

Summary of Actions Arising (SOA) 2021 - Union Precinct

This document is North Sydney Council's response to actions arising from Precinct Committee Minutes. On receipt of the minutes, actions are numbered and allocated to relevant Council Officers for response.

To effectively manage and provide clarity, all actions are allocated a status when reporting to Precinct Committees in response to their minutes. There are three categories:

- **Awaiting Response** - action allotted to Council Officer - response awaited.
- **Open/Ongoing** - action allocated to Council Officer, initial response provided. Matter ongoing and further response/update to be provided at later date.
- **Closed for Council** - Council either completed related works/tasks or has taken all reasonable steps within its power to resolve issue (for example when matter is beyond its jurisdiction). If the Precinct Committee feels Council can take further steps, they can request Council reopen action.

Questions or concerns re content of this document should be directed precincts@northsydney.nsw.gov.au.

| Month | Item | Actions | Council's Reply | Status |
|----------|------|---|---|--------------------|
| December | 2.e | DA 101/2021, 206 Blues Point Rd, McMahons Point (Commodore Hotel) - Modification to consent to alter trading hours in certain parts of the licensed premises to be consistent with the approved trading hours in other parts of the licensed premises (i.e. Covered terrace to trade to midnight Mon - Thurs, 1am Fri & Sat, 10pm Sun). Precinct voted unanimously to make a submission against the extended trading hours in certain parts of the premises. This is in addition to the previous submission where Precinct opposed the modifications to the ground floor into a gaming room. | Comments noted by Council's Assessment Officer. | Closed for Council |
| | 1.ii | Miller St traffic - Precinct asks Council what its plans are for traffic in Miller St. A discussion took place about the pop-up outdoor eatery on Miller St. There were mixed feelings from members about the loss of lanes for | Council's Manager Strategic Planning has advised that Council has adopted various documents that strongly supports the creation of "Miller Place", which constitutes the closure of Miller Place between Berry Street and the | Closed for Council |

| | | | | |
|----------|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>traffic. Some were opposed to it and wanted the traffic reinstated, while there was also support for the initiative and a request to keep it going. The main concern raised was the possible closure of Miller St to traffic permanently.</p> | <p>Pacific Highway. The overall objectives of this are to build on the transformational placemaking benefits of Victoria Cross Metro by creating a more pedestrian friendly and safe CBD, keep "through" traffic at the edges of the city and create more open space for workers, residents and visitors. Council has been working collaboratively with Transport for NSW over the last few years to make this vision happen.</p> <p>Council's Manager Traffic & Transport Operations has advised that the Precinct Committee's comments will be treated as a submission regarding the Miller Street Pop-up. Reminder feedback closes 31 March 2022.</p> | |
| 1.iiiiii | <p>Homeless Person - There appears to be a man who has taken over the structure in Sawmillers Reserve for his home. Precinct asks Council what its strategy is relating to helping homeless people? And also asks Council to look into his welfare and the long-term sustainability of his presence there? What resources are available to help him and others?</p> | <p>Council's Access & Inclusion Co-ordinator has advised that they have attended the site several times with the Police to offer support and provide more suitable living arrangements. The person could not be engaged with and on the 9 December 2021 the local Mental Health Team and Police attended the site and the person was taken to hospital for assessment. His personal belongings have been removed by Council.</p> <p>In addition, the Co-ordinator has advised that information regarding Council's support of the homeless is available from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council's website • Homelessness and Housing Assistance flyer • Council's Homeless Strategy (Note: Strategy to be reviewed in 2021/22) | <p>Closed for Council</p> | |

| | | | | |
|----------|----------|--|---|--------------------|
| | 1.iiiiii | <p>DA397/21 - Installation of 2 x third party advertising signs on either side of the existing pedestrian bridge over the Pacific Highway. Precinct unanimously opposed the DA and notes that it's very distracting for motorists and did not like the aesthetic it brings to the area. Precinct also wanted to understand who stands to benefit from the income? Who receives the advertising revenue for this? Is it Council or is it the RTA or a private enterprise? Money collected from it should go into infrastructure for North Sydney residents.</p> | <p>Council's Director Engineering & Property Services has advised that the proposed Third Party Advertising Signage on the pedestrian bridge over the Pacific Highway is subject to Development Application Approval (DA). A DA was lodged in December 2021 and will be assessed against all applicable planning controls by an independent consultant planner. The application will ultimately be determined by the North Sydney Local Planning Panel as it relates to Council owned infrastructure. If the Development Application is approved, the income generated from the proposed advertising signage will be shared between Council and the applicant. The income received goes towards Council's capital works programs and community initiatives identified in the Delivery Program and Community Strategic Plan.</p> | Closed for Council |
| November | 1.a | <p>Noakes fire audit - The direction that residents should seek advice from their own insurers is not acceptable because it places the onus of safety and compliance on the residents rather than on Noakes. Residents raised concerns that if they were to contact their own insurers and advise that they are living next to a potential fire risk and the non-compliance with fire safety audits, their own premiums would go up.</p> <p>Without release private information, Precinct would like to understand what fire safety actions are being undertaken and what is the timeline for Council to achieve a compliant outcome?</p> <p>Precinct also notes that in line with item 5 from August, the Fire Safety Audit and the Annual Fire Safety</p> | <p>Council's Team Leader - Building Compliance has advised that when a building is first constructed, it would have been deemed compliant with the Building Code of Australia (BCA) at the time - including the fire safety measures. Over time, BCA requirements may change, but that does not necessarily render existing older buildings "non-compliant".</p> <p>Fire Safety Upgrade Orders are usually issued to liaise with building owners to upgrade older measures to meet the relevant standards of the time that the Order was issued. More often than not, upgrades of measures are complex and costly. Therefore, it is a standard procedure for Council to adopt a period of 2 years to allow building owners to undertake the necessary works.</p> | Closed for Council |

| | | | |
|-----|--|--|--------------------|
| | <p>Statements are two separate things. The Precinct then asks has an Annual Fires Safety Statement been submitted? If so when? If not, when does it have to be done by?</p> <p>Follow up request via email 18 July 2022: <i>The progress of the fire order at Noakes (non-compliant) 6 John St. Council has issued a notice. Please advise what works have been done to mitigate this fire hazard to the community?</i></p> | <p>In the case of Noakes, Council has adopted a period of two years to comply with the issued Fire Safety Upgrade Order. In the meantime, Council is satisfied that the existing essential fire safety measures installed at Noakes are compliant with the <i>Environmental Planning and Assessment Regulations 2000</i>. Council has arrived at this conclusion based upon Noakes submission of their Annual Fire Safety Statement. This Statement was submitted to Council in November 2021.</p> <p>UPDATE (18 July 2022) Council has written to the Noakes to request an update, however, they are under no statutory obligation to provide Council with an update until the expiration of the Order. The Precinct Committee will be kept updated should Council receive any advice from Noakes.</p> | |
| 1.b | <p>Noakes public jetty - Precinct thanked Council for the feedback from the Solicitor and noted that a resolution was put by Council again recently so appreciated that the public jetty continues to be on the agenda. What Precinct would like is for it to be resolved. Therefore, Precinct asks:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What is Council doing to push this along? Could we please have more information about the negotiations and where they stand? 2. We would like to know at what stage are the building works deemed “substantially completed”? 3. What works are outstanding in order for it to reach this level? Given the DA is thirty years old, | <p>Council’s Team Leader Building Compliance has advised that staff are liaising with Council’s lawyers to issue Orders requiring the construction of the Jetty. As this is now a legal process, Council is unable to provide a timeline in which compliance may be achieved, but can assure that staff will pursue this matter until it is resolved.</p> <p>UPDATE (27 January 2022) Council at its meeting of 24 January 2022 (Item 9.8 Notice of Motion 8/22: On-going compliance issues at 6 John Street, McMahons Point (Noakes’ Boatyard)) resolved:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>THAT Council be provided with an urgent report on the status of compliance issues, investigations and actions to enforce the conditions of consent of DA 1164/90 for redevelopment of the</i> | Closed for Council |

| | | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| | <p>what could compel the applicant to complete the works and the jetty.</p> <p>4. Precinct is concerned that the Applicant could possibly intentionally be avoiding completing the works to reach the “substantial level” so that it does not have to comply with Condition D51.</p> <p>5. What recourse does Council have to amend the conditions or provide a deadline for the jetty to go ahead with or without the building works completed?</p> <p>Continued request on December 2021 Minutes: Precinct noted Council’s response and acknowledged that given it’s a legal process, Council is not responsible for the timeline. However given the importance of this to the local community and the length of time it has been going on, Precinct will continue to ask Council for an update at each meeting. Therefore, can Council advise if there is any update? Have the Orders been issued? When does Council expect the Orders to be issued?</p> <p>Follow up request via email 18 July 2022: <i>The public jetty (still unbuilt) to be provided by Noakes at John Street. Where is this up to? Was reported to Council in 2017.</i></p> | <p><i>existing boat maintenance facility at 6 John Street, McMahons Point and compliance with the terms of the s34 agreement and subsequent Court Orders made by the Court in respect of Land and Environment Court Proceedings No. 2020/00122833, including, but not limited to, the enforcement of:</i></p> <p><i>(a) the public benefit condition D51 which required the developer to "provide a public jetty extending from land below John Street, approximately in the location of the former sea baths, subject to the design and position being acceptable to Council";</i></p> <p><i>(b) the numbers of boats to be permitted on the site at any time;</i></p> <p><i>(c) the unauthorised caretaker’s cottage and other unauthorised structures; and</i></p> <p><i>(d) environmental and operational conditions including noise standards and industrial equipment.</i></p> <p><i>2. THAT Council be provided with an urgent report on the status of compliance issues, investigations and actions relating to fire safety at 6 John Street, McMahons Point including issues relating to access to and egress from the site for fire trucks and emergency and the storage and use of flammable chemicals and materials.</i></p> <p>UPDATE (1 February 2022) Council’s Team Leader - Building Compliance is currently unable to provide any further updates on matter.</p> <p>UPDATE (3 August 2022) Council’s Team Leader - Building Compliance has advised that staff need more time to analyse and provide comment to this complex matter. A response will be provided in due course.</p> | |
|--|---|--|--|

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--------------------|
| | | DA 1164/90 - Precinct members asked for a copy of DA 1164/90 as it is not available on Council's DA tracker. A copy will be provided with the minutes. Members also raised concerns that the notice of DA that is on display at the site does not display the full picture of the numerous DAs applicable to the property. | Council's Executive Assessment Planner has advised that DA is only available as hard copy due to its age, and that Precinct Committee can submit a GIPA application to view the consent. In relation to the DA Notice it displays the current DA applications. | Closed for Council |
| | 4 | Waverton Peninsula Working Group update - Precinct noted the Council's resolution and thanked Council for voting to make it public. Precinct noted that when it concerns a public asset the community needs to know the detail to ensure transparency and accountability so are encouraged by the decision to make it public. | Comments noted by Council's Director Open Space & Environmental Services. | Closed for Council |
| | 6 | Consultation on Parking Restrictions, Princes St, McMahons Point - Precinct members noted that it is already difficult for residents to park, with the limited off-street parking and it was felt Princes Street was being singled out. There are other nearby streets with 30-minute parking so perhaps they could be considered too. | Council's Manager Traffic & Transport Operations has advised that the Precinct Committee's feedback is noted and will be treated as a submission. | Closed for Council |
| | | Draft Neighbourhood Parks Plan of Management - This proposal is relevant to Union Precinct given it covers parks in Ancrum, Euroka and Riley Streets. Precinct is in support of the neighbourhood park philosophy and the concept of community. There are concerns with the building up of the area, therefore offset of this is having neighbourhood parks. | Council's Landscape Planner/Architect has advised that the Precinct Committee feedback's is noted and will be treated as a submission. | Closed for Council |
| | | Draft Bushland Plan of Management - Similar to the Neighbourhood Park comment, Precinct is in support of | Council's Landscape Planner/Architect has advised that the Precinct Committee's comments are noted, and that | Closed for Council |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--------------------|
| | | <p>the bushland management philosophy and the concept of community. There are concerns with the building up of the area, therefore offset of this is having bushland. Precinct notes Sawmillers is not represented in either plan. Could Council please advise where Sawmillers would sit.</p> | <p>Sawmillers Reserve is included in the Foreshore Parks and Reserves Plan of Management (PoM).</p> <p>The current version of that PoM is available from Council's website. Staff are currently preparing the new version of the Plan to be presented to Council in February 2022, to seeking their endorsement to send it to Crown Lands. Crown Lands need to sign off on Council putting the PoM on public exhibition. Experience shows that this takes about four months. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that the draft Foreshore Parks & Reserves PoM will go on public exhibition in mid-2022. All Precinct Committees will all be notified when it does.</p> | |
| 9 | | <p>Balls Head Infestation - Members raised concerns about the infestations of white ant/termite nests on the trees on Balls Head. Precinct requests a comment from the Bushcare management team as to what's happening with termites on Balls Head.</p> | <p>Council's Bushland Management Co-ordinator has advised that the aerial termite nests seen around Balls Head belong to a native species: <i>Nasutermes walkerii</i>. This species naturally occurs in bushland and to a large extent, native trees are adapted to cope with their workings as they only affect deadwood rather than sapwood/living tissue. This termite perform important ecological functions including breaking down deadwood, helping hollows to form and cycling of soil nutrients. Also are food source for both vertebrates and invertebrates, and their nests are commonly hollowed out by Kookaburras and Kingfishers for their own nesting requirements. Council undertook a study in 2016 that found that the concentration of termites in Balls Head (and other isolated bushland remnants) was having a negative affect particularly on native rough-bark trees (i.e. Red Bloodwood; Red Mahogany and Blackbutts). As part of this study, we undertook targeted treatment of</p> | Closed for Council |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|---------------------------|
| | | | <p>nests in close proximity to the vulnerable tree species and recorded a positive health response.</p> <p>Recently, Council's Bushland Team engaged the same specialist arborist to undertake a follow-up tree health survey with a view to undertaking another round of nest treatments. This work is currently underway. The treatment of termites will likely be an ongoing/periodic management activity in Balls Head as some of the natural limiters for termites (e.g. echidnas) and the absence of fire from parts of the reserve will continue to foster an imbalance that favours the termites.</p> | |
| | | <p>Brush turkey management - A motion was raised and carried to see how the issues of Brush turkeys can be managed. Precinct requests a comment from Council as to what is being done/can be done about the brush turkey situation in the area.</p> | <p>Council's Bushland Management Co-ordinator has advised the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the Australian Brush Turkey first returned to North Sydney around 2011 and appears to have been steadily increasing in numbers ever since. The Brush Turkey is a protected native species and there are historical account of them being common in the area prior to the Great Depression. Council is supporting a University of Sydney research study that is looking at urban Brush Turkeys and changes in their population dynamics. • In natural areas, Brush Turkeys play an important ecological role in the turnover of leaf litter (which aids breakdown and nutrient cycling) , dispersal of plant seeds and fungi spores (which aids bush regeneration) and control of invertebrates. • Council, together with a number of other northern Sydney Councils and State agencies, undertake two 3-week fox baiting programs per annum. This | <p>Closed for Council</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| | | | <p>program has been running since 1999. In North Sydney, baiting only occurs in Balls Head (Waverton), Badangi Reserve and Berry Is Reserve (Wollstonecraft). The baiting duration and frequency is designed to suppress fox numbers in these reserves. Eradication is not possible or feasible given the widespread distribution and relatively high density of foxes in urban areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coordinated fox baiting across northern Sydney, from the Harbour to Hawkesbury has most likely led to a reduction in total fox numbers across this region, however this hypothesis has not been researched to-date. Anecdotally, species known to suffer heavily from fox predation, such as bandicoots, wallabies and possums have appeared to recover their populations over the past 20 years and expand their ranges, to the point that bandicoots (for example) have returned to some North Sydney bushland reserves after an absence of many decades. The same reduction in predation pressures may also have contributed to Brush Turkey numbers increasing, however this has not been studied to date so it cannot be stated with any confidence. Studies of fox scat and stomach contents analysis indicate that birds only make up a small proportion of fox diet in the northern Sydney region, so if there is a correlation, it does not appear to be strong based on the (limited) evidence we have. More likely is the suitability of North Sydney's urban environment to Brush Turkeys, where we have well-watered gardens; good canopy and a | |
|--|--|--|---|--|

| | | | | |
|----------------|----|---|--|--------------------|
| | | | <p>plethora of food resources including people feeding these (and other) birds.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council’s Bushland Team provide property-specific advice and assistance to residents dealing with Brush Turkey issues. We have also coordinated several community talks by Brush Turkey researchers/experts to help raise community awareness of the species. Where problems occur on Council land, steps are taken to ameliorate the community impact through the installation of partial barrier fences or increased cleaning of leaf litter etc. • Council is considering developing additional educational resources for local residents and an information campaign timed for the pre-breeding season (the majority of issues for residents occur during the breeding season from July to December). • The NSW Department of Planning, Industry and Environment’s (DPIE) website provides advice on living with Brush Turkeys. Where problems still persist, contact Council’s Bushland Team and request a home visit to look for site-specific solutions (where possible). Never feed Brush Turkeys or any other wildlife - this exacerbates the problem and can lead to other harmful impacts for both Brush Turkeys and other species. As Brush Turkeys are a protected native species, it is an offence to cause them harm, including their eggs/nests/chicks, without a permit issued by DPIE. | |
| October | 10 | Tunnel impacts on the local community - Precinct objects to the continuous reduction of amenity imposed by the State Government and asks Council to continue | Council’s Public Projects Interface Manager has advised that staff have been, and will continue to, advocate in the best interests of the North Sydney community. Council | Closed for Council |

| | | | | |
|-----------|------|--|--|--------------------|
| | | to act on our behalf to retain as much green and blue space as we can. Precinct supports Council in its continued efforts to place pressure on the State Government to defer to the wishes of the local North Sydney community, rather than simply imposing these infrastructure projects on the area, sometimes to its detriment. It was noted that Inner West Council is objecting strongly to the Western Harbour Tunnel, can North Sydney Council follow the views of its residents and do the same. | officers position is shaped by the various resolutions passed by the elected Council. It is expected that the newly elected Council will also seek to direct staff responses and to define what they consider the community interests. Council staff will continue to address challenges raised by these major projects in line with positions resolved by Council. | |
| | 11 | Blues Point Reserve - Metro is commencing community engagement about future activity around where the shed currently is. It was requested that Metro present at a Precinct meeting in the future. It is not clear whether the use of the site will be decided by North Sydney Council or the NSW State Government. | Council's Public Projects Interface Manager has advised that the reserve at Blues Point will be returned to Council's care and control in early 2022. There have been extensive community consultations, Sydney Metro and Council regarding the final design of the space and these negotiations are ongoing. It is noted that there will be no change to the traditional open space uses of the land. We expect an increase in the design quality and amenity of the reserve. Any request for Metro to present to a Precinct meeting should be made directly by the Precinct Committee to Metro. | Closed for Council |
| September | 2a-c | Response to Previous Minutes/Actions: Arising Noakes Fire audit action not considered closed - Precinct notes the three separate matters and hopes the following questions address this correctly. 1. Precinct is concerned that the Council has determined that there are no immediate public risks when there is | Council's Team Leader - Business Compliance has advised that, in relation to the insurance, it is recommended that individual building owners seek their own advice from their insurers regarding this matter. It is understandable that Precinct Committee has a general safety concern regarding the lack of recent formal Annual Fire Safety Statement from Noakes. Council takes fire safety matters seriously and | Closed for Council |

| | | | |
|----|---|---|---------------------------|
| | <p>no evidence available in the form of the Annual Fire Safety Statement to make that assessment.</p> <p>2. Precinct members have serious concerns about the high risk of fire and consequences.</p> <p>3. Precinct reiterates its question from the minutes of the previous meeting that were not responded to in the summary of actions (SOA) - What is the impact on insurance of non-compliance? Does the liability then rest with Council?</p> <p>4. The SOA says Council staff are in the process of liaising with the owners of the building to submit a current copy of the AFSS to Council for record. When does Council expect to complete this work? How long does the owner have to be compliant and submit the Fire Safety Statement? What is the explanation as to why an owner cannot submit what is supposed to be an annual fire statement for five years? Is there a process or communication breakdown?</p> <p>5. Precinct asks given that a fire statement has not been submitted for five years, can Council seek an audit as a matter of urgency?</p> <p>As can be seen from the comments and questions above, Precinct is worried and anxious about the potential safety issues resulting from a lack of fire certificate and would like Council to confirm that it is doing its utmost to have the situation rectified as soon as possible. Precinct would also like the SOA to reopen this item and not have it as Closed for Council.</p> | <p>appropriate actions are being taken in balance with the evidence available to Council.</p> <p>Without releasing private information, Council can confirm that staff have not closed this case/the matter is ongoing. Appropriate action in accordance with fire safety regulatory actions are being undertaken and Noakes is co-operating with Council to achieve a compliant outcome. Should the Precinct Committee have any further enquiries, please do not hesitate to contact Council's Team Leader - Building Compliance, Mr Long Huynh.</p> | |
| 2d | <p>North Sydney Olympic Pool redevelopment progress - Precinct thanked Council for providing a report to public but asked that it be enhanced to include performance</p> | <p>Feedback noted by Council's Director Engineering & Property Services and Corporate Contracts Manager.</p> | <p>Closed for Council</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|--------------------|
| | | against timeline and importantly performance against budget in the public documents provided at each Council meeting. | | |
| | 3 | Warringah Freeway Upgrade - Precinct is appalled at the removal of 700+ trees as part of the development of the freeway. Precinct reinforces our objection to the process and encourage Council to redouble their efforts to do something about it. | Council's Public Projects Interface Manager has advised that the Warringah Freeway Upgrade project, the Western Harbour Tunnel Project and the Northern Beaches Link project are State Significant Infrastructure and are approved by the NSW Government. Council has no role in approving the works or in auditing works. The planning approval for the projects contain detailed provisions for the appointment of independent environmental auditors and the preparation of a series of Construction Environmental Management Plans (CEMP's) that address matters such as flora, fauna, vegetation, dust and water management. These CEMPs are prepared by specialists firms and are approved by the NSW Department of Planning, Infrastructure and Environment (DPIE). Once approved they are made available on the project website. Due to the significant costs involved in the preparation of these plans and the lack of a defined role for Council in the approval process it is not a reasonable use of resources to undertake such a significant audit without a clearly defined benefit. Council is consulted in the preparation of the CEMPs and has the opportunity to identify any concerns that may arise. Such communications are ongoing. | Closed for Council |
| | 5 | Cycle route from North Sydney to Bradfield Park - Discussed at traffic committee, proposed stopping cycling on the pavement along the highway between Blue and Arthur Streets and requiring cyclists to use Miller and Lavender Streets. MOTION: Precinct passed a | Council's Suitable Transport Project Co-ordinator has advised that Council further considered this matter at its meeting of 27 September 2021 and resolved: <i>22. THAT Council acknowledges communication by local cyclists expressing their dissatisfaction. (General Business – Pacific</i> | Closed for Council |

| | | | | |
|--------|---|---|--|---------------------------|
| | | <p>unanimous motion to request that Council implement the original advice to the traffic committee and rescind the ban. Council should allow continued use of the highway by cyclists implementing a 10km/speed limit and slow signs. It should be emphasised that it's a shared path. It was noted that the alternative (up Lavender and Miller Streets) is not as safe as going along the highway. Some members were also concerned that Council's reaction to conflicting uses of public space was to ban one group over another - this does not make for a harmonious community and we should be looking for ways for different groups to co-exist.</p> | <p><i>Highway Shared Path) 23. THAT the implementation of items 3-5 of the resolution on item 5.4 from 23 July 2021 Traffic Committee meeting be delayed until an assessment of concept options for alternative cycling routes be prepared and brought back to the Traffic Committee. 24. THAT work with TfNSW to build the Pacific Highway Cycleway to address the underlying access issues. 25. THAT Council immediately erects signage and footpath stencils instructing cyclists to '! SLOW' and 10 kph speed advisory at this location. (General Business - Pacific Highway Shared Path) 26. THAT the Council writes to Bike North and to all submitters on the matter to promote the intent of the resolution to change behaviours and increase awareness of pedestrians in the area. (General Business – Pacific Highway Shared Path)</i></p> | |
| | 6 | <p>Noakes Boatyard - Council agreed to seek compliance with the terms of the LEC Orders, investigate fire safety compliance concerns raised by residents, and reiterated its commitment to pursuing compliance with the DA condition for the provision of a public jetty. Precinct supports Council in seeking compliance on the above matters. See above questions re Noakes Fire Audit.</p> | <p>Refer to reply to Item 11, August 2021.</p> | <p>Closed for Council</p> |
| August | 2 | <p>DA217/21, 2 Commodore Crescent, McMahons Point Construction of a carport and associated works - Submissions due 13 August. A question was raised by a member regarding the relation of this DA for a carport to a previously approved DA for an under-building garage. There currently isn't enough information for members to make an informed decision on whether to support the work. The Precinct resolved to ask Council to confirm (with the applicant) if the scope of works in this DA replaces the work in the previous DA or is in addition.</p> | <p>Council's Student Town Planner has advised that DA217/21 is not a modification to the previous DA at this address i.e. DA217/21 is an entirely separate application to DA132/20. The proposal seeks to construct a carport, accessed via Commodore Crescent. The existing garage space will be converted to a workshop/storage space under this DA.</p> | <p>Closed for Council</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|---------------------------|
| | 3 | <p>Local Council Elections - The Precinct resolved to support any motion by Council to present a referendum question as part of the election, in relation to the number of councillors and number of wards. The Precinct unanimously supports the principal of a total of 9 councillors and 3 wards, with 3 councillors to represent each ward, as it believes this would encourage greater participatory democracy.</p> | <p>Noted by Council's Executive Manager Governance, and Manager Council & Committee Services. As advised via the CPC meeting held 17 June 2021, this is a matter for the elected Council.</p> | <p>Closed for Council</p> |
| | 5 | <p>Noakes Fire audit - Council has placed a Fire Order on Noakes given its failure to conduct an annual fire audit since 2016. It was noted that there is currently a supercat blocking the Noakes driveway on John Street, which would impact fire egress from the site. Precinct unanimously resolved to ask Council the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Precinct is seeking assurance from Council that there are no immediate risks to residents from the non-compliance of safety requirements. • What is the impact on insurance of non-compliance? Does the liability then rest with Council? • Can Council advise when the fire order needs to be completed by? i.e. What is the date that Noakes needs to be compliant? | <p>Council's Team Leader - Business Compliance has advised that the Fire Safety Audit, Annual Fire Safety Statement and the docking of the Supercat are three separate matters:</p> <p>a) Fire Safety Audit - which lead to Council issuing an upgrade Fire Safety Order is a standard operating procedure. Fire Safety upgrades are frequently undertaken, either voluntarily or via privately commission Fire Safety Audits, to existing buildings within the North Sydney Local Government Area as a way for building owners to identify what measures they may need to install to upgrade their existing system. The Order Council issues is an instrument that permits the works to be done. As a standard procedure, Council allows a nominated period of 2 years to complete the works outlined within a Fire Safety Audit.</p> <p>b) Annual Fire Safety Statements (AFSS) - this is annually engaged by owners of the building to provide certification that any existing measures within the building are maintained and are functional. The AFSS is not an indication of compliance or noncompliance with current Building Codes. The submission of AFSS is statutorily the responsibility of building owners. In this regard, Council</p> | <p>Closed for Council</p> |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|
| | | | <p>staff are in the process of liaising with the owners of the building to submit a current copy of the AFSS to Council for record.</p> <p>c) Supercat blocking the Noakes driveway - this is not a fire safety matter but rather a matter of conditions of approval. Staff are in the process of investigating the matter.</p> <p>Based upon the evidence available to Council, it has been determined that there are no immediate public risks warranting Council issuing Emergency Orders. Council will continue to investigate and liaise with Noakes to achieve the level of fire safety upgrade recommended by the Fire Safety Audit.</p> | |
| 6 | <p>North Sydney Olympic Pool redevelopment progress -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Management to report on progress of North Sydney Olympic Pool on a monthly basis. • Precinct support the resolution that Council put forward. • Precinct also noted given the size and nature of this major infrastructure project for the Council, it is incumbent on each and every councillor to understand the detail of the build. There needs to be transparency and accountability within the system, particularly for a project of this nature. • Precinct requests the reports be posted on the NSC website. | <p>Council's Manager Corporate Contracts has advised that Council at its meeting of 26 July 2021 resolved as follows:</p> <p><i>1. THAT the General Manager provide a high level update/report on the progress of the redevelopment of the North Sydney Olympic Pool to each Council meeting until the redevelopment is completed.</i></p> <p><i>2. THAT Council notes that this report does not alter the governance structure of the project.</i></p> <p>The first progress report was presented to the Council on 23 August 2021 - Item 8.11 is publicly available within the business paper for this meeting. The progress reports will not include financial information, this is reported confidentially to Council via the quarterly progress report per the previously agreed governance structure.</p> | Closed for Council | |

| | | | | |
|--|----|--|--|--------------------|
| | 11 | <p>Public Jetty - The Precinct unanimously resolved to seek an updated from Council on the progress of the jetty/walkway.</p> | <p>Council resolved at its meeting held 23 August 2021:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>THAT Council seek compliance with the terms of the s34 agreement and subsequent Court Orders made by the Court in respect of Land and Environment Court Proceedings No. 2020/00122833; and</i> 2. <i>THAT Council investigate fire safety compliance concerns raised by residents and take any compliance action arising from the investigation as a matter of urgency.</i> 3. <i>THAT Council reiterates its commitment to pursuing compliance with condition D51 for the provision of the public jetty.</i> <p>UPDATE (1 November 2021)</p> <p>Council’s Solicitor has advised that that Council remains committed to the proposed jetty, to be constructed in accordance with the terms of the relevant development consent (DA 1164/90).</p> <p>There are certain precursors to the construction of the jetty. That is, certain matters need to be completed or satisfied prior to the Applicant, in accordance with the relevant development consent, being obligated to construct the public jetty.</p> <p>Condition D51 of the development consent relevantly states, in part: “The developer shall at no cost to Council provide a public jetty extending from the land below John Street... subject to the design and position being acceptable to Council. This jetty shall be completed and available for use prior to substantial completion of the approved building works”.</p> | Closed for Council |
|--|----|--|--|--------------------|

| | | | | |
|------|---|---|---|--------------------|
| | | | <p>According to legal advice provided to Council, the approved building works on-site have not yet reached a stage where Council has a legally enforceable right to “demand” or “enforce” condition D51. That is, as the building works on-site have not reached a stage where the law would consider the building works “substantially complete”, Council is, at present, unable to demand the public jetty be constructed.</p> <p>Despite the above, and according to my instructions, the Applicant remains committed to complying with condition D51, to include the provision of a public jetty, subject to the building works, in accordance with the development consent, reaching a point where they are “substantially completed”.</p> | |
| July | 1 | <p>Online meeting format - MC noted that given the stay at home orders from the NSW government, this was the first time the Precinct had met online. The meeting is using a free software platform but is requesting that Council allows the precinct to purchase a Zoom account from its funds.</p> | <p>Council's Community Engagement Coordinator has advised (per direct email correspondence) that the management responses to the consultant’s recommendations of the Precinct System Review included the proposal to permit use of remote meetings (if complemented with a minimum number of in person meetings per annum), and that a Zoom (or equivalent) subscription be purchased for Precinct use. As the Council resolved on 28 June 2021 to defer consideration of the Review’s next steps to the new term of Council, we are currently exploring how best to progress consideration of this initiative under the current PHO. The current Precinct System Guidelines do not formally permit use of remote/online meetings. Further information will be provided to all Precinct Committees in due course.</p> | Closed for Council |

| | | | | |
|--|----|---|--|--------------------|
| | 2a | <p>DA 172/21, 26 Thomas Street, McMahons Point - impacted neighbours sent emailed concerns and also presented at the meeting. One set of neighbours raised concerns about the engineering impact on their property, given the proposed retaining wall is due to be set directly against their property as it's on the boundary. Their property is a heritage contributory item being a weatherboard cottage and the proposed retaining wall would bury the side of their house and not provide sufficient airflow, potentially causing damage and rot to their home. Other concerns raised were about privacy and noise. The development proposes a roof terrace when there is already decent outdoor recreation space including a few large balconies on the lower levels, and a large back yard. Concerns that the roof terrace would be a source for noise and lack of privacy for neighbours. The property is a contributory heritage item and the addition of a carport the proposed carport is not in character. While some opposed the carport altogether, others did not, just concerned that it was larger than it needed to be for a single carport. The meeting noted and supported the objections of the neighbours and asks Council to consider these issues in the development assessment process.</p> | <p>Feedback referred to Council's responsible Assessment Officer.</p> <p>Note: this feedback was not received by Council via the online DA Submission Form which is the required format. As advised to all Precinct Committees via the memorandum dated 2 July 2021 (and noted in the Precinct Committees July minutes), the <i>Precincts DA Submission Form</i> has been discontinued. Instead, all Precinct Committees making a submission on an advertised Development Application (DA) or Planning Proposal (PP) must now use the online DA submission form as well as include reference within their Minutes.</p> | Closed for Council |
| | 2b | <p>DA 190/21, 3 Commodore Crescent, McMahons Point - The applicant addressed the meeting and noted that there would be little notable difference. The gate is changing to an electric gate and the car pad has to be lengthened back towards the house. It should be noted</p> | <p>Feedback referred to Council's responsible Assessment Officer.</p> | Closed for Council |

| | | | | |
|--|----|---|--|--------------------|
| | | that the previous rejection was based on the type of application, rather than a rejection of the plans. The meeting noted the application with no objections. | | |
| | 2c | DA 192/21, 67 Union Street, McMahons Point - The meeting noted it was a logical request and would be complimentary to the other restaurants on the strip. No objections. | Feedback referred to Council's responsible Assessment Officer. | Closed for Council |
| | 2d | Conciliation hearing, DA 8/21, 101 Blues Point Road, McMahons Point/ 55 East Crescent - The conciliation hearing is set for 25 July. MC will be appearing as she provided a personal objection. She will also note the discussion at the precinct level. At its May meeting, the Precinct encouraged Council to vigorously defend the appeal on the grounds the alterations are considered over development of the heritage site and not in keeping with the heritage nature of the building. | Noted by Council's Assessment Officer and the Council Solicitor. | Closed for Council |
| | 5 | Pendant lighting on Blues Point Road - Request to have the existing pendant streetlights switched on for pedestrian safety, particularly in the winter months. The Precinct asks Council to explain why the pendant lights on Blues Point Road in front of restaurant and shopping street are not used. Could Council please explain and if possible, have them switched back on? UPDATE (22 September 2021) Precinct Committee has provided photos as example of street light poles. UPDATE (24 November 2021) | Council's Traffic Operations Officer has requested that the Precinct Committee provide further information to enable the query to be investigated. Are these the under-awning lights or the decorative lights? Where in Blues Point Road are the lights. What are the pole numbers of the lights? UPDATE (23 September 2021) Item Allocated to Council's Property Maintenance Supervisor. UPDATE (5 October 2021) | Closed for Council |

| | | | | |
|------|---|--|--|--------------------|
| | | <p>Given Council has advised the street lights were working, could they say when they can be turned on as they were not on during winter. Could we approach the responsible officer at the beginning of winter to have them turned on at that time?</p> | <p>Council's Property Maintenance Supervisor has advised that Council owned street lighting assets in Blues Point Road are all working.</p> <p>UPDATE (27 November 2021) Council's Property Maintenance Supervisor has advised that the street lights at this location turn on by way of photo electric cell. This is activated as natural light diminishes activating the lights to turn on.</p> | |
| June | 2 | <p>Parking and pedestrian issues around Union St - The meeting resolved that the Precinct would ask Council to contact the Manager Traffic & Transport Operations to find out if the area was part of previous survey. Are there current plans around parking for that area? If not, could the area between the bus stop and the corner of Union St/Euroka (in front of 2A/2B Union St) be turned into restricted parking except for residents of Area 8.</p> | <p>Council's Manager Traffic & Transport Operations advises that the last resident parking survey in Union Street (Parking Area 8) was undertaken in 2010/11.</p> <p>The parking rates in North Sydney are set to demand manage parking and achieve the maximum use of this finite resource. Council generally aims for a maximum occupancy rate of 85% to best make use of the parking resource whilst still ensuring motorists are able to find a parking space.</p> <p>Council has undertaken several resident parking surveys within the LGA in the past year, and has found that there is very little support from residents in those areas for additional parking restrictions at this time, even in areas with high occupancy. Should the Precinct Committee demonstrate, through signatures, that there is support from residents for parking restrictions now then Council is happy to review the matter.</p> | Closed for Council |
| | | <p>Parking Patrols - The Precinct also requests for parking inspectors/rangers to come down Union St more regularly.</p> | <p>Council's Manager Ranger & Parking Services advises that parking patrols for Union Street will be increased in frequency.</p> | Closed for Council |

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|--------------------|
| | | <p>Union Street speed control work - The Precinct resolved to ask Council for an update on the status of the Union Street speed control work.</p> | <p>Manager Traffic & Transport Operations advises that the community engagement outcomes were reported to the Traffic Committee on 11 June 2021; the following recommendation was made and subsequently adopted by Council at its meeting on 28 June 2021:</p> <p><i>19. That Council, as part of the 2021/22 LATM Program, installs a concrete median and landscaped kerb extension in Union Street at the bend near Euroka Street, upgrade the road line marking and retain the existing garden bed at Bank Street as shown in the attached plan (Option 3). (4.5)</i></p> <p><i>20. That there be as much landscaping and softening as possible with minimal amounts of concrete. (4.5)</i></p> <p>The minutes are available on Council's website.</p> | Closed for Council |
| | 4 | <p>Update on Precinct Review Process - The Precinct felt it was too early to decide on any particular option and resolved to communicate to Council the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Union definitely does not want to merge with the CBD at any stage of this process • Union does not want to express a specific interest in merging with Edward at this stage. Any potential merger would need to be discussed further • Union would like to be involved in any further consultation on precinct boundaries and potential mergers. | <p>Comments noted by Council's Manager Corporate Planning & Engagement.</p> <p>UPDATE (30 June 2021)</p> <p>A report detailing the outcomes of the Stage 1 and 2 engagement, and the management resources to the consultant's recommendations, was reported Council at its meeting on 28 June 2021 (as deferred from 24 May 2021), whereby Council resolved:</p> <p><i>1. THAT the matter be deferred until after the Local Government Election on 4 September 2021.</i></p> <p>Further information regarding progress of the review will be provided to all Precinct Committees in due course.</p> | Closed for Council |
| | 5 | <p>Sydney Harbour Bridge cycle ramp - The Precinct asks Council to note the following:</p> | <p>Council's Manager Traffic & Transport Operations advises that the Precinct Committee's comments are noted.</p> | Closed for Council |

| | | | |
|---|---|--|---------------------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Union Precinct rejects the spiral option for its safety issues and impact on green space in Bradfield Park. • Union notes the TfNSW linear option has merit, but residents are concerned about impact of people in the park. • Union Precinct’s preferred option is an alternative option - an elevated cycleway ending at Middlemiss St or the tramway area in Blue St. • Union does not feel a lift is the only option, but could be part of a multi-faceted solution. • In the long-term, Union would support a dedicated cycleway on the Harbour Bridge. | <p>This is a TfNSW project and any submissions should be send to sydneyharbourbridgeprojects@transport.nsw.gov.au as listed on the TfNSW website https://roads-waterways.transport.nsw.gov.au/projects/sydney-harbour-bridge/access-projects/cycleway-access-proposals.html</p> | |
| 7 | <p>Webb St Parking Consultation - Council proposes to install “No Parking” restrictions from the south side of No 8’s driveway to the north side of No 10’s driveway. A resident of Webb St addressed the meeting to discuss the issues around this noting it’s a small, narrow street of 11 houses with only 6 having off-street parking. She also noted any loss of carparking would have a huge impact on an area that already has such limited parking. This sentiment was echoed by other members at the meeting. It is thought that the request was withdrawn, however residents would like to ensure that the parking changes will not go ahead. Precinct asks Council for an update on the consultation process. Is the removal going ahead? Precinct requests that it does not go ahead due to residents’ concerns about lack of parking.</p> | <p>Council’s Manager Traffic & Transport Operations advises that the original request to install No Parking in front of No. 8 Webb Street was withdrawn, as such Council is no longer proceeding with any changes and no further action will be taken with regard to this matter.</p> | <p>Closed for Council</p> |
| 8 | <p>Update on public consultation - Blues Point Road, McMahons Point - Speed Cushions - between Princes</p> | <p>Council’s Manager Traffic & Transport Operations advises that the Precinct Committee’s comments are noted and will</p> | <p>Closed of Council</p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | <p>Street and Henry Lawson Avenue: The Lavender Bay Precinct had requested someone from Council attend its meeting to discuss the issues of speed cushions on Blues Point Road. In lieu of someone attending, Council sent answers to a number of questions asked. These were read out in the meeting (and attached to the minutes). The meeting resolved to propose that the Traffic Committee implement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) 40km speed limit along the entire stretch of Blues Point Road (this would assist with the noise as well as speed) b) speed cameras c) spot Police patrols to issue defect notices. | <p>be included in the report on the community engagement outcomes to the Traffic Committee 23 July 2021.</p> <p>UPDATE (August 2021): Council considered the Traffic Committee minutes of 23 July 2021 at its meeting of 23 August 2021, and resolved:</p> <p><i>5. THAT that Council apply to TfNSW for a 40km/h speed zone on Blues Point Road between Lavender Street and Blues Point Reserve. The scheme should incorporate the traffic and pedestrian upgrades identified in the McMahons Point (Blues Point Road) Public Domain Upgrade Masterplan, and as minimal use of raised flat top thresholds as possible between Princes Street and Blues Point Reserve to address the TfNSW criteria for the proposed 40km/h speed zone. (5.3)</i></p> <p><i>6. THAT the raised flat top threshold be used instead of speed cushions. (5.3)</i></p> <p><i>7. THAT if the scheme cannot be implemented with a maximum of two raised flat top thresholds, then the matter be brought back to the Committee. (5.3)</i></p> <p><i>8. THAT following discussions with TfNSW on the proposed scheme, a report be brought back to Council outlining the proposed scheme, the cost implications of the proposed scheme, potential funding, proposed schedule and details of further community engagement if required. (5.3)</i></p> <p><i>9. THAT Council notes a preferred position for full width concrete or asphalt raised thresholds rather than rubber speed cushions for any speed humps proposed on Council roads, where it is practical and feasible to do so (5.3)</i></p> <p><i>10. THAT Council be included in the consultation process for the beautification works in Blues Point Reserve following the completion of the Metro works. (5.3)</i></p> <p><i>11. THAT Council seeks clarification on the timeline and status of the Metro works in the North Sydney LGA. (5.3)</i></p> | |
|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|--|--|
| | | | <p>12. THAT the application for Blues Point Road 40km/h speed zone ensures that there is no loss of parking. (5.3)</p> <p>13. THAT the previous resolution of the 30th April Traffic Committee (Item 5.4) regarding line marking and signage on Blues Point Road be prioritised (subject to Public Health Orders). (5.3)</p> | |
| 9 | <p>Floating Dry Dock appeal - KR addressed the meeting noting the Floating Dry Dock is subject to a planning appeal at the Land and Environment Court. As Union Precinct made a submission, we can nominate someone to be available to speak at the hearing on behalf of the Precinct. A motion was passed to allow members of the Precinct or other nominated precincts to represent Union and speak consistent with the submissions that have been made. The Precinct resolved in the affirmative that it wishes to join Council in the appeal.</p> | <p>Council’s Executive Assessment Planner/Solicitor have advised that “joining Council in the appeal” would take one of two forms:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Join as a party to the proceedings - the Precinct Committee would need seek its own legal advice in the first instance, with view to file a motion with the Court, seeking leave (meaning to seek permission of the Court) to join the proceedings; or 2. Be invited to attend the Hearing to make oral submissions to the Court - participate via the usual objection and submission process. That is, the Precinct Committee cannot present any legal arguments, representatives for the Precinct Committee would make verbal submissions to the Court objecting to the DA on the basis of impacts alone. Anyone wishing to make verbal submissions at the hearing should contact HWL Ebsworth - Kirston Gerathy on 02 9334 8628 or email kgerathy@hwle.com.au <p>Given the Precinct Committee’s lack of status as a legal entity, as well as limited budget, no paid office bearers, limited insurance cover extended by Council etc, option 1 is not viable.</p> | Closed for Council | |

| | | | | |
|-----|----|--|---|--------------------|
| May | 2a | <p>DA 101/21, 206 Blues Point Road, McMahons Point - Motion was put forward by EP for the Precinct to make a submission to oppose the DA, KF seconded it. The submission would be in line with the discussion of the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased patronage would create increased noise - this is especially concerning for the proposed expanded trading hours to 1am on Friday and Saturday nights. • Increase in staff required would also increase the need for already limited parking. • The loss of parking spaces would apply greater pressure on already limited parking. • An increased gaming room is incompatible with the character of the area and the village atmosphere of the neighbourhood. • It would create more congestion on what a busy intersection is already. <p>MCH agreed to make the submission on behalf of the Precinct Committee.</p> | Comments noted by Council's Assessment Officer. | Closed for Council |
| | 2b | <p>DA 95/21, 313 Pacific Highway - Demolition of existing structures and construction of four storey mixed use development with retail/commercial, boarding house with 36 rooms, rooftop communal facilities, basement parking - integrated development, basement. The meeting expressed its concerns about the proposal and questioned whether a boarding house with 36 rooms and rooftop facilities, is an appropriate use of the site given its proximity to schools, other apartments etc.</p> | Comments noted by Council's Executive Assessment Planner. | Closed for Council |

| | | | | |
|--|----|---|---|--------------------|
| | 2e | <p>DA 8/21, 101 Blues Point Road - Alterations and additions to medical consulting room including new administration areas, first floor residence, and various associated works. Refused 7 April, Appeal lodged 23 April. Precinct encourages Council to vigorously defend the appeal on the grounds the alterations are considered over development of the heritage site and not in keeping with the heritage nature of the building.</p> | Comments noted by Council's Assessment Officer. | Closed for Council |
| | 3 | <p>DA 57/19 Noakes Floating Dock - The Union Precinct meeting discussed that the Directions meeting that was set for 30 April did not happen and is now due on 14 May. Union Precinct along with others who have made an objection, has the opportunity to present at the Court and would need to make an application to the court to be heard. The meeting welcomed and supported Council's motion (9.3) to strongly defend the appeal. The meeting also passed a motion for the Chair to contact Council Solicitor CW in response to the invitation to discuss the way forward and our involvement in any court hearing.</p> | Comments noted by Council's Executive Assessment Planner, and Solicitor. | Closed for Council |
| | 6 | <p>Managing main harbour foreshore parks - The Union Precinct would like to notify Council that it supports the idea of a booking system to help manage the usage of the parks, however, does not appreciate non-commercial users being charged a fee. The example was given of a resident family picnic which could have more than 20 people, being charged \$195. The booking system should be free (particularly for NSC residents).</p> | Comments noted by Council's Director Open Space & Environmental Services. | Closed for Council |

| | | | | |
|-------|----|---|---|---------------------------|
| | 12 | <p>Program for Council elections 4 September - The Chair noted the protocols outlined by Council for candidates. The Precinct disagreed that it was inappropriate for candidates to address precinct meetings as it was a good way to get to know the candidates. While the Precinct accepts Council's protocols it requests a public "meet the candidates" event of some kind which would allow the community to learn more about potential Councillors.</p> | <p>Feedback noted by Council's Manager Integrated Planning & Special Projects. As advised to all Precinct Committees, Council resources cannot be used for campaign purposes, therefore Council, nor the Precinct Committees, can convene a meet the candidates' event of any kind. External groups including the local media or Chamber of Commerce could (if they elect to do so) facilitate such an event open to the public.</p> | <p>Closed for Council</p> |
| April | 2 | <p>DA57/19 Noakes Floating Dry Dock</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Precinct asks Council for an update on the appeal of DA 57/19 including advising when objectors would be informed, what involvement Council would be affording them and what is the position of Council on the appeal? 2. Precinct asks Council for an update on DA 11/21 and 13/21 and questions the lack of any DA being lodged for the extra vessels at the boatyard with reference to the Deed of Settlement, noting that they are being assessed by an independent planner. | <p>Council's Manager Development Services has advised that on 4 March 2021 Stannard's Marine filed an appeal with the Land and Environment Court of NSW against the decision of the Sydney North Planning Panel (SNPP). The Appeal is listed for directions on 30 April 2021, at which point in time the parties shall take Orders as to the management of the proceedings, to include the filing of a Statement of Facts and Contentions and the filing of expert evidence. Given the Appeal is one which is against a decision of the SNPP, in accordance with the Environmental Planning and Assent Act, 1979 PA, Council must take instructions from the SNPP as to the conduct of the proceedings. It is not able to manage the appeal in its own right. HWL Ebsworth Lawyers (HWL) have been briefed to defend the appeal, in accordance with instructions issued by the SNPP. Objectors should have already received advice from the Council of the receipt of the appeal and the role of SNPP in its direction. HWL have been instructed to inform all resident objectors of the appeal proceedings and when deemed appropriate, to invite resident objectors to make written or oral submissions during the course of the hearing of the proceedings. Further, HWL will be instructed, per the usual</p> | <p>Closed for Council</p> |

| | | | | |
|---------------------|----------|---|---|---------------------------|
| | | | <p>practice of the Court, to file and serve a bundle of documents to include all written submissions received by Council during the course of Council's assessment of the DA. It must be remembered that the role of submitters in appeal proceedings is dictated by the Courts rules with which the Council and the community are obliged to comply.</p> <p>The two DA's submitted following the Section 34 Agreement between Noakes and Council remain under assessment with Council awaiting further information from the applicant. The additional application required by clause "g" of the agreement has not been submitted and this together with compliance with the other undertakings contained within the Section 34 agreement are currently under review by Council's Compliance Team. Council acknowledges the community keen interest in this site.</p> | |
| | | <p>Traffic issues in John Street - Further traffic issues were brought up by a Precinct Member raised the issue of large trucks and cranes coming down John Street to Noakes which were blocking traffic as they unloaded in John Street as they are not able to take the sharp turn into Noakes. These trucks were blocking access to residents' driveways and access to Waverton Park. The meeting unanimously resolved that Precinct draws the attention to Council of the traffic issues in John Street and request a response on potential solutions.</p> | <p>Comments noted by Council's Traffic & Transport Engineer.</p> | <p>Closed for Council</p> |
| <p>March</p> | <p>3</p> | <p>Waverton Peninsula Working Group - The Precinct raised concerns regarding motion two - namely that it wanted an open and transparent process for potential</p> | <p>Council's Director Open Space & Environmental Services has advised that the Sydney Heritage Fleet is merely a proposal, Council currently doesn't have care and control of</p> | <p>Closed for Council</p> |

| | | | |
|---|--|---|--------------------|
| | <p>future use of the site. While it notes that no commitment has been made to SHF, it calls for Council to ensure transparency of the process and opening it up to other options. As per the Precinct's minutes of the October meeting when representatives from SHF presented, "The meeting resolved to write to the SHF stating that we liked the concept plan in principle, however the plan was not sufficiently developed to give support, as many aspects were still under consideration. Residents also noted that the final proposals should be totally transparent and honest.</p> | <p>the land proposed for this activity at this time or any jurisdiction over the water area of the Bay so at this time it is just a third party proposal for information.</p> <p>The NSW Government through Transport for NSW is undertaking a planning exercise to create a masterplan for Berrys Bay and have recently announced their community stakeholder representatives to progress the planning.</p> | |
| 4 | <p>Blues Point Road Traffic - The Precinct welcomes action from Council in this area, specifically it supports traffic calming. It also asks if the following points could be considered by the Traffic Committee and Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Raising the pedestrian crossing • Reducing the speed limit from the current 50kms per hour to 40km per hour <p>The Precinct also asks that the consultation area for the Blues Point Road speed cushions be broad to take into a larger number of residents, not only those located closest to the proposed speed cushion site.</p> | <p>Council's Manager Traffic & Transport Operations has advised that the Blues Point Road/McMahons Point Village Centre public domain upgrade includes a proposal to upgrade the pedestrian crossing at King George Street to a raised crossing. This is subject to availability of funding. Speed limits are set by TfNSW. For 40km/h a self-enforcing speed environment is required. If traffic calming is effective in reducing speeds to 40km/h then Council may apply for a 40km/h speed limit. Council will take Precinct Committee's comments into consideration regarding the survey area for the traffic calming scheme.</p> | Closed for Council |
| 5 | <p>Traffic Issues and speed controls - The Precinct welcomed the actions from the Traffic Committee and Council and thank them for this. The Precinct notes it is yet to provide its ideas for medium and longer-term suggestions to manage the traffic in the area, as it will wait for these actions to be completed so as not to duplicate efforts. It also notes that the flower bed on</p> | <p>Comments noted by Council's Manager Traffic & Transport Operations.</p> <p>UPDATE (26 May 2021) Council's Manager Traffic & Transport Operations is investigating and also has referred the matter to Council's Manager Ranger & Parking Services, to provide further advice to the Precinct Committee in due course.</p> | Closed for Council |

| | | | | |
|-----------------|----|---|---|--------------------|
| | | Union St/Bank St has been shaved and thanks Council for this. | UPDATED (7 July 2021) Response provided via Item 2b) from the Precinct Committee's minutes of July 2021. | |
| | 7 | Sawmillers Reserve Facilities - The Union Precinct supports more infrastructure within Sawmillers Reserve including additional kayak and boat storage, recreational facilities and toilets using the main sewer line. | Council's Director Open Space & Environmental Services has advised that there are no current plans to build more kayak or dinghy storage at Sawmillers Reserve. The Council proposed a few different quotes, layouts and locations for small watercraft storage to the community and the general consensus was the now current number and rack locations was about right. There is no current budget allocation or plans for the development of public toilets at Sawmillers Reserve, however a new Delivery Program will be prepared during the next term of Council. | Closed for Council |
| | 10 | Blues Point Road Beautification - asked that an update of the Blues Point Road Beautification proposal be provided by Council. Could Council please provide an update to the Precinct on the status? | Council's Project Manager has advised that amendments to the Masterplan addressing the community consultation outcomes is currently underway. This will be reported to Council on its meeting on 26 April 2021. | Closed for Council |
| February | 2 | DA 13/21 and DA 11/21, Noakes 6 John Street - These were discussed together. MC gave an overview of the DAs, disclosing she lives next door to the site. The meeting noted that the DA was missing vital information and is quite confusing. This makes it difficult for the community to make an assessment of the proposals. The DAs also appear to be misleading as they assume the buildings are legal, however members of the precinct believe they are unlawful, and these DAs might | Council's Executive Assessment Planner has advised that comments are noted. Any concerns regarding the adequacy of documentation and level of detail provided in the DAs should be included in submissions, together with any other issues of concern. Both DAs are being assessed by an independent planner. The assessment process will consider the legality of the buildings, whether the buildings are fit for purpose and | Closed for Council |

| | | | |
|----|--|--|---------------------------|
| | <p>be a way of getting retrospective approvals for the buildings. Precinct members have not been able to find approvals on record, including checking the North Sydney Council stamped and approved plans 9041/10 as adopted by Development Consent 1164/90. In addition, the Statement of Environment Effect references a building “was constructed absent of a building application”.</p> <p>There were also questions raised about the zoning of the site and whether residential usage was in keeping with the Local Environmental Plan. The Precinct would like to note that the DAs are confusing and asks Council to clarify the legality of the buildings, whether the buildings are fit for purpose and whether they meet building codes and standards.</p> | <p>whether they meet building codes and standards, among other considerations.</p> | |
| 3a | <p>North Sydney Olympic Pool - MC noted that the building contract has been awarded and there is an FAQ on the Council website. The pool will be closing at the end of February for the building works. There were questions from the floor about the budget increase and the voting records of Councillors with regards to the budget. The Precinct overall expressed concern about the allocation of the contract to the chosen builder given the quality issues the wider company has faced in the past. There are also concerns about the pricing of the contract and the escalating costs which may impact other areas of Council budget.</p> | <p>Comments noted by Council’s Director Engineering & Property Services.</p> <p>Council is hosting an online information session on 16 March 2021, from 6pm to 7pm regarding the NSOP redevelopment. Interested community members must pre-register to be sent the Zoom link. Questions to be addressed before (via the registration form), during and after this session. For more information visit https://www.northsydney.nsw.gov.au/InformationSessions.</p> | <p>Closed for Council</p> |
| 3b | <p>Western Harbour Tunnel - The Precinct raised concerns that many of the issues raised by the community have not been considered in the final decision. Examples</p> | <p>Council’s Manager Strategic Planning has advised that the WHT EIS was conditionally approved by the NSW Government. Whilst some of the issues raised by Council</p> | <p>Closed for Council</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|--------------------|
| | | include the impact on the town centre, traffic in Berry Street and intersection performance in surrounding streets. Can Council please advise what its response to the approval is? | <p>were indeed not satisfactorily addressed, there were several conditions imposed on the approval, that are welcome additions. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • E162 - Need to ensure the design of the WHT must not preclude the delivery of the objectives of the North Sydney Integrated Transport Program, which has been investigating such interventions as the closure of Miller Street ("Miller Place") and bi directional Berry Street. • E195 - An Active Transport Network review must be undertaken with Council. • E199 - A level extension of the existing footpath along the eastern side of the Cahill Expressway from the top of the stairs near the former toll gantry in Kirribilli, to the existing pedestrian crossing on High Street, North Sydney must be considered as part of the requirements of Condition E195. • E101 - The design and establishment of an altered Cammeray Golf Course must provide an equivalent standard golf course or the provision of works to offset the loss in standards. | |
| | 4 | Precinct System Review - The Precinct awaits the results of the review and looks forward to providing further input on the boundary redistribution once maps are available. | Feedback noted by Council's Manager Corporate Planning & Engagement. | Closed for Council |
| | 5 | Traffic issues and speed controls around Union/Euroka/Woolcott/Carr - The Precinct asks for the traffic survey to go to a wider group of people and not just those living in the immediate vicinity of the bend. | Council's Traffic & Transport Engineer had advised that a proposal for a Give Way sign and line marking in Woolcott St at Euroka Street was referred to the Traffic Committee on 26 February 2021 with a minimum response time of 10 | Closed for Council |

| | | | | |
|----|---|---|--|--|
| | | <p>The Precinct also asks for give way/stop signage and better displayed street signage, in addition to the proposed line marking restoration. The Precinct will prepare a paper with both short term and longer-term suggestions to manage the traffic in the area and will submit this to Council for consideration.</p> | <p>business days. Once the approval is received, Council will begin the installation of the the signs and line marking. The line marking in Bank Lane at Union St/Euroka St will be carried out under maintenance at the same time the signs and line are installed in Woolcott Street.</p> <p>Council will distribute consultation letters to the affected residents in Union Street and surrounding streets for the three proposals on the speeding issue in Union Street within the next two weeks.</p> | |
| 7a | <p>Speeding vehicles on Blues Point Road - The Precinct is concerned about the speed of vehicles on Blues Point Road. Particularly larger and contractor vehicles involved in the Harbour Tunnel at Blues Point.</p> | <p>Council’s Manager Traffic & Transport Operations has advised that recent traffic and speed counts in Blues Point Road between Lavender Street and Warung Street revealed the 85th percentile speed is 39km/h to 47km/h.</p> <p>Notwithstanding that the 85th percentile speed is below the 50km/h speed limit, the following recommendations were made by the Traffic Committee (in part):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>THAT Council consults with the affected community with regard to the speed cushion traffic calming scheme for Blues Point Road between Princes Street and Blues Point Reserve as shown in the attached plans.</i> 2. <i>THAT Council request police enforcement of excessive noise from vehicles, illegal parking and street racing as raised by local residents, particularly on Friday and Saturday evenings between 9pm and 4am.</i> 3. <i>THAT Council request TfNSW install a speed camera in Blues Point Road between East Crescent Street and Blues Point Reserve.</i> 4. <i>THAT the traffic calming proposal be included in any funding applications for the McMahons Point (Blues Point Road) Public Domain Upgrade Masterplan and vice versa.</i> | <p>Closed for Council</p> | |

| | | | | |
|----|--|--|---|--------------------|
| | | | The recommendations of the Traffic Committee will be considered at the Council meeting on 22 February 2021 for formal adoption. | |
| 7b | Anti-social behaviour at local parks - There have been large gatherings at local parks including Sawmillers and Carradah Park which have involved amplified music and excessive rubbish. The Precinct asks Council to consider more Rangers to manage this, especially at Sawmillers. The Precinct also asks Council attend to the rubbish bins in Carradah Park and Waverton Oval as they are often overflowing. | | <p>Council's A/Manager Ranger & Parking Services had advised that anti-social behaviour and noise from large parties/groups should be referred immediately to the Police, not Council's Rangers.</p> <p>Council's Supervisor Street Cleaning had advised that the bins are emptied once a day, seven days a week. The bins are intended for coffee cups and dog bags waste. The current level of service (bin size/frequency of emptying) are considered adequate for their intended use.</p> | Closed for Council |
| 7c | Henry Lawson steps from Commodore Crescent down to Waverton Oval - The Precinct thanks Council for the renovated steps and requests Council extend the works to cover a handrail. The steps are quite steep and there was a report of one local resident already having fallen. | | Compliment noted. Council's Street Alive Project Officer has advised that the works undertaken at Henry Lawson Steps were restorative, aimed at preserving the heritage value of the site, while also reinstating the existing staircase. The grade of the steps has not been altered and a handrail is deemed not necessary. | Closed for Council |