

## Harrison Precinct

### Minutes of Meeting

held on Thursday, 8 April 2021 at 5.30pm

at the Cammeray Golf Club

<b>Attendance</b>	<p>22 Attendees - as per Attendance Sheet which included 1 member from Bennett Precinct, two guests from Neutral Precinct and two guests from North Sydney Council</p> <p>15 Apologies: PK, DS, DA, GW, HL, JA, JA, LH, MB, FG, GT, JP, AL, DC, JQ</p>
<b>Previous Meeting</b>	<p>Minutes of the meeting held on 4 March 2021 were accepted and confirmed. Proposed: BD Seconded: AK</p>
<b>Guest Speaker from:</b> <b>North Sydney Council</b> <b>Manager, Strategic Planning</b>	<p>Council's Manager Strategic Planning (MO) and a member of his staff (Council's Executive Planning Advisor GM) attended as our guest speakers. The main purpose of the talk was to provide an overview of Strategic Planning with reference to the Development Control Plan (<b>DCP</b>) and its Area Character Statements (<b>ACS</b>).</p> <p>A brief overview was provided referencing legal documents, contribution plans, heritage, voluntary planning agreements and planning proposals.</p> <p>It is the Local Environment Plan (<b>LEP</b>) which sets specific zone and height controls. In terms of planning decisions it is the more "<i>onerous to overcome</i>". The DCP is 'subservient' to the LEP and is a more 'flexible' document and "is to be flexible in applying its provisions and allow reasonable alternative solutions".</p> <p>ACSs are included within the DCP. MO stated that North Sydney was one of the first councils to develop ACSs. It was acknowledged that many of the ACSs were prepared years ago and may need to be reviewed.</p> <p>OM agreed that the Murdoch Area statement (covering Harrison Precinct) is '<i>light on detail</i>' and ideally it too should be reviewed.</p> <p>The main obstacle to this review is lack of staff and resourcing. OM stated that "normally" his section would receive 4-6 Planning Proposals per year. However, recently four Proposals were received in 2 weeks. (Planning Proposal is a new term for "rezoning" which is no longer utilised).</p> <p>In terms of conservation, Council is currently relying on Interim Heritage Orders (<b>IHO</b>) to identify individual sites at risk. OM admitted that the IHOs were not a "particularly good way" to strategically review heritage. The current adhoc approach actually creates a lot more work for Council staff and other experts.</p> <p>A comprehensive review including public consultation was more effective but would cost approximately \$200-300,000 to undertake comprehensively. OM stated however, that it is uncertain whether a review would result in more or less heritage items.</p> <p>OM stated that heritage was one of the most "polarising" issues within Council and with its stakeholders. Currently NSC has over 1000 heritage items and 26 Conservation areas.</p>

	<p>GC, an owner of a property with a heritage listing, raised a few issues including uncertainty about who to approach to ask questions about what changes can actually be made to heritage listed property. GM said owners should not hesitate to call Strategic Planning by phone or in writing for a fair and quick response. If writing, it was recommended to provide photos and dot points of the issues.</p> <p>Regarding the removal of heritage listing from 125 Holt Avenue which was queried at a past Harrison meeting, OM said this was recommended in the 2007 Heritage Review but no copies of the full report which underpinned this decision can be found currently at Council or within the Stanton archives.</p> <p>OM stated that a heritage listing doesn't guarantee ultimate protection but it is harder to take away. State Heritage listed items are not usually included in the DCP.</p> <p>A question was raised about why older, single owner buildings seem to more frequently targeted for redevelopment. It was acknowledged that market forces, financial gain and opportunity greatly influence decisions by developers. Strata titled apartments and commercial buildings are also harder to redevelop due to the complexities of multiple owners.</p> <p>The new planning study for Neutral Bay Village will guide future changes to planning controls for the area including the existing ACS. OM stated that it is a "conscious decision of Council" to specify the future direction of Neutral Bay.</p>
<p><b>Military Road Corridor Planning Study (Neutral Bay Future Directions)</b></p>	<p><b>Military Road Corridor Planning Study (Neutral Bay Town Centre Planning Study)</b></p> <p>Attendees expressed disappointment that the majority of Councillors had chosen not to consider or support a Recission Motion presented by Crs Baker, Beregi &amp; Carr at 22 March Council meeting, and that the Mayor, in particular, appeared to be gauging public support by the number of people who attend Public Forums without reference to her own Council's Covid restrictions which limit the number of attendees.</p> <p>In response to this discussion, it was agreed to send the Mayor and Councillors the following Motion:</p> <p><b>Motion:</b> That Harrison/Bennett Precinct express disappointment that attendance numbers at Public Forums are being used as the main measure of support for items and that written submissions are not being counted or referred to as part of the decision-making process. We wish to express our thanks to the Councillors who attempted to have the Military Road/Future Directions Report (Neutral Bay) rescinded.</p> <p>Vote: For: 10 Abstain: 8 Against: Nil</p> <p>It should be noted that the attendees who voted to "Abstain" appeared to have no or scant knowledge of the specific proposals outlined within the Neutral Bay Planning Study.</p>
<p><b>Spofforth St intersection improvements</b></p>	<p>General: Overall meeting attendees were grateful that Council has at last proposed intersection improvements after many years of feedback from residents and our Precinct.</p> <p>One issue raised was that the current study does not address the excess speed of traffic on Spofforth Street and the grid-lock in the</p>

	<p>Rangers Road/Murdoch Street/Spofforth Street triangle during SCEGGS Redlands Junior school drop off and pick-up times. All attendees agreed that the SCEGGS congestion issue must be considered when reaching a final decision regarding the Rangers Road intersection improvements.</p> <p>Meeting attendees agreed the best option for Holt Ave was the roundabout.</p> <p>It was agreed unanimously that the meeting express its thanks to Council as follows:</p> <p><b>Motion:</b> Harrison/Bennett Precinct wishes to express its appreciation to North Sydney Council for its effort in liaising with Mosman Council and advancing this project to this final stage.</p> <p><b>Action needed:</b> To return the illuminated Variable Speed indicator sign to Spofforth Street.</p>
<b>Other business and future meeting topics</b>	<p>It was agreed that the May meeting would focus on community, street gardens and other environmental initiatives from Council.</p> <p><b>Action:</b> Convenor will contact Precinct staff to organise a suitable speaker.</p>
<b>Meeting concluded</b>	7.30 pm
<b>Next Meeting</b>	5.30 pm Thursday, 6 May 2021 at Cammeray Golf Club.