/australian-honours-and-awardsaustralian-honours-lists/australia-day-2020-honours-list):

**MEDAL (OAM) OF THE ORDER OF AUSTRALIA IN THE GENERAL DIVISION**

**Mr Peter Maniscalco:** For service to the Italian community of Hunters Hill.

Italian Community
S. Antonio da Padova Protettore di Poggioreale Trapani Association

Italian community
- Member, CO. AS. IT. (Italian Association of Assistance), current.
- Life Member, Associazione Cavalieri di San Silvestro (Knights of St Sylvester, Italy), since 2013.

Rotary Club of Hunters Hill
- President, 2012-2015.
- Director, New Generations, current.
- Member, since 2009.
- Paul Harris Fellow, 2018.

NSW State Government
- Member of Trade and Commerce Sub-Committee, 2012.
- Deputy Chair, Health and Age Care Sub-Committee, 2012.
- Member, Italian Community Ministerial Consultative Committee, 2012.

Artistic Stone Australia
- Founder and Chief Executive Officer, since 1993.

Awards and recognition include:
- Recipient, North Sydney Community Award, by The Honourable Joe Hockey MP, 2013.
- Recipient, Medal from Co.As.It, ‘for outstanding or meritorious contribution, service, promotion, or assistance to the Italian community in NSW’, 2008.
- Recipient, Award from Com.It.Es. (Italian Abroad Committee), ‘for service to the community’, 2008.
- Recipient, Australia Day Award, ‘for service to the community’, 1998.
- Appointed, Cavaliere, Ordine della Stella d'Italia (Knight, Order of the Star of Italy), since 2017.
- Honorary Citizen, City of Poggioreale, Sicily, Italy, 2017.
- Honorary Doctorate, The Tiberine Academy, Rome, Italy, 2017

**Dr Samiul Joseph Sorrenti:** For service to orthopaedic and sports medicine.

Medical
- Orthopaedic Surgeon, since 1986.
- Member, Australian Academy of Medicine and Surgery, current.
- Member, International Society of Arthroscopy, Knee Surgery and Orthopaedic Sports Medicine, current.
- Member, American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons, current.
• Consultant Orthopaedic Surgeon, Parramatta Eels Football Team, 2010.
• Member, European Society of Sports Traumatology, Knee Surgery and Arthroscopy, since 2002.
• Member, Australian Association of Orthopaedic Surgeons, since 1997.
• Consultant Orthopaedic Surgeon, Western Reds Football Team, 1994.

Australian Orthopaedic Association
• Fellow, since 1988.
• Associate, 1985-1988.

Marconi Soccer Club
• Consultant Physician, since 1989.
• Orthopaedic Surgeon, since 1989.

North Sydney Rugby League Football Club
• Life Member, since 1998.

Italian Rugby League
• President, 2002-2014.

International Relations
• Volunteer, St John's Orphanage, Iringa (Tanzania), current.
• Volunteer, St James High School, Iringa (Tanzania), current.

Order Saint John of Jerusalem
• Deputy Grand Prior Order Saint John of Jerusalem (Knight of Malta), 2016.
• Order Saint John of Jerusalem (Knights of Malta), 2010.
• Order Star Solidary of Italy, 2009.

We also wish to congratulate our previous General Manager Barry Smith who was recognised for his 22 years of service at Hunter's Council

Mr Barry Ronald Smith: For service to local government, and to the community of Hunters Hill.

Local Government
Hunters Hill Council:
• General Manager, 1996-2018.

Local Government Professionals Australia NSW:
• President, 2014-2018.
• Board Member, 2008-2014.
• Fellow, current.
• Member, since 1985.

Local Government Professionals Australia:
• Board Member, 2013-2018.

Other:
• Member, Ministerial Advisory Group on Local Government Reform, since 2015.
• Member, Sydney Harbour Councils Working Party, 1999-2012.
• Chairman, General Managers Advisory Committee, Northern Sydney Regional Organisation of Councils (NSROC), 1999-2011.
• Director of Corporate Services, Administration Manager, Financial Accountant, Baulkham Hills Council, 1987-1996.
• Sector Insurance and Risk Management:
• Board Member, CivicRisk Mutual, 2015-2018.
• Foundation Member and Director, StateCover Mutual, 2001-2018.
• Executive Member, United Independent Pools, 2008-2016.
• Executive Member, Metro Pool, 1994-2016.

Community
• Director and Treasurer, GROW (Growing Regional Opportunities for Work),
• Consultative Committee for the Sydney Region, 1996-2009.
• Chairman, Northern Sydney GROW subcommittee, 1998-2009.
• Life Member, Hawkesbury District Cricket Association, 1986.
• Foundation Member and Vice-President, Hawkesbury Grade Cricket Club, 1985-1988.
• Parish Councillor and Church Warden, St Matthew’s Anglican Church, Windsor, 2006-
  2011.

Awards and recognition include:
• Recipient, Hunters Hill Rotary Pride of Workmanship Award.
• Paul Harris Fellow, Rotary, 2018.

MEMBER (AM) IN THE GENERAL DIVISION OF THE ORDER OF AUSTRALIA.

Ms Catherine Mary INGLIS, NSW
For significant service to the building and construction industry.

Brickworks Limited
• General Manager, Technical and Innovation, since 2017.

Housing Industry Association
• National Director, since 2017.
• Chair, National Technical Services Committee, 2012-2014.
• Member, National Policy Congress, current.
• Member, Regional Executive Committee, since 2006.
• Member, since 2002.

New South Wales Branch:
• Vice-President, 2013-2015.
• Chair, NSW Technical Committee, 2012-2013 and 2006-2008.

Standards Australia
• Member, Prefabricated Concrete Elements, current.
• Member, Autoclaved Aerated Concrete, current.
• Other
• Chairperson, Think Brick Technical Committee, 1999-2014.
• Past Member, Built Environment Industry Innovation Council.
• Past Board Member, National Precast Concrete Association of Australia.

Australian Ceramic Society
• Past Federal President.
• Past Federal Councillor.
• Past President, NSW Branch.
• Member, over 25 years.

Awards and recognition include:
• Biennial Australian Ceramic Award, Australian Ceramic Society, 2016.
• Honorary Member, Building Designers Association Australia, 2007.
ITEM NO : 2.3

SUBJECT : POSTPONEMENT OF THE ORDINARY MEETING 10 FEBURARY 2020

STRATEGIC OUTCOME : COUNCIL IS RECOGNISED AND RESPECTED AS AN OPEN AND TRANSPARENT ORGANISATION

ACTION : COUNCIL AND COUNCILLORS ABIDE BY THE CODE OF CONDUCT, CODE OF MEETING PRACTICE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT

REPORTING OFFICER : MARK BENNETT

Ref:446800

RECOMMENDATION
That the report be received and noted.

REPORT
Due to the severe storms experienced over the weekend of 8 – 9 February, a significant area of Hunters Hill Municipality experienced power outages, which continued through Monday 10 and Tuesday 11 February. These power outages were also experienced across the broader Sydney metropolitan area.

As a result of the impact on the local area the meeting scheduled for 10 February was cancelled. The reports that were due to be considered at the meeting scheduled for 10 February have been carried over to the 24 February Council meeting agenda.

ATTACHMENTS
There are no attachments to this report.
**NOTICES OF MOTION INCLUDING RESCISSION MOTIONS**  
24 February 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NO</th>
<th>:</th>
<th>3.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUBJECT</td>
<td>:</td>
<td>MOTION TO ENSURE TRANSPARENCY IN PRESS COMMUNICATIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRATEGIC OUTCOME</td>
<td>:</td>
<td>COUNCIL IS RECOGNISED AND RESPECTED AS AN OPEN AND TRANSPARENT ORGANISATION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTION</td>
<td>:</td>
<td>ENGAGE OUR COMMUNITY IN CONVERSATION AND PROVIDE TIMELY AND ACCURATE INFORMATION INCLUDING MAXIMISING SOCIAL MEDIA, ADVERTISING, PRINT AND FACE-TO-FACE ENGAGEMENT OPTIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPORTING OFFICER</td>
<td>:</td>
<td>BEN COLLINS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ref: 446159

We the undersigned Councillors wish to move the following Notice of Motion at Ordinary Meeting 4475 on 24 February 2020:

Clr Ben Collins  
Clr Zac Miles

**RECOMMENDATION**

1. That Council make all future press releases available on the Hunters Hill Council website exactly as issued; and

2. That Councillors are notified when a new press release is issued.

**ATTACHMENTS**

There are no attachments to this report.
ITEM NO : 3.2

SUBJECT : MOTION TO IMPROVE SCHEDULE OF WORKS COMMUNICATION

STRATEGIC OUTCOME : COUNCIL IS RECOGNISED AND RESPECTED AS AN OPEN AND TRANSPARENT ORGANISATION

ACTION : ENGAGE OUR COMMUNITY IN CONVERSATION AND PROVIDE TIMELY AND ACCURATE INFORMATION INCLUDING MAXIMISING SOCIAL MEDIA, ADVERTISING, PRINT AND FACE-TO-FACE ENGAGEMENT OPTIONS

REPORTING OFFICER : CLR ZAC MILES

Ref:446147

We the undersigned Councillors wish to move the following Notice of Motion at Ordinary Meeting 4475 on 24 February 2020:

Clr Zac Miles
Clr Ben Collins

RECOMMENDATION

1. That Council develops an interactive and searchable Schedule of Works to be made publically available on the Hunter’s Hill Council Website.

ATTACHMENTS

There are no attachments to this report.
ITEM NO : 3.3

SUBJECT : MOTION TO REVIEW HUNTERS HILL PUBLIC SCHOOL DROP OFF ZONES

STRATEGIC OUTCOME : ROAD CONGESTION AND TRAFFIC SAFETY IS IMPROVED

ACTION : REVIEW TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT PLANS TO IDENTIFY AREAS THAT REQUIRE INTERVENTION (E.G. TRAFFIC CALMING)

REPORTING OFFICER : BEN COLLINS

Ref: 446150

We the undersigned Councillors wish to move the following Notice of Motion at Ordinary Meeting 4475 on 24 February 2020:

Clr Ben Collins
Clr Zac Miles

RECOMMENDATION

1. That Council engage a traffic consultant to review the drop off zones at Hunters Hill Public School;

2. That Council investigate the installation of a roundabout at the intersection of Mount Street, Alexandra Street and the Avenue; and

3. That Council bring back a report to Council identifying options to improve safety and traffic flow.

ATTACHMENTS

There are no attachments to this report.
ITEM NO : 3.4

SUBJECT : MOTION TO MAINTAIN A ROLL OF BUSINESS VOTERS

STRATEGIC OUTCOME : THE COMMUNITY IS INFORMED AND INVOLVED IN DECISIONS

ACTION : INCREASE ENGAGEMENT THROUGH SOCIAL MEDIA PLATFORMS AND COUNCIL'S WEBSITE

REPORTING OFFICER : CLR ZAC MILES

Ref: 446152

We the undersigned Councillors wish to move the following Notice of Motion at Ordinary Meeting 4475 on 24 February 2020:

Clr Zac Miles

Clr Ben Collins

RECOMMENDATION

1. That Council establish and maintain a roll of Business electors eligible under s266(b) and (c) of the Local Government Act 1993;

2. That Council engage with the business community, encouraging them to enrol to vote in local government elections through a targeted newsletters, direct mail, council’s TWT column and information sessions; and

3. That Council send the New South Wales Electoral Commission (NSWEC) enrolment forms to all rateable businesses in the Municipality.

ATTACHMENTS

There are no attachments to this report.
We the undersigned Councillors wish to move the following Notice of Motion at Ordinary Meeting 4475 on 24 February 2020:

Clr Zac Miles  
Clr Ben Collins

RECOMMENDATION

1. That Council write to organisations involved in the recovery efforts of the koala population following the devastating bushfire season to offer our support;

2. That Council investigate where appropriate vegetation from Hunters Hill may be of use to shelters who need to feed koalas who are being treated; and

3. That Council investigate adopting koalas from shelters that are currently caring for wounded animals.

ATTACHMENTS

There are no attachments to this report.
ITEM NO : 3.6

SUBJECT : MOTION IN RELATION TO A STATE OF CLIMATE EMERGENCY

STRATEGIC OUTCOME : COUNCIL VALIDATES THE BENEFITS OF SUSTAINABLE LIVING AND SUPPORTS ADVANCED APPROACHES TO RESOURCE RECOVERY

ACTION : CREATE STRONG PARTNERSHIPS WITH OUR COMMUNITY TO SUPPORT INNOVATIVE ATTITUDES TO SUSTAINABLE LIFESTYLES, WASTE MINIMISATION AND INCREASE REUSE AND RECYCLING OPPORTUNITIES

REPORTING OFFICER : JUSTINE MCLAUGHLIN

For several decades Hunters Hill Council has shown purpose and leadership on sustainability and environmental issues.

In light of the recent devastating bushfire season, the ongoing drought and a nationwide call for a greater response to our changing climate.

We the undersigned Councillors wish to move the following Notice of Motion at Ordinary Meeting 4475 on 24 February 2020:

Clr Justine McLaughlin            Clr Elizabeth Krassoi

RECOMMENDATION

1. That Council acknowledges that we are in a state of climate emergency that requires urgent action by all levels of government; that human induced climate change represents one of the greatest threats to humanity, civilisation and other species; and that it is still possible to prevent the most catastrophic outcomes if societies and communities, including local councils, take action to reduce our impact on our environment;

2. That Council acknowledges that every community, no matter how small, has a role to play in reducing the impact of climate change on our built and natural environment and ecosystems; and that we work towards adapting our existing policies and practices where necessary to address more efficient water, energy, waste, use as well as anticipate carbon sequestration and urban heat mitigation practices;

3. That Council continues to build on its strategic commitment to sustainability by consideration and implementation of sustainable principles in all future aspects of our operations and service delivery, and by working towards ensuring that such principles are embedded into our long term strategic plans, our LEP, DCP and our quadruple bottom line;

4. That a report be brought back to Council presenting realistic, attainable goals to demonstrate practices that work towards the above principles as soon as practicable; and
5. That Council continue to collaborate and partner with State and Federal government, LGNSW, NSROC and other relevant agencies on innovation and initiatives that improve our organisational sustainability and that address environmental and climate issues in our wider community.

ATTACHMENTS

There are no attachments to this report.
ITEM NO : 3.7

SUBJECT : MOTION TO REPORT ON UPDATE OF DELIVERY OF PEDESTRIAN CROSSING AT THE CORNER OF MARK AND MARY STREET

STRATEGIC OUTCOME : FOOTPATHS ARE ACCESSIBLE, SAFE AND CONNECTED

ACTION : COUNCIL PLANS, DESIGNS, CONSTRUCTS AND MAINTAINS ACCESSIBLE, SAFE, AND HIGH QUALITY INFRASTRUCTURE (ASSET MANAGEMENT PLAN AND PAMP)

REPORTING OFFICER : BEN COLLINS

<<Insert background text if required>>

We the undersigned Councillors wish to move the following Notice of Motion at Ordinary Meeting 4475 on 24 February 2020:

Clr Ben Collins  Clr Zac Miles

RECOMMENDATION
1. That a report be provided to Council Meeting scheduled for 9 March 2020 to provide an update on the delivery of the pedestrian crossing on the corner of Mark and Mary Street as recommended by the Local Area Traffic Committee on 19 September 2019.

2. That this report provide details of costings, identify sources of funding and a program for the delivery of the pedestrian crossing.

ATTACHMENTS
There are no attachments to this report.
We the undersigned Councillors wish to move the following Notice of Motion at Ordinary Meeting 4475 on 24 February 2020:

Cllr Elizabeth Krassoi  
Cllr Justine McLaughlin

RECOMMENDATION

1. That Council seek grant support to provide a one off, kerbside green waste clean up as soon as practicable, promoting this through local network groups, bushcare and community group networks; and

2. That Council seek grant support to conduct a risk reduction program and a review of green waste collection schedules and sizes for residents in those areas referring to the risk mitigation assessment of heavily wooded areas of our Municipality including those areas identified in the current Bushfire Management Plan.

ATTACHMENTS

There are no attachments to this report.
ITEM NO : 3.9

SUBJECT : MOTION TO AUDIT TREE CANOPY SAFETY IN HUNTERS HILL

STRATEGIC OUTCOME : HUNTERS HILL MUNICIPALITY IS A PLACE WHERE PEOPLE FEEL SAFE

ACTION : INFORM RESIDENTS ABOUT COMMUNITY SAFETY AND ENCOURAGE RESIDENTS TO REPORT ANY SAFETY ISSUES

REPORTING OFFICER : ZAC MILES

Ref: 447621

We the undersigned Councillors wish to move the following Notice of Motion at Ordinary Meeting 4475 on 24 February 2020:

Clr Zac Miles
Clr Ben Collins

RECOMMENDATION

1. That Council undertake an independent audit of the safety of the tree canopy in Hunters Hill with a view to mitigating the significant damage experienced in the wake of major storm events - as seen in recent weeks;

2. That Council focus the audit particularly in areas of high pedestrian traffic, infrastructure and key access points;

3. That Council assess the recommendations from the final audit for implementation to improve the management of our tree canopy.

ATTACHMENTS

There are no attachments to this report.
ITEM NO : 4.1
SUBJECT : PARRAMATTA RIVER FERRY SERVICE REVIEW
STRATEGIC OUTCOME : COUNCIL HAS WELL PLANNED ACCESSIBLE FORESHORE ACCESS
ACTION : CONTINUE TO ADVOCATE TO IMPROVE FORESHORE ACCESS AND BOATING FACILITIES
REPORTING OFFICER : KERRY SMITH
DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION NO : NA
PROPOSAL : PROPOSED TERMINATION OF THE F3 HUNTEYS POINT AND F8 WOOLWICH FERRY SERVICES TO BARANGAROO
APPLICANT : TRANSPORT FOR NSW & TRANSDEV SYDNEY FERRIES
OWNER : NSW GOVERNMENT
DATE LODGED : 1 NOVEMBER 2019
Ref:447524

INTRODUCTION

Council was recently notified that Sydney Ferries operator, Transdev are proposing to alter the ferry timetable and route and in particular to terminate the F3 ‘Hunteys Point’ and the ‘F8 Woolwich Ferry” services at Barangaroo in place of the current termination point being Circular Quay.

This report is to discuss impacts of the proposed changes to the local ferry services and to prepare a formal response from Council as a result of the public exhibition of the proposals and a recent public briefing for the community held at Council.

Recommendation

1. That this report is received and noted.

2. That Council write to the Minister of Transport, the local member The Hon. Mr Anthony Roberts and the General Manager Operations of Transdev to advise that Council is opposed as a matter of principle to the proposed changes to the F3 and F8 ferry services on the basis that it will be a retrograde public transport result to the detriment of the residents of the Hunters Hill Municipality based on the following concerns and reasons:

   a) Barangaroo is not a transport interchange, being a significant walk to or from train, bus and light rail connections at Wynyard;
b) The walk between Barangaroo Wharf and Wynyard includes a number of escalators with the alternative of lifts for those with reduced mobility making this part of a journey more difficult for some (including wheelchair bound commuters, some seniors and parents travelling with young children) as will changing ferries if they continue to Circular Quay;

c) The walk between Barangaroo Wharf and Wynyard is uncovered for much of its distance making it undesirable in inclement weather;

d) By comparison Circular Quay is a major transport interchange in close proximity to train, bus and light rail connections;

e) For those who continue to travel to and from Circular Quay, which is the preferred destination for Woolwich and Huntleys Point residents, the detriment of substantial additional travel time due to changing ferries at Barangaroo or Balmain East will more than offset any benefit of additional services at peak times;

f) Transdev should release data about ferry usage used in the development of their proposal which will assist in understanding the high use of customers within the area;

g) Ferry services played a major role in the early history and development of Hunters Hill and remain a vitally important means of direct transport between the peninsular and the city as road journeys are less direct and are usually congested;

h) The direct ferry services to and from Circular Quay continue to attract people to live in the Hunters Hill and Huntleys Point peninsulas because of the convenient connection to employment and educational institutions via Circular Quay;

i) Residents regularly use the Circular Quay ferry services for travel to and from cultural centres including the Opera House, The Rocks and the Botanic Gardens as well as Macquarie Street medical services, and the Airport Train – the inconvenience of changing ferries or additional walking is likely to reduce demand for these services particularly for those travelling to the airport with baggage;

j) The use of berths at Circular Quay by private cruise operators should be reviewed, exploring arrangements to provide more berthing opportunities for commuter ferries;

k) Residents have indicated that existing services should remain in place as far as possible and that termination of services at Barangaroo should only be used for additional services;

l) There is great potential to improve ferry services by improving connections with buses and other ferries, without disrupting services for those who live west of the Harbour Bridge.
1. **HISTORY**

A meeting was called by the Mayor, Councillor Mark Bennett, requesting Mr Craig Rieck, the General Manager, Operations, and Ms. Anne-Laure Saluden of Transdev Sydney Ferries, to provide a briefing to the Council and the community on the proposed changes to the timetable and route which was held on 13 February 2020, at 6.00pm in the Council Chambers.

This meeting was to enable the above to present to the Council and the local community and enable feedback to be provided to the Transdev representatives. In excess of 180 residents attended this meeting and it was indicated that a formal submission would be forwarded by Council shortly after that public meeting.

The consultation period was due to end on 14 February 2020. Additional time was given to Council beyond this date in which Council could make a formal submission to Transdev. At that meeting, it was stated that up to 2,500 ‘activations/submissions’ had taken place in response to the public consultation process, which commenced in November 2019. However many members of the public have been unaware of this proposal.

2. **EXHIBITION PERIOD**

The application was placed on public exhibition from November 2019 to 14 February 2020. These documents were available for viewing on the NSW Government’s website. A minor extension to this period was granted to Council by the General Manager Operation for Transdev at the community consultation/briefing held on 13 February with Council.

A copy of the exhibition information provided on their website is attached

3. **SUBMISSIONS**

Council is aware of four (4) submissions in response to the proposal submitted to Transdev and have been forwarded to Council and copies are attached.

These are self-explanatory and are used for the formation of the case by Council as part of the recommendation above.

4. **THE LIKELY IMPACTS OF THE DEVELOPMENT**

The proposal is unsatisfactory to Council and the local community as the intended changes to the F3 (Parramatta River) Ferry services involving from Huntleys Point Wharf and those changes to the F8 (Cockatoo Island) service involving the Woolwich wharf are detrimental to the community of Hunters Hill as highlighted within the recommendation of this report.

Barangaroo is not a transport interchange in the traditional sense and hence is not suitable for the leaving of ferry passengers to make their way to destinations on foot to arrive at another means of accessible public transport. In this case, the differences in levels between Barangaroo and, for example, George Street are such that it would be less than accessible for a number of groups of people including those in wheelchair and the sick and elderly, parents with young children etc. It would also be uncomfortable in inclement weather due to a general lack of all weather cover.

Further, on arriving by foot at George Street, unless the light rail is suitable for a continuation to a destination, it will be additional time and cost as well as being much less desirable and comfortable.
In terms of travel convenience, Circular Quay is a major public transport interchange providing suitable connection with train, light rail and buses.

With both services intending to be changed for termination at Barangaroo (instead of Circular Quay), the additional time factor, inconvenience and cost to be forced on ferry passengers to then catch another ferry to Circular Quay which would be most detrimental to the passengers.

Transdev should be required to release data concerning current ferry usage and the prediction of passenger numbers and the effects for the schedule being suggested at this time to rationalise the whole ferry operation.

In any assessment concerning change to ferry services, the desires of the commuters need to be clearly identified and assessed in any change to a termination point. The trip purpose is likely to be travel to work, school, education establishments etc. Further, ferry passengers would also obviously focus on the destinations opportunities and cultural / other activities such as the Opera House, Botanic Gardens, museums, State library, the art gallery, travel to the Rocks for tourism, for medical services in and around Macquarie Street etc.

**4. CONCLUSION**

It is suggested that the following issues need to be addressed by Transdev before any decision is made to dramatically alter local ferry services:

- Circular Quay should be retained and promoted as the main commuter hub for transportation services at this part of the Sydney CBD
- Investigate other ferry services to supplant the current ones without losing customers and their confidence in the system
- Hunters Hill is a well populated peninsular with residents of varying demands where the current ferry services satisfies a strong need for environmentally friendly modes of transport. Ferries are a well accepted and well utilised, practical means of transport for both week days and weekends. They reduce demands for private transport and other less sustainable means of transport.
- The Government through Transdev should Incorporate Barangaroo as a new ferry stop for a journey but not as the terminus for F3 and F8 ferry trips.

That the Minister for Transport, the local member The Hon. Mr Anthony Roberts and the Sydney Ferries General Manager Operations of Transdev be advised that this Council opposes the proposal to cut F3 and F8 ferry services currently terminating at Circular Quay as per the recommendation.

**ATTACHMENTS**

1. Transdev Exhibition Information
2. Submissions
Have your say about the Sydney Ferries network changes

Transport for NSW and Sydney Ferries operator Transdev are committed to delivering the best possible ferry services for our customers.

You’ve told us that you want to see more frequent services and we’ve heard you, which is why planning is underway to add up to 700 more services to timetables over the next two years, as well as a trial of new On Demand ferries.

We are asking the community for feedback about proposed services changes planned for 2021. Click on the projects tiles below for more information about proposed service changes.

This consultation process is conducted by Transdev on behalf of Transport for NSW.
**Consultation Timeline**

- **November 2019**: Start of consultation process for 2021 network redesign
- **End February 2020**: Final Consultation Report on 2021 Proposed Changes
- **May 2020**: TfNSW decision on 2021 network redesign
- **June/July 2020**: Feedback to consultation participants
- **Second half of 2020**: First service changes
- **Second half of 2021**: Second round of service changes
Submissions
Many residents of Hunters Hill and Gladesville travel by ferry to Circular Quay, some as regular commuters, others intermittently. Some use the F3 service from Woolwich, others the F5 service from Huntleys Point. The proposed changes will significantly inconvenience those using both of these routes by requiring them to transfer to reach Circular Quay, so increasing their travel time.

The problem with the proposed changes is that not only will they increase the time taken to complete most travellers' journeys, but the need to change at Balmain East, or take a second ferry from Barangaroo to Circular Quay, or walk to Wynyard will be stressful for the elderly, the handicapped, for those travelling with babies or children, and for those travelling with luggage. It will also potentially be unsafe for the very elderly and women travelling on their own after dark. Obviously these disadvantages cannot be compensated by the addition of additional services.

While Barangaroo may be a more convenient destination for those who work in the central-western part of the city, most people heading to that part of the city have the option of using buses, which are more frequent than ferries, and for some travellers, quicker: the net result would be to disadvantage those who are travelling to the northern parts of the city without improving matters for most of those heading for other parts.

Essentially, termination at Barangaroo would benefit only those travellers whose destination is within walking distance of that wharf because Barangaroo does not connect conveniently with any other mode of transport (for example it is a ten minute walk from Wynyard Station or the light rail).

We welcome your proposal to increase capacity by adding peak hour services on these routes, and would support the introduction of additional services from Huntleys Point and Woolwich to Barangaroo, but this should not be at the expense of reducing services to Circular Quay.

Obviously the proposed changes disadvantage most people travelling on the F3 and F5 ferries. So what is the real reason for moving these services away from Circular Quay? Presumably it is a solution to the frequent congestion at Circular Quay which would result in reduced capacity.

Item 4.1 Attachment 2 Page 48
Response to Proposed Changes to the F8 Ferry Route from Cockatoo Is/Woolwich to Circular Quay from 2021.

To:
Mr Craig Rieck  
Anne-Laure Saluden
GM Operations  
GM Customer experience and Communications
Transdev  
Transdev

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed changes to our F8 Ferry Service Cockatoo Is/Woolwich (Hunters Hill) to Circular Quay from 2021.

The existing Service is fast (24 minutes), direct, convenient, and meets community needs well, as it has done for many decades. However, there is widespread community anger with Transdev’s proposal to cease a direct service to and from Circular Quay. A new termination of this service at Barangaroo is unacceptable and will predictably see a drop off of ferry use on this route.

The ferry service is an important public transport carrier for the Municipality of Hunters Hill. We are a peninsula at the convergence of the two major rivers in Sydney Harbour—the Lane Cove and Parramatta Rivers. Early steam ferries were introduced in the 1850s by French resident Didier Joubert to connect the suburb to the rest of Sydney. Hunters Hill residents have subsequently relied on the ferry service that goes directly to Circular Quay for generations.

The Barangaroo hiatus does not meet our needs. It is a very limited and inconvenient destination.

Circular Quay is in the centre of the CBD and is a transport hub. With a walk of only a few hundred metres, commuters can access other ferry routes across the harbour, the whole train network, the city-wide bus network and now, the light rail.

Circular Quay is also a cultural centre with the Opera House, the MCA, the Museum of Sydney, the State Library and the Royal Botanical Gardens nearby. It is also convenient to the medical practitioners in Macquarie Street and an easy journey to the major Department stores.

Transport NSW says its 'Transport strategy is to have"Customer focus" and I hope you listen to our feedback.

Its own research states that 36% of peak travelers on the F8 are journeying to work. Presumably some of these may welcome an additional peak hour stop at Barangaroo.

However the other 64% of travelers on this route include office workers who start early or finish late, school children who meet trains, buses and other ferries at Circular Quay as well as visitors and residents who chose to travel at non peak times.
Many of the latter are seniors who are big ferry travelers and parents with small children who are not so mobile and who rely on the direct ferry service to CQ as an easy, direct and reliable way to navigate the CBD without having to walk far or needing to use the congested Victoria road.

Barangaroo is not a destination for most passengers from Hunters Hill. It may be useful for some business people in the new high-rise towers, casino patrons and restaurant guests. However, Barangaroo itself isn’t a convenient terminus: it is half an hour walk to Circular Quay and 20 minutes to Wynyard for an able-bodied person. A shuttle ferry from Barangaroo to the Quay would make the whole journey at least an hour each way. The net result will be less passengers and ultimately a further diminution of services.

The ferry service at present provides very effective transport for all demographics of Hunters Hill Municipality’s residents throughout the day, everyday. It delivers them directly where they most need to go - to Circular Quay! If some business people would benefit from an extra Barangaroo stop at peak hours that would seem to be a sensible addition.

Yours sincerely

[Name redacted]
Hunters Hill Resident
Post mortem on last night's meeting in the Hunters Hill Town Hall.

I commend Craig Rieck from Transdev for coming to the meeting, but I can only assume by his presentation (or as much of it that we heard) that he has a lack of real understanding of the local issues and how they are likely to impact on local residents. It appeared that Transdev wanted this to be an opportunity for a public relations exercise rather than any real wish to find any workable solutions to the problem of where the F8 ferry service will terminate.

A few items stood out as things that Transdev should have already been aware of:

1. The question was raised regarding the tenancies for wharves 1 and 6 and when the current leases will expire. Mr Rieck seemed to not realise the importance of this question. If the tourist ferries and jetboats are relocated in Barangaroo, more wharf space for the commuter ferries would be released. This surely would be an important area to explore to enable Circular Quay to remain a commuter hub as most people want. Already a number of tourist ferries are located at King St wharves and it makes sense to make this more of a tourist centre.

2. Access to and from Barangaroo wharf has been seriously understated by Transdev. The nearest bus service at Sussex St is 450m away (number 311 tootts Point), the nearest train service 700m at Wynyard and light rail is 750m on George St, and yet Transdev claimed it was 6 min walk to connecting public transport. The promise of a metro line servicing the wharf in the future has limited use as it proposes to connect with North Sydney and Martin Place, neither places helpful for people going to the Opera House or the airport. As well the site of the proposed metro station is 1km from Barangaroo wharf—hardly a reasonable option.

3. Mr Rieck clearly stated that Transdev was to make proposals to the government, and it was the government that would make the final decisions about the changes to be made. Why were government representatives not evident at last night’s meeting? Anthony Roberts made fallacious contradictory claims about the ferry changes in the local paper over the last two weeks, but again was a no-show at the meeting. (Mr Roberts seems to make a practice of not turning up to community meetings). One interpretation of this governmental disinterest is that Transdev has the influence to make its suggestions accepted—suggestions that the travelling community does not want.

4. My fear is that if F8 ferries terminate at Barangaroo, fewer people will use the ferry because of taking them to a place which is far from where they want to go. Instead people may choose to catch buses along Victoria Rd (after a short car ride and parking near a bus stop) or worse still, drive all the way to their destination. At a time when our roads are so congested, decisions that force more cars on the roads are more than stupid.
5. At the meeting I got the impression that Mr Rieck is not a ferry traveler and has a hazy idea of the regions served by the F8 and F3 ferries. I hope that full community consultation with a proposed community panel will give Transdev more of an idea of what people want and need from a ferry service in this area. Hunters Hill and Woolwich have very limited public transport options and the ferry has been essential for us to get to work, school and after-hours activities. The prospect of catching a ferry home from Barangaroo after an evening function at the Opera House is daunting — a walk of more than 2km walk through streets and tunnels that many would find slightly threatening at that time of night. At present only wharf 6 operates in the evenings, so why not use more wharves at Circular Quay?

6. The harbour offers a wonderful means of moving people around, and so far this has not been maximised. Instead over recent years services have been cancelled eg Elliot St, Balmain and Birkenhead Point as well as those to Lavender Bay, Jeffrey St and Bondi St in Kirribilli. I have some suggestions that I hope will be considered by Transdev:

a) Interlink the F8 and F3 ferries at Cockatoo Island so people from Woolwich who work near Barangaroo can go on the F8 to Cockatoo Island then catch the F3 direct service to Barangaroo. At present the F3 ferry to the city leaves a few minutes before the Woolwich ferry arrives so making any connection rather difficult.

b) Consider a service from Cockatoo Island to Woolwich, Greenwich, Birchgrove and to Luna Park then Circular Quay. Many local people work in North Sydney or go to school in North Sydney and would welcome the F8 stopping at Luna Park. This could be a morning after school and evening peak variation to the F8 route.

c) Consider making a route that Circulates between Cockatoo Island, Greenwich, Birkenhead Point, Elliot St, Balmain and back to Cockatoo Island. Timetables could be constructed so that passengers could change at either Cockatoo or Greenwich for further travel on F8 or F3 ferries. This would provide a very useful cross-harbour route.

d) At present many people use Thames St service as it is such a wonderful direct service to the city. They are lucky to have the choice of two services, the F8 as well as F3. One solution is to leave Thames St as a stop on either the F8 route or the F3 route. However an alternative could be to have a separate service connecting Thames St, Darling St, Luna Park and Circular Quay, giving another much needed cross-harbour connection.

I hope this information and my suggestions will be considered. I feel strongly that what Transdev is proposing is not in the interest of the Hunters Hill/Woolwich community (nor in the longevity of the ferry services) and I will help in any way I can to try to maintain Circular Quay as the hub for the F8 service.
Dear Craig:

Many thanks for attending at Hunters Hill Council this evening. We appreciate your attendance and efforts to inform the community.

We would like to make the following submissions for your consultation:

1. We don't find the feedback web site easy to use or understand.
   - We are not sure how you use this to provide feedback. So we have sent you this email.

2. Existing services from Huntley's Point to Barangaroo will deteriorate:
   - Two additional stops;
   - Increased commute times to Barangaroo.
     - The current 6:22am service takes 17 minutes. We understand this new service will take 26 minutes.
     - The current 7:02am service takes 21 minutes. We understand that this new service will take 31 minutes.
   - The Huntley's Point to Barangaroo services (now commencing at Chiswick) are already crowded. Seating is already limited or unavailable as the morning commute progresses and sometimes the RiverCat service does not stop at Drummoyne because it is already full. By making Henley part of an "all stops service commencing from Abbotsford" will further add to congestion and lack of seating.

3. Cockatoo Island is not a main stop in commuter times (Monday to Friday peaks).
   - We cannot understand why this is now considered a major stop in weekday peak hour RiverCat operations.

4. Lack of direct services to Circular Quay
   - This will deteriorate the quality of operations along the Inner Parramatta river service between Chiswick, Huntley's Point, Drummoyne and the city.
   - An interchange service at Balmain East will add to commute times and effect elderly residents, and school children who rely on the ferry for Milsons Point services.

5. From a user perspective, the Huntley's Point service currently works well.


- Why change this? Leave it as it is operating well and at a good, reliable standard.
- Better is not necessarily more frequent services - it is where they operate, number of stops and time of journey. For Huntleys Point residents, the new proposed service is a backward step for all of these reasons.

In summary, we disagree with these changes for Huntleys Point wharf commuters (residents) and strongly recommend they do not proceed further.

Kind regards
ITEM NO : 4.2

SUBJECT : GLADESVILLE BRIDGE MARINA 'DESIGNATED DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION' NO. 380 VICTORIA ROAD, DRUMMOYNE

STRATEGIC OUTCOME : MAINTAIN THE CHARACTER AND AMENITY OF HUNTERS HILL

ACTION : ENCOURAGE COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION AND RESPONSIBILITY IN DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS AND HERITAGE CONSERVATION

REPORTING OFFICER : KERRY SMITH

DEVELOPMENT APPLICATION NO : 2019-0380

PROPOSAL : ALTERATIONS AND ADDITIONS TO THE MARINA BERTH LAYOUT AND TO WORKS WITHIN THE SLIPWAY AREA

APPLICANT : ENARES PTY LTD

OWNER : MOTOR YACHT MARINE HOLDINGS PTY LTD

DATE LODGED : 9 JANUARY 2020

INTRODUCTION

On 9 January 2020 Council received detailed documents from the applicant as part of the community consultation process for the development application. The application is on public exhibition through the City of Canada Bay Council until 28 February 2020.

Being ‘designated development’ the consent authority is the Sydney Eastern City Planning Panel. Further, being an ‘integrated development application’ it requires the consent of Council (Planning Panel), the Environmental Protection Authority under the Protection of the Environment Operations Act 1997 and of WaterNSW under the provisions of the Water Management Act, 2000.

In essence, the main changes in the proposal are:

The proposed development constitutes alterations and additions to the marina berth layout to provide overall storage for 130 vessels comprising 15 swing moorings and 115 floating berths.

The works include:
- removal of 29 existing swing moorings and retention of 15 existing swing moorings;
- construction of 65 new floating berth spaces of varying sizes, that increases the number of floating berths from 50 to 115;
- cessation of the shipwright workshops and slipway activities;
- demolition of the slipway rails and demolition of the internal office mezzanine;
- structure within the shipwright workshop area; and
• provision of 8 new valet car parking spaces within the existing work shop (to be demolished) to bring the total parking provision on-site to 19.

RECOMMENDATION

1) That the report be received and noted.

2) That the City of Canada Bay Council be advised that this Council opposes the development application for alterations and additions to the marina berth layout for the following reasons:

a) The proposed Marina will have adverse impacts on the State listed Gladesville Bridge, the character of the area and the setting of the heritage items within the vicinity through the introduction of 65 new floating berth spaces of varying sizes that increases the number of floating berths from 50 to 115.

b) The nearby De Burghs Bridge and Burns Bay Road are appurtenant structures and part of the “way” associated with the State Heritage Register (SHR) listed Gladesville Bridge, the impacts on the setting of this item are detrimental. Despite the fact that the expanded marina berths will not be within the SHR curtilage of the Bridge and indicated on State Heritage Register Plan 2625, they will nonetheless be visibly intrusive within the setting of the State Heritage listed Gladesville Bridge.

c) The proposed Marina will intrude into views to and from the Gladesville Bridge which encompasses a broad radius. It will also intrude on views when travelling along Burns Bay Road in both southbound and northbound directions and will have adverse impacts on the setting of the Bridge and the associated way.

d) The Visual Impact Assessment fails to analyse the impacts of the proposed marina on the visual curtilage of Gladesville Bridge or identify the type of curtilage pertaining to the subject site and heritage items in the vicinity which are defined in the heritage office guidelines heritage curtilage (1996).

e) The visual curtilage (Expanded Heritage Curtilage) however is considered to be much greater than the identified curtilage particularly in relation to views to and from the bridge from numerous locations that provides an immediate setting for Gladesville Bridge and to a greater extent views to and from waterfront properties around Parramatta River that have views of the Gladesville Bridge and the location of the proposed Marina.

f) The proposal is contrary to the aims of Regional Environmental Plan (Sydney Harbour Catchment) 2005.

g) The removal of the slipway facilities from the site will be a retrograde step from a regional point of view in that the demand for ‘working waterfront’ activities will not be able to be satisfied and will increase the demand on existing industrial enterprises around the Harbour which service such necessary facilities associated with vessels.

h) The proposal would not be in the public interest and approval will create an undesirable precedent for other marina expansions throughout Sydney Harbour and particularly west of the Harbour Bridge.

i) No details were provided in the Traffic and Transport Study as to the number of additional employees to be engaged on the extended marina premises and the effects it may have on traffic generation and off street parking demands with substantial ‘valet’ parking not being acceptable for new development.

j) No details have been shown as to the arrangements for the deletion of and retention of a number of swing moorings around the site which would be critical in terms of visual
assessment for the heritage impacts on the Gladesville Bridge and its immediate surrounds.

PROPOSAL

To carry out development at a cost of $7.753 million. It will involve the following works:

- The proposal involves the use of lands and water totalling 19,740sqm, with the land based component comprising three lots. The water based component is owned by and administered by the RMS and leased to Enares Pty Ltd.

- Overall storage for 130 vessels will be provided comprising 15 swing moorings and 115 floating berths.

- Twenty nine (29) of the existing swing moorings will be removed leaving fifteen (15) to be retained. No details of the placement of these various swing moorings was available to Council at the time of reporting.

- A total of sixty five (65) new floating berth spaces of varying sizes will be constructed (giving a new total of one hundred and fifteen (115). The length of the vessels to be moored with the extended floating structure will range from 8 metres to 45 metres with the greatest number being 35 x 20 metre vessels 30 x 15 metre vessels. There will be 1 x 45 metre vessel, 3 x 35 metre, 5 x 30 metre and 2 x 25 metre vessels proposed to be moored.

- The slipway activities will cease.

- The slipway rails will be demolished and the internal office mezzanine structure within the covered slipway area will be demolished.

- A total of eight (8) additional valet car parking spaces will be provide in the existing slipway area.

- It is stated that twelve (12) persons will be employed on the site at any one time. It is not known as to the number of employees currently working on the site.

- The hours of operation will be between 7.30am and 5.30pm Monday to Fridays and between 9.00am and 5.00pm Saturdays, Sundays and public holidays. Access to boats will be 24 hours via a swipe card arrangement.

- The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) that accompanies this application was a very comprehensive one and was made up of a series of twenty three (23) separate assessment study papers which included Traffic and Parking, Visual Amenity and Views, Noise and Vibration, Heritage, Aboriginal Cultural Heritage, Economic Impacts, Marina Demand Study, marine Ecology Study etc.

- The Secretary of the then Department of Planning and Environment on 15 November 2018 issued the requirements for the preparation of an EIS, referred to as the Secretary’s Environmental Assessment requirements (SEARs). A copy of this four page document is contained in the EIS and was a requirement under clauses 6 and 7 of the E.P. & A. Regulation 2000.
EXHIBITION PERIOD

The application has been placed on public exhibition from 15 January 2020 to 28 February 2020. The DA and the two part Environmental Impact Statement was exhibited by the communications consultants for the City of Canada Bay Council. These documents are available for viewing at this point of time.

A copy of the exhibition notice is attached.

3. SUBMISSIONS

Hunter’s Hill Council has received a submission from the “Save Gladesville Bridge Waterway Inc” group seeking support from this Council in its opposition to the development. Other submissions have been made to Canada Bay Council with whom the development application was lodged, it is unknown as to the total of these submissions.

Consultation has taken place via five (5) State government instrumentalities

4. PROPERTY HISTORY

Details contained within the EIS indicate that the following developments were granted over a period of time as follows:

- On 7 January 1994, approval was given to the provision of 5 additional car parking spaces
- On 21 December 1999, the Land & Environment Court approved the conversion of forty swing moorings to forty pontoon moorings (for the continued storage of 99 vessels)
- On 17 October 2006, alterations and additions were approved to the existing marina building including signage which included a food facility in the recreation area
- On 1 June 2010 alterations and additions were approved to the existing marina building
- On 7 August 2015 approval was given to create a café, alterations to the existing building, provision of signage and installation of two flagpoles.

5. STATUTORY CONTROLS

Relevant Statutory Instruments relating to Canada Bay Council under the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, 1979 are as set out in the EIS

6. POLICY CONTROLS

Consolidated Development Control Plan 2013.

7. REFERRALS

7.1 External Approval Bodies

The Minister for Planning is the consent authority for this application and so Council is in the process of preparing a submission to the development application which is the basis for this report.
7.3 Heritage

The application, being sited in a Conservation Area was referred to Council’s Heritage Adviser who by memo states as follows:

**Heritage Status:**

NSW State Heritage Register

Gladesville Bridge is listed on the NSW State Heritage Register (SHR).

SREP Sydney Harbour Catchment Item 22 Gladesville Bridge

The following Statement of Significance for the Gladesville Bridge is sourced from the NSW Heritage Inventory database entry for the SHR listing for the item, reference number 5062219:

Gladesville Bridge has state heritage significance as the longest concrete arch span bridge in the world at the time of its completion in 1964 (1000 feet). One of only two of its type in NSW, Gladesville Bridge is considered to be a leading example of technical and engineering achievement on the international stage.

An innovative design that set new global standards for design and construction, Gladesville Bridge was one of the first bridges in the world (if not, the first) to utilise computer programming in its construction.

With particular social significance and an important association with a number of internationally acclaimed engineers and engineering firms (including G. Maunsell & Partners and Eugene Freyssinet), Gladesville Bridge is one of the landmark engineering achievements of the world.

The SHR database entry does not reference the abutments of the earlier Gladesville Bridge which are also included as part of the SREP Sydney Harbour Catchment 2005 Heritage

Schedule listing and on the Canada Bay LEP 2013 Heritage Schedule.

The following Statement of Significance for the Gladesville Bridge Abutments is sourced from the NSW Heritage Inventory database, reference number 2891158:

The bridge abutments are now the only physical trace of the former Gladesville Bridge. They indicate the historic and continuing importance of the Victoria Road alignment through the municipality and are important physical remnants that define the point.

Hunters Hill LEP 2012 includes the following items that are in the vicinity of the subject site:

Item 387 Gladesville Bridge
Item 473 “House” 19 Huntleys Point Road
Item 442 “Wharf Site and Steps” Huntleys Point Road
Item 468 “Remains of Gladesville Bridge” Huntleys Point Road

Schedule 4 of SREP Sydney Harbour Catchment 2005 includes the following items that are in the vicinity of the subject site:

Item 22 Gladesville Bridge including abutments
Item 21 Federation House boatshed, Drummoyne Avenue, Drummoyne
Schedule 5 of the Canada Bay LEP 2013 includes the following items that are in the vicinity of the subject site:

Item I474 Gladesville Bridge abutments, Five Dock Point, End of Victoria Place
Item I475 Howley Park, Five Dock Point, 361P Victoria Place
Item I473 House, 352 Victoria Place
Item I472 Boatshed, 348 Victoria Place
Item I178 House, “Tobigue”, 44 Drummoyne Avenue
Item I177 House, “Shalimar”—private garden, fence and gate, 16 Drummoyne Avenue
Item I176 Marist Brothers’ house, 14 Drummoyne Avenue

Proposal: The proposed development constitutes alterations and additions to the marina berth layout to provide overall storage for 130 vessels comprising 15 swing moorings and 115 floating berths. The works include:

- removal of 29 existing swing moorings and retention of 15 existing swing moorings;
- construction of 65 new floating berth spaces of varying sizes, that increases the number of floating berths from 50 to 115;
- cessation of the shipwright workshops and slipway activities;
- demolition of the slipway rails and demolition of the internal office mezzanine structure within the shipwright workshop area; and
- provision of 8 new valet car parking spaces within the existing workshop to bring the total parking provision on-site to 19.

As the proposed development constitutes a ‘Marina’, with an intended capacity of more than 15 vessels having a length of 20 metres or more and an intended capacity of more than 80 vessels of any size, it is classified as ‘Designated Development’ under Schedule 3, Clause 23 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulation 2000 (EP&A Regulation).


Comments:
In my opinion, the proposed Marina will have adverse impacts on the State listed Gladesville Bridge, the character of the area and the setting of the heritage items within the vicinity through the introduction of 65 new floating berth spaces of varying sizes that increases the number of floating berths from 50 to 115.

While the proposal will not be within the SHR curtilage of the Bridge as indicated on State Heritage Register Plan 2625, it will nonetheless be highly visible within the setting of the Bridge.

Hunters Hill Development Control Plan 2013 states, at 2.4.3 (a) (i) that:

“Evaluation of likely effects upon heritage significance should address principles of the ICOMOS (Australia) Burra Charter which have been adopted by this Plan.”

Article 8. Setting of the Burra Charter states:

Conservation requires the retention of an appropriate setting. This includes retention of the visual and sensory setting, as well as the retention of spiritual and other cultural relationships that contribute to the cultural significance of the place.

New construction, demolition, intrusions or other changes which would adversely affect the setting or relationships are not appropriate.

Importantly, “Setting” is explained at Article 1.12 as:

1.12 Setting means the immediate and extended environment of a place that is part of or contributes to its cultural significance and distinctive character.
The “explanatory notes” are:

Setting may include: structures, spaces, land, water and sky; the visual setting including views to
and from the place, and along a cultural route; and other sensory aspects of the setting such as
smells and sounds.

Setting may also include historical and contemporary relationships, such as use and activities,
social and spiritual practices, and relationships with other places, both tangible and intangible.

By its very nature and intent, the proposed Marina will intrude into views to and from the
Gladesville Bridge which encompasses a broad radius. It will also intrude on views when
travelling along Burns Bay Road in both southbound and northbound directions and will have
adverse impacts on the setting of the Bridge and the associated way.

In this regard, the “...historical and contemporary relationships...” with the bridge and
“...views to and from...” the bridge will suffer adverse setting impacts.

Visual Analysis
The SHR entry for this item defines the boundary of the listing as “Refer to Heritage Council Plan
2625”. The curtilage of Gladesville Bridge is defined (by RMS) as the northern and southern
abutments and the arch. To the south (Drummoyne), the boundary is in line with Drummoyne
Avenue that runs beneath the bridge. To the north (Henleys Point), the boundary is the Victoria
Road off-ramp that runs beneath the bridge (adjacent to Huntleys Point Road). The curtilage
encompasses the bridge structure only and does not extend to any landscape, river or roadways
that exist beneath the structure.”

This listing pertains only to the physical curtilage but does not assess the visual curtilage.

A detailed Visual Impact Assessment was prepared by ARPL to understand what impact the
proposal would have on views to and from the waterway. Refer to this report for an in depth
analysis.

The outcomes of the analysis identified that all location Points assessed (a-h) would have a low
visual impact on existing views from the various locations identified and low impact upon
panoramic views from Huntleys Point. The report did not assess any views from the north eastern
side of Gladesville Bridge or from waterfront properties within Hunters Hill HCA C1 (“The
Peninsula”) that have a clear view of Gladesville Bridge.

The report fails to analyse the impacts of the proposed Marina on the Visual Curtilage of
Gladesville Bridge or identify the type of curtilage pertaining to the subject site and heritage items
in the vicinity which are defined in the Heritage Office guidelines Heritage Curtilage (1996). This
document illustrates several types of curtilage pertaining to a heritage item. The types of curtilage
include the following:

Lot Boundary Heritage Curtilage: the most common type of heritage curtilage comprises the
boundary of the property containing the heritage item as shown on the lot plan.
Reduced Heritage Curtilage: This type applies when the heritage curtilage is less than the property
boundary, and the significance does not relate to the total lot, but to a lesser area. This type of
curtilage is often only defined when subdivision occurs.

The curtilage of a heritage item is defined by the NSW Heritage Office as the “setting” or space
around a heritage item or place that is required to preserve the significance of that place. The
concept of curtilage recognises that significance can be affected by the immediate and broader
setting even if no fabric is altered within the place. The curtilage for Bridge is confined to the
boundary of the listing as “Refer to Heritage Council Plan 2625”. The visual curtilage (Expanded
Heritage Curtilage) however is much greater than the identified curtilage particularly in relation to
views to and from the bridge from numerous locations that provides an immediate setting for
Gladesville Bridge and to a greater extent views to and from waterfront properties around Parramatta River that have views of the Gladesville Bridge and the location of the proposed Marina.

In light of the above, it is my opinion that the likely impacts of the proposed Marina are considered not to be compatible with the amenity and visual character of the surrounding area. The proposed Marina is not supportable in terms of substantive consequential heritage impacts and is detrimental to the necessary protection requirements for the State Heritage Registered Gladesville Bridge.

7.5 Parks & Landscape

The application does not involve any proposed landscaping around the site.

7.6 Waste Management

See waste management Plan in EIS.

7.6 Parking and Traffic

The report prepared for the applicant by Coulston Budd Rogers & Kafes Pty Ltd.

It is stated that peak hour two way flows of a weekday are up to 70 vehicles per hour and of weekends up to 100 vehicles per hour in Victoria Place which has a large number of residential flat buildings with vehicular access to the street. These traffic generation figures are less than the RMS desirable maximum for local residential streets.

The existing development of the site provides for eleven (11) parking spaces over the private and Crown land sections.

On-street vehicle parking counts have been provided in the report for the area between Drummoyne Avenue and the northern end of the public road. The maximum figures given indicate that there are on average 100 car parking spaces available on-street. They summarise that the overall effects of on-street parking is generally unrelated to the marina.

Off-street parking at the marina site has been studied and shows that up to 12 cars are parked on the site at various times during the year. Using the number of berths relative to the number of off street spaces used, indicated a peak parking rate of up to 0.12 spaces per berth per day. This figure is deemed to be comparable with other parking studies carried out for the site carried out by other traffic engineers.

The existing development has eleven (11) off-street car parking spaces provided plus one (1) disabled parking space, (of which three (3) are ‘stacked’ and presumably used for existing employees).

The development plans show an additional eight (8) car parking spaces towards the south end of the site and all such spaces are to serviced as ‘valet’ carparking spaces.

That is, out of a total of nineteen (19) car spaces to be provided on site, eleven (11) spaces will be ‘stacked’ which is not in accordance with standard practice for off-street parking in new developments in that there should be no ‘stacked’ spaces.

Details did not appear to have been provided in relation to the number of employees presently engaged with the marina. That is, it is not known whether there will be additional persons to be engaged as part of the new development proposal. This would have to be subject of additional off street parking that could be required based on the traffic generation figures for off street...
parking. This information is currently being sought from the authors of the EIS. For example, the twelve employees will require the use of six (6) off street car parking spaces and for the two dwellings (to be confirmed) on the site, a further four (4) off-street spaces thus leaving only nine (9) spaces for visitors and clients which could be almost all stacked car spaces. It is considered that this arrangement for off-street parking is not acceptable.

8. **ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT UNDER S.4.15**

The relevant matters for consideration under section 4.15 of the *Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979* are assessed under the following headings

9. **STATE INSTRUMENTS / LEGISLATION**

9.1 State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs)

Not applicable.

9.2 Regional Environmental Plans (REPs) – Deemed SEPPs

**Sydney Harbour Catchment 2005**

**Aims of plan**

(1) This plan has the following aims with respect to the Sydney Harbour Catchment:

(a) to ensure that the catchment, foreshores, waterways and islands of Sydney Harbour are recognised, protected, enhanced and maintained:

   (i) as an outstanding natural asset, and
   (ii) as a public asset of national and heritage significance, for existing and future generations,

(b) to ensure a healthy, sustainable environment on land and water,

(c) to achieve a high quality and ecologically sustainable urban environment,

(d) to ensure a prosperous working harbour and an effective transport corridor,

(e) to encourage a culturally rich and vibrant place for people,

(f) to ensure accessibility to and along Sydney Harbour and its foreshores,

(g) to ensure the protection, maintenance and rehabilitation of watercourses, wetlands, riparian lands, remnant vegetation and ecological connectivity,

(h) to provide a consolidated, simplified and updated legislative framework for future planning.

(2) For the purpose of enabling these aims to be achieved in relation to the Foreshores and Waterways Area, this plan adopts the following principles:
(a) Sydney Harbour is to be recognised as a public resource, owned by the public, to be protected for the public good,
(b) the public good has precedence over the private good whenever and whatever change is proposed for Sydney Harbour or its foreshores,
(c) protection of the natural assets of Sydney Harbour has precedence over all other interests.

Furthermore, Part 3 Division 2 of SREP (Sydney Harbour Catchment) 2005 lists matters for consideration by Council when determining an application. It also states that Council shall not grant consent to an application unless it is satisfied that the proposal is consistent with the relevant objectives of the SREP.

The following matters for consideration are relevant to this application:

25 Foreshore and waterways scenic quality

The matters to be taken into consideration in relation to the maintenance, protection and enhancement of the scenic quality of foreshores and waterways are as follows:

(a) the scale, form, design and siting of any building should be based on an analysis of:
   (i) the land on which it is to be erected, and
   (ii) the adjoining land, and
   (iii) the likely future character of the locality,

(b) development should maintain, protect and enhance the unique visual qualities of Sydney Harbour and its islands, foreshores and tributaries,

(c) the cumulative impact of water-based development should not detract from the character of the waterways and adjoining foreshores.

The proposed development would be readily discernible from the nearby sections of the River.

It is considered that the proposal would not satisfy the above aims of the policy. The matters for consideration, in particular those of specific relevance pertaining to the appearance of the development from the waterway and foreshore are not considered to have been satisfactorily addressed by the proposal.

9.3 Other Legislation

Not applicable.

10. CANADA BAY LOCAL ENVIRONMENTAL PLAN 2013

10.1 Aims and Objectives of Canada Bay Local Environmental Plan 2013 and Zone

The land based section of the proposal is in a Medium Density Residential R3 zone which prohibits ‘marinas’ as defined. However, there is a an additional permitted uses clause under Schedule 1 of the Canada bay LEP 2013 which for this site permits ‘marinas’. This becomes a matter for that Council should it wish to approve this ‘designated Development application’
which would require the matter to be determined by the Sydney Eastern City Planning Panel following an assessment report by Council officers.

10.2 Statutory Compliance Table

Not applicable as there are no development standards applying to the proposal.

10.3 Other Special Clauses / Development Standards

See Part 10.1 above.

11. DRAFT AMENDMENTS TO STATUTORY CONTROLS

No known relevant draft amendments pertaining to this application.

13. THE LIKELY IMPACTS OF THE DEVELOPMENT

The proposal has been primarily assessed by this Council as the basis for a submission to be lodged with Canada Bay Council for its consideration by the Sydney Eastern City Planning Panel as the consent authority.

In very general terms, the floating berth structure and, hence, the area covered by the lease for the mooring of vessels will be virtually doubled to end almost under the south western face of the bridge. This will be offset slightly by moving the northern marina south such that there will be a wider section of the River to be used by rowers.

According to the marina demand study, the marinas west of the harbour bridge show a continuing growth in larger vessel ownership creating strong demand for on-water berthing and mooring. There has been no net increase in available commercial marina berths (which does not include the subject marina) in the west to meet the high level of demand. There has been virtually no growth in NSW Government private mooring licences in the west Sydney areas over the last 15 years. Apparently, there is a current ‘waiting list’ of 102 moorings in the west Sydney harbour areas. Figures showing NSW Recreational Vessel Registrations for vessels of 10 metres and above has been increasing from 1983 data to 2019 figures.

The application on behalf of the owner of the marina with the RMS as part owner for the River lease (which apparently expires on 22 January 2020 being at that time valid for a period of 12 months) is deemed unsatisfactory for the following reasons:

- Since the expanded floating moorings are appurtenant structures to this section of the Gladesville Bridge and part of the “way” associated with the State Heritage Register (SHR) listed Gladesville Bridge, the impacts on the setting of this item are detrimental.

- By their very nature and intent, the increased storage of vessels so close to the sensitive section near the base of the Gladesville Bridge will detrimentally intrude into views to and from the Gladesville Bridge when travelling along this part of the River and making use of the recreational facilities near Five Dock Point. It will have adverse impacts on the historical setting of the Bridge. In this regard, the “…historical and contemporary relationships…” with the bridge and “…views to and from…” the bridge will suffer adverse setting impacts.

- The proposed alteration from a working, waterfront industrial usage to more of a social use of the marina is not deemed acceptable from a regional planning point of view. For example, there are marinas around the Harbour that are zoned Working Waterfront IN4 under LEPs and the loss of the slipway facilities from this
The site will only place higher demands on such usage in time and turn the non-working facilities into major social attractions separate from the strict marina usage i.e registered clubs and the like. In this case, there is proposed the cessation of slipway activities, the demolition of slipway rails and demolition of the internal office mezzanine structure within the covered slipway area. These relatively minor alterations are deemed to be important factors that are negative concerning the development as they will not be resurrected back to current usage over a period of time.

- The development will be in Contravention of the aims of R.E.P. (Sydney Harbour Catchment) 2005.

It is not known whether the lease has been renewed by the RMS and hence, whether they are still content with the original owners consent for the application. This matter was also being followed up at the time of reporting but would not be a make or break as far as this Council is concerned.

14. SUBMISSIONS

It is not known exactly how many submissions have been forwarded to the Canada Bay Council as part of this public exhibition process nor the basis for such submissions. However, its website lists the names of a number of persons having made a submission to date.

This Council has recently received a submission regarding this proposed development with one making reference to a group called Save Gladesville Bridge Waterway Inc seeking support from this Council in opposition to the development and sending copies of a number of State Government Hansard reports over a number of years indicating the emotive issue that increased marina sizes or new developments had created at the time including the State Government taking over a responsible authority for marina applications.

CONCLUSION

There are details associated with the development that are being followed up and should be available before Council gives consideration to this development presently on public exhibition.

The application is unsatisfactory for its installation in a setting in the immediate surrounds of the Heritage listed bridge and, further, is detrimental to the necessary protection requirements for the State Heritage Registered Gladesville Bridge.

The likely impacts of the additional vessel berthing areas as well as for the provision of ever increasing size of the vessels to be moored and floated around the local areas of the Sydney Harbour. It is also felt that more of the relatively limited water views for the nearby residents will be further diminished with the expander area of mooring and the likelihood of increased numbers and sizes of vessels making use of the proposed new moorings.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Locality Map
2. Marina Photos
3. City of Canada Bay Council Notification Plans
4. Submissions
Figure 11 Gladesville Bridge NSW Heritage Council Plan
Source: NSW Heritage Council
Why have | been notified of the application?

Council notifies owners/occupiers who may be affected by a development proposal so that any potential issues or impacts you wish to bring to Council’s attention can be taken into account when considering the application. This allows Council to make more informed decisions.

How long do I have to make a submission?

Submissions should be lodged within the period stated on the notification letter. Should your submission be lodged after the close of this period, every effort will be made to include it in the assessment process; however, the application may have been determined prior to receipt of your submission.

What kind of submission can I make?

Submissions should relate directly to the work proposed, and its possible impact on your property or the locality. Council staff may ask you to view plans and can answer questions on specific technical issues, but are not in a position to comment on the merits of the proposal.

What happens to my submission?

Council will send you a letter acknowledging the receipt of your submission. Your submission can be either emailed, faxed, posted or hand-delivered. Council does not provide a specific response to matters raised in submissions as these are addressed in the report prepared on the application. If minor amendments are made to an application before it is determined, you may not be notified but your written submission will be considered. If more substantial amendments are made, you will be informed and further submissions can be made.

To what extent will Council consider my submission?

The matters which Council must consider are determined by law such as the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, 1979. The matters listed for consideration relate to environmental impact. Matters such as choral objection, commercial property or personal circumstances cannot be given weight in Council’s assessment. Local Environmental Plans, Development Control Plans and the Building Code of Australia are matters that must also be considered. These controls set the framework for an applicant’s expectations to carry out work on their property. They address issues such as consistency, privacy, heritage and streetscape.

Advice concerning submissions on applications

Your comments will be considered in conjunction with Council’s legal responsibilities, the interests of the community and the reasonable expectations and rights of the applicant. Council will balance these competing interests when making a decision.

Who determines the applications?

From 1 March 2018, the NSW Government amended the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act to prevent Mayors and Councillors from determining Development Applications and other DA related applications.

The majority of applications received by Council are determined by senior Council officers under delegated authority. A percentage of applications are determined by Council’s Local Planning Panel (LPP), and some larger scale development proposals are determined by the Sydney Eastern City Planning Panel (the notification letter you received and the site notice address when
such applications will be determined by this Panel. Assessment reports prepared by staff are checked and endorsed by senior officers before being finalised.

How do I know when a matter will be reported to the LPP?

If you make a submission and the matter is required to be reported by the LPP, you will be advised of the Panel meeting date in writing. LPP meetings are open to the general public and generally take place on a monthly basis on a Wednesday and are held during normal business hours. These meetings are all held at the Council Chambers, 1A MacKean Street, Drummoyne.

The Agenda for the meeting is available on Council’s website at www.canada-bay.nsw.gov.au at least one week prior to the meeting. The Agenda contains a copy of the assessment report and recommendation for every application on the agenda.

Objectors and applicants may request to address the Panel Meeting, but you must complete a Request to Address LPP Meeting form and submit it to Council at least two (2) working days prior to the Panel meeting. Council’s forms are available on its website, and a copy will be attached to the letter advising you of the LPP meeting date.

What happens if Council refuses an application or imposes a condition, which the applicant thinks is unreasonable or onerous?

An applicant may request Council to review the decision or appeal to the Land and Environment Court of NSW against any decision, or any aspect of a decision made by Council.

Will my representations remain confidential?

No. Submissions are made available to the applicant and can be viewed on the Development Application Tracking facility on Council’s website at www.canada-bay.nsw.gov.au. Whilst signatures, email addresses, and phone numbers on submissions are removed before being placed on the website, details such as your name and address remain. Your personal details can only be kept confidential if you specifically request the details to be suppressed as part of your written submission and plainly state your reasons for requesting confidentiality, e.g., your safety or that of your family would otherwise be at risk.

However, any such request may not prevent Council from discussing the details of your submission with the applicant. It should be considered that the matters you have raised in your submission should be addressed by the applicant, e.g., by making amendments to their proposal.

You can also withdraw your submission at any time prior to the determination of the application by Council.

When must a person making a submission make a Disclosure?

When making a submission on a development application, you must disclose if you have made a reportable donation or gift within the last two (2) years (and up to the time this proposal is determined). If you make a donation or gift after your submission has been handed in, you must send a disclosure statement to Council within seven (7) days after the donation or gift is made.

A disclosure statement applies where donations have been made to anyone in any associated persons, including:

- all reportable political donations made to any local councillor of the council, and
- all gifts made to any local councillor or employee of the district.

Notice of determination of the application

All people who prepare a submission will be notified of Council’s determination of the application.

Where do I send my submission?

Council prefers all submissions to be emailed to the following address:
council@canada-bay.nsw.gov.au

However, if you do not have an email address, you can send your submission via mail to:

General Manager
City of Canada Bay Council
Locked Bag 1470
DRUMMOYNE NSW 1670

City of Canada Bay

Tel 9911 6622 www.canada-bay.nsw.gov.au
Submissions
Many residents of Hunters Hill and Gladesville travel by ferry to Circular Quay, some as regular commuters, others intermittently. Some use the F3 service from Woolwich, others the F5 service from Huntleys Point. The proposed changes will significantly inconvenience those using both of these routes by requiring them to transfer to reach Circular Quay, so increasing their travel time.

The problem with the proposed changes is that not only will they increase the time taken to complete most travellers’ journeys, but the need to change at Balmain East, or take a second ferry from Barangaroo to Circular Quay, or walk to Wynyard will be stressful for the elderly, the infirm, for those travelling with babies or children, and for those travelling with luggage. It will also potentially be unsafe for the very elderly and women travelling on their own at night. Obviously these disadvantages cannot be compensated by the addition of additional services.

While Barangaroo may be a more convenient destination for those who work in the central-western part of the city, most people heading to that part of the city have the option of using buses, which are more frequent than ferries, and for some travellers, quicker; the net result would be to disadvantage those who are travelling to the northern parts of the city without improving matters for most of those heading for other parts.

Essentially, termination at Barangaroo would benefit only those travellers whose destination is within walking distance of that wharf because Barangaroo does not connect conveniently with any other mode of transport (for example it is a ten minute walk from Wynyard Station or the light rail).

We welcome your proposal to increase capacity by adding peak hour services on these routes, and would support the introduction of additional services from Huntleys Point and Woolwich to Barangaroo, but this should not be at the expense of reducing services to Circular Quay.

Obviously the proposed changes disadvantage most people travelling on the F3 and F5 ferries. So what is the real reason for moving these services away from Circular Quay? Presumably it is a solution to the frequent congestion at Circular Quay which requires a different approach to operation of the ferries.
Response to Proposed Changes to the F8 Ferry Route from Cockatoo Is/Woolwich to Circular Quay from 2021.

To:
Mr Craig Rieck
GM Operations
Transdev
Anne-Laure Saluend
GM Customer experience and Communications
Transdev

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed changes to our F8 Ferry Service Cockatoo Is/Woolwich (Hunters Hill) to Circular Quay from 2021.

The existing service is fast (24 minutes), direct, convenient, and meets community needs well, as it has done for many decades. However, there is widespread community anger with Transdev's proposal to cease a direct service to and from Circular Quay. A new termination of this service at Barangaroo is unacceptable and will predictably see a drop off of ferry use on this route.

The ferry service is an important public transport carrier for the Municipality of Hunters Hill. We are a peninsula at the convergence of the two major rivers in Sydney Harbour — the Lane Cove and Parramatta Rivers. Early steam ferries were introduced in the 1850s by French resident Didier Jeubert to connect the suburb to the rest of Sydney. Hunters Hill residents have subsequently relied on the ferry service that goes directly to Circular Quay for generations.

The Barangaroo hiatus does not meet our needs. It is a very limited and inconvenient destination.

Circular Quay is in the centre of the CBD and it is a transport hub. With a walk of only a few hundred metres, commuters can access other ferry routes across the harbour, the whole train network, the city-wide bus network and, now, the light rail.

Circular Quay is also a cultural centre with the Opera House, the MCA the Museum of Sydney, the State Library and the Royal Botanical Gardens nearby. It is also convenient to the medical practitioners in Macquarie Street and an easy journey to the major Department stores.

Transport NSW says its Transport strategy is to have "Customer focus" and I hope you listen to our feedback.

Its own research states that 36% of peak travelers on the F8 are journeying to work. Presumably some of these may welcome an additional peak hour stop at Barangaroo.

However the other 64% of travelers on this route include office workers who start early or finish late, school children who meet trains, buses and other ferries at Circular Quay as well as visitors and residents who choose to travel at non-peak times.
Many of the latter are seniors who are big ferry travelers and parents with small children who are not so mobile and who rely on the direct ferry service to CQ as an easy, direct and reliable way to navigate the CBD without having to walk far or needing to use the congested Victoria road.

Barangaroo is not a destination for most passengers from Hunters Hill. It may be useful for some business people in the new high-rise towers, casino patrons and restaurant guests. However Barangaroo itself isn’t a convenient terminus: it is half an hour walk to Circular Quay and 20 minutes to Wyaya and for an able-bodied person. A shuttle ferry from Barangaroo to the Quay would make the whole journey at least an hour each way. The net result will be less passengers and ultimately a further diminution of services.

The ferry service at present provides very effective transport for all demographics of Hunters Hill Municipality’s residents throughout the day, everyday. It delivers them directly where they most need to go - to Circular Quay! If some business people would benefit from an extra Barangaroo stop at peak hours that would seem to be a sensible addition.

Yours sincerely

[Name Redacted]

Hunters Hill Resident
Post mortem on last night’s meeting in the Hunters Hill Town Hall (13/02/20).

I commend Craig Rieck from Transdev for coming to the meeting, but I can only assume by his presentation (or as much of it that we heard) that he has a lack of real understanding of the local issues and how they are likely to impact on local residents. It appeared that Transdev wanted this to be an opportunity for a public relations exercise rather than any real wish to find any workable solutions to the problem of where the F8 ferry service will terminate.

A few items stood out as things that Transdev should have already been aware of:

1. The question was raised regarding the tenancies for wharves 1 and 6 and when the current leases will expire. Mr Rieck seemed to not realise the importance of this question. If the tourist ferries and jetboats are relocated to Barangaroo, more wharf space for the commuter ferries would be released. This surely would be an important area to explore to enable Circular Quay to remain a commuter hub, as most people want. Already a number of tourist ferries are located at King St wharves and it makes sense to make this more of a tourist centre.

2. Access to and from Barangaroo wharf has been seriously understated by Transdev. The nearest bus service at Sussex St is 450m away (number 311 to Potts Point), the nearest train service 700m at Wynyard and light rail is 750m on George St, and yet Transdev claimed it was a 6 min walk to connecting public transport. The promise of a metro line servicing the wharf in the future has limited use as it proposes to connect with North Sydney and Martin Place, neither places helpful for people going to the Opera House or the airport. As well the site of the proposed metro station is 1km from Barangaroo wharf—hardly a reasonable option.

3. Mr Rieck clearly stated that Transdev was to make proposals to the government, and it was the government that would make the final decisions about the changes to be made. Why were government representatives not evident at last night’s meeting? Anthony Roberts made full page contradictory claims about the ferry changes in the local paper over the last two weeks, but again was a no-show at the meeting. (Mr Roberts seems to make a practice of not turning up to community meetings). One interpretation of this governmental disinterest is that Transdev has the influence to make its suggestions accepted—suggestions that the travelling community does not want.

4. My fear is that if F8 ferries terminate at Barangaroo, fewer people will use the ferry because of taking them to a place which is far from where they want to go. Instead people may choose to catch buses along Victoria Rd (after a short car ride and parking near a bus stop) or worse still, drive all the way to their destination. At a time when our roads are so congested, decisions that force more cars on the roads are more than stupid.
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5. At the meeting I got the impression that Mr Reck is not a ferry traveler and has a hazy idea of the regions served by the F8 and F3 ferries. I hope that full community consultation with a proposed community panel will give Transdev more of an idea of what people want and need from a ferry service in this area. Hunters Hill and Woolwich have very limited public transport options and the ferry has been essential for us to get to work, school and after-hours activities. The prospect of catching a ferry home from Barranargoo after an evening function at the Opera House is daunting — a walk of more than two km walk through streets and tunnels that many would find slightly threatening at that time of night. At present only wharf 4 operates in the evenings; so why not use more wharves at Circular Quay.

6. The harbour offers a wonderful means of moving people around, and so far this has not been maximised. Instead over recent years services have been cancelled eg Elliot St, Balmain and Birkenhead Point as well as those to Lavender Bay, Jeffrey St and Boulah St in Kirribilli. I have some suggestions that I hope will be considered by Transdev:

a) Interlink the F8 and F3 ferries at Cockatoo Island so people from Woolwich who work near Barranargoo can go on the F8 to Cockatoo Island then catch the F3 direct service to Barranargoo. At present the F3 ferry to the city leaves a few minutes before the Woolwich ferry arrives so making any connection rather difficult.

b) Consider a service from Cockatoo Island to Woolwich, Greenwich, Birchgrove and to Luna Park then Circular Quay. Many local people work in North Sydney or go to school in North Sydney and would welcome the F8 stopping at Luna Park. This could be a morning, after school and evening peak variation to the F8 route.

c) Consider making a route that circulates between Cockatoo Island, Greenwich, Birkenhead Point, Elliot St Balmain and back to Cockatoo Island. Timetables could be constructed so that passengers could change at either Cockatoo or Greenwich for further travel on F8 or F3 ferries. This would provide a very useful cross-harbour route.

d) At present many people use Thames St service as it is such a wonderful direct service to the city. They are lucky to have the choice of two services, the F8 as well as F3. One solution is to leave Thames St as a stop on either the F8 route or the F3 route. However an alternative could be to have a separate service connecting Thames St, Darling St, Luna Park and Circular Quay, giving another much needed cross-harbour connection.

I hope this information and my suggestions will be considered. I feel strongly that what Transdev is proposing is not in the interest of the Hunters Hill/Woolwich community (nor in the longevity of the ferry services) and I will help in any way to try to maintain Circular Quay as the hub for the F8 service.
Dear Craig,

Many thanks for attending at Hunters Hill Council this evening. We appreciate your attendance and efforts to inform the community.

We would like to make the following submissions for your consultation:

1. We don’t find the feedback website easy to use or understand.
   - We are not sure how you use this to provide feedback. So we have sent you this email.

2. Existing services from Huntleys Point to Barangaroo will deteriorate:
   a. Two additional stops;
   b. Increased commute times to Barangaroo.
      - The current 6:23 am service takes 17 minutes. We understand this new service will take 26 minutes.
      - The current 7:02 am service takes 21 minutes. We understand that this new service will take 31 minutes.
   c. The Huntley’s Point to Barangaroo services (now commencing at Chiswick) are already crowded. Seating is already limited or unavailable as the morning commute progresses and sometimes the RiverCat service does not stop at Drummoyne because it is already full. By making Henley part of an “all stops service commencing from Abbotsford” will further add to congestion and lack of seating.

3. Cockatoo Island is not a main stop in commuter times (Monday to Friday peaks).
   - We cannot understand why this is now considered a major stop in weekday peak hour RiverCat operations.

4. Lack of direct services to Circular Quay
   - This will deteriorate the quality of operations along the Inner Parramatta river service between Chiswick, Huntleys Point, Drummoyne and the city.
   - An interchange service at Balmain East will add to commute times and effect elderly residents, and school children who rely on the ferry for Milsons Point services.

5. From a user perspective, the Huntleys Point service currently works well.
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- Why change this? Leave it as it is operating well and at a good, reliable standard.
- Better is not necessarily more frequent services - it is where they operate, number of stops and time of journey. For Huntleys Point residents, the new proposed service is a backward step for all of these reasons.

In summary, we disagree with these changes for Huntleys Point wharf commuters (residents), and strongly recommend they do not proceed further.

Kind regards
ITEM NO : 4.3

SUBJECT : DRAFT LOCAL STRATEGIC PLANNING STATEMENT - POST EXHIBITION REPORT

STRATEGIC OUTCOME : MAINTAIN THE CHARACTER AND AMENITY OF HUNTERS HILL

ACTION : PREPARE AND REVIEW STRATEGIC LAND USE STRATEGIES, POLICIES AND PLANS, SUCH AS THE LEP AND DCP

REPORTING OFFICER : STEVE KOUREPIS

PURPOSE

Council is required to prepare a Local Strategic Planning Statement (LSPS) that aligns with the Ten Directions of the North District Plan. The North District Plan is part of the Greater Sydney Metropolitan Region Plan. The LSPS is also a bridging land use planning statement between the North District Plan and the Hunters Hill Community Strategic Plan.

The purpose of this report is for Council to consider the submissions received as a result of the public exhibition of the draft LSPS, and the feedback from of the Greater Sydney Commission post exhibition of the plan. In total Council received 25 submissions from a mixture of local residents, organisations, government departments or agencies and one neighbouring Council. As a result of the submissions and feedback/direction from the Greater Sydney Commission (GSC), a number of changes have been made to the final draft LSPS.

This report presents the final draft LSPS to Council for its:

(a) consideration of the submissions received to the exhibition of the plan,

(b) consideration of proposed changes to the plan, in response to the public exhibition of the plan and meetings with the GSC,

(c) its endorsement of the plan, so it can be presented to the GSC Assurance Panel on 25 February 2020.

The Environmental Planning and Assessment Act, requires GSC Assurance so it is assured the Council-endorsed LSPS ‘aligns’ with the North District Plan. Once GSC Assurance is provided, the Council-endorsed LSPS returns to Council for adoption.

The Hunters Hill LSPS must be adopted by 31 March 2020 (Environmental Planning and Assessment Act).

RECOMMENDATION

1. That Council receives and notes the submissions to the public exhibition of the draft Hunters Hill Local Strategic Planning Statement.

2. That Council endorse the Hunters Hill Local Strategic Planning Statement, February 2020 as amended and submit the document to the Greater Sydney Commission and seek the support of their Assurance Panel.
BACKGROUND

The LSPS is a 20 year land use planning strategy for the Hunters Hill LGA that sets out how the Council will respond to community’s needs over a 20 year period. It must address the Ten Directions of the North District Plan and detail how these directions or issues will be addressed or interpreted locally as well as give guidance to the required review of the LEP.

The LSPS is also to consider community planning addressed under Integrated Planning and Community Strategic Plan (CSP) of the Local Government Act. A CSP addresses strategic planning activities beyond just strategic land use planning, which is generally the purpose of the LSPS, North District Plan and Greater Sydney Region Pan.

The LSPS is now the primary plan in which the desired land use future for the LGA is stated. This in turn will inform the review of environmental planning instruments, plans and the other activities Council will implement and deliver over a 20-year period.

The LSPS must set out:

a) a 20 year vision for land use in the local area
b) special characteristics which contribute to local identity
c) shared community values to be maintained and enhanced
d) how growth and change will be managed into the future

At the Council Meeting held on 9 September 2019, Council resolved that:

1. That Council endorse the draft Hunters Hill Local Strategic Planning Statement 2040 for public exhibition and note the community consultation program for the draft Hunter’s Hill Local Strategic Planning Statement, which will take place during September and October 2019.

2. That further reports on the draft Hunters Hill Local Strategic Planning Statement 2040 be brought to Council following the community consultation process for its consideration during the Local Strategic Planning Statement process.

3. That the General Manager be authorised to make any minor corrections required to the document.

REPORT

The draft LSPS was publicly exhibited from 16 September until 25 October 2019 and engagement was completed in accordance with the draft Community Participation Plan 2020 and the community engagement principles outlined in the draft Community Engagement Policy. The consultation program was made up of the following elements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Draft LSPS Consultation Program</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>March to October 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councillor Briefings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community consultation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council website</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email databases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rates Notice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newsletter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Strategic Plan - Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project consultation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the exhibition period, the following government agencies were notified:

- Department of Education
- Department of Planning, Industry & Environment
- Department of Premier and Cabinet
- Harbour City Ferries
- Office of Environment and Heritage
- Ministry of Health
In addition neighbouring councils The City of Canada Bay, Lane Cove Council and the City of Ryde were notified along with The Member for Lane Cove, The Hon. Anthony Roberts MP and the Federal Member for North Sydney, The Hon. Trent Zimmerman, MP were also advised.

As a result of the exhibition Council received 25 written submissions, and verbal feedback from the community workshops and pop-up kiosks. The written submissions were made up of submissions from 5 (five) residents of the Hunter’s Hill LGA, 8 (eight) organisations, 1 (one) neighbouring Council (City of Canada Bay) and 11 government agencies.

A detailed summary and response to each of the written submissions is attached (Attachment 1) and all submissions received are also available to view (Attachment 2). Attachment 1 also outlines the proposed changes to the final draft LSPS in response to the submissions.

Key matters raised in these submissions include:

- support for the place making approach to land use planning, development and management of lands, by private land owners, government agencies and Council,

- retention and conservation of local character, whether heritage character (conservation areas) or neighbourhood character (non-conservation areas),

- retention, conservation and promotion of our heritage, including review of heritage program and best practise approach, maintaining natural and built character,

- a vision and use of the Former Gladesville Hospital site and a masterplan process for the hospital site and its precinct, having regard to heritage and health and responding to its surrounds,

- working with the Department of Health, the owner of the former Gladesville Hospital site, and its intention to prepare a conservation management plan for the site and seek a State Heritage listing,

- housing - undertaking a housing study, retention and supply of social/public housing, ways to address the issues of housing affordability, housing supply targets set by GSC to support the North District Plan and the Greater Sydney Regional Plan,

- transport and active transport improvements, to address local roads congestion and in turn improve health of community and to develop links with adjoin networks, like the regional cycle route with City of Canada Bay,
• sustainability, making the transition to alternative energy sources for Council activities and supporting initiatives in the community eg. education, DCP amendments, e-car infrastructure etc,

• local tourism potential,

• contaminated land in Nelson Parade, Hunters Hill,

• bushland protection and conservation in DCP and Plans of Management,

• health and land use changes to facilitate health of community improvements, including shade in public arena,

• vehicle parking improvements,

• engagement with the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander People,

• recreation and sports, outdoor recreational places and indoor recreational space via facilities for arts and cultural pursuits, access to the Harbour Trust lands for activities and events, and

• environmental reporting, including air quality, waterways, energy/carbon/greenhouse gases.

No submissions raised any comments about the LSPS 20-year vision for the local government area (LGA) or the individual visions for Gladesville Town Centre, Hunters Hill Village, Boronia Park Village, Woolwich Corner Village and Garibaldi Corner Village; other than Gladesville Hospital Precinct, which has been addressed in Attachment 1 Written Submissions Summary and amendments to the final draft LSPS.

Since the public exhibition of the draft LSPS, Council officers also attended two meetings in the GSC LSPS meeting schedule, being:

1. GSC Assurance Meeting on 31 October 2019,
2. GSC Health Check Meeting (2nd meeting) on 29 January 2020

At both meetings, it was advised that the LSPS assurance process involves ensuring the final LSPS is consistent with the Greater Sydney Region Plan and the North District Plan and that the LSPS priorities and actions comply with the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act and its regulations. In particular, the GSC reiterated on a number of times that the final LSPS must make reference to State Environmental Planning Polices being the priority planning instrument.

It was advised that the GSC cannot assure an LSPS that conflicts with the North District Plan and the NSW Planning system (EP&A Act).

During the exhibition process and meetings with the Greater Sydney Commission, the following matters were identified as needing to be addressed and/or further addressed:

• The NSW Planning system
• Local Character
• Population projections and targets
• Housing projections and targets, housing types/stock, Local Housing Strategy/affordable and adaptable housing scheme
- Sensitive lands - Green grid, tree canopy, foreshore protection line, scenic and cultural landscapes
- Structure plan – map and content
- Transport – regional roads and corridors, freight at the local level e.g Victoria Road corridor, Burns Bay Road Corridor
- Active Transport – walk ways, cycle ways
- Recreation/open space – mapping, access and commentary
- Social Infrastructure – mapping and commentary
- Resilience, climate change and environmental reporting
- Waste
- Avoiding intensification in areas vulnerable to urban hazards
- Implementation action measures
- Document format – background consultation, structure plan format, centre and village commentary.

The GSC LSPS meeting notes for the meetings mentioned above are attached (Attachment 3), which shows the range of matters that the GSC raised with Council after the public exhibition of the draft LSPS. As a result of the meetings with the GSC significant amendments and additions have been made to the proposed final LSPS document, particularly the addition of new and refined mapping along with content restructuring and additional content.

CONCLUSION

The draft LSPS addresses State and regional planning objectives in the local context.

The LSPS will be the primary resource to express the desired land use future for the LGA and will guide and indicate what significant changes are planned for the LEP and DCP over the next 20 years and beyond.

Feedback obtained from the community, stakeholders and NSW Government agencies during the draft LSPS exhibition period and at GSC meetings (assurance) after the exhibition of the draft LSPS has informed the revised proposed final LSPS, which is now presented to Council for its endorsement before being submitted to the GSC for final assurance (Council endorsed LSPS).

Due to the restricted deadline Council must submit its draft LSPS to the GSC for assurance on Tuesday 25 February 2020, as the GSC’s LSPS Assurance Panel will convene to determine if the draft LSPS is consistent with relevant objectives and actions of the District Plan.

Following this GSC Assurance Panel meeting, Council is issued with a ‘letter of support’ to enable Council to adopt its proposed final LSPS. The letter may also include conditions or terms for support for the assurance of the LSPS (GSC assured LSPS). Once this letter of support is received, the LSPS can be ‘made’ subject to any conditions and terms, if applicable and will be published on the DPIE e-planning portal. The plan is made, by Council formally adopting the Council-endorsed/GSC assured final draft LSPS (by 31 March 2020).

Please note the Draft Local Strategic Planning Statement will be printed and circulated under separate cover.

FINANCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT

This is part of the strategic planning program under Council’s adopted budget.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Greater Sydney Commission Correspondence and Feedback
2. Draft LSPS Public Exhibition Submission summary and comments
Hunters Hill Council
Preliminary Review Meeting – GSC Meeting Notes
4:00pm 31st October 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ORGANISATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eva Klaic</td>
<td>Greater Sydney Commission (chair)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Jordan</td>
<td>Greater Sydney Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Kourepis</td>
<td>Hunters Hill Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiona Mann</td>
<td>Hunters Hill Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brendan Metcalfe</td>
<td>DPIE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolande Miller</td>
<td>DPIE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janice Bagot</td>
<td>DPIE – Environment, Energy and Science</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aoife Wynter</td>
<td>Senior Advisor to Greater Sydney Commission</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Discussion**

- Positives include:
  - Place-based infrastructure priorities
  - Discussion of heritage values
  - Place-based actions for local centres
  - Approaches to better manage car parking
  - Strong focus on productivity outcomes for local centres
  - Clear line of sight with District Plan on access to waterways and water-based transport
  - Actions for protecting catchment health
  - Actions for protecting biodiversity and bushland
  - Options for reducing carbon emissions
- The LSPS could include information from other plans and strategies council has already completed.

**Mapping**

- The LSPS Structure Plan could show key transport connections and bridges linking Hunters Hill to other parts of Greater Sydney. Key links include those that link Hunters Hill to the Harbour CBD and neighbouring strategic centres. Council indicated that it has limited resources to edit maps. The GSC suggested making edits as annotations or in PowerPoint. It may be possible to make these edits with annotation, possibly in PowerPoint.
- The LSPS maps could include labels for road names, suburb names and bridges.
- The LSPS maps could show important local social infrastructure, including community centres, child care and schools.
- The LSPS could map green grid.

These meeting notes represent a summary of preliminary feedback and meeting discussion on the draft LSPS. They do not represent formal advice or assurance.
Infrastructure and Collaboration

- District Plan Action 4 – the LSPS could define what is meant by short, medium and long term (providing an indication of years).
- District Plan Action 5 and 6 – the LSPS could identify the capacity of existing infrastructure, any planned upgrades and initiatives to better utilise existing infrastructure. This could be addressed in scene-setting or context text if Council’s preference is not to include any action. Consider including potential timeframes for anticipated infrastructure delivery.

Liveability

- District Plan Action 11 – The LSPS could strengthen narrative on how Council plans for healthy, safe and inclusive places. This could include references to the planned improvements to places, works or programs to support social connections, existing or proposed key social infrastructure and active transport improvements. The LSPS could discuss local access to fresh food – as part of the discussion of healthy communities. This might include noting where the fresh food is available in the LGA, such as greengrocers/supermarkets, farmers markets and community gardens.
- District Plan Action 15 – The LSPS could describe opportunities for creative and artistic expression and the night time economy and any barriers that exist at present. The LSPS could also refer to the State Cultural Infrastructure Strategy. The LSPS could note any opportunities to expand cultural activities in the LGA especially within the proposed innovation precinct.
- District Plan Action 16 – The LSPS could discuss social connections in relation to social infrastructure and, if appropriate, identify opportunities to strengthen these. This would provide insights into how existing infrastructure might be adapted over the next 20 years to meet the future community’s needs.

Housing

- District Plan Action 17 – the LSPS could:
  o Identify the relationship between existing housing supply and housing needs – with a focus on housing diversity that meets local need.
  o Include high-level principles for how future housing growth will be considered or investigated.
  o Clarify the outcomes that Council is seeking from local character statements – and note the need to work with DPIE on local character.

ACTION: DPIE to confirm comments for the future of the old hospital site and whether any housing is proposed.

ACTION: DPIE to clarify level of detail required for Hunters Hill Local Housing Strategy.

- District Plan Action 18 – The LSPS could discuss opportunities for an Affordable Rental Housing Scheme associated with uplift in Gladesville and describe any affordable rental housing in Hunters Hill.

Productivity

- District Plan Action 25 – The LSPS could map or describe transport connections to major employment hubs outside the LGA, and note any opportunities to improve these.

These meeting notes represent a summary of preliminary feedback and meeting discussion on the draft LSPS. They do not represent formal advice or assurance.
connections. The LSPS could also include an action to advocate to TfNSW to improve connectivity between ferry and bus services to reduce travel times.

- District Plan Action 26 and 52 – The LSPS could note Victoria Road public transport upgrades that are under investigation – including connections to West Ryde.

**ACTION: TfNSW to confirm wording with Hunters Hill on upgrades to Victoria Road.**

- District Plan Action 36 – The LSPS could describe existing public transport connections to nearby strategic centres, such as Chatswood, Macquarie Park and St Leonards.
- District Plan Action 36 – The LSPS could include an action to collaborate with Ryde Council on Gladesville Town Centre, or specifically note this in the vision

**ACTION: GSC to raise collaboration with Ryde Council on local centres shared between Ryde and Hunters Hill.**

- District Plan Action 46 & 48 – The LSPS could acknowledge existing industrial land and note the intent to retain industrial and urban services land, including describing its role in the Greater Sydney working waterfront. The LSPS could map industrial land or annotate maps with the location of working waterfront industrial lands.
- District Plan Action 50 – the LSPS could discuss travel patterns from Hunters Hill to strategic centres and map or describe major public transport routes, with reference to the objective for a 30-minute city.
- District Plan Action 55 & 58 – the LSPS could briefly note the role of Hunters Hill in supporting Sydney’s international tourism industry.
- District Plan Action 57 – the LSPS could provide more detail regarding opportunities to improve communication and Internet infrastructure – linked to discussion of high proportion of people working from home.
- District Plan Action 60 – the LSPS could explore freight and deliveries and impacts on urban amenity, including identifying Victoria Road as an important freight route.

**Sustainability**

- District Plan Action 62 – the LSPS could broadly describe waterways that are environmentally sensitive and how they are protected or will be in the future. Council could refer to mapping in the Sydney Harbour REP.

**ACTION: DPIE to send data on sensitive waterways to Hunters Hill.**

- District Plan Action 65 – the LSPS could mention any opportunities for reinstating natural conditions in highly modified waterways.
- District Plan Action 66 – the LSPS could broadly describe any steps Council is taking or will take to enhance biodiversity and bushland – this can draw from existing plans of management or highlight priority locations.
- District Plan Actions 67 and 68 – the LSPS could describe challenges or opportunities for protecting scenic and cultural landscapes and views to these landscapes. The LSPS could mention that LEP already includes a foreshore building line.
- District Plan Action 71 – The LSPS could quantify current levels of tree canopy in Hunters Hill. This could include recent positive results for increasing tree canopy cover.

**ACTION: DPIE to provide data on tree canopy cover.**

*These meeting notes represent a summary of preliminary feedback and meeting discussion on the draft LSPS. They do not represent formal advice or assurance.*
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Greater Sydney Commission

- District Plan Action 72 – The LSPS could identify Green Grid connections on a map, including the important and priority corridors from the North District Plan. The LSPS could also note the benefits of the Green Grid and any steps to deliver or enhance Green Grid connections.

ACTION: DPIE and GSC to provide spatial data on Green Grid connections

- District Plan Action 73 – The LSPS could describe access to open space, using the 400m and 200m access benchmarks used in the District Plan. LSPS could also describe priorities for new or improved open space. The LSPS could better distinguish between public and private open space on Map 9.
- District Plan Action 74 – The LSPS could note the LGAs current carbon emissions profile by source. The LSPS could potentially note if there are any opportunities for a future low carbon precinct at Gladesville Hospital.

ACTION: DPIE to provide link to NARClim data.

- District Plan Actions 76 and 77 – The LSPS could describe the need for waste management and recycling infrastructure. The LSPS could also note Council’s support for innovative solutions to reduce and manage waste.
- District Plan Action 80 – The LSPS could recognise the potential for more frequent and more severe natural hazards. The LSPS could also highlight potential impacts of these events on local communities and local infrastructure, as well as any steps Council is taking to improve local resilience.
- District Plan Action 81 – The LSPS could broadly describe areas exposed to hazards and note the need to avoid urban intensification in areas most exposed to natural and urban hazards.
- District Plan Action 82 – The LSPS could describe areas most vulnerable to urban heat island effect. The LSPS could also describe the impact of heat on the community and note how council is addressing this.

Implementation

- The LSPS could identify any focus areas for monitoring and reporting and/or outline monitoring and reporting that Council is already doing.
- The LSPS could clarify any planning proposals / LEP changes that will implement the LSPS.
- The LSPS could reference the role of SEPPs and Local Planning Directions (s.9.1) and line of sight back to the District Plan.

Program

- Council has requested a reschedule of assurance program dates to allow time to finalise the LSPS.
- Council intends to take the proposed final LSPS to council for endorsement on 10 February 2020.
- Technical Health Check is rescheduled to 29 January 2020 at 1:15pm. This would require submission of papers by 5pm on 20 January 2020.
- Assurance is rescheduled to 25 February 2020. This would require the document to be submitted by 5pm on 14 February 2020.

ACTION: GSC to contact Council to confirm date for Health Check and Assurance Panel

These meeting notes represent a summary of preliminary feedback and meeting discussion on the draft LSPS. They do not represent formal advice or assurance
Dear Mr Kourepis,

Thank you for attending Hunters Hill Council Health Check with District Commissioner Deborah Dearing on 29th January 2020.

As outlined in our correspondence to Council dated 15 August 2019, the Health Check phase is to provide support to Council in relation to matters of consistency with the District Plans as well as addressing any related alignment and program matters.

In this context please find attached draft Health Check meeting notes and comments. Please provide any clarifications to the attached by 14th February 2020, as the final meeting notes and comments will form part of the assurance documentation.

If you require any further information, please contact me on (02) 8289 6207 or by email: stephanie.barker@gsc.nsw.gov.au

Yours sincerely

Stephanie Barker
Executive Director, City Strategy

10 February 2020
Attachment A – Overview of Health Check

Please note that this overview and draft meeting notes represent a summary of health check discussion and agreed actions. They document discussions and are considered as input into the assurance program. However, it is recognised that these discussions are high level, may not address all matters and are subject to further review by the Assurance Panel.

Program Update by Council

Council confirmed the draft LSPS was publicly exhibited in accordance with the requirements of Schedule 1 Community Participation of the Environmental Planning & Assessment Act, 1979.

The draft LSPS was publicly exhibited on Council’s website for almost six (6) weeks, from 16 September 2019 to 25 October 2019. Notification was placed in the local paper (The Weekly Times), social media and Council’s website, “Have Your Say” website link and community newsletters.

Council received 25 submissions.

Council indicated that a report on feedback from exhibition will be considered at a Council meeting on 10th or 24th February 2020.

GSC will confirm an Assurance Panel date shortly.

Relationship of the Local Housing Strategy to the Local Strategic Planning Statement

All Greater Sydney Region Councils are required to prepare a Local Housing Strategy for endorsement by the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment (DPIE). It is noted that Council will commence work on its local housing strategy and is seeking guidance from DPIE on the scope given the size of the LGA.

At the Health Check meeting GSC initiated discussion on the 6-10 year target. GSC advised that analysis of available information on forecast supply indicates the 6-10 year target is best expressed as a range and is likely to be in the vicinity to the 0-5 year target, however this may be refined by further analysis of local issues.

Opportunities to support the delivery of housing in the right location in both LHS and LSPS are provided under the heading feedback on selected content below.  

Implementation Overview

Planning Proposals predating the Region and District Plans

Council noted that it has one planning proposal, Gladesville Shopping Village, with the DPIE at this stage. This proposal focuses on a local centre (and pre-dates release of Regional and District Plan) and is currently in the finalisation stage.
Current Planning Proposals
See above.

Signalled Imminent Proposals
Council noted that it doesn’t foresee any significant planning proposals, the LEP update Council intends to progress will primarily deal with housekeeping matters.

Key Implementation Focus
- **Planning for local centres**
  Council indicated that local centres (together with the former Hospital site, if it is redeveloped) are to be the focus of future growth. Council was encouraged to include more specific actions and principles to guide future planning of its centres. Ku Ring Gai’s LSPS was noted as an example with clear guidance for future planning and development of centres. District Plan also contains principles for centres and making ‘Great Places’ that may be referenced/highlighted.
- **Local Housing Strategy**
  Council is encouraged to consult with DPIE regarding the scope and approach to its LHS. GSC noted that many Councils have taken a staged approach to their LHSs. Commencing with needs and constraints analysis in the first stage, then undertaking target take up / feasibility analysis in the second stage.
Technical Health Check Meeting Notes

HUNTERS HILL COUNCIL
1:15pm – 3:00pm, 29 January 2019
Greater Sydney Commission, Valentine Avenue, Parramatta

ATTENDANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ORGANISATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deborah Dearing</td>
<td>District Commissioner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie Barker (chair)</td>
<td>Greater Sydney Commission – Acting Executive Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim Stokeld</td>
<td>Greater Sydney Commission – Manager Assurance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eva Stansbury</td>
<td>Greater Sydney Commission – Liveability Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatjana Djuric-Simovic</td>
<td>Greater Sydney Commission – Tech lead Hunters Hill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karunya Subramanian</td>
<td>Greater Sydney Commission – Planning Officer (part only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aoife Wynter</td>
<td>Senior Advisor to the Greater Sydney Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Kouurepis</td>
<td>Hunters Hill Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiona Mann</td>
<td>Hunters Hill Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Rush</td>
<td>Transport for NSW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luke Downeend</td>
<td>DPIE (on the phone)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yolande Miller</td>
<td>DPIE (on the phone)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate McDonald</td>
<td>DoE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janice Bagot</td>
<td>DPIE - EES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann-Marlee Carruthers</td>
<td>NSW Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(apology)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conflict of Interest

No conflict of interest.

It was noted that all attendees are bound by employer’s conflict of interest and confidentiality agreements.

General Discussion

GSC explained that Technical Health Check meetings provide opportunity to discuss feedback received during public exhibition of the draft documents and identify any critical issues that need to be resolved in order to make Council’s LPSs assurance ready.

The Chair noted that the process of LPSs assurance involves ensuring consistency with Regional and District Plans but also confirming that LPSs priorities and actions comply with the current Planning Act, State planning policies and regulations. GSC cannot assure any LPSs policy or statement that is conflicting current planning legislation framework.

Updates and clarifications to the LPSs since the preliminary feedback meeting were noted. The District Commissioner also noted that strengths of the document including a place-based approach to planning for centres and a good description of the local planning context.
Note that Ann-Maree Carruthers from Ministry of Health was an apology for the meeting. She emailed the chair prior to the meeting to say that NSW Health is talking to DPIE and Council regarding the Gladesville Hospital Site.

Program Update by Council

Council received 25 submissions; key matters raised include:

- support for place-based planning and suggested principles for the Gladesville hospital site, including celebrate to heritage and respond to scale of the surrounding context.
- greater flexibility for supermarkets development on behalf of two supermarket chains.
- objection to a specific development proposed for the Gladesville shopping strip.
- calls for remediation of a contaminated site.
- support for open space and public realm improvements.

Council explained that key refinements to the LSFS following exhibition include further comments about tourism including opportunities for a day walk and changes in response to Minister of Health feedback regarding the former Gladesville Hospital.

Council hasn’t formally considered submissions yet.

Maps improvements are underway, and Council welcomes any suggestions to inform updates.

Council intends to update the LEP in stages.

Council currently scoping the Local Housing Strategy and would like to engage with DPIE regarding the approach having regard to the local context.

Matters of clarification/inconsistencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matter</th>
<th>District Plan Action (LSFS Action)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Character</td>
<td>DP Action: 19</td>
<td>GSC sought clarification on character, heritage conservation and garden city concepts and approach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LPS Actions 4.6 &amp; 5.2, Page 16</td>
<td>Council intends to do heritage character statements for heritage conservation areas and local character statements for remaining areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Council was encouraged to more clearly distinguish the approaches. In the case of Statement of Significance for Heritage Conservation Areas (HCAs),</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matter</th>
<th>District Plan Action (LSPS Action)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|                        |                                   | **Local Housing Strategy**:  
DP Action: 17  
LSPS pgs. 16  
- Council noted that it would like its Local Housing Strategy to focus on housing needs of the local community, including housing type, affordability, accessibility, etc.  
- Council was encouraged to describe the planning context for the housing within the LSPS, including noting the proportion of land in the LGA that is constrained (such as heritage conservation and foreshore protection areas).  
- The above constraints analysis (e.g. Mosman LSPS map), together with the LHS needs analysis will help focus the scope of the Local Housing Strategy.  
- DPIE offered to meet with Council regarding the scope and approach to the LHS.  
- **Action:** GSC to provide link to/or contact for Mosman’s constraints maps. |
|                        |                                   | **Housing Targets**:  
DP Action: 17  
- GSC explained that 6 to 10 year housing targets are likely to be in range and is likely to be similar to the 0 to 5 year.  
- GSC noted that DPIE recently released new population projections and noted |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matter</th>
<th>District Plan Action (LPS Action)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affordable and adaptable housing scheme</td>
<td>DP Action:</td>
<td>GSC suggested including explaining Council’s approach to affordable housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Council is encouraged to note they will prepare an affordable rental housing scheme under SEPP70 within the LPS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LPS pgs. 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity of existing infrastructure and access to open space</td>
<td>DP Actions:</td>
<td>Council explained that its infrastructure projects are outlined in its plans of management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3, 5, 6 &amp; 73</td>
<td>GSC suggested that LPS describes infrastructure priorities and any significant current projects which respond to infrastructure needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LPS pgs. 50 &amp; 51</td>
<td>GSC suggested noting any infrastructure needs assessments currently underway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green Grid and Tree Canopy</td>
<td>DP Actions:</td>
<td>Council noted that it has a policy for replacing trees and intends to include a map of the existing tree canopy cover in the LPS for assurance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71 &amp; 72</td>
<td>GSC suggested noting Council’s approach to retaining tree canopy. GSC also suggested describing the local green grid and any gaps or related projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LPS Action 8.7 &amp; pgs. 22, 23 and 24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matter</td>
<td>District Plan Action (LSPS Action)</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenic and cultural landscapes</td>
<td>DP Action: 67 &amp; 68 LSPS pgs. 20</td>
<td>• GSC suggested including a more detail description of the scenic elements of the LGA and mapping the foreshore protection area (see discussion above on constraints mapping).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mapping – structure plan</td>
<td>Page 7 of Supporting Information LSPS page 8 and 11</td>
<td>• GSC suggested that more detail be included in maps and Council noted that it intends to update maps prior to assurance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• GSC noted that maps are small and hard to read. One suggestion to address this could be if the LSPS were landscape orientated maps could be enlarged to a single page.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• GSC suggested combining maps 1 &amp; 4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• GSC also noted that colours on maps 10 and 11 are very similar making them difficult to distinguish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Council noted potential for inaccuracies in maps as a result of GIS data. GSC suggested including a note on affected maps (such as, subject to refinement).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Action:</strong> GSC to provide examples of other councils’ LSPS suggests for maps improvements via email following the Health Check meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporating consultation information in the LSPS</td>
<td>LSPS pgs. 29 to 32</td>
<td>• GSC suggested that the consultation information could be summarised with details included in a separate document.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local centres</td>
<td>DP Action: 22 LSPS pgs. 41</td>
<td>• GSC suggested noting the outcomes of planning work for centres rather than just listing the studies that were done. This could include actions that respond to each of the place visions (Hunters Hill Village, Gladesville town centre,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matter</td>
<td>District Plan Action (LSPS Action)</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Listing previous planning studies for Gladesville Town Centre | DP Action: 22 LSPS pgs. 39 | • GSC suggested that the inclusion of all previous studies for Gladesville town centre could be reconsidered given the date of some of these studies (10 years old) and because Council intends to undertake further work.  
• GSC suggested Council note the next steps for the planning for the centre instead. The LSPS could include a note that this future work will build on previous work, listing a few key studies as examples. |  |
<p>| Summary of Actions | Health Check supporting information | • Consider including the District Plan priority/action numbers in the summary of submission tables |  |
| Use of the Pulse of Greater Sydney Indicators | DP Action: 84 LSPS pgs. 56 | • Consider referencing Pulse indicators in the LSPS as the data is published at LGA level. |  |
| Active Transport | DP Action: 24 &amp; 25 LSPS pg. 54 | • GSC suggested looking at measures that might support active transport. For example, using traffic speed to support cycling. |  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matter</th>
<th>District Plan Action (LSPS Action)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Stakeholder Dependencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to open space</td>
<td>DP Action: 73 LSPS pgs. 18, 54 &amp; 60</td>
<td>- TfNSW noted that changes to traffic speeds will need to be agreed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Freight</td>
<td>DP Action: 60 LSPS pgs. 20</td>
<td>- TfNSW suggested noting Council’s approach in local freight management.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilience and climate change</td>
<td>DP Action: 80 LSPS pgs. 20, 26 &amp; 61</td>
<td>- GSC suggested noting that Council is part of the resilient cities group and referencing actions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- DPIE suggested referencing/including NARClm data in the LSPS, noting existing carbon emission data is also available to Councils via 100 Resilient Cities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- DPIE suggested mapping or describing environmentally sensitive waterways, tree canopy cover and urban heat to expand the ‘environmental’ basis for the LSPS.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoiding intensification in areas vulnerable to urban hazards</td>
<td>DP Action: 81 LSPS pgs. 26, 61</td>
<td>- Consider including a statement that Council will avoid intensification in the areas subject to hazards, (as contained in District Plan).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matter</td>
<td>District Plan Action (LSPS Action)</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria Road Corridor</td>
<td>DP Action: 50 LSPS pgs. 18</td>
<td>• TNSW suggest that the LSPS reference working with TNSW on Movement and place strategy for Victoria Road Corridor.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning process and LSPS wording</td>
<td>DP Action: 16 LSPS pgs. 14</td>
<td>• Suggest that wording ‘no other suitable land’ on page 14 be reconsidered. Suggest positive wording such as ‘a suitable location for housing’ be used instead.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Next Steps**

Submission date for Council’s LSPS will be confirmed along with the date of the assurance meeting. The LSPS is scheduled to go to Council on 24 February 2020. The GSC has indicated that it will prepare for the panel using the version that goes to the Council meeting and schedule a phone call with Council for 25 February 2020 to discuss any major changes following the Council meeting. Council will submit maps ahead of the Council meeting for early consideration.

**Action:** GSC, Council and if available DPIE will hold a phone meeting on 25 February 2020 (morning) to discuss any changes to the LSPS following Council’s meeting on 24 February.

The GSC’s LSPS Assurance Panel, scheduled for 25 February 2020, will determine if the draft LSPS is consistent with relevant planning priorities and actions of the District Plan.

Following the positive determination of the LSPS Assurance Panel it is intended a “letter of support” is to be issued to Council. The letter may also include advisory considerations for future strategic planning to implement the LSPS.

Once Council has received the letter of support, the LSPS can be ‘made’. Council will need to provide the final LSPS to DPIE for publishing on the e-Planning portal.
Hunter's Hill Council

Draft LSPS - Public Exhibition submissions. Summary + Comments

Exhibition: 16 September 2019 to Friday 25 October 2019
Submissions received: 25, 19 community (in exhibition period), 9 NSW government agencies 9 in/ outside exhibition period

Sub. No: Chronological date received (but split into community and NSW Government agencies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub. No</th>
<th>Author/IX Ref</th>
<th>Submission Summary</th>
<th>Council Planner’s Response</th>
<th>LSPS Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1**   |               | Raises footpaths at Riverglade Reserve, indicating that:  
- cyclists are riding on the reserves footpath, which puts pedestrians and  
  their pets safety in jeopardy;  
- a majority of walkers would like to see signs and enforcement  
  prohibiting all cyclists including e-bikes from using sections of footpath,  
  because cyclists create a dangerous environment using this section, as it  
  is narrow and the only way to avoid collision is to drive/fall in to  
  Tarban Creek/Tarban Bay.  
Requests Council to find solution for particular section of footpath in reserve to  
better protect the community, and refers to the cycle path on the opposite side of  
the Tarban Bay walking zone. | Riverglade Reserve (Victoria Rd,  
Huntleys Cove) is owned by the NSW  
Government and Council has care,  
control and management of the reserve  
(Crown Lands Act).  
Submission relates to Council’s current  
renewal of Riverglade Reserve Plan of  
Management (PoM) under the Local  
Government Act (LGA) Act. Submission  
will be provided to Council’s PoM officers/  
and Works & Service team for  
consideration.  
LSPS themes and Planning Priorities:  
PP6, PP8 | Yes.  
1. Add PoMs to  
Measures – Action 6.1,  
Action 6.6 |
| **2**   | #432076 | Indicates important to retain heritage character of area through leadership of  
Council implementing the community’s wishes. Short-term actions/ nipping at  
standards/ spot developments that are out of character with the area should not  
be allowed. Good consistent planning needed and ask private developments to  
join/contribute to vision in agreed/clearly defined planning framework.  
Suggests:  
(a) Former Gladesville Hospital site (PP 1, 2, 2.5, 3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 6.2): Good  
plan needed. Likely requirements of government to increase density in area,  
and if so, make plans for medium density housing issue onsite. Mental  
Health services need to improve in NSW and the lack of supported  
accommodation is a key problem. Consider hospital as a subacute mental  
health facility or for other supported accommodation and retain buildings that  
allow a reasonably high-density of dwellings with parkland areas. Psychiatric  
facilities are beside rivers and in-garden settings, as they are calming, are of  
The matters raised support the place-based approach and actions of the draft  
LSPS that Council will implement over  
the next 20 years under the EP&A Act  
and LG Act, and involve NSW  
Government agencies and private  
landowners/ parties whose actions  
involves them.  
Suggestions for the hospital, health and  
Gladesville town centre noted and  
addressed in the place making initiatives  
and actions of the draft LSPS. Council is  
working with City of Ryde Council and  
Transport for NSW to plan and deliver a  
better placed-based Gladesville. |  
1. Add text for local and  
visitors tourism and tree  
canopy to Strategic  
Concept section.  
2. Add hospital to  
Measures – Action 1.2,  
Action 2.5, Action 3.2,  
Action 3.4, Action 6.2,  
Action 7.1  
3. Add PoMs and work  
with agencies for  
outdoor facilities to  
Measures – Action 1.3,  
Action 2.5 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub. No</th>
<th>Author/IX Ref</th>
<th>Submission Summary</th>
<th>Council Planner’s Response</th>
<th>LSPS Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>minimized risk to surrounding populations, while their residents are supported, and generate local jobs.</td>
<td>Comments about the bus shelters is in response to the recent bus shelter contract, and will be provided to Council’s Works &amp; Service team for consideration in future activities and is addressed in PP8.6 action.</td>
<td>Action 5.1, Action 6.1, Action 8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(b) Provision of Outdoor Gyms (PP 1.3). Encourage exercise for healthy interaction of residents and to build a community. Facilities in parks for jogging and exercise circuits eg. Gladesville Park, Wolli Park and Boronia Park, and for young people e.g. skate park at Boronia Park Reserve to complement the one at Gladesville Park.</td>
<td>Suggestions about the tree canopy support the garden–suburb character and heritage character of area and actions to expand the tree canopy/ green grid in area.</td>
<td>4. Add tourism to Measures – Action 2.4, Action 2.5, Action 3.4, Action 4.1, Action 5.1, Action 5.2, Action 8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(c) Tourism Woolloomooloo (PP 1.3). Cockatoo Island has visitors, but few of them visit Woolloomooloo. A day trip around Woolloomooloo peninsula, would be as good a day as on Cockatoo Island (wharf, lookout, Goat Paddock, Woolloomooloo docks, Clarrie’s Point, Kelly’s Bush, Wolli Park, swimming baths, Sydney to Hobart boat, eat at Woolloomooloo Hotel and restaurants). Market with Sydney Harbour Federation Trust, as its local lands are a neglected part of Trust’s property portfolio.</td>
<td>LSPS themes and Planning Priorities: PP1, PP2, PP4, PP6, PP7, PP8</td>
<td>5. Add access and parking to Measures – Action 4.2, Action 6.1, Action 7.1, Action 7.2, Action 7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(d) Access in Hunters Hill village and shared vehicles (PP 2.4, 7.3). Parking at Hunters Hill shopping precinct and Hunters Hill Hotel inadequate (small difficult to navigate and little use to visitors), extra traffic lights on Church St create significant delays. Any future development in village must provide more parking. Allow shared vehicles (GoGet model) to use parking spaces to lessen the number of vehicles in municipality.</td>
<td>6. Add Gladesville Town Centre Measures – Action 2.3, Action 2.4, Action 4.5, Action 6.1, Action 7.1, Action 7.3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(e) Gladesville Town Centre (PP 4.5, 7.1). Problems are:</td>
<td>7. Add public domain infrastructure, innovative access schemes, sustainable power to Measures – Action 1.3, Action 8.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>i. Two councils manage each side of main road – Council City of Ryde</td>
<td>8. Add tree canopy measures – Action 8.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ii. Victoria Rd is increasingly busy and cleanways are for longer periods</td>
<td>9. Add new Street Tree Canopy map.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(f) Heritage Bus Shelters (PP 8.1, 8.3, 7.2). Bus shelters are needed to encourage the use of public transport. The heritage bus shelter at Woolloomooloo Wharf should be the basis for similar modest shelters along Woolloomooloo Rd and Alexandria Street. Let current aluminium bus shelters contract run out and then have heritage-appropriate bus shelters. Other simple amenities need to reinforce the heritage of Hunters Hill, and should be designed and built with this in mind. See North Sydney LGA approach.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub. No</td>
<td>Author/IX Ref</td>
<td>Submission Summary</td>
<td>Council Planner’s Response</td>
<td>LSPS Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Suggests:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Add new Planning Priority 8.8 being, ‘Develop and implement strategies to improve connectivity between bushland areas for the benefit of our native flora and fauna.’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Add text to Planning Priority 4.1 (Heritage character statements) or 6.2 (Gladesville hospital precinct masterplan), to say, ‘Within the Gladesville Hospital Precinct conserve and protect both built and vegetation heritage, as there are significant trees and heritage gardens within this precinct.’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• For the draft LSPS or Hunters Hill DCP – for new residential developments ensure there is sufficient space for inclusion of a communal garden outside meeting area to build social capital eg. herb garden, food garden. To be maintained by the residents. As housing developments get bigger, people get more isolated.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>#433353</td>
<td>Raises idea of a second exit from the [Woollahra] Peninsula in case of a disaster, as there is only one exit and as the main road in and out during peak times for school and ferry drop off pick up causes traffic to be backed up as far back as Woolwich to the overpass [Burns Bay Road]. Buses to and from the Marist Sisters School in peak times cause a major traffic issue, slow traffic endeavouring to exit the Peninsula. Suggests:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Another road exit from the Peninsula be investigated as it would be a lost opportunity if not done in the 20 year plan, i.e. under the Figtree Bridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Public emergency building on the Peninsula, as a recent fire opposite St. Peter Chanel Church could have been worse if it had spread to adjoining homes, and test emergency vehicles speed and access on Peninsula.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td># 437644</td>
<td>The Association aims to support and develop the slackline community. Slacklining is an outdoor active recreational activity that involves attaching a 1 to 2 inch wide flat webbing (a slackline) between two anchors, usually trees, and balancing on it. It promotes an active lifestyle, which is good for health and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There are 33 hectares of bushland in the area that Council is focused on retaining, protecting and providing links to and corridors between for flora and fauna. Management of bushland is primarily via PoMs and through participation in regional planning like Parramatta River Coastal Management Plan and Parramatta Regional Park PoM, where Council works with other councils at a regional/distinct level. Council is currently or is about to review and update its PoMs for bushland reserves. The submission will be provided to Council PoM Officers, Bushland Management Officer and the Works and Service team for consideration in future activities LSPS themes and Planning Priorities: PP4, PP8, PP9).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes. 1. Add refine text for rivers and foreshores local, Our Economy and international visitors/tourism and tree canopy to Strategic Context section. 2. Add bushland biodiversity to Measures – Action 4.1, Action 8.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The submission is noted and will be considered as part of Council’s routine liaison with NSW Government agencies responsible for emergency services planning and provisions. Suggestions about traffic congestion and parking at peak travel times addressed in transport and parking actions of the draft LSPS. Council is currently preparing a parking strategy for the area and the submission will be provided to the Transport engineer officer Works and Service team for their consideration. LSPS themes and Planning Priorities: PP2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes. 1. Add NSW Government agencies to Measure – Action 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The use of open space and reserves in the area is managed via the Outdoor Sport and Recreation Plan and PoMs for Council’s land.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub. No</td>
<td>Author/IX Ref</td>
<td>Submission Summary</td>
<td>Council Planner’s Response</td>
<td>LSPS Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 9       | #437945       | The Association's submission focusses on the economic and social value of affordable rental housing to local communities; the need for affordable rental housing in Sydney; and the opportunities local councils have to support the delivery of affordable rental housing over the next 20 years. The Association is a body for registered community housing providers and supports Aboriginal Community Housing providers. Comments:  
- Community housing providers in area are Evolve Housing and Link Housing.  
- Supports draft LSPS actions for providing a range of housing types that address affordability as a goal.  
- Supports development of a local housing strategy for evidence on affordable rental housing needs and most appropriate mechanisms for delivering it to ensure that it is financially viable and retained in perpetuity.  
- Supports action seeking inclusion in SEPP 70, as sees an affordable housing contribution scheme under SEPP 70 as the fairest, most transparent for developers and the community and therefore most effective.  
- Welcomes opportunity to work with Council to explore housing opportunities, including how the Council could collect developer contributions to help co-fund the development of affordable housing and how Council could partner with local community housing providers to build fit-for-purpose homes on Council-owned land.  
Recommendations:  
- Identify affordable rental housing as a strategic priority  
- Acknowledge the economic and social benefits of affordable rental housing and its role job growth and economic prosperity  
- Acknowledge Greater Sydney Commission' affordable housing targets  
- Commit to developing an local housing strategy, which quantifies housing need now and into the future and focus on need for affordable rental housing. | Council is currently or is about to review the Outdoor Sports and Recreation Plan and PoMs for OpenSpace, Parks and Reserves and the submission will be provided to the Recreation officer/ Places and Projects Manager for consideration. NSW Government agencies also own lands in the area that are used for community activities. Matter addressed in draft LSPS in scope of Action 1.2, Action 5.1. LSPS themes and Planning Priorities: PP2, PP5. | Yes  
1. Add refine text to Strategic Context, Our Community and Our Housing sections.  
3. Add GSC Housing Targets table. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub. No</th>
<th>Author/IX Ref</th>
<th>Submission Summary</th>
<th>Council Planner's Response</th>
<th>LSPS Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 11     | #438011       | The Institute is a NSW Government authority who delivers the NSW Cancer Plan to reduce the incidence of cancer and the NSW Skin Cancer Prevention Strategy. Skin cancer is the most common cancer in Australia. Comments:  
- Skin cancer is preventable with personal protective behaviours and well-designed and correctly positioned shade (natural vegetation and built structures). Good quality shade is integral to reducing exposure to UVR, but needs to be planned and provided with careful thought if it is to be effective.  
- Local planning provisions and policies can be a practical way to deliver shade and encourage its retention and additional of shade.  
- Commends Council on its recognition of the importance of urban trees and vegetation, and in optimising the use and enjoyment of open space and recreation facilities.  
Requests to make natural and built shade a priority of the LSPS, and to include LSPS content that supports shade in planning and design e.g. principals for new commercial and residential development in DCP; provision of well-designed shade in public spaces - playgrounds, recreation areas, commercial centres, bus stops, along footpaths and streets etc.  
Suggestions inclusion of specific references to shade provision. Despite the focus on urban trees and open space, the words 'shade/shading' are not mentioned in the LSPS and suggest adding reference in the 'Trees' section in the Strategic Context Chapter. | Council provides shade on public lands through its commitment to being the oldest garden-suburb and preserving the character of the area. This involves the street tree planting program and providing trees/canopy structures in recreational spaces to create shade and hence address shade for health. Via the Recreational Plan/ PoMs e.g. play equipment, BBQ areas, sports fields, addressing access to sunlight/shaded areas as development controls in the DCP in line with current standards. The submission will be provided to Council's Street Tree officer/Works and Service team for their consideration.  
The street tree planning program should be formalised through a Council policy/local approvals policy to assist staff in implementing the program. This would be a timely review of practices and could future-proof the program for asset management/sustainability needs and help better inform the community about our future approach.  
The submission will be provided to Council development and Strategic Planner/Works and Service team for their consideration in the DCP review.  
Council is currently or has planned a review of the Outdoor Sports and Recreation Plan and PoMs for OpenSpace, Parks and Reserves and the submission will be provided to the Recreation officer/Places and Projects Manager for consideration in the review of these plans.  
Council supports the retention and planting of trees on private lands through development controls in the DCP and implementing the Vegetation in Non- | Yes.  
2. Add new Street Tree Canopy map |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub. No</th>
<th>Author/Ref</th>
<th>Submission Summary</th>
<th>Council Planner's Response</th>
<th>LSPS Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 12      | #418946    | Requests Council to research housing need and recognise the need for AH and that AH is critical, social and economic infrastructure in line with leading research and the latest Australian Infrastructure Audit in the LSPS. Recommendations:  
- Additional local data on housing affordability (median income, median dwelling prices, levels of housing stress, mortgage stress), housing density  
- Amend data on social housing as a proportion of total stock for greater clarity and so absolute values match the percentages  
- Investigate strategies to support and encourage new innovative housing to increase diversity e.g. shop top housing, and sensitive infill strategies for progressive densification of low density areas.  
- Provide adaptable housing informed by the Liveable Housing Guidelines  
- Ensure the built environment and amenity is designed to be accessible to all members of the community, i.e. Seven Principles of Universal Design  
- Prepare AH Contribution Schemes under SEPP 70 for the entire LGA and/or for Gladesville Town Centre, Boronia Park and Hunters Hill Village, and consider setting contribution at 15% of net floor space.  
- Exemption from s/11 and/or s/12 contributions for affordable housing development led by a Community Housing Provider (CHP) as part of the review of the contributions plan (Action 2.1, 2.2).  
- Advocate for a significant proportion of the housing delivered on the Gladesville Hospital site to be social and AH, e.g. above 30%, as part of Action 3.4.  
- State that Council will consider other planning mechanisms at its disposal to facilitate the delivery of AH, such as Voluntary Planning Agreements and use of section 7.11 contributions to deliver essential social and economic infrastructure such as affordable housing.  
- Advocate to the NSW and Australian Governments for more social and AH development in the area and in the North District.  
- Tackle AH issues at the metropolitan and regional level, through collaboration with other LGAs, and advocate for a Regional AH Strategy  
- Advocate to NSW Government for reform of the Residential Tenancies Act to end ‘no grounds’ evictions.  
- Align the review of the LSPS and the LHS with the review of the LEP and the DCP, every five years  
- Include indicators for AH as part of the monitoring section of the LSPS                                                                                                                                                                                                 | The draft LSPS supports the provision of a range of housing options, which is reflected in the local housing strategy action, the AH investigation and target action, research to support understanding of community needs, and specific SEPP 70 AH action.  
- The submission will be addressed in the local housing strategy, which will be prepared from 2020. There is a significant proportion of public housing and other community housing supply in the area and Council is supportive of retaining this stock and exploring future needs. Opportunities to work with other councils at a district level, NSW Government agencies and other providers will be explored.  
- It is not feasible to include some of the recommendations in the draft LSPS ahead of the local housing strategy, as the strategy would need to be considered by Council first. Likewise, the review of DCP would be informed by the local housing strategy. Details on AH can be included in the next review of the adopted LSPS.  
- The North District Plan indicates the Greater Sydney Commission and the NSW Department of Planning, Industry and Environment need to do further work on developing mechanisms to deliver AH and on population projections and demographic changes.  
- LSPS themes and Planning Priorities: PP3, PP4 | Yes.  
1. Add refine text to Strategic Context for Our Community and Our Housing.  
3. Add GSC Housing Targets table. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub. No</th>
<th>Author/ Ref</th>
<th>Submission Summary</th>
<th>Council Planner's Response</th>
<th>LSPS Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 13      |             | LSPS is an informative and provides helpful guidelines to our community. Congratulations to the Council for preparing this forward looking plan. Indicated the submission represents the majority of residents in Nelson Parade, rather than multiple individual submissions raising the same issues. Suggestions for the final version of the draft LSPS, for the Nelson Parade issue.  
1. Greater commitment from Council, requested to clearly state its role to actively support our community, rather than passively liaising with government.  
2. Complete removal of all contaminants is the agreed method of remediation. Council has repeatedly voted that this method of remediation is their position, and it should be clearly stated in the Council document to avoid ambiguity.  
3. Residents "Agreed Position" document states complete removal in the overall goal of all residents, i.e. "it should be fully remediated by complete removal of all contamination in Nelson Parade."  
4. Removal of all radionuclides of the last sentence in section (for any land use or change in land use), which effectively supports Property NSW's encapsulation position, i.e. reference to "change in land use", which opens the door to encapsulation/open space. Property NSW has initiated change in current residential use/zoning so it can leave the radioactive material onsite. Residents overwhelmingly want the street to remain entirely residential. | The submission has been considered in updating the section on the Nelson Parade contaminated land section to indicate Council's position and to remove any ambiguity around the last sentence that is lands should be fully remediated and decontaminated for sustainability and health grounds. Council may wish to discuss this matter further.  
The contaminated land matter is a significant issue to community and is important to address it in regard to the purpose of the LSPS. But, resolution of the matter sits with NSW Government agencies. Council will continue to support the residents and work with NSW Government agencies in their resolution of the matter for the residents, health and environment. The unresolved remediation of the land would have a negative impact on other aspects of the draft LSPS e.g. sustainability and tourism development.  
LSPS themes and Planning Priorities: P11, P11.1 |
| 14      | #438030 #438091 | The Trust supports the concept of a 20 year vision for land use in Hunters Hill, and most of the proposed actions and associated measures proposed to indicate their achievement. Comments:  
• Document improvements: suggests updates to include more local knowledge, updates include text and maps e.g. bridges, place names, park names, bus routes, what's launching ramp, cycle ways versus cycle routes and shared paths, bushland/landscapes, Woolwich Baths.  
• Consultation section: suggests updates for feedback priorities, five key community precincts' versus five locations, four key centres in the LGA.  
• Gladesville Town Centre: edits updates for Gladesville Occasional Child Care Centre.  
• Boronia Park Village: updates for proximity of Boronia Park Reserve.  
• Woolwich Corner Village is 1.8km from Garbilani Village, why grouped together.  
• Structure Plan: consider location in document for ease of reading.  
• Infrastructure and Collaboration: order of text in paragraph 2, explain how telecommunications relates to optimising access. | The suggested document and section improvements and updates have been considered in the finalisation of the draft LSPS. Maps have been improved with clear and more accurate content. The local knowledge content is appreciated. Woolrich Corner Village and Garbilani village are grouped as they are the two villages on Woolwich Peninsula, and to address what focal points the peninsula has.  
Improvement to measures for actions supported and considered in finalisation of the draft LSPS. Comment on Action 4.4 and Action 4.5 is noted, but actions are different and justification addressed in Our 20 Year Vision and Structure Plan sections. |
|         |             |                    | Yes.  
1. Add/ refine text to Strategic Context for Contaminated Land  
2. Add stakeholder engagement to Measures – Action 1.1, Action 8.4 | Yes.  
1. Add/ refine text to Strategic Context, Our Community, Our Access, Our Environment, Our Infrastructure, Implementation sections.  
2. Add/ refine current maps and new maps – social infrastructure, access, heritage, recreation, Boronia Park Village and reserve |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub. No.</th>
<th>Author/IX Ref</th>
<th>Submission Summary</th>
<th>Council Planner's Response</th>
<th>LSPS Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>#438278</td>
<td>Actions: fix 1.2, 4.4 and 4.5 - no justification to specifying Gladesville Town Centre and Hunters Hill Village, 7.2 and 7.4 - not just locally (and long neglected), many residents cycle further than locally for recreation and commuting, as do residents of other municipalities who travel through Hunters Hill; 8.5 - mention the use of permeable surfaces around buildings to reduce run-off during heavy rainfall. Measures not specific enough to determine if an action is accomplished (1.1, 3.3, 3.1/3.3 versus 4.4/4.5 – incompatible?, 5.2 - Masterplan endorsed by whom) Glossary: definitions for jargon words: e.g. place-making, local precincts, place-based planning, 'five key community precincts', four key centres Implementation Plan (actions and measures): make available via Council's website to provide a running report of the Statement's application. There needs to be recognition of Council's difficulties in meeting expectations when it is limited by NSW Government's policies e.g. the Unsolicited Proposals Policy, and the use of private contillers who are not bound by the constraints of Hunter's Hill's LEP and DCP.</td>
<td>The adopted LSPS will be available on Council's website, the Greater Sydney Commission's website and will be reported on via Council's annual Integrated Planning and Reporting process under the LG Act. LSPS themes and Planning Priorities: PP1, PP4, PP6</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Woolworths has 4 investments in LGA. LSPS is critical for certainty for business and communities for development outcomes. Request Council acknowledge that retail development (supermarkets) is critical in an area as it makes a valuable contribution to liveability of urban areas and ensures goods and services are located within proximity to where people live - crucial to any 30-minute city. There is no Planning Priority or Action, for future vision or intended outcome of retail development/mixed use in the LGA. Recommendations:
- Not finalise LSPS before exhibition of Housing Strategy, critical to strategic direction for LGA.
- Supports investigations to improve transport connections with other key centres around Hunters Hill, to improve the serviceability and efficiency of all businesses. Council encouraged to extend investigations to technological improvements in transport.
- Encourage innovation and flexibility in land use and adaptable business spaces, to respond to changing customer needs, digital and physical spaces merging, growth in take-away and drive-thru features at our stores.
- Promoting local neighbourhood retail renewal; avoiding ad hoc caps on supermarket sizes - renewal of existing retail strips will be required to keep pace with customer and community expectations, but fragmentation of retail landholdings and ownership in traditional retail strips present challenges in achieving holistic renewed outcomes.
- Funding of road infrastructure to service new retail development is critical to managing the freight, servicing and delivery requirements of modern supermarkets and distribution centres. | The submission puts forward suggestions that directly relate to the interest of supermarket-retail activities, notwithstanding retail/supermarket contribution to a local area's liveability. The submission has been considered in the finalisation of the draft LSPS. Retail and other land uses that permit trade are not championed in the draft LSPS actions alone. Some recommendations related to matters applicable across NSW and should be raised with DPIE e.g. floor space, funding road infrastructure and transport connections, and freight matter especially for regional and State roads. Not feasible to include the recommendation to include the housing strategy in the draft LSPS, as it is yet to be undertaken. The study will commence in 2020. Land use provisions for uses in centres, including retail and supermarket FSR, are in line with the DPIE directions and the Standard Planning Instrument. Council Section 7.12 Contributions Plan 2020 provides certainty around |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub. No</th>
<th>Author/IX Ref</th>
<th>Submission Summary</th>
<th>Council Planner's Response</th>
<th>LSPS Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>#436269</td>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Woolwich Corner Village/Geribaldi village, are two distinct areas situated nearly 2 kilometres apart. Where did the term Woolwich Corner Village come from? It is not mentioned in &quot;The Industrial Village of Woolwich&quot; by Connie Ewald (1989, 2000).</td>
<td>The submission has been considered in the finalisation of the draft LSPS. The term Woolwich Corner Village was developed for the draft LSPS to distinguish the size of the location from the larger villages in the area e.g. Hunters Hill Village, Bonnara Park Village. Corner is a scale level 'corner shops' or neighbourhood shops. The use of the term, is only for the purposes of the draft LSPS.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Draft LSPS makes statements about providing adequate parking and creating &quot;great places and streetscapes for people&quot; with little detail as to how that will be achieved.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- Traffic and parking is an ongoing problem for residents and visitors in Woolwich. Does Council have an updated Traffic Management Plan? It is essential when dealing with development applications (Dies), so adequate off street parking is insisted upon.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- A pedestrian crossing on Woolwich Road between the Woolwich Pier Hotel and Cucinotta Restaurant is needed. Currently there is a speed hump marked with white lines which people mistake for a legal crossing. This is dangerous.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The request to amend the visions to specifically reference retail commercial uses in Hunter Hill village and Gladesville local centre and to create a new action are not supported as the LSPS is a strategic context document and technical detail like uses are lower order plans like LEPs and DCPs in zoning provisions. Matter addressed in draft LSPS in scope of Action 2.1, Action 2.2, Action 4.4, Action 4.5, Action 6.1 LSPS themes and Planning Priorities: PP2, PP4, PP6.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub. No</th>
<th>Author/IX Ref</th>
<th>Submission Summary</th>
<th>Council Planner's Response</th>
<th>LSPS Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 17 | #438343 | Comments of the strategic planning team of the council are: **Infrastructure and Collaboration.** Supported:  
- Action 2.3 to deliver City Serving Transport Corridor along Victoria Road.  
- Action 2.5 to investigate future uses for former Gladesville Hospital site.  
**Liveability and Productivity.** Supported:  
- Action 7.2 to improve active transport options for connectivity to local centres and public transport nodes and dovetails with our cycling strategy, which seeks to increase cycle connectivity with Gladesville Bridge and expand the regional cycling network. The council is developing a Bike Plan and would like to liaise with Council to ensure cycle path on both sides of the bridge are compatible.  
**Sustainability.** Supported:  
- Action 8.5 to improve stormwater management and work with Parramatta River Catchment Group, as does our council who also supports the Ten Steps to a Living River. | Traffic Engineer/Works and Services team for their consideration.  
Matter addressed in draft LSPS in scope of Action 2.4.  
LSPS themes and Planning Priorities: PP2 | Yes.  
1. Add Central District (City of Canada Bay) to Action Priority 2.3  
2. Add working with Central District (City of Canada Bay) and working with adjoining councils on connectivity projects to Action 7.2, Action 7.4  
3. Add stakeholder engagement and collaboration with adjoining councils to Measures – Action 2.3, Action 2.5, Action 7.2, Action 7.4, Action 8.5  
4. Add refine test to Hunters Hill and Its Transport and Access Map |
| 22 | #438264 | Like to see a nice cafe at Boronia Park. This park is lovely to visit but no reason to stay round and enjoy the view. | Submission relates to Council's current renewal of Boronia Park Reserve PoM.  
The ability for any scale of commercial activity, like a cafe in a park is addressed under the LG Act. While some is possible with plans and approvals in place, the viability of such ventures also need to be considered. The submission will be provided to Council’s Recreation officer, PoM officer/Works & Service team for consideration.  
LSPS themes and Planning Priorities: PP6, PP8 | Yes.  
1. Add PoMs and review of commercial use of public lands to Measures – Action 6.1, Action 8.6 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub. No</th>
<th>Author/IX Ref</th>
<th>Submission Summary</th>
<th>Council Planner's Response</th>
<th>LSPS Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>#438284</td>
<td>Kaufland is a German supermarket company that has been operating since 1984. It's one of Europe's largest grocery retail chains and intends to roll out full-line supermarkets across Australia. It's supportive of the draft LSPS and the vision to revitalise and enhance the town centres and villages and to achieve the 150 new housing dwelling target set by the Greater Sydney Commission. Suggests:</td>
<td>The submission puts forward suggestions that directly relate to the interest of supermarket-retail activities, notwithstanding retail/ supermarket contribution to a local area’s liveability. The submission has been considered in the finalisation of the draft LSPS. Matters raised are addressed in Action 4.5, Action 6.1, Action 7.1, Action 7.2. A focus on improved development outcomes is addressed in Action 7.1 like, adaptable business spaces, new technology and sustainable business practices. This action will also be considered with Action 8.1, which will the review of the DCP. Suggestions on larger retail development and FSR are noted; any development must comply with the development controls of the LEP and DCP, which provided for appropriate development in this community, while protecting the built and natural environments. Matter addressed in draft LSPS in scope of Action 2.1, Action 2.2, Action 4.4, Action 4.5, Action 6.1. <strong>LSPS themes and Planning Priorities:</strong> PP2, PP4, PP6</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>#427429</td>
<td>Engagement with the Land Council is an important and practical mechanism to ensure that the LSPS supports the vision and plans of local Aboriginal communities and culturally rich and healthy communities. Land councils are often significant landholders in any LGA and as such; ensuring that the visions and plans of the LSPS include Land Council lands will contribute to the long-term success of the LSPS. Aboriginal people’s interest in land is multifaceted and includes, but is not limited to, the use and management of land for culture and heritage purposes as well as providing economic development opportunities for Aboriginal people.</td>
<td>The submissions is addressed in Action 2.6, Action 5.1, Action 5.2, Action 8.2 of the draft LSPS. Council will work with the local Aboriginal Land Council and consult as required. <strong>LSPS themes and Planning Priorities:</strong> PP2, PP5, PP6, PP8</td>
<td>Yes. 1. Add stakeholder engagement and collaboration with Land Council to Measures – Action 2.6, Action 5.1, Action 5.2, Action 8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub. No</td>
<td>Author/IX Ref</td>
<td>Submission Summary</td>
<td>Council Planner's Response</td>
<td>LSPS Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>#437964</td>
<td>Create NSW committed to increasing access to creativity, arts and culture that enables us to reflect and celebrate who we are, express our identity and activate gatherings across NSW for everyone's benefit. Aims to further the Government's vision for arts and culture that engages the community, supports innovation, facilitates economic development, reflects the State's rich diversity and supports a healthy and happy community. Suggests:</td>
<td>The submission has been considered in the finalisation of the draft LPS. It has been updated with commentary on arts and culture and a new Our Infrastructure map to highlight public community facilities, including Council facilities available to the community. The suggestion to include arts and culture in the 20-year vision is not supported, as it is broad statement that embraces arts and culture in celebrating the area and was not extensively worked with by Councilors who represent the community. Council has an active arts and culture program, which includes Council sponsored arts shows at the town hall and Mount Druitt new public domain improvements projects. Council will actively address the role of arts and culture in contributing to creative and c</td>
<td>Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>i. Inclusion of cultural objectives to integrate cultural activity and infrastructure into local planning processes and LSPS, like</td>
<td>exploration of arts and culture in vision statement.</td>
<td>1. Add/ refine text to Strategic Context sections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>iii. Existing cultural infrastructure (The NSW Cultural Infrastructure Plan 2020+ (2019) provides a framework for planning and delivery of cultural infrastructure across NSW)</td>
<td>Add joint-use infrastructure for arts and cultural activity e.g. rehearsal spaces and exhibition and production depending on the facility.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>iv. Cultural diversity within Hunter’s Hill</td>
<td>Action 3.4 – In conjunction with 3.1 and 6.2. Work with NSW Government to deliver a housing community, cultural and recreational solution for the former Gladesville Hospital site. Provide advice to help deliver community and cultural solutions for the Gladesville Hospital site.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>v. The benefits of art and culture to a successful night-time economy</td>
<td>Action 6.1. Use place-making initiatives for centres and villages and key sites.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>vi. The existence or potential of cultural industries in your area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>vii. Existing and future public art projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>viii. Joint-use opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ix. Tourism opportunities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x. The impact of arts and culture to successful place making</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x. The benefits of access to arts and culture for the health and wellbeing of your residents, paying consideration to access by people with disabilities, seniors and children and young people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub. No</td>
<td>Author/IX Ref</td>
<td>Submission Summary</td>
<td>Council Planner's Response</td>
<td>LSPS Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 6 | #437568 | **Sport NSW supports the draft LSPS, and in particular, Action 1.2, Action 2.1, Action 3.4. Suggest:**  
  - Open Space and Recreation section – changes to text to flow better  
  - Woolwich Dock and Parklands – refer to the Harbour Trust's draft Recreational Strategy (2019) about public access to its land, the Trust and Sport NSW to ensure the sporting potential and recreational use of the Woolwich Docks and Parklands meets community expectations locally and more broadly  
  - Action 2.5 (former Gladewoo site) – include text in action, to work with the NSW Government and Local Area Health District to address the future of the former Gladewoo Hospital site  
  - Action 5.1 (regular research) – reference to Office of Sport for local sports participation and facility needs  
  - Action 6.2. Prepare a masterplan for Gladewoo Hospital Precinct, including former Gladewoo Hospital site use Sports NSW data in planning.  
  Sport NSW developing District Sport Infrastructure Plans, and the initiative is identified by the GSC and District Plan. Plans to be a rationale for future facility provision and participation in sport and active recreation. Now collecting data and insights, which can inform and deliver LSPS actions, like PoMs, master planning and strategies for other place based development, e.g. Gladewoo Hospital Precinct. | Create NSW will be consulted as a stakeholder in any of the relevant actions. LSPS themes and Planning Priorities  
Actions:  
LSPS themes and Planning Priorities:  
PP1, PP2, PP4, PP5, PP6, PP7, PP8 | The submission has been considered in the finalisation of the draft LSPS. The Open Space and Recreation section and the woolwich Dock and Parklands section have been updated to provide more details e.g. Harbour Trust's draft recreational strategy.  
In terms of suggestions to add Sports NSW actions, this is not supported in reference to NSW Government agencies lands, as the LSPS does not have jurisdiction over NSW Government agencies lands. The suggestions are measures for the purpose of the LSPS. In terms of the suggestion for Action 2.5, this already exists in the action.  
Once the District Sport Facility Infrastructure Plans are completed, the data’s applicability to the area will be considered in the next review of the adopted LSPS, and in any interim directions of the GSC.  
Council’s has planned a review of the Outdoor Sports and Recreation Plan and the submission will be provided to the Recreation Officer/Facilities and Projects Manager for consideration in the review of this plan. The future review of this plan can make use of the GSC District Sport Facility Infrastructure Plans as they are made available. | Yes  
1. Add/ refine text to Open Space and Recreation section and Woolwich Dock and Parklands section.  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub. No</th>
<th>Author/IX Ref</th>
<th>Submission Summary</th>
<th>Council Planner’s Response</th>
<th>LSPS Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 7.     | #438007       | NSLHD Health Promotion seeks to ensure the built environment has a positive impact on health and well-being of individuals and community. Evidence linking the built environment to the health of the community by influencing: physical activity, healthy eating, tobacco use and alcohol consumption, community strength, social cohesion and mental wellbeing, planetary health. Recommendations:  
  - Vision. Opportunity to put people at the heart of vision e.g. incorporate concepts of ‘health and wellbeing’ and ‘social connectedness’ of residents, to inform land-use and transport planning policies.  
  - Open Space Plan. Could include an overlay of transport and active travel networks, schools and local centres to highlight potential for better connections between transport and open space.  
  - Town centres Maps. Add key amenities - the library, shopping centre, supermarket, and transport routes to demonstrate current assets and gaps for town-centre planning.  
  - Consider expansion of Gladesville Town Centre study area for future housing plans in collaboration with Ryde Council so housing targets can be met.  
  - Structure Plan. More detailed legend and show ferry wharfs to highlight potential public transport connections to local centres and commuter routes to other parts of Sydney.  
  - Infrastructure and Collaboration. Priority 1 and Priority 2 Provide infrastructure to support community needs and aspirations:  
    a. Include map of existing social infrastructure, with potential for joint use agreements to illustrate its locations in relation to transport routes, population growth and other facilities e.g. parks, schools.  
    b. Identify opportunities to work with adjoining councils such as planning of Gladesville town centre and Boronia Park, so planning processes meet the needs of the community.  
  - Liveability - Priority 3. Undertake a Housing Strategy to anticipate and provide for the residential growth of Hunters Hill by 2040.  
    a. Address provision of fresh food outlets in local centres so community has access to nutritious foods within walking distance as per Action 11 of North District Plan. | The submission has been considered in the finalisation of the draft LSPS, and similar matters have been raised in other submissions e.g. mapping. The LSPS has been updated with more mapping that integrates transport and active travel networks. NSLHD Health Promotion will be consulted as a stakeholder in any relevant LSPS actions. In terms of the recommendations:  
  - Expanding the Gladesville town centre study area is not supported, as the housing study needs to consider future housing target and the indicated area is adequate for the purpose of the LSPS.  
  - Mapping Council’s existing social infrastructure, is supported and a map is included in the LSPS.  
  - Mapping Council’s or other parties existing social infrastructure with potential for joint use agreement is not support, nor feasible and possibly subject to future commercial-in-confidence negotiations between parties.  
  - Working with adjoining council is supported, and references to adjoining councils make clearer e.g. City of Ryde and City of Canada Bay for town centres and connected active transport routes.  
  - Addressing fresh food, the LSPS has been amended to highlight the importance of fresh food accessibility. Access to and take up of fresh is subject to vendor business models, prices/value for money and consumer behaviour. | Yes  
b. More details on where additional dwellings could be provided to meet the needs of ageing population.

c. Disperse social housing within new developments and the community generally, so it remains close to public transport.

d. Ensure affordable housing/social housing/ higher density residential developments located within 400m of a bus stop, which provides a service at least every 30 minutes.

e. Ensure new and existing neighbourhood designs provide a well-connected street pattern, which supports walking and cycling along for 400m to 500m (a five-minute walk) between destinations, e.g. site lines through larger blocks, footpaths and cycleways that are shaded with substantial trees canopies, mid-trip facilities (seats, shade, water), footpaths wide enough for a diversity of users and enjoyment, paths and cycleways between Hunter’s Hill Council and its adjoining councils, convenient pedestrian crossing opportunities.

f. Highlight what the current (and planned) upgrades to local schools will achieve in terms of capacity and how that relates to planned growth.

- Priority 5. Provide a caring and safe community where healthy activities are encouraged and promote a strong sense of community and connection among residents by 2040

a. Include map of existing social infrastructure such as community centres and potential facilities for joint use to illustrate its location in relation to transport routes, population growth and other facilities e.g. parks

b. Cluster and co-locate social infrastructure e.g. libraries, cultural facilities and sporting fields, and green infrastructure e.g. parks near public transport.

c. In accordance with the NSW Premier’s Priority, increase proportion of homes within ten minutes’ walk of quality green, open and public space by ten per cent by 2023.

d. Prioritisation of pedestrian and cyclists’ streetscape designs and ensure the needs of older people and those with disabilities are met e.g. wide footpaths and disabled parking.

e. Highlight current and future active travel routes on a map.

- More details on improving access to waterways for recreation and physical activity.

- Priority 6. Work with community and local stakeholders to develop places for business and community interaction.

a. More detail on how sense of place and belonging will be achieved in public spaces, e.g. public art, seating, performance spaces and

- More details on how the environment for new development proposals.

- Council will continue to collaborate with Ryde Council and relevant State agencies for infrastructure, transport planning and active transport options to promote healthy living.

LSPS themes and Planning Priorities: PP1, PP3, PP5, PP 6, PP7, PP8
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub. No</th>
<th>Author/Ref</th>
<th>Submission Summary</th>
<th>Council Planner's Response</th>
<th>LSPS Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>greening of public spaces which is an aspiration identified by community consultations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Productivity - Priority 7. Encourage the development of local centres to support business and provide local centres for the community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a. Provide diverse late night attractions such as night markets, lit parks and public spaces.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. Planning controls should support co-working spaces which allow residents who work from home access meeting and office spaces locally and minimise their commute (7.6% of residents work from home in this LGA which is above North District average).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c. Use place making approach to create mixed use centres which are attractive and walkable to support small businesses, co-working spaces, fresh food outlets and local employment. Reducing car dependency can activate centres by increasing foot traffic and time spent at local centres by residents and visitors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d. Identify opportunities to reduce car use for travel to work and schools, in collaboration with Transport for NSW</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Sustainability - Goal: Facilitate and undertake sustainable practices.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a. Add a priority or action which addresses changing the community’s travel behaviour through sustainable transport, promoting active travel modes to minimise CO2 emissions from private vehicles.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b. Provide baseline of urban tree canopy and whether the Council intends to increase or maintain.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c. Address actions mitigate urban heat particularly in local centres, schools, aged care retirement villages, social housing developments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d. Address sustainable practices for key community events such as New Year’s Eve celebrations and festivals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Measuring Performance. 'The Pulse of Greater Sydney', outlines performance indicators developed by the GSC, which address healthy urban planning. Health indicators for reporting in the GSC 10 Directions are P. Indicator 2 - 30 minute city. Percentage of dwellings within 30 minutes of the nearest metropolitan and strategic centre using the public transport network and/or walking during the morning peak. P. Indicator 3 - Walkable Places: Proportion of trips by walking, Travel mode to work, Access to open space. P. Indicator 4 - Addressing Urban Heat. Tree canopy cover in urban area, number of hot days (&gt;35°C), Urban Heat.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a. Performance Indicators be included as a new section under Implementation, Monitoring and Evaluation or incorporated into Section 5, Plan Summary.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub. No</td>
<td>Author/Ref</td>
<td>Submission Summary</td>
<td>Council Planner's Response</td>
<td>LSPS Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 10      | #438009     | Sydney Water comments on Planning Priorities:  
- PP2. Provide infrastructure to support community needs and aspirations  
  Encouraged to promote Water Sensitive Urban Design (WSUD) principles in all development works and asset management and integrate best practice WSUD and waterway health targets into planning controls, so re redevelopment of private land can assist in addressing waterway health issues Sydney Water willing to explore opportunities to support Council to do this.  
- PP3. Undertake a Housing Strategy to anticipate and provide for the residential growth of Hunter Hill by 2040  
  Requested to inform Sydney Water of potential changes to projected population, dwelling and employment data, to align with infrastructure delivery with Sydney's growth. It will engage with Council on water and water infrastructure needs for the area.  
- PP4. Provide land use planning framework to support community needs and aspirations  
  Encouraged to review options for improving sustainability requirements of new development through LEP and DCP controls. Where appropriate, develop controls to compel developers to connect to planned recycled water schemes for all non-potable water uses, including dedicating space for required metering, storage, connection and plumbing infrastructure.  
- PP5. Provide a caring and safe community where healthy activities are encouraged and promote a strong sense of community and connection among residents by 2040.  
  Recommends that green infrastructure be recognised as essential infrastructure to encourage healthy activities and supported connected communities. Wants to work with Northern Sydney councils and Council to develop a regional Green Grid Masterplan aimed to manage and increase the urban forest canopy cover, and Council in the area of increasing cool shade to alleviate urban heat island effects.  
- PP6. Maintain and enhance the natural and built heritage character of Hunters Hill.  
  Supports planning priority for waterways and wants to share learnings from Parramatta River Master Plan and interested in Council insights on stormwater management and improving waterway health. Encourages Council to work with local catchment stakeholders to develop catchment land use policy and statutory planning mechanisms that improve water quality across the catchments. Supports Action 8.4. Wants to contribute to any future community engagement and education to reduce water | The submission has been considered in the finalisation of the draft LSPS, and similar matters have been raised in other submissions. See the NSW EPA submission below. Sydney Water will be consulted as a stakeholder in any relevant LSPS actions. Council collaborates with various NSW Government agencies on a regular basis. In terms of the suggestions:  
- WSUD, this will be addressed in the DCP review for development on private land and raised with the Works and Services Team for addressing in asset management plans.  
- Project population, incremental change in population from permissible development (i.e. local and SEPPs) is notified through the current process; planned changes to population will involve Sydney Water as a stakeholder at the local strategic planning level so its infrastructure delivery can be considered.  
- Sustainability, this will be addressed in the DCP review for development on private land.  
- Green infrastructure/healthy activities/shade, Council provides a range of green or open space infrastructure across the area and the provision of shade is considered in PolPs and via the Street Tree Planting program.  
- LEP, Sydney Water lands will be zoned in accordance with DPIE guidelines and directions for land use zones. Council will consult Sydney Water in any planning proposals with regard to its water and water infrastructure planning and management. Council | Yes  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub. No</th>
<th>Author/IX Ref</th>
<th>Submission Summary</th>
<th>Council Planner's Response</th>
<th>LSPS Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 18     | #436910    | Consumption and increase re-use, and improve re-use and resource recovery e.g. non-portable recycled water and storm water harvesting.  
• Preparation of LEP  
Requested to consider appropriate land use zoning for water related operational infrastructure. Sydney water to provide further advice on appropriate zoning if its infrastructure as part of formal consultation for future amendments to LEP. Requested to advise of when the next draft LEP is on exhibit.  
• Implementation of the LSPS  
Suggests implementation plan to indicate when and how action to be delivered. | Awaiting further advice on any intended planning proposal from Sydney Water on appropriate zoning of its lands.  
• Implementation, measures have been added to actions to address who, how and when planning priorities will be addressed.  
LSPS themes and Planning Priorities: FPP, FPP, FP, FPP, FPP |

The submission has been considered in the finalisation of the draft LSPS, and similar matters have also been raised in other submission above and below.  
The matters raised are mostly addressed in the draft LSPS in commentary, actions and in turn via NSW legislation/NSW agency policy/guidelines that apply in planning and development application processes and for use/management of Council owned assets, like local roads and off-road car parks.  
A number of matters require leadership, policy, regulation and enforcement from the NSW Government and Australian Government, as the proponents of legislation or are not relevant for the purpose of the LSPS.  
TENSW will be consulted as a stakeholder in any relevant LSPS actions. Council collaborates with various NSW Government agencies on a regular basis.  
The LSPS document has been amended to provide better commentary around the Future Transport 2036 plan as it applies to the LGA and to address other Place and Movement matters, like freight access, active access. See Action 2.3 and added measures.  
In terms of the suggestions,  
1. Mapping has been updated in LSPS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub. No</th>
<th>Author/IX Ref</th>
<th>Submission Summary</th>
<th>Council Planner's Response</th>
<th>LSPS Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Design local streets to be low-speed, low-traffic and low-stress environments that can be safely and comfortably used for walking and cycling, particularly by children. Section could benefit from a statement on the need for new medium density residential and commercial developments in renewed town centres to provide off-street loading facilities, so freight and service vehicle activity generated does not create additional congestion or detract from the amenity and sense of place outcomes envisaged by Council.</td>
<td>2. Not relevant, to be addressed in Outdoor Sport and Recreational Plan and Cycle way Strategy review and development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Gladesville Hospital Action 4.5 (prepare masterplan). Supported by TIPN. Recommend to prepare an appropriate level transport study to support this work to investigate improvements to access, public and active transport opportunities, and to identify the necessary mitigation measures for additional trip demands e.g. travel demand strategies. TIPN will work with Council in the development of these studies.</td>
<td>3. Not applicable, summary of our consultant.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Hunters Hill Village (plus other villages, Infrastructure &amp; Collaboration). Could consider adding text under vision: • Achieves higher rates of walking and cycling for short, everyday trips (e.g. to centres, schools, parks, public transport), offer important benefits in terms of community health, place-making and local transport network outcomes. • Aim is to increase rates of walking/cycling to school within walking and cycling distance by catering/pairing access by the modes.</td>
<td>4. Noted, to be addressed in implementing the LSPS via actions/measures for detailed planning for centres/sites in consultation with NSW agencies and community. See Actions 1.4, 4.4, 4.5. The submission will be referred to the Traffic Engineers and Works and Services for their consideration in plans and strategies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Hunters Hill Village. Under 'A Place that now offers', could consider the need to align speed limits with safe outcomes for pedestrians in these highly pedestrianised areas e.g. 40km/h high pedestrian activity area, similar wording could be applied in the other areas of pedestrian significance.</td>
<td>5. Noted, to be address in implementing the LSPS via actions/measures and at project brief stage in consultation with TIPN.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Goal Liveability. • Could add an additional goal in for 'great walkable places and streetscapes for people' • TIPN will work with Council to investigate opportunities to improve public transport to support long term growth in Hunters Hill LGA.</td>
<td>6. Noted, to be address in implementing the LSPS via actions/measures and at project brief stage in consultation with TIPN.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Considers there is an opportunity for Council with Contributions Plan and Centres Masterplans, to explore incluudd offers for transport infrastructure e.g. facilitating safe, secure pedestrian and cyclist access, quality public transport waiting facilities, wayfinding, EV/Hybrid vehicle charging infrastructure, quality end of trip facilities, priority parking provisions for carpooling and car share, line marking/ signage access to EV charging infrastructure. As per the District Plan, Council should consider future repurposing of car parks. • Actions. Suggest expanding to include road safety needs and new action to align with Greater Sydney Region Plan and North District Plan.</td>
<td>7. Not applicable, technical information not appropriate in LSPS level. To be addressed in implementing the LSPS via actions/measures. The submission will be referred to the Traffic Engineers and Works and Services for their consideration in plans and strategies.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8. Noted, to be address in implementing the LSPS via actions/measures in consultation with TIPN. See Action 1.4, 2.1, 2.2, 2.4, 8.6. New action supported, as can be addressed in place-making initiatives of the LSPS and at project brief stage and NSW agency consultant stages, see Action 8.1. Commentary include for the Victoria Road Corridor in the LSPS. Movement type development controls will be considered in the DCP review, see Action 8.1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Attachment 2

**COUNCIL REPORTS**

**24 February 2020**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub. No</th>
<th>Author/IX Ref</th>
<th>Submission Summary</th>
<th>Council Planner's Response</th>
<th>LSPS Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 4.3</td>
<td>Attachment 2</td>
<td><strong>We will work with Transport for NSW to support and implement travel behaviour change programs to help manage demand on the transport network, including by requiring new developments and businesses operating in key precincts to develop and implement travel plans to encourage the use of sustainable transport choices.</strong>&lt;br&gt;&lt;br&gt;- Statement could be included to address the need to balance the outcomes for transport customers on Victoria Road. TNSW will work with Council on the Victoria Road Corridor.&lt;br&gt;- TNSW has crucial need to balance outcomes for all transport customers on key movement corridors. Victoria Road is a key movement corridor for buses and freight and through movements on Victoria Road are given priority green time to help with journey time reliability, particularly for bus passengers and freight.&lt;br&gt;- Actions. May consider including statements incorporating revised development controls in the future LEP DCP amendments to achieve wider footpaths over the long term, to improve streetscape and provide more space and better amenity for place making initiatives e.g. landscaping, footway dining, without compromising the movement of pedestrians on footpaths. May also consider the need to activate multiple street frontages including local side streets so a fine-grain, walkable, activated grid street layout is maintained long term. This will help to improve place outcomes on local side streets as well as major roads.</td>
<td>The submission will be referred to the Traffic Engineer Officer and Works and Services for their consideration in plans and strategies.&lt;br&gt;- Discussion on freight delivery has been included in the LSPS. The matter will be considered in detailed place making initiative for centres and planning and development stages. See Action 6.1.&lt;br&gt;- While TNSW has a desire to maintain the movement and accessibility of freight on the Victoria Road corridor, it is also important the TNSW recognised the need for the road to function in local place-making initiatives to support the local centre’s economy and local community.&lt;br&gt;- Noted. Sustainability transport opportunities will be considered in conjunction with Action 6.6 with regard to Council operations and in conjunctions with the DCP review for the development process.&lt;br&gt;- The submission will be referred to the Traffic Engineer Officer, the Street Tree Officer and Works and Services for their consideration in plans and strategies. With regard to carbon emission suggestion 5, Council may wish to consider a policy for council operations and working with community.&lt;br&gt;- Council may wish to consider a nil-zero greenhouse gas emissions target and should consult with the community prior to including it in the Community Strategic Plan or LSPS.</td>
<td>9. PP4/PP6.&lt;br&gt;- Would benefit from discussion of last mile freight, its role in helping create and renew 'great places' and the need for good planning and management so it does not detract from amenity outcomes this priority aims for. Suggest include in an action so good planning for freight and servicing is reflected in LEP DCP reviews.&lt;br&gt;- Actions 7.2/7.4. Should note that a successful place generates a supply chain, whether it be a health or education precinct, retail or designated freight precinct. The key centres will remain a need for continued freight access (deliveries, waste and service vehicles) to service the area in future. As growth increases in the centres, the volume and impact of freight and servicing activity will also increase. Supporting freight access for business, services and emerging industries is critical to support the long-term viability of the economy and competitiveness of Hunters Hill LGA and the North District. Maintaining the movement and accessibility of freight on Victoria Road corridor is necessary to support future economic growth of the Hunters Hill centres other centres.&lt;br&gt;- Could consider changing action 7.2 to the following: Support walking or cycling to be the most convenient option for short trips by providing safe,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub. No</td>
<td>Author/IX Ref</td>
<td>Submission Summary</td>
<td>Council Planner’s Response</td>
<td>LSPS Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>high quality walking and cycling links that cater for and encourage short trips to local centres, public transport services, schools, local open space and the Green Grid, and other trip attractors.</td>
<td>use controls for lands In particular, the Roads Act and SEPPs of the NSW Government protect road corridors and freight routes. The DCP review will consider if any development controls for these uses need updating. The place making initiatives for Gladesville centre will consider freight needs and where needed controls will be addressed in the DCP review. The last comment on the Road Safety Plan 2021 in TINSW is committed to working with councils and communities on integrated transport and land use planning is noted. However, it tends to contradict earlier commentary focused on protecting broader community road needs through local centres i.e. road corridors and freight corridors through local centres.</td>
<td>LSPS themes and Planning Priorities: PP1, PP2, PP4, PP6, PP8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Supportive of travel demand management measures to help reduce reliance on private motor vehicle travel, including the proposed review/reduction of off-street car parking provision where appropriate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10. Sustainability.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Suggests incorporate specific sustainability actions relating to ‘transport’:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Council intends to reduce transport related emissions within, and in collaboration with, the community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Improve public vehicle fleet/ influence private vehicle fleet to more energy efficient fuels, promote carpooling within community; when public transport is not viable, facilitate provision of car share facilities as an alternative to car ownership/ replacing ownership of multiple private vehicles.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Would like Council to add text: Integrate the Principal Bicycle Network into Council’s land use and local transport network planning, to ensure opportunities to support cycling as a convenient option for short trips are identified. This includes aligning local bike network planning, new development and place-making opportunities with the Principal Bicycle Network.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Supports initiatives that help increase urban tree canopy and improve public domain, but notes that any street trees proposed within the kerbside clear zone of arterial roads should be suitably located and frangible for road safety reasons.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Encourages widening of footpaths, particularly where landscaping, street furniture and outdoor dining is proposed, so footpaths are of adequate width to be accessible for all users. Explore in LEP DCP amendments, in consultation with TINSW.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Suggests adding an Action to align with North District Plan: “Transport demand management initiatives including working from home, improved walking and cycling, improved access to car sharing, carpooling and on-demand transport will also be considered in helping to achieve net zero greenhouse gas emissions.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12. General comments.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Early consultation on traffic generating land use proposals e.g. schools, hospitals, retail developments so developments are suitably located/ designed in relation to road safety, traffic, access, amenity outcomes.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub. No</td>
<td>Author/IX Ref</td>
<td>Submission Summary</td>
<td>Council Planner's Response</td>
<td>LSPS Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>Encouraged to consider known and potential heritage places and values contribute to local character and sense of place for community, indigenous and non-indigenous matters. Council congratulated on strong recognition of heritage and culture as fundamental aspect of identity the city and local area. Supports many initiatives of LSPS:</td>
<td>The submission has been considered in the finalisation of the draft LSPS, and with other submission raising similar matters for our heritage and culture. D&amp;T/NSW Health will be consulted as a stakeholder in any relevant LSPS actions. Council collaborates with various NSW Government agencies on a regular basis. In terms of the four suggestions, they will be first addressed in the heritage</td>
<td>Yes. 1. Added/update text to Strategic context – Our Heritage. 2. Add stakeholder engagement and collaboration to Measures – Action 1.1, Action 2.6, Action 3.1, Action 3.4 Action 4.1, Action 4.2, Action 4.5,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|         |               | - Aboriginal cultural heritage  
- identifying significance vegetation/bushland/landscapes in area and as part of Sydney Harbour Foreshores area  
- maintain and enhance character of natural and built heritage character, including Heritage Character Statements for conservation areas and review of DCP to control preservation of character and amenity. |                             |               |

COUNCIL REPORTS
24 February 2020

Item 4.3 Attachment 2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub. No</th>
<th>Author/IX Ref</th>
<th>Submission Summary</th>
<th>Council Planner's Response</th>
<th>LSPS Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 20      | #437966       | • Delivering local growth and new infrastructure, while protecting character and the heritage of area  
• Promoting and celebrating an understanding of the area’s character and cultural heritage (indigenous and non-indigenous) to residents and broader community  
• Review or heritage program, and updating heritage planning documents and resources for best-practice heritage management approach in place |

Suggestions for finalising the LSPS:
1. Consider how Aboriginal cultural heritage and landscapes can be protected in LEP
2. Consider the linkages between culture, heritage and tourism and the opportunities culture and heritage bring for economic growth
3. Further articulate heritage as it relates to character of the city, including potentially identifying clusters of places and items which contribute to the significant character of the place
4. Consider linkages between actions and priorities i.e. the ways in which heritage and culture contribute to an attractive and liveable city, as well as local employment and community wellbeing.

Heritage NSW records show 9 State Heritage items, 51 Recorded Aboriginal Sites, and notes the local heritage items listed in the LEP.

Care must be taken to avoid impacts on items and sites and to mitigate these impacts where impacts unavoidable. Heritage NSW offers to provide more information on State heritage items and Aboriginal Sites.

The submission has been considered in the finalisation of the draft LSPS, and with other submission raising similar matters for our heritage and culture.

Heritage NSW will be consulted as a stakeholder in any relevant LSPS actions, like the heritage Program review. Council collaborates with various NSW Government agencies on a regular basis.

In terms of the suggestions:
1. Action 2.5, the collaborative approach of D&IT/NSW Health is noted, and we look forward to them undertaking best practice community engagement along with Community Participation under the EP&A Act. Council is aware of NSW Health/NSW Government previous work and a draft CIP to progress

| Action 2.5: Work with the NSW government and Local Area Health District to address the future of the former Gladesville Hospital site, as a key infrastructure asset for residential, community, cultural and recreational uses. D&IT/NSW Health welcome opportunity to collaborate with Council and the community at an appropriate time as they explore the future uses of the site. |

1. Added/ update text to Gladesville hospital Precinct section.
2. Add stakeholder engagement and collaboration to Measures – Action 2.5, Action 6.1, Action 6.2

Yes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub. No</th>
<th>Author/IX Ref</th>
<th>Submission Summary</th>
<th>Council Planner's Response</th>
<th>LSPS Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Former Gladesville Hospital site's heritage status. Request that the reference to the site being a State Heritage Item be removed and updated to reflect the site being listed on the NSW State Agency Section 170 Heritage and Conservation Register.</td>
<td>future uses for the site, and poor community consultation at the time. It is not known what is meant by 'collaborate at an appropriate time'. It is proposed that the measure for actions include regular communication on a timeframe for the CMP with D&amp;T / NSW Health to better understand its timeframe.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Conservation Management Plan for the former Gladesville Hospital site. NSW Health is in early stages of developing a CMP with the intention of achieving a State Heritage Item listing, following consultation with both Council and the community.</td>
<td>• Vision for site, it is important that the site is innovatively redeveloped in line with place-based planning, heritage best practice and to meet community expectations articulated through our community consultation programs. The reference to 'innovative approach' is updated to 'innovative approach' in the LSPS.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Heritage status of site, the reference to 'State Heritage Item' is to be updated 'Section 170 register' of the Heritage Act.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The section 170 register listing still requires D&amp;T / NSW Health to follow heritage best practice including using the Burra Charter, preparing a CMP and using NSW Heritage guidelines and manuals. The site is a local heritage items under the LEP. Council would require heritage document and justifications for any development proposal in line with the Heritage Conservation Management provisions of the LEP (Section 5.10).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• CMP and proposed State Heritage Listing, this appears to be a new or updated of the draft CMP prepared about 15 years ago by NSW Health. It is proposed that the measure for actions include D&amp;T / NSW Health working with Council in developing the CMP and Council regularly communicate with them on a timeframe.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub. No</td>
<td>Author/IX Ref</td>
<td>Submission Summary</td>
<td>Council Planner's Response</td>
<td>LSPS Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 21      | #438008 # 438653 | EPA generic/ very detailed submission on Air Quality, Noise, Water Quality, Waste and Resource Recovery, and Contaminated Land matters that should need to be included in LSPS in planning for sustainability and resilience. Comments:  
- Air Quality and land use conflicts. The draft LSPS should identify outcomes that support meeting National Air Quality Standards, that recognise the role of councils in managing the cumulative air quality impacts of development and delivery clean, safe and healthy living environments. Should include action to consider air quality in all local planning instruments, set directions for enhanced planning controls to help minimise emissions from major sources and avoid air pollution impacts on residential and other sensitive land uses.  
- Healthy Waterways. Encouraged to use the Risk Based Framework for Considering Waterway Health Outcomes in strategic land use planning decisions to determine actions for managing waterways. Should ideally include map of waterways, important aquatic ecosystems and riparian lands or corridors to highlight at risk management areas. Should recognise the management of cumulative impacts or urban stormwater with an urban water management plan and WSUD. | for the CMP, state listing and community consultation.  
The intended State heritage listing is noted, and is a way to circumvent local development application assessment process (as it is now for local heritage item), as proposed development is considered under the Heritage Act. Hence, there is a reliance on the community engagement steps of D&I/NSW Health to ensure the community is consulted and engaged and the intentions of the NSW Government align with the LSPS vision. This highlights the importance of Action 6.2 (Gladesville Hospital Precinct Masterplan to address the hospital’s role in place-making this key site within the community) LSPS themes and Planning Priorities: PP2, PP 6 | Yes.  
1. Added/ update text to Strategic context - Our Environment (air quality, waste waterways, foreshore lines, carbon, heat/ hot days etc).  
2. Add stakeholder engagement and collaboration to Measures – Action 1.1, Action 2.7, Action 6.1, Action 7.2, Action 8.2  
3. Add/ refine text to Hunters Hill and its Recreation map, Transport and Access map, Structure Plan,  
4. Add new maps for street tree canopy, acid sulphate soils, forested |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub. No.</th>
<th>Author/IX Ref</th>
<th>Submission Summary</th>
<th>Council Planner’s Response</th>
<th>LSPS Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Contaminated Land. The draft LSPS should support SEPP 55 Remediation of Land and associated guidelines to manage the rezoning and development of contaminated land. Include action to consider contaminated land in local planning instruments.</td>
<td>In terms of the suggestions,</td>
<td>line, green grid, riparian lands, sensitive lands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Waste and Resource Recovery. The draft LSPS should identify outcomes that help support and deliver:</td>
<td>• Air quality, commentary has been added to the draft LSPS to raise source and emissions issues. Air quality controls will be considered in the review of the DCP. EPA is involved in planning and development matters in line with legislation. Action 7.2 (active transport) will also support air quality improvements.</td>
<td>5. Add Events Suitability policy to Action 8.2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ waste and recycling targets — NSW Waste and Resource Recovery Strategy (and in development in the 20 Year Waste Strategy)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ the NSW Circular economy policy – e.g. procurement/recovery materials in construction/operational/maintenance; space for community repair, on-site waste management space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ the National Food Waste Strategy - half food waste by 2030</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ UN Sustainable Development Goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Local or precinct-specific resource Goals – e.g. zero waste, Inner West Council, construction waste Barangaroo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Should include vision/encouragement for waste and resource recovery with circular economy perspective in all planning instruments e.g. zoning and development controls, participate in regional spatial strategies for waste, planning and development conditions of consent, use NSW environmental guidelines, review develop local controls for shop home composting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Noise and Land use conflicts. The draft LSPS should identify:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ External noise goals for infrastructure and industry where these encroach on existing noise-sensitive development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Internal noise goals for noise sensitive development where these encroach on existing and planned transport infrastructure and industry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓ Areas of quiet amenity or areas to be created or preserved in urban areas to improve livability. Should include action to consider environmental noise in local planning instruments, enhance planning and development controls to minimise emissions noise impacts on residential and other sensitive land uses e.g., planning for new noise source- transport infrastructure, industry and night time economy, careful planning of sensitive land use (e.g., residential, schools) adjacent to transport infrastructure and industry.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub. No</td>
<td>Author/IX Ref</td>
<td>Submission Summary</td>
<td>Council Planner's Response</td>
<td>LSPS Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 24     | #438286       | DPHE state Hunters Hill plays an important role in the provision of social housing in the Sydney Region, noting that: • There are 347 social housing properties in the LGA, mainly being units (98%). • The housing stock is ageing, with close to 100% over 51 years old • Social housing assets re dispersed across the LGA, with small concentrations in Gladesville and Hunters Hill. • The NSW Government’s Future Directions for Social Housing in NSW was released in 2016. In this strategy, the Corporation is delivering the Community Plus program to grow social housing portfolio. It delivers new and replaced social, affordable and private housing through renewal of exiting assets. New mixed tenure communities will be developed under the program where social housing integrated with private and affordable housing (and indistinguishable from surrounding housing). • DPHE acknowledges Council’s ongoing commitment to affordable housing. Suggests: • Include action which acknowledges the Community Plus program and Council’s role in supporting the Corporation (LAHC) in its implementation. Action wording: Council will work with the NSW Land and Housing Corporation to support the renewal of social housing within the LGA, consistent with the Future Directions for Social Housing policy, including through facilitating changes to the planning framework for public housing assets where required. | making initiatives of the LSPS and which underpins the District Plan (Action 6.1). There is no waste management facility in the LGA and Council works with NSWRC on the NSWRC Waste Management Strategy. The submission will be referred to the Waste Education officer for consideration in activities. Council community engagement includes waste education and uses events sustainability practises, which could be formalised into a policy. • Noise, there are no major noise generating industries in the LGA Noise matters are regulated by Council under the Protection of the Environment Operations Act. LSPS themes and Planning Priorities: R1, R2, R6, R7, R8 | Yes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub. No</th>
<th>Author/IX Ref</th>
<th>Submission Summary</th>
<th>Council Planner's Response</th>
<th>LSPS Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Council will continue to work with the Corporation in relation to social housing provision in the area. If it wishes to seek Council’s support for any changes to the planning framework, it will need to engage and brief Council on proposed changes and why council support is required before hand. LSPS themes and Planning Priorities: PP3, PP4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ITEM NO : 4.4

SUBJECT : CIRCULAR ECONOMY

STRATEGIC OUTCOME : COUNCIL VALIDATES THE BENEFITS OF SUSTAINABLE LIVING AND SUPPORTS ADVANCED APPROACHES TO RESOURCE RECOVERY

ACTION : CREATE STRONG PARTNERSHIPS WITH OUR COMMUNITY TO SUPPORT INNOVATIVE ATTITUDES TO SUSTAINABLE LIFESTYLES, WASTE MINIMISATION AND INCREASE REUSE AND RECYCLING OPPORTUNITIES

REPORTING OFFICER : BEC HO

PURPOSE
This report sets out a pilot proposal in relation to opportunities to promote the circular economy as a measure to support sustainability and reduce waste to landfill.

RECOMMENDATION
1. That the report be received and noted.
2. That Council endorse the pilot projects proposed to be delivered in partnership with the NSW Circular and the University of New South Wales.
3. That at the conclusion of the pilot projects a further report be presented to Council on the outcomes.

BACKGROUND
Council at its meeting held on 28 October 2019 considered a Notice of Motion seeking opportunities to support Council’s strategic goals around sustainability and the circular economy. Council subsequently resolved:

1. That the General Manager provide a report to Council outlining opportunities, for partnerships and projects to support Council’s strategic goals around Sustainability and being an Innovation Incubator.
2. That the report consider LGNSW Circular Economy initiatives and principles, including opportunities for market creation and income generation from recycled products, opportunities for local engagement and education and any funding opportunities for research or pilot partnerships.
3. That the report consider opportunities to engage with or leverage off other work being done in this area by NSROC and neighbouring Councils.

REPORT
NSW Circular

NSW Circular is an innovation network established by the NSW Government to support the transition to a Circular Economy. NSW Circular was launched by the NSW Planning and Public Spaces Minister Rob Stokes late 2019 and is hosted by UNSW.
The vision of NSW Circular is to mainstream the circular economy in broad aspects of business and everyday life to deliver economic, social and environmental benefits to NSW. This involves solving problems, creating pathways to markets, and fostering innovation through a more sustainable approach to design/production, use of resources and recycling of waste to create value.

The Network, funded through the Office of the NSW Chief Scientist and Engineer, brings together industry, government, local councils, researchers and the community, and is led by Scientia Professor Veena Sahajwalla, Director of the Centre for Sustainable Materials Research and Technology (SMaRT) at UNSW Sydney.

The Network are keen to establish pilot projects that aim to create new supply chains, turn trash into valuable products and materials for manufacturing and divert waste from landfill. The attached link provides further information: https://www.nswcircular.org/about

LGNSW

LGNSW has also been conducting, as part of its advocacy role, a campaign: Save our Recycling.

As part of this campaign they are seeking solutions to deal with waste and resource recovery, acknowledging that local government is dealing with the recycling issues and there is a need to improve waste and recycling services and help build a circular economy in NSW.

Pilot projects for Hunters Hill

Over the past few months a number of discussions have taken place to explore opportunities to pilot initiatives as part of the NSW Circular program and partner with the University of New South Wales (UNSW).

Set out below are the two (2) pilot proposals:

Pilot 1: A Community Led Circular Economy Initiative:

In order to be successful and sustainable initiatives should be placed based and respond to the unique characteristic of a community.

This pilot involves bringing together members of our community in a workshop forum to look at the current waste going to land fill and identifying opportunities to divert this into the creation of new matters.

The first step in this process will be a tour of the UNSW micro factories to look at the technologies and possibilities and provide inspiration for projects locally. This tour is scheduled for Friday 14 February.

Following this tour a workshop will be held to scope opportunities and any associated resourcing arising.

Pilot 2: Library and community program space

Council at its meeting held on 23 September 2019, resolved to enter into a Joint use Agreement with Lane Cove Council for the provision of library services, as the conclusion of the joint use agreement with the City of Ryde in June 2020. As part of this resolution, Council also resolved that:
Council authorise the Mayor and General Manager to enter into a lease agreement for premises in the Hunters Hill Village to be used as the venue for the provision of the additional programs and events that will now be provided under the new Joint use Agreement with Lane Cove Council.

A lease has been executed for a site on Gladesville Road in Hunters Hill Village. Planning is underway for the fit out of this space, which will include minor works as well as the purchase of furniture and fittings.

As part of this work, there is an opportunity to integrate into this new space products derived from the circular economy to provide a demonstration site for practical application. This may include furniture fabrication, panels to improve acoustics in the foyer entry to the space and materials for the kitchenette area. This will be scoped and further details provided as part of the end of March budget review.

CONCLUSION
The proposed pilot initiatives support the key organisational strategic direction: *An incubator for Innovation*.

Given our unique characteristics, Hunter’s Hill Council is both relatable to rural and regional councils and scalable for metropolitan councils. These pilot initiatives leverage off our unique positioning and offer the opportunity to deliver benefits locally and more broadly within local government.

FINANCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT
Funds are provided under the Better Waste Levy towards specific initiatives that divert waste from landfill. Through these funds a Sustainability Officer will be employed 14 hours per week in a two year contract role. One aspect of their role will be to lead initiatives such as this one.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT
There is a positive environmental impact on Council arising from Council consideration of this matter.

SOCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT
There is a positive social impact on Council arising from Council consideration of this matter.

RISK ASSESSMENT
There are no direct or indirect risks impacting on Council arising from consideration of this matter.

ATTACHMENTS
There are no attachments to this report.
ITEM NO : 4.5

SUBJECT : TARBAN CREEK FLYING-FOX CAMP MANAGEMENT PLAN

STRATEGIC OUTCOME : OUR NATURAL ENVIRONMENT IS PROTECTED, AND ENHANCED FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS

ACTION : PROTECT THE DIVERSITY OF FLORA, FAUNA AND ECOLOGICAL COMMUNITIES

REPORTING OFFICER : JACQUI VOLLMER

PURPOSE
The purpose of this report is to summarise the outcomes of the public exhibition of the draft Tarban Creek Flying-fox Camp Management Plan (CMP), and seek endorsement of the amended CMP.

RECOMMENDATION
1. That the report be received and noted;
2. That Council endorse the amended Tarban Creek Flying-fox Camp Management Plan (CMP) as attached.
3. That Council write to individuals who made submissions during the exhibition period to advise of the outcome.

BACKGROUND
Council engaged Ecological Consultants Australia Pty Ltd to provide expert input into the draft CMP for the Tarban Creek Grey-headed Flying-fox camp, which will guide the future management of the camp.

At the Council meeting on the 11 June 2019, Council resolved:

1. That Council receive and note the draft Tarban Creek Flying-Fox Camp Management Plan (CMP) attached;
2. That the draft CMP be endorsed for public exhibition for four weeks and all adjoining residents be notified.
3. That Council does not endorse the Flying Fox Camp as being appropriate in residential streets.

The initial public exhibition period was due to cease on 25 July 2019, however the exhibition period was extended to 14 August 2019.

This report outlines the public exhibition period and the community response received.

17 written submissions on the draft CMP were received including a detailed response from the Department of Planning, Industry, and Environment’s Environment, Energy and Science (DPIE EES) Group (former Office of Environment and Heritage).
Reasons for the CMP and legislative requirements

As reported previously, a CMP is required if Council decides to undertake management actions (e.g. nudging), which require a licence from state or federal agencies, or if Council needs to undertake management actions listed and in accordance with the *Flying-fox Camp Management Code of Practice 2018*. In addition an endorsed CMP enables Council to access funding from state government agencies for the implementation of works.

Grey-headed Flying-foxes (GHFF) are listed as a vulnerable species on the *Environmental Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* (commonwealth legislation) and as a vulnerable species on the *NSW Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016*. While present in urban areas, the populations of GHFF have declined dramatically from large parts of their original range due to agricultural changes to the landscape. More recently the increased frequency of high temperatures has resulted in the death of 1000's of flying-foxes.

REPORT

A report to Council seeking that the draft Tarban Creek Flying-fox Camp Management Plan (CMP) be placed on public exhibition, was supported by Council on the 11 June 2019. The CMP was placed on public exhibition for four weeks from the 26 June to 25 July 2019. The public exhibition period was further extended to 14 August 2019.

Notification of the exhibition period was placed in The Weekly Times, Hunter’s Hill Councils website under news, signage in the reserve, email to a registered contact list from community consultation, and a flyer distributed to all adjoining residents.

Of the 17 submissions received, 14 submissions were in support, two (2) submissions were against and one (1) submission neutral regarding the draft CMP.

Four (4) submissions requested subsidies and three (3) submissions requested more support from Council. DPIE EESs submission supports the recommendations of the CMP. It acknowledges that while there is always a need to balance the conservation of flying-foxes and their impacts on human settlements, it considers that the protection of camps *in situ*, including in residential areas, is crucial for the conservation of this threatened species. DPIE EESs submission is attached to this report.

The submissions in support of the CMP identified issues including:
- major vegetation modification or nudging;
- Councils intent in preparing the CMP and decreasing flying-fox numbers;
- Flying-fox camp movement is unpredictable;
- removal of roost trees should be last resort and nudging has not proven to be effective or predictable;
- that the ongoing wellbeing of the Grey-headed Flying-fox is considered as the highest priority in Councils decision regarding future management of the camp;
- attempts to disperse the camp would be expensive, offensive to affected residents and unlikely to be successful in moving the camp far;
- negative public perception about flying-foxes, diseases and declining numbers.

The submissions against the CMP identified issues of:
- increasing flying-fox numbers;
- smell and loss of trees;
- noise unbearable, faeces abundant and human quality of life diminished;
- flying-foxcrossing Manning Road;
difficulty in keeping things clean, CMP impractical and disregards LEP and DCP, clean water supply and displacement of bird species;

- lack of support or action by Council.

A summary of the submissions is attached to this report. The feedback received has provided valuable information regarding some of the management options in the draft CMP. The recommendations suggested in these submissions do not make any significant changes to the general effect of the draft CMP and therefore re-exhibition is not required.

**Community consultation**

As reported previously, extensive community consultation was undertaken between June to October 2018 by Council staff and local residents with expertise in the field. Community consultation consisted of an initial online survey (119 responses), household interviews with adjoining residents (49 households), in park interviews (99 interviews over weekday and weekend sessions), and an online flying fox engage survey where the community ranked management options (85 responses).

Some of the findings include:

- most respondents (70-80%) indicated they were either somewhat or very concerned about common impacts people experience around flying-fox camps;

- a significant proportion of respondents (40%) agreed that flying-foxes are a natural part of the suburbs;

- 72% of park users were neutral or positive about flying-foxes compared to 47% of households

- 16% of park users disliked flying-foxes compared to 53% of nearby households.

The full community consultation report is provided in Appendix 1 of the amended CMP. It summarises the consultation results and concludes that it will be challenging to select actions that align to the expectations of all people. Targeted problem solving may be more achievable that attempting to provide solutions that are universally acceptable. The findings indicate that the focus should be on working with people so they experience fewer impacts. As suggested the recommendations in the CMP for affected residents should be further investigated and align with Councils LEP and DCP including conservation areas.

**Management options**

As reported previously, management options have been derived from the latest research and community input. Table 8.1 in the amended CMP provides an analysis of management options i.e. advantages and disadvantages, suitability in Hunters Hill and a proposed Council decision for each option. The CMP also includes an investigation of what ‘trigger-points’ could be used to determine if flying-foxes are too close to residential properties. The plan will be adaptive as recommended management measures are linked to these trigger points. Descriptions of each management option are provided Appendix 5 of the amended CMP.

**Recommendations**

As reported previously, the CMP includes a series of escalating mitigation measures i.e. level 1 through to level 3 measures, to reduce the impact of the flying-foxes on the surrounding environment, which can be progressively implemented until the impacts are reduced to an acceptable level. Refer to Figure 9.1: example flow chart to demonstrate the planned process for management decision-making on page 49 in the amended CMP.
Recommended level 1 measures are: education and awareness programs, routine camp management (ongoing), encourage planting of odour reducing/screening/masking plants in adjoining properties and non-roost vegetation along Richmond Crescent, creating alternate and artificial habitat in the reserve, protocols to manage incidents, research and appropriate land-use planning i.e. mitigation provisions in DAs.

Recommended level 2 measures are: buffers through vegetation management/removal and buffers without vegetation removal. Recommended level 3 measures are: nudging and potentially active dispersal if flying-foxes reach 15,000 for 2 or more seasons or early dispersal if other camps form in the Council area.

Level 1 and 2 measures need to be implemented in accordance with the *Flying-fox Camp Management Code of Practice 2018*. Level 3 measures require a licence from DPIE EES and possibly the Commonwealth. The full explanation and costing of the above recommendations are provided in Table 8.1 in the amended CMP.

In addition, Ecological Consultants Australia Pty Ltd have provided a map of possible Grey-headed Flying-fox roosts in the Hunters Hill LGA. If active dispersal actions were implemented, the potential likely habitat is located in Upper Tarban Creek Reserve and Boronia Park. The map including site descriptions is attached to this report.

**CONCLUSION**

The draft Tarban Creek Flying-fox CMP has been prepared following extensive community consultation and management options have been derived from the latest research and community input. The public exhibition period resulted in 17 submissions including one from DPIE EES.

It is recommended that Council endorse the amended Tarban Creek Flying-fox CMP attached with DPIE EESS comments incorporated into the draft CMP. This will enable Council to undertake level one (1) and two (2) actions without the need to apply for a DPIE EES licence. By having an endorsed CMP Council will now be able to access State Government funding.

**FINANCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

There is no direct financial impact on Council’s adopted budget as a result of this report.

**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

The CMP addresses the potential impacts of proposed management actions on the Tarban Creek Grey-headed Flying-fox camp.

**SOCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

The CMP addresses the impact of flying-foxes on adjoining residents and the community.

**RISK ASSESSMENT**

There are no direct or indirect risks impacting on Council arising from consideration of this matter.

**ATTACHMENTS**

1. Amended Tarban Creek Flying-fox Camp Management Plan
2. DPIE EES submission
3. Summary of submission
4. Potential GHFF habitat mapping
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expert assessment/input required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(see Appendix 1 for minimum requirements)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder consultation / engagement required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further approvals may be required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mapping required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring required</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendices

Appendix 1 Community Engagement Feedback
Appendix 2. Species Profiles
Appendix 3. Requirements: expert assessment requirements, Section 91 licence application form & legislation likely to apply
Appendix 4. Human and animal health
Appendix 5. General Camp Management Options
Appendix 6. Example flying-fox rescue protocol including the NSW Code of Practice for Injured, Sick and Orphaned Flying-foxes.
1. Overview

Hunter’s Hill Council has prepared a draft Camp Management Plan (CMP) for the Tarban Creek Greyheaded flying-fox camp for comment which will guide the future management of the camp. Council engaged Ecological Consultants Australia Pty Ltd to provide expert input into the plan.

Community feedback has helped Council develop the draft CMP. Council has sought community views on both the impacts of the flying-fox camp and the outcomes people hope management of the flying-fox camp will achieve.

Extensive consultation was undertaken and information and views gathered are included within this draft.

1.1 Objectives

Objectives listed are consistent with the objectives of the NSW Flying-fox Camp Management Policy 2015 (the Policy) (OEH 2015b) and reflect the purpose of the CMP. Objectives also consider the interests/concerns raised by community during surveys and other engagement.

The objectives of this CMP are:

Management outcomes
- implement an adaptive management approach to camp management based on evidence
- provide a reasonable level of amenity for the surrounding community
- minimise impacts to the community, while conserving flying-foxes and their habitat
- manage public health and safety risks
- clearly define roles and responsibilities
- enable long-term conservation of flying-foxes
- improve community understanding and appreciation of flying-foxes, including their critical ecological role

Understanding flying-fox dynamics of the site
- understand the camp dynamics as far as possible including population fluctuations and movement of flying-foxes between camps and major habitat areas
- understand the use of the site by the flying foxes including for roosting and breeding
- understand the carry-capacity of the camp including the use of the environmental features (trees etc) by flying-foxes.

Effective input into the CMP and on-going management
- effectively communicate with stakeholders during planning and implementation of management activities

Management implementation
- ensure flying-fox welfare is a priority during all works
- clearly outline the camp management actions that have been approved and will be utilised at the camp
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- enable land managers and other stakeholders to use a range of suitable management responses to sustainably manage flying-foxes
- ensure management is sympathetic to flying-fox behaviours and requirements

Planning and legislation
- ensure camp management is consistent with broader conservation management strategies that may be developed to protect threatened species/communities
- ensure management activities are consistent with the NSW Flying-fox Camp Management Policy (OEH 2015b)
- facilitate licence approval (where required) for actions at the camp
- ensure camp management does not contribute to loss of biodiversity or increase threats to threatened species/communities

General biodiversity management in the area of the camp
This plan also considers the following especially how actions to manage these values could be effected by GHFF camp management and vice versa.

- Other ecological values of the site including threatened species/communities management and the retention and strengthening of the corridor for small birds.
- Assessment of impacts to flora and fauna of any proposed management actions.
- Assessment of impacts to other threatened species or communities such as Saltmarsh, Mangroves, Sydney Turpentine Ironbark Forest and the Powerful Owl.
- Water quality
2. Context

2.1 Camp area

The camp is located in Riverglade Reserve along Tarban Creek between Manning Road and the unmade road extension of Mary Street, between the suburbs of Gladesville, Huntleys Cove and Hunters Hill (refer to map Figure 2.1).

The camp extent as at August 2018 is shown in Figure 2.1. The camp currently covers approximately 1.1 hectares, with approximately 2ha of suitable contiguous camp habitat remaining.

Figure 2.1 The camp extent as at August 2018

All of the optimal habitat has GHFF roosting within it. Extra capacity is expected to first come from an increase in density then an expansion of area.
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Figure 2.2 Forested area including core habitat zone 2.3 ha

Figure 2.3 Core habitat zone 1.3 ha – used during the 2017-2018 sampling events
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Figure 2.4 Less Suitable habitat away from water – lower value habitat 2.5ha

Figure 2.5 Mangroves 0.75ha – not used by GHFF and waterway (blue-line) location

Ecological Consultants Australia ecologicals@outlook.com 0488 481 929
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Figure 2.6 Tarban Creek 1943 – noting GHFF habitat present at this time. Source SixMaps

Figure 2.7 Core GHFF colony and 20m buffer

Ecological Consultants Australia ecologica@outlook.com 0488 481 929
Flying-fox Camp Management Plan Tarban Creek

7m buffer (yellow) road
20m buffer (pink)
Roosting habitat (hatched)
Optimal habitat (yellow outline)
Optimal Roost area is approximately 1.2ha (11,750m²)
Optimal Roost is in close proximity (within 40m) to the open water

Figure 2.8a Vegetated Land within the GHFF Plan
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Figure 2.8b Detailed Vegetation communities in Riverglafe Reserve

Legend:
- Green = Coastal Sandstone Foreshores Forest
- Pinks = Exotic Closed Forest
- Red = Coastal Saltmarsh
- Yellow = Mangroves including remnants of Coastal Saltmarsh
- Light Blue = Sydney Freshwater Wetlands
- Peach = Sydney Turpentine/Ironbark Forest

2.1.1 History of the camp since 1900

The camp was first recorded in May, 2010 between Manning Road and The Priory, and is now permanently occupied and serves as a maternity site. It is occupied mostly by Grey-headed flying-fox and occasional Black flying-fox. However individuals of these species were anecdotaly observed at the site at least 10 years prior to 2010. The camp moved to the current Tarban Creek site between November 2013 and February 2014. The maximum total number of flying-foxes ever recorded at the camp was [8,000, and proportion of each species] in [February, 2015].

The maximum number of flying-foxes recorded at the camp is 8000 in February 2015 (John Martins).
COUNCIL REPORTS
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GHFF are the most abundant species at the Tarban Creek camp. Black Flying-foxes (BFF) Pteropus alecto are present though in lower numbers than GHFF with maximums around 2000. Black Flying-foxes are not recorded on site each year and records from other parts of Sydney indicate BFF were first reported roosting in Sydney in the summer of 2006 – 2007.

Black Flying-foxes appear to be migrating in a southerly direction. Evidence from coastal areas north from the Clarence Valley and in the tablelands of southeast Queensland during the past 20 years show that the numbers of Grey-headed Flying-foxes relative to those of Black Flying-foxes have declined markedly.

The rate of increase in Black Flying-foxes in northern New South Wales has been particularly rapid in the past 10 years and numbers may increase at Tarban Creek. Monitoring is required to know if this is occurring.

![Figure 4: Timing and extent of southern extension to the range of Black Flying-foxes](image)

**Figure 2.9** BHFF moving south through time. Source: National Recovery Plan for the Grey-headed Flying Fox (2009)

**Population Monitoring**

The abundance of fruit and blossom within a 20-50 km radius of a camp site is a key determinant of the population size of a camp at any given time. Understanding the availability of foraging resources goes beyond general knowledge of usual fruiting and flowering times. The majority of eucalypts do not flower every year in a local area and several rainforest species do not fruit annually. The often erratic changes in camp size reflect the irregular nature of local food resources and the migratory responses of flying-foxes. All species move long distances as they track flowering and fruiting of species in their diet. Production of fruit and blossom is thought to be related to conditions in previous seasons. Extended dry or wet periods, e.g. drought, may have a significant impact on local food availability.

**Population Monitoring** is essential to effective management and decision making as it provides an understanding of flying-fox behaviour and movements. Monthly monitoring has occurred at known Sunshine Coast roosts since 2003 with weekly monitoring occurring at high-conflict roosts since September 2014. Monitoring is a useful means of providing population information and assessing the outcome of management activities while also allowing for early detection of a colony to a new or unsuitable roost location.

**CSIRO** developed monitoring methodology is being used to gather updated information about Grey-headed Flying-fox populations and population trends. Figures 2.10 and 2.11 are for the Tarban Creek Camp (see below).
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Commonwealth and state governments are working together to implement a multi-year monitoring program, based on the CSIRO’s method (ideally). The Method recommends census should be conducted at the time when the greatest numbers of animals are present in camps in order to minimise errors associated with uncertainty in the proportion of the population being counted. For GHFF this period corresponds to the period after birthing, during territory establishment and leading up to mating which is some point in the spring or summer.

See the Australian Government’s flying-fox web viewer [Monitoring Flying-Fox Populations](#) this has information spans the data gathered from November 2012 to present.

![Figure 2.12 FF Camp locations and status](image)

Tarban Creek Camp marking with Purple Symbol

Red = Nationally Important Flying Fox Camp Purple = other Flying Fox Camp

As part of this CMP counts were conducted using the CSIRO method Table 2.1 summarises the data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jan 2018</td>
<td>4100</td>
<td>Near pathway and in core habitat. None on the two Eucalypts trees with die-back</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2018</td>
<td>5800</td>
<td>Same as Jan but increased density</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2018</td>
<td>6500</td>
<td>Near pathway and in core habitat. 5+ FF at least 50m from nearest house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2018</td>
<td>4500</td>
<td>Near pathway and in core habitat. None on the two Eucalypts trees with die-back. 5+ FF at least 80m from nearest house.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Population Dynamics and Historical Data

Flying-fox numbers at any camp can be highly variable and made up of resident and visiting individuals. When undisturbed, camp locations are generally stable through time (Lunney and Moon 1997). Numbers are strongly linked to diet and foraging ecology. Grey-headed Flying-foxes feed primarily on blossom and fruit in canopy vegetation and supplement this diet with leaves (Ratcliffe 1931, Parry-Jones and Augee 1991, Eby 1995, 1998, Tidemann 1999, Hall and Richards 2000).

The majority of animals feed on nectar and pollen from eucalypts (genera Eucalyptus, Corymbia and Angophora), melaleucas and banksias. Grey-headed Flying-foxes forage over extensive areas. One-way commutes of approximately 50 km have been recorded between camps and foraging areas (Eby 1991), although commuting distances are more often < 20 km (Tidemann 1999).

Long distance movements.

The majority of eucalypts have regular seasonal flowering schedules but do not flower every year, and there are few areas within the range of the Grey-headed Flying-fox where nectar is available continuously (House 1997, Wilson and Bennett 1999, Law et al. 2000). Grey-headed Flying-foxes have no adaptations for withstanding food shortages (e.g., torpor) and migrate in response to changes in the amount and location of food (Hall and Richards 2000).

Evidence from broad-scale surveys, radio-telemetry and satellitetelemetry shows that adults and young can move hundreds of kilometres between productive habitats (Eby 1991, Spencer et al. 1991, Parry-Jones 1993, Augee and Ford 1999, Tidemann and Nelson 2004). In most areas within the species’ range, patterns of migration and distribution vary considerably between seasons and between years (Eby and Lunney 2002).

The mechanisms that flying-foxes use to locate stands of flowering trees are unknown and have not been studied. However, no speculative movements of large numbers of animals have been observed, and there is inferential evidence that information exchange plays a role in locating food.

Thus accurate historical populations, numbers and distribution, is most accurately gained from First Peoples (Aboriginal People) rather than vegetation cover. With connected vegetation it’s expected the flying-foxes had more continuous ranges with set birthing camps within these.

The number of flying-foxes in most camps is primarily related to the amount of food available within nightly commuting distance, although the annual reproductive cycle also influences the stability and size of populations (Ratcliffe 1931, Nelson 1965a, Parry-Jones and Augee 2001, Birt 2005).

In late spring and summer the camp provides refuge for flightless young. Vocalisations associated with territorial disputes and mother–infant recognition are most concentrated pre-dawn, when animals return to camps.
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Estimating Resources

Methods developed by Eby & Law (2008) are comprehensive for determining the significance of vegetation communities for flying-foxes based on the flowering and fruiting characteristics of the diet plants they contain. The Tarban Creek Camp is within an urban area with few intact vegetation communities.

Hence, resource estimation was via determining total vegetation within a 30km radius. 30km was chosen because the data indicates that 20km (each way) is the usual for GHFF in an evening however it can go 50km each way) in one evening so the 30km is a slight increase over the average.

See Figure 2.13 for graphic showing the area of 30km radius from the site.

Figure 2.13 30km radius from Tarban Creek Camp.

The process used to determine values of habitats to flying-foxes uses a combination of the productivity of flowers (nectar) and the duration that nectar is available. This can be used to determine, identify and flag for conservation priority vegetation communities that:

- contain high densities of highly productive food plants;
- are highly productive during key periods in the reproductive cycle of GHFFs (spring to autumn); and / or
- contain high densities of Spotted Gum.

Flower Scores

Various characteristics of nectar production are significant to the assessment. High-quality dietary species are those that:

1. provide relatively large volumes of food (Productivity score),
2. are annually reliable in their productivity (Reliability score), and
3. are productive for lengthy periods (Duration score).

The Hunter GHFF Management Plan has a comprehensive example of how to value food resources.
2.2  Land tenure

Council is now Crown Land Manager under Crowns Land Management Act 2016 and Riverglade Reserve POM is currently being reviewed.  

The camp area is zoned E2 Environmental Conservation under the Hunters Hill Local Environment Plan 2012. The adjoining land uses are public recreation immediately south and north west, residential to the north, further south and west, and special activities i.e. place of public worship to the east.

Riverglade Reserve is managed in accordance with the Riverglade Reserve Plan of Management 2013 (in revision) and the Estuary Vegetation Rehabilitation Action Plan for Riverglade Reserve and Tarban Creek Reserve 2011. In addition management actions within the Parramatta River Coastal Zone Management Plan 2013 relate to the camp area.

2.3  Reported issues related to the camp

The following list is a collation of the issues related to the camp that have been reported by the community. The list has been compiled from information collected via a range of reporting and consultation methods. Further discussion about community engagement efforts and outcomes can be found in Section 3 and Appendix 1.

Reported issues include:

- noise as flying-foxes depart or return to the camp – this is worse in spring/summer and at dawn and dusk.
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- noise from the camp during the day
- faecal drop on outdoor areas, cars and washing lines, and estimated resources [time, cost] associated with cleaning areas adjacent to the camp
- smell, most problematic during humid and lightly rainy weather, especially in February and March
- fear of disease
- health and/or wellbeing impacts
- reduced general amenity
- damage to vegetation
- increased need for bush regeneration and associated costs
- concern about water quality
- perceived property value lower

The majority of issues related to the camp are recorded around February to May when the camp population is at its annual maximum.

The majority of issues recorded are related to the interface of the camp and the residential properties.

A total of ~20 complaints with 12 complaints over approx. 5 years.

Reported positive feedback stems from people who:
- recognise the landscape-scale benefits flying-foxes provide through seed dispersal and pollination
- acknowledge the need to conserve flying-foxes as an important native species
- enjoy watching flying-foxes at the camp and/or flying out or in
- appreciate the intrinsic value of the camp
- see the value of the camp as a local education/attraction
- appreciate the natural values of the camp and habitat
- feel the camp does not negatively impact on their lifestyle
- value the opportunity the camp provides for them and their family to get close to nature
- recognise the need for people and wildlife to live together.

2.4 Management response to date

Management of the camp to date includes: bush regeneration with contractors working monthly in the reserve. In addition to this Council staff undertaken regular maintenance in the adjoining parkland. Community education about flying foxes has been conducted via Council newsletter and temporary signage.

It is suspected that contractor activity and associated noise moved the camp from The Priory to the Tarban Creek camp area.
3. Community engagement

This draft CMP has been developed within the context of a community engagement strategy for flying-fox management in order to build a shared understanding of the approach and ensure it is relevant to the local area.

Appendix 1 is a summary of this Community Consultation.

It is recommended that the CMP be placed on public exhibition, and made available online and in hard copy at an appropriate location for at least 30 days. Stakeholder consultation, including community engagement, started before the CMP’s development, and will continue through its development and implementation.

Consultation and the engagement process generally, considered OEH’s - working with communities living with flying-foxes fact sheet as well as the OEH Flyingfox-engage program.

3.1 Stakeholders

Stakeholders who are directly or indirectly affected by the flying-fox camp, or who are interested in its management are included in Table 3.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Interest/reported impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residents</td>
<td>Residents include those within 300m and more specifically those within 100m and 50m and 20m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>Within 300m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park users</td>
<td>The majority are local people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other adjoining landholders; these may include government departments such as Crown Lands, Transport for NSW / Roads and Maritime Services, or neighbouring councils</td>
<td>Adjoining landholders are affected by neighbouring landholders actions within the communities and environment of those areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic leaders and influencers (including local, state and federal politicians)</td>
<td>Councillors of Hunters Hill Council are interested in the management process and successes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government</td>
<td>Local government has responsibilities to the community and environment of the area for which it is responsible in accordance with the Local Government Act 1993. Council is also responsible for administering local laws, plans and policies, and appropriately managing assets (including land) for which it is responsible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government NSW (LGNSW)</td>
<td>LGNSW is an industry association that represents the interests of councils in NSW.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OEH</td>
<td>OEH is responsible for administering legislation relating to (among other matters) the conservation and management of native plants and animals, including threatened species and ecological communities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crown Lands</td>
<td>Land holdings with camps and or food supplies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads and Maritime Services</td>
<td>Mgt of Roads within Camps Areas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Interest/reportd impacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commonwealth Department of the Environment (DoE) (relevant to camps with grey-headed flying-foxes or other matters of national environmental significance)</td>
<td>DoE is responsible for administering federal legislation relating to matters of national environmental significance, such as the grey-headed flying-fox and any other federally-listed values of the camp site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife carers and conservation organisations</td>
<td>Wildlife carers and conservation organisations have an interest in flying-fox welfare and conservation of flying-foxes and their habitat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researchers/universities/CSIRO</td>
<td>Researchers have an interest in flying-fox behaviour, biology and conservation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 Community Engagement

Extensive input has been made to engage with the community regarding the flying-fox camp to:

- understand the issues directly and indirectly affecting the community
- raise awareness within the community about flying-foxes
- correct misinformation and allay fears
- share information and invite feedback about management responses to date
- seek ideas and feedback about possible future management options

The types of engagement that have been undertaken include:

- promotion of contact details of responsible officers
- residents contacting council via customer service line
- face-to-face interviews with adjacent residents and park users
- media (print, social media)
- brochures and other educational material
- website pages and links
- direct contact with adjacent residents including letters, brochures and emails
- on-site signage
- online surveys.

3.3 Community feedback — management options

A summary of the main feedback received is as follows:

- Responses were from: 49 household interviews, 99 park uses interviewed, 119 online surveys on Councils website and 85 responses to Flyingfoxengage online survey

The overall feedback from the community received via engagement favoured flying-fox camp management measures that:

- were of low financial cost to residents near the site
- were of low financial cost to local ratepayers
- ensured the risk of transmission of flying-fox pathogens, viruses and disease remains low
- reduced the impact of noise and odour on nearby residents
- reduced the impact of flying-fox excrement
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- would be unlikely to have a negative impact on the flying-foxes
- would retain the natural and ecological values of the site
- would retain the visual appeal or recreational opportunities currently undertaken at the site.
4. Legislation and policy

4.1 State

4.1.1 Flying-fox Camp Management Policy 2015

The Flying-fox Camp Management Policy 2015 (the Policy) has been developed to empower land managers, primarily local councils, to work with their communities to manage flying-fox camps effectively. It provides the framework within which OEH will make regulatory decisions. In particular, the Policy strongly encourages local councils and other land managers to prepare Camp Management Plans for sites where the local community is affected.

4.1.2 Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016

The objects of the Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016 (BC Act) include to conserve biological diversity and protect the critical habitat of threatened species, populations and ecological communities. The grey-headed flying-fox is listed as threatened under the Act (see also Why the Grey-headed Flying-fox is listed as a threatened species).

The Act provides for the application of licences if the proposed action is likely to result in one or more of the following:

a. harm to any animal that is of, or is part of, a threatened species, population or ecological community
b. the picking of any plant that is of, or is part of, a threatened species, population or ecological community
c. damage to critical habitat
d. damage to habitat of a threatened species, population or ecological community.

4.1.3 Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act 1979

It may be an offence under this Act if there is evidence of unreasonable/unnecessary torment associated with management activities. Adhering to welfare and conservation measures provided in Section 10.3 will ensure compliance with this Act.

4.1.4 Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979

The objects of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 (EP&A Act) are to encourage proper management, development and conservation of resources, for the purpose of the social and economic welfare of the community and a better environment. It also aims to share responsibility for environmental planning between different levels of government and promote public participation in environmental planning and assessment.

The EP&A Act is administered by the NSW Department of Planning and Environment.

Development control plans under the Act should consider flying-fox camps so that planning, design and construction of future developments is appropriate to avoid future conflict.

Development under Part 4 of the Act does not require licensing under the Biodiversity Conservation Act (BC).

Where public authorities such as local councils undertake development under Part 5 of the EP&A Act (known as 'development without consent' or 'activity'), assessment and licensing under the BC Act may not be required. However a full consideration of the development's potential impacts on threatened species will be required in all cases.
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Where flying-fox camps occur on private land, land owners are not eligible to apply for development under Part 5 of the EP&A Act. Private land owners should contact Council to explore management options for camps that occur on private land.

4.1.5  **Coastal Management SEPP 2016**

Objective to retain the coastal ecosystems and aesthetics.

4.2  **Commonwealth**

4.2.1  **Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999**

The Commonwealth’s *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* (EPBC Act) provides protection for the environment, specifically matters of national environmental significance (MNES). A referral to the Commonwealth DoE is required under the EPBC Act for any action that is likely to significantly impact on an MNES.

MNES under the EPBC Act that relate to flying-foxes include:

- world heritage sites (where those sites contain flying-fox camps or foraging habitat)
- wetlands of international importance (where those wetlands contain flying-fox camps or foraging habitat)
- nationally threatened species and ecological communities.

The grey-headed flying-fox (*Pteropus poliocephalus*; GHFF) is listed as a vulnerable species under the EPBC Act, meaning it is an MNES. It is also considered to have a single national population. DoE has developed the *Referral guideline for management actions in GHFF and SFF*[^1] camps (DoE 2015) (the Guideline) to guide whether referral is required for actions pertaining to the GHFF.

The Guideline defines a nationally important GHFF camp as one that has either:

- contained ≥10,000 GHFF in more than one year in the last 10 years, or
- been occupied by more than 2500 GHFF permanently or seasonally every year for the last 10 years.

Provided that management at nationally important camps follows the mitigation standards below, DoE has determined that a significant impact to the population is unlikely, and referral is not likely to be required.

Referral will be required if a significant impact to any other MNES is considered likely as a result of management actions outlined in the Plan. Self-assessable criteria are available in the *Significant Impact Guidelines 1.1* (DoE 2013) to assist in determining whether a significant impact is likely; otherwise consultation with DoE will be required.

**Mitigation standards**

- The action must not occur if the camp contains females that are in the late stages of pregnancy or have dependent young that cannot fly on their own.

[^1]: spectacled flying-fox (*P. conspicillatus*)
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- The action must not occur during or immediately after climatic extremes (heat stress event\(^2\), cyclone event\(^3\)), or during a period of significant food stress\(^4\).
- Disturbance must be carried out using non-lethal means, such as acoustic, visual and/or physical disturbance or use of smoke.
- Disturbance activities must be limited to a maximum of 2.5 hours in any 12 hour period, preferably at or before sunrise or at sunset.
- Trees are not felled, topped or have large branches removed when flying-foxes are in or near to a tree and likely to be harmed.
- The action must be supervised by a person with knowledge and experience relevant to the management of flying-foxes and their habitat, who can identify dependent young and is aware of climatic extremes and food stress events. This person must make an assessment of the relevant conditions and advise the proponent whether the activity can go ahead consistent with these standards.
- The action must not involve the clearing of all vegetation supporting a nationally-important flying-fox camp. Sufficient vegetation must be retained to support the maximum number of flying-foxes ever recorded in the camp of interest.

These standards have been incorporated into mitigation measures detailed in Section 10.3. If actions cannot comply with these mitigation measures, referral for activities at nationally important camps is likely to be required.

---

\(^2\) A 'heat stress event' is defined for the purposes of the Australian Government's [Referral guideline for management actions in CHPP and SFF camps](https://www.bom.gov.au/wx/camps/flying-foxes/) as a day on which the maximum temperature does (or is predicted to) meet or exceed 38°C.

\(^3\) A 'cyclone event' is defined as a cyclone that is identified by the Australian Bureau of Meteorology ([www.bom.gov.au/cyclone/](https://www.bom.gov.au/cyclone/)).

\(^4\) Food stress events may be apparent if large numbers of low body weight animals are being reported by wildlife carers in the region.
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5. Other ecological values of the site

Vegetation mapping from Sydney Metro Mapping (accessed via the SEED data Portal) shows 3 Plant Community Types (PCTs). Figure 5.1 shows these.

![Map of the site with vegetation types highlighted.](image)

Figure 5.1 Plant Community Types. Source: SEED data Portal

- **1778 Smooth-barked Apple - Coast Banksia / Cheese Tree open forest on sandstone slopes on the foreshores of the drowned river valleys of Sydney (Common Name: Coastal Sandstone foreshores Forest)**

- **1281 Turpentine - Grey Ironbark open forest on shale in the lower Blue Mountains, Sydney Basin Bioregion. (Common Name: Sydney Turpentine/Ironbark Forest)**

- **920 Mangrove Forests in estuaries of the Sydney Basin Bioregion and South East Corner Bioregion (Common Name: Estuarine Mangrove Forest)**

Sydney Turpentine-Ironbark Forest is listed as Critically Endangered Ecological Community under BC Act 2016 and Critically Endangered under the EPBC Act 1999. It originally extended over 26,000 hectares but today, Sydney Turpentine-Ironbark Forest is reduced to 4.5 percent its original extent, surviving as small remnants. It is an open forest community and occurs <150m north west of the Flying Fox Camp.
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A list of threatened species known to occur within 10 km of the site is provided in Table 5.1. A bionet search has been conducted and threatened species, populations and communities.

Vegetation is mapped as Smooth-barked Apple - Coast Banksia / Cheese Tree open forest on sandstone slopes on the foreshores of the drowned river valleys of Sydney. The vegetation forms part of a biodiversity corridor linking the Lane Cove River and Parramatta River. In addition the mangroves and coastal saltmarsh are mapped Coastal Wetlands in the creekline under the NSW Coastal Management SEPP Maps.

Riverglade Reserve also supports breeding populations of native birds that have disappeared from much of urban Sydney.

A list of threatened species known to occur within 10 km of the site is provided in Table 5.1, including the likelihood of each occurring on site. Most works will require expert assessment and OEH defines this – See Appendix 3 for details.

Table 5.1: Threatened species that may occur at the site or use it at times as habitat and two Endangered Ecological Communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species name</th>
<th>Common name</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Likelihood of occurring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Pseudophryne australis</em></td>
<td>Red-crowned Toadlet</td>
<td>Vulnerable</td>
<td>Potential habitat in camp area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Nettapus coromandelianus</em></td>
<td>Cotton Pygmy-Goose</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Botaurus poicilopterus</em></td>
<td>Australasian Bittern</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td>Potential habitat in camp area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ibidorhyncha flavicollis</em></td>
<td>Black Bittern</td>
<td>Vulnerable</td>
<td>Potential habitat in camp area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Haliaeetus leucocephalus</em></td>
<td>White-billed Sea-Eagle</td>
<td>Vulnerable</td>
<td>Sighted in the UGA but unlikely habitat in camp area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hierocephalus morrisoni</em></td>
<td>Little Eagle</td>
<td>Vulnerable</td>
<td>Potential habitat in camp area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pandion cristatus</em></td>
<td>Eastern Osprey</td>
<td>Vulnerable</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Burhinus grallarius</em></td>
<td>Bush Stone-curlew</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td>Potential habitat in camp area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Haematopus longirostris</em></td>
<td>Pied Oystercatcher</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Calidris ferruginea</em></td>
<td>Curlew Sandpiper</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td>Potential habitat in camp area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Limosa limosa</em></td>
<td>Black-called Godwit</td>
<td>Vulnerable</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sterna chlidarana</em></td>
<td>Little Tern</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Calyptorhynchus labiati</em></td>
<td>Glossy Black-Cockatoo</td>
<td>Vulnerable</td>
<td>Unlikely due to lack of She-oaks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Glossopitta pusilla</em></td>
<td>Little Lorikeet</td>
<td>Vulnerable</td>
<td>Potential habitat in camp area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lathamus discolor</em></td>
<td>Swift Parrot</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ninox caniceps</em></td>
<td>Barking Owl</td>
<td>Vulnerable</td>
<td>Potential habitat in camp area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ninox strenua</em></td>
<td>Powerful Owl</td>
<td>Vulnerable</td>
<td>Sighted by Bushland Management Office in 2017 and Birdlife Australia Volunteer in 2014 in camp area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Daphoenoptila chrysostoma</em></td>
<td>Varied Sittella</td>
<td>Vulnerable</td>
<td>Potential habitat in camp area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artamus cyanopterus</th>
<th>Dusky Woodswallow</th>
<th>Vulnerable</th>
<th>Potential habitat in camp area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psophodes australis</td>
<td>Little Bentwing-bat</td>
<td>Vulnerable</td>
<td>Potential habitat in camp area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sciurocanis capenarae</td>
<td>Eastern Bentwing-bat</td>
<td>Vulnerable</td>
<td>Potential habitat in camp area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caretta caretta</td>
<td>Loggerhead Turtle</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dermochelys coriacea</td>
<td>Leatherback Turtle</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varanus rosenbergi</td>
<td>Rosenberg's Goanna</td>
<td>Vulnerable</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piluopithecus superbus</td>
<td>Superb Fruit-dove</td>
<td>Vulnerable</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circus aerodactylus</td>
<td>Spotted Harrier</td>
<td>Vulnerable</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lophoictinia isura</td>
<td>Square-tailed Kite</td>
<td>Vulnerable</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callocephalon femoratum</td>
<td>Gang-gang Cockatoo</td>
<td>Vulnerable</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhus glabrata</td>
<td>Australian Painted Snake</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nestor livingstonii</td>
<td>Turquoise Parrot</td>
<td>Vulnerable</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ephiphanus australiensis</td>
<td>White-fronted Chat</td>
<td>Vulnerable</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saccolaimus flaviventris</td>
<td>Yellow-bellied Sheath-tailed Bat</td>
<td>Vulnerable</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macropus norfolcensis</td>
<td>Eastern Freetail-bat</td>
<td>Vulnerable</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Falco longipennis</td>
<td>Eastern Fizhe Pipistrelle</td>
<td>Vulnerable</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotopana noticulata</td>
<td>Greater Broad-nosed Bat</td>
<td>Vulnerable</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myotis minimus</td>
<td>Southern Myotis</td>
<td>Vulnerable</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Flora

| Hibbertia xanthantha | Julian Hibbertia | Critically Endangered | Unlikely |
| Tetrathla glansulosa | Vulnerable | Possible occurrence due to shale influence |
| Epacris purpureascens var. purpureascens | Vulnerable | Possible occurrence due to shale influence |
| Dillwynia teutonica | Vulnerable | Unlikely |
| Acacia byrneana | Bynoe's Wattle | Endangered | Unlikely |
| Acacia pubescens | Downy Wattle | Vulnerable | Unlikely |
| Acacia terminalis | Sunshine Wattle | Endangered | Unlikely |
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### SUBSP. TERMINALIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Conservation Status</th>
<th>Occurrence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prostanthera maritima</td>
<td>Seaforth Mintbush</td>
<td>Critically Endangered</td>
<td>Highly unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Callistemon linearifolius</td>
<td>Netted Bottle Brush</td>
<td>Vulnerable</td>
<td>Possible occurrence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doremaea biflora</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vulnerable</td>
<td>Possible occurrence due to saline influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eucalyptus camfieldii</td>
<td>Camfield's Stringybark</td>
<td>Vulnerable</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eucalyptus nicholii</td>
<td>Narrow-leaved Black Peppermint</td>
<td>Vulnerable</td>
<td>Highly unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leptospermum dawei</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vulnerable</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melaleuca bicornis</td>
<td>Bicornex Paperbark</td>
<td>Vulnerable</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melaleuca deali</td>
<td>Dearn's Paperbark</td>
<td>Vulnerable</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syzygium paniculatum</td>
<td></td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caladenia tessellata</td>
<td>Thick Lip Spider Orchid</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genoplesium baueri</td>
<td>Bauer's Milge Orchid</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td>Possible occurrence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pterostylis saxicola</td>
<td>Sydney Plains Greenhood</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td>Possible occurrence due to saline influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persoonia hisuta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pinelbera curviflora var. curviflora</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vulnerable</td>
<td>Possible occurrence due to saline influence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilsonia backhousei</td>
<td>Narrow-leaved Wilsonia</td>
<td>Vulnerable</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zanichella palustris</td>
<td></td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Threatened ecological communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>Conservation Status</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Saltmarsh</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td>Mapped in Riverglade Reserve by Bush-it Pty Ltd in 2011.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Freshwater Wetlands</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td>Mapped in Riverglade Reserve by Bush-it Pty Ltd in 2011.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swamp Oak Floodplain Forest</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td>Not mapped within Riverglade Reserve (SEED 2019).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sydney Tarrentine-Ironbark Forest</td>
<td>Critically Endangered</td>
<td>Not mapped within Riverglade Reserve (SEED 2019).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swnn Sclerophyll Forest on Coastal Floodplains</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td>Not mapped within Riverglade Reserve (2019).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Gum High Forest</td>
<td>Critically Endangered</td>
<td>Not mapped within Riverglade Reserve (2019).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Flying-fox ecology and behaviour

6.1 Ecological role

Flying-foxes, along with some birds, make a unique contribution to ecosystem health through their ability to move seeds and pollen over long distances (Southerton et al. 2004). This contributes directly to the reproduction, regeneration and viability of forest ecosystems (DoE 2016a).

It is estimated that a single flying-fox can disperse up to 60,000 seeds in one night (ELW&P 2015). Some plants, particularly Corymbia spp., have adaptations suggesting they rely more heavily on nocturnal visitors such as bats for pollination than daytime pollinators (Southerton et al. 2004).

Grey-headed flying-foxes may travel 100 km in a single night with a foraging radius of up to 50 km from their camp (McConkey et al. 2012), and have been recorded travelling over 500 km in two days between camps (Roberts et al. 2012). In comparison, bees, another important pollinator, move much shorter foraging distances of generally less than one kilometre (Zurbuchen et al. 2010).

Long-distance seed dispersal and pollination makes flying-foxes critical to the long-term persistence of many plant communities (Westcott et al. 2008; McConkey et al. 2012), including eucalypt forests, rainforests, woodlands and wetlands (Roberts et al. 2006). Seeds that are able to germinate away from their parent plant have a greater chance of growing into a mature plant (EHP 2012). Long-distance dispersal also allows genetic material to be spread between forest patches that would normally be geographically isolated (Parry-Jones & Augée 1992; Eby 1991; Roberts 2006). This genetic diversity allows species to adapt to environmental change and respond to disease pathogens. Transfer of genetic material between forest patches is particularly important in the context of contemporary fragmented landscapes.

Flying-foxes are considered 'keystone' species given their contribution to the health, longevity and diversity among and between vegetation communities. These ecological services ultimately protect the long-term health and biodiversity of Australia's bushland and wetlands. In turn, native forests act as carbon sinks, provide habitat for other fauna and flora, stabilise river systems and catchments, add value to production of hardwood timber, honey and fruit (e.g. bananas and mangoes; Fujita 1991), and provide recreational and tourism opportunities worth millions of dollars each year (EHP 2012; ELW&P 2015).

Flying fox stages of life-cycle can greatly influence both numbers in a Camp and the noise levels. In general animals are noisiest when males are establishing and maintaining territories. Numbers tend to swell during breeding time. Figure 6.1 show the life-cycle in a diagram. It is important to assess Camp characteristics (and management decisions) based on the life-cycle stage. For example noise will abate after territories are set up.
6.2 Flying-foxes in urban areas

Flying-foxes appear to be roosting and foraging in urban areas more frequently. There are many possible drivers for this, as summarised by Tait et al. (2014):

- loss of native habitat and urban expansion
- opportunities presented by year-round food availability from native and exotic species found in expanding urban areas
- disturbance events such as drought, fires, cyclones
- human disturbance or culling at non-urban roosts or orchards
- urban effects on local climate
- refuge from predation
- movement advantages, e.g. ease of manoeuvring in flight due to the open nature of the habitat or ease of navigation due to landmarks and lighting.

6.3 Under threat

Flying-foxes roosting and foraging in urban areas more frequently can give the impression that their populations are increasing; however, the grey-headed flying-fox is in decline across its range and in 2001 was listed as vulnerable by the NSW Government.

At the time of listing, the species was considered eligible for listing as vulnerable as counts of flying-foxes over the previous decade suggested that the national population may have declined by up to 30%. It was also estimated that the population would continue to decrease by at least 20% in the next three generations given the continuation of the current rate of habitat loss and culling.

The main threat to grey-headed flying-foxes in NSW is clearing or modification of native vegetation. This threatening process removes appropriate roosting and breeding sites and limits the availability of natural food resources, particularly winter–spring feeding habitat in north-eastern NSW.
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Urbanisation of the coastal plains of south-eastern Queensland and northern NSW has seen the removal of annually-reliable winter feeding sites, and this threatening process continues. There is a wide range of ongoing threats to the survival of the GHFF, including:

- habitat loss and degradation
- conflict with humans (including culling at orchards)
- infrastructure-related mortality (e.g. entanglement in barbed wire fencing and fruit netting, power line electrocution, etc.)
- predation by native and introduced animals
- exposure to extreme natural events such as cyclones, drought and heat waves.

Flying-foxes have limited capacity to respond to these threats and recover from large population losses due to their slow sexual maturation, small litter size, long gestation and extended maternal dependence (McIlwae & Martin 2002).

6.4 Camp characteristics

All flying-foxes are nocturnal, roosting during the day in communal camps. These camps may range in number from a few to hundreds of thousands, with individual animals frequently moving between camps within their range. Typically, the abundance of resources within a 20–50 kilometre radius of a camp site will be a key determinant of the size of a camp (SEQ Catchments 2012). Therefore, flying-fox camps are generally temporary and seasonal, tightly tied to the flowering of their preferred food trees. However, understanding the availability of feeding resources is difficult because flowering and fruiting are not reliable every year, and can vary between localities (SEQ Catchments 2012). These are important aspects of camp preference and movement between camps, and have implications for long-term management strategies.

Little is known about flying-fox camp preferences; however, research indicates that apart from being in close proximity to food sources, flying-foxes choose to roost in vegetation with at least some of the following general characteristics (SEQ Catchments 2012):

- closed canopy >5 metres high
- dense vegetation with complex structure (upper, mid- and understorey layers)
- within 500 metres of permanent water source
- within 50 kilometres of the coastline or at an elevation <65 metres above sea level
- level topography (<5° incline)
- greater than one hectare to accommodate and sustain large numbers of flying-foxes.

Optimal vegetation available for flying-foxes must allow movement between preferred areas of the camp. Specifically, it is recommended that the size of a patch be approximately three times the area occupied by flying-foxes at any one time (SEQ Catchments 2012). See Species Profiles in Appendix 2.
7. Human and animal health

Flying-foxes, like all animals, carry pathogens that may pose human health risks. Many of these are viruses which cause only asymptomatic infections in flying-foxes themselves but may cause significant disease in other animals that are exposed. In Australia the most well-defined of these include Australian bat lyssavirus (ABLV), Hendra virus (HeV) and Menangle virus. Specific information on these viruses is provided in Appendix 4.

Outside of an occupational cohort, including wildlife carers and vets, human exposure to these viruses is extremely rare and similarly transmission rates and incidence of human infection are very low. In addition, HeV infection in humans apparently requires transfer from an infected intermediate host and direct transmission from bats to humans has not been reported. Thus despite the fact that human infection with these agents can be fatal, the probability of infection is extremely low and the overall public health risk is judged to be low (Qld Health 2016).

7.1 Disease and flying-fox management

A recent study at several camps before, during and after disturbance (Edson et al. 2015) showed no statistical association between HeV prevalence and flying-fox disturbance. However the consequences of chronic or ongoing disturbance and harassment and its effect on HeV infection were not within the scope of the study and are therefore unknown.

The effects of stress are linked to increased susceptibility and expression of disease in both humans (Altew 2012) and animals (Henry & Stephens-Larson 1985; Alch et. al. 2009), including reduced immunity to disease.

Therefore it can be assumed that management actions which may cause stress (e.g. dispersal), particularly over a prolonged period or at times where other stressors are increased (e.g. food shortages, habitat fragmentation, etc.), are likely to increase the susceptibility and prevalence of disease within the flying-fox population, and consequently the risk of transfer to humans.

Furthermore, management actions or natural environmental changes may increase disease risk by:

- forcing flying-foxes into closer proximity to one another, increasing the probability of disease transfer between individuals and within the population
- resulting in abortions and/or dropped young if inappropriate methods are used during critical periods of the breeding cycle. This will increase the likelihood of direct interaction between flying-foxes and the public, and potential for disease exposure
- adoption of inhumane methods with potential to cause injury which would increase the likelihood of the community coming into contact with injured/dying flying-foxes.

The potential to increase disease risk should be carefully considered as part of a full risk assessment when determining the appropriate level of management and the associated mitigation measures required.
8. Camp management options

A summary of general FF Camp Management Options is included in Appendix 5

8.1 Site-specific analysis of camp management options

Table 8.1 focuses on actions raised by and through the community. Currently there are few specific camp management options that seek to protect and increase the well-being of flying-foxes. Such management options to support flying-foxes long-term sustainability could include having adequate food resources and opportunities for alleviating the impacts of high temperatures on flying-foxes.

Table 8.1 includes cost estimates and most of these are given a range due to the actions having levels of delivery. For example alternative habitat creation is both a one-off item (planting / creating alternative habitat) and then there is the cost of maintenance. The cost depends on the area to be created and the condition of the areas per works.

Actions have been retained in this plan, even where Council could not fund them (such as purchasing homes) as it shows what has been considered and allows actions to be funded from sources other than Council.

Including the range of cost enables grants to be applied for to secure external funding for works. External funding is currently available, at 10-50K per project, to assist local government with implementing plans and this, or similar, is expected to be available in future.
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**Table 8.1: Analysis of management options; definitions and descriptions of each management option are provided in Appendix 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management option</th>
<th>Relevant impacts</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
<th>Suitability in Hunters Hill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1 actions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Education and awareness programs</td>
<td>Fear of disease</td>
<td>$10K+</td>
<td>Low cost. Can help reduce community angst that could be based on misinformation or false understanding. Increasing awareness and providing options for landholders to reduce impacts can be an effective long-term solution, can be undertaken quickly, will not impact on ecological or amenity value of the site.</td>
<td>Education and advice itself will not mitigate all issues and on its own would not be acceptable to the community.</td>
<td>Community consultation results indicate the community is relatively well informed of flying-fox ecology. However, the community reported an ongoing fear of disease. This is generally without foundation and may be improved by additional targeted information. OEH to provide factual information on living near FF for Council to distribute. The community should continue to be updated and involved in flying-fox matters through targeted factual information. Disseminate environmental information via: ‘Living with Flying Fosses’ education material <a href="https://www.environment.nsw.gov.au/topics/animal-plants-native-animals/native-animals-facts/flying-foxes/living-with-flying-foes">https://www.environment.nsw.gov.au/topics/animal-plants-native-animals/native-animals-facts/flying-foxes/living-with-flying-foes</a>. Council conduct Walks and Talks at least annually covering all aspects of ecology of the park including the FF. Proposed Council Decision: Adopt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management option</th>
<th>Relevant impacts</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
<th>Suitability in Hunters Hill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 Property modification</td>
<td>Noise Small Fecal drop Health/wellbeing Property devaluation Lost rental return</td>
<td>$20K-$500K</td>
<td>Property modification is one of the most effective ways to reduce amenity impacts of a camp without dispersal (and associated risks). It can be relatively low cost, promotes conservation of FF, can be undertaken quickly, will not impact on the site, may add value to the property.</td>
<td>May be cost prohibitive for private landholders, However, subsidies would assist. Unlikely to fully mitigate amenity issues especially in outdoor areas. Ongoing program administration to achieve equitable access to services may be challenging</td>
<td>Options like subsidising property modification were ranked highly in the community consultation. Trigger Point: when FF are within 20m of residential dwellings (or roosting within 5m of Richmond Crescent) for 2 seasons consecutively. Approximately 30 dwelling fall into this category. Prepare a site-specific options Paper for these dwellings. Proposed Council decision: Investigate and develop action plan for when trigger point is reached or external funds are available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Service subsidies</td>
<td>Noise Small Fecal drop Health/wellbeing Property devaluation Lost rental return</td>
<td>$20K-$500K</td>
<td>May encourage tolerance of living near a camp, promotes conservation of FF, can be undertaken quickly, will not impact on the site, may reduce the need for property modification.</td>
<td>Ongoing program administration to achieve equitable access to services may be challenging</td>
<td>Option of subsidising service subsidies were ranked highly in the community consultation Trigger Point: when FF are within 100m of residential dwellings (or roosting within 50m of Richmond Crescent) for 6 months consecutively. Approximately 50 dwelling fall into this category. Prepare a site specific options Paper for these dwellings. NSW Government funding may be available in 2019 Proposed Council decision: Investigate and develop action plan for when trigger point is reached or external funds are available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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#### Management Options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management option</th>
<th>Relevant Impacts</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
<th>Suitability in Hunters Hill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rate rebates</td>
<td>Noise Small Faecal drop Health/wellbeing Property devaluation Lost rental return</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>May encourage tolerance of living near a camp.</td>
<td>Rate rebates would be costly across multiple properties and would incur ongoing costs. Distance based criteria would require community agreement. Ongoing program administration to achieve equitable access to services may be challenging.</td>
<td>Council cannot afford this option. External funding from NSW Government would be required. Proposed Council Decision: Investigate if external funding becomes available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routine camp management</td>
<td>Health/wellbeing</td>
<td>$20K-$200K</td>
<td>Will allow property maintenance, likely to improve habitat, could improve public perception of the site, will ensure safety risks of a public site can be managed. Weed removal has the potential to reduce roost availability and reduce numbers of roosting FFs.</td>
<td>Will not generally mitigate amenity impacts for nearby landholders.</td>
<td>Routine maintenance ranked in the middle of community responses but as cost is low and environmental and amenity outcomes are positive, on-going maintenance is worth undertaking. Bushcare group, contractors and staff are undertaking a maintenance program. Weed removal is being staged and alternative roost habitat planted (or installed), otherwise activities may constitute a Level 3 action. Proposed Council decision: Adopt – expand existing work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management option</th>
<th>Relevant impacts</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
<th>Suitability in Hunters Hill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 Odour reducing/ screening/ masking plants</td>
<td>Noise Small Health/wellbeing</td>
<td>$20K-200K</td>
<td>Residents to plant dense screens and fragrant plants to assist with odour and noise. Trim tall trees to less than 5 metres and use wildlife friendly netting to prevent roosting.</td>
<td>May take time for plants to provide desired effect and unlikely to mitigate odour during large influxes. Space and opportunity for a suitable screen may not be available to the extent required.</td>
<td>Residents could be encouraged to modify properties by planting dense screens and fragrant plants. This information could be provided in an education program. Plants could be subsidised by Council.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Planting of non-woody vegetation along the reserve side of Richmond Crescent is recommended. Prepare and options paper for planting opportunities, species, costs, maintenance.

Nudging: Trigger Point when FF are within 20m of residential dwellings (or roosting within 5m of Richmond Crescent) for 2 seasons consecutively and where FF have a density of over 1 FF/m²

Proposed Council decision: Adopt.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management option</th>
<th>Relevant impacts</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
<th>Suitability in Hunters Hill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 Alternative habitat creation</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>$10K–$200K+</td>
<td>If successful in attracting FFs away from high conflict areas, dedicated habitat in low conflict areas will mitigate all impacts, promotes FF conservation. Rehabilitation of degraded habitat that is likely to be suitable for FF use could be a more practical and faster approach than habitat creation.</td>
<td>Several years before useable habitat features develop.</td>
<td>Creation of alternative FF habitat was favoured by the community. Initial research to identify low conflict areas where habitat can be created found that options are limited. The current area is low-conflict habitat relative to other urban areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Trigger point for alternative habitat creation is linked to other actions (high populations within the existing camp ($800+), excessive damage to existing habitat (roosting sites reduced to 50% of 2019 levels) or death of 50% of trees. Or when triggers for “nudging FF” out of the camp are reached. Notice: Trigger Point for nudging when FF are within 30m of residential dwellings (or roosting within 5m of Richnacad Crescent) for 2 seasons consecutively and where FF have a density of over 1 FF/m²

Proposed Council decision: Investigate and develop action plan now for implementation if trigger point(s) is reached.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management option</th>
<th>Relevant impacts</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
<th>Suitability in Hunters Hill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 Provision of artificial roosting habitat</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>$10K–$200K+</td>
<td>If successful in attracting FFs away from high conflict areas, artificial roosting habitat in low conflict areas will assist in mitigating all impacts, generally low cost, can be undertaken quickly, promotes FF conservation. Artificial roosting habitat is required as soon as practical as this can take pressure of the existing trees and allow for wood tree removal while retaining a net area of roosting habitat.</td>
<td>Would need to be combined with other measures (e.g. buffers/alternative habitat creation) to mitigate impacts, previous attempts have had limited success. Research is needed as there are few case studies. On-site trial and error is expected – along with successes. Cost of artificial roosts are estimates only.</td>
<td>Artificial roosts were not specifically raised with the community but managing the site to create alternative habitat ranked highly. Artificial habitat should be tested now, with funding from State and Federal Agencies. Case Studies with artificial habitat are uncommon yet artificial habitat is likely to work within FF camps. Key is to have solid (not rope) habitat. Proposed Council decisions: Develop options and, when funding is available, implement installation and monitoring of artificial roosts so that successful designs are known before a trigger point is reached.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Protocols to manage incidents</td>
<td>Health/wellbeing</td>
<td>$10K–$200K+</td>
<td>Low cost, will reduce actual risk of negative human/FF interactions, promotes conservation of FFs, can be undertaken quickly, will not impact the site. Provides reassurance to community that risks will be managed.</td>
<td>Will not generally mitigate amenity.</td>
<td>This was not addressed in the community consultation. Council will build on existing guidelines as required and engage and train carers to respond to heat stress events and other incidents. Proposed Council decisions: Adopt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management option</th>
<th>Relevant impacts</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
<th>Suitability in Hunters Hill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 10 Research       | All              | $10K-$80K+ | Supporting research to improve understanding may contribute to more effectively mitigating all impacts, promotes FF conservation. Increased understanding of the following will assist greatly in managing long-term:  
- Population dynamics (resident vs visiting FF)  
- Food resources within 30 and 50km and seasonal availability. | Generally, cannot be undertaken quickly, management trials may require further cost input. | This was not addressed in the community consultation. Council will continue to be involved in State and national FF monitoring programs and will stay up-to-date with research into effective management of FF colonies and update this CMP as necessary. Any management and mitigation measures implemented must include monitoring before/after to ascertain the success or not of actions. Proposed Council decision: Adopt |
| 11 Appropriate land-use planning | All | $10K-$80K+ | Likely to reduce future conflict, promotes FF conservation. Identification of degraded sites that may be suitable for long-term rehabilitation for FFs should facilitate offset strategies should camp reduction be required under Level 2 actions. Zoning permissabilities (including future re-zoning) in the vicinity of the FF Camp can be set such that it is appropriate. | Will not generally mitigate current impacts, land-use restrictions may impact the landholder. | This option was not canvassed in the community consultation. Council may consider including buffer zones and recommendations for appropriate mitigation provisions in DAs. Council to consider any future re-zoning proposals within 300m of the Camp or 300m from suitable camp-expansion/relocation habitat such that it is appropriate with neighbouring a FF colony. Proposed Council decision: Apply consideration to any proposed re-zoning within 300m of the camp. Council consider recommendations for appropriate mitigation provisions in DAs. |
| 12 Property acquisition | All for specific property owners, Nil for broader community | millions | Will reduce future conflict with the owners of acquired property. | Owners may not want to move, only improves amenity for those who fit criteria for acquisition, very expensive. | Cost prohibitive and not feasible for Hunters Hill Council. Proposed Council decision: Disregard |
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management option</th>
<th>Relevant impacts</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
<th>Suitability in Hunters Hill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Do nothing</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>No resource expenditure.</td>
<td>Will not mitigate impacts and unlikely to be considered acceptable by the community.</td>
<td>Net sustainable. Not supported in community consultation. Proposed Council decision: Disregard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management option</th>
<th>Relevant impacts</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
<th>Suitability in Hunters Hill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>14. Buffers through vegetation removal/mgt.</strong> Vegetation mgt. can be location specific ranging from pruning tree-limits to removing trees.</td>
<td>Noise Small Health/wellbeing Property degradation Lost rental return</td>
<td>$8K-$220K+</td>
<td>Can increase the distance of FF from residents properties. Can be undertaken quickly, limited maintenance costs.</td>
<td>Will impact visual and ecological values of the site, will not eliminate impacts, vegetation removal may not be favoured by the community. Requires external approvals.</td>
<td>Managing habitat was generally supported by the community. In other camps this has been reported as the most effective measure for mitigating conflict. Can reduce the direct exposure to impacts at the most sensitive receiving properties. To be In accordance with <em>Mitigation and Restoration of Flying Fox Camps</em> (2014) Comm. Gov. Publication. Tree limb or tree removal can be considered and additional roosting habitat created elsewhere in the camp so there is no net loss of roosting areas. Plant Figs, and other favoured plants, in areas away from residence. This involves the trimming or removal of whole canopy trees at the camp boundary to create a buffer between the flying-fox camp and areas of human settlement, to a maximum distance of 30 metres from any occupied building, to prevent flying-foxes roosting within that buffer. Proposed Council decision: Investigate and issue options paper for managing and reducing roost trees adjoining residence ensuring there is no net loss of roosting habitat. Seek necessary approvals for works. Additions by Code of Practice states that camp management actions are not authorised for the clearing or trimming of vegetation that results in damage to a TDC. Therefore, if any clearing or trimming of vegetation is proposed in plant community type 1281, the landholder or Council will need to apply for a license for this activity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Flying-fox Camp Management Plan Tarban Creek

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management option</th>
<th>Relevant impacts</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
<th>Suitability in Hunters Hill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 Buffers without vegetation removal. Buffers can be created through such tools as visual deterrents in trees, noise emitters on timers, smell deterrents and canopy mounted water sprays (may also attract FF in extreme heat)</td>
<td>Noise&lt;br&gt;Small&lt;br&gt;Health/wellbeing&lt;br&gt;Damage to vegetation&lt;br&gt;Property devaluation&lt;br&gt;Lost rental return</td>
<td>$10K–$200K+</td>
<td>Successful creation of a buffer will reduce impacts, promotes FF conservation, can be undertaken quickly. Options without vegetation removal may be preferred by the community.</td>
<td>May impact the site, buffers will not generally eliminate impacts, maintenance costs may be significant, often logistically difficult, limited trials so likely effectiveness unknown.</td>
<td>This option was not specifically canvassed but tools such as sprinklers and visual deterrents could be used to create buffers. Plant Figs, and other favoured plants, in areas away from residence. Proposed Council decision: Investigate and develop an action plan. Support camp re-vegetation to establish favoured roots and food trees away from residence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Noise attenuation fencing</td>
<td>Noise&lt;br&gt;Small&lt;br&gt;Health/wellbeing&lt;br&gt;Property devaluation&lt;br&gt;Lost rental return</td>
<td>$10K–$200K+</td>
<td>Will eliminate/significantly reduce noise impacts, will reduce other impacts, limited maintenance costs.</td>
<td>Costly, likely to impact visual amenity of the site, will not eliminate all impacts, may impact other wildlife at the site.</td>
<td>This option was not specifically canvassed and is not practical for the site. Proposed Council decision: Disregard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Flying-fox Camp Management Plan Tarban Creek

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management option</th>
<th>Relevant Impacts</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
<th>Suitability in Hunters Hill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 3 actions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Nudging</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>$20K- $200K+</td>
<td>Noise and other low intensity active disturbance restricted to certain areas of the camp can be used to encourage flying-foxes away from high conflict areas. This technique aims to actively “nudge” flying-foxes from one area to another, while allowing them to remain at the camp site. If nudging is successful this may mitigate all impacts.</td>
<td>Costly, FFs will continue attempting to recolonise the area unless combined with habitat modification/deterrents creating favourable habitat away from residents.</td>
<td>Nudging may be a viable option to move FFs away from residents. Nudging links to the more interventionist management options that are supported by heavily impacted community members. Trigger Point: when FF are within 20m of residential dwellings (or roosting within 5m of Richmond Crescent) for 2 seasons consecutively and where FF have a density of over 1 FF/m². Proposed Council decision: Investigate and develop action plan for when trigger point is reached.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Active dispersal</td>
<td>All at that site but not generally appropriate for amenity impacts only (see Section 8)</td>
<td>$20K- $200K+</td>
<td>If successful can mitigate all impacts at that site, often stated as the preferred method for impacted community members.</td>
<td>May be very costly, often unsuccessful, ongoing dispersal generally required unless combined with habitat modification, potential to splinter the camp creating problems in other locations and possible accountability for the original site manager. FF Camps have years where camp members increase significantly due to scarcity (or abundance) of food resources elsewhere. Dispersal without understanding what proportion of the population are ‘visitors’ will result in ‘moving’ the situation throughout the urban areas (into areas where conflict is higher than here) when there may have been no need to as the visiting FF will leave naturally. Potential for significant animal welfare impact, disturbance to community, negative public perception, unknown conservation impacts, unpredictability makes budgeting and risk assessment difficult, may increase disease risk (see Section 7.1), potential to impact on aircraft safety.</td>
<td>This option was strongly supported by a small number of impacted community. It was strongly opposed by a larger number of the community consulted. It will only be considered in extreme circumstances such as a large influx that persists in the camp over many months. Not recommended and it would require State and Federal government approval. Proposed Council decision: Seek and secure funding to undertake population monitoring so population dynamics are better understood. Have a plan ready for approval process to be implemented if FF population reaches 15,000 and stays that way for 2 or more seasons.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Flying-fox Camp Management Plan Tarban Creek

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management option</th>
<th>Relevant impacts</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
<th>Suitability in Hunters Hill</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19 Early dispersal before a camp is established at a new location</td>
<td>All at that site</td>
<td>$20K-$200K+</td>
<td>Potential advantages as per other dispersal methods, but more likely to be successful than dispersal of a historic camp. Early action can avoid the establishment of a camp in an area that would have very high conflict with existing users.</td>
<td>Potential disadvantages as per other dispersal methods, but possibly less costly and slightly lower risk than dispersing a historic camp. Potential to increase pressure on FFs that may have relocated from another dispersed camp, which may exacerbate impacts on these individuals.</td>
<td>Potential option if other camps form in the Council area. Recommended Council decision: Seek funding to ID and map potential areas for where FF camps may naturally establish. Determine what sites are (i) appropriate or (ii) not appropriate for FF to Camp (permanently or temporarily). With this information determine action and approvals needed and take action if and when required.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Where there are not specific triggers to determine a management action then the following decision making tool could be used to assist. It is noted though that environmental management is often multi-faceted with often unmanageable factors. For example if the region has climatic conditions that are resulting in flying-fox numbers crashing (sequence of extremely hot days) then the permits to disturb them will be less available.

### Decision Support Tool for Tarban Creek Flying Fox Camp

#### Consequences/Considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AFFECT</th>
<th>Insignificant</th>
<th>Minor</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Serious</th>
<th>Very Serious</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>People Affected- consider: Sensitive receivers Proximity to camp Extent of impacts</td>
<td>Slight effect</td>
<td>Contained area, Limited impacts</td>
<td>Major onsite</td>
<td>Major onsite and Moderate offsite</td>
<td>Major onsite and Major offsite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment - consider Cultural Ecological Amenity</td>
<td>Slight effect</td>
<td>Contained area, Limited environmental harm</td>
<td>Major onsite</td>
<td>Major onsite and Moderate offsite</td>
<td>Major onsite and Major offsite</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Flying-fox Camp Management Plan Tarban Creek

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial cost</th>
<th>Less than $5,000</th>
<th>$5,000 - $20,000</th>
<th>$20,000 - $100,000</th>
<th>$1000,000 - $500,000</th>
<th>More than $500,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very high</strong></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known to currently occurring and likely to continue in the mid-long term</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High</strong></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Known to have occurred - likely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium</strong></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could occur - possible</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low</strong></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not likely to occur - unlikely</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very low</strong></td>
<td>L</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>H</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No incidents - rare.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### KEY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>E</strong> (Extreme-RED)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 3 Actions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate controls required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provided legislative requirements met, consider dispersal if adequate and appropriate resources are available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seek management advice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement education and communication strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement subsidies program if appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify and implement mechanisms to reduce impacts e.g. buffers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor impacts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| H (High-AMBER) | Level 2 Actions  
Implement education and communication strategy  
Implement subsidies program if appropriate  
Identify and implement mechanisms to reduce impacts e.g. buffers  
Monitor impacts |
| M (Medium-YELLOW) | Level 1 Actions  
Implement education and communication strategy  
Approval to proceeds required by Manager to implement subsidies program if appropriate  
Monitor impacts. |
| L (Low-GREEN) | Level 1 Actions  
Generally no action required  
Continue to monitor the impacts |

Considerations: Legislation and approval requirements, Tenure, Risks of management and likelihood of success.
## 9. Planned Management Approach

### Table 9.1: Management approach overview (updated March 1st, 2020)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Management aim</th>
<th>Example success measures (recommend one measure only per aim)</th>
<th>Management actions to be considered Level 1 actions</th>
<th>Level 2 actions</th>
<th>Level 3 actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noise</td>
<td>Mitigate noise impacts.</td>
<td>Reasonable level of amenity achieved based on independent assessment.</td>
<td>Education and awareness. Property modification (including providing subsidies if possible). Dense planting to create screens at boundaries. Revegetate and manage land to create alternative habitat. Provision of artificial roosting habitat away from conflict areas.</td>
<td>Buffers. Buffers include dense 3m tall plantings.</td>
<td>Nudging will be considered if necessary (e.g. FF within 5m of residence).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flying foxes overhanging pathways / residential properties</td>
<td>Prevent flying foxes overhanging pathways/properties.</td>
<td>No roosting flying foxes overhanging used pathways/residential properties.</td>
<td>Divert / temporarily close paths.</td>
<td>Trim overhanging vegetation</td>
<td>Level 3 actions will not be considered to mitigate this issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faecal drop</td>
<td>Mitigate impacts of faecal drop.</td>
<td>Reduce faecal drop by 50% (random quadrant sampling may be used to quantify). Reduce impacts of faecal drop by 80% (e.g. minimal financial impact of cleaning through subsidies).</td>
<td>Education and awareness (e.g. managing foraging attractants and tips to reduce impacts / fear of disease). Property modification (including providing subsidies if possible). Subsidise services to reduce impacts if funding available. Support research to understand site-specific movements / trials to influence fly-out/in.</td>
<td>Buffers.</td>
<td>Level 3 actions will not be considered to mitigate this issue.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Flying-fox Camp Management Plan Tarban Creek

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Management aim</th>
<th>Example success measures (recommend one measure only per aim)</th>
<th>Management actions to be considered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Smell</td>
<td>Mitigate impacts of smell</td>
<td>Reduce odour by 70% (seasonal odour sampling required to quantify)</td>
<td>Education and awareness programs (e.g. ensuring community understand not associated with uncleanliness). Property modification (including providing subsidies if possible). Dense planting at boundaries (including use of fragrant flowers to mask odour). Camp re-vegetation to establish favoured roosts away from residence. Revegetate to create alternative habitat. Provision of artificial roosting habitat away from conflict areas. Support research to determine odour masking techniques. Buffers. Nudging will be considered if necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of disease</td>
<td>Promote awareness of actual low disease risk.</td>
<td>All concerned community members have received and have access to factual information on disease. Surrounding community is no longer concerned about disease (poll may be required).</td>
<td>Education and awareness programs (e.g. ensuring community understand actual low risk of disease transfer and simple mitigation measures). Protocols to prevent incidents. Camp re-vegetation to establish favoured roosts away from residence. Trim roost vegetation overhanging properties where hygiene protocols may not be sufficient (e.g. child care centres). Level 3 actions will not be considered to mitigate this issue.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and/or wellbeing impacts (e.g. associated with lack of sleep, anxiety)</td>
<td>Mitigate health and wellbeing impacts.</td>
<td>No negative human/flying-fox interactions.</td>
<td>Education and awareness programs. Property modification (including subsidies if possible) to prevent wellbeing impacts associated with noise. Camp re-vegetation to establish favoured roosts away from residence. Protocols to prevent incidents. Routine management actions to improve the site. Revegetate land to create alternative habitat. Buffers. Nudging will be considered if necessary.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Flying-fox Camp Management Plan Tarben Creek

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Management aim</th>
<th>Example success measures (recommend one measure only per aim)</th>
<th>Management actions to be considered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Damage to vegetation       | Mitigate impacts to vegetation.                     | Long-term viability of vegetation not at risk / can be rehabilitated (need to assess cost/benefits of impacts associated with damage to vegetation against environmental services provided by flying-foxes and risks of other impacts if camp is dispersed). | Routine management actions to improve the site.  
Deterrents from select trees (e.g. netting, wires, sprinklers, etc) (may constitute a Level 3 action, provide details).  
Nudging considered for properties where FF are within 20m [at density of >1/m² over 20m²] and other modifications have been implemented. |
| Property devaluation       | Reduce economic loss associated with potential property devaluation. | Property value not being impacted for owners that purchased property prior to camp formation, as assessed through independent valuation.                                                                | Subsidise services to reduce impacts if funding available.  
Property modification (including subsidies if possible).  
Education and awareness programs to manage ‘ungrounded-fear’ perceptions and increased FF appreciation.  
Dense planting to create screens at residential boundaries.  
Revegetate to create alternative habitat.  
Buffer.  
Nudging (frightening FF so that they leave the area) considered for properties where FF are within 20m [at density of >1/m² over 20m²] and other modifications have been implemented.  
Dispersal may be considered if this issue is unable to be mitigated in any other way where FF are within 20m [at density of >4/m² over 100m²] |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Management aim</th>
<th>Example success measures (recommend one measure only per aim)</th>
<th>Management actions to be considered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lost rental return</td>
<td>Reduce economic loss associated with lost rental return.</td>
<td>Rental return is not being impacted for owners that purchased property prior to camp formation, as assessed through an independent valuation.</td>
<td>Property modification (including subsidies if possible), Subsidise services to reduce impacts if funding available, Education and awareness programs to result in FF appreciation, Appropriate land-use planning, Dense planting to create screens at residential boundaries, Revegetate to create alternative habitat.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Flying-fox Camp Management Plan Tarben Creek**
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9.1 Stop work triggers

The management program will cease and will not recommence or progress to subsequent levels without consulting OEH if:

- any of the animal welfare triggers occur on more than two days during the program, such as unacceptable levels of stress (see Table S)
- there is a flying-fox injury or death
- a new camp/camps appear to be establishing
- impacts are created or exacerbated at other locations
- there appears to be potential for conservation impacts (e.g., reduction in breeding success identified through independent monitoring)
- standard measures to avoid impacts (detailed in Section 10.3) cannot be met.

Management may also be terminated at any time if:

- unintended impacts are created for the community around the camp
- allocated resources are exhausted.

Dispersal will cease if:

- in the opinion of the land manager or OEH, there is ongoing proliferation of splinter colonies in unsuitable locations (as determined by the land manager or OEH)
- splinter camps become established in inappropriate locations and for ecological, social or other reasons, a dispersal at the splinter location is not appropriate (as determined by the land manager or OEH).

If a dispersal program is stopped it may be permanently abandoned and other strategies considered, or reassessed and resumed in consultation with OEH.
### Table 9.2: Planned action for potential impacts during management

A person with experience in flying-fox behaviour (as per Appendix 1) will monitor for welfare triggers and direct works in accordance with the criteria below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Welfare trigger</th>
<th>Signs</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable levels of stress</td>
<td>If any individual is observed:</td>
<td>Works to cease for the day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• panting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• saliva spreading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• located on or within 2 m of the ground</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fatigue</td>
<td>In-situ management</td>
<td>In-situ management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• more than 30% of the camp takes flight</td>
<td>Works to cease and recommence only when flying-foxes have settled*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• individuals are in flight for more than 5 minutes</td>
<td>/ move to alternative locations at least 50 m from roosting animals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• flying-foxes appear to be leaving the camp</td>
<td>Dispersal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dispersal</td>
<td>Works to cease for the day.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• low flying</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• laboured flight</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• settling despite dispersal efforts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injury/death</td>
<td>• a flying-fox appears to have been injured/killed on site (including aborted foetuses)</td>
<td>Works to cease immediately and OEH notified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• any flying-fox death is reported within 1 km of the dispersal site that appears to be related to the dispersal</td>
<td>AND rescheduled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• females in final trimester</td>
<td>OR adapted sufficiently so that significant impacts (e.g. death/injury) are highly unlikely to occur, as confirmed by an independent expert (see Appendix 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• dependent/criching young present</td>
<td>OR stopped indefinitely and alternative management options investigated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• loss of condition evident</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*maximum of two unsuccessful attempts to recommence work before ceasing for the day.
10. Assessment of impacts to flying-foxes

10.1 Regional context

Potential impacts of planned management actions should be assessed in a regional context with respect to flying-fox distribution (known flying-fox camp sites within 25–50 kilometres depending on location and the number of camps in the surrounds) and potential habitat in the local area. The National Flying-fox Monitoring Program mapping can assist with identifying other camps in the region.

Potential habitat may be identified by modelling camp preferences provided in Section 6.3 and/or mapping habitat in the local area that is similar to habitat at the current camp. Identifying and assessing the likely suitability of potential habitat in the local area (minimum 6 km radius from the camp), with respect to both likelihood of flying-foxes using the habitat and likelihood of alternative sites impacting the community, is required prior to any Level 3 action.

In order for OEH to assess potential cumulative impacts, a proposed Level 3 action must include detail on any other Level 3 action that has occurred (e.g. in the past five years), or is planned to occur at known camps within a 50 kilometres radius. OEH can assist if required. Similarly, prior to early intervention dispersal an assessment should consider whether other nearby camps have recently been abandoned for another reason. If this is found to be the case, resources may be better directed at reinstating preferred conditions at the initial camp site.

10.2 Flying-fox habitat to be affected

Flying-fox habitat to be affected by the proposed management actions outlined in Table 9.1 is not known and will only be known:

i) after monitoring both numbers and behaviours of FF over a period of time.

ii) or post monitoring for the required time / duration to see that the suggested trigger points for action are reached or exceeded for the stated time periods.

The level of impact on habitat, as a result of actions, should be measured in a systematic way. Standard bush regeneration condition classes should suffice for this purpose. Other methods, such as Biodiversity Assessment Method plots are not suitable at Tarban Creek due to the small size and level of disturbance.

10.3 Standard measures to avoid impacts

The following mitigation measures will be complied with at all times during Plan implementation.

10.3.1 All management activities

These flying-fox specific measures are required to avoid impacts. Additional site-specific measures may also be required. N.B. Timing has been set around GHFF breeding time.

- All personnel will be appropriately experienced, trained and Inducted. Induction will include each personnel’s responsibilities under this Plan.

- All personnel will be briefed prior to the action commencing each day, and debriefed at the end of the day.
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- Works will cease and OEH consulted in accordance with the 'stop work triggers' section of the Plan.
- Large crews will be avoided where possible.
- The use of loud machinery and equipment that produces sudden impacts/noise will be limited. Where loud equipment (e.g. chainsaws) is required they will be started away from the camp and allowed to run for a short time to allow flying-foxes to adjust.
- Activities that may disturb flying-foxes at any time during the year will begin as far from the camp as possible, working towards the camp gradually to allow flying-foxes to habituate.
- Any activity likely to disturb flying-foxes so that they take flight will be avoided during the day during the sensitive GHFF/BFF birthing period (i.e. when females are in final trimester or the majority are carrying pups, generally August – December) and avoided altogether during crèching (generally November/December to February). Where works cannot be done at night after fly-out during these periods, it is preferable they are undertaken in the late afternoon close to or at fly-out. If this is also not possible, a person experienced in flying-fox behaviour will monitor the camp for at least the first two scheduled actions (or as otherwise deemed to be required by that person) to ensure impacts are not excessive and advise on the most appropriate methods (e.g. required buffer distances, approach, etc.).
- OEH will be immediately contacted if LRFF are present between March and October, or are identified as being in final trimester / with dependent young.
- Non-critical maintenance activities will ideally be scheduled when the camp is naturally empty. Where this is not possible (e.g. at permanently occupied camps) they will be scheduled for the best period for that camp (e.g. when the camp is seasonally lower in numbers and breeding will not be interrupted, or during the non-breeding season, generally May to July).
- Works will not take place in periods of adverse weather including strong winds, sustained heavy rains, in very cold temperatures or during periods of likely population stress (e.g. food bottlenecks). Wildlife carers will be consulted to determine whether the population appears to be under stress.
- Works will be postponed on days predicted to exceed 35°C (or ideally 30°C), and for one day following a day that reached ≥35°C. If an actual heat stress event has been recorded at the camp or at nearby camps, a rest period of several weeks will be scheduled to allow affected flying-foxes to fully recover. See the OEH fact sheet on Responding to heat stress in flying-fox camps.
- Evening works may commence after fly-out. Noise generated by the works should create a first stage disturbance, with any remaining flying-foxes taking flight. Works should be paused at this stage to monitor for any remaining flying-foxes (including crèching young, although December – February should be avoided for this reason) and ensure they will not be impacted. All Level 1 and 2 works (including pack up) will cease by 0100 to ensure flying-foxes returning early in the morning are not inadvertently dispersed. Works associated with Level 3 actions may continue provided flying-foxes are not at risk of being harmed.
- If impacts at other sites are considered, in OEH’s opinion, to be a result of management actions under this Plan, assistance will be provided by the proponent to the relevant land manager to ameliorate impacts. Details of this assistance are to be developed in consultation with OEH.
- Any proposed variations to works detailed in the Plan will be approved, in writing, by OEH before any new works occur.
- OEH may require changes to methods or cessation of management activities at any time.
- Ensure management actions and results are recorded to inform future planning. See the OEH fact sheet on Monitoring, evaluating and reporting.

Further information on management activities is provided in the following OEH factsheets:
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- **Routine camp management (Level 1) actions**
- **Creation of buffers (Level 2) actions**
- **Camp disturbance or dispersal (Level 3) actions**

### 10.3.2 Risk Assessment

It is the responsibility of the land manager and contractors to conduct a risk assessment and determine workplace health and safety requirements. However, minimum requirements are provided below.

**Human safety**
- All personnel to wear protective clothing including long sleeves and pants; additional items such as eye protection and a hat are also recommended. People working under the camp should wash their clothes daily. Appropriate hygiene practices will be adopted such as washing hands with soap and water before eating/smoking.
- All personnel who may come into contact with flying-foxes will be vaccinated against Australian bat lyssavirus with current titre.
- A wash station will be available on site during works along with an anti-viral antiseptic (e.g. Betadine) should someone be bitten or scratched.
- Details of the nearest hospital or doctor who can provide post-exposure prophylaxis will be kept on site.

**Post-works**
- Reports for Level 1 actions will be provided to OEH annually. Reports for Level 2 and 3 actions will be submitted to OEH one month after commencement of works and then quarterly for the life of the Plan (up to five years) for all Level 3 actions and in periods where works have occurred for Level 2 actions. Each report is to include:
  - results of pre- and post-work population monitoring
  - any information on new camps that have formed in the area
  - impacts at other locations that may have resulted from management, and suggested amelioration measures
  - an assessment of how the flying-foxes reacted to the works, with particular detail on the most extreme response and average response, outlining any recommendations for what aspects of the works went well and what aspects did not work well
  - further management actions planned including a schedule of works
  - an assessment of how the community responded to the works, including details on the number and nature of complaints before and after the works
  - detail on any compensatory plantings undertaken or required
  - expenditure (financial and in-kind costs)
  - Plan evaluation and review (see Section 12).

### 10.3.3 All Level 2 and 3 actions

Level 3 actions include those that actively displace or disturb flying foxes, such as nudging. Prior to works

---

5 A similar approach should be taken to pre-management engagement (see Section 3) to allow direct comparison, and responses should be assessed against success measures (Section 9) to evaluate success.
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- Residents adjacent to the camp will be individually notified one week prior to on-ground works commencing. This will include information on what to do if an injured or orphaned flying-fox is observed, a reminder not to participate in or interfere with the program, and details on how to report unusual flying-fox behaviour/daytime sightings. Relevant contact details will be provided (e.g., Program Coordinator). Resident requests for retention of vegetation and other concerns relating to the program will be taken into consideration.

- Where the Plan is being implemented by Council, information will be placed on Council’s website along with contact information.

- OEH will be notified at least 48 hours before works commence.

- A protocol, in accordance with the NSW Code of Practice for Injured, Sick and Orphaned Flying-foxes (OEH 2012), for flying-fox rescue will be developed including contact details of rescue and rehabilitation organisations. This protocol will be made available to all relevant staff, residents and volunteers prior to the action commencing. See Appendix 6 for an example protocol.

- A licensed wildlife carer will be notified prior to beginning works in the event that rescue/care is required.

**Monitoring**

- A flying-fox expert (identified in section 13.3) will undertake an on-site population assessment prior to, during works and after works have been completed, including:
  - number of each species
  - ratio of females in final trimester
  - approximate age of any pups present including whether they are attached or likely to be crèched
  - visual health assessment
  - mortalities.

- Counts will be done at least:
  - once immediately prior to works
  - daily during works
  - immediately following completion
  - one month following completion
  - 12 months following completion.

**During works**

- A flying-fox expert (identified in section 13.3) will attend the site as often as OEH considers necessary to monitor flying-fox behaviour and ensure compliance with the Plan and the Policy. They must also be able to identify pregnant females, flightless young, individuals in poor health and be aware of climatic extremes and food stress events. This person will make an assessment of the relevant conditions and advise the supervisor/proponent whether the activity can go ahead.

- Deterrents in buffer areas will be assessed by a flying-fox expert so those that may cause inadvertent dispersal (e.g., canopy-mounted sprinklers) are not used during fly-in.

- At least one flying-fox rest day with no active management will be scheduled fortnightly, preferably weekly. Static deterrents (e.g., canopy-mounted sprinklers) may still be used on rest days.

**10.3.4 Vegetation trimming/removal**

- Dead wood and hollows will be retained on site where possible as habitat.
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- Vegetation chipping is to be undertaken as far away from roosting flying-foxes as possible (at least 100 metres).

10.3.5 Canopy vegetation trimming/removal

Prior to works
- Trees to be removed or lopped will be clearly marked (e.g. with flagging tape) prior to works commencing, to avoid unintentionally impacting trees to be retained.

During works
- Any tree lopping, trimming or removal is undertaken under the supervision of a suitably qualified arborist (minimum qualification of Certificate III in Horticulture (Arboriculture) who is a member of an appropriate professional body such as the National Arborists Association).
- Trimming will be in accordance with relevant Australian Standards (e.g. AS4373 Pruning of Amenity Trees), and best practice techniques used to remove vegetation in a way that avoids impacting other fauna and remaining habitat.
- No tree in which a flying-fox is roosting will be trimmed or removed. Works may continue in trees adjacent to roost trees only where a person experienced in flying-fox behaviour assesses that no flying-foxes are at risk of being harmed. A person experienced in flying-fox behaviour is to remain on site to monitor, when canopy trimming/removal is required within 50 metres of roosting flying-foxes.
- While most females are likely to be carrying young (generally September – January) vegetation removal within 50 metres of the camp will only be done in the evening after fly-out, unless otherwise advised by a flying-fox expert.
- Tree removal as part of management will be offset at a ratio of at least 2:1. Where threatened vegetation removal is required, the land manager will prepare an Offset Strategy to outline a program of restoration works in other locations (in addition to existing programs). The strategy will be submitted to OEH for approval at least two months prior to commencing works.

10.3.6 Bush regeneration

- All works will be carried out by suitably qualified and experienced bush regenerators, with at least one supervisor knowledgeable about flying-fox habitat requirements (and how to retain them for Level 1 and 2 actions) and trained in working under a camp.
- Vegetation modification, including weed removal, will not alter the conditions of the site such that it becomes unsuitable flying-fox habitat for Level 1 and 2 actions.
- Weed removal should follow a mosaic pattern, maintaining refuges in the mid- and lower storeys at all times.
- Weed control in the core habitat area will be undertaken using hand tools only (or in the evening after fly-out while crouching young are not present).
- Species selected for revegetation will be consistent with the habitat on site, and in buffer areas or conflict areas should be restricted to small shrubs/understorey species to reduce the need for further roost tree management in the future.

10.3.7 Additional measures for Level 3 actions

Prior to dispersal
- Prepare a communications plan (see Section 3) in relation to the program and provide a copy to OEH.
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- Councils that manage camps within 50 kilometres, and airports within 50 kilometres, will be informed of the intended start date and likely duration, and encouraged to report any change in flying-fox movements.
- Council will liaise with the Environment Protection Authority (EPA) in regard to management of noise issues.

Monitoring

Additional monitoring requirements for dispersal actions (including maintenance dispersal and splinter camp dispersal):

- potential flying-fox habitat within three kilometres of the site monitored within two weeks of works commencing and at the completion of works
- daily checks of ‘potential flying-fox habitat’ within 600 metres, twice weekly checks of ‘potential flying-fox habitat’ within three kilometres and weekly checks of known camps within 20 kilometres of the site
- where weekly counts are already being undertaken by flying-fox experts at other camps within 20 kilometres, counts at these camps are not required, provided there is an agreement with these experts to access these data.

A count is also required at any known camp site within a 25 kilometres radius once within two weeks of works commencing and again at the completion of works.

During dispersal

- At least one person experienced in dispersal, vaccinated against ABLV and able to rescue flying-foxes if required, is to be present at all times. For maintenance dispersals only, this person may be on-call rather than on site, however maintenance dispersal personnel will still have suitable experience in flying-fox behaviour and monitoring.
- Dispersal of an occupied camp will only occur when females are not in final trimester and dependent young are not present (generally May and July). If flying-foxes in the region are recorded as being visibly pregnant dispersal will cease.
- Dispersal methods will not have the potential to harm flying-foxes and may include only noise, spotlights, laser pointers, smoke from contained fires, canopy-mounted sprinklers, and visual deterrents such as balloons.
- Dispersal may continue for up to a total of 2.5 hours in a 12-hour period, early morning and/or in the evening. Morning dispersal will not continue past sunrise. Evening dispersal will not begin before sunset. If flying-foxes are showing signs of distress or are tiring, dispersal will cease for the day as per “stop work triggers” in the Plan.
- The duration of dispersal each day will be minimised as much as possible.
- A section of the camp will be designated as a rest area for flying-foxes during dispersal, to be progressively reduced in size over time, unless the nominated flying-fox expert justifies a reason not to do so.
- During any dispersal action, liaison with wildlife carers is required to monitor whether there is an increase in the number of flying-foxes being taken into care or showing signs of stress. If increases are apparent, OEH will be consulted before continuing the action.
- Maintenance dispersal activities (i.e. deterring flying-foxes from recolonising a dispersed or otherwise empty camp) may be undertaken. During November to February it is essential that camps are checked to ensure there are no crèched young in the camp or individuals in visibly poor health, as determined by a suitably qualified expert. While females are likely to be in final trimester or carrying young (generally August to January), maintenance dispersal will be implemented at a reduced intensity using smoke, lights, continuous noise (no sudden noises) and
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- Passive deterrents (e.g. canopy mounted sprinklers turned on prior to possible fly-in, visual deterrents, etc.).
- Residents will be notified of a maintenance action, within a timeframe as agreed to by the residents.
- Splinter camp dispersals are subject to the conditions above. Adequate consultation will be undertaken with neighbouring landowners and land managers.
- No actions are to be undertaken at any splinter camps without consulting OEH.
11. Assessment of impacts to other threatened species or communities

For developments likely to affect other threatened species or ecological communities (identified in Section 5), a Biodiversity Development Assessment Report may be required as outlined in section 6.12 of the Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016 (BC Act).

All statements:
- need to conform to the requirements of the legislation under which the project will be assessed
- must be prepared by either a project applicant or by a qualified consultant working on their behalf.
12. Evaluation and review

This Plan should be review annually, including evaluation of management actions against measures shown in Section 8.

The following will trigger a reactive review of the Plan:

- completion of a management activity
- progression to a higher level of management
- changes to relevant policy/legislation
- new management techniques becoming available
- outcomes of research that may influence the Plan
- incidents associated with the camp.

Results of each review will be included in reports to OEH (as per reporting timing outlined in Section 10.3.1).

If the Plan is to remain current, a full review including stakeholder consultation and expert input will be undertaken in the final year of the Plan's life prior to being re-submitted to OEH.
13. Plan administration

13.1 Monitoring of the camp

Monitoring of the camp should establish a standard precedent for regular monitoring of the area, size and composition of the camp over the life of the Plan, as well as the results of any management actions undertaken (consolidating information from Sections 10.3.2 and 10.3.6, and making reference to the monitoring fact sheet associated with the Policy).

Monitoring data sheets

To assess the success of actions there has to a process to monitor, evaluate and report on outcomes. Three monitoring datasheets for this work are included here as links and provide information to take action, or modify action to achieve effective ways to manage flying-foxes in the future.

- Creation of buffers (Level 2) actions - Monitoring data sheet (DOC 861KB)
- Camp disturbance or dispersal (Level 3) actions - Monitoring data sheet (DOC 1MB)
- Responding to heat stress in flying-fox camps - Monitoring data sheet (DOC 90KB)

13.2 Reporting

Reporting against this Plan, includes any reporting obligations related to licences or certificates associated with proposed works. The requirements will differ depending on the works planned/approved. When decisions/approvals are made for works the reporting requirements will be made known at the same time. Some reporting can be conducted by Council with OEH others would need to be by an independent consultant.

13.3 Management structure and responsibilities

Table 13.1 identifies who is responsible for what, including specific contractors and experts planned to be involved in management implementation. Specific contractors names have not be provided in this Plan, however they will be detailed in relevant licence applications for OEH approval.

A project health and safety plan that includes all relevant contact details will be developed prior to implementing the Plan, for team reference.
## Table 13.1: Roles and responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Required experience/approvals</th>
<th>Responsibilities/authority</th>
<th>Communication lines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program Coordinator</td>
<td>[insert]</td>
<td>Project management&lt;br&gt;Human resource management&lt;br&gt;Community engagement&lt;br&gt;Reporting</td>
<td>Inform and consult with stakeholders and interested parties&lt;br&gt;Community engagement&lt;br&gt;Evaluate program&lt;br&gt;Submit reports to OEH/DoE&lt;br&gt;Ensure all landowners have provided consent prior to works</td>
<td>Reports to: [insert]&lt;br&gt;Direct reports: Project Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>[insert]</td>
<td>Project management&lt;br&gt;Team leadership and coordination&lt;br&gt;Data management</td>
<td>Coordinate field teams and ensure all personnel are appropriately experienced and trained for their roles&lt;br&gt;Induct all personnel to the program&lt;br&gt;Collect and collate data&lt;br&gt;Liaise with OEH and DoE&lt;br&gt;Liaise with wildlife carers/veterinarians (for orphaned/injured wildlife only)</td>
<td>Reports to: Program Coordinator&lt;br&gt;Direct reports: Supervisor, Contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>[insert]</td>
<td>Knowledgeable in flying-fox biology, behaviour and camp management (see Appendix 1 for detail)&lt;br&gt;ABLIV-vaccinated and trained in flying-fox rescue&lt;br&gt;Team training, leadership and supervision</td>
<td>Pre- and post-management monitoring&lt;br&gt;Surrounding camp monitoring&lt;br&gt;Coordinate daily site briefings&lt;br&gt;Coordinate daily activities&lt;br&gt;Monitor flying-fox behaviour&lt;br&gt;Rescue flying-foxes if required (and no carer/vet on site)&lt;br&gt;Determine daily works end point&lt;br&gt;Participate in management activities</td>
<td>Reports to: Project Manager&lt;br&gt;Direct reports: Team members, Observers/support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team member</td>
<td>[insert]</td>
<td>Recommended ABLIV-vaccinated (employer to assess risk)&lt;br&gt;Ideally all team knowledgeable in flying-fox biology, behaviour and camp management however not required</td>
<td>Attend daily site briefings&lt;br&gt;Participate in relevant management activities</td>
<td>Reports to: Supervisor&lt;br&gt;Direct reports: Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor</td>
<td>[insert]</td>
<td>Relevant licences and experience in field</td>
<td>Conduct specified activities (e.g. tree trimming)&lt;br&gt;Adhere to all directions given by Supervisor</td>
<td>Reports to: Project Manager&lt;br&gt;Direct reports: Nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observer/support</td>
<td>[insert]</td>
<td>Approval to access site</td>
<td>Provide care of injured/orphaned wildlife (under licence) if required</td>
<td>Reports to: Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flying fox expert</td>
<td>[insert]</td>
<td>See Appendix 1</td>
<td>On-site population assessment, monitor flying-fox behaviour and</td>
<td>Reports to: Supervisor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Required experience/approvals</th>
<th>Responsibilities/authority</th>
<th>Communication lines</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ensure compliance with the Plan.</td>
<td>Direct reports: Nil</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ecological Consultants Australia [ecologicalca@outlook.com](mailto:ecologicalca@outlook.com) 0488 481 929
13.4 Adaptive management

Mechanisms for amending the Plan based on lessons from implementation, feedback from the community and results of monitoring and broad-scale FF population situations are required for plan success. While these have not yet been determine they will be linked to retained the Camp and the health of the FF as well as aiming to achieve the plans objectives.

13.5 Funding commitment

The Action Table has some cost estimated however other cost will need to be considered as detail on particular actions is included.
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Appendix 1: Community Engagement Feedback

15. Summary

It is a common misconception that most people feel the same way about a flying-fox camp in their district. Because of smell, noise and droppings we expect most people will be negative about the situation. Community consultation in Hunters Hill and Huntleys Cove reveals a different story.

This report describes the results of consultation undertaken by Hunters Hill Council (Council) during 2018. Council wanted to discover more about community experiences and perspectives on the flying-fox camp and to explore community views about options to resolve any issues.

The community living around or visiting Riverglade Reserve is interested in the management of the flying-fox camp at Tarban Creek. The four consultation events gave the interested community an opportunity to have their say about impacts they experience and their preferences for flying-fox camp management.

Community perspectives are complex, and the diversity of opinions indicates that there is currently no general agreement about the right approaches to flying-fox camp management. Consultation and an ongoing planning process will help build agreement for options that are most likely to reduce impacts on people and are supported by the community.

16. What the consultation tells us.

There is a difference between being exposed to the effects of flying foxes (noise, smell, and droppings and tree damage) and experiencing those factors as negative impacts. People with the same exposure can report quite different reactions. This was evident both within households and between neighbouring properties.

There are some people who feel the impacts of flying foxes intensely, finding it hard to be at ease in their own home. These people need support to deal with the impacts they are experiencing. Most respondents (70-80%) indicated they were either somewhat or very concerned about common impacts people experience around flying-fox camps.

Other people, including some living with high exposure are relatively untroubled. Some people are fond of and positive about flying-foxes. A significant proportion of respondents (40%) agreed that flying-foxes are a natural part of the suburbs.

Compared to households living near the camp a larger proportion of park users were neutral or positive. 72% of park users neutral or positive compared to 47% of households. Among reserve users a smaller proportion disliked the flying-foxes (16% compared to 53% of nearby households).

Consultation tells us that people experiencing the impacts intensely are wary of the suggestion that education will fix the problem. They consider themselves to be well informed. However, it is probably true that allowing people to discover more information about flying-foxes will help alleviate their concerns. For example, many people are concerned about risk of disease, but health experts can advise that the risk of disease from flying-foxes is negligible with basic precautions. Supporting people to properly investigate the issue of health risk may be a key to reducing community concern about disease.

17. Implications for planning and management.

It will be challenging to select actions that align to the expectations of all people. However, the community can understand decisions when they can see the effort made to balance differing points of view and competing objectives and are given enough information.
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Reducing impacts on people requires consideration of their needs. Targeted problem solving may be more achievable than attempting to provide solutions that are universally acceptable.

People want action, but action needs to fit with community expectations. Inaction risks perpetuating antagonism about the situation. Actions need to be sympathetic to the environment. The findings indicate the focus should be on working with people, so they experience fewer impacts.

18. Introduction

19. Background and purpose of community consultation

Over the years since flying-foxes first established a camp in Riverglade Reserve, Council has received a small but steady flow of emails and letters from residents about the flying-fox Camp. Most of these were complaints to council, raising concerns about the presence of the flying-foxes, their increasing numbers and the problems that they create for nearby residents. Most complaints were received from people living nearby or using the reserve.

Like most managers of land with a flying-fox camp in or near an urban areas, Council decided to undertake community consultation to gather feedback from the community. They wanted to discover more about community perspectives, experiences and opinions about the flying-fox camp and to explore community views about options to resolve any issues.

20. Scope of the consultation

Four different consultation activities were used to:

- provide a variety of opportunities for people to give their feedback to council,
- reach a reasonable cross-section of people who might have opinions and
- improve Council’s ability to discover the range of perspectives that exist in the community.

Consultation took place from June 2018 and included two online surveys and two sets of face-to-face interviews using questionnaires. A description of the four consultation approaches and the results are provided in later sections of this report.

21. Overview description of the four consultation events

The consultation was undertaken so Council could better understand the breadth of opinions, the strength of feelings and some of the reasons behind people’s views relating to the flying-fox camp at Tarban Creek. It will help Council identify actions to help people affected by the flying-foxes. Consulting the community helps to:

- understand the different needs and expectations across the community,
- communicate more effectively about flying-foxes, the camp and actions that people and Council can take,

- draft a Camp Management Plan that is relevant and effective to address peoples concerns and

- work with the community to manage the impacts of flying-foxes over time and reduce the impacts on people who are sensitive to them.

The consultation was not merely trying to establish statistics about majority and minority views across the whole population. Rather it intentionally focussed on people who have, or are likely to have, an interest in the flying-fox camp. This focussed, qualitative approach is desirable for this project for two reasons.
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- Council primarily wants to understand and, where possible, address the needs of interested or affected parties and
- the consultation was targeted but still open to all. The two online surveys were publicised across the Council area and were open to anyone to ‘opt-in’ and complete.

It is worth noting that individuals were free to participate in more than one consultation event and it is clear that a number did. Therefore, the samples for each consultation approach overlap and cannot be added together. Each event provided different ways to understand community perspectives.

22. Online Survey 1 June to 22 August 2018
This survey was created in Survey Monkey, a web-based survey program, and was open to anyone with internet access. The survey was promoted in the June 2018 edition of the Council newsletter delivered to all residents in the LGA, on the website and on a postcard sized flyer distributed opportunistically and left at addresses visited for the householder survey. It appears the survey was undertaken by people in the local area or very nearby.

119 responses were received. 59 responses were from people within 300 metres of the reserve.

There was no incentive provided to complete this survey and it is most likely completed by people with genuine interest and motivation to provide feedback. Survey Monkey allows only one response per computer.

23. Householder interviews at properties nearby the flying-fox camp
This questionnaire was structured to enable residents to freely express what they thought and felt about flying-foxes and the camp and to describe any impacts they experienced from flying-foxes. It also created an opportunity to inform respondents, in a general sense, about Council’s intention to have a planned approach to managing impacts from the camp on nearby residents.

This interview questionnaire was used in a door-to-door survey undertaken by Council staff and volunteers in streets adjacent and close to the flying-fox camp. It was usually completed by one (occasionally two) respondent answering on behalf of people in the household. Interviews took between 5 minutes and 30 minutes, depending on the type of information respondents wanted to provide.

49 surveys were completed. The priority was to hear from as many households as possible in streets adjacent to the camp. Some households were surveyed at a greater distance to help gauge the spatial extent of direct impacts from the camp. When a householder was not home, repeat visits were made at differing times to increase the opportunity to hear from priority households. A postcard and some general information was left when a householder was not contacted, including a handwritten message inviting them to complete the online survey.

Interviews were undertaken in Reserve Street, Fryar Place, Karrabee Avenue, Prince Edward Street, Mary Street, Richmond Crescent, Tarban Street and Manning Road.

24. Park visitor interviews within the reserve
The questionnaire was designed to enable park visitors to discuss their use of the reserve and how the presence of flying-foxes intersects with their use of the reserve. The questionnaire initially avoided raising the topic of flying-foxes thereby allowing people to freely describe issues affecting their use of the reserve. The questionnaire then allowed full discussion of any impacts that related to flying-foxes. The survey was designed to signal Council’s intention to have a planned approach to managing impacts from the camp including impacts on nearby residents.
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This interview questionnaire was conducted as an intercept survey among visitors to the reserve on a selection of weekend and weekday. A high proportion of visitors agreed to undertake the survey. Very few declined, therefore the views captured are likely to be representative of park users.

25. Online interactive survey – Flyingfoxengage

Flyingfoxengage is an engagement platform that provides a mechanism for community members to learn about and rank management options and appreciate what is involved in decisions about management options for the Tarban Creek flying-fox camp. The results provide support for Council planning tasks, e.g. drafting a flying-fox camp management plan.

The online Flyingfoxengage consultation tool was launched on the 22 August 2018 with the website www.flyingfoxengage.com/huntershill remaining open for submissions until October 17 2018. During this consultation period the Flyingfoxengage website received 83 valid submissions.

Flying-fox engage is an online survey tool that invites each respondent to consider what they value and expect from management options. The tool then generates a list for each respondent of proven management options in rank order that aligns to those values. Finally, a respondent can re-rank those options according to their own preferences for camp management.

26. Overview of the consultation outcomes

27. Key insights and conclusions from the consultation.

Community perspectives vary widely.

Consultation showed a wide range of perspectives in the community about the Tarban Creek flying-fox camp. Some views are polarised within the community.

People’s responses covered three aspects of living near flying-foxes: Whether they like flying-foxes, whether they care what happens to them and whether they can accept the flying-fox camp. Attitudes and opinions can be described as on a spectrum as follows:

- Appreciation of flying-foxes: “I love flying-foxes” to “I detest flying-foxes”,
- concern for flying-foxes: “They need our help” to “I don’t care what happens to them”, and
- acceptance of the flying-fox camp in an urban setting: “They are a natural part of our urban environment” to “they don’t belong here”.

Participants in the consultation held opinions across these spectrums. Some were at the extremes. Most were somewhere in between. Each person’s position is multi-faceted and may shift somewhat according to circumstances and recent experiences. For example, people talked about being “OK with them now but...” dreading the breeding season when smell, activity and noise intensifies.

Consultation revealed a range of divergent views including some people who were extremely positive about flying-foxes, even among those with high exposure to factors that could negatively impact people. This contrasts to previous correspondence received by Council, which was generally negative about the flying-fox camp.

One surprising result was that people in broadly the same circumstance could express vastly differing viewpoints. Here are some examples:

A person living adjacent to the reserve is extremely distressed by the impacts of the flying-foxes on their lifestyle at home and wants them gone. Two doors away, and just as close the animals, a person is indifferent to the impacts. Two doors the other way, another person is
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committed to accepting and protecting the animals as part of the environment, despite experiencing some of the impacts.

A parent with young children visiting the reserve feels repulsed by the animals, concerned about health risks for their children and tries to avoid getting close. Another parent with children deliberately stops and spends time admiring the animal.

A person in Huntleys Cove deeply resents the regular burden of cleaning spatter from their property while another person in Huntleys Cove expresses awe and wonder at the spectacle as flying-foxes fly out to feed each evening.

Strong emotions are involved. People have real needs for meaningful results.

Importantly, those who feel they are impacted by flying-foxes usually feel it intensely. We expect home to be a restful place, where we can be at ease. However, for these people the impacts from flying-foxes impinge upon that rest and ease. Decisions about camp management actions need to respect the seriousness of this situation.

Whether or not they are impacted, some people express strong feelings about human responsibility to care for animals. This could be wildlife or animals in general. Decisions about camp management also need to respect the strongly held feelings of empathy and responsibility people have for animals in the suburbs.

Impacts are confined to a relatively small number of people.

The consultation was deliberately undertaken among people who, because they are in proximity to the flying-fox camp, are the most likely to feel they are impacted. Reasonable effort was made to speak to all households adjacent to the reserve where impacts are most likely.

26 households (53%) reported they were struggling with the impacts. At this scale it may be feasible to work closely with affected households to reduce the impacts on them.

Because households experience impacts differently, options to mitigate impacts will differ between households.

Households will have their own ideas about how proven management options could apply best to them. Community have explored common management options in flyingfoxengage (see other parts of this report).

Community knowledge and expert knowledge overlap but are not fully aligned. The link between understanding and belief is less clear.

A significant proportion of the community seems to understand some key information about flying foxes. The proportion is probably higher than in many other parts of NSW. Many people

- understand they are Australian native animals, an important part of the Australian ecosystem and a natural feature of the urban environment
- recognise that, in an overall sense, habitat is diminishing and populations are in decline.

Whether it is knowledge or belief there are some areas where community understanding diverges from expertise.

- Information about disease risk. A significant proportion of people are concerned about disease however expert knowledge identifies this risk as very low. People may be unnecessarily concerned given expert assessment of disease risk.
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- Wildlife management and the ability of humans to influence the behaviour of wild animals. People may not accept that it is difficult to shift a camp and impossible to guarantee the outcome. The successful dispersion at the Royal Botanic Gardens is reasonably well known.

People suspect management decisions are made for ideological reasons rather than using evidence and practical considerations.

Across the consultation, and in flying-fox engagement in particular, there is evidence that people doubt the integrity of how decisions will be made for camp management.

Some people are hoping for active dispersal or culling of flying-foaxes. They worry that such strategies have already been ruled out because of the view that experts and decision makers tend to favour nature above people.

People concerned for the wellbeing of animals and the preservation of nature worry that the realities of wildlife and the environment will be ignored to provide amenity for people.

28. Main results from Initial Online Survey

The survey was open for 3 months from mid-May to mid-August 2018. 119 people participated.

Respondents were invited to agree or disagree with statements about the flying-fox camp. Around 55-60% of respondents agreed with statements that were NOT positive about the camp. 30-35% agreed with positive statements. 5-10% were neutral.

A significant proportion of respondents (40%) agreed that flying-foaxes are a natural part of the suburbs.

Most respondents (70-80%) indicated they were either somewhat or very concerned about common impacts people experience around flying-fox camps.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>To what extent are you concerned about the following?</th>
<th>Not Concerned</th>
<th>Somewhat Concerned</th>
<th>Very Concerned</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tree health within the flying-fox camp in Riverplate Reserve</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excrement/droppings within Riverplate Reserve</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noise within or adjacent to Riverplate Reserve</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usability of Riverplate Reserve</td>
<td>28.9%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smell within or adjacent to Riverplate Reserve</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impacts on people in properties surrounding the reserve when flying-foaxes fly in and fly out of the camp (eg. droppings, feeding on fruit trees, noise)</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk of disease from flying-foaxes</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual amenity of Riverplate Reserve (the appearance of the camp, damaged tree canopy, etc.)</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The survey succeeded in reaching local audiences. Participants were from Huntleys Cove, Hunters Hill and Gladesville except for one participant each from North Ryde and Huntleys Point. 50% of respondents lived within 300 metres of the reserve. Direct impacts from the camp are more likely within 300 metres, however disturbance caused by droppings and night time feeding can be more widespread.

The survey was completed by people who lived near the reserve and by people who visit the reserve. Most respondents use the reserve and visit it on at least a monthly basis, and most of those visit more than once a week or daily.
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Nearly all respondents were aware of the flying-foxes and based on proximity or use of the reserve were likely to be exposed to aspects of the flying-fox camp like noise, smell, visual appearance and droppings.

Respondents to the initial online survey can be characterised as highly engaged in the issue. 93 of 119 respondents provided additional comments. 75 provided email addresses to stay involved in further consultation.

29. Main results from Householder interviews in properties nearby the flying-fox camp

The results were more varied than expected by the interviewers who had anticipated that householders in the selected streets would consistently report problems living near the camp. Most respondents noticed some or all of the potentially problematic aspects of flying-fox camps, (noise, smell, droppings and tree damage). However, each of these aspects was not noticed by between 30% and 50% of respondents.

Even if an aspect was observed, level of concern about it varied.

The questionnaire was undertaken by four interviewers visiting households on weekends and weekday evenings over the two weeks from 1 June 2018 to 16 June 2018.

Interviews were completed at 49 households. Interviews usually took place with one or two members of the household.

All respondents were aware of flying-foxes. Respondents were asked what they notice about flying-foxes, interviewers recorded when respondents mentioned noise, smell, faecal drop and tree damage. Different people noticed different aspects. Three respondents, at some distance from the camp did not report noticing any of those aspects. Most noticed some or all aspects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aware of</th>
<th>Notice smell</th>
<th>Notice noise</th>
<th>Notice tree damage</th>
<th>Notice droppings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>counts &quot;Yes&quot;</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counts &quot;No and Blank&quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interviewers also asked what they were were concerned about from the things they had noticed.

People who noticed these things were not equally concerned. Some people are highly concerned. These people reported being strongly impacted by the issue.

Two people with similar exposure to the same aspects experience them differently and are therefore impacted differently.

Levels of concern have been categorised. The issue is assumed to impact someones quality of life in categories, "Yes, I hope it improves" and "Yes, it is a problem".

In broad terms, among the households interviewed, people were concerned and experiencing problems with Noise (47%), Smell (49%), Tree Damage (58%), Droppings (39%), concern about disease risk (36%).
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern smell</th>
<th>Concern noise</th>
<th>Concern tree damage</th>
<th>Concern droppings</th>
<th>Concern Disease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blank</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes can accept</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes hope improves</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes its problem</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Householders were asked about their overall feelings towards flying-foxes. 47% were neutral, somewhat positive or fond of flying-foxes. 53% hated or disliked flying-foxes. People who disliked flying foxes tended to think everyone disliked them. However, these overall results show a different picture.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall feeling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Love them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>don’t bother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dislike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30. Main results from Intercept interviews within the reserve.

99 people were interviewed in the reserve.

It is of interest to note that, when asked if anything concerns them about the reserve only 20% of respondents mentioned bats unprompted. This suggests that for most people choosing to use Riverglade Reserve, flying-foxes are not a major intrusion on their enjoyment of the reserve. This may not be surprising as they choose to use the reserve with flying foxes present.

When people were discussing flying-foxes the sentiments toward the flying-foxes were mixed. Twice as many people were positive about flying foxes as were negative. The results differ markedly from householder surveys.

Compared to households living near the camp larger proportion were neutral (40% compared to 22%) or positive (32% compared to 25%). Among reserve users a smaller proportion disliked the flying-foxes (16% compared to 53% of nearby households). We were unable to categorise the attitude of some (12%).

When discussing problems some park users report certain aspects of flying-foxes affecting their enjoyment of the reserve. Smell was a problem (27%), concern about tree damage (19%), concern about disease risk (17%), noise (16%), faecal drop was a concern for very few (6%).
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31. Main results from online interactive survey – Flyingfoxengage.

A separate report on flyingfoxengage explains the findings in detail. The following summarises the results and how this consultation tool operates.

The results of flyingfoxengage indicate the three most commonly preferred management options are

- provision of flying-fox education and awareness programs
- subsidising property modification to reduce the impacts of flying-foxes
- health and safety guidelines to manage incidents related to the camp.
- subsidising services to reduce the impacts of flying-foxes.

Flyingfoxengage is an engagement decision support system. The online flyingfoxengage consultation tool was launched on the 22 August 2018 with the website www.flyingfoxengage.com/huntershill remaining open for submissions until October 17 2018. During this consultation period the Flyingfoxengage website received 85 valid submissions.

The results provide insights about which management options respondents prefer and which they do not. Consistent with other consultation events there is evidence of strongly differing views within the group that responded and there are polarised views about some management options.

There are two main kind of results reported.

1. Aggregated rankings. Like ‘average scores’ aggregated rankings show the average ranked preference for management options when all 85 individual responses are brought together. Aggregated scores tend to mask the diversity views. Aggregate results indicate a wide base of support for education, awareness and guidelines and subsidies to help affected households adapt to impacts.

2. Cumulative rankings. A cumulative ranking shows how many times various options were ranked by individuals in their top 5 (most preferred) and how many times various options were ranked by individuals in the bottom 5 (least preferred). Cumulative rankings help reveal the diversity of views (and divergence) of views. Cumulative impacts show polarised views on actions to disperse or cull flying foxes and education and awareness.

Aggregated Rankings.

The table below compares two ranked lists produced by aggregating responses where management options are ranked from most preferred to least preferred on aggregate.

The first list aggregates results from stage one where each respondent elects what is important to them about flying fox management and Flyingfoxengage generates a ranked list of management options for the respondent based on their information.

Next a respondent can ‘override’ the ranking and put the management options in order based on their own preference for the management options now they can see them. The second list aggregates that re-ranked list.

The table below shows that only a few management options were significantly re-ranked by respondents. Those that moved more than one rank position on aggregate are highlighted in colour.
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Cumulative Rankings.

The table below shows the diverse and sometimes polarised views hidden within the aggregate rankings. Culling flying-foxes rises higher in the cumulative rankings because 12 of 85 respondents ranked ‘culling flying-foxes’ as their most preferred. 53 of 85 people ranked it least preferred. These tables reveal when even a relatively small number of respondents strongly prefer or do not prefer a management option.

Cumulative results help reveal those management options which appear to have strongly differing feelings attached and are likely to be polarising for management planning and implementation.

---

Flying-fox engagement provides important information about how to help planners appreciate how the community understand and evaluate management options and can guide where extra explanation about decisions will be required.

**Discussion/Interview Guide – Affected Residents.**

**ADDRESS of interview:**

Hi, my name is __________, I live in Hunters Hill and I am council volunteer. Council wants to hear from residents about the flying-foxes. They are roosting in trees in Riverglade Reserve and fly out to feed at night.

If you agree to talk to me it will probably take between 15 minutes and 30 minutes.

Would now be a good time, or do you want to set another time?

**PREFERRED TIME/DATE:**

We are asking about it now because Council wants to have a plan in place. This will help them coordinate any activities that might be needed to manage the impacts from the flying-foxes in the future. Also Council are required by State and Federal Government to have a management plan before any management activities can happen.
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Council is interested to hear from you about the flying-foxes and to hear any other comments you want to make.

I have 7 questions to run through and I will write notes from your answers.

But before that, have you got any questions about flying-foxes and the intention to prepare a Camp Management Plan?

QUESTION 1.

Are you aware of flying-foxes in the district? YES/NO ________________________________

What have you noticed and when do you noticed those things?

Do you visit the reserve? YES/NO ________.

○ I don't really go to the reserve
○ I go past the reserve, but not into it.
○ I walk my dog in the reserve
○ I walk, exercise or relax in the reserve
○ I walk through the reserve on my way somewhere else.
○ I am there mainly for the sports fields
○ Other (please specify) ________________________________

How often?

○ Every day
○ Once or twice a per week
○ Once per month
○ Irregularly
○ Seldom or never
○ Other (please specify)

QUESTION 2.

How do you feel about the flying-foxes based on your experiences?

QUESTION 3

You mentioned some of your concerns about the flying foxes.

What are you most concerned about?

What is it it about ______________ that concerns you? (probe: how does that affect you? What about other people in the household?)

QUESTION 4 (If respondent attaches positive values to the flying foxes)

You mentioned you appreciate some things about the flying foxes.

What do you appreciate?

What is it it about ______________ that you like? (What about other people in the household?)

QUESTION 5

As I mentioned at the start, Council is going to prepare a Flying-fox Camp Management Plan for Riverglade Reserve. Your input will help Council understand what residents need as they prepare the plan.
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A. Would you like to stay in touch with progress on the plan? 
   What way do you think Council should use to keep you informed?

B. Would you be interested in being involved in further consultation about managing the camp, 
such as a community workshop or an online survey about management options? 
Would you like to give Council your email address so they can let you know about the project and 
upcoming consultation

QUESTION 6
Do you have any other comments at this stage.

QUESTION 7. Are there other people in the area you think I should be speaking to about flying-foxes?

Not everyone will be at home when we call, please let your neighbours know you spoke to me and 
they can go onto Councils website to complete an online survey, to request to be kept informed or to 
find out who to speak to in Council about the Flying-fox Camp Management Plan.

Thank you for your information. It will help Council find workable solutions.

Discussion Guide – Park Users Riverglade Reserve.

Hi, my name is __________, I live in Hunters Hill and I am council volunteer. Council wants to check 
in to see how things are going for people using Riverglade Reserve. If you agree to talk to me it will 
probably take between 3 and 10 minutes, depending what you want to tell me.

1. What have you come to this reserve to do? 
   ○ I walk my dog in the reserve
   ○ I walk, exercise or relax in the reserve
   ○ I walk through the reserve on my way somewhere else.
   ○ I am there mainly for the sports fields
   ○ Other (please specify)

2. How often do you come here for that? 
   ○ Every day
   ○ Once or twice a per week
   ○ Once per month
   ○ Irregularly
   ○ Seldom or never
   ○ Other (please specify)
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3. Why do you choose this reserve/ what makes this reserve suitable?

4. What, if anything, concerns you about this reserve when you visit?

5. Specifically, have you noticed the bats in the reserve (which are also called flying foxes)?

6. When are you aware of them and what do you notice?

7. In what way, if any, do they change your use of the park?

8. What do you think about the flying foxes?

9. Is there anything else you would like to say about Flying foxes?

Thanks so much, Council is checking in with a range of people about flying foxes because some people have raised concerns. Information from a range of people will inform Council as they prepare a Camp Management Plan. - Offer information about flying foxes if relevant.
Appendix 2: Species Profiles

31.1 Species profiles

31.1.1 Black flying-fox (Pteropus alecto)

![Black flying-fox indicative species distribution](image)

Figure 1: Black flying-fox indicative species distribution, adapted from OEH 2015a

The black flying-fox (BFF) (Figure 1) has traditionally occurred throughout coastal areas from Shark Bay in Western Australia, across Northern Australia, down through Queensland and into NSW (Churchill 2008; OEH 2015a). Since it was first described there has been a substantial southerly shift by the BFF (Webb & Tidemann 1995). This shift has consequently led to an increase in indirect competition with the threatened GHFF, which appears to be favouring the BFF (DoE 2016a).

They forage on the fruit and blossoms of native and introduced plants (Churchill 2008; OEH 2015a), including orchard species at times.

BFF are largely nomadic animals with movement and local distribution influenced by climatic variability and the flowering and fruiting patterns of their preferred food plants. Feeding commonly occurs within 20 kilometres of the camp site (Markus & Hall 2004).

BFF usually roost beside a creek or river in a wide range of warm and moist habitats, including lowland rainforest gullies, coastal stringybark forests and mangroves. During the breeding season camp sizes can change significantly in response to the availability of food and the arrival of animals from other areas.
31.1.2 Grey-headed flying-fox (Pteropus poliocephalus)

The grey-headed flying fox (GHFF) (Figure 2) is found throughout eastern Australia, generally within 200 kilometres of the coast, from Finch Hatton in Queensland to Melbourne, Victoria (OEH 2015a). This species now ranges into South Australia and has been observed in Tasmania (DoE 2016a). It requires foraging resources and camp sites within rainforests, open forests, closed and open woodlands (including melaleuca swamps and banksia woodlands). This species is also found throughout urban and agricultural areas where food trees exist and will raid orchards at times, especially when other food is scarce (OEH 2015a).

All the GHFF in Australia are regarded as one population that moves around freely within its entire national range (Webb & Tidemann 1996; DoE 2015). GHFF may travel up to 100 kilometres in a single night with a foraging radius of up to 50 kilometres from their camp (McConkey et al. 2012). They have been recorded travelling over 500 kilometres over 48 hours when moving from one camp to another (Robert et al. 2012). GHFF generally show a high level of fidelity to camp sites, returning year after year to the same site, and have been recorded returning to the same branch of a particular tree (SEQ Catchments 2012). This may be one of the reasons flying-foxes continue to return to small urban bushland blocks that may be remnants of historically-used larger tracts of vegetation.

The GHFF population has a generally annual southerly movement in spring and summer, with their return to the coastal forests of north-east NSW and south-east Queensland in winter (Ratcliffe 1932; Eby 1991; Parry-Jones & Augee 1992; Roberts et al. 2012). This results in large fluctuations in the number of GHFF in NSW, ranging from as few as 20% of the total population in winter up to around 75% of the total population in summer (Eby 2000). They are widespread throughout their range during summer, but in spring and winter are uncommon in the south. In autumn they occupy primarily coastal lowland camps and are uncommon inland and on the south coast of NSW (DECCW 2009).

There is evidence the GHFF population declined by up to 30% between 1989 and 2000 (Birt 2000; Richards 2000 cited in OEH 2011a). There is a wide range of ongoing threats to the survival of the GHFF, including habitat loss and degradation, deliberate destruction associated with the commercial horticulture industry, conflict with humans, infrastructure-related mortality (e.g. entanglement in barbed wire fencing and fruit netting, power line electrocution, etc.) and competition and hybridisation with the BFF (DECCW 2009). For these reasons it is listed as vulnerable to extinction under NSW and federal legislation (see Section 4).
31.1.3 Reproduction

Black and grey-headed flying-foxes

Males initiate contact with females in January with peak conception occurring around March to April/May; this mating season represents the period of peak camp occupancy (Markus 2002). Young (usually a single pup) are born six months later from September to November (Churchill 2008). The birth season becomes progressively earlier, albeit by a few weeks, in more northerly populations (McGuirk & Blackshaw 1991), however out of season breeding is common with births occurring later in the year.

Young are highly dependent on their mother for food and thermoregulation. Young are suckled and carried by the mother until approximately four weeks of age (Markus & Blackshaw 2002). At this time they are left at the camp during the night in a crèche until they begin foraging with their mother in January and February (Churchill 2008) and are usually weaned by six months of age around March. Sexual maturity is reached at two years of age with a life expectancy up to 20 years in the wild (Pierson & Rainey 1992).

As such, the critical reproductive period for GHFF and BFF is generally from August (when females are in final trimester) to the end of peak conception around April. Dependent pups are usually present from September to March (see Figure 4).

Little red flying-fox

The LRFF breeds approximately six months out of phase with the other flying-foxes. Peak conception occurs around October to November, with young born between March and June (McGuirk & Blackshaw 1991; Churchill 2008) (Figure 4). Young are carried by their mother for approximately one month then left at the camp while she forages (Churchill 2008). Suckling occurs for several months while young are learning how to forage. LRFF generally birth and rear young in temperate areas (rarely in NSW).
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- Peak conception
- Final trimester
- Peak birthing
- Crèching (young left at roost)
- Lactation

Figure 4: Indicative flying-fox reproductive cycle. Note that LRFF rarely birth and rear young in NSW. The breeding season of all species is variable between years and location, and expert assessment is required to accurately determine phases in the breeding cycle and inform appropriate management timing.
Appendix 3: Requirements

Summary of other key legislation likely to apply at some camps

Local government legislation

Local government is required to prepare planning schemes (including Environmental Planning Instruments and Development Control Plans) consistent with provisions under the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 (EP&A Act; see Section 4.1.5 of the template).

Local Environment Plans are environmental planning instruments that are legal documents and that relate to a local government area. Other environmental planning instruments, such as State Environmental Planning Policies (SEPPs), may relate to the whole or part of the state. A development control plan provides detailed planning and design guidelines to support the planning controls in a Local Environment Plan, but they are not legal documents.

Planning schemes enable a local government authority to manage growth and change in their local government area (LGA) through land use and administrative definitions, zones, overlays, infrastructure planning provisions, assessment codes and other administrative provisions. A planning scheme identifies the kind of development requiring approval, as well as zoning all areas within the LGA based on the environmental values and development requirements of that land. Planning schemes could potentially include a flying-fox habitat overlay, and may designate some habitat as flying-fox conservation areas.

State legislation

Rural Fires Act 1997

The objects of this Act are to prevent, mitigate and suppress bushfires and coordinate bush firefighting, while protecting persons from injury or death, and reduce property damage from fire. A permit is generally required from the Rural Fire Service for any fires in the open that are lit during the local Bush Fire Danger Period as determined each year. This may be relevant for fires used to disperse flying-foxes, or for any burning associated with vegetation management.


The main object of the Protection of the Environment Operations Act 1997 (POEO Act) is to set out explicit protection of the environment polices (PEPs) and adopt more innovative approaches to reducing pollution.

The use of smoke as a dispersal mechanism may constitute ‘chemical production’ under Schedule 1, clause 8 of the POEO Act, so this type of dispersal activity may require a licence under Chapter 3 of the Act.

The POEO Act also regulates noise including ‘offensive noise’. The Protection of the Environment Operations (Noise Control) Regulation 2008 (Part 4, Division 2) provides information on the types of noise that can be ‘offensive’ and for which the Environment Protection Authority (EPA) can issue fines. This may include noise generated as a part of dispersal activities. It is best to discuss the types of noise makers and the sound levels and times these will be generated, along with identified noise receptors, with Council prior to any dispersal. Detailed advice and guidance on noise regulation can be found in the EPA’s Noise guide for local government (EPA 2013).

Crown Lands Act 1989

The principles of Crown land management include the observance of environmental protection principles and the conservation of its natural resources, including water, soil, flora, fauna and scenic quality. Any works on land that is held or reserved under the Crown Lands Act 1989 (including Ecological Consultants Australia ecological@outlook.com 0488 481 929 87
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vegetation management and dispersal activities) are an offence under the Act without prior authorisation obtained through the Department of Primary Industries (Lands).

Local Government Act 1993
The primary purpose of this Act is to provide the legal framework for an effective, efficient and environmentally responsible, open system of local government. Most relevant to flying-fox management is that it also provides encouragement for the effective participation of local communities in the affairs of local government and sets out guidance on the use and management of community land which may be applicable to land which requires management of flying-foxes.

State Environmental Planning Policies
SEPPs are environmental planning instruments which address specific planning issues within NSW. These SEPPs often remove power from local councils in order to control specific types of development or development in specific areas. SEPPs often transfer decision-making from Council to the Planning Minister. While there may be others, some of the SEPPs likely to apply at some flying-fox camps are outlined below.

SEPP 14 – Coastal Wetlands
This policy provides additional protection for coastal wetlands by requiring development consent to be obtained before any clearing, draining, filling or construction of levees can occur on a mapped wetland. Camps are unlikely to fall within the bounds of a SEPP 14 wetland, but additional restrictions for vegetation management in these areas may be required if they do.

SEPP 26 – Littoral Rainforests
SEPP 26 aims to protect coastal rainforests (littoral rainforests) by requiring development consent for activities within or adjacent to mapped coastal rainforest. It is unlikely that clearing for flying-fox management would be considered significant enough to trigger this SEPP but this should be confirmed if the site is within a mapped SEPP 26 area.

SEPP 19 – Bushland in Urban Areas
The aim of this policy is to protect and preserve bushland within urban areas which are defined in Schedule 1 of the SEPP. Broadly, this covers most LGAs within the Greater Sydney Region. It does not cover:

- land reserved or dedicated under the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974
- state forests, flora reserves or timber reserves under the Forestry Act 1916
- land to which SEPP (Western Sydney Parklands) 2009 applies.

Bushland within the designated LGAs may not be disturbed without the consent of the council unless the disturbance is for: bushfire hazard reduction, facilitating recreational use of the bushland in accordance with a plan of management referred to in clause 8 of the policy and essential infrastructure such as electricity, sewerage, gas or main roads. If the land owned by the proponent is zoned as SEPP 19 bushland, council approval would be required under this SEPP. Council should be contacted to discuss any potential disturbance associated with camp management.
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*Expert assessment requirements*

The Plan template identifies where expert input is required. The following are the minimum required skills and experience which must be demonstrated by each expert.

**Flying-fox expert**

**Essential**
- Knowledge of flying-fox habitat requirements.
- Knowledge and experience in flying-fox camp management.
- Knowledge of flying-fox behaviour, including ability to identify signs of flying-fox stress.
- Ability to differentiate between breeding and non-breeding females.
- Ability to identify females in final trimester.
- Ability to estimate age of juveniles.
- Experienced in flying-fox population monitoring including static and fly-out counts, demographics and visual health assessments.

**Desirable**
- It is strongly recommended that the expert is independent of the Plan owner to ensure transparency and objectivity. OEH may be able to provide assistance with flying-fox experts.
- ABLV-vaccinated (N.B. This is often an essential requirement during management implementation as detailed within the template).
- Trained in flying-fox rescue (N.B. This is often an essential requirement during management implementation as detailed within the template).
- Local knowledge and experience.

**Ecologist**

**Essential**
- At least five years demonstrated experience in ecological surveys, including identifying fauna and flora to species level, fauna habitat and ecological communities.
- The ability to identify flora and fauna, including ground-truthing of vegetation mapping.
- Formal training in ecology or similar, specifically flora and fauna identification.

**Desirable**
- Tertiary qualification in ecology or similar.
- Local knowledge and experience.
- Accredited Biobanking Assessor under the *Biodiversity Conservation Act 1995*.
- Practising member of the Ecological Consultants Association of NSW.

Depending on the site, for example when vegetation management is proposed for an endangered ecological community or an area with a high likelihood of containing other threatened flora and fauna species, a specialist in that field (e.g. specialist botanist) may be required.
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Appendix 3b. Biodiversity Conservation Licence

At the time the Plan is submitted to OEH for approval, it should include a completed section 91 licence application form. The form can include information already contained in the Plan. Alternatively, the land manager should inform OEH that the proposed works are to be assessed under Part 5 of the EP&A Act and will not require a licence application under the Biodiversity Conservation Act 1995.

Note that OEH is obliged to place licence application forms on its website, and the application, accompanying documentation and approval, form part of the public register for the BC Act. The licence application is available at: Section 91 Licence.

Appendix 3c. Expert assessment requirements

The Plan template identifies where expert input is required. The following are the minimum required skills and experience which must be demonstrated by each expert.

Flying-fox expert

Essential

- Knowledge of flying-fox habitat requirements.
- Knowledge and experience in flying-fox camp management.
- Knowledge of flying-fox behaviour, including ability to identify signs of flying-fox stress.
- Ability to differentiate between breeding and non-breeding females.
- Ability to identify females in final trimester.
- Ability to estimate age of juveniles.
- Experienced in flying-fox population monitoring including static and fly-out counts, demographics and visual health assessments.

Desirable

- It is strongly recommended that the expert is independent of the Plan owner to ensure transparency and objectivity. OEH may be able to provide assistance with flying-fox experts.
- ABLV-vaccinated (N.B. This is often an essential requirement during management implementation as detailed within the template).
- Trained in flying-fox rescue (N.B. This is often an essential requirement during management implementation as detailed within the template).
- Local knowledge and experience.

Ecologist

Essential

- At least five years demonstrated experience in ecological surveys, including identifying fauna and flora to species level, fauna habitat and ecological communities.
- The ability to identify flora and fauna, including ground-truthing of vegetation mapping.
- Formal training in ecology or similar, specifically flora and fauna identification.

Desirable

- Tertiary qualification in ecology or similar.
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- Local knowledge and experience.
- Practising member of the Ecological Consultants Association of NSW.

Depending on the site, for example when vegetation management is proposed for an endangered ecological community or an area with a high likelihood of containing other threatened flora and fauna species, a specialist in that field (e.g. specialist botanist) may be required.
Appendix 3: Desktop ecological assessment guideline

Buffer

Desktop assessments should include the camp and a suitable buffer area. The suggested buffer for ecological assessments is 10 km, however this may be reviewed on a case by case basis.

Sources of information for database searches

Depending on the location and extent of the project, the following databases may provide information on flora and fauna species and ecological communities for the site and surrounds.

Sources of ecological information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Links</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Atlas of Living Australia</td>
<td>Biodiversity knowledge contributed by Australia's academic, scientific, environmental and general communities</td>
<td><a href="http://www.aiba.org.au">www.aiba.org.au</a> - page provides a link to a mapping and analysis page where you can view records within an area of interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected Matters Search Tool</td>
<td>Used to generate a list of matters of national environmental significance within an area of interest</td>
<td><a href="http://www.environment.gov.au/epbc/protected-matters-search-tool">www.environment.gov.au/epbc/protected-matters-search-tool</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW BioNet</td>
<td>Contains government-held information about plants and animals in NSW. The following organisations provide data: Office of Environment and Heritage; National Parks and Wildlife Service; Royal Botanic Gardens and Domain Trust; Department of Primary Industries; Forests NSW; Australian Museum. Users can register for a log-in version which provides additional detail and functionality.</td>
<td><a href="http://www.bionet.nsw.gov.au/">www.bionet.nsw.gov.au/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetation Information System: Maps</td>
<td>Statewide regional scale vegetation map, and for some areas, a local fine-scale map</td>
<td><a href="http://www.environment.nsw.gov.au/research/PlantCommunityEcoSoftware.htm">www.environment.nsw.gov.au/research/PlantCommunityEcoSoftware.htm</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S10Maps</td>
<td>Provides maps showing cadastral and topographic information</td>
<td>s10.maps.nsw.gov.au/maps/portal/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threatened Species Profile Database</td>
<td>Provides a search tool for NSW threatened species including a description and indicative distribution</td>
<td><a href="http://www.environment.nsw.gov.au/threatened-species/">www.environment.nsw.gov.au/threatened-species/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other sources of data

Depending on the type of project and location, the local council, or National Parks and Wildlife Service may hold more detailed vegetation mapping than publicly available. The relevant authority should be contacted to confirm if the most detailed mapping and data records have been obtained.
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Appendix 4 Additional human and animal health information

Australian bat lyssavirus

ABLV is a rabies-like virus that may be found in all flying fox species on mainland Australia. It has also been found in an insectivorous microbat and it is assumed it may be carried by any bat species. The probability of human infection with ABLV is very low with less than 1% of the flying fox population being affected (DPI 2013) and transmission requiring direct contact with an infected animal that is secreting the virus. In Australia three people have died from ABLV infection since the virus was identified in 1996 (NSW Health 2013).

Domestic animals are also at risk if exposed to ABLV. In 2013, ABLV infections were identified in two horses (Shinwari et al. 2014). There have been no confirmed cases of ABLV in dogs in Australia; however, transmission is possible (McCall et al. 2005) and consultation with a veterinarian should be sought if exposure is suspected.

Transmission of the virus from bats to humans is through a bite or scratch, but may have potential to be transferred if bat saliva directly contacts the eyes, nose, mouth or broken skin. ABLV is unlikely to survive in the environment for more than a few hours, especially in dry environments that are exposed to sunlight (NSW Health 2013).

Transmission of closely related viruses suggests that contact or exposure to bat faeces, urine or blood does not pose a risk of exposure to ABLV, nor does living, playing or walking near bat roosting areas (NSW Health 2013).

The incubation period in humans is assumed similar to rabies and variable between two weeks and several years. Similarly the disease in humans presents essentially the same clinical picture as classical rabies. Once clinical signs have developed the infection is invariably fatal. However, infection can easily be prevented by avoiding direct contact with bats (i.e. handling). Pre-exposure vaccination provides reliable protection from the disease for people who are likely to have direct contact with bats, and it is generally a mandatory workplace health and safety requirement that all persons working with bats receive pre-vaccination and have their level of protection regularly assessed. Like classical rabies, ABLV infection in humans also appears to be effectively treated using post-exposure vaccination and so any person who suspects they have been exposed should seek immediate medical treatment. Post-exposure vaccination is usually ineffective once clinical manifestations of the disease have commenced.

If a person is bitten or scratched by a bat they should:

- wash the wound with soap and water for at least five minutes (do not scrub)
- contact their doctor immediately to arrange for post-exposure vaccinations.

If bat saliva contacts the eyes, nose, mouth or an open wound, flush thoroughly with water and seek immediate medical advice.

Hendra virus

Flying foxes are the natural host for Hendra virus (HeV), which can be transmitted from flying foxes to horses. Infected horses sometimes amplify the virus and can then transmit it to other horses, humans and on two occasions, dogs (DPI 2014). There is no evidence that the virus can be passed directly from flying foxes to humans or to dogs (AVA 2015). Clinical studies have shown cats, pigs, ferrets and guinea pigs can carry the infection (DPI 2015a).

Although the virus is periodically present in flying-fox populations across Australia, the likelihood of horses becoming infected is low and consequently human infection is extremely rare. Horses are
thought to contract the disease after ingesting forage or water contaminated primarily with flying-fox urine (CDC 2014).

Humans may contract the disease after close contact with an infected horse. HeV infection in humans presents as a serious and often fatal respiratory and/or neurological disease and there is currently no effective post-exposure treatment or vaccine available for people. The mortality rate in horses is greater than 70% (DPI 2014). Since 1994, 81 horses have died and four of the seven people infected with HeV have lost their lives (DPI 2014).

Previous studies have shown that HeV spillover events have been associated with foraging flying-foxes rather than camp locations. Therefore risk is considered similar at any location within the range of flying-fox species and all horse owners should be vigilant. Vaccination of horses can protect horses and subsequently humans from infection (DPI 2014), as can appropriate horse husbandry (e.g. covering food and water troughs, fencing flying-fox foraging trees in paddocks, etc.).

Although all human cases of HeV to date have been contracted from infected horses and direct transmission from bats to humans has not yet been reported, particular care should be taken by select occupational groups that could be uniquely exposed. For example, persons who may be exposed to high levels of HeV via aerosol of heavily contaminated substrate should consider additional PPE (e.g. respiratory filters), and potentially dampening down dry dusty substrate.

Menangle virus

Menangle virus (also known as bat paramyxovirus no. 2) was first isolated from stillborn piglets from a NSW piggery in 1997. Little is known about the epidemiology of this virus, except that it has been recorded in flying-foxes, pigs and humans (AVA 2015). The virus caused reproductive failure in pigs and severe febrile (flu-like) illness in two piggery workers employed at the same Menangle piggery where the virus was recorded (AVA 2015). The virus is thought to have been transmitted to the pigs from flying-foxes via an oral–faecal matter route (AVA 2015). Flying-foxes had been recorded flying over the pig yards prior to the occurrence of disease symptoms. The two infected piggery workers made a full recovery and this has been the only case of Menangle virus recorded in Australia.

General health considerations

Flying-foxes, like all animals, carry bacteria and other microorganisms in their guts, some of which are potentially pathogenic to other species. Direct contact with faecal material should be avoided and general hygiene measures taken to reduce the low risk of gastrointestinal and other disease.

Contamination of water supplies by any animal excreta (birds, amphibians and mammals such as flying-foxes) poses a health risk to humans. Household tanks should be designed to minimise potential contamination, such as using first flush diverters to divert contaminants before they enter water tanks. Trimming vegetation overhanging the catchment area (e.g. the roof of a house) will also reduce wildlife activity and associated potential contamination. Tanks should also be appropriately maintained and flushed, and catchment areas regularly cleaned to remove potential contaminants.

Public water supplies are regularly monitored for harmful microorganisms, and are filtered and disinfected before being distributed. Management plans for community supplies should consider whether any large congregation of animals, including flying-foxes, occurs near the supply or catchment area. Where they do occur, increased frequency of monitoring should be considered to ensure early detection and management of contaminants.
Appendix 5: General Camp Management Options

31.2 Level 1 actions: routine camp management

31.2.1 Education and awareness programs

This management option involves undertaking a comprehensive and targeted flying-fox education and awareness program to provide accurate information to the local community about flying-foxes.

Such a program would include managing risk and alleviating concern about health and safety issues associated with flying-foxes, options available to reduce impacts from roosting and foraging flying-foxes, an up-to-date program of works being undertaken at the camp, and information about flying-fox numbers and flying-fox behaviour at the camp.

Residents should also be made aware that faecal drop and noise at night is mainly associated with plants that provide food, and independent of camp location. Staged removal of foraging species such as fruit trees and palms from residential yards, or management of fruit (e.g. bagging, pruning) will greatly assist in mitigating this issue.

Collecting and providing information should always be the first response to community concerns in an attempt to alleviate issues without the need to actively manage flying-foxes or their habitat. Where it is determined that management is required, education should similarly be a key component of any approach. See also Section 3 and incorporate an education and awareness program into any community engagement plan.

An education program may include components shown in Figure 5.

The likelihood of improving community understanding of flying-fox issues is high. However, the extent to which that understanding will help alleviate conflict issues is probably less so. Extensive education for decision-makers, the media and the broader community may be required to overcome negative attitudes towards flying-foxes.

It should be stressed that a long-term solution to the issue resides with better understanding flying-fox ecology and applying that understanding to careful urban planning and development.

Ecological Consultants Australia ecologicalsa@outlook.com 0488 481 929
31.2.2 Property modification without subsidies

The managers of land on which a flying-fox camp is located would promote or encourage the adoption of certain actions on properties adjacent or near to the camp to minimise impacts from roosting and foraging flying-foxes (note that approval may be required for some activities, refer to Section 4 for further information):

- Create visual/sound/smell barriers with fencing or hedges. To avoid attracting flying-foxes, species selected for hedging should not produce edible fruit or nectar-exuding flowers, should grow in dense formation between two and five metres (Roberts 2006) (or be maintained at less than 5 metres). Vegetation that produces fragrant flowers can assist in masking camp odour where this is of concern.
- Manage foraging trees (i.e. plants that produce fruit/nectar-exuding flowers) within properties through pruning/coversing with bags or wildlife friendly netting, early removal of fruit, or tree replacement.
- Cover vehicles, structures and clothes lines where faecal contamination is an issue, or remove washing from the line before dawn/dusk.
- Move or cover eating areas (e.g. BBQs and tables) within close proximity to a camp or foraging tree to avoid contamination by flying-foxes.
- Install double-glazed windows, insulation and use air-conditioners when needed to reduce noise disturbance and smell associated with a nearby camp.
- Follow horse husbandry and property management guidelines provided at the NSW Department of Primary Industries Hendra virus web page (DPI 2015a).
- Include suitable buffers and other provisions (e.g. covered car parks) in planning of new developments.
- Turn off lighting at night which may assist flying-fox navigation and increase fly over impacts.
- Consider removable covers for swimming pools and ensure working filter and regular chlorine treatment.
- Appropriately manage rainwater tanks, including installing first-flush systems.
- Avoid disturbing flying-foxes during the day as this will increase camp noise.

The cost would be borne by the person or organisation who modifies the property; however, opportunities for funding assistance (e.g. environment grants) may be available for management activities that reduce the need to actively manage a camp.

31.2.3 Property modification subsidies

Fully funding or providing subsidies to property owners for property modifications may be considered to manage the impacts of the flying-foxes. Providing subsidies to install infrastructure may improve the value of the property, which may also offset concerns regarding perceived or actual property value or rental return losses.

The level and type of subsidy would need to be agreed to by the entity responsible for managing the flying-fox camp.

31.2.4 Service subsidies

This management option involves providing property owners with a subsidy to help manage impacts on the property and lifestyle of residents. The types of services that could be subsidised include clothes washing, cleaning outside areas and property, car washing or power bills. Rate reductions could also be considered.
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Critical thresholds of flying-fox numbers at a camp and distance to a camp may be used to determine when subsidies would apply.

**31.2.5 Routine camp maintenance and operational activities**
Examples of routine camp management actions are provided in the Policy. These include:

- removal of tree limbs or whole trees that pose a genuine health and safety risk, as determined by a qualified arborist
- weed removal, including removal of noxious weeds under the *Noxious Weeds Act* 1993, or species listed as undesirable by a council
- trimming of understorey vegetation or the planting of vegetation
- minor habitat augmentation for the benefit of the roosting animals
- mowing of grass and similar grounds-keeping actions that will not create a major disturbance to roosting flying-foxes
- application of mulch or removal of leaf litter or other material on the ground.

Protocols should be developed for carrying out operations that may disturb flying-foxes, which can result in excess camp noise. Such protocols could include limiting the use of disturbing activities to certain days or certain times of day in the areas adjacent to the camp, and advising adjacent residents of activity days. Such activities could include lawn-mowing, using chainsaws, whipper-snippers, using generators and testing alarms or sirens.

**31.2.6 Revegetation and land management to create alternative habitat**
This management option involves revegetating and managing land to create alternative flying-fox roosting habitat through improving and extending existing low-conflict camps or developing new roosting habitat in areas away from human settlement.

Selecting new sites and attempting to attract flying-foxes to them has had limited success in the past, and ideally habitat at known camp sites would be dedicated as a flying-fox reserve. However, if a staged and long-term approach is used to make unsuitable current camps less attractive, whilst concurrently improving appropriate sites, it is a viable option (particularly for the transient and less selective LRFF). Supporting further research into flying-fox camp preferences may improve the potential to create new flying-fox habitat.

When improving a site for a designated flying-fox camp, preferred habitat characteristics detailed in Section 6.4 should be considered.

Foraging trees planted amongst and surrounding roost trees (excluding in/near horse paddocks) may help to attract flying-foxes to a desired site. They will also assist with reducing foraging impacts in residential areas. Consideration should be given to tree species that will provide year-round food, increasing the attractiveness of the designated site. Depending on the site, the potential negative impacts to a natural area will need to be considered if introducing non-indigenous plant species.

The presence of a water source is likely to increase the attractiveness of an alternative camp location. Supply of an artificial water source should be considered if unavailable naturally, however this may be cost-prohibitive.

Potential habitat mapping using camp preferences (see Section 6.4) and suitable land tenure can assist in initial alternative site selection. A feasibility study would then be required prior to site designation to assess likelihood of success and determine the warranted level of resource allocated to habitat improvement.
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31.2.7 Provision of artificial roosting habitat

This management option involves constructing artificial structures to augment roosting habitat in current camp sites or to provide new roosting habitat. Trials using suspended ropes have been of limited success as flying-foxes only used the structures that were very close to the available natural roosting habitat. It is thought that the structure of the vegetation below and around the ropes is important.

31.2.8 Protocols to manage incidents

This management option involves implementing protocols for managing incidents or situations specific to particular camps. Such protocols may include ‘bat watch’ patrols at sites that host vulnerable people, management of pets at sites popular for walking dogs or heat stress incidents (when the camp is subjected to extremely high temperatures leading to flying-foxes changing their behaviour and/or dying).

31.2.9 Participation in research

This management option involves participating in research to improve knowledge of flying-fox ecology to address the large gaps in our knowledge about flying-fox habits and behaviours and why they choose certain sites for roosting. Further research and knowledge sharing at local, regional and national levels will enhance our understanding and management of flying-fox camps.

31.2.10 Appropriate land-use planning

Land-use planning instruments may be able to be used to ensure adequate distances are maintained between future residential developments and existing or historical flying-fox camps. While this management option will not assist in the resolution of existing land-use conflict, it may prevent issues for future residents.

31.2.11 Do nothing

The management option to ‘do nothing’ involves not undertaking any management actions in relation to the flying-fox camp and leaving the situation and site in its current state.

31.3 Level 2 actions: in-situ management

31.3.1 Buffers

Buffers can be created through vegetation removal and/or the installation of permanent/semi-permanent deterrents.

Creating buffers may involve planting low-growing or spiky plants between residents or other conflict areas and the flying-fox camp. Such plantings can create a visual buffer between the camp and residences or make areas of the camp inaccessible to humans.

Buffers greater than 300 metres are likely to be required to fully mitigate amenity impacts (SEQ Catchments 2012). The usefulness of a buffer to mitigate odour and noise impacts generally declines if the camp is within 50 metres of human habitation (SEQ Catchments 2012), however any buffer will assist and should be as wide as the site allows.

Buffers through vegetation removal

Vegetation removal aims to alter the area of the buffer habitat sufficiently so that it is no longer suitable as a camp. The amount required to be removed varies between sites and camps, ranging from some weed removal to removal of most of the canopy vegetation.
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Any vegetation removal should be done using a staged approach, with the aim of removing as little native vegetation as possible. This is of particular importance at sites with other values (e.g. ecological or amenity), and in some instances the removal of any native vegetation will not be appropriate. Thorough site assessment (further to desktop searches, see Appendix 4) will inform whether vegetation management is suitable (e.g. can impacts to other wildlife and/or the community be avoided?).

Removing vegetation can also increase visibility into the camp and noise issues for neighbouring residents which may create further conflict.

Suitable experts (Appendix 1) should be consulted to assist selective vegetation trimming/removal to minimise vegetation loss and associated impacts.

The importance of under- and mid-storey vegetation in the buffer area for flying-foxes during heat stress events also requires consideration.

Buffers without vegetation removal

Permanent or semi-permanent deterrents can be used to make buffer areas unattractive to flying-foxes for roosting, without the need for vegetation removal. This is often an attractive option where vegetation has high ecological or amenity value.

While many deterrents have been trialled in the past with limited success, there are some options worthy of further investigation:

- Visual deterrents – Visual deterrents such as plastic bags, fluoro vests (GeolINK 2012) and balloons (Ecosure 2016, pers. comm.) in roost trees have shown to have localised effects, with flying-foxes deterred from roosting within 1–10 metres of the deterrents. The type and placement of visual deterrents would need to be varied regularly to avoid habituation.

- Noise emitters on timers – Noise needs to be random, varied and unexpected to avoid flying-foxes habituating. As such these emitters would need to be portable, on varying timers and a diverse array of noises would be required. It is likely to require some level of additional disturbance to maintain its effectiveness, and ways to avoid disturbing flying-foxes from desirable areas would need to be identified. This is also likely to be disruptive to nearby residents.

- Smell deterrents – For example, bagged python excrement hung in trees has previously had a localised effect (GeolINK 2012). The smell of certain deterrents may also impact nearby residents, and there is potential for flying-foxes to habituate.

- Canopy-mounted water sprinklers – This method has been effective in deterring flying-foxes during dispersals (Ecosure personal experience), and a current trial in Queensland is showing promise for keeping flying-foxes out of designated buffer zones. This option can be logistically difficult (installation and water sourcing) and may be cost-prohibitive. Design and use of sprinklers need to be considerate of animal welfare and features of the site. For example, misting may increase humidity and exacerbate heat stress events, and overuse may impact other environmental values of the site.

Note that any deterrent with a high risk of causing inadvertent dispersal may be considered a Level 3 action.

The use of visual deterrents, in the absence of effective maintenance, could potentially lead to an increase in rubbish in the natural environment.
31.3.2 Noise attenuation fencing

Noise attenuation fencing could be installed in areas where the camp is particularly close to residents. This may also assist with odour reduction, and perspex fencing could be investigated to assist fence amenity. This option could negate the need for habitat modification, maintaining the ecological values of the site, and may be more cost-effective than ongoing management. However, heritage and cost considerations may make this option unfeasible.

31.4 Level 3 actions: disturbance or dispersal

Level 3 actions will only take place if and when specific triggering events occur. An example of a triggering event could be the Camp expanding to occupy the Villa Maria property. Other triggering events will be defined based on further community consultation.

31.4.1 Nudging

Noise and other low intensity active disturbance restricted to certain areas of the camp can be used to encourage flying-foxes away from high conflict areas. This technique aims to actively ‘nudge’ flying-foxes from one area to another, while allowing them to remain at the camp site.

Unless the area of the camp is very large, nudging should not be done early in the morning as this may lead to inadvertent dispersal of flying-foxes from the entire camp site. Disturbance during the day should be limited in frequency and duration (e.g., up to four times per day for up to 10 minutes each) to avoid welfare impacts. As with dispersal, it is also critical to avoid periods when dependent young are present (as identified by a flying-fox expert).

31.4.2 Dispersal

Dispersal aims to encourage a camp to move to another location, through either disturbance or habitat modification.

There is a range of potential risks, costs and legal implications that are greatly increased with dispersal (compared with in-situ management as above). See Appendix 6 for more details. These include:

- impact on animal welfare and flying-fox conservation
- splintering the camp into other locations that are equally or more problematic
- shifting the issue to another area
- impact on habitat value
- effects on the flying-fox population, including disease status and associated public health risk
- impacts to nearby residents associated with ongoing dispersal attempts
- excessive initial and/or ongoing capacity and financial investment
- negative public perception and backlash
- unsuccessful management requiring multiple attempts, which may exacerbate all of the above.

Despite these risks, there are some situations where camp dispersal may be considered. Dispersal can broadly be categorised as ‘passive’ or ‘active’ as detailed below.

Passive dispersal

Removing vegetation in a staged manner can be used to passively disperse a camp, by gradually making the habitat unattractive so that flying-foxes will disperse of their own accord over time with little stress (rather than being more forcefully moved with noise, smoke, etc.). This is less stressful to
Flying-fox Camp Management Plan Tarban Creek

Flying-foxes, and greatly reduces the risk of splinter colonies forming in other locations (as flying-foxes are more likely to move to other known sites within their camp network when not being forced to move immediately, as in active dispersal).

Generally, a significant proportion of vegetation needs to be removed in order to achieve dispersal of flying-foxes from a camp or to prevent camp re-establishment. For example, flying-foxes abandoned a camp in Bundall, Queensland once 70% of the canopy/mid-storey and 90% of the understorey had been removed (Ecosure 2011). Ongoing maintenance of the site is required to prevent vegetation structure returning to levels favourable for colonisation by flying-foxes. Importantly, at nationally important camps (defined in Section 4.2.1) sufficient vegetation must be retained to accommodate the maximum number of flying-foxes recorded at the site.

This option may be preferable in situations where the vegetation is of relatively low ecological and amenity value, and alternative known permanent camps are located nearby with capacity to absorb the additional flying-foxes. While the likelihood of splinter colonies forming is lower than with active dispersal, if they do form following vegetation modification there will no longer be an option to encourage flying-foxes back to the original site. This must be carefully considered before modifying habitat.

There is also potential to make a camp site unattractive by removing access to water sources. However at the time of writing this method had not been trialled so the likelihood of this causing a camp to be abandoned is unknown. It would also likely only be effective where there are no alternative water sources in the vicinity of the camp.

Active dispersal through disturbance

Dispersal is more effective when a wide range of tools are used on a randomised schedule with animals less likely to habituate (Ecosure pers. obs. 1997–2015). Each dispersal team member should have at least one visual and one aural tool that can be used at different locations on different days (and preferably swapped regularly for alternate tools). Exact location of these and positioning of personnel will need to be determined on a daily basis in response to flying-fox movement and behaviour, as well as prevailing weather conditions (e.g. wind direction for smoke drums).

Active dispersal will be disruptive for nearby residents given the timing and nature of activities, and this needs to be considered during planning and community consultation. This method does not explicitly use habitat modification as a means to disperse the camp, however if dispersal is successful, some level of habitat modification should be considered. This will reduce the likelihood of flying-foxes attempting to re-establish the camp and the need for follow-up dispersal as a result. Ecological and aesthetic values will need to be considered for the site, with options for modifying habitat the same as those detailed for buffers above.

Early dispersal before a camp is established at a new location

This management option involves monitoring local vegetation for signs of flying-foxes roosting in the daylight hours and then undertaking active or passive dispersal options to discourage the animals from establishing a new camp. Even though there may only be a few animals initially using the site, this option is still treated as a dispersal activity, however it may be simpler to achieve dispersal at these new sites than it would in an established camp. It may also avoid considerable issues and management effort required should the camp be allowed to establish in an inappropriate location.

It is important that flying-foxes feeding overnight in vegetation are not mistaken for animals establishing a camp.
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Maintenance dispersal

Maintenance dispersal refers to active disturbance following a successful dispersal to prevent the camp from re-establishing. It differs from initial dispersal by aiming to discourage occasional over-flying individuals from returning, rather than attempting to actively disperse animals that have been recently roosting at the site. As such, maintenance dispersal may have fewer timing restrictions than initial dispersal, provided that appropriate mitigation measures are in place (see Section 10).

31.5 Unlawful activities

31.5.1 Culling

Culling is addressed here as it is often raised by community members as a preferred management method; however, culling is contrary to the objects of the BC Act and will not be permitted as a method to manage flying-fox camps.

Dispersal results summary

Roberts and Eby (2013) summarised 17 known flying-fox dispersals between 1990 and 2013, and made the following conclusions:

1. In all cases, dispersed animals did not abandon the local area.
2. In 16 of the 17 cases, dispersals did not reduce the number of flying-foxes in the local area.
3. Dispersed animals did not move far (in approx. 63% of cases the animals only moved <600 m from the original site, contingent on the distribution of available vegetation). In 85% of cases, new camps were established nearby.
4. In all cases, it was not possible to predict where replacement camps would form.
5. Conflict was often not resolved. In 71% of cases conflict was still being reported either at the original site or within the local area years after the initial dispersal actions.
6. Repeat dispersal actions were generally required (all cases except where extensive vegetation removal occurred).
7. The financial costs of all dispersal attempts were high, ranging from tens of thousands of dollars for vegetation removal to hundreds of thousands for active dispersals (e.g. using noise, smoke, etc.).

Ecoseure, in collaboration with a Griffith University Industry Affiliates Program student, researched outcomes of management in Queensland between November 2013 and November 2014 (the first year since the current Queensland state flying-fox management framework was adopted on 29 November 2013). An overview of findings is summarised below.

• There were attempts to disperse 25 separate roosts in Queensland (compared with nine roosts between 1990 and June 2013 analysed in Roberts and Eby (2013)). Compared with the historical average (less than 0.4 roosts/year) the number of roosts dispersed in the year since the Code was introduced has increased by 625%.

---

6 Local area is defined as the area within a 20 km radius of the original site = typical feeding area of a flying-fox.

7 This was based on responses to questionnaires sent to councils; some did not respond and some omitted responses to some questions.
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- Dispersal methods included fog, birdfright, lights, noise, physical deterrents, smoke, extensive vegetation modification, water (including cannons), paintball guns and helicopters.
- The most common dispersal methods were extensive vegetation modification alone and extensive vegetation modification combined with other methods.
- In nine of the 24 roosts dispersed, dispersal actions did not reduce the number of flying-foxes in the LGA.
- In all cases it was not possible to predict where new roosts would form.
- When flying-foxes were dispersed, they did not move further than 6 km away.
- As at November 2014 repeat actions had already been required in 18 cases.
- Conflict for the council and community was resolved in 60% of cases, but with many councils stating that they feel this resolution is only temporary.
- The financial costs of all dispersal attempts, regardless of methods used were considerable, ranging from $7500 to more than $400,000 (with costs ongoing).

\(^{a}\) Fog refers to artificial smoke or vapours generated by smoke/fog machines. Many chemical substances used to generate smoke/fog in these machines are considered toxic.
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Appendix 6: Example flying-fox rescue protocol

Reference documents:

Purpose
These work instructions are intended for Australian bat lyssavirus (ABLV)-vaccinated fauna spotter catchers (FSCs) or wildlife rescue personnel on site during dispersal activities to monitor, capture or provide first aid treatment for sick or injured flying-foxes that may require human intervention for their survival. Flying-fox rescue must only be attempted by personnel trained and experienced in flying-fox rescue and handling.

This work instruction provides rescuers with information regarding capture and first aid until a flying-fox is in the specialist care of a veterinarian or person qualified in wildlife rehabilitation.

Requirements
FSC and wildlife rescue personnel involved in flying-fox rescue must:
- be trained and experienced in rescue and handling
- be vaccinated against ABLV (titre levels checked at least once every two years)
- be aware of the hazards and risks of coming into contact with all bats
- utilise appropriate PPE and equipment for capture, transport and treatment of flying-foxes
- undertake a risk assessment before carrying out a rescue – do not endanger yourself or others during a rescue
- have the contact details for a local veterinarian or bat carer who will accept the sick or injured flying-fox.

Human first aid
All bats in Australia should be viewed as potentially infected with ABLV. If bitten or scratched by a bat, immediately wash the wound with soap and water (do not scrub) and continue for at least five minutes, followed by application of an antiseptic with anti-viral action (e.g. Betadine), and immediate medical attention (post-exposure vaccinations may be required). Similarly medical attention should be immediately sought if exposed to an animal’s saliva or excreta through the eyes, nose or mouth.

Equipment
- lidded plastic carry basket or ‘pet-pack’ with bedding (juveniles) / transport container with hanging perch, tall enough for bat to hang without hitting its head (in accordance with Section 5.1 of the NSW Code of Practice for Injured, Sick and Orphaned Flying-foxes (OEH 2012))
- warm water bottle / cold brick
- wraps /towels
- teats for small bottle
- extension pole or broom
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- bat first aid kit – juice drink/glucose powder, syringes, cloths for wounds, Betadine/saline, dummy for baby bats. FFs only to be offered liquids under advice from a licensed wildlife carer.

Work instructions

Case assessment

Observe, assess and then determine if/what intervention is required using the decision tree in the NSW Code of Practice for Injured, Sick and Orphaned Protected Fauna (OEH 2013), included below.

Personnel should approach stressed flying foxes cautiously. If flying foxes panic or fly this will waste energy; retreat and continue to monitor behaviour.

8. Dehydration: eyes dull or depressed in skull, change to skin elasticity, skin stays pinched, animal cold, wing membranes dry, mouth dry.

9. Heat stress: wing fanning, shade seeking, clustering/clumping, salivating, panting, roosting at the base of trees, on the ground, falling from tree.


Rescue instructions

As per Section 4 of the NSW Code of Practice for Injured, Sick and Orphaned Flying-foxes (OEH 2012): Ecological Consultants Australia ecologicalas@outlook.com 0488 481 929
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i. The objective is to rescue a flying-fox while minimising further stress and injury to the animal.

ii. Before a rescue attempt, rescuers must assess the risks to the flying-fox from environmental hazards and from capture.

iii. Rescuers must employ the correct rescue equipment for the condition and location of the flying-fox, and be trained in its use.

Example scenarios

11. Bat low in tree:
   ○ quickly place towel around bat before it can move away
   ○ grab hold of feet, toes may curl over rescuers fingers
   ○ place in carry basket / transport container.

12. Bat high in tree:
   ○ place pole wrapped in towel in front of bat
   ○ coax bat onto towel
   ○ once on towel, quickly move away from branches and lower to ground
   ○ once on ground, cover with towel and place into carry basket / transport container.

13. A bat caught on barbed wire fence:
   ○ two people only – one to restrain with towel, while the other untangles
   ○ put towels on the wire strands under or around to avoid further entanglement
   ○ if the membrane has dried onto wire, syringe or spray water onto wing
   ○ use piers or wire cutter if necessary.

Animal first aid

Physical assessment: Keep animal wrapped and head covered, only expose one part at a time.
Examine head. Unwrap one wing and extend. Wrap and extend other wing. Check legs. Examine front and back of body.

Dehydration: Offer water/juice (low acid juice only, e.g. apple/mango) orally with syringe (under supervision/advice from licensed wildlife carer ONLY).

Heat stress: Reduce temperature in heat exhausted bats by spraying wings with tepid water.

Hypothermia: May be seen in pups separated from mother – keep head covered and warm core body temperature slowly by placing near (not on) warm water bottle covered by towel.

Bleeding: Clean wounds with room temperature saline or diluted Betadine.

Transport to veterinarian / wildlife carer

See Section 5 of the NSW Code of Practice for Injured, Sick and Orphaned Flying-foxes (OEH 2012) summarised below.

Objective

To transport a flying-fox so as to minimise further stress and injury to the animal.

Standards

a. The transport container must be tall enough for the flying-fox to hang by its feet without hitting its head on the floor.
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b. The container must be designed, set up and secured to prevent injuries to the flying-fox. The sides of the container must prevent the flying-fox from poking its head or wings out.

c. The container must be designed to prevent the flying-fox from escaping.

d. The flying-fox must be allowed to hang by its feet from the top of the container or if it is unable to hang, wrapped in material (e.g. sheet or flannel) and placed in a sling so its feet are higher than its head.

e. The container must be kept at a temperature which is appropriate for the age and condition of the flying-fox. A range of 25–27°C is appropriate for an adult. A temperature of 28°C is appropriate for an orphan. A cool or warm water bottle may be required.

f. The container must be ventilated so air can circulate around the flying-fox.

g. The container must minimise light, noise and vibrations and prevent contact with young children and pets.

h. During transport, a container holding a flying-fox must have a clearly visible warning label that says ‘Warning – live bat’.

i. A flying-fox must not be transported in the back of an uncovered utility vehicle or a car boot that is separate from the main cabin.

Guidelines

- Flying-fox transport should be the sole purpose of the trip and undertaken in the shortest possible time.
- The fauna rehabilitation group’s contact details should be written on the transport container in case of an emergency.
Dear Ms. Miscamble

Re: Public exhibition of draft Tarban Creek Flying-fox Camp Management Plan

I refer to the draft Tarban Creek Flying-fox Camp Management Plan (FFCMP), currently on public exhibition, I appreciate the opportunity to provide comment on this plan. Please note that as of 1 July 2019, the responsibilities and functions of the previous Office of Environment and Heritage were transferred to the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment's Environment, Energy and Science (DPIE EES) Group.

The draft plan has been reviewed against the relevant DPIE EES policies (e.g. Flying-fox Camp Management Policy, Flying-fox Camp Management Code of Practice and Flying-fox Camp Management Plan template) and DPIE EES considers that the plan is generally in keeping with the policy, code and plan template. Specific comments on the plan are attached (Attachment 1).

DPIE EES notes that Table B.1 of the FFCMP lists a number of recommended actions to be carried out at the camp, and that the classification level of these actions corresponds to those in DPIE’s Flying-fox Camp Management Policy. DPIE EES notes that generally, the plan recommends implementation of Level 1 actions, investigation of Level 2 and some Level 3 actions (such as buffers and nudging) and recommends that active dispersal is not pursued. DPIE EES supports these recommendations as being appropriate for this camp. While DPIE EES acknowledges that there is always a need to balance the conservation of flying-foxes and their impacts on human settlements, it also considers that the protection of camps in situ, including in residential areas, is crucial for the conservation of this threatened species.

DPIE EES notes that the results of the community consultation demonstrate that a relatively small group of people are impacted by flying-foxes. Therefore, DPIE EES supports the recommendation of the report that given the scale of the issue, it may be feasible to work closely with affected households to reduce impacts on them.

Council may wish to resubmit the final adopted plan to DPIE EES for endorsement. Once endorsed, Council will be able to undertake actions in accordance with the FFCMP without the need for licensing from DPIE EES.
Hunters Hill Council is to be commended for its proactive approach to management of flying-foxes at this site. If you have any questions about this, please contact me on 9985 6848 or via sarah.burke@environment.nsw.gov.au

Yours sincerely

Sarah Burke 22/7/19

Sarah Burke
A/Senior Team Leader, Compliance & Regulation, Greater Sydney Climate Change and Sustainability
ATTACHMENT 1: DETAILED COMMENTS ON DRAFT TARBAN CREEK FFMP:

- Figure 2.3 should map all vegetation that is visible on the figure i.e. it should include vegetation to the east of the camp that is Council land and Church land.

- Table 3.1: park users should be a separate line, as they may not be residents or landholders. It may also be appropriate to include the church separately as their land is close to the camp.

- Section 4.1.2: remove paragraph that refers to section 94 of the Threatened Species Conservation Act 1995 as this act has been repealed, and replace with wording about the Code of Practice. The Flying-fox Camp Management Code of Practice 2018 is made under clause 2.9 of the Biodiversity Conservation Regulation 2017, to authorise camp management actions in flying-fox camps in NSW, to provide convenience for carrying out of giving effect to this Act.

- Remove section 4.1.3 that discusses the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974 as this act is not relevant to this plan.

- The labelling of the vegetation communities in Figure 5.1 is incorrect. The light green should be PCT 1281 and the dark green should be PCT 1778.

- Suggest that Figure 5.1 includes the common names for plant communities, i.e. PCT 1778 is Coastal Sandstone Forests, PCT 1281 is Sydney Turpentine Ironbark Forest, PCT 620 is Estuarine Mangrove Forest.

- Section 5 should include discussion that plant community type 1281 (Sydney Turpentine Ironbark Forest) is listed as a critically endangered ecological community and is very close to the camp.

- Page 15 - amend typo. A total of 20 complaints from 12 complaints.

- Suggest removing figure 6.1 given that Little Red Flying-fox are not known from the camp, and replace with a similar life cycle wheel or diagram e.g. Figure 4 from the CMP template.

- In Table 8.1, when discussing how to create ‘buffers through vegetation removal/mgt’, amend wording to be in line with the GHFF Code of Practice i.e. “this will involve trimming or removal of whole canopy trees at the camp boundary to create a buffer between the flying-fox camp and areas of human settlement, to a maximum distance of 30 metres from any occupied building, to prevent flying-foxes roosting within that buffer”

- Note that the Code of Practice states that camp management actions are not authorised for the clearing or trimming of vegetation that results in damage to a threatened ecological community. Therefore, if any clearing or trimming of vegetation is proposed in plant community type 1281, the landholder or Council will need to apply for a licence for this activity.

- In Table 8.1, some actions (2.3, 14.15) have a description of the action in the ‘advantages’ column, this wording would be more appropriate in the ‘management option’ column.

- Section 2.2: health/wellbeing should include a definition, so it is clear what this term means. As per the CMP template, amend wording in section 2.3 to read “health and/or wellbeing impacts (e.g. associated with lack of sleep, anxiety)”.

- The heading for Table 8.1 states that definitions and descriptions of each management option are provided in Section 8, which is incorrect, suggest this should say Appendix 5.

- Take out word “example” in Table 9.1 and Figure 9.1.

- In Table 9.1, include education and awareness as a Level 1 action to address the noise issue.

- In Table 9.1, include what the triggers would be, such that nudging would be considered necessary, to address sound and health/wellbeing impacts. This trigger could be similar to triggers for other issues, or the plan could stipulate a minimum number of people or properties deemed to be severely affected.
Table 9.1 suggests that, to address property devaluation and rental return, dispersal will be undertaken as a first step if the trigger is reached of flying-foxes within 20 m at a density of >4m² over 100 m². This would not be supported by OEH. It is recommended that this wording is amended to ‘dispersal’ will be considered if this issue is unable to be mitigated in any other way’ (to be in accordance with the CMP template).

In Section 10.2, suggest first sentence is amended to provide context i.e. Flying-fox habitat to be affected by the proposed management actions outlined in Table 9.1 is not known and will only be known ...

Also, section 10.2, it is suggested that the paragraph on Biobanking plots is rewritten as: ‘The level of impact on habitat, as a result of actions, should be measured in a systematic way. Standard bush regeneration condition classes should suffice for this purpose. Other methods, such as Biodiversity Assessment Method plots are not suitable at Tarban Creek due to the small size and level of disturbance.’

Section 10.3.8 is relevant to nationally important camps. It is not clear why this section has been included, given in section 2.1.1, the plan states that the camp is not a nationally important camp.

Wording in section 11 needs to be edited for the new legislation. Suggested wording: For developments likely to affect other threatened species or ecological communities (identified in section 5), a Biodiversity Development Assessment Report may be required as outlined in section 6.12 of the Biodiversity Conservation Act 2016.

Remove template wording under section 13 heading.

Reward title of Appendix 3b to ‘Appendix 3b. Biodiversity Conservation Licence’ as section 91 licences no longer exist. This appendix is designed to attach the completed Biodiversity Conservation licence, where the plan is being submitted to OEH for approval, so the following wording is suggested at this stage: “Once the plan has been finalised, a completed Biodiversity Conservation Licence will be attached for all actions requiring licensing.”

Table 9.1 does not include all threatened species and ecological communities which have been recorded within 10 km of the site. The table should be amended to include the following additional species/threatened ecological communities which have recent (>1990) BioNet records within 10 km of the site:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FAUNA:</th>
<th>FLORA:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green and Golden Bell Frog (Litoria aurea)</td>
<td>Wilsania backhousei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loggerhead Turtle (Caretta caretta)</td>
<td>Zanichella palustris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leatherback Turtle (Dermochelys coriacea)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosenberg’s Goanna (Varanus rosenbergi)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superb Fruit-dove (Ptilinopus superbus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spotted Harrier (Circus assimilis)</td>
<td>Swamp Oak Floodplain Forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Square-tailed Kite (Lophoictinia isura)</td>
<td>Sydney Turpentine Ironbark Forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gang-gang Cockatoo (Calyptorhynchus funereus)</td>
<td>Swamp Sclerophyll Forest on Coastal Floodplains</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian Painted Snipe (Rostratula australis)</td>
<td>Castlecrag/Cooks River Ironbark Forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turquoise Parrot (Neophema pulchra)</td>
<td>Blue Gum High Forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White-fronted Chats (Euphagus aguia)</td>
<td>Swamp Oak Floodplain Forest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yellow-billed Stealthy-bat (Saccopteryx flaveolenta)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Freetail-bat (Mormopterus nolfkensis)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern False Pipistrelle (Falostethus tasmaniensis)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Broad-nosed Bat (Scotinomys rueppellii)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Myotis (Myotis macropus)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

END OF SUBMISSION
### Attachment 3: Summary of submissions on draft Tarban Creek Flying-fox CMP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Id</th>
<th>Summary of comments</th>
<th>Major issue</th>
<th>Response/proposed change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Well written, comprehensive, and recommendation well thought out. Looking forward to the Plan being implemented.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Supports benefits to flying-foxes, environment and residents. Does not support major vegetation modification or nudging. Also supports subsidies, camp management, planting screens, research and education.</td>
<td>Does not support major vegetation modification or nudging.</td>
<td>Table 8.1 analysis of management options notes (level 2 action) buffers through vegetation removal that &quot;tree limb or tree removal can be considered and additional roosting habitat created elsewhere in the camp so there is not net loss of roosting areas.&quot; Also (level 3 action) nudging is triggered &quot;when FF are within 20 m of residential dwellings (or roosting within 5m of Richmond Crescent) for 2 seasons consecutively and where FF have a density of over 1 FF/m²&quot;. No change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Concerned about flying-fox increasing numbers; smell overpowering she no longer uses the reserve. Concerned about potential loss of trees.</td>
<td>Smell, loss of trees</td>
<td>Table 8.1 analysis of management options notes smell and loss of trees can be mitigated by: level 1 actions such as education and awareness programs, odour masking plants, creating alternative habitat and provision of artificial habitat; level 2 actions such as buffers without vegetation removal; and level 3 actions such as nudging. No change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 4.5</td>
<td>Attachment 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 4. Flying-foxes increased, noise unbearable, faeces abundant and human quality of life diminished. He wants in the Plan "a clear commitment to act to prevent the incursion of the flying-foxes into new frontiers across Manning Road" i.e. Council to act promptly to stop them. Doesn't want a community education campaign.  
Flying-foxes increased, noise unbearable, faeces abundant and human quality of life diminished.  
Table 8.1 analysis of management options notes noise, faeces and wellbeing can be mitigated by: level 1 actions such as routine camp management, odour masking plants, creating alternative habitat and provision of artificial habitat; level 2 actions such as buffers through vegetation removal/management, and buffers without vegetation removal; and level 3 actions such as nudging.  
No change |
| 5. Ok with Flying-foxes in Riverglade Reserve but concerned if they were to cross Manning Rd would be a significant concern. Would like to see them "nudged" back into Riverglade Reserve  
Flying-foxes crossing Manning Rd  
The CMP recommends following the outcomes of implementation of level 1 & 2 actions, level 3 action of nudging may be considered to move flying-foxes to Riverglade Reserve should they cross Manning Road.  
No change |
| 6. DPIE EES submission  
DPIE EES amendments to be incorporated into the CMP. |
| 7. Concerned about Councils intent in preparing the CMP and decreasing flying-fox numbers. Tarban Creek good location for flying-foxes. Suggests financial support for residents affected by noise. Concerned political interests will dominate the Council process.  
Concerned about Councils intent in preparing the CMP and decreasing flying-fox numbers.  
Noted. The CMP was prepared by Ecological Consultants Australia Pty Ltd in conjunction with Council staff and local volunteers with expertise in the field.  
No change |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Interest stems involved with Ku-ring-gai Flying fox Reserve in Gordon. Primary measures should be education and awareness programs; bushcare and revegetation to encourage movement away from residential areas; increasing the amount of understorey; revegetation; good water quality in Tarban Creek; noise abatement measures to local residents; and vegetation buffers. Movement of the camp cannot be predicted; location of the camp may change in future due to natural causes; climate change may lead to the camp looking for an alternative area. Removal of roosting trees last resort and nudging has not proven to be effective or predictable. Table 8.1 analysis of management options notes (level 2 action) buffers through vegetation removal that &quot;tree limb or tree removal can be considered and additional roosting habitat created elsewhere in the camp so there is not net loss of roosting areas.&quot; Also (level 3 action) nudging is triggered &quot;when FF are within 20 m of residential dwellings (or roosting within 5m of Richmond Crescent) for 2 seasons consecutively and where FF have a density of over 1 FF/m^2&quot;. <strong>No change</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>CMP comprehensive and pro flying-fox protection but concerned that the intention of Council will be to attempt to move the camp. Current location suitable and noise throughout year not constant. Clearing of native forests is why flying-fox are in urban areas. Grey-headed Flying-fox numbers diminishing. Recommends community education and “double glazing” program for immediate neighbours. That the ongoing well-being of the Grey-headed Flying-fox is considered as the highest priority in Council’s decision regarding future management of the camp. <strong>No change</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: The CMP was prepared by Ecological Consultants Australia Pty Ltd in conjunction with Council staff and local volunteers with expertise in the field.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Appreciates flying-foxes. Notes the CMP points out that attempts to disperse the camp would be expensive, offensive to affected residents, unlikely to be successful in moving the camp far, and may move them to a location that is more offensive to residents. Supports education and awareness programs, advice on property modification without subsidies, property modification subsidies, camp maintenance and revegetation and land management. Attempt to disperse the camp would be expensive, offensive to affected residents, unlikely to be successful in moving the camp far, and may move them to a location that is more offensive to residents. Table 8.1 analysis of management options notes that level 3 action of nudging is triggered &quot;when FF are within 20 m of residential dwellings (or roosting within 5m of Richmond Crescent) for 2 seasons consecutively and where FF have a density of over 1 FF/m². The level 3 action of active dispersal will only be considered &quot;if the FF population reaches 15,000 and stays that way for 2 or more seasons&quot;. No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Pro flying-foxes, current camp site suitable location. Noise not constant throughout year. Recommends double glazing and heavy duty sun shade canopies. In urban areas due to loss of habitat. Draft CMP thoughtful document and presents a very strong case for protection of flying-foxes but concerned about the outcome. Hostility of some residents due to lack of knowledge of flying-fox benefits. Negative public perception about flying-fox diseases being a public concern &amp; flying-foxes declining. Noted. The CMP was prepared by Ecological Consultants Australia Pty Ltd in conjunction with Council staff and local volunteers with expertise in the field. Table 8.1 analysis of management options notes the level 1 action of education and awareness programs. No change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Plan looks well-informed, compassionate to flying-foxes and practical. Learnt a lot reading it. Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>CMP a little intimidating for most residents, especially where English is their second language. 2010-2012 there was a small colony next to The Priory, then moved to Tarban Creek, where flying-foxes increased more than 10 fold. Local residents have already implemented CMP recommendations, yet increasing numbers make it difficult to keep things clean. CMP impractical and disregards LEP and DCP e.g. not encouraged to build carparks, shade sails and trim trees to less than 5 metres. Nor does the report refer to the management of flying-foxes in a residential conservation area or conservation landscape area e.g. 5 nominated class 5 heritage items. Recommends to make a significant attempt to relocate or moderate the camps ability to increase.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased flying-foxes has had detrimental effect on reserve trees, clean water supply and displacement of bird species. Smell, sound and spread of faeces in the reserve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Noted. Table 8.1 analysis of management options notes smell, noise, faeces and loss of trees can be mitigated by: level 1 actions such as routine camp management, odour masking plants, creating alternative habitat and provision of artificial habitat; level 2 actions such as buffers through vegetation removal/management, and buffers without vegetation removal; and level 3 actions such as nudging. <strong>No change</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Flying-foxes should be left alone. Happy to see them and causing no trouble in winter. Suggests if you don’t like them, move.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Impressed with CMP attempt to acknowledge needs of both residents at Tarban Creek &amp; flying-foxes. Flying-foxes under pressure &amp; could be accommodated at Tarban Creek. Suggestions are made in the draft CMP to support residents, sound policy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 4.5</td>
<td>Attachment 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Table 8.1</strong> analysis of management options notes smell and faeces can be mitigated by: level 1 actions such as routine camp management, odour masking plants, creating alternative habitat and provision of artificial habitat; level 2 actions such as buffers through vegetation removal/management, and buffers without vegetation removal; and level 3 actions such as nudging. <strong>No change</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Droppings, smell, black stains over property, water pressure cleaning constantly needed and children can't play in backyards. Vermin, lack of support or action by Council.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flying-foxes increased immensely over last few years. Asks when Council is going to do something about them i.e. move them on or decimate their population.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Possible Grey Headed Flying Fox Roosts in Hunters Hill LGA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Distance from last known roost (m)</th>
<th>Area (ha)</th>
<th>Likelihood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Upper reach Tarban Creek east of Mannings Road. Branch width: high. Branch numbers: high. Over freshwater creek</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Lower reach Tarban Creek west Batemans Road. Branch width: suitable. Branch numbers: low. Over freshwater drain</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>Likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mangroves of upper Lane Cove River. Branch width: thick. Branch numbers: medium. Mangroves</td>
<td>2100</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lower reach Brickmakers Creek. Branch width: large. Branch numbers medium. Over freshwater creek</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>Likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Upper reach Brickmakers Creek. Branch width: medium. Branch numbers: low. Over freshwater creek.</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>Likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Lower reach Tarban Creek. East of Mannings Road. Branch width: large. Branch numbers: medium. Mangroves</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Adjacent to mouth of Brickmakers Creek. Branch size large. Branch width: thick. Branch numbers: medium. Mangroves</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>Unlikely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ITEM NO :  4.6

SUBJECT : LEASING OF ROAD RESERVE ADJACENT TO 13 EUTHELLA AVE, HUNTERS HILL

STRATEGIC OUTCOME : COUNCIL IS FINANCIALLY SUSTAINABLE

ACTION : COUNCIL DEVELOPS COMMERCIAL OPPORTUNITIES THAT GENERATE ALTERNATE SOURCES OF INCOME/REVENUE (E.G. PROPERTY PORTFOLIO)

REPORTING OFFICER : NICK TOBIN

PURPOSE
To consider a five (5) year lease to the owners of 13 Euthella Avenue, Hunter's Hill of land totalling approximately 834 sqm adjacent to 13 Euthella Avenue, Hunters Hill (the Road Reserve) under the NSW Roads Act 1993.

RECOMMENDATION
1. That prior to granting a lease, appropriate notice be provided in accordance with Division 2, Section 154 of the NSW Roads Act 1993 No 33.
2. That provided no submissions are received, proceed with the lease of the Road Reserve.
2. That a lease be prepared for the Road Reserve and issued to the owner of 13 Euthella Avenue, Hunter's Hill.
2. That the Road Reserve lease be for a five (5) year period from the date of its execution for a sum of $20,000 per annum (excluding GST) subject to annual CPI adjustments.
3. That the Lessee meets all legal costs associated with the Road Reserve lease.
4. That the Mayor and General Manager be granted Delegated Authority to execute the documentation as required.

BACKGROUND
The Road Reserve, which is the subject of this report comprises of a rectangular strip of land adjacent to 13 Euthella Avenue, Hunter’s Hill. The land is not accessible to the general public and in general is maintained by the adjacent owner, being 13 Euthella Avenue. The total Road Reserve area is approximately 834 square metres. See attached Valuation Report for details of the Road Reserve at Attachment 1.

Council received a request from the owner of 13 Euthella Avenue, Hunter’s Hill to purchase this Road Reserve, however there are a number of matters that need to be considered before a decision on this request can be made. In the interim leasing the Road Reserve to 13 Euthella Avenue, Hunter’s Hill would be appropriate.

REPORT
A lease agreement has not been in place previously for this particular Road Reserve. Council received a rental valuation of $20,000 per annum (excluding GST) in December 2019. The owner has agreed to this valuation.
Whilst the Road Reserve is an extensive piece of land it should be noted that the area to be leased is landscaped open space, only accessible from 13 Euthella Avenue, Hunter's Hill. As part of the lease, the owners of 13 Euthella Avenue will be required to maintain the area and will not be able to remove any trees or landscaping without Council’s approval. In addition, no structures will be allowed on the Road Reserve.

**FINANCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

Lease fees will provide additional income of $20,000 per annum for Council.

**ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

There is no direct environmental impact on Council arising from Council consideration of this matter.

**SOCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT**

There is no direct social impact on Council arising from Council consideration of this matter.

**RISK ASSESSMENT**

There are no direct or indirect risks impacting on Council arising from consideration of this matter.

**ATTACHMENTS**

1. Land Evaluation
VALUATION
OF LAND
FOR POTENTIAL LEASE

Prepared By:

Ross Sheerin AAPI
Registered Valuer & Property Consultant

9th December 2019
VALUATION SUMMARY

PROPERTY

Land defined part road reservation Euthella avenue Hunters Hill, adjoining Lot 2 Deposited Plan 29392 as defined on annexure A in this report.

DESCRIPTION

The land as shown on annexure A comprises a generally rectangular allotment along the part of south eastern side boundary of 13 Euthella Avenue Hunters Hill

CLIENT

The Municipality of Hunters Hill

INSTRUCTIONS

We have been requested to provide a reviewed assessment of the current rental market value of the property for the purpose of assisting negotiations for a proposed lease. The land is identified as road reservation and comprises a generally rectangular shaped parcel comprising approximately 834 square meters.

DEFINITION OF MARKET VALUE

The estimated amount for which a property should exchange on the date of valuation between a willing buyer and a willing seller in an arms-length transaction after proper marketing wherein the parties had each acted knowledgeably, prudently, and without compulsion.

DATE OF INSPECTION

6th December 2019

VALUATION

We are of the market value of the subject portion of Euthella Avenue Hunters Hill as at 8th December 2019 is

$20,000 (excluding GST)

TWENTY THOUSAND DOLLARS PER ANNUM
INTRODUCTION

We have been instructed by Mr Nick Tobin on behalf of Hunters Hill Council.

It is noted that our advice is required for the purpose of a potential lease and cannot be used for mortgage purposes and in this connection we have made relevant investigations and enquiries enabling us to report as follows:

CRITICAL ASSUMPTIONS

Verifiable assumptions relate to encumbrances, Owners Corporation matters, zoning, encroachments and sewer location. They may be confirmed by reference to a full title search, Sec. 149 Certificate under the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 from the Hunters Hill Council, and a sewerage diagram from Sydney Water.

Assumptions requiring further consultancy relate to environmental issues, structural integrity of the improvements.

Assumptions based on opinion are those detailed under our headings Valuation Approach and General Comments.

LOCATION

The subject land is located upon the Hunters Hill peninsula, being approximately ten (10) kilometres from the Sydney Central Business District.

The subject is a south east facing property with an aspect to Tarban Creek.

Surrounding development comprises single residential dwellings.

Location Map
LAND AND TITLES

The parent land forms an irregular allotment. The drainage appears sufficient. The advised total land area of approximately 832 square metres (as per annexure A provided by Council).

The subject property is within the Joubert street road reservation. Should further searches be forwarded to the valuer by the Client, our valuation may require a review. A full title search is recommended.

The land has no street frontage to Joubert or Euthella Street with an advised area of approximately 834 square meters.

The valuation has been assessed from a site inspection and perusal of the supplied plan attached to this report.

Supplied plan

TOWN PLANNING
Hunters Hill Council advised the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning:</th>
<th>R2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning Scheme:</td>
<td>Hunters Hill Local Environmental Plan 2012.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitted Use:</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above zoning information was accessed from Council records and should be verified by the Client by way of a Certificate issued under Section 149 of the Environmental Planning & Assessment Act, 1979. Should a Certificate indicate zoning information to the contrary, we reserve the right to amend our assessment.

SITE CONTAMINATION

While the subject property appears suitable for the existing use, no soil tests or environmental studies have been made available to us. There are no signs of contamination and it is therefore presumed that there are no surface or sub-surface soil problems, toxic or hazardous wastes or building material hazards in or on the property that would adversely affect its existing or potential use or reduce its marketability — although we cannot and do not warrant that this site is contamination free.

APPROVALS

This assessment presumes that all relevant Authority approvals required are in place in respect of this property.

INSPECTION LIMITATION

We have carried out an inspection of the exposed and readily accessible areas of the improvements. However, the valuer is not a building construction or structural expert and is therefore unable to certify the structural soundness or compliance of the improvements. Readers of this report should make their own enquiries.
### SALES EVIDENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Sale Price</th>
<th>Strata Unit</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 Reiley Rd</td>
<td>06/2019</td>
<td>$2,450,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>An original five bedroom two bathroom dwelling located on Hunters Hill peninsula. Total land area 902 square metres. North facing with pontoon. Some noise affected from Fig tree bridge. Land component assessed at $5197 per square meter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Esthella Ave</td>
<td>03/2019</td>
<td>$3,470,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>A brick veneer 1970s dwelling comprising three bedrooms, two bathrooms, double garage. High set on safer or waterfront location. Total land area 657.7 Square metres. Land component assessed at $4561 per square meter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC Woolwich Rd</td>
<td>09/2019</td>
<td>$6,350,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>Contemporary dwelling Comprises five bedrooms, 5 bathrooms, five car garage. Building area approx. 720 square meters total land area 1188 square meters. Land component assessed at $4160 per square meter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Lloyd Ave</td>
<td>09/2019</td>
<td>$5,860,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>An 196602 “Sydney School” designed 4 bedroom dwelling located on north facing waterfront allotment. Total land area 866.5 square meters. Land component assessed at $5990 per square meter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Esthella Ave</td>
<td>12/2019</td>
<td>$2,800,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>A tri level dwelling house with pool. Good views. Land area 413 square meters. Land assess at $3200 m2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Bonarfin Rd</td>
<td>12/2018</td>
<td>$4,900,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>A architect designed and built two level dwelling house with pool. Good river views. Land area 1114 square meters. Land assess at $2800 m2.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above sales reflect the following rate range for land $2800 /m2 - $5197/ per square meter
VALUATION APPROACH

The highest and best use of the subject is considered to be for residential development as part of a single land holding. Accordingly I have analysed the sales of R2 zoned properties in the area.

For the purpose of the report the direct comparison approached based on a assessed land rate per square metre has been used. The land on its own has no development potential and is limited in use due to the location of the easement though the parcel.

We have previously analysed the lease of waterfront land leased by Transport NSW through Roads and Maritime Services. Rates for domestic leases are calculated on a rate per square metre of occupation. These wetland rates are subject to review annually to reflect the latest statutory land values. The Service has rental rates for the different precinct around Sydney. The subject lies within Precinct 4, Sydney Harbour Northwest. Each precinct has allocated a "wetland rate" of $23.67 per square meter. Since these areas are below mean high water mark we consider the rate is inferior to what would be expected of a elevated land parcel with views and road access. We would consider a rate of $23.67 per square meter appropriate for the subject land.

As a check a potential yield of 3% capitalization indicates a value of $750,600 which falls within our range of value.

Based on our analysis of comparable sales land component and given the location of the site we have adopted a rate of $3000 per square meter and applied a discount of 70% due to the limited users of the land and the limited use with easements.

Our calculations are as follows:

**Rental by capitalisation rate**

1. 834 square meters @ $3000 psm. $2,502,000

Discounted by 70% for the purpose of limited use, limited parties $1,751,400

Assessed value $750,600

Rental Capitalisation rate 3 % $22,518

Less provision for maintenance $3,000

Balance $19,518 PA

**Calculation by Roads and Maritime Services wetland rate**

Land Area 834 m2 @ $23.67 m2 (wetland rate) $19,740 PA
GENERAL COMMENTS

The subject land comprises a rectangular parcel with a frontage to Tarban creek of 21.9 metres and a rear northern boundary of 22.7 metres. Side boundaries are 39.9 and 42.52 metres respectively, as shown in the annexed plan. As requested we have valued the land in for the purposes of assisting negotiations for a proposed lease.

The subject land has no direct street access and abuts an section of un made road at the north (Joubert Street) We therefore consider the only practical users of the site are the owners of 13 Euthelia Ave Hunters Hill or potentially the properties at 10 Euthelia Ave and 2 Joubert Street provided a right of way can be obtained for access.

The parcel has a cliff section at the Joubert street (northern boundary) that could be accessed from Joubert Street by stair or mechanical access.

Our rental value by adoption of Roads and Maritime Services Wetland Rate is $19,740 per annum while we have utilised a capitalisation of the assessed value of the land as a check method for the subject property, at $19,578 per annum

We have analysed the sale of land in the area and made allowance for the limited use and purchasers of the site. There may be argument that the subject land may also be of significant public benefit providing vision of a natural rocky outcrop along the street, green space and access to Tarban Creek foreshore to the public. These type of outcrops are a significant feature throughout the Municipality and have often been the subject of conditions of retention in developments in the area.

Hunters Hill Council consolidated Development Control Plan 2013 mentions the significance of rocky outcrops

"Successive planning policies which have been adopted by Hunter’s Hill Council over the past thirty years confirm that the existing character and identity of this Municipality may be explained according to four broad themes.

(i) Natural or scenic qualities which include:

(ii) Major waterways and tributaries, together with shorelines that are identified by the Hunters Hill LEP 2012 as riparian lands.

(iii) Bushland reserves, slopes and foreshores which provide scenically prominent backdrops to waterways, shorelines and nearby residential habitats, and which are defined as forested areas or foreshores areas by the Hunters Hill LEP 2012.

(iv) An extensive tree canopy for river front areas in particular, which ensures that building forms or structures do not visually dominate scenically prominent backdrops to waterways.

(v) Rock outcrops and rock platforms are features of some foreshore areas and riparian lands, and of some properties in river front areas.

(vi) Scenic views and vistas which are available towards waterways, shorelines or bushland reserves from many public places and residential properties, and which include glimpses beneath the tree canopy as well as shared views across residential properties (either between or above existing buildings)."
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The addition of this parcel to allotment at 13 Euthella Avenue provides both a potential increase in the passive and active areas for the site by substantially increasing the total usable land area of that site.

Should a surveyors report indicate any substantial variations in these areas then this report may require review, although, this seems unnecessary at this point.

We have considered a capitalisation as a check method on the rental for the land parcel. In so far as a fair rental for the parcel we believe that a higher capitalisation rate would be appropriate in the circumstances. Given there is limited practical users of the subject land, being the public, or neighbours on either side of the subject, we believe the risk factor warrants a rate of return of three percent (3.%) per annum based on our assessment of the land value.

Our interpretation and assessment of the subject land may well be used to negotiate between the parties in reaching a fiscal agreement between the parties on the disposal of the said parcel or rental.
DISCLAIMERS & QUALIFICATIONS
This valuation is free exclusive of GST and is made on the following assumptions:

(i) That the property is not subject to any undisclosed encumbrances or restrictions that would affect the valuation in any way.
   A) That any works or structures are wholly within the subject land.
   B) That there are no encroachments upon the subject land.

The valuation is made subject to the following limiting conditions:

That the ownership, legal description, zoning, dimensions and area have been ascertained by due enquiry but have not been the subject of a title search. This valuation is for the use only of the party to whom it is addressed and for no other purposes. This valuation can only be relied upon for valuation purposes only and by the direct client. Possession of this report or a copy thereof does not carry with it the right to publication, nor may it be used for any purposes by anyone but the applicant without the written consent of the Valuer.

The value stated in this report is only valid for a period of three months from the report date. This valuation is current as at the date of valuation only. The value assessed herein may change significantly unexpectedly over a relatively short period (including as a result of general market movements or factors specific to the particular property). We do not accept liability for losses arising from such subsequent changes in value. Without limiting the generality of the above comment, we do not assume any responsibility or accept any liability where this valuation is relied upon after the expiration of 3 months from the date of the valuation, or such earlier date if you become aware of any factors that have any effect on the valuation. No responsibility is accepted to any third party who may use or rely on the whole or any part of the content of this valuation.

DEFINITION OF MARKET VALUE
Market Value is defined as the estimated amount for which an asset should exchange on the date of valuation, between a willing buyer and a willing seller in an 'arms length' transaction after proper marketing, wherein the parties had each acted knowledgeably, prudently and without compulsion.

BUILDING & CONSTRUCTION
This Valuation inspection and Report does not constitute a structural survey and is not intended as such. We have carried out an inspection only of the exposed and readily accessible areas of the improvements. Note, the Valuer is not a building construction or structural expert and is therefore unable to certify the structural soundness of the improvements. Readers of this report should make their own enquiries. This Valuation has been based on the condition of the structural improvements and the property in general as at the inspection date, and if the property has to be sold in circumstances where its condition has deteriorated and/or essential fixtures/fittings removed there is likely to be a significant write down in the asset value when compared to the current assessment. Under these circumstances the Valuer will not be responsible for any reduction in value.

LAND DIMENSIONS/AREA
Unless stated as otherwise in this report we advise that we have not searched or been provided with a copy of the current Title or Registered Plans and that any dimensions or land areas quoted in this report have been obtained from third party information sources and whilst every endeavour has been made to verify such information we accept no responsibility for inaccuracy of any information provided and relied upon.

ENVIRONMENTAL
The client acknowledges and recognizes that the Valuer is not expert in identifying environmental hazards and compliance requirements affecting properties. The Valuer has endeavoured to identify all matters of environmental concern and the effect they might have on the value of the property.

However, the Valuer will not be held liable nor responsible for his/her failure to identify all such matters of environmental concern and the impact which any environmental related issue has on the property and its value including loss arising from site contamination; or the non-compliance with environmental laws; or costs associated with the clean up of the property to which an environmental hazard has been recognized, including action by the Environmental Protection Agency to recover clean up costs pursuant to the relevant Environmental Protection Act.
MARKET MOVEMENT & REPORT EXPIRY
This valuation is current as at the date of valuation only. The value assessed herein may change significantly and unexpectedly over a relatively short period (including as a result of general market movements or factors specific to the particular property). We do not accept liability for losses arising from such subsequent changes in value.

CERTIFICATE OF TITLE
Unless stated as otherwise in this report we advise that a copy of the current Certificate of Title has not been provided or searched. This valuation assumes clear title. Should any encumbrances, easements, leases or other restrictions not mentioned in this report be known or discovered then the valuation should be referred to the valuer for comment.

Valuer: R. SHEERIN, AAPI
API No. 69687

Signature
Photographic report

View of subject parcel of land from northern boundary

Subject site
RMS WETLANDS PRECENCTS

INSTRUCTION

We are currently seeking additional advice from Crown Lands as to whether a sale of the area being used by your client is possible.

In the interim Council is willing to consider leasing the portion of the area being utilised. In order for this to be considered council requires a survey of the proposed area.

Following receipt of the survey a report will be presented to council detailing options to lease or sell the portion of the site.

Please let your client know and ask for a survey of the utilised are ASAP.

Regards
Nick Tobin
Networked Urban Solutions Pty Ltd
ITEM NO : 4.7
SUBJECT : SALE OF PORTION OF UNMADE ROAD ADJACENT TO 45 THE POINT ROAD WOOLWICH
STRATEGIC OUTCOME : COUNCIL IS FINANCIALLY SUSTAINABLE
ACTION : COUNCIL DEVELOPS COMMERCIAL OPPORTUNITIES THAT GENERATE ALTERNATE SOURCES OF INCOME/REVENUE (E.G. PROPERTY PORTFOLIO)
REPORTING OFFICER : NICK TOBIN

PURPOSE
To consider the closure and subsequent sale of land adjacent to 45 The Point Road, Woolwich (the Road Reserve) to the owners of 45 The Point Road, Woolwich.

RECOMMENDATION
1. That Council resolve to make application to close the Road Reserve portion of road adjacent to 45 The Point Road, Woolwich under the NSW Roads Act 1993 and provide the necessary.
2. That once the Road Reserve is closed, Council resolve the Road Reserve be classified as Operational under the Local Government Act 1993.
3. That provided no submissions are received, proceed with the sale of the Road Reserve to the owner of 45 The point Road, Woolwich for the agreed valuation sum.
4. That the purchaser meets all costs associated with the sale.
5. That the Mayor and General Manager be granted Delegated Authority to execute the documentation as required.

BACKGROUND
The Road Reserve is approximately 180 sqm and triangular in shape. See Plan contained within Valuation Report in Attachment 1.

Council considered a report on this matter on 10 December 2018 and resolved:
1. That Council endorse the sale of the Road Reserve subject to reaching agreement on the land valuation and securing concurrence from Shell Oil Pipeline, due to the easement in place; and
2. That a further report be provided to Council on the outcomes of these negotiations.

REPORT
Update
Discussions have been held with Viva Energy Australia in relation to the creation of an easement on the site who have raised no objection subject to the owner of 45 The Point Road paying the cost of the survey and associated legal documents.
Council also sought a valuation from its valuer and the owner of 45 The Point Road, Woolwich has agreed to this valuation. A copy of the valuation is attached.

Next Steps
The next steps in this process are:

1. Formally apply to close the Road Reserve and create a registered lot for the Road Reserve to enable the sale to occur.
2. Council must classify the new lot as Operational under the Local Government Act 1993 to allow the sale to proceed.
3. Proceed with the sale via a contract for sale of land for the registered lot.

Sale
The owner of 45 The Point Road, Woolwich has agreed to meet all of the following Council costs in relation to the sale and closure of the Road Reserve and have paid a 10% deposit to Council:

1. Purchase Price $270,000
2. Road Closure Application Fee and legal costs associated with closure estimated at $5,000 (plus GST)
3. Preparation of Survey and lodgement $10,300 (plus GST)
4. Preparation of easement for Viva Est $8,000 (plus GST)
5. Payment of Valuation Fee $900 (plus GST)

CONCLUSION
Based on the above information and provided no there are no objections to the formal closure of the portion of Road Reserve. A survey is to be undertaken to allow the closure to occur and a Lot and DP created to allow sale of the Road Reserve to the owner of 45 The Point Road Woolwich.

FINANCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT
Sale fees will provide additional income for Council to undertake road maintenance.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT
There is no direct environmental impact on Council arising from Council consideration of this matter.

SOCIAL IMPACT ASSESSMENT
There is no direct social impact on Council arising from Council consideration of this matter.

RISK ASSESSMENT
There are no direct or indirect risks impacting on Council arising from consideration of this matter.

ATTACHMENTS
1. Land Valuation
VALUATION

OF LAND

FOR LEASE AND
POTENTIAL SALE

Part road reservation
Mount Morris Street Woolwich

Prepared By:

Ross Sheerin AAPI
Registered Valuer & Property Consultant

23rd September 2019
VALUATION SUMMARY

PROPERTY

Land defined part road reservation Mount Morris Street Woolwich, adjoining Lot 1 Deposited Plan 499762 as defined on annexure A attached to this report also known as 45 The Point Road Woolwich

DESCRIPTION

The land as shown on annexure A comprises a generally triangular strip running along the part of south eastern side boundary of 45 The Point Road Hunters Hill and forms part of an unmade Road known as Mount Morris Street Hunters Hill.

CLIENT

The Municipality of Hunters Hill

INSTRUCTIONS

We have been requested to provide a reviewed assessment of the current market value of the property for the purpose of assisting negotiations for potential or lease. The land is identified as road reservation and comprises a triangular shaped parcel comprising approximately 180 square meters of road reservation on the street frontage.

DEFINITION OF MARKET VALUE

The estimated amount for which a property should exchange on the date of valuation between a willing buyer and a willing seller in an arms-length transaction after proper marketing wherein the parties had each acted knowledgeably, prudently, and without compulsion.

DATE OF INSPECTION

4th May 2017

VALUATION

We are of the market value of the subject portion of Mount Morris Street Woolwich NSW as at 23rd September 2019 is

$270,000 (excluding GST)
TWO HUNDRED AND SEVENTY THOUSAND DOLLARS
VALUATION REPORT

INTRODUCTION

We have been instructed by Mr Nick Tobin on behalf of Hunters Hill Council.

It is noted that our advice is required for the purpose of a potential lease and cannot be used for mortgage purposes and in this connection we have made relevant investigations and enquiries enabling us to report as follows:

CRITICAL ASSUMPTIONS

Verifiable assumptions relate to encumbrances, Owners Corporation matters, zoning, encroachments and sewer location. They may be confirmed by reference to a full title search, Sec. 149 Certificate under the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 from the Hunters Hill Council, and a sewerage diagram from Sydney Water.

Assumptions requiring further consultancy relate to environmental issues, structural integrity of the improvements.

Assumptions based on opinion are those detailed under our headings Valuation Approach and General Comments.

LOCATION

The subject land is located upon the Hunters Hill peninsula, being approximately ten (10) kilometres from the Sydney Central Business District.

The subject is a north east facing property with an aspect to Lane Cove River, Mount Morris Street is a partially sealed road.

Surrounding development comprises single residential dwellings.

Location Map

![Location Map](image-url)
LAND AND TITLES

The parent land forms an irregular allotment. The drainage appears sufficient. The advised total land area of approximately 180 square metres (as per annexure A provided by Council).

The subject property is within the Mount Morris Street road reservation. Should further searches be forwarded to the valuer by the Client, our valuation may require a review. A full title search is recommended.

The land has a street frontage to Mount Morris Street with an advised area of approximately 180 square meters.

The valuation has been assessed from a site inspection and perusal of the supplied plan attached to this report.

TOWN PLANNING

Hunters Hill Council advised the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning:</th>
<th>R2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning Scheme:</td>
<td>Hunters Hill Local Environmental Plan 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permitted Use:</td>
<td>Residential</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above zoning information was accessed from Council records and should be verified by the Client by way of a Certificate issued under Section 149 of the Environmental Planning & Assessment Act, 1979. Should a Certificate indicate zoning information to the contrary, we reserve the right to amend our assessment.
SITE CONTAMINATION

While the subject property appears suitable for the existing use, no soil tests or environmental studies have been made available to us. There are no signs of contamination and it is therefore presumed that there are no surface or sub-surface soil problems, toxic or hazardous wastes or building material hazards in or on the property that would adversely affect its existing or potential use or reduce its marketability — although we cannot and do not warrant that this site is contamination free.

APPROVALS

This assessment presumes that all relevant Authority approvals are in place in respect of this property.

INSPECTION LIMITATION

We have carried out an inspection of the exposed and readily accessible areas of the improvements. However, the valuer is not a building construction or structural expert and is therefore unable to certify the structural soundness or compliance of the improvements. Readers of this report should make their own enquiries.
## SALES EVIDENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Sale Price</th>
<th>Strata Unit</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 Reiby Rd.</td>
<td>06/2019</td>
<td>$3,450,000</td>
<td>$/m²</td>
<td>An original four bedroom two bathroom dwelling located on Hunters Hill peninsula. Total land area 902 square meters. North facing with pontoons. Some noise affected from Fig tree bridge. Land component assessed at $2197 per square meter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Eustella Ave</td>
<td>03/2019</td>
<td>$3,470,000</td>
<td>$/m²</td>
<td>A brick veneer 1970s dwelling comprising three bedrooms, two bathrooms, double garage. High set on inferior waterfront location. Total land area 657.7 Square meters. Land component assessed at $4561 per square meter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3C Woolwich Rd</td>
<td>09/2019</td>
<td>$6,350,000</td>
<td>$/m²</td>
<td>Contemporary dwelling Comprises five bedrooms, 5 bathrooms, five car garage. Building area approx. 520 square meters. Total land area 1188 square meters. Land component assessed at $4100 per square meter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Lloyd Ave</td>
<td>09/2019</td>
<td>$5,860,000</td>
<td>$/m²</td>
<td>An 1960s &quot;Sydney School&quot; designed 4 bedroom dwelling located on north facing waterfront allotment. Total land area 865.5 square meters. Land component assessed at $5090 per square meter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 The Point Rd</td>
<td>02/2017</td>
<td>$6,680,000</td>
<td>$/m²</td>
<td>An four bedroom character dwelling located on main Rd. Total land area 759 square meters. Adjusted Land component assessed at $5928. A dated sale previously used in determination.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above sales reflect the following rate range for land $4561/M² - $5928/ per square meter
VALUATION APPROACH

The highest and best use of the subject is considered to be for residential development as part of a single land holding. Accordingly I have analysed the sales of R2 zoned properties in the area.

For the purpose of the report the direct comparison approach, based on a assessed land rate per square metre has been used. The land on its own has no development potential and is limited in use due to the location of the easement though the parcel.

We have previously analysed the lease of waterfront land leased by Transport NSW through Roads and Maritime Services. Rents for domestic leases are calculated on a rate per square metre of occupation. These wetland rates are subject to review annually to reflect the latest statutory land values. The Service has rental rates for the different precincts around Sydney. The subject lies within Precinct 4, Sydney Harbour Northwest. Each precinct has allocated a "wetland rate" of $23.63 per square meter. Since these areas are below mean high watermark we consider the rate is inferior to what would be expected of a elevated land parcel with views and road access. We would consider a rate of $47.00 per square meter appropriate for the subject land.

As a check a potential yield of 3% capitalization indicates a value of $281,718 which falls within our range of value.

Based on our analysis of comparable sales land component and given the location of the site we have adopted a rate of $5000 per square meter and applied a discount of 70% due to the limited users of the land and the limited use with easements.

Our calculations are as follows:

1. 180 square meters @ $5000 psm. $900,000

Discounted by 70% for the purpose of limited use, limited parties and easements $270,000
GENERAL COMMENTS

The subject land comprises a triangular strip along the eastern boundary of 45 The Point Rd Woolwich NSW as shown in the annexed plan. As requested we have valued the land in for the purposes of assisting negotiations for a proposed lease.

The subject land has an easement running east to west, practically down the centre of the site and along the driveway of 45 The Point Rd Woolwich.

We therefore consider the only practical user of the site are the owners of 45 The Point Rd Woolwich.

We have analysed the sale of land in the area and made allowance for the limited use and purchasers of the site. There may be argument that the subject land could provide for street parking in Mount Morris Street which is limited, may also be of significant public benefit providing vision of a natural rocky outcrop along the street, and City and harbour views available to the public. These type of outcrops are a significant feature throughout the Municipality and have often been the subject of conditions of retention in developments in the area.

Hunter Hill Council consolidated Development Control Plan 2013 mentions the significance of rocky outcrops

*Successive planning policies which have been adopted by Hunter’s Hill Council over the past thirty years confirm that the existing character and identity of this Municipality may be explained according to four broad themes:

(a) Natural or scenic qualities which include:

(i) Major waterways and tributaries, together with shorelines that are defined by the Hunter’s Hill LEP 2012 as riparian lands.

(ii) Bushland reserves, slopes and foreshores which provide scenically prominent backdrops to waterways, shorelines and nearby residential hillocks, and which are defined as river front areas or foreshore areas by the Hunter’s Hill LEP 2012.

(iii) An extensive tree canopy for river front areas in particular, which ensures that building forms or structures do not visually dominate scenically prominent backdrops to waterways.

(iv) Rock outcrops and rock platforms are features of some foreshore areas and riparian lands, and of some properties in river front areas.

(v) Scenic views and vistas which are available towards waterways, shorelines or bushland reserves from many public places and residential properties, and which include glimpses beneath the tree canopy as well as shared views across residential properties (either between or above existing buildings).*

We note the subject parcel has an easement for the shell oil pipeline and has domestic natural gas lines at various point dissecting the land, removing any development potential of the land and provides for access to maintain the oil line.
The addition of this parcel to allotment provides both a potential increase in the passive and active areas for the site by substantially increasing the total usable land area of 45 The Point Rd Woolwich.

Should a surveyors report indicate any substantial variations in these areas then this report may require review, although, this seems unnecessary at this point.

We have considered a capitalisation as a check method on the rental for the land parcel. In so far as a fair rental for the parcel we believe that a higher capitalisation rate would be appropriate in the circumstances. One could argue that a rate as high as 4 to 5% on the value of the subject if a long term rental agreement was in place, however, given there is limited practical users of the subject land, being the public, or neighbours on either side of the subject, we believe the risk factor is low and warrants a rate of return of three percent (3%) per annum based on our assessment of the land value.

Our interpretation and assessment of the subject land may well be used to negotiate between the parties in reaching a fiscal agreement between the parties on the disposal of the said parcel or rental.
DISCLAIMERS & QUALIFICATIONS

This valuation is free exclusive of GST and is made on the following assumptions:

(i) That the property is not subject to any undisclosed encumbrances or restrictions that would affect the valuation in any way.

A) That any works or structures are wholly within the subject land.

B) That there are no encroachments upon the subject land.

The valuation is made subject to the following limiting conditions:

That the ownership, legal description, zoning, dimensions and area have been ascertained by due enquiry but have not been the subject of a title search. This valuation is for the use only of the party to whom it is addressed and for no other purposes. This valuation can only be relied upon for valuation purposes only and by the direct client. Possession of this report or a copy thereof does not carry with it the right to publication, nor may it be used for any purposes by anyone but the applicant without the written consent of the Valuer.

The value stated in this report is only valid for a period of three months from the report date. This valuation is current as at the date of valuation only. The value assessed herein may change significantly unexpectedly over a relatively short period (including as a result of general market movements or factors specific to the particular property). We do not accept liability for losses arising from such subsequent changes in value. Without limiting the generality of the above comment, we do not assume any responsibility or accept any liability where this valuation is relied upon after the expiration of 3 months from the date of the valuation, or such earlier date if you become aware of any factors that have any effect on the valuation. No responsibility is accepted to any third party who may use or rely on the whole or any part of the content of this valuation.

DEFINITION OF MARKET VALUE

Market Value is defined as the estimated amount for which an asset should exchange on the date of valuation, between a willing buyer and a willing seller in an arm's length transaction after proper marketing, wherein the parties had each acted knowledgeably, prudently and without compulsion.

BUILDING & CONSTRUCTION

This Valuation inspection and Report does not constitute a structural survey and is not intended as such. We have carried out an inspection only of the exposed and readily accessible areas of the improvements. Note, the Valuer is not a building construction or structural expert and is therefore unable to certify the structural soundness of the improvements. Readers of this report should make their own enquiries. This Valuation has been based on the condition of the structural improvements and the property is as at the inspection date, and if the property has to be sold in circumstances where its condition has deteriorated and/or essential fixtures/fittings removed there is likely to be a significant write down in the asset value when compared to the current assessment. Under these circumstances the Valuer will not be responsible for any reduction in value.

LAND DIMENSIONS/AREA

Unless stated as otherwise in this report we advise that we have not searched or been provided with a copy of the current Title or Registered Plans and that any dimensions or land areas quoted in this report have been obtained from third party information sources and whilst every endeavour has been made to verify such information we accept no responsibility for inaccuracy of any information provided and relied upon.

ENVIRONMENTAL

The client acknowledges and recognizes that the Valuer is not expert in identifying environmental hazards and compliance requirements affecting properties. The Valuer has endeavoured to identify all matters of environmental concern and the effect they might have on the value of the property.

However, the Valuer will not be held liable nor responsible for his/her failure to identify all such matters of environmental concern and the impact which any environmental related issue has on the property and its value including loss arising from site contamination; or the non-compliance with environmental laws; or costs associated with the clean up of the property to which an environmental hazard has been recognized, including action by the Environmental Protection Agency to recover clean up costs pursuant to the relevant Environmental Protection Act.
MARKET MOVEMENT & REPORT EXPIRY
This valuation is current as at the date of valuation only. The value assessed herein may change significantly and unexpectedly over a relatively short period (including as a result of general market movements or factors specific to the particular property). We do not accept liability for losses arising from such subsequent changes in value.

CERTIFICATE OF TITLE
Unless stated as otherwise in this report we advise that a copy of the current Certificate of Title has not been provided or searched. This valuation assumes clear title. Should any encumbrances, easements, leases or other restrictions not mentioned in this report be known or discovered then the valuation should be referred to the valuer for comment.

Valuer: R. SHEERIN, AAPI
API No. 69687

Signature
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Photographic report

Driveway to subject with Access to 45 The Point Rd Woolwich

View from subject parcel of land

View to street from waterside of subject
Diagram of services on Mount Morris Street
RMS WETLANDS PRECINCTS

INSTRUCTION

We are currently preparing a report for Council regarding a resident’s request for a road lease (to replace the one given to the previous owners).

The land is a parcel of unmade road - 180m² adjacent to 45 The Point Road, Woolwich (Known as Mount Morris Street).

Could you please provide Council with a land valuation?

Please find attached the relevant location map and survey. If you require further information, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Annie Hathaway
Deposited Plan 1927
Deposited Plan
45 The Point Rd and Mount Morris Street
ITEM NO : 4.8


STRATEGIC OUTCOME : COUNCIL IS RECOGNISED AND RESPECTED AS AN OPEN AND TRANSPARENT ORGANISATION

ACTION : COUNCIL AND COUNCILLORS ABIDE BY THE CODE OF CONDUCT, CODE OF MEETING PRACTICE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT

REPORTING OFFICER : MARIA KENNY

PURPOSE
The purpose of this report is to advise of delegations which were exercised during the Christmas / New year period – 2019/20.

RECOMMENDATION
1. That this report be received and noted.

BACKGROUND
During the Christmas/ New Year period, a delegation to the Mayor and General Manager, in accordance with “Delegations Pursuant to Chapter 12 Part 3, Sections 377, 378 and 379 of the Local Government Act 1993”, was invoked to provide for the continued efficient operation of Council and the ability to deal with any urgent matters.

The criteria for matters being dealt with under delegated authority included urgent works, legal proceedings and development applications subject to the following limitations:

- Approval of a development or subdivision application where an application:
  - involves a proposal, which is of major local, regional or environmental significance;
  - does not comply with the provisions of the relevant Environmental Planning Instrument and an objection under State Environmental Planning Policy No.1 cannot be justified; or
  - does not comply with adopted objectives, policies, development control plans or codes of Council and the delegate concludes that compliance therewith is reasonable or necessary upon due consideration of the various matters listed in Section 79C of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act and such conflict or deficiency cannot be rectified by the incorporation of special conditions of approval.

REPORT
Council, in conjunction with Lane Cove Council, called for tenders for the provision of a Civil and Associated Works Services Preferred Supplier Panel.

All tenders were assessed by the tender evaluation panel consisting of the following Lane Cove (LCC) and Hunters Hill’s Council (HHC) officers:
• Manager Assets, LCC
• Project Engineer Assets, LCC; and
• Director Service Delivery and Special Projects, HHC.

31 tender submissions were received and assessed on the following criteria:

• Tenderers price (30%);
• Capability and Capacity (25%);
• Experience (25%);
• Service Delivery (5%);
• Work Health and Safety (10%); and
• Environment and Sustainability (5%).

The following 13 suppliers (in no order of preference) were recommended for Hunters Hill Council:

• State Civil Pty Ltd
• Mack Civil Pty Ltd
• Get Civil Pty Ltd
• Awada Civil Engineering
• NSW Kerbing Pty Ltd
• JM Schembri Pty Ltd
• Ezypave Pty Ltd
• Stateline Asphalt Pty Ltd
• South Syd Concrete Pty Ltd
• KK Consultants Pty Ltd TA KK Civil Engineering
• Resco Civil Pty Ltd
• Civeco Pty Ltd
• TGB Son Pty Ltd.

In accordance with Council's resolution to delegate to the General Manager over the Christmas period, “Delegations Pursuant to Chapter 12 Part 3, Sections 377, 378 and 379 of the Local Government Act 1993”, the above suppliers were accepted and awarded as Panel of Suppliers for Hunters Hill Council.

CONCLUSION

The term of the Agreement is for a 3 year period to 27 January 2023, with provision for 2 x 12 month extensions subject to satisfactory performance. This tender will support the efficient delivery of projects through a prequalified panel.

ATTACHMENTS

There were no attachments to this report.
The purpose of this report is to provide a summary of the performance of Council's investments as at 30 November 2019 and 31 December 2019.

All investments are undertaken and reported in compliance with the requirements of the Local Government Act 1993, the Local Government (General) Regulation 2005 and Council's policy on investments.

RECOMMENDATION
That the report be received and noted.

REPORT
In accordance with Council’s Investment Policy, investments have been made to ensure the preservation of capital and to ensure that there is sufficient liquidity to meet cash flow requirements.

The investments have regular maturity dates and this prevents the unnecessary loss of income due to having to retire the investment before maturity.

It is considered prudent to maintain this flexibility until future requirements and directions in terms of other revenue raising options have been determined.

At present the investments have been made across several Financial Institutions to spread the risk.

The majority of Council’s investments are for a period of 90 days. Table 6 shows the monthly average rate of Council’s investment portfolio in comparison with average bank deposit rates.

The 90 day bank bill average rate is an industry performance benchmark.

Over the past 12 months, Council’s average rate of 2.04% is performing above the 90 day bank bill average rate of 1.34%.
## TABLE 1 - SUMMARY OF COUNCIL’S INVESTMENTS AS AT 30 NOVEMBER 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>Lodged</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Matures</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>Term Deposit</td>
<td>$1,071,163.43</td>
<td>09-Sep-19</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>20-Jan-20</td>
<td>1.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>Term Deposit</td>
<td>$515,811.53</td>
<td>13-Sep-19</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>10-Jan-20</td>
<td>1.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>Term Deposit</td>
<td>$504,113.70</td>
<td>25-Nov-19</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>24-Mar-20</td>
<td>1.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>Term Deposit</td>
<td>$691,851.14</td>
<td>23-Sep-19</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>22-Jan-20</td>
<td>1.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>Term Deposit</td>
<td>$1,041,000.85</td>
<td>19-Aug-19</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>16-Dec-19</td>
<td>1.66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>Term Deposit</td>
<td>$513,627.96</td>
<td>02-Sep-19</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>6-Jan-20</td>
<td>1.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>Term Deposit</td>
<td>$608,135.88</td>
<td>14-Oct-19</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>11-Feb-20</td>
<td>1.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>Term Deposit</td>
<td>$594,078.67</td>
<td>21-Oct-19</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>17-Feb-20</td>
<td>1.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>Term Deposit</td>
<td>$504,113.70</td>
<td>25-Nov-19</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>24-Mar-20</td>
<td>1.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>Term Deposit</td>
<td>$502,527.40</td>
<td>29-Aug-19</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>02-Dec-19</td>
<td>1.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>Term Deposit</td>
<td>$400,546.08</td>
<td>02-Sep-19</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>13-Jan-20</td>
<td>1.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>Term Deposit</td>
<td>$947,881.09</td>
<td>26-Aug-19</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>09-Dec-19</td>
<td>1.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>Term Deposit</td>
<td>$501,684.93</td>
<td>11-Nov-19</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>02-Mar-20</td>
<td>1.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>Term Deposit</td>
<td>$501,808.22</td>
<td>18-Nov-19</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>17-Mar-20</td>
<td>1.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>Term Deposit</td>
<td>$501,832.57</td>
<td>08-Oct-19</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>05-Feb-20</td>
<td>1.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>Term Deposit</td>
<td>$1,000,000.00</td>
<td>09-Sep-19</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>27-Jan-20</td>
<td>1.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>Term Deposit</td>
<td>$600,000.00</td>
<td>21-Oct-19</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>24-Feb-20</td>
<td>1.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>Term Deposit</td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
<td>25-Nov-19</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>30-Mar-20</td>
<td>1.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAB</td>
<td>Term Deposit</td>
<td>$1,242,045.32</td>
<td>04-Nov-19</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>03-Mar-20</td>
<td>1.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAB</td>
<td>Term Deposit</td>
<td>$1,225,344.92</td>
<td>02-Sep-19</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>03-Dec-19</td>
<td>1.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAB</td>
<td>Term Deposit</td>
<td>$2,204,271.06</td>
<td>21-Oct-19</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>18-Feb-20</td>
<td>1.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAB</td>
<td>Term Deposit</td>
<td>$1,000,000.00</td>
<td>25-Nov-19</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>25-Feb-20</td>
<td>1.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMB</td>
<td>Term Deposit</td>
<td>$2,619,116.31</td>
<td>26-Nov-19</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>27-Feb-20</td>
<td>1.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMB</td>
<td>Term Deposit</td>
<td>$2,729,654.41</td>
<td>21-Nov-19</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>20-Feb-20</td>
<td>1.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bankwest</td>
<td>Term Deposit</td>
<td>$830,394.72</td>
<td>11-Nov-19</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>10-Mar-20</td>
<td>1.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bankwest</td>
<td>Term Deposit</td>
<td>$1,017,721.28</td>
<td>10-Sep-19</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>08-Jan-20</td>
<td>1.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call</td>
<td>24 HR Call</td>
<td>$600,000.00</td>
<td>30.11.2019</td>
<td>Bank Account Balance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$24,464,611.47

CBA General $1,666,091.64 30.11.2019 Bank Account Balance

**Total** $26,130,703.11

Certification – Responsible Accounting Officer
November’s investments include the following estimated restrictions

### Table 2 - Internal Restrictions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Actual as at 30 November 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office Equipment &amp; Furniture</td>
<td>$104,790.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>$249,130.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement of Plant</td>
<td>$388,665.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elections</td>
<td>$84,082.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Leave Entitlements</td>
<td>$632,400.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Reserve</td>
<td>$98,859.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property advisor</td>
<td>$216,573.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Reserve</td>
<td>$300,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety &amp; Welfare Expenses OH&amp;S Incentive</td>
<td>$14,453.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposits</td>
<td>$2,787,595.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Internal Restrictions</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,896,550.57</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### External Restrictions

- S94: $1,750,123.29
- Grants: $1,136,830.45
- Domestic Waste Management: $505,055.71
- Special Environmental Levy: **369081.88**
- Special Community Facilities: $1,192,872.08
- Special Roads: $302,636.00
- Other Infrastructure Special Rate: $543,486.57

**Total External Restrictions**: $5,800,085.99

**Total Restrictions**: $10,696,636.56

### Table 3 – Council’s total portfolio by month

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Portfolio</th>
<th>90 Day BB</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$</td>
<td>% Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.12.18</td>
<td>$23,260,918</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.1.19</td>
<td>$22,272,373</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.2.19</td>
<td>$22,874,491</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.3.19</td>
<td>$22,905,647</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.4.19</td>
<td>$22,552,800</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.5.19</td>
<td>$22,607,315</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.6.19</td>
<td>$22,138,672</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.7.19</td>
<td>$21,822,607</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.8.19</td>
<td>$23,373,650</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.9.19</td>
<td>$23,902,238</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.10.19</td>
<td>$23,922,513</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.11.19</td>
<td>$24,464,611</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average Rate**: 2.13% | 1.44%
## TABLE 4 - SUMMARY OF COUNCIL’S INVESTMENTS AS AT 31 DECEMBER 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>Lodged</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Matures</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>Term Deposit</td>
<td>$ 1,071,163.43</td>
<td>09-Sep-19</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>20-Jan-20</td>
<td>1.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>Term Deposit</td>
<td>$ 515,811.53</td>
<td>13-Sep-19</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>10-Jan-20</td>
<td>1.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>Term Deposit</td>
<td>$ 504,113.70</td>
<td>25-Nov-19</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>24-Mar-20</td>
<td>1.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>Term Deposit</td>
<td>$ 691,851.14</td>
<td>23-Sep-19</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>22-Jan-20</td>
<td>1.53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>Term Deposit</td>
<td>$ 1,046,587.46</td>
<td>16-Dec-19</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>14-Apr-20</td>
<td>1.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>Term Deposit</td>
<td>$ 513,627.96</td>
<td>2-Sep-19</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>6-Jan-20</td>
<td>1.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>Term Deposit</td>
<td>$ 608,135.88</td>
<td>14-Oct-19</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>11-Feb-20</td>
<td>1.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>Term Deposit</td>
<td>$ 594,078.67</td>
<td>21-Oct-19</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>17-Feb-20</td>
<td>1.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>Term Deposit</td>
<td>$ 504,685.51</td>
<td>25-Nov-19</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>31-Mar-20</td>
<td>1.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>Term Deposit</td>
<td>$ 400,546.08</td>
<td>02-Dec-19</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>13-Jan-20</td>
<td>1.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>Term Deposit</td>
<td>$ 600,000.00</td>
<td>09-Sep-19</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>27-Jan-20</td>
<td>1.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>Term Deposit</td>
<td>$ 501,684.93</td>
<td>11-Nov-19</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>02-Mar-20</td>
<td>1.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>Term Deposit</td>
<td>$ 501,808.22</td>
<td>18-Nov-19</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>17-Mar-20</td>
<td>1.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>Term Deposit</td>
<td>$ 501,832.57</td>
<td>08-Oct-19</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>05-Feb-20</td>
<td>1.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>Term Deposit</td>
<td>$ 1,000,000.00</td>
<td>09-Sep-19</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>27-Jan-20</td>
<td>1.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>Term Deposit</td>
<td>$ 600,000.00</td>
<td>21-Oct-19</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>24-Feb-20</td>
<td>1.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>Term Deposit</td>
<td>$ 500,000.00</td>
<td>25-Nov-19</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>30-Mar-20</td>
<td>1.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAB</td>
<td>Term Deposit</td>
<td>$ 1,242,045.32</td>
<td>04-Nov-19</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>03-Mar-20</td>
<td>1.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAB</td>
<td>Term Deposit</td>
<td>$ 1,230,533.67</td>
<td>03-Dec-19</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>01-Apr-20</td>
<td>1.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAB</td>
<td>Term Deposit</td>
<td>$ 2,204,271.06</td>
<td>21-Oct-19</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>18-Feb-20</td>
<td>1.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAB</td>
<td>Term Deposit</td>
<td>$ 1,000,000.00</td>
<td>25-Nov-19</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>25-Feb-20</td>
<td>1.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMB</td>
<td>Term Deposit</td>
<td>$ 2,619,116.31</td>
<td>26-Nov-19</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>27-Feb-20</td>
<td>1.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMB</td>
<td>Term Deposit</td>
<td>$ 2,729,654.41</td>
<td>21-Nov-19</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>20-Feb-20</td>
<td>1.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bankwest</td>
<td>Term Deposit</td>
<td>$ 830,394.72</td>
<td>11-Nov-19</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>10-Mar-20</td>
<td>1.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bankwest</td>
<td>Term Deposit</td>
<td>$ 1,017,721.28</td>
<td>10-Sep-19</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>08-Jan-20</td>
<td>1.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call</td>
<td>24 HR Call</td>
<td>$ 1,552,325.75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$ 24,481,989.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Total $ 25,540,409.96

Certification – Responsible Accounting Officer
December’s investments include the following estimated restrictions

**Table 5 - Internal Restrictions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Actual as at 31 December 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office Equipment &amp; Furniture</td>
<td>$104,790.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>$249,130.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement of Plant</td>
<td>$388,665.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elections</td>
<td>$84,082.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Leave Entitlements</td>
<td>$632,400.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Reserve</td>
<td>$98,859.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property advisor</td>
<td>$191,533.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Reserve</td>
<td>$300,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety &amp; Welfare Expenses OH&amp;S Incentive</td>
<td>$30,669.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposits</td>
<td>$2,683,726.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Internal Restrictions</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,783,858.23</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

External Restrictions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S94</td>
<td>$1,776,602.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>$1,137,143.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Waste Management</td>
<td>$505,055.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Environmental Levy</td>
<td>$304,902.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Community Facilities</td>
<td>$1,156,215.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Roads</td>
<td>$302,635.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Infrastructure Special Rate</td>
<td>$499,155.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total External Restrictions</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,681,710.38</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Restrictions**

$10,465,568.61

**Table 6 – Council's total portfolio by month**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Portfolio $</th>
<th>90 Day BB % Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31.1.19</td>
<td>22,272,373</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.2.19</td>
<td>22,874,491</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.3.19</td>
<td>22,905,647</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.4.19</td>
<td>22,552,800</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.5.19</td>
<td>22,607,315</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.6.19</td>
<td>22,138,672</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.7.19</td>
<td>21,822,607</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.8.19</td>
<td>23,373,650</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.9.19</td>
<td>23,902,238</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.10.19</td>
<td>23,922,513</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.11.19</td>
<td>24,464,611</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.12.19</td>
<td>24,481,990</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Average Rate

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 1 - Portfolio Average Rate vs Bank Average Rate**

- Portfolio Rate
- 90 Day Bank Rate

**ATTACHMENTS**

There are no attachments to this report.
ITEM NO : 4.10

SUBJECT : SUMMARY OF COUNCIL INVESTMENTS AS AT 31 JANUARY 2020

STRATEGIC OUTCOME : COUNCIL IS FINANCIALLY SUSTAINABLE

ACTION : PROVIDE TIMELY FINANCIAL INFORMATION, ADVICE AND REPORTS TO COUNCIL, THE COMMUNITY AND STAFF INCLUDING THE LONG TERM FINANCIAL PLAN

REPORTING OFFICER : JOHN JAVILLONAR

PURPOSE
The purpose of this report is to provide a summary of the performance of Council’s investments as at 31 January 2020.

All investments are undertaken and reported in compliance with the requirements of the Local Government Act 1993, the Local Government (General) Regulation 2005 and Council’s policy on investments.

RECOMMENDATION
That the report be received and noted.

REPORT
In accordance with Council’s Investment Policy, investments have been made to ensure the preservation of capital and to ensure that there is sufficient liquidity to meet cash flow requirements.

The investments have regular maturity dates and this prevents the unnecessary loss of income due to having to retire the investment before maturity.

It is considered prudent to maintain this flexibility until future requirements and directions in terms of other revenue raising options have been determined.

At present the investments have been made across several Financial Institutions to spread the risk.

The majority of Council’s investments are for a period of 90 days. Table 3 shows the monthly average rate of Council’s investment portfolio in comparison with average bank deposit rates. The 90 day bank bill average rate is an industry performance benchmark.

Over the past 12 months, Council’s average rate of 1.94% is performing above the 90 day bank bill average rate of 1.25%.

Going forward, Council’s investment advisor has been requested to provide a report on our current investment portfolio. This includes recommendations for diversifying our portfolio to ensure investment income is utilised to its maximum potential, whilst being compliant with the requirements of Council’s investment policy.
TABLE 1 - SUMMARY OF COUNCIL'S INVESTMENTS AS AT 31 JANUARY 2020

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>Lodged</th>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Matures</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>Term Deposit</td>
<td>$ 1,077,525.55</td>
<td>20-Jan-20</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>19-May-20</td>
<td>1.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>Term Deposit</td>
<td>$ 518,586.31</td>
<td>10-Jan-20</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>11-May-20</td>
<td>1.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>Term Deposit</td>
<td>$ 504,113.70</td>
<td>25-Nov-19</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>24-Mar-20</td>
<td>1.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>Term Deposit</td>
<td>$ 695,360.25</td>
<td>22-Jan-20</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>22-May-20</td>
<td>1.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>Term Deposit</td>
<td>$ 1,046,587.46</td>
<td>12-Jan-20</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>14-Apr-20</td>
<td>1.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>Term Deposit</td>
<td>$ 516,518.07</td>
<td>6-Jan-20</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>5-May-20</td>
<td>1.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>Term Deposit</td>
<td>$ 608,135.88</td>
<td>14-Oct-19</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>11-Feb-20</td>
<td>1.39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>Term Deposit</td>
<td>$ 594,078.67</td>
<td>21-Oct-19</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>17-Feb-20</td>
<td>1.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>Term Deposit</td>
<td>$ 504,685.51</td>
<td>02-Dec-19</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>31-Mar-20</td>
<td>1.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>Term Deposit</td>
<td>$ 402,925.10</td>
<td>13-Jan-20</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>20-Apr-20</td>
<td>1.41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>Term Deposit</td>
<td>$ 501,684.93</td>
<td>11-Nov-19</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>02-Mar-20</td>
<td>1.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>Term Deposit</td>
<td>$ 501,808.22</td>
<td>18-Nov-19</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>17-Mar-20</td>
<td>1.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>Term Deposit</td>
<td>$ 501,832.57</td>
<td>08-Oct-19</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>05-Feb-20</td>
<td>1.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>Term Deposit</td>
<td>$ 600,000.00</td>
<td>21-Oct-19</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>24-Feb-20</td>
<td>1.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>Term Deposit</td>
<td>$ 500,000.00</td>
<td>25-Nov-19</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>30-Mar-20</td>
<td>1.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAB</td>
<td>Term Deposit</td>
<td>$ 1,242,045.32</td>
<td>04-Nov-19</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>03-Mar-20</td>
<td>1.57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAB</td>
<td>Term Deposit</td>
<td>$ 1,230,533.67</td>
<td>03-Dec-19</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>01-Apr-20</td>
<td>1.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAB</td>
<td>Term Deposit</td>
<td>$ 2,204,271.06</td>
<td>21-Oct-19</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>18-Feb-20</td>
<td>1.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAB</td>
<td>Term Deposit</td>
<td>$ 1,000,000.00</td>
<td>25-Nov-19</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>25-Feb-20</td>
<td>1.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMB</td>
<td>Term Deposit</td>
<td>$ 2,619,116.31</td>
<td>26-Nov-19</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>27-Feb-20</td>
<td>1.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMB</td>
<td>Term Deposit</td>
<td>$ 2,729,654.41</td>
<td>21-Nov-19</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>20-Feb-20</td>
<td>1.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bankwest</td>
<td>Term Deposit</td>
<td>$ 830,394.72</td>
<td>11-Nov-19</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>10-Mar-20</td>
<td>1.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call</td>
<td>24 HR Call</td>
<td>$ 2,559,762.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$23,489,620.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBA</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>$ 1,362,685.86</td>
<td>31.1.2020</td>
<td>Bank Account Balance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$ 24,852,306.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Certification – Responsible Accounting Officer
January's investments include the following estimated restrictions

**Table 2 - Internal Restrictions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Actual as at 31 January 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office Equipment &amp; Furniture</td>
<td>$104,790.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>$249,130.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement of Plant</td>
<td>$388,665.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elections</td>
<td>$84,082.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Leave Entitlements</td>
<td>$632,400.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance Reserve</td>
<td>$98,859.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property advisor</td>
<td>$178,880.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability Reserve</td>
<td>$300,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety &amp; Welfare Expenses OH&amp;S Incentive</td>
<td>$28,369.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deposits</td>
<td>$2,675,026.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Internal Restrictions</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,760,205.23</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**External Restrictions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S94</td>
<td>$1,765,413.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants</td>
<td>$1,137,143.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic Waste Management</td>
<td>$505,055.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Environmental Levy</td>
<td>$292,334.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Community Facilities</td>
<td>$1,155,850.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Roads</td>
<td>$302,635.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Infrastructure Special Rate</td>
<td>$499,155.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total External Restrictions</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,657,588.55</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Restrictions**

| Total Restrictions                                | $10,417,793.78               |

**Table 3 - Council's total portfolio by month**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Portfolio $</th>
<th>90 Day Bank</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 2019</td>
<td>$22,874,491</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2019</td>
<td>$22,905,647</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2019</td>
<td>$22,552,800</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2019</td>
<td>$22,607,315</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2019</td>
<td>$22,138,672</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July 2019</td>
<td>$21,822,607</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2019</td>
<td>$23,373,650</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 2019</td>
<td>$23,902,238</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2019</td>
<td>$23,922,513</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2019</td>
<td>$24,464,611</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2019</td>
<td>$24,481,990</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 2020</td>
<td>$23,489,620</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Average Rate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Portfolio Rate</th>
<th>90 Day Bank Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.94</strong></td>
<td><strong>1.25</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATTACHMENTS

There are no attachments to this report.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM NO</th>
<th>4.11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUBJECT</td>
<td>REPORT OF LEGAL MATTERS JANUARY 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRATEGIC OUTCOME</td>
<td>MAINTAIN THE CHARACTER AND AMENITY OF HUNTERS HILL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTION</td>
<td>ALL BUILDING WORK COMPLIES WITH COUNCIL REGULATIONS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPORTING OFFICER</td>
<td>STEVE KOUREPIS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PURPOSE</td>
<td>The purpose of this report is to update Council on legal matters. These matters are generally with the Land and Environment Court.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECOMMENDATION</td>
<td>That the report be received and noted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPORT</td>
<td>Attached is a Status Report provided by Council's Legal Advisors – HWL Ebsworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATTACHMENTS</td>
<td>1. Report of Legal Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Ref</td>
<td>Matter Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 639411  | Advice re compulsory acquisition: 105 Pittwater Road  
Advice regarding compulsory acquisition of 105 Pittwater Road | Adam Stipcevic / John Cole | 10 January 2017 | Valuer and surveyor briefed. Discussions with owner's solicitor commenced. Surveyor finalised report. Valuation report provided. Have reviewed draft report and sending comments back to valuer. Advice provided to owners solicitor re-engineering and garbage questions raised by owner. VFA finalised and placed on exhibition and awaiting execution pending any changes as a consequence of submissions received. Waste and parking issues resolved as between Council and owner. VFA signed and s66 into allow construction of Duchini site – associated matter. Owner's valuation served. Seeking valuation advice. Kent Wood has provided valuation advice. Valuation served on owner and they are considering. Letter return with agreed position between Council and Owner's values and forwarded to Council. Council to consider putting offer in. | $12,448.50 |
| 896599  | HHC; Class 1 Application – 219 Victoria Road Gladesville – Proposed construction of mixed use development (residential/commercial) (Corn Bank)  
Applicant lodged a doomed refusal application had not yet been determined by Council  
Nonlow Pty Limited v Hunter’s Hill Council - 2018/208397 | John Cole | 19 July 2018 | First directions hearing on 3 August 2018. Urban designer, planner, traffic consultant and heritage experts briefed. Site inspection by John Cole and review plans. SOFAC filed. Conciliation conference held 26 February 2019. Without prejudice meeting held on 18 December 2018. Amended plans provided for discussion at conciliation conference. Conciliation conference held 26 February 2019. Applicant to provide amended plans and supporting documentation for purpose of seeking to reach an s34 agreement. Concerns from Council's experts re proximity of two towers to each other and possible neighbours (redevelopment - see Allen v HHC) even with variation of near setback. New plans received. Matter listed for hearing on 12 and 13 December 2019. S34 Agreement entered into. Orders made by the Court in accordance with same including costs order. Costs order paid. Objectors notified. | $24,228.00 |
| 918046  | 64/64A High Street, Hunters Hill - Advice re compliance/stormwater issues  
Advising Council in relation to complaints made regarding unauthorised works and potential orders to be issued | John Cole | 15 Jan 2019 | Letter to complainant settled and sent out. Response received. Further letter drafted and sent. No order proceeding for pump out system. Gravity system through no. 62B under consideration. Site inspection with complainant undertaken. Letter to owners of no. 64 drafted. Draft notice of intention drafted and currently with Council. Notice of Intention issued. Followed up with owner's solicitor. Awaiting response. They have said they will advise within 14 days. Further Notice of Intention issued by Council and email to neighbour re same. | $14,027.50 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Our Ref</th>
<th>Matter Name</th>
<th>Acting Solicitor</th>
<th>Date File Opened</th>
<th>Description/Further investigation being conducted/Status/Forecast</th>
<th>Fees billed to date excluding GST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>928701</td>
<td>HHC ats Jason Khouri - LEC 2019/98953 - 32 Ryde Road Hunters Hill Proposed child care centre Applicant lodged a deemed refusal application had not yet been determined by Council</td>
<td>John Cole / Alex Epstein</td>
<td>27 March 2019</td>
<td>Site inspection John Cole and Steve Kourpis carried out. Planner, heritage, arborist, traffic and acoustic experts briefed. SOFC filed 6 May 2019. Parties to have without prejudice meeting on 8 August 2019. Matter listed for conciliation conference on 16 December 2019. Without prejudice meeting has occurred. Amendments agreed at the meeting have been provided. Council's experts are reviewing. Conciliation conference held. Further plans issued. Council's experts reviewed. Plans notified to neighbours. Parties to enter into s34 agreement by 7 February 2020 or proceed to hearing.</td>
<td>$15,760.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>939455</td>
<td>HHC ats David Charles Shad - LEC 2019/00188972 - 96 Barons Crescent, Hunters Hill Appeal against refusal for development works including works on rear deck at 96 Barons Crescent</td>
<td>John Cole / Alex Epstein</td>
<td>19 June 2019</td>
<td>Planner and tree expert briefed. Without prejudice meeting has occurred on site. Matter currently listed for s 34AA conciliation hearing on 13 and 14 February 2019. Notice of Motion to amend filed. Expert evidence and amended SOFAC still to be prepared.</td>
<td>$825.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>951188</td>
<td>Advice re Tree Prosecution – 2 Passy Avenue Removal of tree at 2 Passy Avenue</td>
<td>John Cole / Philip Brown</td>
<td>16 September 2019</td>
<td>Philip Myles investigating matter and interviewing relevant parties.</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Ref</td>
<td>Matter Name</td>
<td>Acting Solicitor</td>
<td>Date File Opened</td>
<td>Description/Further investigation being conducted/Status/Forecast</td>
<td>Fees billed to date excluding GST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>962187</td>
<td>Class 1 Appeal 22 Vernon Street Hunters Hill  Applicant lodged a deemed refusal application had not yet been determined by Council</td>
<td>John Cole/Alex Epstein</td>
<td>21 November 2019</td>
<td>Statement of Facts and Contentions filed 17 December 2019. First directions on 10 December 2019. Planner, heritage expert and barrister sent initial brief. Proceedings listed for s34AA on 9-10 July 2020.</td>
<td>$3,395.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>967057</td>
<td>HHSC as George Antoniou – 38 Alexandra Street Hunters Hill – 2019/396302 Proposed child care centre Applicant lodged a deemed refusal application had not yet been determined by Council</td>
<td>John Cole/Alex Epstein</td>
<td>20 December 2019</td>
<td>Planner, heritage, traffic, arborist and acoustic consultants briefed. SOFAC being drafted. First directions on 29 January 2020.</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITEM NO</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBJECT</td>
<td>MINUTES OF CONSERVATION ADVISORY PANEL MEETING HELD 20 NOVEMBER 2019</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STRATEGIC OUTCOME</td>
<td>MAINTAIN THE CHARACTER AND AMENITY OF HUNTERS HILL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTION</td>
<td>PROVIDE QUALITY TECHNICAL HERITAGE ADVICE TO RESIDENTS, DEVELOPERS, DCU, AND THE LAND AND ENVIRONMENT COURT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPORTING OFFICER</td>
<td>GREG PATCH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PURPOSE**

The purpose of this report is to provide Council with the Minutes of the Conservation Advisory Panel (CAP) Meeting held on 20 November 2019.

The purpose of CAP is to consider and advise Council staff on any matter of environmental heritage referred to the committee by staff including building and development proposals and plans or policies referred by Council or the General Manager.

**RECOMMENDATION**

That the report be received and noted.

**ATTACHMENTS**

1. Minutes of the Conservation Advisory Panel held on 20 November 2019
MINUTES OF CONSERVATION ADVISORY PANEL  
held 20 November 2019

COMMENCEMENT

IN ATTENDANCE

Cllr Ross Williams  Councillor, Hunters Hill Council  
Cllr Jim Sanderson  Councillor, Hunters Hill Council  
Tony Coote  Hunters Hill Trust Representative  
Brian McDonald  Heritage Architect  
Graham Atkins  Community Representative (Alt)

ALSO PRESENT

Steve Kourepis  Director, Development & Regulatory Services  
Greg Patch  Heritage Consultant

APOLOGIES

Bronwyn Doutreband  Community Representative  
Michael Lehany  Landscape Adviser  
Helen Temple Berry  Community Representative

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Mr Greg Patch – Item 3.3  
Mr Brian McDonald – Item 3.3

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

RECOMMENDATION
The Minutes of Conservation Advisory Panel held on 16/10/2019 were read and accepted.

BUSINESS ARISING

2.1 SITE INSPECTIONS

PROCEEDINGS IN BRIEF

4.00pm – 29 Waruda Place, Huntleys Cove

Panel members met the owner, Mrs McKinley, a representative of Weir Phillips, architects, and Andrew Martin, planner.

The property is within the curtilage of a heritage item 101 (“Farm Attendants Cottage”).

It is proposed to erect a carport with storage facilities to the existing vehicle hardstand to the rear of / above the existing house.

The on-site discussion revolved around reducing the relatively heavy support and
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roof structure through adopting a more conventional support system (i.e. not
cantilevering the south-west corner of the roof and using more slender support
posts) so that the visual intrusion of the structure can be minimised. Panel members
also reiterated the position taken on the original application for the house was not to
permit any structures on top.

The proponents undertook to further consider the matters raised and present a
revised proposal.

4.30pm – 13 Moorefield Avenue, Hunters Hill
See Item 3.5

5.00pm – 32 Hillcrest Avenue, Gladesville
See Item 3.1

REPORTS

3.1 6.00PM - 32 HILLCREST AVENUE, GLADESVILLE

PROCEEDINGS IN BRIEF

The meeting was addressed by the owners, Mr & Mrs Perrin, Anne Warr, heritage
consultant (on site) and Geoff Dalgleish, architect

Panel members (RW, JS, TC, BM, GA, GP) had the benefit of a site inspection and
discussion with the proponents on site prior to the meeting.

The property is within Hunters Hill Conservation Area C2 ("The Islet"). It is proposed
to demolish the existing house and erect a new house with attic rooms and a
basement in its stead.

The Panel had previously considered the proposal at its meeting of September and
once again thanked Geoff Dalgleish for the thorough site and streetscape analysis.

The Panel raised concerns at the potential impact of vibration resulting from
excavation for the basement on adjoining houses, particularly that to the north-west
which has a sandstone basecourse/footings. Concern was raised about the
unrealistically thin retaining walls depicted by the drawings and implication of
consequent design changes.

The proportion of the proposed triple-sash set to the street-facing gable was also
considered to be excessively wide relative to the barges, and it was recommended
that it be reduced in width to either two sashes or proportionally adjusted to allow a
more comfortable margin to the gable.

COMMITTEE ADVICE

The Conservation Advisory Panel advises the Director, Development and
Regulatory Services that the Panel has qualified support for the proposal, subject to
geotechnical and structural design/detailing for the basement, and the gable window
adjustment.

3.2 6.20PM - 1 REIBY ROAD, HUNTERS HILL

Minutes of the Conservation Advisory Panel held on 20 November 2019.
The Panel was addressed by the owner Glen Dawes and architect Ian Stapleton of Lucas Stapleton Johnson.

The property is heritage item No 286 ("Figtree House"), within Hunters Hill Conservation Areas C1 ("The Peninsula") and occupies a prominent position on the banks of the Lane Cove River.

It is proposed to make alterations and additions to the house, including a "clip-on" bathroom to the north wall, to construct a boatshed over an existing sandstone inlet from the Lane Cove River, and install an inground swimming pool.

In considering the proposal, the Panel was generally supportive, but advised that the boatshed would be best set back from the seawall so that the inlet entry from the Lane Cove River remains visible, and that the proposed "clip-on" bathroom should have a skirt below floor level so that the plumbing and drainage paraphernalia can be gathered, rationalized and screened to reduce the presence of piping in views from the River.

**COMMITTEE ADVICE**

That the Director, Development and Regulatory Services be advised that the Panel generally supports the proposal, subject to boatshed being set back from the seawall so that the inlet entry from the Lane Cove River remains visible, and that the proposed "clip-on" bathroom should have a skirt below floor level so that the plumbing and drainage paraphernalia can be gathered, rationalized and screened to reduce the presence of piping in views from the River.

**3.3** 6.40PM - HUNTERS HILL TOWN HALL - 22 ALEXANDRA STREET HUNTERS HILL

**PROCEEDINGS IN BRIEF**

Brian McDonald declared a conflict of interest and left the Chambers.

The Panel was addressed by Greg Patch, architect.

It is proposed to construct an access ramp to the main entry of the Town Hall, an airllock to the proposed staff entry, a lift to allow internal access to all floors, convert two WC cubicles to ambulant configuration, to make alterations to the Council Chamber and the office area immediately to the south to form a customer service area, accessible WC and Mayors Office.

The Panel raised no objection to the access provisions works but considered that the proposed changes to the Chamber be subject to further discussion in terms of the existing versus proposed layout.

**COMMITTEE ADVICE**

That the Director, Development and Regulatory Control be advised that the Panel generally supports the proposal, but that the proposed works to the Council Chamber be subject to further consultation.

**3.4** 7.00PM - 22 JOUBERT STREET HUNTERS HILL
MINUTES OF CONSERVATION ADVISORY PANEL held 20 November 2019

PROCEEDINGS IN BRIEF

There was no representative of the applicants present and so the Panel considered the proposal in their absence.

It is proposed to erect shade-sail structures within the ground of the childcare centre at the above. The property is within Hunters Hill Conservation Area C1 ("The Peninsula") and within the vicinity of heritage items at 1 Figtree Road and 3 Avenue Road.

In considering the proposal, the Panel advised that the proposal is deficient in that no Statement of Heritage Impact has been provided, that the drawings appear to be shop drawings prepared by the manufacturer of the sails, and do not provide enough detail of the context and setting of the place to allow a proper assessment.

COMMITTEE ADVICE

That the Director, Development and Regulatory Control be advised that the Panel does not support the proposal as no Statement of Heritage Impact has been provided and the drawings prepared do not provide enough detail of the context and setting to allow for proper assessment.

3.5 7.20PM - 13 MOOREFIELD AVENUE HUNTERS HILL

PROCEEDINGS IN BRIEF

The Panel was addressed by the owners, Andrew Martin, planner, and Jonathan Plant of Campbell Architecture.

The property is within Hunters Hill Conservation Area C1 ("The Peninsula") and within the vicinity of heritage items at 15 Kareelah Rd and 2 & 7 Herberton Ave. It also occupies a foreshore position to Tarban Creek/Paramatta River.

It is proposed to demolish the existing much modified mid- 20th century house and erect a new one on the property.

Panel members (RW, JS, TC, BM, GA, GP) had the benefit of a site inspection prior to the meeting.

In considering the proposal, the Panel essentially reiterated its previous comments in relation to roof forms (hipped roofs preferred rather than composite hips/gables), the comparative proportion of the Living Room component, the foreshore planting (more endemic canopy trees required), and the visibility of what is a relatively light colour scheme to the façade presented to the waterways. The objective sought by the panel is to achieve a better balance of landscape over built-form.

COMMITTEE ADVICE

That the Director, Development and Regulatory Services be advised that the Panel still maintains its previous objections to the proposal including in relation to roof forms (hipped roofs preferred rather than composite hips/gables), the comparative proportion of the Living Room component, the foreshore planting (more endemic canopy trees required), and the visibility of what is a relatively light colour scheme to the façade presented to the waterways and considers that additional design...
COUNCIL REPORTS
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MINUTES OF CONSERVATION ADVISORY PANEL held 20 November 2019

refinement is required before the scheme will attract its support

OTHER BUSINESS

4.1 GENERAL BUSINESS

PROCEEDINGS IN BRIEF

1. 261-263 Victoria Road Gladesville- Mural

Panel members reiterated their concerns at the proposal to paint a mural on the Pittwater Road- facing wall of the former Wilson’s Butcher building at the above address. It is a relatively prominent example of a “Federation Free Style” commercial building, is a listed heritage item, and would be adversely impacted upon by a mural

2. The Use of Standard Heritage Conditions

The Committee discussed the use of model heritage conditions such as the ones listed below that could be used and tailored for use in Hunters Hill:

No demolition of extra fabric

Alterations to, and demolition of the existing building shall be limited to that documented on the approved plans (by way of notation). No approval is given or implied for removal and/or rebuilding of any portion of the existing building which is shown to be retained.

Reason: To ensure compliance with the development consent.

Conservation

Detailed plans of and schedules of conservation works for XXXXXXXX are to be submitted prior to the issue of a construction certificate. The conservation works plans and schedules shall be prepared by a properly qualified and experienced conservation architect.

Reason: To ensure the conservation of the heritage item.

A preventative maintenance plan, in accordance with the preventative maintenance strategy set out in the Conservation Management Plan prepared by XXXXXXXX shall be submitted prior to the issue of a construction certificate. The preventative maintenance plan shall be prepared by a properly qualified and experienced conservation architect.

Archival recording of buildings (heritage items)

Prior to the commencement of any demolition, excavation or building works on site, the Certifier shall be satisfied that an archival report for XXXXXXXXX has been completed and submitted to Council’s Heritage Advisor.

The report must be a bound A4 report, prepared by a recognised NSW Heritage Office heritage consultant and must contain the following minimum requirements:

- title page
- statement of reasons the recording was made
- outline history of the item (including title records, subdivision plans, water and
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sewerage plans and any archival documents such as family records, old photographs, etc)
• statement of a heritage significance (to accepted Heritage Council criteria)
• specialised reports such as heritage assessments, dilapidation report, and builders or engineers reports
• location plan showing relationship of site to nearby area
• site plan to scale (1:200 - 1:500) showing all structures and site elements
• measured drawing including site survey, floor plans, all elevations, roof plan and one cross section (1:00)
• drawings of specific interiors or details nominated by Council’s Heritage Advisor
• room inventories noting materials, profile of nominated decorative elements (1:2) and nominated by Council’s Heritage Advisor
• archival quality colour photographs, contact prints, and selected prints (one copy of contact sheets and selected prints)
• digital images and archival quality DVD, CD or USB may be submitted as supplementary information

All photographs in the report are to be mounted, labelled and cross-referenced to the relevant site plan and floor plans and showing position of camera. A photographic recording sheet must be included. Photographs of the following must form part of the archival report:
• each elevation
• each interior room
• photographs of specific details nominated by Council’s Heritage Advisor
• views of the gardens from the interior
• all structures on site, such as sheds, outhouses and significant landscape features
• several photographs of house from public streets or laneways including several views showing relationship to neighbouring buildings

Note:
Two copies of the report must be submitted to Council’s Heritage Advisor. A written acknowledgment from Council must be obtained (attesting to this condition being appropriately satisfied) and submitted to the Principal Certifier prior to the commencement of any excavation works.

Reason:
To ensure the preservation and proper management of historical artefacts.

Preparation of heritage interpretation plan

An interpretation plan for the garden and building of XXXXXXXX must be prepared in accordance with the Office of Environment and Heritage guideline “Interpreting Heritage Places and Items” prepared by the NSW Heritage Office. The interpretation plan shall be submitted to Council’s Heritage Advisor for approval prior to release of Construction Certificate.

Archaeological survey

Prior to commencement of any demolition, excavation or building works, the Certifier shall be satisfied that an archaeological survey has been completed and submitted to Council’s Heritage Advisor.
The survey shall be carried out by a qualified archaeologist and shall identify the likelihood of remains and/or artefacts, whether European or Aboriginal, being present on site.

If this report identifies that such items are likely to be present on site, demolition, earthworks and excavation shall be undertaken under the direct supervision of the consultant archaeologist. An excavation permit under s.140 of the Heritage Act may be required if it is likely relics will be uncovered.

In the event that remnants or artefacts are found during the progression of works on the site, excavation or disturbance of the area is to stop immediately. In accordance with s.146(a) of the Heritage Act, 1977 the applicant must ensure the Heritage Council of NSW is notified within a reasonable time of the discovery or location of these relics. Archaeological assessment and approval, or endorsement, may be required prior to works continuing in the affected area(s) based on the nature of the discovery.

A policy of managing the known relics and an interpretative strategy developed on how to interpret any relics found on the site must be developed and subject to separate approval by Council's Heritage Advisor.

Reason:

To comply with the provisions of the NSW Heritage Act and to ensure the preservation and proper management of relics and historical artefacts.

1. GENERAL HERITAGE

(a) The proposed works are to be carried out in a manner that minimises demolition, alterations and new penetrations/fixings to the significant fabric of the existing building, which is a contributory item in a heritage conservation area.

(b) The fabric and features to be retained by the proposal must be properly protected during the process of demolition, excavation and construction. The protection measures are to be specified in the construction management plan.

(c) All conservation and adaptation works are to be in accordance with the Articles of the Australian ICOMOS Burra Charter 2013.

(d) New services are to be surface mounted rather than chased-in to existing walls to minimise impact on heritage fabric.

(e) Appropriately qualified tradespersons (as appropriate) are to be commissioned who are skilled in traditional building and engineering trades to carry out the proposed scope of works.

(f) The new windows and doors on the existing building must match the original material, which is timber joinery.

(g) The painted brickwork must not be rendered.

(h) Where internal partitions meet external walls they must abut window mullions, columns or other such building elements and not glazing.

(i) The works should be monitored and reviewed by a suitably qualified heritage consultant.
(a)

A heritage consultant experienced in heritage restoration and renovation works is to be commissioned to work with the consultant team throughout the design development, contract documentation and construction stages of the project. The heritage consultant is to be involved in the resolution of all matters where existing significant fabric and spaces are to be subject to preservation, restoration, reconstruction, adaptive reuse, recording and demolition. The heritage consultant is to be provided with full access to the site and authorised by the applicant to respond directly to Council where information or clarification is required regarding the resolution of heritage issues throughout the project.

Evidence and details of the above commission on the above terms are to be provided to Council’s Area Coordinator Planning Assessments / Area Planning Manager prior to commencement of work on site. The heritage consultant must sign off the completed project and submit a final report to Council’s Area Coordinator Planning Assessments / Area Planning Manager specifying how the heritage conditions are satisfied prior to the issue of an Occupation Certificate or the commencement of the use, whichever is earlier.
ITEM NO : 4.13

SUBJECT : MINUTES OF CONSERVATION ADVISORY PANEL MEETING HELD 11 DECEMBER 2019

STRATEGIC OUTCOME : MAINTAIN THE CHARACTER AND AMENITY OF HUNTERS HILL

ACTION : PROVIDE QUALITY TECHNICAL HERITAGE ADVICE TO RESIDENTS, DEVELOPERS, DCU, AND THE LAND AND ENVIRONMENT COURT

REPORTING OFFICER : GREG PATCH

PURPOSE
The purpose of this report is to provide Council with the Minutes of the Conservation Advisory Panel (CAP) Meeting held on 11 December 2019.

The purpose of CAP is to consider and advise Council staff on any matter of environmental heritage referred to the committee by staff including building and development proposals and plans or policies referred by Council or the General Manager.

RECOMMENDATION
That the report be received and noted.

ATTACHMENTS
1. Minutes of the Conservation Advisory Panel held 11 December 2019
MINUTES OF CONSERVATION ADVISORY PANEL

held 11 December 2019

COMMENCEMENT

IN ATTENDANCE

Cllr Ross Williams  Councillor, Hunter’s Hill Council
Cllr Jim Sanderson  Councillor, Hunter’s Hill Council
Tony Coote  Hunters Hill Trust Representative
Bronwyn Doutreband  Community Representative
Michael Lehany  Landscape Adviser
Brian McDonald  Heritage Architect

ALSO PRESENT

Steve Kourapis  Director, Development & Regulatory Services
Greg Patch  Heritage Adviser

APOLOGIES

Helen Temple Berry  Community Representative
Graham Atkins  Community Representative (Alt)

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Ross Williams – Item 3.1

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

RECOMMENDATION

The Minutes of Conservation Advisory Panel held on 20/11/2019 were read and accepted.

BUSINESS ARISING

2.1  SITE INSPECTIONS

PROCEEDINGS IN BRIEF

Nil.

REPORTS

3.1  6.00PM - ST JOSEPH’S COLLEGE, MARK STREET, HUNTERS HILL

PROCEEDINGS IN BRIEF

Cllr Williams left the meeting.

The Panel was addressed by Dr Chris Hayes, principal, project manager Peter Brogan and representatives of TKD Architects.

The property is heritage item No 286 (“St Joesphs College”), is within Hunters Hill
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MINUTES OF CONSERVATION ADVISORY PANEL  

held 11 December 2019

Conservation Areas C1 ("The Peninsula") and is a landmark building/complex. The stone wall to the perimeter of the college grounds is also a listed heritage item and there are numerous heritage items within the vicinity.

It is proposed to demolish the existing swimming pool and ancillary structures, and construct a new multi-use pool, a two storey change rooms/ multi-purpose building and reconstruct the war memorial.

In considering the proposal, the Panel advised:

- The proposal in its current form entails excessive removal of trees, including Brush Box, Swamp Cypress and a Black Bean, some of which have a substantial canopy and contribute positively to the character of the conservation area. Their loss will have detrimental effects, particularly in views from the east.

The proposed change rooms/multi-purpose building is of excessive bulk and scale and will have an overbearing presence and detrimental impact on Luke Street.

COMMITTEE ADVICE

That the Director, Development and Regulatory Services be advised that the Panel does not support the proposal in its current form.

3.2 6.20PM - 7 CRESCENT STREET, HUNTERS HILL

PROCEEDINGS IN BRIEF

Cllr Williams re-joined the meeting.

The Panel was addressed by the owners, Mr & Mrs McKinley.

The property is within Hunters Hill Conservation Area C1 ("The Peninsula") and is within the vicinity of heritage items at 13 and 15 Crescent Street. It is also partially visible from Alexandra Bay.

It is proposed to demolish the existing development on the property and erect a new house and garage. The proposal is essentially a design development of previously considered proposals.

In considering the proposal, the Panel raised issue with the lack of articulation in the proposal, the use of applied stone cladding, and the fenestration.

The Panel also consider that the proposal does not pass the "two-part test" for demolition/new houses within the conservation area as the proposal will not make an equal or better contribution to the character of the conservation area and setting of heritage items within the vicinity.

COMMITTEE ADVICE

That the Director, Development and Regulatory Services be advised that the Panel does not support the proposal in its current form.

3.3 6.40PM - 39 ALEXANDRA STREET, HUNTERS HILL
COUNCIL REPORTS
24 February 2020

MINUTES OF CONSERVATION ADVISORY PANEL
held 11 December 2019

PROCEEDINGS IN BRIEF

There was no representative of the applicants present and so the Panel considered the proposal in their absence.

The property is heritage item No 40 ("Shop" [Clarke's Store]), is within Hunters Hill Conservation Area C1 ("The Peninsula"). is located on a prominent corner and is within the vicinity of numerous heritage items, including "The Garibaldi" opposite on Ferry Street, and All Saints Church to the rear boundary.

It is proposed to use the property as a long day care childcare centre.

At least two proposals for adaptive re-use of this heritage item have previously been considered by the Panel, and it is noted that the current proposal does not include the previously approved single-storey posted awning to the Alexandra / Ferry St corner (based on historical photographic evidence).

Furthermore, the proposal entails excessive internal alteration of the heritage item, a paucity of meaningful landscaping, and will entail the provision of boundary acoustic screens and other paraphernalia associated with the proposed childcare use.

The proposed external materials, finishes and colours are considered inappropriate.

While not strictly a heritage/conservation matter, it was noted that there appears to be no plausible drop-off area nor vehicular parking provision, and that the proposed childcare centre use is inappropriate for such a location.

COMMITTEE ADVICE

That the Director, Development and Regulatory Services be advised that the Panel does not support the proposal.

3.4 7.00PM - 8 TOOCOOGA ROAD, HUNTERS HILL

PROCEEDINGS IN BRIEF

The Panel was addressed by the owner and John Rose of TKD Architecture.

The property is within Hunters Hill Conservation Area C1 ("The Peninsula") and within the vicinity of heritage items at 5 and 10 Tocoooya Rd.

The Panel was requested to review proposed design amendments to the street façade of the proposal and the landscaping of the property in light of comments made at the meeting of October.

In considering the amending proposal, the Panel found the change from scalloped arched to a more trabeated expression to be more appropriate in the context of the conservation area, and that the detail of the landscaping with regard to the existing and proposed trees to be acceptable.

COMMITTEE ADVICE

That the Group Manager, Development and Regulatory Services be advised that the Panel now supports the proposal.

Minutes of the Conservation Advisory Panel held on 11 December 2019.

This is page 3
OTHER BUSINESS

4.1 GENERAL BUSINESS

PROCEEDINGS IN BRIEF

NA

NEXT MEETING
The next meeting of the CAP will be held on Wednesday, 19 February 2020 commencing at 5.30 at the Council Chambers, subject to site inspections that may arise in the interim.
ITEM NO : 4.14

SUBJECT : MINUTES OF THE AUDIT RISK AND IMPROVEMENT COMMITTEE HELD ON 27 NOVEMBER 2019

STRATEGIC OUTCOME : COUNCIL IS FINANCIALLY SUSTAINABLE

ACTION : PROVIDE TIMELY FINANCIAL INFORMATION, ADVICE AND REPORTS TO COUNCIL, THE COMMUNITY AND STAFF INCLUDING THE LONG TERM FINANCIAL PLAN

REPORTING OFFICER : LISA MISCAMBLE

PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to provide Council with the Minutes of the Audit Risk and Improvement for 27 November 2019.

The purpose of the Audit Risk and Improvement is Committee to provide independent assurance and advise Council on risk management, internal control, governance and external accountability.

The Minutes of the meeting held 27 November 2019 are attached.

RECOMMENDATION

That the Minutes be received and noted.

ATTACHMENTS

1. ARIC Minutes 27 November 2019
COMMENCEMENT
The meeting opened at 2.15pm.

PRESENT
Ms Deborah Goodyer Independent Chair
Cllr Ben Collins Councillor, Hunter’s Hill Council
Mr Brian Robertson Independent
Barry Husking Hunter’s Hill Council
Susan Leahy Hunter’s Hill Council Internal Auditor
Lisa Miscamble Hunter’s Hill Council
Cameron Parsons InConsult (in attendance for item 3.2)

APOLOGIES
May Vilaythong – Hunter’s Hill Council

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST
The Chair called for Declarations of Interest without response.

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES
RESOLVED on the motion of Cllr Collins, seconded Mr Robertson
That the Minutes of Audit Risk and Improvement Committee of the meeting held on 9/10/2019 be adopted.

BUSINESS ARISING
2.1 REPORT ON ACTIONS ARISING FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS OF THE AUDIT, RISK AND IMPROVEMENT COMMITTEE
RESOLVED on the motion of Cllr Collins, seconded Mr Robertson
1. That the report be received and information noted.
2. That completed items be removed from this table after noting by the Committee.

REPORTS
3.1 PROPOSED MEETING SCHEDULE
RESOLVED on the motion of Cllr Collins, seconded Mr Robertson
That the report be received and noted.
3.2 ENTERPRISE RISK AND BUSINESS CONTINUITY MANAGEMENT

PROCEEDINGS IN BRIEF

Cameron Parsons from Inconsult provided an update on the risk management system and business continuity plan. Focus was at looking at ‘are there the right risks documented’ and then looked at the controls. This was based on any risk items from 2017 or arising from any other audit reports. Next phase is to undertake an assessment by business units and look at controls.

Points raised:
The existence of the ARIC is not mentioned in the high level document. Agreed to be added.
It was noted that it was good to see risk appetite covered.

Cameron also provided an update on the development of the BCP. This consisted of workshops to identify business impact analysis, a BCP and an IT disaster recovery plan.

Developed a BCP for Council. This included a workshop with the senior management team and walk through. Currently finalising some contact details with an exercise to be held early in the new year.

RESOLVED on the motion of Mr Robertson, seconded Cllr Collins
2. That Council’s updated risk register be submitted to the next meeting of the ARIC.
3. That the ARIC’s role be documented in the ERM Policy and Plan.
3.3 INTERNAL AUDIT REPORT

PROCEEDINGS IN BRIEF

Feedback was provided on the internal shared services program. The 2020 plan will include:
Physical access; DA process and procurement
Discussion around the 'i' in improvement and what that means. It was agreed that the 'Sustainable and Thriving' initiatives can form the basis of this and utilise the Pulse report for ARIC reporting.
RESOLVED on the motion of Councillor Collins, seconded Mr Robertson

1. That this report and the status of the 2019 internal audit plan be received and noted.
2. That the proposed 2020 internal audit plan be received and endorsed, subject to determining potential inclusions of risk management and privacy of information audits.
3. Agreed that the Directors be invited to the ARIC to present an overview of their 'Sustainable and Thriving' initiatives.

3.4 REVIEW OF ARIC CHARTER

PROCEEDINGS IN BRIEF

Discussion re the draft charter and composition. The draft was based on Ku-Ring-Gai Council's charter.
Discuss about the proposed removal of Councillors – as it reducing the linkage between the ARIC and Council; removes the ability to share information between the Council and ARIC –
Brian supported the inclusion of a councillor as it makes it more transparent and information flow better.
Agreed to amend the charter to 'one councillor' on the basis that Hunters Hill is smaller than Ku-Ring-Gai.

RESOLVED on the motion of Councillor Collins, seconded Mr Robertson

That clause 3.1 of the ARIC charter be amended to provide for one Councillor as a voting member in addition to the external members.

3.5 INTERNAL AUDIT RECOMMENDATIONS STATUS REPORT

RESOLVED on the motion of Councillor Collins, seconded Mr Robertson

1. That this report and the status of the previous recommendations raised by internal audit during 2019 be received and noted.
3.6 INTERNAL AUDIT REPORT - FRAUD AND CORRUPTION RISK ASSESSMENT

PROCEEDINGS IN BRIEF

That the report be received and noted.

RESOLVED on the motion of Cr Collins, seconded Mr Robertson

3.7 OLG - DISCUSSION PAPER, RISK MANAGEMENT AND INTERNAL AUDIT FRAMEWORK

PROCEEDINGS IN BRIEF

Members of the ARIC expressed that they will be preparing individual response to the discussion paper.

Key issues discussed:
- Around composition and whether there should be a Councillor rep or not
- Pre-qualification scheme and the need to provide criteria around local government experience.
- Remuneration: possibly suggest a different cost structure

RESOLVED on the motion of Cr Collins, seconded Mr Robertson

That the report be received and noted with the following:

1. Input from the ARICs of the shared service is being sought and a response from the shared service is currently being prepared. Feedback from this Committee will be sought for inclusion in the response and it is proposed that the draft will be circulated to members for their feedback prior to submission.

2. The Committee's feedback is to be received by 2nd December 2019 to enable time for collation, further review and then submission to the Office of Local Government on behalf of the shared service, noting that discussions have been held with NSROC who share similar views. The shared service response and NSROC responses will be exchanged prior to submission, to ensure that the submissions to the OLG are aligned.

The meeting closed at 3.25pm.
ITEM NO : 4.15

SUBJECT : MINUTES OF THE GLADESVILLE MAIN STREET COMMITTEE MEETING HELD 21 NOVEMBER 2019

STRATEGIC OUTCOME : PUBLIC PLACES ARE VIBRANT AND ACTIVE

ACTION : LIAISE WITH THE MAIN STREET COMMITTEES AND CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE TO SUPPORT AND PROMOTE LOCAL BUSINESSES

REPORTING OFFICER : FIONA MANN

PURPOSE
The purpose of this report is to provide Council with the Minutes of the Gladesville Main Street Committee meeting (Meeting) held on 21 November 2019.

The Committee is established for the purpose of:

1. Communicating to residents, business owners, landlords and visitors the benefits of a strong and vibrant business precinct and engaging their support and cooperation in the achievement of the Committee’s objectives.

2. Reviewing the various strategic documents produced for and by both Hunters Hill and Ryde Councils to identify and prioritise initiatives.

3. Develop strategies to create attractive and friendly places and enhance the economic viability of the Gladesville Village Precinct.

REPORT
Set out in the Attachment to this report, are the Minutes of the Meeting held 21 November 2019.

At the meeting, the Committee while considering the following item made a recommendation to Council:

(a) Minutes Item 2.1 – 1 Cowell Street Car Park – in ground sensors

Item: Parking time limits in the car park and consultation

Committee recommendation to Council

That the Local Traffic Committee be advised that the Committee supports a parking time limit of three hours between 8.30am and 6.00pm for the Council owned Cowell Street Car Park.

Comment

The Local Traffic Committee (LTC) at its meeting on 26 November 2019 considered an item on:
• the initial review of the two hour parking limit in the Council owned Cowell Street Car Park,
• the use of the in ground sensors,
• the app to monitor parking turnover, and
• consultation with local businesses about the parking limits.

Council Officers also spoke on the item at the LTC meeting with regard to the Committees' proposed recommendation to Council on the matter.

The LTC deferred the item, deciding to further consider the matter at its next meeting.

Recommendation

That Council adopt and note the Committee's recommendation and that it be considered in conjunction with the review of parking in the Council owned Cowell Street Car Park and in Gladesville as part of the development of the area-wide Parking Strategy.

RECOMMENDATION

1. That the Minutes of the Gladesville Main Street Committee Meeting of 21 November 2019 be received and noted.

2. That consultation about parking time limits in the Council owned Cowell Street Car Park be considered as part of an area-wide parking strategy.

3. That the Gladesville Main Street Committee be involved in any consultations about parking limits in the Council owned Cowell Street Car Park.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Minutes of the Gladesville Main Street Committee held 21 November 2019
COMMENCEMENT

The meeting opened at 6.05pm.

IN ATTENDANCE

Clerk Elizabeth Krassoi  Councilor, Hunter’s Hill Council
Mr Chris Schofield  Community member
Mr Ernie Zappia  Commercial member
Mr Harry Loi  Representative of Gladesville Shopping Centre site
Ms Hannah Goodchild  Centres Co-Ordinator, City of Ryde Council
Mr Steve Kurepis  Director, Development & Regulatory Services, Hunter’s Hill Council
Bec Ho  Acting Manager Place & Programs, Hunter’s Hill Council
Fiona Mann  Strategic Planner, Development & Regulatory Services, Hunter’s Hill Council

APOLOGIES

Clerk Ben Collins  Deputy Mayor, Hunter’s Hill Council
Clerk Penny Pederson  Councillor, City of Ryde Council
Mr Max McFarlane
Mr Russell Young

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Chair called for Declarations of Interest and Committee members made no declarations.

CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

RECOMMENDATION

That the Minutes of the Gladesville Main Street Committee meeting held on 22 August 2019 be accepted.


BUSINESS ARISING

2.1 BUSINESS ARISING

PROCEEDINGS IN BRIEF

(a) Cowell Street Car Park – in ground parking sensors

Mr Kurepis provided an update on the in ground parking sensors that have been trialled in the car park, which is owned by Council (Signal Place). He indicated Council’s Rangers are using the app to monitor parking turnover and where necessary have booked cars parked longer than the current approved two hour time limit.

He also indicated that the time parking limits need to be fine-tuned and flagged this with the Committee for further discussion. It was advised that the Service Delivery team has undertaken an initial review of the two hour parking limit in the car park in

Minutes of the Gladesville Main Street Committee held on 21 November 2019.
conjunction with the monitoring of parking via the in ground sensors and app and consultation with local business. This initial review is to be reported to the next Local Traffic Committee on Tuesday 26 November 2019.

Councillor Krassoi indicated that the monitoring of parking in the car park has freed-up parking, with parking spaces now more readily available.

A question was raised around what consultation was undertaken to inform the report to the Local Traffic Committee. Mr Kourepis indicated that the Director of Works and Services is seeking feedback from the committee on the matter to assist with the review of parking at the car park. This would also feed into an overall Parking Strategy for the Municipality which is being explored.

The Committee went on to discuss the matter further, noting that at the last meeting there was support for further investigation of consumer and business supported parking time limits to provide adequate parking times for trade to occur depending on the range of business and services available in Gladesville town centre. There should not be an over focus on time limits aimed at ‘high-turn over’ type businesses and commuter parking. The town centre needs to be active and a place for all users.

Ms Mann indicated there should be some variance in parking time limits to be responsive to town users and traders. Ms Goodchild indicated in her experience that 2 hours is good for retail business and three hours is good for commercial and services businesses. Mr Loi provided some thoughts around parking time frames for parking in proximity to Gladesville Shopping Centre site (GSV) and thought two hours was sufficient based on the GSV size and range of shops and in the overall Gladesville town centre.

It was agreed that the Services delivery team and the Local Traffic Committee should further liaise with business, the community, and the committee to ensure parking time limits in the car park are responsive to users.

Mr Kourepis indicated he would speak to the matter at the Local Traffic Committee meeting.

RECOMMENDATION TO COUNCIL

1. That the Local Traffic Committee be advised that the Committee supports a parking time limit of three hours between 8.30 am and 6.00 pm for the Council owned Cowell Street Car Park.

   Moved: Mr Schofield. Seconded. Mr Zappia

REPORTS

3.1 UPDATES FROM CITY OF RYDE COUNCIL AND HUNTER'S HILL COUNCIL

PROCEEDINGS IN BRIEF

City of Ryde

Ms Goodchild provided an update on planning and other matters being:

(a) Development applications
A list of development applications received by the City of Ryde for 21 August to 21 November 2019 and a map of significant development sites and their status was tabled. The following matters were highlighted:

- Gladesville RSL Club - construction commenced.
- Bunnings site – construction commenced.

(b) Coulters Street Upgrade - completed

(c) Pittwater Road Upgrade - completed

Hunter’s Hill Council

Mr Kourepis provided an update on planning and others matters being:

(a) Development Applications

- DA2017-1183. 219-221 Victoria Road, Gladesville (Commonwealth Bank). The matter is going to Court in early December (two weeks’ time). An amended design has been negotiated, including the retention of the facade, and the design complies with Hunters Hill LEP 2012 and Hunters Hill Consolidated DCP 2013.

- DA2017-1197. 223-227 Victoria Road, Gladesville (Gladesville Arcade). An approval has been finalised with a right-of-way for public access over the arcade. The design complies with Hunters Hill LEP 2012 and Hunters Hill Consolidated DCP 2013.

Mr Zappia asked about parking and Mr Kourepis advised it will be provided and accessed from the laneway (right-of-way).

Mr Loi flagged details about possible existing right-of-way or easements for adjoining landowners in the vicinity of the subject site. Councillor Krassoi asked Mr Kourepis about third party use of land and he advised that these are generally civil matter and noted that in the subject matter that the Court will approve the development and the right-of-way.


(b) Gladesville Shopping Village Planning Proposal

Council is still waiting on advice from the Department of Planning, Industry and Environment (Department) on its determination of the planning proposal. The General Manager has written to the Department on the matter.

(c) Gladesville Masterplan

Council resolved in late 2018 to prepare a Masterplan for the core blocks of Gladesville town centre, to better guide the vision for buildings on those blocks.

The project includes Block 1 (Massey Street to Cowell Street), Block 2 (Cowell Street to Junction Street) and now Block 3 (Pittwater Road to Massey Street).
The work was extended to Block 3, to include the three main commercial sites along Victoria Road.

Mr Kourepsis advised that the design and masterplan work for each of the core blocks has now been completed and Council was briefed on the masterplan vision for the three blocks on 11 November 2019. The consultant (GMU) is refining the masterplan work having meet attended the briefing ad will come back to Council with proposed final design details for the three blocks e.g. shadow, heights, scale, bulk, car parking entry, pedestrian access, frontages.

Mr Kourepsis explained who GMU is – Council’s urban design consultant undertaking the masterplan work and its role in the DA court cases. GMU also sits on urban design panels.

The next step is to present the proposed design and masterplan work to Council and land owners within the three blocks for feedback and thoughts. Mr Kourepsis indicated that:

- the landowners meeting will touch on the matter of amalgamation of sites
- the landowners are keen to talk about the masterplan work, the vision and development potential, for the blocks.

Subsequent steps could include amending the Hunters Hill LEP 2012 and Hunters Hill Consolidated DCP 2019, which also include consulting the community via the Community Participation Plan 2019.

3.2 UPDATES

PROCEEDINGS IN BRIEF

Gladesville Place Activation Project - Love Gladesville

Ms Goodchild and Ms Ho provided an update on the project, which includes:

1. Gladesville Brand/logo
   a. Brand launched and being established
   b. Calico bags produced and distributed

2. Gladesville Newsletter – Nil comment

3. Gladesville Brochure and Map
   Both items released this week and being distributed to business and available on the Love Gladesville webpage on both council’s websites.

4. Love Gladesville webpage
   Pages created on both council’s websites. Page to be created on the Gladesville Chamber of Commerce website.

5. Retailer Guide
Ms Goodchild, Ms Ho and Mr McFarlane to walk Gladesville town centre streets and talk with business about shop frontages and accessibility etc.

6. Activation projects - underway
   a. Mural at 230A Victoria Road completed (map of Gladesville)
   b. Plotting Land Marks project completed.
   c. Next two murals, waiting on land owners permission to lodge DA. Would include the Signal Hill history story.
   d. Street Planter boxes (garden beds). As a joint project (Hen Beds), the Happy Hens community group to plant up planter boxes and work with nearby shop owners to adopt the boxes/garden beds.
   e. Working with Mr Loi and the Gladesville Shopping Village site on the 50 Faces of Hunters Hill project.
   f. Bush Poetry and Gladesville School project – meet with teachers and students on the project that will see paintings on shops and pavements in Gladesville.

7. Activation projects – pipeline
   a. Copper Street - Street party, Friday 6 March 2020. Ms Goodchild advised an event planning committee has been established (i.e. Gladesville Chamber, Gladesville School, Gladesville RSL Club, The Bayview Hotel). Local business will be encouraged participate and help hand out show bags etc.
   b. Banners to Street Poles. A design for banner, along the lines of a painted murals (mentioned above), is planned. Link to ‘palette of colours’ developed for project. Mr Schofield, asked about media and promotion.

8. Gladesville Marketing Campaign.

Ms Goodchild, Ms Ho and Mr McFarlane to walk Gladesville town centre streets and talk with business about ‘my google business profile’ as a way to promote Gladesville and about the developed Love Gladesville communication strategy. Ms Goodchild indicated the project should be champion and lead by Gladesville Chamber of Commerce as a business development activity.

Ms Ho indicated that the Love Gladesville Facebook group has 800 members.

9. Business development. Ms Ho advised Hunter’s Hill Council has signed up to the Services NSW ‘Easy to do Business’ program that is a portal for business to explore and obtained approval for some forms of activities, and in this case Outdoor Dining. Ms Ho to further advise on business use of portal and take up on forms of activity.

Ms Goodchild and Ms Ho to continue working on the Love Gladesville for the benefit of businesses and residents living and working area.

The Committee was supportive of Ms Goodchild and Ms Ho’s project and their work to date was appreciated.
OTHER BUSINESS

4.1 GENERAL BUSINESS

PROCEEDINGS IN BRIEF

1. Gladesville Hospital Cemetery Memorial

Mr Schofield provided an update on the memorial event that will take place on 10 December 2019. The event will be prompted via Council's Communications Officer. Councillor Krassoi advised she has been liaising with the Mental Health Commission about the event.

The committee thanked Mr Schofield for bringing the event to the attention of the Committee and the councils.

2. Gladesville Chamber of Commerce update

Nil.

Ms Ho advised of the Chamber’s Christmas Party that will be on 5 December 2019. Other Chamber activities to be reported in the next Love Gladesville Newsletter (Edition No. 2).

3. End of Library Services Agreement with City of Ryde Council

Mr Schofield noted that the library services agreement between City of Ryde Council and Hunter's Hill Council and asked what arrangements have been made for the historical and local studies content for the Municipality held by City of Ryde Library Service.

Councillor Krassoi advised:

- the library services agreement will end in June 2020,
- she is on Council’s library planning committee, which will next meet in early 2020,
- the format of the new library space for the Municipality will be discussed at the next meeting, and
- she will raise the matter of the historical and local studies content held by City of Ryde Library Service at the next meeting.

Mr Schofield suggested there should be community engagement on Council’s new approach to library services in the Municipality and how people can still access Gladesville Library (City of Ryde Council). This to be referred to Council’s Communications Officer for an upcoming Council e-newsletter.

The meeting closed at 7.01 pm
The purpose of this report is to advise of Development Applications determined under delegated authority for the period December 2019 and January 2020.

RECOMMENDATION
That the report be received and noted.

DELEGATED AUTHORITY
In accordance with Section 327 of the Local Government Act 1993, authority is hereby delegated to the Director, Development and Regulatory Services to exercise and perform those powers, duties and functions in line with the authority and limitations of that position. These include approval and refusal of Development Applications as per Section 10 of Hunter’s Hill Council Delegations of Authority.

REPORT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Application No.</th>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Classification (BCA)</th>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Classification (BCA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DA2019/1098</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>R1a, 10a, 10b</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Certificate No.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Notification</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Value $1,173,799</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premises</td>
<td>3 Fern Road, Hunters Hill</td>
<td>Landscaped Area</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing Officer</td>
<td>Shahram Zadgan</td>
<td>Date lodged</td>
<td>3 Sept 2019</td>
<td>12 Dec 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>Demolition of existing dwelling, construction of new dwelling, swimming pool and landscaping</td>
<td>Compliant with LEP &amp; DCP - Approval</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Application No.</th>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Classification (BCA)</th>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>Classification (BCA)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DA 2019/1123</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Certificate No.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Notification</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Mr T &amp; Mrs L Young</td>
<td>Value N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premises</td>
<td>4 Woolwich Road, Hunters Hill</td>
<td>Garden Area</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing Officer</td>
<td>Anna Hopwood Martin Peacock</td>
<td>Determination Date</td>
<td>19 Dec 2019</td>
<td>12 Dec 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>Removal of one (1) tree</td>
<td>Compliant with LEP &amp; DCP - Approval</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Determinations

Approve removal of one (1) *Lagerstroemia indica* (Crepe Myrtle) tree with one (1) replacement tree to be planted.

**Tree 1 Lagerstroemia indica** (Crepe Myrtle)

- Mature specimen with low landscape significance
- The tree is in fair health as evidenced by a reduced crown density (50-75%)
- Poor form due to suppression from adjacent street tree
- Applicant proposes tree removal as the tree appears to be damaging the front boundary wall

The following replacement planting is required:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Minimum container size at purchase</th>
<th>No. of replacement plants required</th>
<th>Replacement tree Species</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within subject property</td>
<td>300mm</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>Camillea</em> sp. (<em>Camillea</em>) or <em>Acer japonicum</em> or <em>A. palmatum</em> (Japanese Maple)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Development Application** 2019/1061  
**Zone** R2

**Construction Certificate No.** N/A  
**Notification** Yes

**Applicant** Dr. Van Minh Nguyen & Mrs. Kim Thanh Pham Nguyen  
**Value** $597,810

**Premises** 5 Wybalena Road, Hunters Hill  
**Lansdcape Area** 54.52%

**Classification (BCA)** 1a & 10a  
**Date lodged** 14 Jun 2019

**Assessing Officer** Kerry Smith  
**Determination Date** 23 Oct 2019

**Proposal** New basement for parking and storage serviced by a car lift. New bathroom and louvres to existing services area on pool level. Pool fence relocated to lower ground floor and external stairs extended. Enlarge two approved kitchen windows on ground floor

**Determination** Approval

**Development Application** 2019/1005  
**Zone** B4

**Construction Certificate No.** N/A  
**Notification** Yes

**Applicant** Anthony Beattie  
**Value** $1,500

**Premises** 45 Gladesville Road, Hunters Hill  
**Lansdcape Area** N/A

**Classification (BCA)** 5  
**Date lodged** 16 Jan 2019

**Assessing Officer** Kerry Smith  
**Determination Date** 19 Dec 2019

**Proposal** Replacement of Telstra advertising on payphone booths on the footpath
## Determination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Application</th>
<th>2019/1004</th>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>R2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Certificate No.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Notification</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Matthew Vincent JCDecaux Australia P/L</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premises</td>
<td>101 Pittwater Road, Hunters Hill</td>
<td>Landscaped Area</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification (BCA)</td>
<td>10b</td>
<td>Date lodged</td>
<td>16 Jan 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing Officer</td>
<td>Kerry Smith</td>
<td>Determination Date</td>
<td>23 Dec 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>Replacement of Telstra advertising on payphone booth on the footpath</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determination</td>
<td>Refusal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Reasons for Refusal

1. No owner’s consent of Council has been issued for this application and hence there is no power to approve such application.

2. Advertisements are deemed prohibited within the B4 Mixed Use zone under Hunters Hill LEP 2012 and Council is not prepared to exercise its powers under 'existing use rights' of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979.

3. Council is not prepared to consider the 'existing use rights' for this development as it involves larger panels for electronically displayed and illuminated third party advertising.

4. The proposed development would add to the visual environmental clutter at this location and further restrict reasonable pedestrian/disabled footpath access which is undesirable to Council and the community.

5. The increase in size of the advertising panel and its situation in the footpath area of Gladesville Road makes it unsatisfactory and contrary to the objectives adopted within the Hunters Hill Village under the provisions of Part 4.5 of DCP 2013.

6. The proposal would create an undesirable precedent for Council.

7. The proposal would not be in the public interest.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determination</th>
<th>Refusal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Advertisements are deemed prohibited within the Low Density Residential R2 zone under Hunters Hill LEP 2012 and Council is not prepared to exercise its powers under ‘existing use rights’ of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Council is not prepared to support the argument of the ‘existing use rights’ for this development as it involves larger panels for electronically displayed and illuminated third party advertising in a residential zoned area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The proposed development would add to the visual environmental clutter at this location and further restrict reasonable pedestrian/disabled footpath access which is likely to be undesirable to Council and the community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The increase in size of the advertising panel and its situation in the footpath area of Pittwater Road makes it unsatisfactory and contrary to the objectives adopted within the Hunters Hill Village under the provisions of Clause 2.2.4(d) – Desired Character of DCP 2013.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The proposal would create an undesirable precedent for Council.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The proposal would not be in the public interest.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Application No.</th>
<th>2019/1130</th>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>R2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Certificate No.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Notification</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Kathryn Lisa Armati</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premises</td>
<td>1 McBride Avenue Hunters Hill</td>
<td>Landscaped Area</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification (BCA)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Date lodged</td>
<td>15 Nov 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing Officer</td>
<td>Anna Hopwood Martin Peacock</td>
<td>Determination Date</td>
<td>18 Dec 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>Removal of one (1) tree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determination</td>
<td>Refuse removal of one (1) <em>Glochidion ferdinandi</em> (Cheese Tree). Approve pruning with Conditions imposed to limit the extent of the works.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasons for Refusal</td>
<td>Very large, late mature specimen in good/fair health as indicated by the crown density and colouration of foliage.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The production of epicormic shoots throughout the crown is a typical growth response of a late mature tree. Although this signifies a reduction in vigour, it does not necessarily indicate that the trees remaining lifespan is very short.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tree is a locally indigenous species which contributes to the amenity of the site and harbour foreshore and has moderate landscape significance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Determination

- Applicant proposes tree removal as it is in poor health and is over-mature.
- The Arboricultural Report identifies a co-dominant inclusion between the main stems as a structural defect with increased likelihood of failure.
- It is acknowledged that bark inclusions can lead to branch failures however in the case of Tree 1 the inclusion is not considered a major structural defect based on the size of the inclusion and the relatively limited loading on the defect from the crown above.
- It should be noted that the tree was assessed following an extreme weather event which passed through the suburb (26.11.19). Although many trees were damaged, the co-dominant inclusion present at the base of Tree 1 showed no signs of movement at the time of assessment.
- The tree has had a number of live branch failures which appear to have occurred in the vicinity of decayed branch wounds/cavities.
- With appropriate pruning to reduce loading on decayed branches to minimise the likelihood of further branch failures, the tree can still provide a positive contribution to the canopy cover and amenity of the site and local area.

Pruning is approved with conditions imposed to limit the extent of the works

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Tree 1* 
Glochidion ferdinandi (Cheese Tree) | Rear garden | Remove third order branch (300mm diameter) at 3m above grade on western side of crown |
|                       |          | Reduction Prune damaged first-order stem on south-eastern side of crown. Branches pruned shall be no greater than 100mm diameter |
|                       |          | Reduction Prune/Crown Lift branches no greater than 50mm diameter on the northern side of crown |

Development Application No. 2019-1109
Construction Certificate No. N/A
Notification Yes
Applicant Mr Richard Roebuck
Value N/A
Premises 63 Downing Place Gladesville
Landscaped Area N/A
Classification (BCA) N/A
Date lodged 3 Oct 2019
Assessing Officer Anna Hopwood Martin Peacock
Determination Date 16 Jan 2020
Proposal Removal of one (1) tree
Determination

Approve removal of one (1) *Eucalyptus nicholii* (Narrow Leaf Black Peppermint) tree with one (1) replacement tree to be planted.

The following tree may be removed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tree 1 <em>Eucalyptus nicholii</em> (Narrow Leaf Black Peppermint)</td>
<td>Front garden</td>
<td>Extensive crown dieback</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Late-mature specimens with low to moderate Landscape Significance.
- The trees are in fair to poor heath and structural condition as indicated by crown dieback and multiple trunk and branch cavities.
- Application proposes tree removal as the trees are diseased and structurally unsound.

The following replacement planting is required:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Minimum container size at purchase</th>
<th>No. of replacement plants required</th>
<th>Replacement tree Species</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within the front garden</td>
<td>45L</td>
<td>1</td>
<td><em>Angophora costata</em> (Sydney Red Gum) or <em>Corymbia ficifolia</em> cvs. (Flowering Gum cultivars) or <em>Ginkgo biloba</em> (Ginkgo – male form only) or <em>Michelia doltsopa</em> (Chinese Magnolia)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note 1:** Please contact Council’s Tree & Landscape Consultant if you would like to nominate an alternate replacement species

**Note 2:** The replacement trees should be located at sufficient distance as to minimise conflict with adjacent structures when fully mature.

---

**Development Application**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Application</th>
<th>Zone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019/1089</td>
<td>R2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Construction Certificate No.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Construction Certificate No.</th>
<th>Notification</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$90,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Applicant**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Applicant</th>
<th>Landscaped Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sam Sheppard</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Premises**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Premises</th>
<th>Date lodged</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>47 Auburn Street, Hunters Hill</td>
<td>20 Aug 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Classification (BCA)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification (BCA)</th>
<th>Date lodged</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10a</td>
<td>20 Aug 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assessing Officer**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessor</th>
<th>Determination Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kerry Smith</td>
<td>16 Jan 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Proposed new double garage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reasons for Refusal

1. The proposal does not satisfy the provisions of Section 4.15 of the Environmental Planning & Assessment Act 1979, particularly in relation to clauses (1)(a)(i), (iii), (b)(c)(d) and (e) for general matters of consideration of development applications.

2. The proposal does not satisfy the planning and design principles of Part 3.6 of DCP 2013 in relation to Garages and Carports.

3. The proposal does not satisfy the Aims of LEP 2012 as set out under clause 1.2.

4. The proposal does not satisfy the provisions of Part 2 of DCP 2013 relating to Character and heritage of the Hunters Hill Municipality.

5. The proposal does not satisfy the objectives of the Low Density Residential R2 zone under LEP 2012.

6. The proposal would create an undesirable precedent for Council.

7. The proposal would not be in the public interest.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Application</th>
<th>Zone</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019/1140</td>
<td>R3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Certificate No.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Charles Amos</td>
<td></td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>$184,064.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premises</td>
<td>Unit 4, 10 Elgin Street, Woolwich</td>
<td></td>
<td>Landscaped Area</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification (BCA)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Date lodged</td>
<td>6 Dec 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing Officer</td>
<td>Kerry Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td>Determination Date</td>
<td>15 Jan 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>Alterations &amp; additions to existing residential unit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determination</td>
<td>Approval</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Application</th>
<th>Zone</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019/1139</td>
<td>R2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Certificate No.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Victor Molyneaux</td>
<td></td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premises</td>
<td>2 The Point Road Woolwich</td>
<td></td>
<td>Landscaped Area</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification (BCA)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td>Date lodged</td>
<td>5 Dec 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing Officer</td>
<td>Anna Hopwood Martin Peacock</td>
<td></td>
<td>Determination Date</td>
<td>22 Jan 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>Removal of two (2) trees and pruning of three (3) trees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determination</td>
<td>Approve removal of two (2) trees - Tree 1 <em>Populus deltoides</em> (Cottonwood) &amp; Tree 3 <em>Celtis occidentalis</em> (Hackberry) and pruning of three (3) trees with conditions imposed to limit the extent of the works</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following trees may be removed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tree 1 <em>Populus deltoides</em> (Cottonwood)</td>
<td>Rear garden</td>
<td>Poor structural condition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree 3 <em>Celtis occidentalis</em> (Hackberry)</td>
<td>Rear garden</td>
<td>Weed species</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tree 1 *Populus deltoides* (Cottonwood)
- Large, mature specimen with moderate landscape significance
- Poor health and structural condition as indicated by extensive crown dieback and decay
- Failed terminal resulting in large trunk wound with decay
- Application proposes removing Tree 1 due to the tree’s poor structural condition
- Application for tree removal is supported
- Replacement planting required to maintain the canopy cover within the suburb

Tree 3 *Celtis occidentalis* (Hackberry species)
- Small, mature specimen with low landscape significance
- Considered a weed species
- Application proposes removing Tree 3 due its weed status
- Application for tree removal is supported
- Replacement planting required to maintain the canopy cover within the suburb

The following trees may be pruned:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tree 2 <em>Ficus macrophylla</em> (Moreton Bay Fig)</td>
<td>Adjacent to garage and driveway</td>
<td>Reduction Prune branch first order branch over driveway by approximately 4m to suitable lateral branch. The maximum diameter of the finishing cut shall be no greater than 150mm diameter. Remove damaged and decayed 250mm diameter branch in upper crown (resulting from failed bark inclusion). The branches pruned shall represent no greater than 5% of the tree’s total crown volume.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Determination

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tree 4 <em>Araucaria</em> <em>heterophylla</em> (Norfolk Island Pine)</td>
<td>Rear garden</td>
<td>Crown Lift lower whorl of lopped branches as indicated in Tree Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree 5 <em>Macadamia</em> <em>tetraphylla</em> (Macadamia)</td>
<td>Rear garden</td>
<td>Crown Lift and Reduction Prune branches no greater than 100mm diameter to provide additional pavilion clearance and increase solar access beneath canopy. The branches pruned shall represent no greater than 5% of the tree’s total crown volume.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following replacement planting is required:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Minimum container size at purchase</th>
<th>No. of replacement plants required</th>
<th>Replacement tree Species</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within the rear garden</td>
<td>100 Litre</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1x <em>Caesalpinia ferrea</em> (Leopard Tree)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1x <em>Waterhousea floribunda</em> (Weeping Lilly Pilly)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Development Application**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2019/1142</th>
<th>Zone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019/1142</td>
<td>R2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Construction Certificate No.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Notification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Applicant**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barbara Webb</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Premises**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>19 Mark Street, Hunters Hill</th>
<th>Landscaped Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Classification (BCA)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Date lodged</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>9 Dec 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assessing Officer**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kerry Smith</th>
<th>Determination Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>23 Jan 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proposal**

Removal of three trees

**Determination**

Approve removal of three (3) *Acer negundo* (Box Elder) trees with two (2) replacement trees to be planted.

The following trees may be removed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trees 1-3 <em>Acer negundo</em> (Box Elder)</td>
<td>Rear Garden</td>
<td>Poor health and structural condition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Late-mature specimens with low to moderate Landscape Significance  
The trees are in fair to poor heath and structural condition as indicated by crown dieback and multiple trunk and branch cavities  
Application proposes tree removal as the trees are diseased and structurally unsound

The following replacement planting is required:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Minimum container size at purchase</th>
<th>No. of replacement plants required</th>
<th>Replacement tree Species</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Rear garden | 45 Litre                          | 2                                  | 1x *Camellia* sp. (Camellia species)  
or *Acer palmatum* (Japanese Maple)  
1x *Pyrus calleryana* 'Capital' (Capital Pear)  
or *Banksia serrata* (Old Man Banksia) |

**Development Application No.** DA 2019-1145  
**Zone** R2  
**Notification** Yes  
**Applicant** Ward Partners  
**Zone** R2  
**Premises** 2 Collingwood Street Woolwich  
**Notification** Yes  
**Applicant** Ward Partners  
**Value** N/A  
**Premises** 2 Collingwood Street Woolwich  
**Landscaped Area** N/A  
**Classification (BCA)** N/A  
**Date lodged** 10 Dec 2019  
**Assessing Officer** Anna Hopwood Martin Peacock  
**Determination Date** 22 Jan 2020

Proposal  
Removal of one (1) tree

Determination  
Approve removal of one (1) *Melaleuca bracteata* (Black Tea-Tree) with replacement tree planting of one (1) tree

The following trees may be removed:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tree 1 <em>Melaleuca bracteata</em></td>
<td>Outside front gate of property</td>
<td>Partially collapsed, senescent specimen</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The existing, semi-mature *Melaleuca bracteata* growing through the crown of Tree 1 must not be damaged by tree removal works
Determination

- Senescent specimen with low landscape significance
- The tree is in fair health as evidenced by a reduced crown density and the presence of moderate volumes of small diameter deadwood
- The tree’s structural condition is poor with the three (3) first order branches which support the crown having split apart and partially collapsed
- The collapsed branches partially obstruct the footpath and entry to the Applicant’s property
- The Applicant proposes tree removal as the tree is hazardous

The following replacement planting is required:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Minimum container size at purchase</th>
<th>No. of replacement plants required</th>
<th>Replacement tree Species</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within subject property</td>
<td>25 Litre</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Banksia serrata (Old Man Banksia)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Development Application No. 2019/1052

Zone R2

Construction Certificate No. N/A

Notification Yes

Applicant Minto Planning Services Pty Ltd

Value $3,158,210

Premises 22 Martin Street, Hunters Hill

Landscaped Area 60.8%

Classification (BCA) 1a, 10a 10b

Date lodged 31 May 2019

Assessing Officer Shahram Zadgan

Determination Date 21 Jan 2020

Proposal Demolition of existing dwelling and construction new dwelling, cabana, swimming pool and landscape works

Determination Refusal

Reasons for Refusal

1. The proposal does not satisfy the provisions of Section 4.15 of the Environmental Planning & Assessment Act 1979, particularly in relation to clauses (1)(a)(i), (iii), (b)(c)(d) and (e) for general matters of consideration of development applications.

2. The height of the proposal, being 3 storeys in height fails to comply with the maximum of no more than two storeys height limit as prescribed by Clause 4.3 of the Hunters Hill Local Environmental Plan 2012.
### Determination

3. The extent of the proposed excavation appears to be excessive. Excavation cut and fill for any development of the site shall generally be limited to a maximum of 1 metre vertical depth at any point, with a combined overall maximum vertical height of 1.5 metres. Excavation above this limit is usually an excessive intrusion on the natural topography of the site. Excessive excavation of the site will not be supported under the Local Environmental Plan 2012 Clause 6.2 – Earthworks and Chapter 3.3. – Clause 3.3.4 (f) Landscaped area within the Hunters Hill Consolidated Development Control Plan 2013.

4. The subject site is also located within the Foreshore Scenic Protection Area and, as such, assessment is required in accordance with Clause 6.7 of *Hunters Hill Local Environmental Plan 2012*. It is considered that the bulk/scale of the proposed structures may have an adverse impact on the character of the conservation area when viewed from the Lane Cove River.

5. The proposal was referred to Council’s Heritage Advisor who provided the following comments:

   Comments: the proposal appears to rely on the presence of an existing uncharacteristic/ nonconforming existing building on the property to justify its replacement by one of greater magnitude and similar presentation to Martin Street.

   The placement of the various components of the house down the slope of the site towards the Lane Cove River will lead to “foreshortening” and the appearance of an uncharacteristically bulky agglomeration of built form which will have adverse impacts on the character of the Conservation Area when viewed from the waterway.

6. The proposal does not comply with the relevant objectives, design parameters and preferred design elements under Part 2 of Hunters Hill Consolidated DCP 2013, in that the proposed building is excessive in bulk and scale and uncharacteristic, and fails to adhere to the urban form characteristics of the Municipality.

7. The proposal fails to comply with Part 3.3.2 Height DCP 2013, as the proposal breaches the height of external walls being 7.2 metres when measured in relation to ground level (existing) immediately below. The proposal contains three (3) storeys and would have the appearance of three (3) storeys from the waterway.

8. Design modifications are required to ensure the health and structural condition of Tree 4 Eucalyptus pilularis (Blackbutt) is not impacted by the proposed works.

9. Council has received five (5) objections to the proposal. The proposal is contrary to the public interest and would create an undesirable precedent undermining Council’s planning objectives.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>4.16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Page</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Development Application
- **Application No.**: 2016/1063-1
- **Zone**: R2
- **Construction Certificate**: N/A
- **Notification**: Yes
- **Applicant**: Geoffrey Kwan
- **Value**: $500,000
- **Premises**: 44 Prince Edward Street, Gladesville
- **Landscaped Area**: 52.2%
- **Classification (BCA)**: 1a
- **Date Lodged**: 25 Oct 2019
- **Assessing Officer**: Kerry Smith
- **Determination Date**: 21 Jan 2020

#### Proposal
- Alterations & additions including demolition of rear skillion, garage & shed, rear additions and internal renovations to existing dwelling – s4.55 – Delete upper level addition as approved

#### Determination
- Approval

### ATTACHMENTS
There were no attachments to this report.
ITEM NO : 4.17

SUBJECT : DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS DETERMINED BY THE DEVELOPMENT CONTROL UNIT IN DECEMBER 2019

STRATEGIC OUTCOME : MAINTAIN THE CHARACTER AND AMENITY OF HUNTERS HILL

ACTION : ALL BUILDING WORK COMPLIES WITH COUNCIL REGULATIONS

REPORTING OFFICER : STEVE KOUREPIS

PURPOSE

This report provides the outcome of determinations of Development Applications referred to the Development Control Unit (DCU) in December 2019.

The role of the Development Control Unit is to determine Development Applications where submissions have been received and/or reviews under Section 8.2 have been requested because a previous application has been refused.

All reports presented to the DCU as shown below are available on the Council’s website http://www.huntershill.nsw.gov.au/dcu.

RECOMMENDATION

That the report be received and noted.

REPORT OF MEETING HELD 18 DECEMBER 2019

The table below sets out a summary of the determinations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Application No.</th>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>R2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Certificate No.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Notification</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Applicant | Champion Homes Sales Pty Ltd | Value | $870,000

Premises | 92 High Street, Hunters Hill | Landscaped Area | 45.1%

Classification (BCA) | 1(a) | Date lodged | 9 July 2019

Assessing Officer | Shahram Mehdizadgan | Determination Date | 18 Dec 2019

Proposal | Demolition of existing dwelling and construction of attached dual occupancy with strata subdivision

Determination | The Development Control Unit Committee resolved:

That the development application No.2019-1072 for the demolition of existing dwelling and construction of attached dual occupancy with strata subdivision be granted a “Deferred Commencement” consent pursuant to Section 4.16 of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 in respect of No. 92 High Street, Hunters Hill subject to the following special conditions and standard conditions:
Schedule No.1

1. The following additional information relating to landscape management is required to be submitted for assessment:

Amendments to the Landscape Plan (prepared by Iscape Landscape Architecture, dwg no 203.19 (18)/536 A, dated June 2019) are requested that show:

- A redesign of the front garden area. Trees should be selected with consideration to the available growing environment.
- All proposed species should be notated.
- To compensate for tree/shrub removal along the western side boundary additional amenity plantings should be incorporated.

Stormwater Management

2. Stormwater from the site, prior to discharge to the receiving public stormwater drainage system shall be managed in accordance with Hunters Hill Council’s Consolidated DCP2013. General requirements are described as follows:

- The site catchment drains to the Lane Cove River.

- In accordance with Hunters Hill Consolidated DCP2013, the site is located in Zone 2 (ref. Figure 5.1, Catchment Management Zone, Section 5.6 Stormwater Management), which requires On-site Stormwater Detention. The DCP objectives for stormwater management states to “Promote water sensitive urban development” and “reduce adverse impacts upon water quality” due to "urbanisation". Furthermore “Appropriate measures should restrict the volume and rate of runoff to levels which, as near as possible, would have existed for a natural site prior to development”.

- The following stormwater management requirements are also triggered:
  1. Water Conservation
  2. Control Stormwater Pollution
  3. Extended Detention
  4. Flood Control Detention
- Design guidelines for the above are given in Hunters Hill Council’s Sustainable Water Part I and Part II, technical guidelines.

- In relation to Rainwater Harvesting, the BASIX Commitment requires minimum 3,000L to collect a roof area of 100sqm. Rainwater re-use shall comply with Sydney Water Guidelines and Council’s sustainable water requirements as given in Sustainable Water Part III.

- The stormwater concept plan provided by ANA Civil does not satisfy Council’s Sustainability Criteria. A Revised stormwater concept plan which addresses the above requirements along with supporting calculations, shall be submitted to Council for approval.

- The current concept plan is also deficient as follows:
  - Rainwater volume as given in BASIX Certificate is not indicated.
  - Detention storage volume has not been provided.
  - Detention volume configuration as stored in the rainwater tank does not work.
  - No alternative water sensitive urban design feature has been provided.
  - No supporting calculations.

**Traffic/Parking/Access**

3. The development includes a widened vehicular access to service the proposed dual occupancy. The following items are therefore required to be addressed:

- Vehicular access shall comply with the relevant provisions of AS/NZS 2890.1:2004 and Council’s Guidelines and Specifications for Driveway and Footpath.

- The applicant is required to provide the following details prior to the issue of Development Consent:

  a. Submit a longitudinal section along the extreme wheel paths of the new driveway demonstrating compliance with the scraping provisions of AS/NZS 2890.1:2004. It shall include all levels and gradients, including those levels shown as boundary levels, both existing and proposed. It shall extend from the centre-line of the roadway through to the parking area.
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Show the location of any verge trees, street furniture and services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Show minimum width of the driveway across the boundary and at the kerb line. The widths shall comply with Council’s Guidelines and Specifications for Driveway and Footpath.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Maintain the width and cross fall of the existing footpath such that where the footpath meets the new driveway, it shall not be steeper than 2.5% (1 in 40) to ensure compliance with AS1428 disabled accessibility for pedestrian movement and graded towards the road.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ATTACHMENTS**

There were no attachments to this report.
ITEM NO : 4.18

SUBJECT : DEVELOPMENT APPLICATIONS DETERMINED BY THE LOCAL PLANNING PANEL IN DECEMBER 2019

STRATEGIC OUTCOME : MAINTAIN THE CHARACTER AND AMENITY OF HUNTERS HILL

ACTION : ALL BUILDING WORK COMPLIES WITH COUNCIL REGULATIONS

REPORTING OFFICER : STEVE KOUREPIS

PURPOSE

This report provides the outcome of determinations of Development Applications referred to the Local Planning Panel (LPP) in December 2019.

The role of the Local Planning Panel is to determine Development Applications where submissions (10 and over) have been received and/or a Clause 4.6 (variation to Hunters Hill Local Environmental Plan 2012) has been received.

Panel Members:

The Hon. David Lloyd QC
Mr David Logan
Mr Chris Young
Ms Virginia Wise

All reports presented to the LPP as shown below are available on the Council’s website http://www.huntershill.nsw.gov.au/lpp .

RECOMMENDATION

That the report be received and noted.

REPORT OF MEETING HELD 19 DECEMBER 2019

The table below sets out a summary of the determinations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Application No.</th>
<th>2019-1026</th>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>R2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Certificate No.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Notification</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Chris Gadelrabb</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>$2,390,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premises</td>
<td>3 Hunter Street, Woolwich</td>
<td>Landscaped Area</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification (BCA)</td>
<td>1a, 10a, 10b</td>
<td>Date lodged</td>
<td>8 March 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing Officer</td>
<td>Kerry Smith</td>
<td>Determination Date</td>
<td>19 Dec 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>Demolition of existing structures and construction of new two storey dwelling with basement parking and swimming pool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determination</td>
<td>Deferred Commencement Approval</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
That a “Deferred Commencement” consent be granted pursuant to Section 80(3) of the Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979. The development consent as contained in Schedule 2 shall not operate (or be issued) until such time as the matters contained in Schedule 1 are finalised to the satisfaction of Council. The information requested within Schedule No.1, is to be submitted to Council within 12 months of the date of determination of this application, otherwise the application will lapse.

**Schedule 1**

**Root Mapping Report**

1. A root mapping report prepared by an Arborist with a minimum qualification (using the Australian Qualifications Framework) of NSW TAFE Level 5 or above in Arboriculture for the assessment of the potential impact of the proposed development on Tree 8 *Magnolia grandiflora* and Tree 11 *Eucalyptus saligna*. The report must verify the quantity, size, type, depth and orientation of tree roots along the footprint of the proposed basement excavations and building footprint in relation to Tree 8 *Magnolia grandiflora* and Tree 11 *Eucalyptus saligna*. The exploratory excavation must be carried out using non-destructive or non-injurious techniques and in the presence of a Level 5 Project Arborist.

2. The amending landscaping plans as received by Council on 18 July 2019 being subject to assessment by Council’s tree consultants and such conditions being incorporated in this Schedule 2 draft consent for the ‘outright’ consent at that time.

3. The detailing of the elevations is to be modified to be less historically derivative

4. The Schedule of finishes being altered to provide for the external walls being finished in a darker recessive colour and the ‘grit blasted limestone’ stone cladding being of a darker colour and the window/door frames being of a colour in less of a contrast to the satisfaction of Council’s Heritage Adviser in order to reduce the visual prominence of the dwelling. Details being provided to Council in two (2) hard copies and on a USB memory stick.

5. The extensive amount of glazing for windows and doors shown on the eastern elevation being reduced to give better compliance to the DCP accompanying the REP (Sydney Harbour Catchment) 2005. Details being provided to Council in two (2) hard copies and on a USB memory stick.
6. The existing sandstone stairs on Mayfield Avenue are to be retained. A new garage door opening may be provided at the southern end of the garage. The removed sandstone is to be reused to reinstate the wall on Hunter Street, that is to close up the existing opening.

7. The design be modified so that the rock remains in-situ in more or less natural strata without having to resort to rectification works that may include rock bolts and steel/concrete columns. Details being provided to Council in two (2) hard copies and on a USB memory stick.

8. Details of the sandstone retaining wall/drystone fence and the works/renovations on the Mayfield Avenue frontage being submitted to Council prior to the release of the Construction Certificate to be to the satisfaction of Council’s Heritage Adviser. In any event, the front fence above footway level on the Hunter Street frontage being retained, protected and preserved and no new palisade fence being constructed there in its place. Details being provided to Council in two (2) hard copies and on a USB memory stick.

9. Details of the construction, materials and colours of the vehicular sliding gate to Mayfield Avenue being lodged with Council prior to the issue of the Construction Certificate and to be to the satisfaction of the Heritage Adviser. Details being provided to Council in two (2) hard copies and on a USB memory stick.

10. A detailed geotech report being carried out and submitted to Council prior to the issue of the Construction Certificate for the sandstone retaining wall to be preserved along the Hunters Street frontage, the excavation works as well as the proposed vehicular opening to the Mayfield Avenue frontage rock face. Details being provided to Council in two (2) hard copies and on a USB memory stick.

REASONS FOR DECISION
The Panel supports the findings contained in the assessment report and endorses the reasons for approval contained in the officer’s report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECORD OF VOTING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Hon. David Lloyd QC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr David Logan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Chris Young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Virginia Wise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Application No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Certificate No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification (BCA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### RECORD OF VOTING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For</th>
<th>Against</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Hon. Davi Lloyd QC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr David Logan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Chris Young</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Virginia Wise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Application No.</th>
<th>2019/1120</th>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>R2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Certificate No.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Notification</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Hunter’s Hill Council</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Premises</td>
<td>22 Alexandra Street, Hunters Hill</td>
<td>Landscaped Area</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classification (BCA)</td>
<td>5 &amp; 9b</td>
<td>Date lodged</td>
<td>29 Mar 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing Officer</td>
<td>Kerry Smith</td>
<td>Determination Date</td>
<td>19 Dec 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Proposal

Access ramp for disabled persons, internal airlock to staff entrance, installation of lift, upgrade entrance foyer, access to toilets and office fit out

#### Determination

That the Local Planning Panel, as the consent authority, determine that Development Application No. 2019/1120 for alterations and additions to Hunters Hill Town Hall, at 22 Alexandra Street, Hunters Hill, be **approved**, subject to the following special conditions and standard conditions:

1. Amended plans shall be submitted detailing the design of the "focus rooms" to retain the existing raised dais, limit the partition wall height to 2100mm and to detail the works to be reversible by minimising physical impacts on existing fabric prior to issue of a Construction Certificate.

2. Amended plans shall be submitted detailing the design of the widened door opening to the Council Chambers reduced in width to ensure operation of the sliding door prior to issue of a Construction Certificate.

3. Detailed plans demonstrating the fabric and finishes of the lift and lift shaft, incorporating glass lift fronts, shall be submitted prior to issue of a Construction Certificate.

   **Purpose:** To minimise the visual impact of the lift.

4. A waste management and recycling plan in accordance with Chapter 5.7 of Council’ Consolidated DCP 2013, shall be submitted prior to issue of a Construction Certificate.

5. The handrail for the access ramp is to be detailed to the satisfaction of the Council’s Heritage Advisor so to be less utilitarian in appearance.

#### REASONS FOR DECISION

The Panel supports the findings contained in the assessment report and endorses the reasons for approval contained in the officer’s report.
COUNCIL REPORTS  
24 February 2020

RECORD OF VOTING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>For</th>
<th>Against</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Hon. David Lloyd QC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr David Logan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr Chris Young</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms Virginia Wise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ATTACHMENTS

There were no attachments to this report.
ITEM NO : 4.19

SUBJECT : MINUTES OF THE BUSHLAND MANAGEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE HELD ON 21 OCTOBER 2019

STRATEGIC OUTCOME : OUR NATURAL ENVIRONMENT IS PROTECTED, AND ENHANCED FOR FUTURE GENERATIONS

ACTION : ENCOURAGE AND SUPPORT ACTIVE COMMUNITY PARTICIPATION IN LOCAL ENVIRONMENTAL PROJECTS AND EVENTS

REPORTING OFFICER : JACQUI VOLLMER

PURPOSE

The purpose of this report is to provide Council with the Minutes of the Bushland Management Advisory Committee (BMAC) for 21 October 2019.

The objectives of the Committee are to:

- Assist Council in the formulation and implementation of bushland management strategies and initiatives;
- Use the expertise, experience and local knowledge of community bush care representatives to inform Council about best practice, bush health and priority areas / species concerning bushland management and rehabilitation, making recommendations where appropriate;
- Advise Council on bush care priorities including assisting Council with grant applications and in achieving optimum effectiveness and value for money in meeting bushland management and natural areas obligations; and
- Promote the value of Hunter's Hill's bushland heritage and bush care to the local community and encourage volunteer involvement.

The minutes are attached

RECOMMENDATION

That the report be received and noted.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Bushland Management Advisory Committee minutes 21 October 2019
COMMENCEMENT

The meeting opened at 2.30pm.

PRESENT

Cllr Jim Sanderson   Councillor, Hunter's Hill Council
Cllr Ross Williams  Councillor, Hunter's Hill Council
Vince Cusumano     Community Representative
Steven Buchert      Friends of Boronia Park
Jenny Craigie       Collingwood St Reserve
Kate Botting        Friends of Kellys Bush
Heather Armstrong  Friends of Buffalo Creek Reserve and the Great North Walk
John Harper         Riverglade Bushcare
Sally Gaunt         Tarban Creek Action Group
George El Kazzi     Director, Service Delivery and Special Projects, Hunter's
                    Hill Council
Esteban Zepeda      Bushcare Coordinator, Hunter's Hill Council
Jacqui Voltmer      Bushland Management Officer, Hunter's Hill Council

APOLOGIES

Bev Debrincat       Tarban Creek Bridge and Bedlam Bay
Liz Hinton          Friends of Kellys Bush
John Anschau        Friends of Betts Park and Gladesville Reserve
Brigid Dowsett      Tarban Creek Action Group and Ferdinand St Reserve
Bob Hayes           Friends of Boronia Park

REPORTS

3.1 INTRODUCTION AND WELCOME

The Bushland Management Advisory Committee members were welcomed and Committee members introduced themselves.

3.2 ELECTION OF CHAIR

Councillor Ross Williams was elected Chair of the Bushland Management Advisory Committee on the motion of Councillor Jim Sanderson and seconded by Kate Botting.

3.3 ADOPTION OF THE TERMS OF REFERENCE WITH AN AMENDMENT

- It was recommended to include "enhancement" in the third dot point under functions i.e. "support the protection and enhancement of bushland ..." in line with 36 (j) core objectives for management of community land categorised as bushland under the Local Government Act 1993 (NSW).
- Councillor Sanderson noted that there are reporting requirements under functions.
- Councillor Williams noted the original proposed Committee included parks and reserves however this Committee focuses on natural areas.
- It was recommended to endorse the Terms of Reference with an amendment.
George El Kazzi outlined that reporting of issues/complaints such as dead limbs overhanging bush tracks should be reported directly to the Customer Relationship Management System (CRMS) via Customer Service.

3.4 BUSHCARE GROUPS STATUS AND REPORTS

The bushcare groups reported the following key common issues:

Membership
• Bushcare groups identified that new membership was an issue for most groups.
• It was recommended that doorknocking is successful for recruiting volunteers.
• It was recommended to liaise with high schools i.e. Duke of Edinburgh via letter/email at the beginning of each year. The Mayor has a schools meeting.
• It was recommended that word of mouth and signage also works. There has been interest from SEEK Volunteering but not many have followed through.
• It was suggested to get the corporate sector involved to adopt sites.
• It was suggested to involve social community groups in projects such as the scouts working on a garden bed in Kellys Bush and schools hosting a patch of native bush on their sites.

Funding
• More funding was identified by some groups as an ongoing issue.

Control burns
• Some groups would like to investigate the possibility of further hazard reduction burns in locations such as Boronia Park and Kellys Bush.

Drainage
• Some groups identified issues with stormwater and sediment runoff into bushcare sites.

3.5 KEY ISSUES TO BE FURTHER DEVELOPED

Councillor Williams outlined future meeting agendas as follows:

1. Membership – Council Communications Officer to attend
2. Burning
3. Methodology
4. Drainage
5. Loss of peak species
6. Plans of Management for Boronia Park and Riverglade Reserve i.e. bushcare in these plans.

Other issues included:

1. Opportunity for sponsorship or cash contributions
2. Education i.e. TAFE and SES organisations
3. Guest speakers e.g. on fire regimes, chemicals and stormwater
4. Training

• Councillor Williams appreciates the efforts on the groups and would like to “sell” the benefits and measure success.
• Councillor Williams would like to optimise connectedness between bushland areas. It was suggested that tree planting to create canopy in parks and reserves was also important to achieve this connectedness.

Next Meeting 3 February

The meeting closed at 4.15 pm.

APPENDIX 1:

3.7 REPORTS FROM INDIVIDUAL BUSHCARE GROUPS

Tarban Creek Action Group (Sally Gaunt)
• A group of 4 to 6 working in North Tarban and Upper Tarban Creek Reserve.
• North Tarban is in good condition, with some woody weeds coming up.
• Flying-fox droppings and damage to canopy are issues but they come and go.
• Funds needed, more planting and more members.
• This groups issues include the health of Tarban Creek and the concrete weir which should be destroyed to allow natural flush and habitat.

Friends of Boronia Park (Steven Buchert)
• Low membership now but there have been bumper years, dedicated group and would like to make it a social event i.e. have a morning tea.
• It was reported that 5 trees in the open area are looking dead.
• Some tracks are now closed due to Privet regrowth.
• Boronia Park PoM will assist in bushland management.
• The biggest concerns are membership and the area Princes St to Bridal track to Montefiore.
• Currently working in an area as a show piece to attract people passing by.
• Interested in a control burn.
• It was asked how the group sets priorities i.e. using best practice approach and working from good to bad condition areas.
• The group has invited other bushcare groups to working bees.

Friends of Buffalo Creek Reserve (Heather Armstrong)
• This group works from Pains Road through wetlands to the viewing platform.
• Bush regeneration is organised, structured approach.
• Recruitment is a problem although door knocking was the best recruitment since 2002.
• Contractors have achieved a lot, and bush is generally in good condition.
• Coastal saltmarsh is under threat from sediment runoff from building sites.
• Pesticides in houses are affecting wildlife such as Owls via eating poisoned rodents.

Collingwood Street Reserve (Jenny Craig)
• The group has been going for 5 years.
• Previously neglected and containing Morning Glory, Madeira Vine, Lantana and Bamboo.
• Plantings have done well. Planting and weeding to a strategy.
• Currently 5 permanent workers.
• Constructed an informal track.
Only native groundcovers have regenerated naturally.
- The main problem is a large stormwater pipe which is a source of rubbish and weeds.
- It was advised that fixing the pipe needs to be included in the capital works program as it can’t be done with Council staff.

Friends of Kellys Bush (Kate Botling)
- The group works to a plan, everyone has their own areas to work.
- The group consists of 8 to 10 people.
- A pool used by Aborigines has been emptied of vegetation and it was reported recently that there is a further 2 or 3 pools in the vicinity.
- It was suggested that local Aboriginals be involved in the project.
- In the past, smoke testing and water smoke have been trialled for regeneration without success. Fire is needed.
- Trees have been poisoned in the past.

Riverglade Bushcare (John Harper)
- This group works in three areas; near the toilet block, around the retention pond, and near the Manning Rd boardwalk.
- Areas 1 & 2 have no major weeds and are under control.
- The group has 5 or 6 members.
- The major problem is weed grasses.
- The private bushland at the end of Fryar Place is owned by 3 stratas and would like Council to take it over.

Vince Cusumano – community representative
- Vince has 40 years’ experience in natural resource management.
- He suggested to get the corporate sector involved to adopt sites.
- He suggested to get volunteers involved in planting in the first instance before introducing them to weeding.
- Dead trees and dead wooding can be done by TAFE training days for arborist students and are free of charge. It was also suggested to approach the SES.
- It was suggested to involve social community groups in projects such as the scouts working on a garden bed in Kellys Bush and schools hosting a patch of native bush on their sites.
- The Boronia Park PoM is an opportunity to get actions in the PoM.

Friends of Gladesville Reserve and Betts Park (Esteban Zepeda)
- The group is mainly working in Betts Park pushing back the weeds.
- They will open up the canopy and plant in the future.

Bedlam Bay (Esteban Zepeda)
- The group is working at the Punt Road entrance leaving lantana as habitat.
- They are planning of doing a lot of planting as the reserve needs diversity.
- The group consists of 4 people.

Friends of Ferdinand St Reserve, Tarban Creek Bridge and The Priory will be discussed at the next meeting.
ITEM NO : 4.20

SUBJECT : COUNCILLOR BRIEFING: 4 NOVEMBER 2019

STRATEGIC OUTCOME : COUNCILLORS ARE SUPPORTED WITHIN A DEMOCRATIC GOVERNANCE FRAMEWORK

ACTION : PROVIDE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR COUNCILLORS

REPORTING OFFICER : LISA MISCAMBLE

PURPOSE
A program of briefings and workshops are held to:

- Foster effective communication between the elected Council and the administration
- Provide professional development opportunities
- Enable an environment where there can be open and frank conversations around organisational and strategic priorities.

Set out below is information relating to the Councillor briefing held on 4 November 2019.

RECOMMENDATION
That the report be received and noted.

PRESENT
Clr Ben Collins
Clr Elizabeth Krassoi
Clr Justine McLaughlin
Clr Zac Miles
Clr Ross Williams
Clr Jim Sanderson

APOLOGIES
Mayor – Clr Mark Bennett
General Manager – Lisa Miscamble

Staff:
Director, Development and Regulatory Services – Steve Kourepis
Director, Service Delivery and Special Projects – George El Kazzi
Acting Community Services Manager – Annie Goodman
Acting Manager, Place and Projects – Bec Ho

BRIEFING
This briefing provided Councillors with an update on the following matters:

1. **Place Partner: Place Score results and next steps**
   Place Partners provided an update on their recent survey work in Gladesville and Hunters Hill and provided suggestions for actions to be implemented.

2. **Love Gladesville**
   An update on the Love Gladesville project was provided. Initiatives delivered under this project to date include:
• Worked with local businesses and the Gladesville Chamber of Commerce to develop Love Gladesville
• Hen Beds x 7 installed in partnership with the Happy Hens
• Mural on Sunny’s Bakery
• Graffiti Moss logo at Westpac
• Poetry competition with Gladesville PS - poems will be installed in the New Year
• Development of Mural for Wilson’s Corner
• Banners being installed in collaboration with City of Ryde
• Coulter Street Event being held with City of Ryde.
• Web pages on HHC and CoR
• Facebook group - almost 1000 active members
• Development of brochure
• Development of Google Campaign
• Delivery of 2000 Love Gladesville canvas totes
• Painted seats

ATTACHMENTS

1. Gladesville Place Plan Oct 2019
The aim of this project is to beautify the Gladesville Town Centre whilst benefitting the local businesses and residents. It will also unify Gladesville by streamlining the appearance on both sides of Victoria Road for Ryde and Hunters Hill Councils.

The Happy Hens Social Enterprise Inc (The Happy Hens) can establish and maintain raised garden beds along Victoria Road and surrounds. Consultation with local business can connect their cultural needs with food and cooking, with the herbs and vegetables planted in the raised beds outside their restaurants. The businesses will "sponsor" the bed. For example, Rosso Italian would have Italian herbs including basil and tomatoes. Café Elation could produce Japanese herbs for their style of cooking. There are various Thai, Indian, Modern Australian cuisines offered in the Gladesville Town Centre.
HEN BEDS

The installation of raised garden beds throughout Gladesville Town Centre will have many advantages:

- Unification of both sides of Gladesville
- Both attractive and productive additions to the streetscape
- Goodwill to all businesses in the town centre.
- Education to all ages as to how to grow a sustainable garden.
- Residents can “own” their town centre - ours is the one with murals, raised garden beds, pop up shops... Councils thinking about their community needs. Soil and plants are for example, $140 for three cubic metres of soil with seedling herb calculated as per the size of the beds. Seedlings can be purchased from Henley Green Community Garden.
- Maintenance by The Happy Hens for two weeks to three months would include care taking, educating and communicating with the local restaurants who could then take over their care with a handover pack.
- Establishment - overseen by The Happy Hens with Council partnership.
- Gladesville Town Centre looks barren, and with some imagination, how sustainably responsible the Town could become, not to mention attractive!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Phase</th>
<th>Costs per bed</th>
<th>Art Box</th>
<th>Eco Timber</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council/TBA</td>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>Dependent on materials used</td>
<td>$8,000.00</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy Hens</td>
<td>Establishment</td>
<td>Soil, plants, Geotech, fabric, time.</td>
<td>$440.00</td>
<td>$440.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Happy Hens</td>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>2 hours per week</td>
<td>$160.00</td>
<td>$160.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handover Pack</td>
<td></td>
<td>Incl. 1*hr time, Happy Hen Watering Can, Happy Hen Care Instructions</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TOTAL PER BED</td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,700.00</td>
<td>$1,100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
GREEN CAFES

Good For the Hood will work with Huskee to activate a program which will approach 15 cafes in the Gladesville area (8 in Ryde and 7 in Hunters Hill) to manage the delivery of the Huskee Swap reusable cup pilot that will:

1. Engage cafe owners with an introductory letter and a face to face meeting with the 19 Gladesville cafes.
2. Support ongoing stakeholder relationship management for the duration of the pilot.
3. Provide a one page report at the end of the activation in conjunction with Huskee Swap outlining:
   a. the deployment - the number of cups, the number of cafes who’ve taken up the pilot, the ongoing float size, the number of coffees served in the busiest hour of business for each of the cafes.
   b. whether the cafes are equipped with the appropriate dishwashers and retail spaces to enable a larger activation.
4. Co-manage media and marketing the project as required for the pilot period.
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GREEN CAFES

A. Toby's Estate, Tower 3 International Towers
B. Toby's Estate, Tower 2 International Towers
D. Paloma Espresso
   Ground Floor/2D Shelley St, Sydney.
E. Good Vibes Only
   26b Sussex St, Barangaroo.
F. South Coffee & Food
   Tower Two, International Towers

Here's how it works:

1. Buy a HuskeeCup and download the HuskeeSwap app (coming soon)
2. Drop your HuskeeCup and lid at the counter and order as per usual
3. Get your coffee to-go in a different, clean HuskeeCup!

Join the Huskee family for 'Keep Australia Beautiful Week' (19th – 25th August) to help rid Barangaroo of single use disposables! We're offering free coffee in the precinct for the entire week for every HuskeeCup that is Swapped.

@huskeecup #huskeeswap
Visit www.huskee.co/swap today to learn more!
ART ALLEYS

$5500

$11000
Using Moss Graffiti technique, we will create a green wall on the side of the Westpac bank in Massey street. The suggestion is to use the words Love Gladesville in line with the current campaign.
Proposed: a combination of playful and sculptural new furniture combined with updating old street furniture with paint.
STREET FURNITURE
SIGNAL HILL ART PROJECT

In colonial times, a flagstaff was erected on the high point of a local ridge. It was an important communication point between Sydney and Parramatta, especially when the Governor was in residence at Parramatta. Signal flags relayed messages from Sydney to the next flagstaff near Brush Farm, and on to Parramatta. We propose an artwork painted on the wall in Signal Hill Car Park and installation of painted timber poles tied into the scheme of the precinct, representing the flagstaff.
SIGNAL HILL ART PROJECT
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hen Beds</td>
<td>4620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Cafes</td>
<td>3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainable Cafes</td>
<td>3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mural - Wilsons Corner</td>
<td>11000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mural - Sunny's Bakery</td>
<td>2200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mural - Sunny's Bakery</td>
<td>3300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banner Flags</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moss Graffiti</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flower Chairs</td>
<td>42900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footpath painting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light installation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paint existing seats</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paint existing planters</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal Hill sculpture poles</td>
<td>12000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signal hill mural</td>
<td>10000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>95520</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please note - some costs are estimates only
 ITEM NO : 4.21

SUBJECT : COUNCILLOR BRIEFING: 9 DECEMBER 2019

STRATEGIC OUTCOME : COUNCILLORS ARE SUPPORTED WITHIN A DEMOCRATIC GOVERNANCE FRAMEWORK

ACTION : PROVIDE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR COUNCILLORS

REPORTING OFFICER : LISA MISCAMBLE

PURPOSE
The purpose of this report is to provide a summary of matters discussed at the Councillor Briefing held on 9 December 2019.

RECOMMENDATION
That the report be received and noted.

PRESENT
Clr Mark Bennett
Clr Ben Collins (arrived at 5.40pm)
Clr Elizabeth Krassoi
Clr Justine McLaughlin
Clr Zac Miles (arrived at 5.40pm)
Clr Ross Williams
Clr Jim Sanderson

APOLOGIES
NIL

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE
General Manager – Lisa Miscamble
a/ Director, Corporate Services – Barry Husking
Director, Development and Regulatory Services – Steve Kourepis
Director, Service Delivery and Special Projects – George El Kazzi

BRIEFING
Information on the following was presented:

1. Legal Advice on the Notice of Motion on the 9 December business paper:

Council’s legal advisor provided an overview and provided advice on the matter.

This advice was reiterated at the Council meeting held on 9 December and assisted the Councillors in their deliberations.
2. Legal services panel

The a/Director, Corporate Services provided an update on the process undertaken as part of the legal services panel.

The report on the tenders was presented to Council at its Extraordinary Meeting held on 16 December.

3. Funding opportunities available through T-Corp

The a/Director, Corporate Services provided an overview of funding opportunities available via T-Corp to assist in funding works identified through the asset assessment work and process. This includes the links with the Long term financial plan.

This will be further explored in early 2020, once the asset condition assessment works are complete.

4. Rugby Club fees

The a/Director Corporate Services provided an update on the fees owed by the Hunters Hill Rugby Club and options for moving forward.

This item will be reported to Council in early 2020 for formal consideration.

5. Draft Use of Drones Policy

The Director, Development and Regulatory Services provided an overview of the draft policy. The purpose of the policy is to guide Council’s own use of drones.

The draft Policy will be presented to Council seeking endorsement for public exhibition early 2020.

ATTACHMENTS

There are no attachments to this report.